tice, his work in the reorganization of the administration of justice within the courts of this State constitutes possibly his greatest contribution. It is believed that he accomplished more in this field than any other individual in this or any other previous generation. He was also instrumental in organizing the conference of chief justices. I have some firsthand knowledge of his interest in his reorganizational work and of the monumental proportions of his efforts. I am sure that he would regard his accomplishments along these lines as certainly one of the greatest achievements of his useful career.

Whatever he did was well done. He was a man in every sense of the word. He was a sturdy oak and a tower of strength. Those who were interested in promoting the welfare of our State and Nation, naturally gravitated to him. He will be greatly missed as one of the great Virginians of his generation. Let us hope that the example of his life will animate us all to a higher and a renewed consecration, to worthy and unselfish devotion to our country and to our kind, and that we may all become stronger and better and more effective by reason of having known and been associated with him.

"God give us men! A time like this demands
Strong minds, great hearts, true faith, and ready hands;
Men whom the lust of office does not kill;
Men whom the spoils of office cannot buy;
Men who possess opinions and a will;
Men who have honor—men who will not lie;
Men who can stand before a demagogue.
And damn his treacherous flatteries without winking!
Tall men, sun-crowned, who live above the fog
In public duty, and in private thinking:
For while the rabble, with their thumb-worn creeds,
Their large professions and their little deeds—
Mingle in selfish strife, lo! Freedom weeps,
Wrong rules the land, and waiting Justice sleeps!"

It is difficult for those of us who knew the late chief justice to associate him with those whose duties and earthly labors have ended and who have passed on into other realms.

As we reflect upon the many events in his full and useful life, we become conscious of the rapidity of the movement of the sands in the hourglass of time and of the swift falling of the leaves of life. "The wine of life keeps oozing—drop by drop, the leaves of life keep falling—one by one," and so it is with us.

But despite these somber thoughts, and the interest and admonition with which this hour is freighted, it is not altogether one of sadness. For we do appreciate the privilege of having known and lived and served with the beloved late chief justice in whose cherished memory we are here assembled. We take comfort in the knowledge that he devoutly practiced the faith he embraced, and when on that July day his immortal soul winged its way into a boundless eternity, he carried with him the faith of our fathers. He will continue to live in the hearts and minds of those who knew and loved him and in the great institutions he loved and served with such ability and devotion. May we be taught to so number our days that we may apply our hearts unto wisdom, and, at last, like him, enter into the inheritance reserved for the faithful.

"Green be the turf above thee,
Friend of my better days!
None knew thee but to love thee
Nor named thee but to praise."

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 18, 1959

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

O Thou, whose throne is justice and truth: Frail creatures of dust, yet stamped with Thine image, serving out our brief day on the world's vast stage, we would set our little lives in the midst of Thine eternity.

We fear no foe, with Thee at hand to bless and to gird us with a strength that is not our own.

As those to whom has been committed the stewardship of the fair and firm fabric of the Nation's life, grant us now in a violent world in these dread days of decision a saving experience of inner quiet and serenity.

Knowing that all truth is Thine, and that it is only truth that makes men free and that fetters of the mind and spirit and body as they desecrate human dignity are an offense to Thee, the Creator, strengthen our will, we beseech Thee, not to be browbeaten by threatening evil, or to surrender to craven fear, but having done all for a just peace, to stand where honor and duty draw the line from which there can be no retreat without our being recreant to our solemn trust, and thus failing man and Thee.

We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, March 16, 1959, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that the President had approved and signed the following acts:

On March 17, 1959:

S. 79. An act to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to permit the temporary listing and certification of citrus red No. 2 for coloring mature oranges under tolerances found safe by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, so as to permit continuance of established coloring practice in the orange industry pending congressional consideration of general legislation for the listing and certification of food color additives under safe tolerances.

On March 18, 1959:

S. 50. An act to provide for the admission of the State of Hawaii into the Union.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

As in executive session,

The VICE PRESIDENT 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.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 10. An act to encourage the establishment of voluntary pension plans by self-employed individuals;

H.R. 318. An act to authorize a revision of the boundaries of the Edison Laboratory National Monument, N.J., and for other purposes;

H.R. 519. An act to revise the laws relating to depository libraries;

H.R. 1306. An act to provide for the sale of Columbia Basin project lands to the State of Washington, and for other purposes;

H.R. 1400. An act for the relief of Berta Reitberger;

H.R. 1411. An act for the relief of T. V. Cashen;

H.R. 1453. An act for the relief of Mrs. Mathilde Ringol;

H.R. 1457. An act for the relief of Mrs. Sue Pyle;

H.R. 1462. An act for the relief of Logan Duff;

H.R. 1471. An act for the relief of Jim B. Hill;

H.R. 1531. An act for the relief of Cesar Garcia;

H.R. 1535. An act for the relief of Sister Mary Damion (Maria Saveria D'Amelio), Sister Maria Tarcisia (Maria Giovanna Fenuta), and Sister Mary Regina (Maria Lizzi);

H.R. 1600. An act for the relief of Francis M. Haischer;

H.R. 1605. An act for the relief of Harry F. Lindall;

H.R. 1611. An act for the relief of Olin Fred Rundlett;

H.R. 1632. An act for the relief of Dean E. Fosmoe;

H.R. 1653. An act for the relief of Evelyn Albi;

H.R. 1691. An act for the relief of Oliver O. Newsome;

H.R. 1718. An act for the relief of Oather S. Hall;

H.R. 1727. An act for the relief of Dimitrios Kondoleon (also known as James Kondolous);

H.R. 1736. An act for the relief of John C. Matlon;

H.R. 1739. An act for the relief of Lt. Col. John M. Brizzard;

H.R. 1744. An act for the relief of Gordon E. Martin;

H.R. 1749. An act for the relief of Mrs. Maxine L. Cowan Harrison;

H.R. 2044. An act for the relief of the estate of Richard Anthony Nunes, Jr.;

H.R. 2050. An act for the relief of Nissim S. Tawil, Esther Tawil (nee Goldman), Solomn Tawil, Isaac Tawil, Kathy Tawil, Jacqueline Tawil, and Sarina Goldman;

H.R. 2063. An act for the relief of Otis Parks, W. B. Dunbar, and J. C. Dickey;

H.R. 2065. An act for the relief of Arthur J. Dettmers, Jr.;

H.R. 2099. An act to provide for a posthumous cash award in recognition of the scientific contributions in the field of electronic ordnance made by the late Paul M. Tedder;

H.R. 2104. An act for the relief of Alfonso Giangrande;

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

H.R. 2154. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire certain additional property to be included within the Independence National Historical Park;

H.R. 2237. An act to amend chapter 13—Wage Earners' Plans—of the Bankruptcy Act;

H.R. 2279. An act for the relief of Mrs. Tyra Fenner Tynes;

H.R. 2280. An act for the relief of Adele M. Parker;

H.R. 2281. An act to provide for the payment of relocation expenses to Milo G. and Patricia Wingard;

H.R. 2286. An act for the relief of Joseph E. Gallant;

H.R. 2289. An act for the relief of Mrs. Gertrude E. Shetler;

H.R. 2294. An act for the relief of the Ellis Timber Co.;

H.R. 2295. An act for the relief of the Sterilon Corp.;

H.R. 2586. An act for the relief of Miss Mame E. Howell;

H.R. 2589. An act for the relief of Elizabeth Lucie Leon (also known as Lucie Noel);

H.R. 2602. An act for the relief of William C. Hutto;

H.R. 2603. An act for the relief of the American Hydrotherm Corp.;

H.R. 2668. An act for the relief of John R. Cook;

H.R. 2717. An act for the relief of Eber Brothers Wine & Liquor Corp.;

H.R. 2741. An act to amend section 2734 of title 10, United States Code, so as to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to settle claims arising in foreign countries incident to noncombat activities of the Coast Guard;

H.R. 2846. An act for the relief of Dorman William Whittom;

H.R. 2909. An act relating to the maintenance and travel expenses of judges;

H.R. 2949. An act for the relief of Lois K. Alexander;

H.R. 2950. An act for the relief of Lt. Col. James A. Beplat;

H.R. 2975. An act to validate payments of certain quarters allowances made in good faith, and pursuant to agreements by authorized officials, to employees of the Department of the Navy, but which were subsequently determined to be inconsistent with applicable regulations;

H.R. 3093. An act for the relief of Mrs. Dorothy (Hyman) Monk;

H.R. 3095. An act for the relief of Hilary W. Jenkins, Jr.;

H.R. 3104. An act for the relief of Col. John T. Malloy;

H.R. 3111. An act for the relief of Rachel Nethery;

H.R. 3243. An act for the relief of Col. Fred E. Ducker;

H.R. 3248. An act to provide for the payment of just compensation to certain claimants for the taking by the United States of private fishery rights in Pearl Harbor, Island of Oahu, T.H.;

H.R. 3249. An act for the relief of William S. Scott;

H.R. 3252. An act for the relief of Mrs. Martha Nicometi;

H.R. 3254. An act for the relief of Thomas Forman Screven, Julia Screven Daniels, and May Bond Screven Rhodes;

H.R. 3290. An act to amend title 10, United States Code, to eliminate the requirement that each chaplain make an annual report to the Secretary of the Navy;

H.R. 3291. An act to amend title 10, United States Code, with respect to certain medals;

H.R. 3292. An act to amend title 10, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to furnish supplies and services to foreign vessels and aircraft, and for other purposes;

H.R. 3320. An act to amend the act of June 21, 1950, relating to the appointment of boards of medical officers;

H.R. 3322. An act to amend title 10, United States Code, and certain other laws to authorize the payment of transportation and travel allowances to escorts of dependents of members of the uniformed services under certain conditions, and for other purposes;

H.R. 3323. An act to establish a peacetime limitation on the number of lieutenant generals in the Marine Corps;

H.R. 3406. An act for the relief of William H. Pearlmutter;

H.R. 3410. An act for the relief of Mrs. Leonard O. Erickson;

H.R. 3412. An act to authorize the appointment of Robert Wesley Colglazier, Jr., as permanent brigadier general of the Regular Army;

H.R. 3413. An act to authorize the appointment of Philip Ferdinand Lindeman as permanent colonel of the Regular Army;

H.R. 3495. An act to direct the Secretary of the Interior to administer certain acquired lands as revested Oregon and California railroad grant lands;

H.R. 3496. An act to revise the boundaries of the Kings Mountain National Military Park, S.C., and to authorize the procurement and exchange of lands, and for other purposes;

H.R. 3522. An act for the relief of Aaron Green, Jr.;

H.R. 3797. An act for the relief of Mrs. Alberta S. Rozanski;

H.R. 3816. An act for the relief of Mukhtar Mohammed;

H.R. 3939. An act for the relief of Virginia E. Speer;

H.R. 3960. An act for the relief of Patrick W. Gowan, David Dooling, Harlie L. Mize, James H. Blaes, and William L. Perkins;

H.R. 4068. An act to amend title 10, United States Code, by repealing section 7475, which restricts the increasing of forces at naval activities prior to national elections;

H.R. 4121. An act for the relief of certain members of the Armed Forces of the United States, or their survivors, who were captured and held as prisoners of war in the Korean hostilities;

H.R. 4142. An act for the relief of Wintford Jesse Thompson;

H.R. 4154. An act to amend section 3238 of title 18, United States Code;

H.R. 4314. An act for the relief of Samuel Abraham, John A. Carroll, Forrest E. Robinson, Thomas J. Sawyers, Jack Silmon, and David N. Wilson;

H.R. 4318. An act for the relief of D. A. Whitaker and others;

H.R. 4445. An act for the relief of Stirley Louis Berutich;

H.R. 4615. An act to relieve certain members and former members of the naval service of liability to reimburse the United States for the value of transportation requests erroneously furnished to them by the United States, and for other purposes;

H.R. 4748. An act to extend the leasing provisions of the act of June 14, 1926, as amended by the act of June 4, 1954 (68 Stat. 173; 43 U.S.C. 869—869-3), to certain lands in Oregon, and for other purposes;

H.R. 4893. An act for the relief of William R. and Alice M. Reardon;

H.R. 4913. An act to amend the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958 to authorize the National Aeronautics and Space Administration to lease buildings in the District of Columbia for its use;

H.R. 4964. An act for the relief of Mrs. Betty L. Fonk;

H.R. 5640. An act to extend the time during which certain individuals may continue to receive temporary unemployment compensation; and

H.R. 5676. An act making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 34) favoring the meeting of the North Atlantic Treaty Parliamentary Conference for 1959 in Washington, D.C., in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H.R. 1776) to amend the act of June 28, 1958, to provide for a National Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission, and for other purposes, and it was signed by the Vice President.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H.R. 10. An act to encourage the establishment of voluntary pension plans by self-employed individuals;

H.R. 1632. An act for the relief of Dean E. Fosmoe; and

H.R. 5640. An act to extend the time during which certain individuals may continue to receive temporary unemployment compensation; to the Committee on Finance.

H.R. 318. An act to authorize a revision of the boundaries of the Edison Laboratory National Monument, N.J., and for other purposes;

H.R. 1306. An act to provide for the sale of Columbia Basin project lands to the State of Washington, and for other purposes;

H.R. 2154. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire certain additional property to be included within the Independence National Historical Park;

H.R. 3495. An act to direct the Secretary of the Interior to administer certain acquired lands as revested Oregon and California railroad grant lands;

H.R. 3496. An act to revise the boundaries of the Kings Mountain National Military Park, S.C., and to authorize the procurement and exchange of lands, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 4748. An act to extend the leasing provisions of the act of June 14, 1926, as amended by the Act of June 4, 1954 (68 Stat. 173; 43 U.S.C. 869—869-3), to certain lands in Oregon, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 519. An act to revise the laws relating to depository libraries; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

H.R. 1400. An act for the relief of Berta Reitberger;

H.R. 1411. An act for the relief of T. V. Cashen;

H.R. 1453. An act for the relief of Mrs. Mathilde Ringol;

H.R. 1457. An act for the relief of Mrs. Sue Pyle;

H.R. 1462. An act for the relief of Logan Duff;

H.R. 1471. An act for the relief of Jim B. Hill;

H.R. 1531. An act for the relief of Cesar Garcia;

H.R. 1535. An act for the relief of Sister Mary Damion (Maria Saveria D'Amelio), Sister Maria Tarcisia (Maria Giovanna Fenuta), and Sister Mary Regina (Maria Lizzi);

H.R. 1600. An act for the relief of Francis M. Haischer;

H.R. 1605. An act for the relief of Harry F. Lindall;

H.R. 1611. An act for the relief of Olin Fred Rundlett;

H.R. 1653. An act for the relief of Evelyn Albi;

H.R. 1691. An act for the relief of Oliver O. Newsome;

H.R. 1718. An act for the relief of Oather S. Hall;

H.R. 1727. An act for the relief of Dimitrios Kondoleon (also known as James Kondolous);

H.R. 1736. An act for the relief of John C. Matlon;

H.R. 1739. An act for the relief of Lieutenant Colonel John M. Brizzard;

H.R. 1744. An act for the relief of Gordon E. Martin;

H.R. 1749. An act for the relief of Mrs. Maxine L. Cowan Harrison;

H.R. 2044. An act for the relief of the estate of Richard Anthony Nunes, Jr.;

H.R. 2050. An act for the relief of Nissim S. Tawil, Esther Tawil (nee Goldman), Solomn Tawil, Isaac Tawil, Kathy Tawil, Jacqueline Tawil, and Sarina Goldman;

H.R. 2063. An act for the relief of Otis Parks, W. B. Dunbar, and J. C. Dickey;

H.R. 2065. An act for the relief of Arthur J. Dettmers, Jr.;

H.R. 2099. An act to provide for a posthumous cash award in recognition of the scientific contributions in the field of electronic ordnance made by the late Paul M. Tedder;

H.R. 2104. An act for the relief of Alfonso Giangrande;

H.R. 2237. An act to amend chapter 13—Wage Earners' Plans—of the Bankrupty Act;

H.R. 2279. An act for the relief of Mrs. Tyra Fenner Tynes;

H.R. 2280. An act for the relief of Adele M. Parker;

H.R. 2281. An act to provide for the payment of relocation expenses to Milo G. and Patricia Wingard;

H.R. 2286. An act for the relief of Joseph E. Gallant;

H.R. 2289. An act for the relief of Mrs. Gertrude E. Shetler;

H.R. 2295. An act for the relief of the Sterilon Corp.;

H.R. 2586. An act for the relief of Miss Mame E. Howell;

H.R. 2589. An act for the relief of Elizabeth Lucie Leon (also known as Lucie Noel);

H.R. 2602. An act for the relief of William C. Hutto;

H.R. 2603. An act for the relief of the American Hydrotherm Corp.;

H.R. 2668. An act for the relief of John R. Cook;

H.R. 2717. An act for the relief of Eber Brothers Wine & Liquor Corp.;

H.R. 2741. An act to amend section 2734 of title 10, United States Code, so as to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to settle claims arising in foreign countries incident to noncombat activities of the Coast Guard;

H.R. 2846. An act for the relief of Dorman William Whittom;

H.R. 2909. An act relating to the maintenance and travel expenses of judges;

H.R. 2949. An act for the relief of Lois K. Alexander;

H.R. 2950. An act for the relief of Lt. Col. James A. Beplat;

H.R. 2975. An act to validate payments of certain quarters allowances made in good faith, and pursuant to agreements by authorized officials, to employees of the Department of the Navy, but which were subsequently determined to be inconsistent with applicable regulations;

H.R. 3093. An act for the relief of Mrs. Dorothy (Hyman) Monk;

H.R. 3095. An act for the relief of Hilary W. Jenkins, Jr.;

H.R. 3104. An act for the relief of Col. John M. T. Malloy;

H.R. 3111. An act for the relief of Rachel Nethery;

H.R. 3243. An act for the relief of Col. Fred E. Dueker;

H.R. 3248. An act to provide for the payment of just compensation to certain claimants for the taking by the United States of private fishery rights in Pearl Harbor, Island of Oahu, T.H.;

H.R. 3249. An act for the relief of William S. Scott;

H.R. 3252. An act for the relief of Mrs. Martha Nicometi;

H.R. 3254. An act for the relief of Thomas Forman Screven, Julia Screven Daniels, and May Bond Screven Rhodes;

H.R. 3406. An act for the relief of William H. Pearlmutter;

H.R. 3410. An act for the relief of Mrs. Leonard O. Erickson;

H.R. 3522. An act for the relief of Aaron Green, Jr.;

H.R. 3797. An act for the relief of Mrs. Alberta S. Rozanski;

H.R. 3816. An act for the relief of Mukhtar Mohammed;

H.R. 3939. An act for the relief of Virginia E. Speer;

H.R. 3960. An act for the relief of Patrick W. Gowan, David Dooling, Harlie L. Mize, James H. Blaes, and William L. Perkins;

H.R. 4121. An act for the relief of certain members of the Armed Forces of the United States, or their survivors, who were captured and held as prisoners of war in the Korean hostilities;

H.R. 4142. An act for the relief of Wintford Jesse Thompson;

H.R. 4154. An act to amend section 3238 of title 18, United States Code;

H.R. 4314. An act for the relief of Samuel Abraham, John A. Carroll, Forrest E. Robinson, Thomas J. Sawyers, Jack Silmon, and David N. Wilson;

H.R. 4318. An act for the relief of D. A. Whitaker and others;

H.R. 4445. An act for the relief of Stirley Louis Berutich;

H.R. 4615. An act to relieve certain members and former members of the naval service of liability to reimburse the United States for the value of transportation requests erroneously furnished to them by the United States and for other purposes;

H.R. 4893. An act for the relief of William R. and Alice M. Reardon; and

H.R. 4964. An act for the relief of Mrs. Betty L. Fonk; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3290. An act to amend title 10, United States Code, to eliminate the requirement that each chaplain make an annual report to the Secretary of the Navy;

H.R. 3291. An act to amend title 10, United States Code, with respect to certain medals;

H.R. 3292. An act to amend title 10, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to furnish supplies and services to foreign vessels and aircraft, and for other purposes;

H.R. 3320. An act to amend the act of June 21, 1950, relating to the appointment of boards of medical officers;

H.R. 3322. An act to amend title 10, United States Code, and certain other laws to authorize the payment of transportation and travel allowances to escorts of dependents of members of the uniformed services under certain conditions, and for other purposes;

H.R. 3323. An act to establish a peacetime limitation on the number of lieutenant generals in the Marine Corps;

H.R. 3412. An act to authorize the appointment of Robert Wesley Colglazier, Jr., as permanent brigadier general of the Regular Army;

H.R. 3413. An act to authorize the appointment of Philip Ferdinand Lindeman as permanent colonel of the Regular Army; and

H.R. 4068. An act to amend title 10, United States Code, by repealing section 7475, which restricts the increasing of forces at naval activities prior to national elections; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 4913. An act to amend the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958 to authorize the National Aeronautics and Space Administration to lease buildings in the District of Columbia for its use; to the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences.

H.R. 5676. An act making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 34) favoring the meeting of the North Atlantic Treaty Parliamentary Conference for 1959 in Washington, D.C., was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

Whereas United States delegates have attended each of the four North Atlantic Treaty Parliamentary Conferences which have been held in Paris; and

Whereas the Fourth North Atlantic Treaty Parliamentary Conference, by resolution, expressed a wish to hold the next conference in Washington, District of Columbia: Therefore be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Chairmen of the United States delegation to the North Atlantic Treaty Parliamentary Conference be requested to invite the North Atlantic Treaty Parliamentary Conference to hold its annual meeting for the year 1959 in Washington, District of Columbia.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

REPORT ON COOPERATION WITH MEXICO IN CONTROL AND ERADICATION OF FOOT-AND-MOUTH DISEASE

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, reporting, pursuant to law, that there have been no significant developments to report for the month of February relating to the cooperative program of the United States with Mexico for the control and eradication of foot-and-mouth disease; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORT ON SOIL BANK CONSERVATION RESERVE PROGRAM

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the 1958 soil bank conservation reserve program, dated March 1959 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

CLARIFICATION OF STATUS OF CERTAIN BANKS

A letter from the Governor, Farm Credit Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to clarify the status of the Federal land banks, the Federal intermediate credit banks, and the banks for cooperatives and their officers and employees with respect to certain laws applicable generally to the United States and its officers and employees, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL FARM LOAN ACT

A letter from the Governor, Farm Credit Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to

amend the Federal Farm Loan Act to transfer responsibility for making appraisals from the Farm Credit Administration to the Federal land banks, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORTS ON REAPPORTIONMENT OF APPROPRIATIONS

A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, reporting, pursuant to law, that the appropriation for the General Services Administration for "Operating expenses, Public Buildings Service," for the fiscal year 1959, had been apportioned on a basis indicating a need for a supplemental estimate of appropriation; to the Committee on Appropriations.

A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, reporting, pursuant to law, that the appropriation to the Treasury Department for "Salaries and expenses, Office of the Secretary," for the fiscal year 1959, had been apportioned on a basis indicating a need for a supplemental estimate of appropriation; to the Committee on Appropriations.

DOROTHY E. GREEN AND THELMA L. ALLEY

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation for the relief of Dorothy E. Green and Thelma L. Alley (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

PROPOSED TRANSFER OF BOAT TO CHELSEA YACHT CLUB

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Navy (Material), reporting, pursuant to law, that the Department of the Navy proposes to transfer a 64-foot work boat to the Chelsea Yacht Club, Chelsea, Mass.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON NUMBER OF OFFICERS ON DUTY WITH DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY AND ARMY GENERAL STAFF

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the number of officers on duty with the Department of the Army and the Army General Staff, on December 31, 1958 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON MILITARY CONSTRUCTION CONTRACTS AWARDED WITHOUT FORMAL ADVERTISING

A letter from the Chief of Bureau, Bureau of Yards and Docks, Department of the Navy, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on military construction contracts awarded without formal advertising, covering the period July 1, 1958, through December 31, 1958 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT PROCUREMENT ACTION

A letter from the Director, Legislative Liaison, Department of the Air Force, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, the Air Force report entitled "Semiannual Research and Development Procurement Action," covering the period from July 1, 1958, to December 31, 1958 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT OF FEDERAL CIVIL DEFENSE ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Director, Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Federal Civil Defense Administration, for the fiscal year 1958 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

AMENDMENT OF GOVERNMENT CORPORATION CONTROL ACT

A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Government Corporation Control Act, as amended (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPUBLIC OF ICELAND

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation for the relief of the Government of the Republic of Iceland (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

REPORT ON REVIEW OF CONTRACT WITH ILLINOIS STATE MEDICAL SOCIETY AND ILLINOIS MEDICAL SERVICE

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on review of Department of the Army Contract DA-49-007-MD-814 with Illinois State Medical Society and Illinois Medical Service, under dependents' medical care program, dated March 1959 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON EXAMINATION OF CONTRACT WITH AVCO MANUFACTURING CORP.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the examination of Department of the Air Force Contract AF 33 (600)-31100 with AVCO Manufacturing Corp., Crosley Division, Cincinnati, Ohio, dated March 1959 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON REVIEW OF ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION SHIPPINGPORT ATOMIC POWER STATION

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on review of Atomic Energy Commission Shippingport atomic power station constructed and operated under contracts with Westinghouse Electric Corp. and with Duquesne Light Co., June 1958 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

ADJUSTMENT OF LEGISLATIVE JURISDICTION EXERCISED BY THE UNITED STATES OVER CERTAIN LAND

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the adjustment of the legislative jurisdiction exercised by the United States over land in the several States used for Federal purposes, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Government Operations.

CERTIFICATION OF ADEQUATE SOIL SURVEY AND LAND CLASSIFICATION, SAN ANGELO PROJECT, TEXAS

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, reporting, pursuant to law, that an adequate soil survey and land classification has been made of the lands in the San Angelo project, Texas, and that the lands to be irrigated are suspectible to the production of agricultural crops by means of irrigation; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

CLAIM OF THE KIOWA, COMANCHE, AND APACHE TRIBES OF INDIANS *v.* THE UNITED STATES

A letter from the Chief Commissioner, Indian Claims Commission, Washington, D.C., reporting, pursuant to law, that proceedings have been finally concluded with respect to the claim of *The Kiowa, Comanche, and Apache Tribes of Indians, petitioners,* v. *The United States of America, defendant,* Docket No. 32 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

CLAIM OF THE SENECA-CAYUGA TRIBE OF OKLAHOMA, AND PETER BUCK, ET AL., *v.* THE UNITED STATES

A letter from the Chief Commissioner, Indian Claims Commission, Washington, D.C., reporting, pursuant to law, that proceedings have been finally concluded with respect to the claim of *The Seneca-Cayuga Tribe of Oklahoma, and Peter Buck, et al., members and representatives of members thereof, petitioners,* v. *The United States of America, defendant,* Docket No. 341, sixth (general) claim (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

AMENDMENT OF COMMUNICATIONS ACT OF 1934, RELATING TO OATH REQUIRED ON CERTAIN DOCUMENTS

A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, by eliminating the requirement of an oath or affirmation on certain documents filed with the Federal Communications Commission (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORT ON TORT CLAIMS PAID BY DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on tort claims paid by that Department, in the fiscal year 1958 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CHANGE OF DESIGNATION OF CHILD HEALTH DAY

A letter from the Acting Secretary, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to change the designation of Child Health Day from May 1 to the first Monday in October of each year (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT ON TORT CLAIMS PAID BY HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY

A letter from the Administrator, Housing and Home Finance Agency, Washington, D.C., reporting, pursuant to law, on tort claims paid by that Agency, for the calendar year 1958; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

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

GRANTING TEMPORARY ADMISSION INTO THE UNITED STATES OF CERTAIN ALIENS

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

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF ALIENS—WITHDRAWAL OF NAME

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, withdrawing the name of Liw Jack from a report relating to aliens whose deportation has been suspended, transmitted to the Senate on April 15, 1958; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT OF NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

A letter from the Chairman, National Labor Relations Board, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Board, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1958 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

PROVISION OF CERTAIN CIVILIAN POSITIONS REQUIRED BY DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

A letter from the Deputy Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide more adequate numbers of civilian positions required by the Department of Defense to carry out scientific research and development relating to the national defense and to improve the management of the activities of the Department, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

PUBLICATION ENTITLED "A PROGRAM FOR REDUCING THE NATIONAL FLOOD DAMAGE POTENTIAL"

A letter from the Chairman of the Board, and Director, Tennessee Valley Authority, Knoxville, Tenn., transmitting, for the information of the Senate, a publication entitled "A Program for Reducing the National Flood Damage Potential" (with an accompanying document); to the Committee on Public Works.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, and so forth, were laid before the Senate, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A resolution of the Legislature of the Territory of Guam; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"RESOLUTION 63

"Resolution relative to respectfully requesting Congress of the United States to enact certain legislation authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to carry out the recommendations of the Guam Survey Group, released March 1958

"Whereas agriculture is one of the basic economics of any community and agriculture on Guam is presently very much underdeveloped and large areas of land that could be used for agricultural purposes are now idle; and

"Whereas the Department of Agriculture prior to World War II maintained an Agriculture Experiment Station on Guam; and

"Whereas the methods of farming now undertaken on Guam in many instances are crude as many of the farmers have not been trained or educated in modern farming methods; and

"Whereas there are many agricultural pests on Guam; and

"Whereas the Guam Survey Group was organized by the Department of Agriculture and did in fact make a survey of the agricultural needs of Guam and reported their findings and recommendations in March 1958: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the Congress of the United States be and it is hereby respectfully requested and memorialized to enact certain legislation authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to carry out the recommendations of the Guam Survey Group including the following:

"(a) To establish and maintain a joint agricultural program on Guam that will promote the welfare of Guam.

"(b) To utilize any authority available to him to such extent as he may determine necessary to meet the agricultural program needs of Guam,

"(c) In developing and carrying out such agricultural program, to utilize the agency's facilities, employees and other resources of the Department of Agriculture as he may determine and to cooperate with the Government of Guam and the public and private organizations and individuals on Guam and elsewhere; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the speaker certify to and the legislative secretary attest the adoption hereof and that copies of the same be thereafter transmitted to the Congress of the United States, to the Secretary of Agriculture, to the Secretary of the Interior, and to the Governor of Guam."

A joint resolution of the legislature of the State of Illinois; to the Committee on Finance:

"SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 10

"Whereas there is in existence an unfair and unnecessary Federal excise tax of 10 percent on all telephone calls; and

"Whereas this tax was imposed during World War II not as a revenue measure but essentially as a method of restricting the use of the telephone because of the critical wartime shortage in the communications field and has continued since World War II although no shortage in available communications exists today; and

"Whereas the Federal excise tax on the telephone is unfair because it is the only such excise now imposed on household utility services such as electric, gas, and water service: Therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Senate of the 71st General Assembly of the State of Illinois, the House of Representatives concurring herein*, That the United States Congress is respectfully requested to repeal the Federal excise tax now imposed on telephone service and that suitable copies of this resolution be sent by the Secretary of State to the Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives, the President of the U.S. Senate, and each Member of Congress elected from the State of Illinois.

"Adopted by the Senate, March 3, 1959.

"JOHN WM. CHAPMAN,
"President of the Senate.
"EDWARD E. FERNANDES,
"Secretary of the Senate.

"Concurred in by the House of Representatives, March 10, 1959.

"PAUL POWELL,
"Speaker of the House of Representatives.
"CLARENCE BOYLE,
"Clerk of House of Representatives."

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of Alaska; to the Committee on Finance:

"HOUSE MEMORIAL 1

"Memorial to the Honorable Dwight D. Eisenhower, President of the United States; the Honorable Richard M. Nixon, President of the U.S. Senate; the Honorable Sam Rayburn, Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives; the Honorable Russell C. Harrington, Commissioner of Internal Revenue of the United States; the Honorable E. L. Bartlett and the Honorable Ernest Gruening, Senators from Alaska; and the Honorable Ralph J. Rivers, U.S. Representative from Alaska.

"Your memorialist, the House of Representatives of the Legislature of the State of Alaska, in first regular session assembled respectfully submits that:

"Whereas the cost of food and clothing and other commodities necessary to sustain life is much higher in Alaska than in the continental United States; and

"Whereas such costs are on the average between 25 and 57 percent higher than similar costs in the State of Washington, Alaska's nearest neighbor State; and

"Whereas the U.S. Government has already recognized this differential in living costs by granting a 25-percent cost-of-living allowance to certain Federal employees in Alaska; and

"Whereas the action of the Federal Government relative to their own employees is proper and correct; and

"Whereas this action on the part of the U.S. Government has granted relief to only a portion of the population of Alaska; and

"Whereas the entire population of Alaska needs like assistance in the form of tax relief in order to increase the general standard of living in Alaska;

"Now, therefore, your memorialist, the House of Representatives of the State of Alaska, in first session assembled, respectfully urges that the Congress of the United States amend the Federal income tax laws to permit all Alaskan taxpayers to deduct from their taxable income an amount equal to 25 percent of their adjusted gross income in arriving at their total net taxable income.

"And your memorialist will ever pray.

"Passed by the House February 13, 1959.

"WARREN A. TAYLOR,
"Speaker of the House.

"Attest:

"ESTHER REED,
"Chief Clerk of the House."

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of Montana; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"HOUSE RESOLUTION 11

"Resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of Montana to Dwight D. Eisenhower, President of the United States; to the Congress of the United States; to the Honorable James E. Murray and the Honorable Mike Mansfield, Senators from the State of Montana; to the Honorable Lee Metcalf and the Honorable LeRoy Anderson, Representatives from the State of Montana; to the Department of the Interior and to the Honorable Secretary of the Interior; requesting that such action be taken as may be required to place the Absaroka-Yankee Jim project under construction as early as possible

"Whereas only one-eighth of Montana's water resources has been developed; and

"Whereas the upper Missouri Basin States, particularly Montana, are faced with a real and critical power shortage during the years immediately ahead; and

"Whereas construction of Absaroka Dam, reservoir and powerplant was authorized in the Flood Control Act of 1944; and

"Whereas Yankee Jim Dam and Reservoir would maintain a relatively constant pool elevation at Absaroka Reservoir, thus assuring needed protection to the city of Livingston and the surrounding developed area, the railway and highway, and intensive recreational and resort use; and

"Whereas the integrated operation of Absaroka and Yankee Jim will great enhance firm power generation, thus increasing project revenue; and

"Whereas the rate of unemployment in Montana continues high; and

"Whereas construction of the Absaroka-Yankee Jim project would provide an estimated 4,750 man-years of onsite employment, with an additional 9,500 man-years of onsite employment in service industries; and

"Whereas power made available by the project could well mean the development of important ore deposits in this area and related industrial development; and

"Whereas feasible multipurpose projects are fully repayable and thus pay their own way while improving the economy of the region in which they are built; and

"Whereas on March 31, 1958, the Honorable JAMES E. MURRAY, U.S. Senator from Montana, with the support of the entire Montana congressional delegation presented to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs information regarding the engineering and economic feasibility of the Absaroka-Yankee Jim project and its importance to the well-being of the State of Montana; and

"Whereas on the basis of this and other information presented at said hearing of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, the Senate of the United States on May 6, 1958, adopted Senate Resolution 299 recommending the prompt start of construction of urgently needed new water and power supply projects: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the Legislature of the State of Montana hereby memorializes the Senate and the House of Representatives, the President, and the Secretary of the Interior to take such action as may be required to place the Absaroka-Yankee Jim project under construction at the earliest possible time; and be it further

"Resolved, That a substantial block of power to be generated by Absaroka-Yankee Jim Dam be reserved for Montana; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this material be submitted by the chief clerk of the House of Representatives of the State of Montana to the President of the United States, the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States, Senator JAMES E. MURRAY, Senator MIKE MANSFIELD, Congressman LEE METCALF, Congressman LEROY ANDERSON, and to the Secretary of the Department of the Interior."

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of Colorado; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"HOUSE JOINT MEMORIAL 6

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

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

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

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the 42d General Assembly of the State of Colorado, the Senate concurring herein, That the Congress and President of the United States and the Representatives of Colorado in the Congress of the United States are hereby urged and requested to take all necessary action to (1) preserve the water rights of the individual and the States and to prevent Federal usurpation of those rights; (2) see that legislation is initiated and supported to reestablish to the individuals and to the States the rights taken from them by the Federal courts and the Justice Department; and (3) in every way possible reaffirm, renew, and defend the concepts that water rights are property rights and that these established rights to the use of water by a State or an individual should not be taken away without due process of law and adequate compensation: be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this memorial be promptly transmitted to the President and Vice President of the United States, Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress, chairmen of the U.S. Senate and House Committees of Interior and Insular Affairs, U.S. Senator JOHN A. CARROLL, U.S. Senator GORDON ALLOTT, U.S. Representative WAYNE ASPINALL, U.S. Representative J. EDGAR CHENOWETH, U.S. Representative BYRON ROGERS, and U.S. Representative BYRON JOHNSON.

"ROBERT S. EBERHARDT,
"Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives.

"CHARLES R. CONKLIN,
"Speaker of the House of Representatives.

"LUCILE L. SCHUSTER,
"Secretary of the Senate.

"ROBERT L. KNORR,
"President of the Senate."

A resolution of the Legislature of the Territory of Guam; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"RESOLUTION 50

"Resolution relative to respectfully requesting Congress of the United States to amend the Organic Act of Guam, so as to provide that the legislature may override with finality, the veto of the Governor of Guam

"Be it resolved by the Legislature of the Territory of Guam—

"Whereas, under section 19 of the Organic Act of Guam, Public Law No. 630, 81st Congress, chapter 512, the Legislature of Guam is empowered to override the veto of the Governor of Guam on any bill presented to him only in limited fashion because of the provision contained in such section that upon such override by the legislature, the bill is transmitted to the President of the United States, who is empowered to uphold the veto of the Governor, the wishes of the legislature to the contrary notwithstanding; and

"Whereas the prerogative of legislative bodies to override the veto of the chief executive officer is within the traditional power of almost all legislative bodies within the American framework of representative government; and

"Whereas the local autonomy granted by virtue of said Organic Act is narrowly limited if, as the history of Guam indicates, the veto of an appointed Governor cannot be overridden by the elected representatives of the people of Guam; and

"Whereas the Fourth Guam Legislature, did, on the 6th day of August 1958, pass and adopt a similar resolution (Res. 6, 4th special sess.), which was thereafter transmitted to the officials hereafter named, but that the U.S. Congress adjourned several days thereafter thereby precluding their consideration of the same: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the Congress of the United States be and it is hereby respectfully requested and memorialized to amend the Organic Act of Guam to permit the legislature to effectively override the veto of the Governor of Guam; and, be it further

"Resolved, That in considering such amendment, the Congress bear in mind that the Legislature of Guam is willing to accept a very limited right to so override executive vetoes, even to the extent requiring a unanimous consent vote by the legislature, since it is the desire of the people of Guam to override the veto of their appointed Governor only when the opinion of their elected representatives is unanimous on the desirability of such action; and, be it further

"Resolved, That in considering such amendment, the Congress bear in mind that section 19 of the Organic Act of Guam still reserves to the Congress of the United States the final power and authority to annul all laws enacted by the Legislature of Guam; and, be it further

"Resolved, That the speaker certify to and the legislative secretary attest the adoption hereof and that copies of the same be thereafter transmitted to the President of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the chairman of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committees of the Senate and House, and to the Governor of Guam."

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of Arkansas; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 24

"Be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the 62d General Assembly of the State of Arkansas, the Senate concurring therein—

"SECTION 1. That the General Assembly of the State of Arkansas, pursuant to article 5 of the Constitution of the United States, hereby petitions the Congress of the United States to call a convention for the purpose of proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States in substantially the following form and content.

"PROPOSED CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT

"1. The chairmen of the standing committees of the Congress of the United States shall each, within 30 days of the ratification of this article as an amendment, appoint one member to a commission to be known as commission on the constitutionality of the 14th amendment, notwithstanding other provisions of the Constitution vesting appointive power in the executive branch of the Government.

"2. No person shall be appointed who shall not have obtained the age of 45 years and been 30 years a citizen of the United States and for 20 consecutive years been engaged in the general practice of law.

"3. Within 60 days of said appointment the said Commission shall begin hearings to determine the constitutionality of the deprival of equal suffrage in the Senate of the 39th Congress, the submission, and ratification of the 14th amendment to the Constitution of the United States, prior to the date of December 31, 1870.

"4. Within 18 months of said appointments a formal written report of the findings of said Commission shall be filed with the Secretary of State of the United States and copies thereof made public.

"5. Upon the filing of a finding that there was an unconstitutional deprival of equal suffrage in said Senate, or said submission or ratification, then said amendment shall after 30 days become null and void, unless within 30 days a national referendum be called as provided herein.

"6. Within 30 days of the filing of said findings the Secretary of State shall upon the application of the legislatures of five States call for a nationwide referendum to be conducted on the first Tuesday following a period of 120 days from the filing of the findings in accordance with the laws of the various States. There shall appear on the ballot only 'approve Commission finding' and 'disapprove Commission finding.' Should the Commission finding disclose an unconstitutional action in either of the 3 instances, then upon a majority vote of all those voting in the 49 States to 'approve Commission finding' said amendment shall become null and void. Should the Commission finding not disclose an unconstitutional action in either of the 3 instances, then upon a majority vote of all those voting in the 49 States to 'disapprove Commission finding' said amendment shall become null and void. The result of said election shall be final, decisions of the Supreme Court notwithstanding.

"7. The Congress shall promptly provide adequate compensation for members of said Commission, its staff, and all other expenses.

"SEC. 2. That the Secretary of State, upon adoption of this resolution, shall furnish copies of the same to the President of the Senate and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the U.S. Congress, to the presiding officers of the Senate and House of Representatives of each of the 49 States and to the members of the Arkansas delegation in the U.S. Congress."

A resolution of the Senate of the State of New Mexico; to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

"SENATE MEMORIAL 6

"Memorial memorializing the Congress of the United States to give favorable consideration relative to the employment of Albert Gallegos as a page in the House of Representatives or the Senate of the United States.

"Whereas Albert Gallegos, of Taos, N. Mex., has rendered outstanding service as a page in the New Mexico State Senate during the regular session of the 24th legislature; and

"Whereas the services and personality of Albert Gallegos as a page in the New Mexico State Senate have endeared him to the entire membership of the senate; and

"Whereas Albert Gallegos is a boy of the highest character and is outstanding in his academic studies in the Taos, N. Mex., municipal schools; and

"Whereas Albert Gallegos, although only 15 years of age, has for several years contributed to the support of his family, consisting of his parents, brothers and sisters, by selling newspapers, shining shoes, cleaning yards, washing cars, and other honorable means; and

"Whereas Albert Gallegos comes from a respected and reputable family: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the State of New Mexico, That the Congress of the United States be memorialized to give favorable consideration relative to the employment of Albert Gallegos as a page in either the House of Representatives or the Senate of the United States; and be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this memorial be transmitted to the President of the U.S. Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative in Congress from New Mexico.

"ED V. MEAD,
"President, Senate.
"HAL THORNBERRY,
"Chief Clerk, Senate.

"Approved by me this 6th day of March, 1959.

"JOHN BURROUGHS,
"Governor, State of New Mexico."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of West Virginia; ordered to lie on the table:

"HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 30

"Resolution relating to the Honorable John Foster Dulles, Secretary of State of the United States

"Whereas West Virginia and the peace-loving people of our Nation and the world are saddened by the illness of Secretary of State John Foster Dulles, now a patient in Walter Reed Hospital, Washington, D.C.; and

"Whereas Mr. Dulles as a soldier, statesman and world citizen has given more than 50 years of his long and fruitful life in the unselfish service of his country and to upholding and furthering the principles of freedom, beginning at the Hague Peace Conference of 1907 and continuing through World War I and World War II to 1950 when President Truman named him as his personal representative to negotiate the Japanese Peace Treaty; and

"Whereas this statesman and diplomat who grew up dreaming of being not President but Secretary of State, and who had trained for the job during 50 years of law practice and international diplomacy, was appointed Secretary of State by President Eisenhower in 1953 to guide the foreign policy of the United States through the cold war period and to give leadership to the free peoples of the world in the staggering battle against communism; and

"Whereas as Secretary of State Mr. Dulles has translated his respect for Theodore Roosevelt's experiences with peace-by-power and Woodrow Wilson's principles of peace-by-moral-fervor into a gleaming weapon against communism, wielding this weapon brilliantly in building up a commanding influence by wrapping up the political, military, economic and moral complexities of cold war into his own fighting faith, which faith is based upon the principles stated by him in these words, 'Freedom must be a positive force that will penetrate. If we demonstrate the good fruits of freedom, then we can know that freedom will prevail'; and

"Whereas Mr. Dulles has faithfully, courageously, with single-minded strength and outstanding ability, carried out the tremendous assignment of his country at the very risk of his life, traveling more than one-half million miles to the far corners of the earth in good weather and bad, on journeys that would tax to exhaustion the strength of men far younger than himself, which arduous labors in the service of his country and the cause of freedom have sapped his rugged physique to the extent that he finally had to submit to hospitalization; and

"Whereas his absence from the international scene is the greatest possible loss to Western policymaking and temporarily removes from the active scene a unique cold-war leadership; and

"Whereas this appreciation of one of the world's outstanding statesmen and diplomats is without taint of partisan political influence as evidenced by the fact that the West Virginia senate is composed of 23 members of the Democratic Party and 9 members of the Republican Party and the house of delegates consists of 85 Democrats and 15 Republicans: Therefore be it

"Resolved by the house of delegates, the senate concurring therein, That the Legislature of West Virginia prays for the early recovery of this great American and fine father of two clergymen, not only for the peace and joy of his family, but for a continuation of the priceless counsel he has given free men everywhere; and be it further

"Resolved, That the clerk of the house of delegates transmit a copy of this resolution to Mr. Dulles and his family, to President Eisenhower, Vice President Nixon, House Speaker Sam Rayburn, Senate Majority Leader Lyndon B. Johnson, and Senate Minority Leader Everett M. Dirksen.

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Alaska; ordered to lie on the table:

"HOUSE JOINT MEMORIAL 1

"Joint memorial to the President of the United States, the President of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and the congressional delegation of the State of Alaska

"Your memorialist, the Legislature of the State of Alaska in first session assembled, respectfully represents:

"Whereas Alaska has at long last joined the American Union, becoming the 49th State on January 3, 1959, after many years as a Territory without the full benefits of U.S. citizenship; and

"Whereas Hawaii has for many years also been a Territory similarly deprived of the equal rights and privileges granted U.S. citizens fortunate enough to reside in a State, with the result that the people of Alaska and Hawaii have always felt akin and in sympathy toward the attainment of this objective and have always cooperated in attempting to obtain the benefits of statehood; and

"Whereas during the recent successful struggle for Alaska statehood the people of Hawaii and their representatives lent both encouragement and aid, thereby showing not only their unselfish interest in the aspirations of the people of Alaska but also demonstrating their commitment to the American ideals of democracy and self-government; and

"Whereas the people of Hawaii have shown the capability, initiative, and responsibility to accept the burdens and privileges of statehood; and

"Whereas the achievement of statehood by the people of Alaska makes any objection to statehood for Hawaii untenable:

"Now, therefore, your memorialist, the First Legislature of the State of Alaska in first session assembled, respectfully urges that the Congress of the United States at its present session pass legislation as will admit Hawaii to the Union on an equal footing with the other States.

"And your memorialist will ever pray.

"Passed by the House February 2, 1959.

"WARREN A. TAYLOR,
"Speaker of the House.

"Attest:

"ESTHER REED,
"Chief Clerk of the House.

"Passed by the Senate, February 5, 1959.

"WILLIAM E. BELTZ,
"President of the Senate.

"Attest:

"KATHERINE T. ALEXANDER,
"Secretary of the Senate."

(The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota, relating to the retention of the present 2 percent interest rate applying to loans made to rural electrical cooperative associations or corporations, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.)

(See the above concurrent resolution printed in full when presented by Mr. LANGER (for himself and Mr. YOUNG) on March 16, 1959, page 4197, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

(The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota, relating to the development of organized labor in that State, which was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.)

(See the above concurrent resolution printed in full when presented by Mr. LANGER (for himself and Mr. YOUNG) on March 16, 1959, page 4198, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

A petition signed by sundry citizens of the United States, members of Astoria Post No. 1, Catholic War Veterans of the United States, Inc., of Astoria, N.Y., favoring a closer participation by all in the Nation's foreign policy; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The petition of E. C. McCreery, of Springfield, Ohio, favoring a severance of diplomatic relations with Russia because of certain attacks on American airplanes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The petition of James Dukas, president of the Edwardsville Amusement Corp., of Edwardsville, Pa., praying for a redress of grievances; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The petition of Gordan B. Dickinson, of Sour Lake, Tex., relating to certain charges against J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A letter in the nature of a petition from Msgr. John Balkunas, chairman of the Conference of Americans of Central-Eastern European Descent, of New York, N.Y., relating to the inclusion of naturalized citizens in the settlement of certain claims; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by the Board of Supervisors of the County of Kauai, T.H., relating to the admission of Hawaii into the Union; ordered to lie on the table.

A telegram in the nature of a petition from the Maui (Hawaii) Merchants Association, expressing thanks for the granting of statehood to Hawaii; ordered to lie on the table.

A petition, signed by sundry students of Roosevelt High School, of Honolulu, Hawaii, praying for the enactment of legislation to provide statehood for Hawaii; ordered to lie on the table.

A resolution adopted by the Maryland State Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, relating to the defense of the Islands of Quemoy and Matsu; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, yesterday the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr.

FULBRIGHT] was authorized, on behalf of the committee—by an almost unanimous vote, I believe—to report an important piece of administration-proposed legislation involving the International Monetary Fund. The hearings will be available, I believe, late today or in the morning. The report will be available.

There is not a great deal of controversy, I am informed, in regard to this measure. I should like to have Senators know that we expect to have the Senate debate the bill during the week; and although we could reach a vote on it tomorrow, and would like to do so, if it is the desire of any Senator to discuss it at some length we shall be glad to have him do so. The Senate could be in session on Friday and Saturday.

It may be possible to obtain an agreement to have the Senate vote on that measure tomorrow. If not, I hope the Senate will vote on it on Monday, along with the area redevelopment bill. I propose to bring up the bill by motion, if a majority of the Members of the Senate concur. Then, I intend to ask the distinguished Senator from Arkansas, the chairman of the committee, to make an opening statement on the bill, at least, even if I have to move to displace that bill by another measure.

After the joint session, we intend to have the Senate proceed with the usual morning hour. If that is agreeable, I should like to have a quorum call had now, because I have been asked to have the Senate be in the other body at 12:14; the House expects us to arrive at 12:14, and we must notify Senators who are absent at this moment.

I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate reconvenes we have the usual morning hour, with a 3-minute limitation on statements. If that consent is given, then I propose to suggest the absence of a quorum at this time, and, at the conclusion of the quorum call, to have the Senate stand in recess, subject to the call of the Chair. Mr. President, I make those requests.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

RECESS—JOINT MEETING OF THE TWO HOUSES—ADDRESS BY HON. SEAN T. O'KELLY, PRESIDENT OF IRELAND

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings under the call be dispensed with, that the Senate stand in recess, and that Senators assemble at the door so that they may proceed to the other body for a joint meeting to hear the President of Ireland.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CARLSON in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered, and the Senate will stand in recess.

At 12 o'clock and 15 minutes p.m. the Senate, preceded by its Secretary [Felton M. Johnston], its Sergeant at Arms [Joseph C. Duke], the Vice President, and the President pro tempore, proceeded to the Hall of the House of Representatives for the purpose of attending the joint meeting of the two Houses to hear the address to be delivered by the Honorable Sean T. O'Kelly, President of Ireland.

(For the address delivered by the President of Ireland, see the House proceedings of today's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The Senate returned to its Chamber at 1 o'clock and 6 minutes p.m., and reassembled when called to order by the President pro tempore.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights, of the Judiciary Committee; the Subcommittee on Health, Education, Welfare, and Safety, of the Committee on the District of Columbia; and the Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary, were authorized to meet today during the session of the Senate.

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

MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the order previously entered, morning business is now in order.

ADDITIONAL PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Additional petitions, etc., were presented, and referred, as indicated:

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

Resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

"Resolutions memorializing the Congress of the United States to establish a Federal domiciliary hospital in New England

"Whereas the Federal Government has provided 18 domiciliary hospitals throughout the Nation for the care of its veterans; and

"Whereas the New England area, comprising a group of 6 States having a veteran population of 1,350,000, has no domiciliary hospital therein; and

"Whereas the nearest domiciliary hospital to the New England area is located in Bath, N.Y., thereby entailing additional hardship and expense on the families of New England veterans now hospitalized when they visit their loved ones: Therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the General Court of Massachusetts respectfully urge the Congress of the United States to take such action as may be necessary to establish a Federal domiciliary hospital in New England; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of these resolutions be transmitted forthwith by the secretary of the Commonwealth to the President of the United States, to the Presiding Officer of each branch of the Congress, and to the Members of the Congress from this Commonwealth and the other New England States.

"House of Representatives, adopted, February 17, 1959.

"LAWRENCE R. GROVE,
"*Clerk*.

"Senate, adopted in concurrence, February 19, 1959.

"IRVING N. HAYDEN,
"*Clerk*."

UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION—RESOLUTION OF CITY COUNCIL OF WORCESTER, MASS.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and my colleague, the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], I present a resolution adopted by the city council of the city of Worcester, Mass., relating to the extension of unemployment compensation. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed in the RECORD, and appropriately referred.

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

Whereas the Federal temporary unemployment compensation program expires the week ending April 4, 1959; and

Whereas this area is considered a distress area with approximately 10 percent unemployment: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That our Massachusetts Senators and Congressmen be and are hereby urged to extend legislation for unemployment compensation payments for such further period as they deem necessary.

JOINT RESOLUTION OF OREGON LEGISLATURE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, Senate Joint Memorial 2, adopted recently by the Senate and the House of Representatives of the State of Oregon.

It gives me special pleasure to bring this joint memorial to the attention of my colleagues because it reflects a view concerning Federal excise taxes on telephone and telegraph services with which I am in complete accord.

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

ENROLLED SENATE JOINT MEMORIAL 2

To the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America, in Congress assembled:

We, your memorialists, the 50th Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon, in legislative session assembled, most respectfully represent as follows:

Whereas the Federal Government levies an excise tax on telephone and telegraph services; and

Whereas such tax was levied during World War II as a wartime emergency tax to help defray war costs and to discourage unnecessary use of such services; and

Whereas the wartime emergency has expired and there is no longer a justification for imposing such tax for the purpose for which it was initially levied; and

Whereas the tax on telephone and telegraph bills imposes an undue hardship upon

millions of individuals and businesses in this country, and is discriminatory; and

Whereas telephone and telegraph services are essential to the orderly transmission of information required in transaction of business and personal affairs and should not be taxed in the same manner as luxury items such as furs, jewelry, and other nonessentials; and

Whereas the continued imposition of this tax is discriminatory upon businesses in the western United States who market their products competitively in the East, with communication service to such eastern markets essential to such competition; and

Whereas the maintenance of an adequate communication system is essential to the economic prosperity and welfare of the people of this country: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of Oregon, the House of Representatives jointly concurring therein, That the Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon respectfully memorializes the Congress of the United States to repeal the excise tax levied upon telephone and telegraph services; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this memorial be sent to the President and Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives, and to all members of the Oregon congressional delegation.

Adopted by senate February 18, 1959. Readopted by senate March 4, 1959.

MEDA COLE,
Chief Clerk of Senate.
WALTER J. PEARSON,
President of Senate.

Adopted by house February 26, 1959.

ROBERT B. DUNCAN,
Speaker of House.

(The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Oregon, identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.)

RESOLUTIONS OF THE OREGON STATE FARMERS UNION

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to bring to the attention of the Senate a series of resolutions adopted by the Oregon State Farmers Union at their annual convention in Salem, Oreg., last February 7, 1959. I ask unanimous consent that the resolutions, to which I have alluded, be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

The Farmers Union is one of the great farm organizations in my State; and I feel that it is important that the Senate have the benefit of the thinking of the members of that great organization when the time comes to deliberate upon legislative matters affecting our farm policy.

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

RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED AT THE 49TH ANNUAL CONVENTION OF THE OREGON STATE FARMERS UNION, FEBRUARY 7, 1959, SALEM, OREG.

Resolved, That the membership of county ASC committees, which at present is made up of three members, be increased to five, the number of alternates remaining the same, two.

Resolved, That the Oregon State Farmers Union go on record as being in favor of the formation of an International Food Bank.

Whereas the destructive power of the atomic bomb has been demonstrated beyond question; and

Whereas the earth's atmosphere has been polluted by atomic fallout from bombs heretofore detonated, to an extent that it constitutes a hazard to human life; and

Whereas the United States and the Soviet Union have stock piles of atomic bombs that could, if used, devastate the whole earth; and

Whereas further detonation of atomic bombs cannot be justified from any standpoint: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Oregon State Farmers Union, in convention assembled, That we are opposed to the further detonation of atomic bombs by the United States or any other country; and be it further

Resolved, That the United States enter into agreement with other countries to cease the detonation of atomic or hydrogen bombs; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, the Atomic Energy Commission, and to our Senators and Representatives in Congress.

NEWBERG FARMERS UNION.

Whereas we believe that any farm program should be regulated according to the need of the particular farmer to maintain his place in the economy of his community: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the actual production per acre over the last 10 years be used as a basis for county records to determine allotments and conservation reserve payments.

MORROW COUNTY FARMERS UNION.

Whereas we are of the firmest belief that the Creator gave the natural resources for all people—past, present, and future; and

Whereas the only way the present and future generations can be assured of their benefits and safeguards from river development is through entire area planning and development to produce the most possible power potential, flood control, irrigation, recreation, navigation, etc.; and

Whereas the only way that all people, farmers, businesses, consumers, etc., can fully enjoy their heritage is by developing the resources themselves through the most democratically controlled organization possible to perpetuate the safeguards for people in the future; and

Whereas we feel that the appointment of both the board of directors and general manager by the President of the United States with the consent of the Congress has a possibility of making the corporation one with unstable management and a political football: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Oregon State Farmers Union, in convention assembled, go on record as supporting a Columbia River Development bill similar to that presented by United States Senator RICHARD L. NEUBERGER, except that portion which may weaken the present preference clause, and except that portion which allows the President of the United States to appoint the general manager instead of leaving his appointment up to the board of directors.

BUENA VISTA FARMERS UNION.

INVESTIGATION OF MANAGEMENT OF MISSOURI RIVER WATER—JOINT RESOLUTION OF MONTANA LEGISLATURE

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I present for printing in the RECORD a joint memorial passed by the House and Senate of the Montana State Legislature requesting a thorough congressional investigation of management of Missouri River water.

When the Flood Control Act of 1944 was before Congress, we added to it the O'Mahoney-Millikin amendment, reserving waters arising in the Western States for western uses. Today, we are confronted with a shortage of power for our public and cooperative electric systems in several of the upper basin States. A part of the reason is the Corps of Army Engineers' use of a disproportionate part of Missouri River water to maintain a flowing navigation channel in the lower Missouri River during the summer months. Although our power peaks come in the winter, water is allowed to flow out of the upper basin at the rate of 30,000 cubic feet per second during the summer months. This flow is cut back to less than a third of this in the winter months when power is most needed.

The Corps of Army Engineers insists that the O'Mahoney-Millikin amendment does protect upper basin water for electric power generation for the upper basin. The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], a coauthor of the amendment, has stated before our committee that power generation was contemplated by him and former Senator Millikin when the amendment was written, offered and adopted. It was certainly in my mind when I supported the adoption of the amendment.

The upper basin States do not want to stop navigation in the lower basin. We have urged studies of slack water navigation. We have suggested the construction of thermal powerplants in the vast lignite areas of the Dakotas and eastern Montana to meet the electric power requirements of the area and relieve some of the pressure on scarce water supplies.

In the upper basin we do not believe in fighting over scarcities when there are abundant resources to meet all needs. We are for the full development of our resource potentials.

But it is becoming increasingly clear that there is an effort to deny upper basin States both the use of their own water to meet their own needs and development of alternative resources as well. You are all familiar with our effort to get construction of Yellowtail Dam started, and of executive obstruction of that project.

We have urged the Appropriations Committees of the House and Senate to authorize new studies of the feasibility of slack water navigation in the lower Missouri Basin. I have urged the Executive Department to plan and build thermal generating plants in the upper Missouri Basin lignite areas to meet our power requirements.

Unhappily, the same lobbies which demand that our water be illegally released for lower basin navigation also oppose the construction of alternative plants.

I hope that the Members of this body and other agencies of Government will take note of this joint memorial and give some thought to the situation.

When the Army Engineers' and the Bureau of Reclamation's conflicting plans for Missouri River development

were joined in the renowned "shameless, loveless shotgun wedding" at Omaha, Nebr., in 1944, Congress was warned that there was not enough water for both schemes. The wedding is right now headed for the rocks and it is going to end in an irreconcilable domestic break if the lower basin partner believes that the upper basin partner is going to provide everything on the table, and let the lower basin consume all of it.

I deplore the fact that we did not create a Missouri Valley Authority and assure full resources development back in 1945, instead of permitting the "shameless, loveless shotgun wedding" of the Pick and Sloan plans. We knew then that the two plans were not compatible. But the wedding was solemnized and has been consummated by gigantic public expenditures although some of us were speaking up, and refusing to hold our peace, all the time.

The Montana joint memorial now going into the RECORD may well be regarded as notice that divorce proceedings are just ahead unless some new arrangements can be made so the upper basin will not have to sacrifice all its needs in order to float a fleet of sand and gravel barges and a relatively few commercial barges on a costly, wasteful, water-extravagant flowing navigation channel in the lower river.

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

Joint memorial of the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Montana to the Congress of the United States; Hon. JAMES E. MURRAY and Hon. MIKE MANSFIELD, Senators from the State of Montana; Hon. LEE METCALF and Hon. LEROY ANDERSON, Representatives in Congress from the State of Montana; urging the U.S. Congress to investigate and study the supply, control, allocation, and use of the Missouri Basin waters and power

Whereas it is a well established fact that the growth and development of any basin area in the United States is dependent upon adequate water supply for industry, agriculture, power, and municipal requirements; and

Whereas the people of Montana are now looking to the Missouri River for large quantities of water for the ultimate irrigation of a quarter of a million acres of land; and are endeavoring to establish industry in this State to maintain and hold the future young people of this State; and in order to have this industry, large blocks of low-cost power will be needed for development; and

Whereas it is evident that the present disposition of the Missouri waters will result in a shortage of water to meet the aforementioned requirements in addition to meeting requirements as are now proposed in other Missouri River Basin States; and

Whereas it is imperative that a determination be made as quickly as it is possible, regarding an equitable and prudent handling of these Missouri Basin waters so that the most justifiable water requirements can be met to the fullest extent possible, with all due regard to the State of Montana in which over 80 percent (80%) of the waters on the Missouri system rise: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the 36th Legislative Assembly of the State of Montana of 1959, now in session, the Senate and the House of Representatives concurring, do recommend to the Congress of the United States, that they immediately proceed with a compete investigation and study of the Missouri Basin water supply situation. This investigation and study to cover the present method of control and allocation of water; control and allocation of federally generated power; and the question of maximum financial return to the Federal Government through the sale of such power as it shall produce; be it further

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States make a study of the present application of the O'Mahoney-Millikin amendment to the Flood Control Act of 1944, to determine if there is any abrogation of that amendment; be it further

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States take such steps as shall be necessary to the end that Montana people and Montana industry shall be given first consideration in the adjudication of water and power distribution, and to protect their rights in such water and such power already established, whether by use or otherwise; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this memorial be forwarded by the Secretary of the Senate of the Senate of Montana to each of the individuals named in the title of this memorial, Hon. JAMES E. MURRAY and Hon. MIKE MANSFIELD, Senators from the State of Montana and Hon. LEE METCALF and Hon. LEROY ANDERSON, Representatives in Congress from the State of Montana.

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

By Mr. KERR:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Oklahoma; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"ENROLLED SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 4

"Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to act promptly and favorably to provide authority and funds for the construction of the Canton irrigation project water distribution works; directing that authenticated copies of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States and to Members of the Oklahoma congressional delegation

"Whereas the Congress of the United States did approve and provide funds for construction of Canton Reservoir on the North Canadian River, Canton, Okla.; and

"Whereas the reservoir was constructed to include outlet works and storage for the irrigation of 16,000 acres of land in the Canadian River Valley; and

"Whereas in 1945 the landowners in the valley below Canton Dam did organize and perfect the Canton Irrigation District under Oklahoma law, comprising aforesaid 16,000 acres of land; and

"Whereas the Canton Irrigation District is ready and willing to enter into contract negotiations for the repayment of construction costs of the project water distribution works to serve the lands of said district; and

"Whereas the Secretary of the Interior has, through the Bureau of the Budget, presented to the Congress the Canton project report for its consideration and approval: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the 27th Legislature of the State of Oklahoma, the House of Representatives concurring therein, That we respectfully request the 86th Congress of the United States, now assembled, to act promptly and favorably to authorize the construction of the Canton Irrigation District project water distribution works and to provide the necessary funds to initiate construction of said works at the earliest possible date; be it further

"Resolved, That an authenticated copy of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States and to each Member of the Oklahoma congressional delegation.

"Adopted by the Senate the 3d day of March 1959.

"HAROLD GARVIN,
"President pro tempore of the Senate.

"Adopted by the House of Representatives the 9th day of March 1959.

"CLINT G. LIVINGSTON,
"Speaker of the House of Representatives."

A resolution of the Senate of the State of Oklahoma; ordered to lie on the table:

"ENROLLED SENATE RESOLUTION 27

"Resolution commemorating the life and achievements of Charles Curtis, member of the Kaw Nation and Vice President of the United States; and expressing the gratitude of the Senate of the State of Oklahoma to those persons whose efforts resulted in the presentation of a statute of Vice Precident Curtis to the National Hall of Fame for Famous American Indians at Anadarko

"Whereas this sovereign State of Oklahoma has long been known among all her sister commonwealths as the foremost repository of those memorials and monuments which preserve for future generations of Americans some knowledge of the culture of the American Indian and of the indelible imprint made on our national character by the original inhabitants of this great land; and

"Whereas the proudest heritage and most cherished birthright of every Oklahoman is the proud legacy of courage and honor bestowed upon our State by our Indian citizens; and

"Whereas the very name of our great commonwealth springs from the meaningful and melodious tongue of one of the greatest of the American Indian Nations; and

"Whereas Anadarko, Okla., was therefore chosen as the site of the National Hall of Fame for Famous American Indians, established for the perpetuation of the memory of the contributions of this great people, and for the preservation of the symbols and memorials of their noble way of life; and

"Whereas Charles Curtis, outstanding attorney, civic leader and statesman, five times U.S. Senator and Vice President of the United States from 1929 to 1933, was a member of the Kaw Nation, and had a tribal allotment in the lands of that people in Oklahoma; and

"Whereas because of his contributions to the cultural, spiritual and social development of the American way of life, it has long been desired that this illustrious son of the Kaw Nation be included among that select and immortal group of American Indians honored in the National Hall of Fame for Famous American Indians at Anadarko; and

"Whereas a life-size bronze bust of Charles Curtis will be unveiled at Washington, D.C., on March 4, 1959, by his daughter, Mrs. Webster Knight, II, of Providence, R.I., and will thereafter be transported to Anadarko, where it will be dedicated and permanently installed in the Hall of Fame for Famous American Indians on August 17, 1959, in the presence of thousands of persons of American Indian descent from all over the United States; and

"Whereas this wholly appropriate tribute to the greatness of Charles Curtis and this magnificent addition in our own Oklahoma institution has been made possible only by the unceasing efforts and devotion of a dedicated band of Oklahomans, both private citizens and Members of our congressional delegation, and a group of citizens of other States whose gracious efforts on behalf of this project should earn them the gratitude of our entire State; and

"Whereas it is appropriate that this body tender its tribute to the memory of Charles Curtis and express its deep appreciation to

those who have given so unstintingly of their time to consummate this tribute to Mr. Curtis and the transfer of his bust to our Indian Hall of Fame: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the 27th Legislature of the State of Oklahoma, That this body, now duly assembled, does hereby pay official tribute to the accomplishments of the late Charles Curtis, illustrious son of the Kaw Nation, and does hereby officially express its deep gratitude on behalf of the people of Oklahoma, to the following persons who have obtained this signal honor for the National Hall of Fame for Famous American Indians: Hon. Patrick J. Hurley, general chairman; Hon. Edgar S. Vaught, Oklahoma City, Okla.; Joe W. McBride, Oklahoma City, Okla.; Hon. Roy Johnson, Ardmore, Okla.; Gov. Floyd Maytubby, Oklahoma City, Okla.; Paul Stonum, Anadarko, Okla.; Helen Peterson, executive director of National Congress of American Indians, Washington, D.C.; Dena Woods, Washington, D.C.; Allan Cromley, National Press Building, Daily Oklahoman, Washington, D.C.; Mrs. Peter J. Ward, 8144 Audrain Drive, St. Louis 21, Mo.; Mrs. Logan Billingsley, Katonah, N.Y.; Robert Goombi, tribal chieftain and president American Indian Exposition, members of the Charles S. Curtis memorial committee; Hon. Richard Nixon, Vice President of the United States; Hon. Henry A. Wallace, former Vice President of the United States, honorary members; Mrs. Webster Knight, II, Providence, R.I.; Madeleine Park, Katonah, N.Y., the sculptress; Hon. Ed Edmondson, Carl Albert, Tom Steed, John Jarman, Page Belcher and Toby Morris, U.S. Representatives from Oklahoma; Senator Robert S. Kerr, and Senator Mike Monroney our U.S. Senators; be it further

"Resolved, That properly prepared copies of this resolution be mailed to the persons above named, to the University of Oklahoma Library, and to the National Hall of Fame for Famous American Indians, at Anadarko, Okla.

"Adopted by the senate the 25th day of February 1959.

"HAROLD F. GARVIN,
"President pro tempore of the Senate."

TAXATION OF COOPERATIVES—RESOLUTIONS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I present, for appropriate reference, two resolutions which I have received from the Wild Rice Electric Cooperative, Mahnomen, Minn., in regard to further taxation of cooperatives. I ask unanimous consent that the resolutions may be printed in the RECORD.

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

RESOLUTION 1

Whereas it has been brought to the attention of the members of Wild Rice Electric Cooperative, Inc., Mahnomen, Minn., that there is an administration co-op tax proposal; and

Whereas such proposal could be detrimental to all cooperatives; and

Whereas such proposal is a punitive tax proposal: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the membership of Wild Rice Electric Cooperative, Inc., assembled at the annual meeting do hereby oppose such legislation; and be it further

Resolved, That said resolution be forwarded to its Senators and Representatives.

RESOLUTION 2

Whereas it has been brought to the attention of the members of Wild Rice Electric Cooperative, Inc., Mahnomen, Minn., that the administration proposal to make effort to increase the present interest rates now charged to REA co-ops; and

Whereas such increase in interest rates would work a definite hardship on all such co-ops; and

Whereas such proposal could result in the defeat of the purpose of REA's to serve all those without service: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the membership of Wild Rice Electric Cooperative, Inc., assembled at the annual meeting do hereby oppose such legislation; and, be it further

Resolved, That said resolution be forwarded to its Senators and Representatives.

INTEREST RATE INCREASES ON REA LOANS—RESOLUTION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a resolution I have received from the McLeod Cooperative Power Association in opposition to proposed interest rate increases on REA loans be inserted at this point in the RECORD and appropriately referred.

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

Whereas the administration of the Federal Government has proposed and recommended that the interest rate to be charged on REA loans be increased; and

Whereas such an increase will be detrimental to the rural electrification program: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the members of McLeod Cooperative Power Association, That this association and its membership shall oppose any legislation increasing the interest rate to be charged for REA loans.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

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

S. 1094. A bill to amend the Bretton Woods Agreements Act (Rept. No. 109).

By Mr. MORSE, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, without amendment:

S. 643. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act relating to the levying and collecting of taxes and assessments, and for other purposes," approved June 25, 1938 (Rept. No. 111); and

S. 745. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to create a Board for the Condemnation of Insanitary Buildings in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved May 1, 1906, as amended (Rept. No. 113).

By Mr. MORSE, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, with an amendment:

S. 645. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to remove dangerous or unsafe buildings and parts thereof, and for other purposes," approved March 1, 1899, as amended (Rept. No. 112).

By Mr. MORSE, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, with amendments:

S. 644. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for compulsory school attendance, for the taking of a school census in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved February 4, 1925 (Rept. No. 114).

By Mr. HAYDEN, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, without amendment:

S. Con. Res. 13. Concurrent resolution to provide additional funds for special study by the Joint Economic Committee (Rept. No. 117);

H. Con. Res. 15. Concurrent resolution providing for the printing of the "Code of Ethics for Government Service" as a House document;

H. Con. Res. 64. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of House Document No. 234, 84th Congress, entitled "The Prayer Room in the U.S. Capitol"; and

H. Con. Res. 75. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of committee print entitled "Title 38, United States Code, Veterans' Benefits."

AREA REDEVELOPMENT ACT—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE—MINORITY AND INDIVIDUAL VIEWS

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, I report favorably, with amendments, the bill (S. 722) to establish an effective program to alleviate conditions of substantial and persistent unemployment and underemployment in certain economically depressed areas, and I submit a report (No. 110) thereon. I ask unanimous consent that the report, together with individual and minority views, be printed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be received and printed, as requested by the Senator from Illinois, and the bill will be placed on the calendar.

AUTHORIZATION OF RENTAL OF COTTON ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. President, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, I report an original bill to authorize the rental of cotton acreage allotments, and I submit a report (No. 115) thereon. I ask unanimous consent that the report be printed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be received and the bill will be placed on the calendar.

The bill (S. 1455) to authorize the rental of cotton acreage allotments, reported by Mr. JORDAN, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, was read twice by its title and ordered to be placed on the calendar.

ADDITIONAL JUDGES FOR JUVENILE COURT OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, I report an original bill to provide for the appointment of two additional judges for the juvenile court of the District of Columbia, and I submit a report (No. 116) thereon.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be received and the bill will be placed on the calendar.

The bill (S. 1456) to provide for the appointment of two additional judges for the juvenile court of the District of Columbia was received, read twice by its title, and placed on the calendar.

ELSIE F. WILKINSON—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. HAYDEN, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 93) to pay a gratuity to Elsie F. Wilkinson, which was placed on the calendar, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay, from the contingent fund of the Senate, to Elsie F. Wilkinson, widow of James M. Wilkinson, an employee of the Senate at the time of his death, a sum equal to 7 months' compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

REPORT ON DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, from the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments, to which was referred for examination and recommendation a list of records transmitted to the Senate by the Archivist of the United States that appeared to have no permanent value or historical interest, submitted a report thereon, pursuant to law.

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

The following favorable report of a nomination was submitted:

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

Thomas C. Mann, of Texas, Assistant Secretary of State for Economic Affairs, to be the representative on the Commission on International Commodity Trade of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations.

BILLS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. JACKSON:

S. 1438. A bill to require that a certain tract of land in Walla Walla, Wash., be disposed of on an individual lot basis; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. LONG:

S. 1439. A bill for the relief of Peter Kopanic, Martin Radovcic, and Ivan Talijancica; and

S. 1440. A bill for the relief of Hugo Tarantino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

S. 1441. A bill to amend the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, as amended, to provide a certain number of visas for persons of Armenian ethnic origin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

By Mr. SCOTT:

S. 1442. A bill for the relief of Kim Fukata and her minor child; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEATING:

S. 1443. A bill to preserve seniority rights of 10-point preference eligibles in the postal service transferring from the position of letter carrier to clerk or from the position of clerk to letter carrier, and for other purposes; and

S. 1444. A bill to amend section 4 of the act of July 6, 1945, as amended, so as to provide for payment of overtime compensation to substitute employees in the postal field service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

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

By Mr. JAVITS:

S. 1445. A bill for the relief of William Winter and Mrs. Regina Winter; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

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

S. 1446. A bill to provide for the appointment of additional judges for the Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit and the district courts for the southern and eastern districts of New York; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILEY:

S. 1447. A bill to amend section 161, title 35, United States Code, with respect to patents for plants; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COOPER (for himself and Mr. MORTON):

S. 1448. A bill to change the name of the Abraham Lincoln National Historical Park at Hodgenville, Ky., to Abraham Lincoln's Birthplace; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CARLSON:

S. 1449. A bill to incorporate the Agricultural Hall of Fame; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

By Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey:

S. 1450. A bill to amend section 13a(1) of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, relative to the discontinuance or change of the operation of certain trains or ferries; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FULBRIGHT (by request):

S. 1451. A bill to amend further the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

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

S. 1452. A bill to provide authority for temporary price, wage, and rent controls, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

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

By Mr. MARTIN:

S. 1453. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to sell and convey certain lands in the State of Iowa to the city of Keosauqua; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. MORSE:

S. 1454. A bill for the relief of Keitha L. Baker; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JORDAN:

S. 1455. A bill to authorize the rental of cotton acreage allotments; placed on the calendar.

(See the remarks of Mr. JORDAN when he reported the above bill from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, which appear under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

By Mr. HARTKE:

S. 1456. A bill to provide for the appointment of two additional judges for the juvenile court of the District of Columbia; placed on the calendar.

(See the remarks of Mr. HARTKE when he reported the above bill, which appears under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

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

S. 1457. A bill to amend title XI of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. JACKSON:

S. 1458. A bill to amend the Career Compensation Act of 1949, as amended, to correct certain deficiencies; to the Committee on Armed Services.

RESOLUTION

Mr. HAYDEN, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 93) to pay a gratuity to Elsie F. Wilkinson, which was placed on the calendar.

(See the above resolution printed in full where it appears under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

AMENDMENT OF REFUGEE RELIEF ACT OF 1953, RELATING TO VISAS FOR PERSONS OF ARMENIAN ETHNIC ORIGIN

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and my colleague, the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Refugee Relief Act, as amended, to provide a certain number of visas for persons of Armenian ethnic origin.

There are many people of Armenian origin living in our country. They have made many splendid contributions to our Nation and to our culture. The bill I have introduced would permit them now to be reunited with their relatives abroad who have heretofore been denied admission into the United States. This legislation would correct an inequitable omission in the immigration laws which now prevent many worthy people from finding refuge in America with friends and relatives.

To admit 10,000 refugees of Armenian origin, as provided by the amendment to the Refugee Relief Act which I am introducing, would remind people throughout the world that our Nation continues to be sensitive to the plight of the persecuted and to recognize the enrichment which results from sharing our life with deserving people less fortunate than we.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at the conclusion of my remarks a resolution favoring legislation like the bill which I have introduced, which was adopted by the Council for Immigration and Resettlement of Armenians, and submitted by the council to the Committee on the Judiciary on December 11, 1958.

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

The bill (S. 1441) to amend the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, as amended, to provide a certain number of visas for persons of Armenian origin, introduced by Mr. SALTONSTALL (for himself and Mr. KENNEDY), was received, read twice by

its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The resolution presented by Mr. SALTONSTALL is as follows:

Whereas the Congress of the United States has been sympathetic toward the plight of World War II refugees, escapees and other oppressed peoples of Europe, Asia, and Middle East by providing special legislations for the entry of these peoples as immigrants under the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, the Refugee Relief Act of 1953 and Public Law 85-316; and

Whereas persons of Armenian ethnic origin, following the outbreak of World War I, World War II and numerous other conflicts in the Middle East suffered reprisals because of their race and Christian beliefs and experienced mass deportation, massacres and tortures comparable to the suffering of any other minority in the world history; and

Whereas these persons of Armenian ethnic origin have found temporary refuge in the Middle East and European countries as escapees and deportees, but have not resettled and are still considered and classified as refugees where they reside; and

Whereas based upon the figures submitted by the U.S. Department of State, Visa Division, on August 1, 1958, it is estimated that approximately 40,000 persons of Armenian ethnic origin have registered at the American Consulates abroad to join their relatives and friends, and find asylum in the United States, and that many thousands of others have attempted to register but have been discouraged, because of the hopelessness of their ever being granted a visa by reason of the fact that they are chargeable to countries whose quota allocation is less than 310 annually and in most cases to quota areas of 100 annually; and

Whereas Americans of Armenian origin residing in the United States have at all times distinguished themselves by their loyalty and resourcefulness, and as a minority group of approximately 250,000 have contributed greatly to the growth and enrichment of the United States, and have upheld the principles of democracy and have fought for the preservation of our institutions and our way of life during two World Wars and the Korean conflict; and

Whereas the Americans of Armenian origin residing in the United States are capable and willing to sponsor qualified immigrants and provide suitable employment, housing facilities, and other resettlement assistance; and

Whereas the Congress of the United States has enacted special legislation authorizing the admission of refugees and escapees of the Chinese, Dutch, German, Hungarian, Italian and Portuguese origin: Therefore be it

Resolved, That 10,000 special nonquota visas be allocated to persons of Armenian ethnic origin seeking entry to the United States as immigrants, and to their spouses and the unmarried sons and daughters under 21 years of age accompanying them.

Submitted on December 11, 1958, by the Council for Immigration and Resettlement of Armenians to the U.S. Senate Judiciary Subcommittee at Washington, D.C.

PRESERVATION OF SENIORITY AND PREFERENCE RIGHTS IN CERTAIN CASES IN THE POSTAL SERVICE

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to preserve the seniority rights of 10-point preference eligibles in the postal service transferring from position of letter carrier to clerk or from the position of clerk to letter carrier, and for other purposes.

Simply stated, this bill would allow a 10-point veteran to transfer from the job of letter carrier to clerk or vice versa without losing his seniority rights. Since Congress has seen fit to grant disabled war veterans special preference under the civil service rules, it seems unfair to limit this preference to one type of job, rather than to all positions within the postal service. Surely, maintaining a standard of ease and flexibility for transfers within the service would tend to promote efficiency. Adamant rules which discourage workers from seeking positions they like better tend to make for inefficiency, and injure morale.

Enactment of this measure would eliminate this inequity from the present law, and promote even better postal service.

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

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

The bill (S. 1443) to preserve seniority rights of 10-point preference eligibles in the postal service transferring from the position of letter carrier to clerk or from the position of clerk to letter carrier, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. KEATING, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, 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 subsection (b) of Public Law 739, Eightieth Congress, shall be amended to read as follows:

"(b) Any such letter carrier or clerk who, prior to the date of enactment of this Act, has transferred from the position of letter carrier to that of clerk or from the position of clerk to that of letter carrier, as the case may be, and has incurred loss of seniority by reason of such transfer, shall be restored the seniority to which he would have been entitled if such transfer had not occurred (1) if he presents to the Civil Service Commission evidence satisfactory to the Commission that such transfer was necessitated principally by reason of a disability which he received on active duty in the Armed Forces of the United States, or (2) if his name had originally appeared on the Civil Service Register for the position to which he transferred, Public Law 577 of the Seventy-ninth Congress notwithstanding."

OVERTIME COMPENSATION FOR SUBSTITUTE EMPLOYEES IN POSTAL FIELD SERVICE

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to provide for payment of overtime compensation to substitute employees in the postal field service. It is the purpose of this bill to bring the overtime wages of the substitute employees of the Post Office under the same provisions which govern those of the regular employees.

In other words, if a substitute works over 8 hours in 1 day, he should be paid time and a half, as is a regular employee. If a substitute works over 40 hours in a week, he should be paid time and a half, as is a regular employee.

Under the current provisions, the substitute carrier or clerk may work any number of hours in 1 day or 1 week, and yet never receive additional pay for overtime. This is grossly unfair, and certainly not in keeping with established wage practices in private industry. My bill would correct this injustice, and therefore deserves widespread support in this body.

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

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

The bill (S. 1444) to amend section 4 of the act of July 6, 1945, as amended, so as to provide for payment of overtime compensation to substitute employees in the postal field service, introduced by Mr. KEATING, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 4 of the Act entitled "An Act to reclassify the salaries of postmasters, officers, and employees of the postal service; to establish uniform procedures for computing compensation, and for other purposes", approved July 6, 1945, as amended, is amended by striking out the period in the last sentence and inserting a colon and the following: "*Provided further*, That in emergencies or if the needs of the service require, substitute and hourly rate employees in post offices of the first, second, and third class may be employed in excess of eight hours per day or forty hours per week and for such overtime service they shall be paid on the basis of 150 per centum of the hourly rate of pay received by such employees."

APPOINTMENT OF CERTAIN ADDITIONAL JUDGES

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and my colleague, the junior Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill providing for the appointment of a total of seven additional judges for three Federal courts in the New York area. One new Federal judgeship would be created in the Second Circuit, Court of Appeals, located in New York City, plus two additional judgeships in the eastern district and four more in the southern district of New York.

The enormous caseload imposed upon the judges in these three Federal courts, far in excess of the national average, has resulted in an intolerable situation. Citizens who seek their rights in any of these courts may experience a delay of up to 4 years between the time their case is filed and final trial. Additional judicial manpower is essential to help assure the prompt administration of justice in the jurisdictional area concerned which is populated by nearly 19 million people.

The omnibus judgeship bill introduced last year by the chairman of the Judiciary Committee called for the appointment of 34 additional Federal judges including the seven provided in the bill Senator KEATING and I are introducing today. The proposal for a seventh judge for the Second Circuit, Court of Appeals was part of a measure first introduced by

myself and Senator Ives during the last Congress; this bill was passed by the Senate but not acted upon in the House before adjournment. The longer we delay, the more acute the situation becomes. In the last 4 years, the average number of appeals per judge has soared to 92, practically double the national average of 54. However, it was in 1955, when the caseload was considerably lower, that the Judicial Conference of the United States originally endorsed the need for another judge in the second circuit based on the amount of judicial business then being carried on in this court which covers Vermont and Connecticut as well as New York.

Regarding the additional judgeships required in the eastern and southern districts of New York, a review of the statistics compiled by the administrative office of the U.S. courts shows that in recent years these two courts have been having grave problems in the timely disposition of civil cases settled after trial. Presently, the eastern district has a record delay in such cases of 49.9 months, which is 8 times longer than the 6-month period the Judicial Conference considers reasonable. Under those circumstances, our proposal to increase from six to eight the total number of judges in that district seems extremely modest.

We also propose to raise from 18 to 22 the number of judges serving in the southern district of New York. A great deal has been done to accelerate case disposition there by excellent pretrial work but the need for more judges continues acute. Located in the world's commercial and industrial center, the southern district is the biggest trial court in the entire Federal system and according to the Senate Judiciary Committee's report in 1957 it has a history best described only in terms of excessive caseloads, large numbers of protracted cases, a continual accumulation of arrearages, and mounting delays. Four more judges would seem to represent a minimum addition in this district where there was a backlog of over 10,000 cases in 1958, with 578 civil cases pending per judge.

Court reform at all levels has become a major issue in New York State in recent years where there is a growing public awareness and concern that justice delayed for a prolonged period of time is often justice denied. Successful efforts have been made to institute more efficient calendar procedures in the southern district, for example, and it is certainly possible that the State legislature will enact comprehensive court reform legislation during the current session. In light of the extensive hearings held by the Senate Judiciary Committee and its favorable report on a similar Ives-Javits judgeship bill, along with the 4-year-old recommendations of the Judicial Conference and the mounting impartial statistical evidence from the courts themselves, my colleague [Mr. KEATING] and I hope Congress will act promptly on this bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1446) to provide for the appointment of additional judges for the Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit and the district courts for the southern and eastern districts of New York, introduced by Mr. JAVITS (for himself and Mr. KEATING), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

DESIGNATION OF ABRAHAM LINCOLN'S BIRTHPLACE

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, joined by my colleague the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON], I introduce for appropriate reference, a bill to change the name of the Abraham Lincoln National Historical Park to Abraham Lincoln's Birthplace. It would designate the national park near Hodgenville, where the log cabin in which Abraham Lincoln was born is preserved, for what it is—the birthplace of the 16th President of the United States, the sesquicentennial of whose birth we are celebrating this year.

I am informed there are 182 national parks and national historical parks, sites, and monuments. There are also many memorials, residences, parks, and shrines marking points of interest in Abraham Lincoln's life. Each has its own significance.

We mark the date and place of birth of every great figure as of special significance. The purpose of the bill I introduce is to accord to Abraham Lincoln's birthplace this special significance.

Abraham Lincoln was born on February 12, 1809, on a farm in Hardin County, Ky. Later Larue County was established, and Abraham Lincoln's birthplace now is located in Larue County, a few miles from the county seat at Hodgenville, Ky. On the original farm the cabin believed to be the one in which Lincoln was born still stands in a marble memorial.

In 1916 Lincoln's birthplace was made a national park, and was named Abraham Lincoln National Park by the act of July 17, 1916. Later it was changed to the Abraham Lincoln National Historical Park, by the act of August 11, 1939.

This is Lincoln's birthplace, and it should be so named. Having the site accurately described by the official name of the park will be helpful to all those who visit the birthplace and to all who take a passing or a profound interest in Lincoln's life. It is only right that his birthplace be so named, and that it be specifically recognized rather than generally labeled.

It is the belief of many Kentuckians, and one I share, that this national park should be designated as Abraham Lincoln's Birthplace, to identify it and distinguish it from the many parks and shrines which mark Abraham Lincoln's life. I am sure that thousands of people throughout the United States will approve the change which the bill I introduce today proposes. I think it is appropriate to make this change during the sesquicentennial anniversary of the birth of Abraham Lincoln.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD some examples of National Park Service sites, which support the principle of the bill I have just introduced, together with a list of historical sites marking Lincoln's life, most of which are already specifically named, and which illustrate the need for designating the Abraham Lincoln National Historic Park as his "Birthplace."

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

EXAMPLES OF NATIONAL PARK SERVICE SITES

There are 182 parks, historical parks, monuments, historic sites and other areas administered by the National Park Service. Eight of these are national historical parks, as is Abraham Lincoln's birthplace at Hodgenville, Ky.

Several are more accurately named.

For example, the national monument marking George Washington's birthplace in Westmoreland County, Va., is named exactly that, "George Washington's Birthplace."

One national memorial here in Washington is accurately and officially titled the "House Where Lincoln Died."

The national historic site in Hyde Park is officially listed as the "Home of Franklin D. Roosevelt."

The national historic site and the national monument marking Thomas Edison's "Home," and the "Edison Laboratory," are so named.

Without such proper designation, many could confuse the significance of what is now the "Abraham Lincoln National Historical Park." For example:

The Theodore Roosevelt National Memorial Park is not his birthplace, but is part of his Elkhorn Ranch in the Badlands along the Little Missouri River.

Similarly, the Andrew Johnson National Monument is not his birthplace, but is the President's home and grave, in Greenville, Tenn.

As I have said, it would be better to have the title of our national historical park near Hodgenville state the simple fact that it is Lincoln's birthplace. It should not be necessary for those who might not recall the fact to look further in order to guess the significance of the place. Accurately named, the fact will stand forth for all to see at once.

LINCOLN HISTORICAL SITES

Abraham Lincoln National Historical Park, Hodgenville, Ky. (Birthplace.)

Knob Creek Farm, northeast of Hodgenville. (Where Lincoln lived from 2 to 7 years of age, with replica of Hodgenville cabin.)

Lincoln State Park, Lincoln City, Ind. (Pigeon Creek cabin site and Nancy Hanks Lincoln grave.)

Lincoln Pioneer Village, City Park, Rockport, Ind. (Memorial to Lincoln's years in Spencer County, Ind.)

New Salem State Park, New Salem, Ill. (Site of Lincoln-Berry store; where Lincoln began practicing law and was elected to legislature.)

Vandalia State House, Vandalia, Ill. (Old Statehouse, where Lincoln served; State ownership.)

Lincoln Home, Springfield, Ill. (State ownership.)

Lincoln Speech Memorial, Gettysburg National Cemetery, Gettysburg, Pa.

Lincoln Museum National Memorial, Washington, D.C. (Ford's Theater.)

House Where Lincoln Died National Memorial, Washington, D.C.

Lincoln Tomb, Springfield, Ill. (State ownership.)

Lincoln Memorial National Memorial, Washington, D.C.

Lincoln Homestead State Park, near Springfield, Ky. (Replica of the cabin of Abraham Lincoln's grandmother.)

Thomas and Nancy Hanks Lincoln Marriage Temple, Pioneer Memorial State Park, Harrodsburg, Ky.

Lincoln Log Cabin State Park, Coles County, Ill. (Thomas Lincoln cabin.)

Sarah Lincoln House, Campbell, Ill. (State ownership.)

Lincoln cabin replica, Chicago Historical Society, Chicago, Ill. Replica of Hodgenville cabin.)

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I hope the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs will promptly consider and approve the proposal.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1448) to change the name of the Abraham Lincoln National Historical Park at Hodgenville, Ky., to Abraham Lincoln's Birthplace, introduced by Mr. COOPER (for himself and Mr. MORTON), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

INCORPORATION OF AGRICULTURAL HALL OF FAME

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, the Agricultural Hall of Fame, which was permanently located near Kansas City, Kans., at a recent meeting of the executive committee is well on the way toward actual construction.

The architect's plans have been submitted and generally approved. When completed, it will truly be a shrine for agriculture.

I am today introducing, in behalf of myself and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] a bill which would provide for the incorporation of the Agricultural Hall of Fame.

I ask unanimous consent that this bill lie on the Vice President's desk until the end of the session next Monday, in order that other Members might have an opportunity to cosponsor if they so desire.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Kansas.

The bill (S. 1449) to incorporate the Agricultural Hall of Fame, introduced by Mr. CARLSON, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AMENDMENT OF INTERSTATE COMMERCE ACT, RELATING TO DISCONTINUANCE OF CERTAIN TRAINS AND FERRIES

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend section 13a (1) of the Interstate Commerce Act. The section was enacted into law last year as part of the Transportation Act of 1958. Briefly, section 13a(1) speeds up the procedure for abandonment of train or ferry service by railroads. The Interstate Commerce Commission is given the right to supersede State jurisdiction; the Commission is not required to hold a public hearing, or to conduct an investigation.

I need not describe the conditions under which the Transportation Act was passed. It was the result of intensive, widespread hearings at which representatives of the railroads of this Nation described the financial emergency which now faces them. The act permits widespread, constructive steps to help this basic American industry.

Two complaints, however, have been raised against section 13a(1). New Jersey State officials and commuter groups protested when the ICC did not grant a hearing on the New York Central system petition to abandon its Hudson River ferry service. The other complaint was that—even when the Interstate Commerce Commission does institute an investigation and conduct hearings, severe limitations are imposed by the present law as to the time within which the Interstate Commerce Commission may exercise its jurisdiction. Such time limits, it has been charged, do not permit full investigation and public hearing. A representative of the ICC has made a similar complaint to members of my staff.

In New Jersey, and in other important areas of the United States, these complaints were given additional urgency by the threat of large-scale breakdowns within the transportation networks now serving large metropolitan areas. Public alarm over this threat is great, particularly since State and local governments have no working plan to replace rail service. The amendment I propose today will, I am aware, not give us any such working plan; that is still the duty of the State and local governments.

But it may help give the officials the time they need to work out a plan which will preserve our transportation system.

I am aware, of course, that several of my colleagues introduced S. 1331 on March 9. Their bill also would place the entire discontinuance problem under the present procedures for line abandonment. Certain provisions of that proposal would, however, in my opinion, be too far-reaching for acceptance by the Congress. I believe that the practical facts of life dictate the need for a more limited alternative, if anything is to prevail. The bill I am introducing today is an attempt to give the action we need while maintaining chances of acceptance.

The provisions of section 13a(1) appear to have given insufficient recognition to established procedures and familiar provisions for a review under the Interstate Commerce Act. The bill I am introducing would amend the present law by requiring an investigation as to public convenience and necessity and put the burden on the Interstate Commerce Commission and a mandatory hearing in every instance. While the bill requires expedited action in these cases, the arbitrary limitation upon the Commission's final order is removed. I would assume that the ICC would act with the maximum promptness consistent with reasonable opportunity for hearing, and the service would continue to be operated by the railroad. The urgency of prompt action on this corrective legislation makes it necessary, it seems to me, that we avoid involving any other provisions of the Interstate Commerce Act unnecessarily, such as the long-established provisions for total abandonment of a line of railroad. These frequently affect freight services and other major issues requiring consideration of additional and complex factors. It is preferable to act promptly in correcting the difficulties encountered in section 13a(1) before the burdens on the carrier and the procedural uncertainty of that paragraph result in the elimination of the remaining commutation services.

In my opinion, this bill represents a less drastic approach than that proposed in S. 1331. Consequently, its terms offer a better opportunity for relief to commuters because its chance of passage would be considerably greater than that of a measure that offers more far-reaching changes in the present statute.

In presenting this bill, I have no illusion that it will cure the problems of railroad commuters or the metropolitan areas in their efforts to move the increasing millions of suburban dwellers to and from their work. This will require prompt, cooperative and very expensive action by the States and the municipalities as well as sacrifices by both the riders and the railroads.

Therefore, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks a summary of the bill I have introduced.

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

The bill (S. 1450) to amend section 13a(1) of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, relative to the discontinuance or change of the operation of certain trains or ferries, introduced by Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The summary presented by Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey is as follows:

SUMMARY OF CHANGES PROPOSED IN SECTION 13a(1) OF THE INTERSTATE COMMERCE ACT IN REGARD TO DISCONTINUANCE OR CHANGE OF TRAINS OR FERRIES OPERATING ACROSS STATE LINES

The bill would make the following changes in section 13a(1) of the Interstate Commerce Act that pertains to discontinuance of trains or ferries crossing State lines.

1. Add a requirement that investigation and hearing by the Interstate Commerce Commission on proposed discontinuance of train or ferry service be mandatory to replace the present provision of the law that leaves the holding of an investigation of the proposed discontinuance or change to the discretion of the Interstate Commerce Commission.

2. The present law provides that 30 days' notice of the proposed discontinuance or change be given by the railroads to the governor of each State in which such train or ferry is operated and by posting in the facilities affected. This bill would require in addition that notice be given by the Interstate Commerce Commission to the governor of each State in which a train or ferry proposed to be discontinued is operated,

at least 30 days prior to the beginning of the hearing.

3. The present law provides that upon institution of an investigation of the proposed discontinuance or change, the Commission may require the railroad to continue to operate the service for a period not longer than 4 months beyond the date when the discontinuance or change would have become effective. Thus at present if the Commission cannot complete its investigation within that time and issue its order, the railroad is free at the end of the 4 months' period to discontinue the service. This bill would eliminate this restriction on time to allow the Commission adequate time to conclude its investigation and make known its findings.

4. The present act further leaves it to the discretion of the ICC as to whether the service proposed to be discontinued shall be continued in operation pending hearing and decision by the Commission. This bill would make it mandatory that such service be continued until hearing and decisions in such investigation.

5. Finally, the bill would require the Interstate Commerce Commission, upon instituting the required investigation, to give the carrier proposing the discontinuance or change of service, notice at least 7 days prior to the proposed effective date of the discontinuance that such service must be continued in operation. The present act provides that 10 days' notice shall be given.

AMENDMENT OF MUTUAL SECURITY ACT OF 1954, AS AMENDED

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I introduce a bill to give effect to the President's message of March 13 requesting the appropriation of $3,929,995,000 for the 1960 mutual security program, and ask for its appropriate referral.

This bill was prepared by the executive branch of the Government, and for that reason I introduce it by request, reserving my right to support it in whole or in part, and to offer amendments as may seem appropriate.

Mr. President, in introducing this bill, I invite attention to two sentences from the President's message.

First:

> The mutual security program which I propose for fiscal year 1960 is in the same pattern and has the some component parts as the program which the Congress enacted at the last session.

Second. In requesting funds for the Development Loan Fund, the President stated:

> This sum ($700 million) will allow the Fund a level of activity no higher than it established in its first year of operation.

In other words, Mr. President, we are offered the same program we now have.

In defense, in our domestic economy, and in our foreign relations, the administration seems to be unaware of the depth and scope of the Soviet challenge. There is no evidence that the administration is now or ever will be willing to urge the American people to take in one notch on our belt to deal with a Soviet challenge which confronts us in missiles, arms, and just downright capacity to produce.

How many Americans would be complacent if the President were to tell them this simple fact: Since 1955, the Soviet gross national product has been growing at a rate of about 8 percent each year; the Chinese Communist gross national product at the rate of approximately 10 percent; and the American gross national product at a rate of only a little over 1 percent?

The President's message on foreign aid reads:

> We have the capacity and the national program to surmount these dangers and many more.

I agree, Mr. President, we do have the capacity. We have the capacity but not the program.

I believe that the people of America will rise to the needs of our situation if they are clearly told what is at stake. They certainly would be willing to be taxed if it is necessary to survival. But I am not sure the administration agrees with even that simple proposition.

I am fully aware that foreign aid is not a very palatable program in this country. Some of the stories of maladministration fill one with despair and with frustration. The preoccupation of the administration with military assistance to the underdeveloped countries, and its half-hearted response to their economic needs, makes it difficult for Members of Congress to justify the aid program.

Having said these things, however, I must add that I am in agreement with the administration on the fundamental concept that the security of the United States requires that we continue to invest funds in the development of underdeveloped areas. We of the West cannot expect to survive forever if we grow richer while the bulk of mankind grows poorer. Survival requires adaptability and imagination, not rigidity—the kind of rigidity evidenced by this bill.

I anticipate that the Committee on Foreign Relations will begin consideration of the Mutual Security Act of 1959 about April 15. This will afford time for interested members of the public to familiarize themselves with the bill which I am introducing today. This will also allow time for Americans to communicate with their Senators to make their views known regarding the nature of the legislation which should be approved by the Congress. In this connection, I would especially invite the public to communicate not with me, but with their own Senators with respect to their views on the subjects I have listed above.

I hope Members of the Senate desiring to present amendments will do so in sufficient time so that the committee may give such amendments most careful consideration prior to reporting the Mutual Security Act to the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. (Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey in the chair). The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1451) to amend further the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. FULBRIGHT, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

PROPOSED LEGISLATION TO GIVE THE PRESIDENT STANDBY CONTROLS OVER PRICES, WAGES, AND RENTS

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to give the President of the United States authority to establish standby controls over prices, wages, and rents whenever a national emergency exists—either from the military or economic standpoint. The able senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] is joining me as cosponsor.

I believe we can do no less than this if we are serious about our efforts to control inflation. Much of the talk about inflation has been swatting flies; now I propose that we drain the swamp.

We are told that a balanced budget will prevent inflation. I think we must face up to balancing the budget. For that reason, I have offered four bills to increase Federal revenues, including an excess profits tax to reach windfall profits. Yet the basic fact remains that, during the late 1940's, we experienced sharp inflation during years when we not only balanced the budget but also set aside substantial Federal Treasury surpluses. So that is not the final answer.

Today there are in America monopolistic industries which can administer higher prices despite the consumer drop in demand for their products. This has happened on many occasions. We also have powerful labor unions which can levy demands for higher wages, to the detriment price-wise of groups of fellow workers who lack this cohesive and forceful type of organization. The total impact on the weaker groups in our society is often catastrophic, especially in maintaining a decent standard of living.

AUTHORITY PROVIDES SAFEGUARD

This is why I believe any Chief Executive must have standby authority to safeguard the American people from the steady erosion of rising prices, wages, and rents.

Mr. President, the year 1959 may well be noted by historians who will chronicle events occurring in the United States during this period as the time of The Great Economic Debate.

No single consideration has so threaded through public discussion of issues by Government officials, Congressmen, and private citizens. This factor appears destined to play a critical role in policy determination in the fields of foreign affairs, agriculture, welfare, resources development, and defense. It has made obscure academic economists national figures, enlarged the language with new nouns, such as spenders, seller's inflation, budget flap, and administered prices, and made a financial pundit of the man in the street. It has posed such puzzling philosophical and fiscal questions as, "Can we afford peace"? and "Is provision for need possible with fiscal responsibility"?

Perhaps no basic issue has so exemplified our current obsession with the economic ramifications of national and international affairs as the question of in-

flation. It has become, in effect, a symbol of our concentration on the economic aspect of public policy in all fields. Public discussion of this issue has, of course, resulted in much useful analysis, information, and clarification. I propose to review some of this material today and to suggest procedures which I believe will permit us to take efficacious action in connection with this problem. I hope that I will contribute not only to the volume, but also the substance of the debate.

INFLATION DYNAMIC CONCEPT

Inflation is the phenomenon of a generally rising price level over time; it is a dynamic concept. The presence of inflation cannot be determined to exist at a particular instant—it does not mean, for instance, high prices. It can be studied only within the context of historical perspective.

In the 60-year period from 1897 to 1958 the general price level in the United States rose at an average rate of 2⅓ percent per year. The rate of increase was, of course, not even; inflation has increased most in war and in immediate postwar periods.

But concentration on the average annual rate of inflation tends to obscure the impact on the price level. For example, using the base period 1947–49, it can be seen that the average consumer price level in 1958 was more than double that in 1940 and almost two-thirds greater than in 1945. Although the U.S. record in comparison with that of certain European countries since 1948 has been good, there has nevertheless been a 20.1-percent increase in the consumer price index during this 10-year period. I ask unanimous consent that there appear at this point in my remarks a table prepared for me by the Department of Labor, which indicates the percent change in the consumer price level of various goods and services included in the consumer price index from 1945 to January 1959, the period following removal of wartime price and credit controls.

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

U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, Washington, D.C.—Consumer Price Index—U.S. city average, major group and subgroup indexes; annual indexes 1945; monthly indexes, January 1959; and percent changes

[1947–49=100]

Group	Annual indexes, 1945	Monthly indexes, January 1959	Percent change 1945 to January 1959
All items	76.9	123.8	61.0
Food	68.9	119.0	72.7
Cereals and bakery products	65.9	133.9	103.2
Meats, poultry, and fish	56.5	113.8	101.4
Dairy products	69.5	114.1	64.2
Fruits and vegetables	86.7	121.7	40.4
Housing [1]	86.1	128.2	48.9
Rent	90.9	138.8	52.7
Gas and electricity	100.7	118.2	17.4
Solid fuels and fuel oil	73.0	138.9	90.3
Housefurnishings	76.9	103.2	34.2
Household operation	82.5	133.1	61.3

U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, Washington, D.C.—Consumer Price Index—U.S. city average, major group and subgroup indexes; annual indexes 1945; monthly indexes, January 1959; and percent changes—Continued

[1947–49=100]

Group	Annual indexes, 1945	Monthly indexes, January 1959	Percent change 1945 to January 1959
Apparel	76.3	106.7	39.8
Men's and boys'	72.4	108.0	49.2
Women's and girls'	78.8	98.7	25.3
Footwear	67.3	130.8	94.4
Other apparel	65.4	91.7	40.2
Transportation	78.1	144.1	84.5
Private	76.1	133.1	74.9
Public	82.3	191.8	133.0
Medical care	83.1	147.6	77.6
Personal care	81.5	129.4	58.8
Reading and recreation	86.8	117.0	34.8
Other goods and services	85.7	127.3	48.5

[1] Includes house purchase, interest, taxes, insurance, and upkeep, not shown separately.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, much of current economic discussion concerns the cause of inflation. Three general theories are commonly advanced: First, the classic demand-pull explanation, that is too much money chasing too few goods; second, the cost-push analysis, which suggests that rising production costs push prices up; and third, the administered price concept, a theory which points to the ability of certain industries to price their products without consideration of actual costs or demand.

NEW ANALYSIS ADVANCED

There is substantial agreement that the economic doctrine of demand-pull is not capable of satisfactorily explaining the general price rise which has occurred within the past 2-year period. Last year, although demand was down because of the recession, prices in certain administered sectors of the economy rose anyway. There is increasing evidence to indicate that concentrated industries may be able to exert a monopolistic power in setting prices for their products.

Validity of the cost-push approach to the study of inflation has been also seriously questioned. For instance, one economist has shown that increased labor productivity has largely counteracted the inflationary tendency of wage increases in the last few years, and that when such productivity has been taken into account, it can be shown that the earnings of factory workers during the period 1953 to 1957 have risen only half as much as the cost of living, and only a third as much as the prices of manufactured products.

However, there exists substantial disagreement regarding the relationship between wages and output over the long run, due primarily to the lack of agreement on a realistic measure of this ratio. AFL–CIO researchers contend that in the 10-year period between 1948 and 1958 output per worker rose faster than real wages and point out that, during this period, gross output increased 35 percent while the number of factory employees decreased from 12,700,000 to 11,900,000. On the other hand, Harvard economist Sumner H. Slichter declared recently that hourly compensation of nonagricultural workers in the last 10 years has risen more than twice as fast as the increase in output per man-hour and charged that unions tend to "raise money wages far faster than is justified by the growth of the output per man-hour." These statements have indicated that the question is by no means resolved. The legislation which I introduce today would, however, provide machinery for handling inflation of this type.

Peculiarities of recent general price rises has focused attention on the theories of such economists as Abba Lerner and Gardiner Means, who have pointed to the ability of certain businesses to determine their own prices without consideration of demand and production pressures. The distinguished senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], as chairman of the subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly Legislation of the Senate Judiciary Committee, has been instrumental in bringing these facts to public attention. Within the past few days, a number of key Government officials have indicated Federal economic policy may be reshaped to take into account these findings. The paradox of continued large unemployment and rising prices has further stimulated such reevaluation. I ask unanimous consent that there appear at the conclusion of my remarks an article written by Edwin L. Dale, Jr., which appeared in the New York Times of March 15, 1959, and which indicates the effect of this new theory on inflation study, and recounts reservations advanced by economists and others concerning its importance.

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

(See exhibit 1.)

EFFECTS NOT ABSTRACT

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, discussion of the cause and nature of inflation necessarily takes place within a theoretical and statistical framework, which at times make the issue appear only distantly related to the lives of working Americans. However, the effects of inflation are far from abstract.

The adverse nature of inflation lies principally in its relative effect on different segments of the economy. During an inflationary trend, all prices do not rise evenly; strains and distortions develop in the economy, and income and wealth are hence redistributed in an unpredictable fashion. Among those first injured by inflation are persons who depend upon a fixed income for the necessities of life—those living on the income from annuities or pensions, bonds or fixed contracts. As prices rise, their purchasing power is decreased since the return on their original investment is rigid. Individuals who rely on wages or salaries suffer in direct proportion to their inability to exert pressure for an increase in their rate of compensation. Even when such opportunity is available, time lags between consumer-price increases and achievement of the new pay, or the obtainment

of compensation increases which are not proportional to price rises, frequently cause a decline in the economic position of the individual involved.

INFLATION CAUSES INEQUITIES

The inequity of this situation is obvious when it is realized that other economic and social groups stand to gain from an inflationary trend. For instance, as recent testimony before the Senate Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee pointed out, corporation executives who are provided with stock options as a form of compensation have a strong interest in a rising price level within their industry. As profits go up, the company's stock rises. Executives may then purchase the stock at prices considerably below market value, sell it and be taxed at a maximum rate of 25 percent on their gains. The extent of this windfall was indicated by a report on the testimony of Eugene Havas, investment adviser, who appeared before the Kefauver subcommittee on March 13. The Washington Post and Times Herald reported Havas' explanation of how this process works to the benefit of United States Steel executives.

In the case of United States Steel Corp., the industry's price leader, Havas said that net profits divided by total shares of stock jumped from $2 in 1948 to $7.33 in 1957 and fell to $5.13 in the slump last year. Currently, per share earnings of United States Steel are estimated at record levels. Meanwhile, the stock has jumped in price from a low of $10.12 in 1949 to a high this year of $99.87.

(According to United States Steel's forthcoming annual report, some 258 executives have this prospect—because of stock options outstanding on January 1; they can make a few calls and divide about $19,300,000. And this income of about $75,000 per man is subject to a top tax rate of 25 percent.)

Although these inequalities constitute a major—and age-old—indictment of inflation, there currently exist numerous other charges against the countenance of continued rising prices. Many responsible fiscal authorities, including Governor William McC. Martin, Jr., Chairman of the Federal Reserve System, have expressed concern regarding the faith in the dollar abroad; in December Mr. Martin returned from a trip to the Far East to report that confidence in the dollar is declining due to inflation. He foresaw potential adverse effects on the economy of the United States as a direct result of this attitude abroad. The able Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] and others have suggested that this country may price itself out of world markets. It is suggested that the possibility of long-run inflation may sufficiently discourage investment so as to seriously restrict certain aspects of economic growth, as individuals attempt to place their funds in areas where they will realize the advantages of rising prices and maintain a degree of liquidity consistent with their estimate of the economic situation. I will not presume to judge the validity of these positions; however, they are stands taken by responsible and knowledgeable persons and are deserving of thoughtful consideration.

CONTEXT NECESSARY FOR STUDY

If inflation is a major problem affecting the well-being of the populace—and I believe this to be the case—it must be considered within the context of the overall economy of the United States. President Eisenhower has repeatedly insisted that inflation is the major problem. It is difficult to reconcile this view with Government figures which show that total unemployment in February increased by 25,000 to 4,749,000, although February is a month when employment usually rises and unemployment falls. February was the third consecutive month in which unemployment has been 6 percent or higher. Furthermore, Commerce and Labor Department statistics showed that those out of work 15 weeks or more numbered 1.5 million last month—approximately twice the normal postwar February figure. The New York Times reported last week that the Labor Department has advised congressional leaders that unemployment will continue at high levels for many months.

In view of these facts, the administration's reluctance to endorse relief and recovery measures such as the area redevelopment bill now pending in the Senate, the emergency unemployment compensation measure introduced by the distinguished senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA], and the much-needed housing bill passed by this body earlier, is indeed perplexing.

During the past few months the economy has experienced a period of relatively stable prices following a 2-year period in which the Nation witnessed one of the steepest increases in the cost of living in American history, except while the country was engaged in a shooting war. Experts in this field have indicated their belief that this newly realized stability will continue through 1959. But as the majority of the Joint Economic Committee indicated in their views issued March 9:

Economic prospects * * * are subject to abrupt change. Those responsible for public economic policies must remain alert, therefore, to the possibility of a resurgence of inflationary pressure, and must be prepared to deal promptly with any such development.

GENERAL MONETARY CONTROL UNDESIRABLE

Reaction of the administration to such pressures in the past has been to tighten the screws of monetary restraint. Should further action in this direction be taken at the present time, in anticipation of a general price increase, the ramifications in terms of short-run recovery and long-term growth are readily apparent. The effect of tight money on the funding of the public debt is already visible: the price of money and the liquidity desires of investors have seriously curtailed the ability of the Treasury to place the debt so as to minimize its inflationary potential. Many State governments are in financial difficulties which will be intensified by a monetary policy which attempts to make money more dear. Small businessmen will be similarly blocked from necessary credit sources. Such areas as housing, which has enjoyed a significant increase in activity beginning late in 1958, will be heavily dependent upon Government monetary and credit policy to insure continued expansion in accordance with national need.

Within the context of both growth and recovery, the administration's continued reliance on monetary policy as a present depressant on potential inflation and a tool for suppressing the specter of galloping inflation, represents either a dearth of ideas or a failure to realize fully the implications of such a policy.

The inadequacies of this short-sighted approach to the problem are readily apparent in the light of current long and short range economic factors and recent analysis of the nature of post-Korean war inflation.

TWO MAJOR OBJECTIONS

First. General monetary restraints as employed by the administration are a weapon to bludgeon price rises to death. In the process, economically weak industries are often seriously injured.

Second. If recent inflation has been largely the result of administered prices, then general monetary restraints are ineffectual in reaching the real culprit.

It is frequently said that general controls are nondiscriminatory—they affect everyone equally without regard to person or place. Yet what perhaps seems axiomatic in theory is anything but true in fact. The impact of general controls, such as those exercised through the Federal Reserve System on different sectors of the economy is dependent upon a variety of factors, including availability of retained earnings for financing, borrowing sources available, ability to bargain with the lender, the type of market in question, and various other factors. The Government, in effect, relinquishes responsibility for determining where the controls will be most felt and assume a laissez faire attitude with respect to their operation. Thus dealing with the aggregate, difficult, and detailed policy decisions are avoided.

This criticism of the existing system for fighting inflation does not consider the even more basic fact that there exists considerable evidence to indicate that the efficacious quality of general monetary policy is intermittent; serious questions can be raised concerning the utility of this policy during such periods as the 1955–57 boom.

HOUSING FURNISHES EXAMPLE

During the past few years, residential construction has provided, unfortunately, a classic example of the ability of general monetary restraints to retard a particular industry while failing to affect substantially numerous other sectors of the economy. The result of this phenomenon has been a decrease in the rate of new starts to a point far below that needed to supply minimum needs for elimination of slum housing and provision of new homes for new households.

If the administered price theory concerning the nature of inflation in the last five-year period is correct, then it is obvious that the "concentrated" industries have a great ability to resist the suppressing influence of general monetary controls. To halt effectively inflationary practices engaged in by these

businesses would have necessitated such a massive application of the broad restraints as to adversely affect vast sections of the economy. An economist, Warren Smith, of the University of Michigan and Harvard, has pointed out:

In the 1955–57 period of inflation, I believe the Federal Reserve's effectiveness was reduced by the fact that it had to rely almost entirely on so-called general credit controls. It became quite apparent that the effects of these controls fell disproportionately upon certain groups, and this made it both economically unwise and politically inexpedient to apply credit restraint with sufficient force to bring the inflation under control. If selective controls had been available in at least certain areas, I believe monetary policy could have done a considerably more effective job.

During the past few months, President Eisenhower has repeatedly used his press conferences and other public appearances to emphasize his great concern with inflation. He has repeatedly informed the Nation of the unfavorable effects that future general price rises will have on our economy. He has urged amendment of the Unemployment Act of 1946 to include as a major objective of Government policy the maintenance of stable prices. He has admonished labor and business to consider the significance of wage and price hikes on the future solvency of this country before they initiate such action. He has formed committees to explore and expose the problems of inflation. He has constantly reiterated his demand for a balanced budget.

SUBSTITUTE CONTROLS FOR JAWBONE

If the President truly wishes to attack effectively future inflation, I suggest he take the step which he has occasionally bandied as a threat in his widely reported "jawbone" attacks, but so far declined to present as a method of dealing with possible price rises—selective standby controls.

If we are to meet the challenge of recovery and growth now facing us, it is obvious that we cannot move forward with one foot continually on the brake; tight money is a detriment to immediate stimulation of the economy and long-term increases in productivity. Moral suasion cannot serve as a decisive factor in controlling prices over time. Amendment of the Unemployment Act to clarify the meaning of the stated goals, and provide for the provision of further information and recommendations by the President with respect to the operation of the economy, may be desirable as a means of reaffirming and sharpening responsibility, but such action will not create machinery necessary to carry out an effective anti-inflation program. Studies of the relationship of budget surpluses and deficits to upward movement of prices have failed to show any direct casual connection between the two: for instance, in 1947 and 1948 we experienced the sharpest increase in prices since World War II, yet the Federal Government had surpluses of $19.4 billion and $7.3 billion in these same respective years.

TEXT NOT ORIGINAL

The text of my bill to give the President standby authority to impose price, wage, and rent controls is taken from S. 1081 of the 83d Congress. The bill then was reported favorably to the Senate, with some amendments. The bill I introduce today is taken directly from the amendment to the Defense Production Act of 1950 which was proposed by section 16 of S. 1081 in 1953. This section was actually in the legislation as passed by the Senate, but it was eliminated in conference with the House of Representatives—possibly because the economic consequences attendant upon the Korean emergency were thought to be on the way toward solution without the need for further direct controls.

The text of the new title 8 which would be added to the Defense Production Act by my bill differs from the text adopted by the Senate in 1953 in one respect. The earlier language gave the President standby authority to establish temporary wage, price, and rent ceilings whenever the United States has declared war against a foreign nation, or whenever the Congress, by concurrent resolution, shall find and declare that a grave national emergency exists and that the exercise of such authority is necessary in the interest of national security and economic stability.

Modern conditions, as we have seen them in the past 4 or 5 years, require a broader statement of the circumstances under which direct controls may be necessary in the fight against inflation. These years have been a period of continuous attrition on the value of the dollar, irrespective of the absence of any war or comparable U.S. military operations such as took place in Korea. The military commitment which we have most recently undertaken in the Middle East lends renewed urgency to this aspect of inflationary pressures, but these have existed irrespective of such crises.

BROAD DISCRETIONARY AUTHORITY PROVIDED

Consequently, my bill broadens the conditions for the exercise of Presidential standby authority to impose temporary controls by stating that the President shall have this authority whenever the United States has declared war against a foreign nation, or whenever he shall find on the basis of current reports and studies made by the Council of Economic Advisers, the Bureau of Labor Statistics, and the Federal Reserve Board, that inflationary pressures existing within the economy threaten the economic stability of the Nation, or whenever the Congress, by concurrent resolution, shall find and declare that a grave national emergency exists and that the exercise of such authority is necessary in the interest of national security or economic stability.

Use of selective economic controls is not new to the United States. During World War II the Office of Price Administration, the War Production Board, the War Labor Board, and monetary authorities enforced direct economic regulations. These controls were removed at the end of the conflict. In 1950 and 1951, the Federal Reserve Board, under the terms of the Defense Production Act, issued regulation W imposing installment credit controls, followed by regulation X establishing controls on housing credit.

Economic controls, such as I have suggested today, are not pleasant to contemplate; but I believe that if we are to most effectively work toward implementation of the goals of price stability, full employment and maximum growth we may best proceed with standby selective economic controls available as a corrective device.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill lie over until March 19 so that Senators who might be interested in cosponsoring this proposal may add their names to the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Oregon.

The bill (S. 1452) to provide authority for temporary price, wage and rent controls, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. NEUBERGER (for himself and Mr. WILEY), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

EXHIBIT 1

[From the New York Times, Mar. 15, 1959]

U.S. AIDS UNEASY ON PRICE POLICIES—ADMINISTERED LEVELS SEEN AS LEADING TO POSSIBLE GOVERNMENT CONTROLS

(By Edwin L. Dale, Jr.)

WASHINGTON, March 14.—Price and wage developments during last year's recession have brought a quiet revolution in the thinking of key Government economic officials.

In brief, these officials have come to accept the concept of administered prices. They accept recent evidence that important sectors of the private economy can hold or even increase prices when demand is weak.

If the revolution in thought goes far enough—and if future events warrant—the result could be some form of Government price control.

The reason for controls would be that the concentrated industries that administer their prices appear largely immune from the classic Government instruments for controlling inflation. These are mainly balanced budgets and tight money, which are aimed at curbing demand.

ROSE AGAINST TREND

Last year, demand was sluggish because of the recession, and yet prices in the administered sector rose anyway. Steel and automobiles are the most commonly cited examples.

The major retreat has been in the Federal Reserve Board, long the stronghold of classic economic thinking. In the last week two leading officials of the Board have gone on record publicly with expressions of their concern at the consequences of private economic power in steel and autos.

The same view was expressed, also publicly, by Raymond J. Saulnier, Chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers. It is known that even Robert B. Anderson, the Secretary of the Treasury, is persuaded that the inflation outlook will depend at least as much upon wage and price decisions by powerful economic groups as upon balancing the budget.

HAD MINIMIZED THREAT

In the Federal Reserve, officials long minimized the fear that monopolistic power

among concentrated industries was a serious threat to the price level. The conviction was that when things got tough and orders fell off, prices would be cut in these sectors of the economy just like any other.

Last year this did not happen. Prices in several of such areas actually rose. The result was that the Federal Reserve has begun taking this problem far more seriously than in the past.

None of this means that officials now favor price or wage controls or any form of direct Government intervention—even intervention limited to big business-big labor part of the economy. But the sharp change in thinking about the problem is the sort that would necessarily precede a decision that controls are necessary.

A great deal will depend on this year's steel wage negotiations and subsequent pricing decisions. If the steel settlement, with or without a strike, is not followed by a price increase, the wave of concern will subside to a considerable degree.

AUTO DECISION AWAITED

This would be particularly the case if such an event was followed by a decision in Detroit next fall not to raise the prices of the 1960 automobile models.

In the background is the possibility of a Democratic President after 1960. A number of leading Democrats were convinced of the administered price problem in advance of the more conservative officials in the Eisenhower administration.

Thus a Democratic President might be even less reluctant than President Eisenhower to choose the road of controls.

Much of the groundwork for the increasing awareness and acceptance of the administered price problem has been laid by hearings of the Senate Antitrust Subcommittee, headed by Senator ESTES KEFAUVER, Democrat, of Tennessee. The hearings have gone on for nearly 2 years and produced nine volumes of testimony.

LAST CHANCE IS SEEN

Even Senator KEFAUVER is not yet persuaded that direct controls are necessary. But he warned last week that the steel and auto industries are now having their last chance.

There remain a number of economists and others who do not believe the administered price problem is a major one, threatening the future stability of prices. But some of these men, while not worrying about the economic power of big business to raise prices, do find dangers in the upward push on costs exerted by big labor.

Others argue that the effect on consumers of recent developments in the steel and other concentrated industries is much overrated.

One witness before the Kefauver subcommittee, Simon N. Whitney, sought to show last week that the 33-percent increase in steel prices since 1953 could have been the cause, at most, of only six-tenths of 1 percent increase in the Consumer Price Index, the usual measure of inflation.

The cost of living, he noted, is dominated by food, services, and such soft goods as apparel.

But these reservations have not changed the growing concern about the problem in the Government. There is a strong belief in the Federal Reserve, for example, that the persistent failure of unemployment to decline with the recovery from the recession, particularly unemployment in the durable goods industries, is attributable in great part to price and wage decisions in those industries in recent years.

In brief, the idea is that these industries, to a significant degree, have priced themselves out of their market. By the same token, so have their workers.

Again, this view is sometimes challenged. But it was stated in explicit terms last week by Woodlief Thomas, economic adviser to the Federal Reserve Board, in a lengthy letter to the Washington Post and Times Herald. In part, this is what Mr. Thomas said:

"One of the considerations in fixing prices, of course, should be what price can be sustained and whether markets might be lost for a longer period by asking the highest possible price for any short period of time. Criticism arises with respect to administered prices when they are not adjusted properly in response to supply and demand forces.

"They are harmful if prices are raised so as to choke off demand and lead to reductions in output or if prices are held up in the face of declining demand when lower prices might sooner or later stimulate some demand.

EXTENSION OF TIME FOR CERTAIN VETERANS TO BE GRANTED NATIONAL SERVICE LIFE INSURANCE—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, on February 19, 1959, on behalf of myself and other Senators, I introduced the bill (S. 1113) to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide a 1-year period during which certain veterans may be granted national service life insurance. I ask unanimous consent that the name of the junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD] may be added as an additional cosponsor of that bill.

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

ELIGIBILITY OF WELFARE AND RECREATION AGENCIES FOR FEDERAL SURPLUS PROPERTY—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Under authority of the order of the Senate of March 10, 1959, the names of Senators JAVITS, ALLOTT, LANGER, SALTONSTALL, CASE of South Dakota, YOUNG of North Dakota, BUSH, BEALL, BENNETT, MARTIN, and CARLSON were added as additional cosponsors of 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) on March 10, 1959.

NATIONAL TURKEY MARKETING ACT—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Under authority of the order of the Senate of March 12, 1959, the names of Mr. HENNINGS and Mr. MARTIN were added as additional cosponsors of the bill (S. 1395) to enable producers to provide a supply of turkeys adequate to meet the needs of consumers, to maintain orderly marketing conditions, and to promote and expand the consumption of turkeys and turkey products, introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself and other Senators on March 12, 1959).

COMMISSION ON METROPOLITAN PROBLEMS — ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my name may be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 1431) to provide for the establishment of a Commission on Metropolitan Problems, introduced by the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] on March 16, 1959.

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

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

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

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

The President's March 16 report to the people on Berlin and security in a free world.

By Mr. TALMADGE:

Address delivered by Senator Moss before the Hibernian Society of Savannah, Ga., on March 17, 1959.

By Mr. KEATING:

Statements prepared by him regarding St. Patrick's Day, also the 49th anniversary of the founding of the Campfire Girls, and the celebration of March 16 throughout New York State as West Point Day.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON CERTAIN NOMINATIONS BY COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, as chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, I desire to announce that the Senate today received the nominations of Ellis O. Briggs, of Maine, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States to Greece, and Carl W. Strom, of Iowa, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States to Bolivia.

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

DIVERSION OF LAKE MICHIGAN WATERS—REFERENCE OF HOUSE BILL 1

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas will state it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. As I understand, House bill 1, which provides for diversion of water from Lake Michigan into the Illinois waterway, is at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The distinguished minority leader is aware, I assume, that we announced that we would consider the reference of that bill at the conclusion of the morning hour.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I should like to have the attachés of the Senate notify all Senators that that question will be before the Senate, so they will not be taken by surprise.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Will that matter be considered before the call of the calendar?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Yes, I think so.

Mr. AIKEN. Under the order which has been entered, I assume that the calendar will be called following the conclusion of morning business.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the calendar be called as soon as debate on the reference of House bill 1 is concluded.

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

DEATH OF CANADIAN SECRETARY OF STATE FOR EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, it was with deep regret that I learned of the death of the Canadian Secretary of State for External Affairs, the Honorable Sidney Earle Smith.

Sidney Smith has served as Secretary of State for External Affairs since 1957.

Prior to that time, Secretary Smith served for many years as a distinguished and able professor of law. He contributed many scholarly articles to the field of the law.

From 1934 to 1944, Mr. Smith served as President of the University of Manitoba; and from 1945 to 1957, he was President of the University of Toronto.

Sidney Smith has been in Washington frequently in recent years, and he had a wide and intimate circle of friends here.

His loss will be deeply felt.

HAWAIIAN STATEHOOD

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I am informed that today President Eisenhower either has signed or will sign Senate bill 50, the measure the Senate passed just a week ago, to admit Hawaii as a State.

Both the Congress and the President are to be congratulated on their actions. I venture to say that few, if any, of the laws this Congress will enact will have as great a historic effect on the future of our country and, indeed, on the free world, as will the Statehood for Hawaii bill, for the people of Hawaii come from a variety of racial backgrounds, including races of the Orient. It is there, in Asia, the home of the ancestors of a large segment of the people of Hawaii, that probably the decisive battle between communism and freedom will be waged. The overwhelming majority of the people of Hawaii are, of course, native-born American citizens. They know no loyalty other than that to the United States, and they have given the ultimate proof of that loyalty. Our recognition of the fact that these sons and daughters of the peoples of the Orient have qualified for full equality in our Union, by each and every one of our historic tests, is irrefutable proof of America's position and attitude with respect to the peoples of Asia.

Statehood for Hawaii is democracy in action.

Mr. President, as chairman of the committee which had initial responsibility for legislation for statehood for Hawaii, I visited the then Territory and traveled extensively in it. While there, I talked with men and women of various racial backgrounds. From my personal knowledge, I would welcome to the Congress of the United States men and women of any of these races who, by reason of their ability, character, and personal attainments, might be chosen by the people as their representatives.

FORTY-FIRST ANNIVERSARY OF LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE—STATEMENT AND RESOLUTION

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, although I was absent from the Senate on official business on February 16 when many of my colleagues paid tribute to Lithuania on the 41st anniversary of her independence, I should like to join them in their tribute, and I ask unanimous consent that a statement I have prepared on the anniversary be placed in the RECORD at this point. I also ask unanimous consent that a resolution adopted by the Lithuanian American Council of Chicago, at a mass meeting of Lithuanian Americans on Sunday, February 15, commemorating this event be placed in the RECORD.

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

STATEMENT ON 41ST ANNIVERSARY OF INDEPENDENCE FOR LITHUANIA BY SENATOR PAUL H. DOUGLAS

On February 16, all those in the United States and the rest of the free world who cherish liberty, will commemorate the 41st anniversary of Lithuanian national independence. In the year since we last celebrated this important anniversary, the Russian rulers of this brave country have attempted to make us forget their treachery of 1940 when they crushed the legal government and occupied Lithuania. They have sent their super salesman, Deputy Premier Anastas Mikoyan, to woo us and have tried through him to sell to many gullible Americans their hypocritical proposition that world peace and stability will be advanced by economic cooperation and competition between the two worlds. Mikoyan would have these Americans forget his part in the bloody crushing of freedom in Hungary, as well as the Communist takeover in Lithuania. He would have us believe that a settlement could be reached between Russia and the free world if the latter would only accept the political status quo.

This we cannot do. We cannot in honor or good conscience release the U.S.S.R. from its obligations to allow self-determination and free elections to these captive peoples. We must not close the door of hope to the freedom-loving Lithuanian people by accepting this Russian siren song. We must not consider Lithuania as an expendable pawn in the power struggle between Communist imperialism and the outside world. We must not permanently consign the Baltic countries of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania to the tyrannical oppression of Communist dictatorship, and we are glad that our Government has never recognized their annexation by the U.S.S.R.

It is fitting that all Americans pay tribute to the great love of freedom that binds together the people of the United States and of Lithuania. In celebrating the 41st anniversary of Lithuanian independence, we hope to show these brave people behind the Iron Curtain that they are not forgotten. We must do more, however, than utter empty phrases of hope to them. We must work through the United Nations and the Congress for action to hasten the return of complete national freedom and self-government to all those countries forcibly incorporated into the Soviet Union or otherwise forcibly controlled by the Russian Communists.

I know the Lithuanian American Council will continue their fine efforts to secure such actions in the United Nations and will be of invaluable help in our efforts in Congress.

RESOLUTION

Whereas the American people continue to believe in certain inalienable principles enunciated in the American Declaration of Independence, the Constitution of the United States, the Atlantic Charter, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the Charter of the United Nations; and

Whereas the people of Lithuania, firmly espousing the selfsame principles in their declaration of independence promulgated in 1918, have won their liberty by valiant fight against the oppressors and, during 22 peaceful years, against seemingly insurmountable odds, converted war-devastated Lithuania into a prosperous and progressive country; and

Whereas in 1940, Soviet Russia, in conspiracy with Hitlerite Germany and in consistent and unilateral violation of all the treaties and declarations solemnly underwritten by it, viz, peace and nonaggression pacts with the Baltic States, occupied Lithuania and annexed her to the Soviet Union, and, in 1944, following the defeat of the German armies on the eastern front, again took over that country, in complete disregard of the wartime policies and obligations under the Atlantic Charter and the Charter of the United Nations to which Soviet Russia is a cosignatory with the United States and other allied countries; and

Whereas a major part of Europe, the cradle of modern civilization, and Asia, the most populous continent, lies today under the sway of lawless rule by the militant communism which, eagerly looking for new victims, continues rearing its ugly head in other adjacent areas; and

Whereas the Communist conspiracy, by unprecedented and unorthodox methods has infiltrated deep into the still free world, using any deceit or strategem to further its ideological, psychological, or subversive attack upon every strata of free world society including education, art, press, labor, industry, agriculture, and government; and

Whereas military preparedness of the free nations alone or together with isolated attempts to counter Communist aggression are not adequate to cope with the global Kremlin strategy and its unorthodox methods: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the patriotic American citizens of Lithuanian descent of Chicago, Ill., having carefully reviewed the events of the recent past and the deplorable state of international affairs at the beginning of the year 1959, respectfully submit to the President, Secretary of State, and Members of Congress of the United States:

That the Government of the United States continue, in true American tradition, a vigorous and consistent policy to effectively confront the global and centrally controlled Kremlin conspiracy for world subjugation;

That the Government of the United States utilize its leadership in political, military and economic world affairs to the benefit of mankind by providing a wise and coordinated leadership to the nations of the Western Hemisphere in their struggle to resist Communist imperialism;

That the Government of the United States enlist the cooperation of the great potential anti-Communist force among the several hundreds of millions of the enslaved by employing all suitable means and measures, but avoiding premature and abortive uprising, to assist the subjugated peoples to coordinate their fight for survival;

That the Government of the United States, through its representatives in the United Nations strongly oppose the consideration and/or adoption of the "Draft Code of Offense Against the Peace and Security of Mankind," as submitted by the Secretary General of the United Nations, which code in its present form would prohibit oppressed persons and organizations wrongfully enslaved by an aggressor nation to work and fight for their freedom and the restoration of their government to their own people and further said code destroys the agreements reached at the Genocide Convention and ratified by the United Nations.

That the Government of the United States insist upon the sanctity of treaties, much advertised by Soviet spokesmen since 1939, and invoke the authority of the United Nations to demand that the Soviet Government conform its policies to the principles of the Atlantic Charter and United Nations Charter solemnly underwritten by it, as well as honor its prewar international obligations under the peace treaties and nonaggression and friendship pacts concluded by the Soviet Union with the Republics of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia, by withdrawing military and police forces and Communist Party apparatus from the occupied territories so that the people may freely fashion governments of their own choosing; be it further

Resolved, That the Lithuanian Americans of Chicago, Ill., reaffirming their pledge of cooperation with the Government of the United States in its efforts to bring about peace, stability, and prosperity in the world, express greatest appreciation and gratitude to the President of the United States and his administration for steadfast adherence to the principles of morality and democracy in international relations and for the support extended to the cause of independence of Lithuania; and to individual distinguished Members of the Senate and the House of Representatives who, on numerous occasions, have lent their moral encouragement to and sympathy with the Baltic and other persecuted peoples.

LITHUANIAN COUNCIL OF CHICAGO,
Judge ALFONSE F. WELLS,
President.
EUPHROSINE MIKUZIS,
Secretary.

ST. PATRICK'S DAY

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, it has been my privilege in recent months to note on the floor of the Senate the passing of significant national anniversaries of various peoples. It is, therefore, a special honor and privilege for me to pay a small tribute on the occasion of Saint Patrick's Day, the great national holiday of Ireland, the country of my own ancestors.

There is a certain sadness and depression surrounding the national holidays of many nations in the world today because they have come to signify the passing of another year of enslavement for peoples who were once free. In the happy case of Ireland, however, we honor not a country that has become enslaved, but a nation which in our generation has achieved freedom.

The history of Ireland holds forth hope to the many millions throughout the world who are striving to keep alive their dreams of eventual liberation.

For 700 years, the people of Ireland were subjected to a systematic oppression which in its severity and duration is probably unparalleled in human history. Over the centuries, every device of the tyrant was employed to reduce the Irish people to slavery. The harshest measures were taken to undermine their economy, to ruin their educational system, to obliterate their language, to destroy their religion, to extinguish their national conciousness, and to crush their will to be free and independent.

Yet, throughout these centuries, Ireland remained unified in spirit, and its people were sustained by the faith which Saint Patrick brought to its shores 1,500 years ago. The Irish resolve to be free was never broken.

Yoked geographically to the world's strongest power, the Irish sought freedom in vain for numberless generations. Thwarted in their own land, they contributed richly to the struggle for freedom all over the globe. Wherever men fought against tyranny, whether the field was Europe, South America, or our own continent, Irishmen stood in the forefront.

Seven of the thirty-nine men who signed the American Constitution were either Irish born or of Irish descent. A large part of our own Revolutionary Army was composed of Irish immigrants. George Washington's repeated commendations of his Irish soldiers serve as a reminder of the debt which all of us owe to these wandering, homeless fighters for freedom.

I was a boy in Connecticut when the 700-year struggle for Irish independence was approaching its climax. I remember the stirring days when the Friends of Irish Freedom were going up and down our land preaching the gospel of Irish independence and seeking help for the cause.

The help which went to Ireland from the outside world was small indeed. This forsaken little nation, which had contributed so much to freedom in other lands, was left to rely on its own small resources in its unequal struggle against the British Empire.

But the victory so long sought in vain could not ultimately be denied.

Once having achieved its free institutions, Ireland has maintained them during a 40-year period when democratic government has come and gone in a score of nations.

Throughout this period Ireland has lived in freedom and tolerance. There is probably less religious or racial prejudice there than in any other country in the world. Though more than 90 percent Catholic, the first president of free Ireland was a Protestant, as were many heroes in the long fight for Irish independence. And the thriving Jewish community of Ireland is one of the most happy and secure in the world.

Independence has been achieved for a large part of Ireland. Unification remains to be achieved. It is sure to come, but it will come peacefully, under law. Unification of Ireland will be based upon consent, and not upon force. Thus, Ireland, through its example, can once again serve the world by pointing the way toward freedom based upon justice.

And so, it is with a sense of pride and gratitude that I join so many others here, and wherever Irishmen are scattered, in paying tribute to a remarkable saint, a sturdy people, and a free nation.

GOVERNOR MEYNER'S BALANCED BUDGET

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, in the past few months, newspaper correspondents in all parts of the Nation have busily written of the fiscal difficulties faced by Governors of many States. The term "crisis" is frequently used. The stories usually ask "Where can States find new money?"

Under these circumstances, it is a particular pleasure to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article about Gov. Robert B. Meyner, of New Jersey. It is interesting to note in the newspaper of another State the high regard in which the Governor is held. He has shown that the budget procedure can be an imaginative and creative process, and I welcome this opportunity to ask for additional public recognition of achievements in the Garden State. I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the RECORD as part of my remarks.

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

[From the Chicago Daily News, Mar. 6, 1959]

HOW MEYNER KEEPS JERSEYITES HAPPY ON BUDGET—GOVERNOR TRIMS STATE'S DEBT, INTRODUCES NO NEW TAXES

(By Milt Freudenheim)

TRENTON, N.J.—Gov. Robert B. Meyner, an oft-mentioned Democratic presidential possibility, has won cheers here with his "no new taxes" balanced budget.

"Dollars-and-cents evidence that there are times when it's nice to have a man around the statehouse who's running for President," glowed more than one influential Republican editorial page.

Meyner's budget joy, astutely kept under wraps until broached as a surprise thunderclap, stands out against the clouds of new taxes and fiscal hurricanes in New York, Pennsylvania, Michigan, and Massachusetts.

No new taxes is an especially choice bit of news in New Jersey (population, 5 million), one of only three States that boast neither sales nor income tax.

In an interview, the youthful looking Meyner (he's 50) explained how he does it.

"Every year, and this is my sixth as Governor, I impress on my cabinet the necessity to be careful about spending," he began.

"We never tolerate the attitude that because there is money left over we should say, 'Let's spend it.' Almost every year, we have more than $1 million surplus, as a result."

Furthermore, the Governor added, "to my knowledge, there are no no-show jobs in the State government." State employees all work.

Meyner has reduced the New Jersey bonded debt from $120 million when he came in, to $86 million now.

He has held the line on State aid to schools, forcing local communities to shoulder this leading expense.

"When they get the money from the State they are less careful how they spend it," he believes.

Meyner's $403,325,022 budget anticipates a $5 million surplus. It allots 38 percent for schools and colleges, 20 percent for highways, 17 percent for institutions, 7 percent for welfare, and so on down the list.

The other two States with neither income nor sales taxes are Nebraska and Texas.

What oil does for Texas, auto traffic does for New Jersey, a corridor State between New York City and Philadelphia.

Gasoline taxes and auto registrations provide nearly 40 percent of New Jersey's cash.

Budget director Abraham Vermeulen, a Republican career official under eight Governors since 1931, cites the State's freedom to allot highway and other revenues as it chooses as a major boon.

"If, like California and Michigan, we had to use auto revenues exclusively for roads, we'd be paving right over the statehouse dome," Vermeulen exclaimed.

Meyner put in a 1.75-percent corporation income tax and raised the gasoline tax a penny to 5 cents last year.

Result: An expected $15 million surplus this year.

New Jersey's constitution requires a balanced budget.

In recent years, the Governor has had to ask $3 million to $4 million in supplementary appropriations when welfare costs soared.

The State AFL–CIO has criticized the Meyner budget for allegedly slighting school, welfare, and institution needs.

Meyner replies: New Jersey is one of the three leading States on per-pupil public school spending. We're doing a job among the leading States on welfare and old-age aid.

"On our mental-health program, we're doing as effective a job as some States that spend half again as much as we do," he asserts.

The Governor admits need for a new institution for mentally retarded children, a medium-security prison, and buildings for the State universities and colleges.

He would like to put in some new taxes on business transactions that would cover these expenses, but the legislature refuses. Therefore, bond issues that must be approved by the voters are the inevitable he says.

Is Meyner conservative because his legislature forces him to be? he was asked.

"I think I'm more fiscally conservative than they are," he replied.

SENATORS AND REPRESENTATIVES SERVING IN CONGRESS MORE THAN 30 YEARS

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a compilation of Senators and Representatives who have served longest in Congress throughout the entire history of our Nation.

These data were compiled by Svend Petersen.

Mr. President, I invite attention to the fact that my distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] leads the list, with 47 years and 1 month of service.

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

Member	State	Branch	Years	Length of service
Carl Trumbull Hayden	Arizona	House	1912–27	47 years ½ month.
		Senate	1927–	
Sam Taliaferro Rayburn	Texas	House	1913–	46 years exactly, with 11 leap years.
Joseph Gurney Cannon	Illinois	do	1873–91, 1893–1913, 1915–23	46 years exactly, with 10 leap years.
Adolph Joseph Sabath	do	do	1907–52	45 years 8 months.
Carl Vinson	Georgia	do	1914–	44 years 4 months.
Justin Smith Morrill	Vermont	do	1855–67	43 years 10 months.
		Senate	1867–98	
William Boyd Allison	Iowa	House	1863–71	43 years 5 months.
		Senate	1873–1908	
Carter Glass	Virginia	House	1902–18	42 years 5 months.
		Senate	1920–46	
Robert Lee Doughton	North Carolina	House	1911–53	41 years 10 months.
Kenneth Douglas McKellar	Tennessee	do	1911–17	41 years 2 months.
		Senate	1917–53	
William Pierce Frye	Maine	House	1871–81	40 years 5 months.
		Senate	1881–1911	
Eugene Hale	do	House	1869–79	40 years.
		Senate	1881–1911	
Daniel Alden Reed	New York	House	1919–59	39 years 11½ months.
George William Norris	Nebraska	do	1903–13	39 years 10 months.
		Senate	1913–43	
Samuel Smith	Maryland	House	1793–1803	39 years 1 month.
		Senate	1803–15	
		House	1816–22	
		Senate	1822–33	
Morris Sheppard	Texas	House	1902–13	38 years 5 months.
		Senate	1913–41	
John Sherman	Ohio	House	1855–61	38 years 4 days.
		Senate	1861–77, 1881–97	
Frederick Huntington Gillett	Massachusetts	House	1893–1925	38 years exactly.
		Senate	1925–31	
Robert Crosser	Ohio	House	1913–19, 1923–55	37 years 10 months.
Nathaniel Macon	North Carolina	do	1791–1815	37 years 8 months 10 days.
		Senate	1815–28	
Henry Cabot Lodge	Massachusetts	House	1887–93	37 years 8 months 5 days.
		Senate	1893–1924	
Alben William Barkley	Kentucky	House	1913–27	37 years 2½ months.
		Senate	1927–49, 1955–56	
Francis Emroy Warren	Wyoming	do	1890–93, 1895–1929	37 years.
Clarence Cannon	Missouri	House	1923–	36 years exactly, continuous, with 9 leap years.
Emanuel Celler	New York	do	1923–	Do.
John Taber	do	do	1923–	Do.
Henry Laurens Dawes	Massachusetts	do	1857–75	Do.
		Senate	1875–93	
Shelby Moore Cullom	Illinois	House	1865–71	36 years exactly, broken, with 8 leap years.
		Senate	1883–1913	
Henry Allen Cooper	Wisconsin	House	1893–1919, 1921–31	35 years, 11 months, 25 days.
Thomas Terry Connally	Texas	do	1917–29	35 years, 10 months.
		Senate	1929–53	
Ellison DuRant Smith	South Carolina	do	1909–44	35 years 8 months.
George Frisbie Hoar	Massachusetts	House	1869–77	35 years 7 months.
		Senate	1877–1904	
Lister Hill	Alabama	House	1923–38	35 years 6½ months.
		Senate	1938–	
Claude Augustus Swanson	Virginia	House	1893–1906	35 years 6 months.
		Senate	1910–33	
William Rufus de Vane King	North Carolina	House	1811–16	34 years 6 months.
	Alabama	Senate	1819–44, 1848–52	
Matthew Mansfield Neely	West Virginia	House	1913–21	34 years 3½ months.
		Senate	1923–29, 1931–41	
		House	1945–47	
		Senate	1949–58	
Joseph Taylor Robinson	Arkansas	House	1903–13	34 years, 3 months.
		Senate	1913–37	
Knute Nelson	Minnesota	House	1883–89	34 years, 2 months.
		Senate	1895–1923	
Walter Franklin George	Georgia	do	1922–57	34 years, 1 month.
Joseph William Martin	Massachusetts	House	1925–	34 years exactly, continuous, with 8 leap years.
Gilbert Nelson Haugen	Iowa	do	1899–1933	Do.
Charles Curtis	Kansas	do	1893–1907	34 years exactly, broken, with 8 leap years.
		Senate	1907–13, 1915–29	

Member	State	Branch	Years	Length of service
Thomas Albert Jenkins	Ohio	House	1925–59	33 years, 10 months, exactly, continuous.
Hatton William Sumners	Texas	do	1913–47	Do.
Roy Orchard Woodruff	Michigan	do	1913–15, 1921–53	33 years, 10 months, exactly, broken.
Wesley Livsey Jones	Washington	do	1899–1909	33 years 8½ months.
		Senate	1909–32	
Edith Nourse Rogers	Massachusetts	House	1925–	33 years, 8 months, 4 days.
John Henry Ketcham	New York	do	1865–73, 1877–93, 1897–1906	33 years 8 months.
Edward William Pou	North Carolina	do	1901–34	33 years 1 month.
Henry Harrison Bingham	Pennsylvania	do	1879–1912	33 years ½ month.
William Edgar Borah	Idaho	Senate	1907–40	32 years 10½ months.
John Hollis Bankhead	Alabama	House	1887–1907	32 years 8½ months.
		Senate	1907–20	
Edward Thomas Taylor	Colorado	House	1909–41	32 years 6 months.
Furnifold McLendell Simmons	North Carolina	do	1887–89	32 years exactly, broken, with 8 leap years.
		Senate	1901–31	
Nelson Wilmarth Aldrich	Rhode Island	House	1879–81	32 years exactly, continuous, with 7 leap years.
		Senate	1881–1911	
Brazilla Carroll Reece	Tennessee	House	1921–31, 1933–47, 1951–	32 years exactly, broken, with 7 leap years.
Julius Caesar Burrows	Michigan	do	1873–75, 1879–83, 1885–95	32 years exactly, broken, with 6 leap years.
		Senate	1895–1911	
Allen Towner Treadway	Massachusetts	House	1913–45	31 years, 10 months, exactly, continuous, with 8 leap years.
Harold Knutson	Minnesota	do	1917–49	Do.
Clarence Frederick Lea	California	do	1917–49	Do.
Wallace Humphrey White	Maine	do	1917–31	Do.
		Senate	1931–49	
John Elliott Rankin	Mississippi	House	1921–53	Do.
Schuyler Otis Bland	Virginia	do	1918–50	31 years 7 months.
Thomas Hart Benton	Missouri	Senate	1821–51	31 years 6½ months.
		House	1853–55	
Joseph Eugene Ransdell	Louisiana	do	1899–1913	31 years 6 months.
		Senate	1913–31	
Jacob Harold Gallinger	New Hampshire	House	1885–89	31 years 5 months.
		Senate	1891–1918	
Oscar Wilder Underwood	Alabama	House	1895–96, 1897–1915	31 years 3 months, 5 days.
		Senate	1915–27	
Thomas Stalker Butler	Pennsylvania	House	1897–1928	31 years 2 months, 22 days.
August Herman Andresen	Minnesota	do	1925–33, 1935–58	31 years ½ month.
Thomas Newton	Virginia	do	1801–30, 1831–33	31 years.
Theodore Elijah Burton	Ohio	do	1889–91, 1895–1909	30 years 8 months.
		Senate	1909–15	
		House	1921–28	
		Senate	1928–29	
Joseph Jefferson Mansfield	Texas	House	1917–47	30 years 4 months.
John William McCormack	Massachusetts	do	1928–	30 years 3 months 26 days.
Byron Patton Harrison	Mississippi	do	1911–19	30 years 3 months 18 days.
		Senate	1919–41	
John Tyler Morgan	Alabama	do	1877–1907	30 years 3 months.
William Steele Holman	Indiana	House	1859–65, 1867–77, 1881–95, 1897.	30 years 1½ months.
John Nance Garner	Texas	do	1903–33	30 years exactly, continuous, with 8 leap years.
Reed Smoot	Utah	Senate	1903–33	Do.
Earl Cory Michener	Michigan	House	1919–33, 1935–51	30 years exactly, broken, with 8 leap years.
Wright Patman	Texas	do	1929–	30 years exactly, continuous, with 7 leap years.
Francis Marion Cockrell	Missouri	Senate	1875–1905	Do.
John Percival Jones	Nevada	do	1873–1903	30 years exactly, continuous, with 6 leap years.

The record for continuous congressional service is held by CARL HAYDEN, who is still serving.

The record for continuous House service is held by SAM RAYBURN, who is still serving.

The House service of Joseph G. Cannon covered exactly 50 years, a record.

The record for continuous Senate service is held by Kenneth D. McKellar.

The Senate service of Francis E. Warren covered 39 years, a record.

William P. Frye and Eugene Hale, both of whom were from Maine, were colleagues in the Senate for all but the first 2 weeks of a period of 30 years, after having been colleagues in the House for exactly 8 years.

Data have been broken down into months and days only sufficiently to avoid ties. The same applies to consideration of leap years.

Data for 12 contemporary members are as of Mar. 4, 1959.

YOUTH CONSERVATION CORPS

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, the Civilian Conservation Corps, which I supported while a Representative-at-Large from Ohio, was a great national experiment in social welfare. The CCC did an excellent job. It proved its great worth to the Nation.

Again, with so much unemployment causing our youth to feel helpless and, in many localities to be jobless and almost without hope, memories of the great record of the Civilian Conservation Corps provide a basis for its reorganization.

I am one of a number of cosponsors of a bill to create a Youth Conservation Corps.

This is a meritorious proposal.

It is my hope that the bill will be enacted into law within the next few months.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey in the chair). Does the Senator from Ohio yield to the Senator from West Virginia?

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. I yield to the senior Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, the Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG] correctly invites our attention once again to the impact for good—in the building of human and natural resources—of the original Civilian Conservation Corps Act. That effort initiated a program which extended over a number of years during the serious depression of the thirties. I feel that now—25 years later—considering the impact of unemployment in the State of West Virginia, the enactment into law of similar legislation, as is proposed, would provide worthwhile channels not only to help our youth but also to assist in the rebuilding of the economic structure of our State.

I commend the able Senator for his efforts. I recall our service together in the House. It is a privilege to be a cosponsor of the legislation to which he has referred, and which is pending in this body.

There is ample reason for me to join in cosponsoring a youth conservation bill. Not only did I militantly support and vote for the Civilian Conservation Corps Act—one of the cornerstones of the New Deal program; I assisted in the framing of that legislation. The important part the CCC program accomplished for economic recovery and human progress under the authority of that act, has had almost universal approval. In retrospect those who doubted its original purpose became its ardent supporters.

In counseling with the people of West Virginia as I traveled about the State in the last election year, I spoke often of both the emergency and lasting values of the Civilian Conservation Corps. In a more specific speech reference at Summersville in Nicholas County on October 24, 1958, I said:

> I was a strong believer in the validity and the usefulness of the Civilian Conservation Corps as a reforestation assistant, as a builder of young men, and as a financial aid to depression-stricken families in the early and mid-1930's. If the present recession should unfortunately deepen—

I added—

> or if another seriously depressed economic era should befall our country, I would strongly recommend a revival of the New Deal era Civilian Conservation Corps instrumentality and technique.

Mr. President, the impacts West Virginians were feeling from the recession in the fall of 1958 bear down deeper today in our State. Even the Wall Street

Journal and the New York Times have, in recent days, carried on their front pages stories of the economic and social distress prevailing in West Virginia—facts written by their own staff writers who went into the depressed areas of the State to observe and report upon conditions.

Published testimony taken at hearings before the Subcommittee on Banking and Currency of the U.S. Senate in the cities of Charleston, Beckley, and Morgantown, W. Va., as recently as March 4, 5, and 6, bear out more vividly and pointedly the actual economic and social dislocation in our State.

Hence, Mr. President, I feel impelled to renew my pledge to recommend a revival of the Civilian Conservation Corps, and I strongly urge early and favorable consideration of the proposed youth conservation bill, in which I join, and about which the Senator from Ohio has forcefully addressed his remarks.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, over the years the distinguished senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] has established an outstanding reputation for the performance of real and needed service to the people of this Nation. The Senator has proved himself to be a great humanitarian, and I am pleased, of course, that he is in full accord with the views I am expressing today.

Mr. President, I embody in my remarks in support of this proposed legislation an editorial statement of Don Miller, associate news editor of the Chronicle-Telegram, an important newspaper published in Elyria, Ohio. Don Miller, an outstanding editorial writer of my State, is himself an alumnus of the CCC.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article entitled "Afloat and Afield," written by Don Miller, be printed in the RECORD.

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

AFLOAT AND AFIELD

(By Don Miller)

The kid was just out of high school, jobs were scarce, and he was at loose ends.

Gradually he moved in with an older crowd which kept some wild hours, pooled their skimpy resources to buy illicit homebrew, and were on the borderline where youthful exploration of a big world could turn at any time to tragedy.

Then, on an impulse, the boy joined the Civilian Conservation Corps.

In the time it takes to whistle "Dixie" he found himself in a fairly wild section of Utah. Here he became acquainted with rattlesnakes and scorpions. He hunted for jackrabbits and cougar.

He explored the beauties of Zion National Park, hunted big mule deer in the Pentura Mountains, and roamed the mountains near Cedar City. Several weekends he hitched rides 185 miles away, across the Arizona strip, to Las Vegas and to Boulder City, where he explored every part of Boulder (now Hoover) Dam he could reach.

At St. George, Utah, he played basketball against junior college teams. He learned to box, to work in a darkroom in printing pictures.

He also learned to work as a rodman for a surveyor, working in blizzards each day, barely able to see through the snow while below, in a valley, others worked without shirts, getting suntans.

He worked on irrigation canals, learning riprap work with stone. And with a shovel he helped to work on other irrigation canals. He helped to dam streams, retaining precious water where it was scarce.

A year later, after some lazy months at home with the same old crowd, he again went into the CCC. This time he went to Idaho in the southeastern corner. Again he saw the beauties of a strange country; the snow-crowned mountains; the towering pines; the clear, swift-flowing streams.

He learned to fish for trout, to explore the rocky ledges. He killed scores of rattlesnakes unearthed in winter by huge bulldozers slashing into a cliffside at a rock crusher.

He learned to drive a dump truck. He studied diesel engines and photography. He helped to build roads and a Scout mountain ski jump. And he spent an entire winter going up into the mountains alone each day, wearing snowshoes, and putting out poison blocks for porcupines.

He also learned shooting accuracy, using a .22 on the porcupines which were so numerous they were destroying beautiful timber, girdling the trees.

He went up the mountains at daylight, and sat for hours, watching beavers work on their dams and cutting trees. He saw a Government trapper cutting down on the beaver surplus through trapping.

It was quite an education for a boy not yet aged 18. And even today, people both in Utah and Idaho are receiving benefit from things on which he and hundreds of other CCC boys worked.

Today there are bills both in the U.S. House of Representatives and Senate which would set up a 150,000-man Youth Conservation Corps. It would further the conservation programs and help to combat delinquency by utilizing unemployed youths.

I hope it passes, and perhaps some letters to Representatives and Senators would be of assistance in getting support.

I hope it passes—for 20 years ago I was the kid on the brink of a world of trouble, and enjoyed the rich benefits of that CCC work, travel, and an earthy but wonderful education.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, our most valuable natural resource is our youth.

We pass legislation to conserve our oil, our timber, and many of our other natural resources.

We accommodate our surplus in agriculture.

We subsidize certain vital industries.

Certainly we can and should legislate to conserve our youth—especially those thousands whose future might otherwise be wasted both for themselves and for the Nation.

A boy approaching young manhood, unable for financial or other reasons to go on to college and likewise unable to secure employment and possibly unable to pass the physical examination necessary to enter our Armed Forces, would, if we were to create a Youth Conservation Corps, be physically and mentally rehabilitated by reason of outdoor activities of such a YCC.

Mr. President, those enrolled would repeat the great accomplishments achieved by members of the Civilian Conservation Corps 26 years ago.

By their work they would accelerate the construction of forest service and national park recreational facilities.

Their time would not be wasted from that standpoint, and boys who now face a well-nigh hopeless situation would gain strength and self-respect.

Juvenile delinquency would be lessened.

Conservation of natural resources is involved, as well as conservation of the youth of our country.

The best news to hundreds of thousands of families in America in this time of widespread unemployment, would be the passage of the bill, S. 812, introduced by the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] to create a Youth Conservation Corps providing healthful outdoor training and employment for young men and, at the same time, advance the conservation development and management of natural resources of timber, soil, and of recreational areas.

I express the earnest hope that the action on this bill will not be long delayed.

HOOVER MEDAL FOR 1958

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, the Hoover Medal for 1958, an award given annually to an engineer selected by the four Founder Societies of America of Civil, Electrical, Mechanical, and Mining Engineering, was presented recently to Lt. Gen. Raymond A. Wheeler, U.S. Army Engineers, retired.

Having served under General Wheeler in the China-Burma-India Theater during World War II, and later having witnessed his distinguished performance of the important duties of Army Chief of Engineers, I know full well how richly "Speck" Wheeler deserves this recognition of his superb talents. I ask unanimous consent that the brief citation accompanying the award of the Hoover Medal to General Wheeler may be included in the RECORD at this point.

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

RAYMOND ALBERT WHEELER

Typifies all that is best in leadership, training, experienced judgment, character and warm friendship in both the military engineer and the civilian engineer. His accomplishments throughout his life are outstanding, have brought great credit to his chosen profession, and mark him an eminent engineer of national and international recognition. His significant contributions include the monumental task of clearing the Suez Canal.

FIFTEENTH ANNIVERSARY OF BOYS' TOWNS OF ITALY

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, tomorrow night in the grand ballroom of the Hotel Waldorf-Astoria in New York City, a ball will be held in celebration of the 15th anniversary of the Boys' Towns of Italy.

Former President Hoover will appear at this event to make an award in behalf of the Boys' Clubs of America to Msgr. John Patrick Carroll-Abbing, the remarkable Irish priest who founded Boys' Towns of Italy.

The New York celebration will be the first of a series of 15th anniversary fund-raising balls in 17 cities throughout the country. Next Monday, Princess Gabriella Pacelli, niece of the late Pope Pius

XII, will arrive in New York to begin an extensive tour of the United States in connection with this series of events. Her trip will get under way formally when Mrs. Eisenhower receives her at the White House.

The Princess will be acting as good-will ambassador for a cause with which she has been closely allied since its very beginning on the war-torn streets of Rome. In those early days of heartbreak and discouragement, the Princess worked by the side of Monsignor Carroll-Abbing. The monsignor, then a domestic prelate to the Vatican, gathered together the wandering, homeless boys of postwar Italy and fed them. He saw his work grow from this to the cellar refuge he started on Christmas Day 1944, and then gradually to its present stature of 9 self-governing Boys' Towns, the newly founded Girls' Town, and 30 nurseries in southern Italy.

Princess Pacelli and her 22-year-old daughter, Ursula, will be guests of honor at an Italian Embassy reception given by Ambassador and Signora Manlio Brosio. She will also meet with the Italo-American delegation in Congress.

Monsignor Carroll-Abbing, the "Father Flanagan of Italy," and the man responsible for enlisting the Princess' interest in Boys' Towns, might well have rested on his laurels as a scholar of the Catholic Church and a domestic prelate of His Holiness Pope Pius XII. Instead, he chose to dedicate his life to the bands of homeless boys wandering the streets of Italy in the wake of the armies. It is his work which has inspired thousands of Americans differing in religion, national background, politics and professions, in this effort toward a better world.

Mrs. George Skouras, of New York, international chairman of Boys' Towns of Italy, has arranged the details for the trip of the distinguished visitors.

An American of Italian background, Mrs. Skouras is the wife of the Greek-born head of one of the country's largest motion picture theater chains. A trip to Italy 5 years ago, and her first encounter with Monsignor Carroll-Abbing and his Boys' Towns, transformed Julia Skouras from a suburban matron to the dynamo who has recruited thousands of volunteers for these amazing colonies which have salvaged the youth of Italy from delinquency and communism.

Boys' Towns of Italy consist of nine model, self-governing communities, for boys, patterned after the famed Boys' Town founded by the late Father Flanagan. They have been built almost completely with funds donated by Americans.

Boys' Town of Pozzuoli, for example, was sponsored by Local 48 of the International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union of New York City. Boys' Town of Palermo, on the other hand, was a project of a committee of the Men's Clothing Industry of New York, representing the management side of that industry.

Sea Town, one of the three villages of the Boys' Republic of Civitavecchia, was founded under the auspices of an American food industry committee. The magnificent athletic fields of Boys' Towns of Rome are the gift of New York merchant Nathan Ohrbach.

Americans who have visited Boys' Towns of Italy have become boosters for this international project. These include Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt, Mrs. Clare Booth Luce, film star Mitzi Gaynor, actress Helen Hayes, sports' greats Gene Tunney and Joe DiMaggio, singer Julius La Rosa, and opera star Robert Merrill. The famed Negro basketball team, the Harlem Globetrotters, put on an exhibition game for the boys. And the efforts of Linda Darnell, Hollywood star, inspired the first Girls' Town.

Mr. President, Boys' Towns of Italy is a great humanitarian undertaking which will pay dividends in good citizenship for generations. I am proud of the role my own State of New York has played in its development, including notable support by both labor and management. All associated with this enterprise deserve the commendation and support of each one of us.

SEVENTH ANNUAL DEDICATORY PRAYER BREAKFAST

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, last Thursday morning, 1,000 persons, including members of the executive, legislative, and judicial branches of our Government, delegates to the conference and representatives of the Council of Christian Leadership groups attended the Presidential prayer breakfast at the Mayflower Hotel in Washington, D.C.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a copy of the program and transcript of the proceedings of this service.

In my opinion this prayer breakfast and program added much to the religious life of our Nation.

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

PROGRAM FOR PRESIDENTIAL BREAKFAST, THURSDAY, MARCH 12, 1958, 8 A.M., MAYFLOWER HOTEL

Presiding: Senator FRANK CARLSON.

Invocation: Judge Boyd Leedom.

Message of welcome: Senator CARLSON.

Comments: Dr. Richard C. Halverson.

Old Testament Scripture, Psalm 46: Hon. Ezra Taft Benson.

New Testament Scripture, Matthew 16: 13–27: Hon. Wilber M. Brucker.

Greetings from the House of Representatives breakfast group: Hon. ALVIN M. BENTLEY.

Greetings from the Senate breakfast group: Senator A. WILLIS ROBERTSON.

Solo: Fague Springman.

The Vice President of the United States.

Prayer, in unison:

"Our Father in Heaven:

"We pray that You will save us from ourselves.

"The world that You have made for us, to live in peace, we have made into an armed camp. We live in fear of war to come.

"We are afraid of 'the terror that flies by night, and the arrow that flies by day, the pestilence that walks in darkness and the destruction that wastes at noonday.'

"We have turned from You to go our selfish way. We have broken Your commandments and denied Your truth. We have left Your altars to serve the false gods of money and pleasure and power.

"Forgive us and help us.

"Now, darkness gathers around us and we are confused in all our counsels. Losing faith in You, we lose faith in ourselves.

"Inspire us with wisdom, all of us of every color, race, and creed, to use our wealth, our strength, to help our brother instead of destroying him.

"Help us to do Your will as it is done in heaven and to be worthy of Your promise of peace on earth.

"Fill us with new faith, new strength and new courage that we may win the Battle for Peace.

"Be swift to save us, dear God, before the darkness falls.

"In Jesus name, Amen."

(Prayer by Conrad N. Hilton given at previous Prayer Breakfast.)

Conclusion: Dr. Abraham Vereide.

PROCEEDINGS

Senator CARLSON. Judge Boyd Leedom, Chairman of the National Labor Relations Board and President of the FCC will offer the invocation.

INVOCATION: JUDGE BOYD LEEDOM

Judge LEEDOM. Eternal God, as we are gathered here at this unique meeting where many, many of great responsibility are gathered together, we ask that Thy spirit be here in a remarkable degree.

We pray especially this morning for the leaders of nations, that the peace of Christ may prevail on earth. Particularly we pray for the President of the United States, and all in high places who assist him in the Government of this land of ours. God save him from little men in other positions of high authority who may, out of selfish interest and greed, deviate from the single purpose of peace.

We pray for others in our own Government, especially Secretary Dulles, and may the miracle of his healing which we think is unfolding come to full fruition, so that his services may be continued.

We pray for the leaders of all nations, for the leaders especially of the Soviet Union of Russia. Grant somehow God that Thy wisdom and Thy spirit may enlighten them so that the affairs of men on this planet may finally come to a peaceful conclusion at this tragic time.

God, in our military might, make us truly aware that love is the greatest force of all, and guide us so that we may know how to exert it to bring about peaceful relations between nations.

But most especially, eternal God, we pray at this time that You may become real in the lives of each of us here gathered and that we may truly understand, not merely mentally accept, but truly understand that in Your divine plan You did send to this planet of ours in our time and space One like us, a Man Jesus Christ, to reveal Yourself to us and let each of us here gathered be fully aware that Christ stands at our right hand to offer the solution for all problems if we will but accept Him.

For it is certainly true, and history would affirm the fact, that if all the people gathered here would accept Christ as a reality in their lives and so conduct their affairs, that peace would certainly prevail.

This we most earnestly pray.

In Christ's name, Amen.

MESSAGE OF WELCOME: SENATOR FRANK CARLSON

Senator CARLSON. We are delighted that there are so many here this morning for this seventh annual prayer breakfast. I regret that I do not have time to introduce the many members of the executive branch, the judicial branch, and the legislative branch of our Government.

This annual breakfast is in commemoration of the organization of the breakfast prayer group of 25 years ago which was organized in Seattle, Wash. Now these

groups have been organized in every section of the Nation, and many of them in foreign countries.

This is truly a dedicated group, with a spiritual consideration of the practical problems which we believe can be solved by groups such as this. We believe that the cornerstone of American life rests on a strong prayer foundation. We firmly believe that the greatness of America comes from the loyalty of the patriotism and the righteousness of our people. We believe it is imperative, in order to preserve and save our sacred freedom, that we have a strong and courageous God-fearing people and a total mobilization of all the spiritual forces of this Nation.

At the headtable we have a few guests whom I want to present before we get into the program.

I want to state to this fine group gathering this morning that the President of the United States planned on being here until as late as 5 o'clock last evening. There was a pressing matter that made it practically impossible for him to be away from the White House this morning. I told him I regretted it very sincerely; on the other hand, I just felt a little embarrassed to ask him to come down to a breakfast with all the pressing problems he is carrying at this time. He asked that I extend his greetings and best wishes to this group.

At the headtable we have the chairman of the Senate prayer breakfast group, Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, of Wisconsin.

We have at the headtable a man who has been very interested in Christian and religious work, very active in the working of a great newspaper, recently appointed Ambassador to Israel, Mr. Ogden Reid.

Then, if it comes to people of importance, I think we all owe a debt of gratitude to the host of this breakfast, Mr. William Jones, of California. Mr. Jones.

Every Thursday morning there is a prayer group that meets in the House of Representatives; every Wednesday morning there is a prayer group that meets in the Senate of the United States.

This morning, before we get into the program, we are going to have a Scripture read from the Old Testament by the Honorable Ezra Taft Benson, the Secretary of Agriculture, and a Scripture read from the New Testament by the Honorable Wilber M. Brucker, the Secretary of the Army.

(Old Testament Scripture: Psalm 46, read by the Honorable Ezra Taft Benson.)

(New Testament Scripture: Matthew 16: 13–27, read by the Honorable Wilber M. Brucker.)

Senator CARLSON. We will now have a message from the president of the House prayer breakfast group, Congressman BENTLEY, and following we shall have a message from Senator A. WILLIS ROBERTSON, of Virginia.

GREETINGS FROM THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES BREAKFAST GROUP, HON. ALVIN V. BENTLEY

Mr. BENTLEY. Thank you, Senator CARLSON.

Mr. Vice President, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, Christian friends all, it is a deep privilege to be able this morning to bring you greetings from the breakfast group of the House of Representatives, of which I am president this year. The House breakfast group, with a total membership of nearly 100, assembles in a private dining room at the Capitol every Thursday morning while Congress is in session. Following the meal, one of our own Members brings us a message of his own choosing, usually on some theme of our Christian religion. A discussion period follows whenever time permits.

The membership of the House group is as cosmopolitan as is the House itself. The presidency of the group alternates between our two political parties annually. We have northern Democrats and southern Democrats, northern Republicans and even southern Republicans, difficult as it is to find them in the Congress. Our members in fact represent not only an accurate cross section of the Congress but indeed of the country itself.

On political, economic and social questions, you would find a wide variety of opinions indeed. But there are two factors which make us all feel very close to one another. The first is, of course, our love of and devotion to our great Nation whose citizens we represent in the Congress. The second is our common belief in the teachings of the Master and a firm dedication to those principles which He inspired by His words and actions.

I am sure there are many persons, possibly including some of our own Members, who ask themselves what can possibly be acomplished through these weekly meetings. We do have some concrete accomplishments, such as the establishment of the Congressional Prayer Room, to our credit. But I should think that our main purpose is twofold in nature and is indeed applicable not only to our own group but to all similar groups throughout this country and even in foreign lands.

The first is based on the premise that the continued practice of our Christian faith better qualifies us to perform the duties and pursue the careers which we have chosen for ourselves or to which God has called us. Having in mind our own example as legislators, the spiritual and moral refreshment which we derive from these weekly meetings is indeed a source of strength and inspiration to all of us as we go about our daily tasks. No matter how sharply our personal opinions may vary on other questions, we are all conscious of the continuing need to ask God and His beloved Son to guide our footsteps in the path of freedom and righteousness for the sake of His blessed name. Speaking personally, I leave that room every Thursday morning with a renewed devotion to our Christian precepts and a determination to practice them as a legislator in the light of Jesus Christ and insofar as God may grant me the mercy to see that light. We are all of us, I know, better Congressmen, better Americans, and better Christians for having met with one another in an abiding spirit of fellowship and love.

And yet there is perhaps even a higher motivation for our weekly assemblies. We are a prayer group and we pray earnestly and feverently upon meeting and before departing. We are all of us convinced of the power of prayer and of the belief that indeed prayer changes things. If you will pardon another personal reference, people have told me that I am a living example of what prayer can accomplish and I refer, of course, to that time 5 years ago last March 1, when five of us were shot down in the House of Representatives, and my own life hung in the balance. And I will firmly believe throughout all of my days that the heartfelt prayers of thousands of my fellow citizens and Christians had the power to restore me to health and strength and to permit me to stand before you this morning. It is the most humbling, the most ennobling, and the most revealing experience that a human being can ever pass through. And so we of the House breakfast group join millions of our fellow Christians in their prayers for a righteous peace, for the eternal glory of God throughout the world and for brotherly love and fellowship to permeate all mankind as the Master taught us nearly 2,000 years ago. And, if our faith is strong enough, we know that our prayers will be answered.

Again I greet you on behalf of my colleagues in the House breakfast group and wish for you a successful and a spiritually satisfying conference. May you find Christian answers to the problems which beset us today and may God in His infinite goodness and mercy help you to discover the solutions we all so sorely need.

GREETINGS FROM SENATE BREAKFAST GROUP, SENATOR A. WILLIS ROBERTSON

Senator ROBERTSON. Mr. Chairman, Your Excellency the Vice President of the United States, members of the Cabinet, colleagues, ladies, and gentlemen, in quoting from the greatest military leader that the Jews ever produced, Secretary Benson has given me an appropriate text for my remarks today, when he quoted King David as saying: "God is our refuge and strength, a very present help in trouble."

A serious crisis has been created by the demand of the Soviet dictator that we and our allies leave Berlin by May 27, to which we have replied that we do not intend to go. As we drift toward the possibility of armed conflict over the Berlin issue my thoughts turn to the crisis that confronted us in Virginia 185 years ago. British troops had invaded Massachusetts and Massachusetts had called upon us for help. Before acting on that plea the Virginia House of Burgesses adopted a resolution designating the first Sunday in the following June as a day of fasting and prayer. That resolution called on the people "devoutly to implore the divine interposition, for averting the heavy calamity which threatens destruction of our civil rights and the evils of civil war; to give us one heart and one mind firmly to oppose, by all just and proper means, every injury to American rights; and that the minds of his Majesty and his Parliament may be inspired from above with wisdom, moderation, and justice, to remove from the local people of America all cause of danger, from a continued pursuit of measures pregnant with their ruin."

George Washington, who helped to frame that resolution of 1774 knelt in the snows of Valley Forge to ask the help of God to carry on an unequal military struggle for independence and it was Washington who was presiding over the Philadelphia Constitutional Convention in the summer of 1787 when his friend, Benjamin Franklin, said: "In the situation of this assembly groping as it were in the dark to find political truth, and scarce able to distinguish it when presented to us, how has it happened, sir, that we have not hitherto once thought of humbly applying to the Father of light to illuminate our understanding? I have lived, sir, a long time, and the longer I live, the more convincing proofs I see of this truth—that God governs in the affairs of men. And if a sparrow cannot fall to the ground without His notice, is it probable that an empire can rise without His aid?"

Again, in 1789, Washington said in his inaugural address: "It would be peculiarly improper to omit in this first official act my fervent supplications to that Almighty Being who rules over the universe, who presides in the councils of nations, and whose providential aids can supply every human defect, that His benediction may consecrate to the liberties and happiness of the people of the United States a Government instituted by themselves for these essential purposes, and may enable every instrument employed in its administration to execute with success the functions allotted to his charge."

In the birth of a new nation, in the rise of a new empire the Founding Fathers asked for and received God's help. Do we no longer need that help?

The possession by the Soviet Union of nuclear weapons, including intercontinental missiles, hangs over our heads like the Sword of Damocles. For the next fiscal year and as long thereafter as the present cold war lasts, our Government will spend more than half

of its current revenue on its Military Establishment. Yet our military experts frankly admit that we will suffer heavy casualties in the event of a surprise nuclear attack and an all-out nuclear war might destroy civilization as we have known it, if it did not, indeed, destroy all life on our planet.

In the fight for religious, political, and economic freedom, 3 million relatively poor and untrained colonists survived 7 years of armed conflict with the 35 millions of the mother country. In that conflict the Founding Fathers asked for and received Divine interposition.

In meeting the threat of nuclear destruction we, like our forefathers, should pray daily for God's help.

Because of her dependence upon and reverence for the Supreme Ruler of the universe, America has been spared in two World Wars.

She stands now at the crossroads of her destiny—threatened from within by spiritual indifference and moral deterioration, and from without by a deadly foe.

The conflict is no longer might against superior might. The battlelines are already drawn. The one issue which faces us today is this: Will America accept the moral challenge of this hour, as she has accepted the military challenge of past years, or will she allow this glorious opportunity to slip from her grasp forever?

This, my friends, is the world leadership to which we are called today: To stand before the nations of the entire world and say with young David: "Thou comest to me with a sword, and with a spear, and with a shield; but I come to thee in the name of the Lord of hosts."

The unseen forces of a mighty God are on our side, and we can go confidently forward in the power of His might if we will take Him at His word when He says: "If my people, which are called by my name, shall humble themselves, and pray, and seek my face, and turn from their wicked ways; then will I hear from heaven, and will forgive their sin, and will heal their land."

Senator CARLSON. I have the honor to present to this fine group this morning the Vice President of the United States.

STATEMENT OF THE VICE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. NIXON. Senator CARLSON, my fellow Cabinet members, Members of the Senate and House, members of the diplomatic corps, and all distinguished guests from around the country today, it is a very great privilege for me to be here this morning even at this early hour to attend this meeting. I say early hour, because while the President, as you know from reading your newspapers, likes to do business and go to meetings at breakfast, I prefer to work my schedule later on in the evening; so, consequently, it begins to burn at both ends when you get up at 8 after staying up to 12.

Now, of course, I have been commissioned to say just a few words at the conclusion of this breakfast, and the themes that have already been indicated by the scriptures and the eloquent statements presented by Congressman BENTLEY and Senator ROBERTSON I think are ones I could very well follow. I would like to relate those themes, if I might, very briefly to the world situation in which we find ourselves today. And perhaps if you will also pardon a personal reference in my case, I think we might start from an individual, a personality, who visited the United States a few weeks ago.

Many of you probably saw Mr. Mikoyan on "Meet the Press." Many of us had the oportunity in Government of meeting him or talking to him, of seeing his mind work and of learning what he believed. But more important than that, how deeply he believed what he believed. I can tell you from my own personal conversations with him that I was tremendously impressed by his mental equipment, by his keen and decisive sense of humor, by his remarkable background, not only in his own philosophy, but also his understanding of our philosophy, by the fact that he had done his homework well.

He knew all about me, all about the various other people in the conference in which I participated, which meant, of course, here was a man who was especially qualified from a diplomatic standpoint to carry out the mission on which he had been assigned.

But all these factors which I have mentioned did not make the greatest impression as far as I was concerned. After all, he is the second man in the Soviet Union, and being the second man he should be certainly extremely well trained. He should be well briefed. He should have great ability and great understanding of world problems and of the problems of his own country, as well as an understanding of the country which he was visiting. There was something else which impressed me and perhaps, I should say, disturbed me more than these things which I would have expected from a visitor of his quality from a great nation and a great people, and it was the fact that this man had a faith, a burning faith, that his cause was right. This is hard for those of you in this room to believe, I am sure, as it is hard for me to believe. But one thing we must remember about the great struggle in which we are engaged today is that whatever we may think of communism—and we would get a unanimous vote in this room or in any American audience or any audience in the free world with regard to the evils of the Communist system—whatever we may think of the system, we must make no mistake about it that those who are advocates of that system have a faith, a burning faith, one, that their system is right, and two, a faith that their system will prevail.

Mr. Mikoyan himself told me when I was talking to him that he could see because of the great industrial development that occurred in the United States, because our workers lived so well even when they were unemployed after he had visited Detroit and other areas, he could see that the old classical Marxist theory that revolution would come in all the capitalist countries as the result of the workers of the country joining together and overthrowing the employers and the capitalists and bourgeois, he could see that that theory might not be applicable to the United States. And I asked him how will communism come to a country like this, and his answer was very significant. He said, "communism will come to the United States because we in the Soviet Union will outproduce you, we will work harder, our system is more efficient, our system is more desirable, and the people of the United States, in the years ahead, as they see that we are moving ahead of the United States, will in self-defense have to turn to some form of communism if they are to avoid becoming a second rate power." He said this and he believed it.

Now, I mention this only to point out what our problem in the world today is. How do we meet this threat? Well, you pick up the morning papers. You will note that a great debate is going on, as it should go on, may I say, on the defenses of the United States, because this is a matter that is not partisan; this is a matter in which whether we are Democrats or Republicans we want to make the decision that will be best in the interest of the country. Healthy discussions of these matters, of course, is desirable, but when we put our emphasis on the defenses of the United States, let us remember that this alone is not the whole answer and this alone may not be the most important part of the answer. We need to be, with our allies, strong enough to deter or discourage any attack by the Soviet Union or by any of her aggressive power, but we need more than that if we are to win or even to survive against the likes of people like Mr. Mikoyan.

What more would you say? Well, many would say, I am sure, that this great struggle is going to be decided in the economic area, and Mr. Mikoyan believes this, I am sure. He believes as we look around the world today, as we see poverty and misery and disease, that that system which proves to be the most efficient economically will eventually prevail. And following that theory to its logical conclusion, there are many who say that the United States, in addition to being strong militarily, must be strong economically and that the free world with its economic strength must surpass the Soviet world, and looking toward the great new developing areas of the world—Africa, Asia, and the Near East—that the answer to whether these countries in those areas are going to turn to communism or turn to the free world will depend almost exclusively on the economic phase of this struggle.

Putting it in bold terms, you often hear it said when you travel in Asia, "give every Asian another bowl of rice and you will have no communism." Is this the answer? And again, I would be so presumptuous to say I don't believe so. Giving every Assian another bowl of rice, raising the living standards of peoples throughout the world is tremendously important; building missiles, aircraft, having ground forces sufficient to deter aggression is tremendously important for our survival. But if we allow this struggle in which we are engaged to be decided solely by the number of our missiles, by the productivity of our factories, we are meeting our potential opponents on the ground they select. We are meeting them in the area where they could win, and we are not using a third area of our own strength, which in my opinion can be, should be, and will be decisive.

It is true that certainly we cannot and should not allow the peoples in the newly developing countries to have to choose between bread and freedom. It is true for that reason that we need programs which will help them build the economic strength, which will allow them to have the political independence that they desire and that they deserve.

But it is also true that we have something more to offer than atheistic scientific materialism, and this meeting, of course, is the most eloquent demonstration of what we have to offer. The rights that we believe in as Americans are not rights that are derived solely from governments. They are not rights that, having come from government, can with impunity be taken away by government. We know that we say our rights are God-given. We know that as we consider the growth of America over 185 years that the fact that we have had a belief in God and spiritual strength has been certainly one of the major factors in our growth.

Putting this in the international context, may I simply say that today, as Americans interested in our survival, we need to maintain our military strength, we need to keep the economy of this country strong and sound and productive, and as free as possible. But, above everything else, we need faith, a faith stronger than Mr. Mikoyan's, a faith not only in the rightness of our cause, but faith in God, and a belief that the rights which come only from God, that those rights not only belong to us but they are also the rights of people throughout the world who are free or who want to be free, and that our responsibility is more than simply to maintain the military strength which will keep an easy peace and the economic strength which will provide the progress which men deserve around the world.

May I just say in conclusion this one word. In our attitudes toward the people

of the world these days, I think there is sometimes too much of a tendency for us to allow America to be painted as a nation which is solely interested in our relations with other countries in saving our own security. This, of course, is a primary concern for us. But if the peoples of the world believe that our economic assistance programs, that our military security programs, are supported in this country solely because of our interest in preserving American freedom and not because of our equal interest in maintaining the freedom and independence of other peoples, you can see what the outcome of this struggle will be.

You hear, for example, these days that it is most unfortunate for anyone to suggest that in our economic programs, technical assistance and the like, that we might be motivated by humanitarian concerns for those who are poor and sick, for the destitute of the earth, in Asia, Africa, and the Middle East. Just let me say this, having visited most of those countries, having seen these people, knowing them, I think, perhaps as well as most of the people in this room, I can say, and I would agree with them, that if they come to believe that our interest is simply that of Mr. Mikoyan and his friends, our interest is in them purely because of our self-interest in ourselves, there will be nothing to choose, and in the end the other side will prevail.

And so far that reason, let us with our great Christian tradition, let us not be ashamed to say to the world that we are not only interested in them because we need allies, as we do; that we are not only interested in them because we want a world in which we can have greater trade, productivity, on the economic side; but that Americans have an interest in other people for humanitarian reasons, because we believe that our interests are served when people throughout the world can share not only the good things of life materially, but can also share the priceless freedoms which we enjoy today because of sacrifices our fathers made in times past.

And so, with that, may I say that the work that you do, the work that you do in inspiring faith, in leaders in your own communities and leaders in the halls of Congress and Government, is basically important, important because you are emphasizing that phase of American life which needs emphasizing today. You are helping us to point out to the world that we have something more to offer than the enemies of freedom, and you are helping to remind us of the fact that our tradition is not simply one of great military strength, of tremendous economic productivity, but it is one in which we have arrived, where we have arrived because we have had faith, faith in God, faith in our country, and faith in the great God-given rights which we believe belong to every man in the world today.

Thank you, very much.

Senator CARLSON. The meeting will now be concluded by our executive director, Dr. Abraham Vereide, who will lead with the closing prayer.

Dr. VEREIDE. God, we thank Thee for the morning. We thank Thee that Thou has heard our prayers, that we can depend absolutely on Thee. If that is so, we can go forward today with confidence and courage to acquit ourselves like God's men and women in the genuineness of our faith and our love and devotion, and in the strength of the cause for which we are committed.

And so, we here hand ourselves over to You this morning, with our President and his Cabinet, and our leaders in every area at home and abroad, and as Thy people the world over say:

"Our Father which art in heaven, hallowed be Thy name.

"Thy kingdom come. Thy will be done in earth, as it is in heaven.

"Give us this day our daily bread.

"And forgive us our debts, as we forgive our debtors.

"And lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil: For Thine is the kingdom, and the power, and the glory, forever. Amen."

FREEDOM FOR YOUTH—U.S.A.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, May 1, 1959, will be a significant occasion to a great many people all over the world. May Day has traditionally been a time of happiness and festivities to freedom-loving peoples everywhere. It is the early part of springtime, the symbol of the recreation of life—the "flowery May," to quote John Milton—and, in the words of the immortal Shakespeare, it is the "May of youth and bloom of lustihood."

We in America have always maintained an affirmative attitude in our celebrations of this early day of springtime. In beautiful Hawaii, the Paradise of the Pacific soon to join our family of States, May 1 is known as Lei Day, with garlands of flowers everywhere and the smile of friendliness shining from every face.

In the Soviet Union May 1 is also a holiday. International communism celebrates this occasion with long parades displaying military might; Red Square in Moscow is alive with teeming crowds carrying banners bearing the picture of Lenin and slogans glorifying the workingman. This day ranks in national importance with the anniversary of the October revolution.

May 1 in the United States is also an occasion when all Elks Clubs throughout the country will celebrate Elks National Youth Day—a day observed in sharp contrast to Communist May Day in Europe. On this spring day all youth organizations of the Elks Club will sponsor programs based on the theme "Let's make it American," emphasizing the freedom enjoyed by the youth in America as compared to that possessed by the youth in Communist-dominated countries.

In Milwaukee, the Elks Lodge No. 46, at 910 East Wisconsin Avenue, will hold a big celebration at which I shall be privileged to be the speaker. There will be $1,800 in awards presented to winners of contests held in local high schools, and participants in the celebration will include officers of the lodge, parents, award winners, and other students. The kind invitation for me to speak was extended by the chairman of the youth activities committee, Mr. Harold M. Jankowski. The exalted ruler of the Elks Club is Mr. Arthur Steinhalb. Incidentally, this club placed second in the United States last year in sponsoring this type of program and they have high hopes of winning first place this year.

There is no sharper contrast in principles and ideology between the Soviets and Americans than in the field of education. Authoritarian theory and authoritarian practice characterize the Soviet educational system, both of which are anathema to persons who cherish freedom. Soviet policy precisely enunciates the function of education in the U.S.S.R., which is to serve the needs of the state. The state is preeminent and to its full development every person is expected to contribute his best efforts as his primary obligation, the growth and development of his own individuality are of secondary importance. By contrast, the American system is dedicated to freedom and democracy, the goal of education being the individual development of the human being, with freedom and opportunity to choose his own life's work.

Mr. President, it has been said by a distinguished authority in the law enforcement branch of our Government that America is facing an emergency—a crisis which is threatening the very future of our Nation. This is the emergency of juvenile delinquency. Whether our parents, our schools, or our entire culture is to blame, I don't profess to know. It is claimed that we seem to have misplaced the sense of values which made this a great Nation; placing self-indulgence and the principle of pleasure before duty, with the result that our youth is the victim of this breakdown of authority and moral standards in the home, the neighborhood, and sometimes the whole community.

However, I have seen so many outstanding and constructive activities of youth going on all over this great Nation, and particularly in my home State of Wisconsin, that I am inclined to believe there is every reason to be confident in our world of tomorrow. The world of the future is not a paper place, or pretty colors daubed on the perfect canvas of imagination. It is a reality which is just around the corner, and every 24 hours a little piece of it becomes today. What kind of experience each today becomes is being increasingly determined by youth. More than ever younger men are making the decisions which affect men everywhere; and the kind of decisions they make depends on the ideals, or lack of them, with which their minds were molded. That is why such activities as those sponsored by the Milwaukee Elks Club are so vitally important in tapping the vital energies of our youth and channeling those energies into the most useful civic projects. It gives our youth a chance to work constructively; and in that way they will serve themselves, serve their communities, and serve their country.

I firmly believe that we must all do our utmost, not only to improve and stabilize our national life, but also to help the individual youth with whom we come in contact—through example, through encouragement, through our own right living—to become the citizens and leaders of tomorrow to whom we can entrust the future of our children, and indeed the very survival of our civilization.

"In perfect honor, perfect truth, and gentleness to all mankind, they trod the golden paths of youth."

U.S. MILITARY ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I feel that the report which was issued yesterday by the President's Committee To Study the U.S. Military Assistance Program deserves greater currency than it

will get merely from publication in typewritten or mimeographed form. It is a very, very distinguished committee. Its Chairman is William H. Draper, Jr., and the remainder of its membership consists of Dillon Anderson; Joseph M. Dodge, a former Director of the Budget; Gen. Alfred M. Gruenther; Marx Leva; John J. McCloy, formerly High Commissioner in Germany; George McGhee; Gen. Joseph T. McNarney, who had a brilliant career in World War II; Adm. Arthur W. Radford, who was Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff; and James E. Webb.

There is one significant paragraph to which I invite attention. It is in the letter of transmittal to the President:

The increasing intensity of repeated and bitter attacks on the foreign assistance programs by their articulate critics raises the basic question as to whether these programs are more useful implements of national security policy than equivalent efforts and resources devoted to other uses. The only alternative we can see to the interdependent allied free world, strengthened by our aid where needed, would be the Fortress America concept—taking our first stand in the last ditch.

I thought that was a rather significant paragraph. That is why I read it in its entirety. I believe the entire document should be made a part of the RECORD, because there are some conclusions and some policy which are spun out in preliminary fashion, and which now merit widespread consideration. I emphasize that these are preliminary conclusions.

I emphasize one other fact. The question was addressed to me yesterday: In view of the fact that here is a recommendation for a $400-million increase, what impact would that have on the budget for 1960? On page 9 of the report, I note the following:

The Committee recommends that approximately $400 million be made available for new commitments, primarily for the NATO area, in addition to the $1.6 billion present request. This should not change significantly the estimated expenditures in fiscal year 1960.

I call attention to the fact that when we speak about a balanced budget, we are dealing with an expenditure budget, not with authorizations and commitments. I wanted that particular item to be accented, so that it would come to the attention of the Senate.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the report in its entirety, together with the letter of transmittal, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

THE PRESIDENT'S COMMITTEE
TO STUDY THE U.S.
MILITARY ASSISTANCE PROGRAM,
Washington, D.C., March 17, 1959.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Your Committee has completed its preliminary analysis of military assistance and related economic aspects of the mutual security program. We have advised you informally of our preliminary conclusions and we now present them in written form. You will note we unanimously recommend that an additional amount should be made available for military assistance in fiscal year 1960, mostly for the area of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO). In our judgment, the economic assistance requested for the same year is the minimum required, and increased funds for economic development will be needed in subsequent years.

In our final report we will deal with what we think needs to be done over the longer term in organizing a more effective mutual security effort and will outline the desirable scope and nature of that effort.

In transmitting our interim conclusions we invite your attention to our unanimous belief that a basic issue of foreign policy underlies the questions that you have submitted to us, and that there is an urgent need for its early resolution.

Simply put, the issue is whether we intend to seek survival in isolation—a state of seige—as the world continues to shrink. This would be the inevitable result if we fail to take vigorous action on mutual security. The positive course—much more in the nature of our people—would be to accept fully the great responsibilities which our generation has partly inherited and partly earned.

This is not a new issue. It is an old one, but the new feature is that time to settle it is running out.

What we do this year is an important step in one direction or the other. By forthright and affirmative action we can set the example expected of us. The penalty for failure to do so can well be the beginning of the end of the free world coalition, and the gradual isolation of America. For there can be no doubt that the free world is gravely threatened by the aggressive onslaught of a powerful and determined opponent—the Sino-Soviet Communist bloc. There is no precedent in history for the enormity of the threat.

Our strong military forces, supported as they are and must continue to be by a sound economy, constitute but a portion of the total resources which oppose the Communist threat. The remaining elements are the capabilities of the other nations of the free world whose clear and obvious desire is to remain free. These nations have varying degrees of ability to support enough military strength to resist Communist takeovers. For a number of years our Nation has aided many of them in their efforts to strengthen their military forces and to develop economies which could ultimately support their own forces. There is indeed no precedent in all history for what our country has done under the mutual security programs.

This course of action has involved the employment of substantial U.S. resources for military and economic uses in other countries. This now amounts to somewhat less than 1 percent of our annual gross national product.

The increasing intensity of repeated and bitter attacks on the foreign assistance programs by their articulate critics raises the basic question as to whether these programs are more useful implements of national security policy than equivalent efforts and resources devoted to other uses. The only alternative we can see to the interdependent allied free world, strengthened by our aid where needed, would be the fortress America concept—taking our first stand in the last ditch.

We are all convinced that the mutual security program both in its military and in its economic aspects is a sound concept. What is needed is the determination to continue it and the ability to administer it well.

The administration of this program has been imperfect in some respects. We in America are novices at many of the tasks which befall us in our unprecedented position in world affairs, for in history's perspective these tasks have occupied us for a relatively few years. We have not developed the well-trained corps of personnel required to carry out such a farflung program with absolute efficiency. Some projects have been imperfectly conceived, inadequately planned and poorly executed. On the other hand most projects have been well conceived and successfully carried out. Additionally, we have developed many competent administrators, though it may be years before there are enough such people in the program to provide a level of efficiency comparable to that which we see in business affairs and in other American endeavors. Meantime, while each blunder seemed worth a headline, the successes have made little news.

Nevertheless, we have seen, with substantial contributions from the Marshall plan and from our mutal security and other efforts, the rebuilding of Europe and Japan, the development of powerful allies in NATO and the strengthening of the nations around the periphery of the Sino-Soviet bloc. We have seen slow but heartening progress in some parts of the less developed third of the world. With better internal security and a greater ability to defend themselves, peoples in these areas have acquired a growing confidence in their future. This is indispensable to economic development. Thus, despite imperfections of the programs, we have seen greater strength come to free world nations with the help of our aid. We do not now stand alone.

The choice our country faces is very real and near at hand. In our fascination with our own mistakes, and the constant use of foreign aid as a whipping boy, we may be gradually choking this vital feature of our national security policy to death.

The United States should commit itself to go ahead with a constructive program in this whole field, both military and economic, or alternately determine that we should no longer undertake the program.

We believe strongly that the doubts about the program and the policy it supports should be resolved affirmatively in the context of a longer term outlook, and not be left to year-by-year uncertainty as to what course our country will follow.

At the same time all of us must realize that ultimate success depends on something more than the dollars and military equipment of our aid programs. It also depends on our ability to maintain and strengthen, along with other nations, the political and economic bases of our free world relationships. We can truly succeed only if we have the full confidence and willing cooperation of our friends and allies.

We recommend, Mr. President, that every effort be made within the legislative and executive branches of the Government to bring clearly before the American people the relationship between the mutual security program and the national interest, and the need for continuity of this program if it is to make its required contribution toward our world position of strength.

Respectfully yours.

William H. Draper, Jr., Chairman; Dillon Anderson, Alfred M. Gruenther, John J. McCloy, Joseph T. McNarney, Joseph M. Dodge, Mark Leva, George McGhee, Arthur W. Radford, James E. Webb.

PRELIMINARY CONCLUSIONS OF THE PRESIDENT'S COMMITTEE TO STUDY THE U.S. MILITARY ASSISTANCE PROGRAM, SUBMITTED TO THE PRESIDENT WITH THE COMMITTEE'S LETTER OF MARCH 17, 1959

The Committee appointed by you has made its preliminary analysis of the U.S. military assistance program. Previous studies of the program made by the Congress, the executive branch, and others have been taken into account. We have consulted governmental, business, academic, and private

agencies and individuals. Members of the Committee have visited all of the major areas of the world which participate in the military assistance program. While our work is not complete, we submit our findings thus far in response to your wish that they be available in connection with recommendations you may wish to make to the Congress.

THE WORLD SITUATION

The Committee believes that the military assistance program must be determined primarily in the light of three main considerations:

First, the mighty challenge to the free world posed by the great strength of the Soviet Union and Communist China and their continuing determination to dominate the world.

Second, the revolutionary changes taking place in many areas of the world still free of Communist control, generally classed as "less developed," many of which have only recently achieved their independence.

Third, the ability and willingness of the United States to sustain the expenditures involved in such a program together with its own defense requirements while preserving a sound domestic economy.

The Communist-dominated countries contain about one-third of the world's population, and the less developed countries above referred to constitute more than another one-third. This fact indicates the scope of the problem.

We are convinced that there has been no lessening of the total Communist threat to the survival of the free world. In fact, Soviet-Chinese capability to apply military, political, and economic pressures is expanding. This is evidenced by its arms assistance programs, by an aggressive propaganda and political drive directed particularly to the weaker economic areas of the world, and by a vigorous economic offensive in those areas. It is indisputable that Communist military strength is steadily increasing. Clear evidence has recently appeared of an intent to wield that strength in order to obtain political objectives. The attack on Quemoy, the threats of atomic destruction, and the talk of possible war over West Berlin are the most dramatic recent instances of the continuance of the military threat.

NEED FOR LONG TERM PROGRAM

The challenge is a powerful one. It is a long term challenge requiring long term methods to meet it. The United States, together with its allies and friends, certainly has the wisdom and the resources to win. But we must be resolute in taking the necessary action.

While every effort should be made to reduce the tensions which are implicit in this challenge, we fail to find in the present situation any promise of relaxation of those tensions. Unless progress is made in the way of general disarmament or in moderating the objectives of the Sino-Soviet bloc, we shall have to face a protracted period of international tension.

Now that the United States no longer has a monopoly of long range nuclear weapons, any weakening of our support to outlying allied positions makes the danger of local aggression even greater, and accordingly the military assistance program becomes even more essential to our security.

The time has come to face the facts of both the long term nature of the struggle and what we must do to assure survival and ultimate victory. We believe strongly that the attainment of U.S. objectives in the military assistance program has been impaired by the lack of continuity in the authorization and administration of the program. The present methods, we find, interfere with the meshing of the plans and the resources of the recipient countries with our military assistance programs, materially delay deliveries, increase costs, and sometimes even prevent the accomplishment of our objectives.

The Committee therefore believes it is essential to the achievement of the program's basic objectives, and to the flexibility necessary to meet new threats and new challenges, that the country recognize its long term nature. Legislative and administrative steps must be taken to put the program on a continuing basis. We are convinced that this would not only improve the effectiveness of the program, but its economy as well.

Such a long-range program would have important imponderable advantages. We believe it would strengthen the deterrent vis-a-vis the Soviet Union, it would improve the confidence of our allies and result in greater willingness to make longer range commitments and to devote a larger element of their resources to the common defense.

FREE WORLD DEFENSE

The free world's far flung defense perimeter is manned jointly by allied and U.S. forces and extends through middle Europe, the Middle East, and around the rim of Asia to the northern Pacific. The weapons for the allied forces defending this perimeter have very largely been furnished by our military assistance program. It is a very wide area important to our security. The nations of this area, without our help, cannot defend it. Together we do have the strength. Within this perimeter are the homelands of our friends and allies and the means by which we together can maintain mutual bases, room for maneuver, defense in depth, and unrestricted use of the seas. This forward area, manned largely by allied forces, defends a complex of dispersed air bases which materially strengthen the effectiveness of our strategic deterrent. If strong and well armed forces hold these perimeter positions, then, in the event of local aggression, our friends, our allies, and we ourselves gain time for reinforcement, and equally important, for political action. These forces in being give the free world advantages should war come; but more importantly, they represent a major deterrent to aggression and an opportunity through negotiation to avoid war itself. Also, the capacity of these forward allied forces to meet limited attack, as recently demonstrated at Quemoy, provides another and much more acceptable alternative than surrender or resort to atomic warfare.

NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ORGANIZATION

Our most important alliance and the one in which we have our largest investment is NATO. NATO includes Canada and the United States and—extending across the Atlantic to the Mediterranean—encompasses most of Western Europe. Western Europe is an area of more than 1 million square miles, 250 million people and great resources. It contains an accumulation of some of the highest managerial and technical skills in the world, to say nothing of its being a great repository of the arts and culture of the world. It is emerging, for the first time in history, as an integrated unit. Combined it has potentialities that approach the strength of the United States. Its unity today is being forged by increasing economic ties which may, in the not too remote future, involve closer political association—a post-World War II development comparable in its significance to the rise of Soviet power and the development of China.

The first and the basic expressions of European unity were in terms of United States-European cooperation in the Marshall plan and the common defense effort of NATO. The present NATO structure, appreciably strengthened by military assistance, is potentially a great defensive force against Communist pressures. Our NATO allies will continue to require our aid to achieve the necessary strong and well integrated defense.

The impact of technology on the development of new weapons has recently made it necessary from the overall NATO as well as the United States standpoint to make large new investments in modern types of planes and other weapons, including strategic and tactical missiles in Europe. These modern weapons represent an invaluable addition to the already existing deterrent capabilities. At the same time, an incident like the current Berlin crisis demonstrates the need to support resolute statements with actions. It underlines the extremely sensitive nature of the European situation and the fact that forces with a flexible capability are essential. Any further advance by the Soviets in Europe would be a disaster for the entire free world.

The developing political, economic and technological situation makes the unity, strength and defensive versatility of NATO increasingly important. While our allies are moving to share in production of some of the more modern and expensive weapons, most of these are currently being produced only in the United States. The Committee is convinced that the present situation requires adequate provision of modern weapons to other countries of NATO, and also greater mutual effort during the next fiscal year to maintain a strong position in other weapons and to meet the existing obsolescence and replacement problem.

OTHER AREAS

We recognize that our mutual defense effort in less developed countries in direct contact with Communist forces is particularly difficult, though vital to them and to ourselves. Unless these countries have adequate holding forces, they cannot hope for timely help short of the most drastic military action by their allies. Situated on the front line and with examples of recent Communist aggression in mind, their leadership, with which we live on a cooperative basis, wants to have the forces they judge adequate to their particular circumstances.

Without the weapons and support we have furnished to the SEATO and Baghdad Pact nations, and to other Asian nations adjacent to the Communist bloc, their own direct defenses, and our own position beyond our shores would have little substance short of a major nuclear effort. Large forces far beyond the capacity of these countries to maintain need to be supported in Korea, Taiwan, and Vietnam, since they are not even formally at peace with the Communist power they face. In our judgment some increased air strength, replacement of obsolete equipment and a degree of weapons modernization are needed in the Far East area.

We believe that changes and modifications in certain of the military assistance programs can be justified in terms of more selectivity in allocating military assistance to fulfill essential objectives. In programing our mutual defense efforts, we and our allies have to give full consideration to geographic location, to national characteristics, and to many other local, regional, and historical problems.

However, in making any changes, we are faced with the fact that existing treaties, commitments, and programs cannot be easily or quickly modified. Any abrupt or substantial changes by the United States could easily be misunderstood and could produce a whole new series of complicated negotiations and readjustments in our relations with friendly countries and allies.

THE PIPELINE—UNEXPENDED BALANCES

In view of the time required to produce and deliver military hardware, the amount of funds appropriated for fiscal year 1960 will not greatly influence the amount of expenditures or deliveries until 1961 and later. We and our allies have the problem of proceeding with a progressive re-equipping of forces abroad that were equipped years ago with weapons that are now wearing out or are becoming obsolete. There is every indication

that the initial and maintenance cost of modern weapons will be substantially higher in the future. A partial offset is the fact that several of our NATO partners are now able to pay most or all of the costs of their forces and weapons. Consequently, it should not be necessary to return to the delivery levels required for the first round of initial equipment of several years ago which reached a peak of $4 billion in 1953. It seems clear to us, however, that expenditure levels estimated at $1.85 billion for fiscal year 1960, and the even lower levels in fiscal year 1961 and fiscal year 1962 which would result from the proposed appropriation of $1.6 billion for fiscal year 1960, are inadequate. They would not permit the United States to make the contribution necessary for the modernization of NATO forces now under way, and to help maintain effective forces in other parts of the world.

We believe not only that deliveries must be maintained at higher future levels than would be supported by the $1.6 billion proposed appropriation, but that certain factors now operative may result in longer lead times and a consequent need for increased funding. A larger part of future deliveries for military assistance will come from new production and less from the existing inventories of our own forces. Also a greater proportion will consist of advanced weapons requiring longer time to produce. In addition to these factors, the long decline in obligated but unexpended balances from over $8 billion a few years ago to about $2.5 billion at the end of this fiscal year, has brought these balances to about the minimum level for funding the needed procurement. We cannot any longer rely on large drawdowns from this pipeline to supplement current appropriations. In summary, deliveries in future years, on the average, will approximately equal the current flow of appropriations. We view with concern the projected sharp decline in the rate of deliveries below the $2.4 billion average level of recent years.

MILITARY ASSISTANCE PROGRAM FOR FISCAL YEAR 1960

Your letter calls for our general conclusions respecting the fiscal year 1960 program. A review of the strategy and objectives of NATO and the requirements which have been outlined to us by the various commands in other areas of the world convinces us that it would be less than prudent if we did not maintain something more than the level of the fiscal year 1959 and the fiscal year 1960 programs. Our conclusion is reached on the basis of our trips, our studies, and the presentations which have been given us, as well as upon some consideration of what additional modern weapons should be funded in fiscal year 1960.

We conclude from our area studies and from the pipeline analysis presented above, as well as from our many discussions in Washington, that an additional amount in the order of $400 million, primarily for NATO, should be available for commitment in fiscal year 1960 in addition to the program already proposed. Representatives of the executive branch have assured us that suitable weapons can be contracted for in that fiscal year to cover some of the shortfalls in force modernization which would otherwise occur. Even this increased level would not maintain the rate of deliveries in future years which we believe will be necessary.

The Committee must of course leave to the executive branch the determination of additional specific weapons and other assistance to be programed. In view of the long lead time required for the type of weapons which would be so provided, the action we propose should not change significantly the estimated expenditures in fiscal year 1960.

ECONOMIC AID PROGRAM FOR FISCAL YEAR 1960

In accordance with your instructions, the Committee has considered the impact of our military assistance program, where it appeared to be a significant factor, on the economic betterment and growth of the free world. It has also endeavored to assess the relative emphasis which should be given to military and economic programs, particularly in the less developed areas.

Economic assistance serves two main purposes: First, our own military defense requires effective forces in the hands of our friends and allies, which, in turn, depend in large measure on the stability of the underlying economic base of the individual countries. Secondly, our security requires that both our allies and the uncommitted countries have an opportunity to solve their pressing economic problems within the framework of the free world. Without such an opportunity, some of them would offer an easy target for communism. They are not only being attracted by well contrived offers of assistance from the Communist bloc, but they are also impressed by the economic achievements of Russia and Communist China, without always fully understanding the real cost in human misery.

We recognize that some of our military allies among the less developed countries are unable to support their part of the common military effort without economic defense support assistance. Members of the Committee have visited the major countries receiving such aid. We have been able to review the program in some detail and believe it to be programed to an austere level which it would be dangerous to reduce. The same reasons which lead this Committee to recommend placing military assistance on a continuing basis apply with equal force to the closely related defense support.

Defense support serves effectively to cushion the economic burden of military forces supported by the United States, with the result that the normal economy of the country, and prospects for economic development are not adversely affected. As long as this balance is achieved, military assistance and additional funds for development assistance are, in effect, independent variables and should be considered on their respective merits, and not as competitors. Money should be appropriated for each to the extent that it is considered in the U.S. interest in achieving free world security.

In some countries the Committee believes that under certain conditions there is a reasonable possibility that military expenditures by the United States or the country concerned could be reduced. Problems, of course, arise in obtaining acceptance by sovereign nations of our view. No important needs for increases in defense spending now exist among most of the less developed countries, although this could change with circumstances.

The fostering of economic growth throughout the free world presents a real challenge to the American people. Here is a positive goal which is consistent with our long-term economic interests and at the same time provides an opportunity to further the free political development of other nations. This opportunity calls for a cooperative effort by the United States and other nations which can generate export capital. There is need for both public and private financing, and for mutilateral and unilateral programs, with increasing emphasis on loans rather than grant aid.

The precarious situation throughout the less developed countries leads us to conclude that the total fiscal year 1960 budget for economic assistance is the minimum required.

In its final report, the Committee expects to examine this question more fully; however, as an order of magnitude, we believe that loans for economic development under the mutual security program will probably be needed at a rate of at least $1 billion a year by fiscal year 1961.

THE COST OF THE MUTUAL SECURITY PROGRAM

We have considered the burden of financing these programs upon the economy of the United States. Its military and economic strength is a bulwark of the free world alliance. Our economy is carrying a heavy burden and the amounts involved in the mutual security program are a part of that burden. These amounts are substantial but they represent a relatively small proportion of our resources. The total, including both military and economic aid in the mutual security program, has accounted for less than 5 percent of our total Federal budget in recent years, and has represented less than 1 percent of our annual gross national product. It would cost us far more to attempt to build an equivalent amount of defensive strength in the world with our own forces than it does through this program. Even apart from other considerations, loss of any important part of the free world to international communism would have repercussions on our own economy and defense expenditures greater than the cost of the mutual security program. We believe the program essential to our own security and that of the free world and are convinced that we can afford what is necessary. What we cannot afford are the costs and risks involved in abandoning or emasculating the mutual security program.

CRITICISMS

During its field trips and deliberations the Committee took note of the many criticisms by the public, the Congress, and within the executive branch. These were of varying degrees of validity and credibility. We found evidence of long delays from the initiation of proposals to the development of a firm program, and of an excessive number of reviews and overcoordination during the programing process. Further, there has been evidence presented of faulty or uneconomic programing, and of various other shortcomings. In Washington, policy coordination has not always been promptly or effectively accomplished. A firm and persistent effort to improve the overall management of the program is called for. The Committee believes that its recommendation to place the program on a continuing basis, if accepted, will provide the opportunity to overcome many of these problems and to alleviate some of these criticisms. It expects to consider and deal with them further in its final report.

The Committee states, however, that while mistakes have been made in the conduct of the program, a fair review must take into account the many difficulties inherent in such a complex and widely spread operation. It must also recognize that the errors have been largely in matters of detail. Most projects in the program have been well planned and successfully executed. The Committee concludes that the mutual security program is and will continue to be an effective and essential tool in carrying out our national security interests and in promoting free-world defense. To abandon the program, for errors in execution or for any other reasons, would be to abandon the free world and to lose the cold war.

SUMMARY

1. The Communist military threat is greater than ever.

2. The Communist economic and political threat and capabilities are expanding.

3. The average level of expenditure needed for military assistance over the next few years is, in the judgment of the Committee, not likely to be less, as an order of magnitude, than that required in the recent past. To reduce the program by approximately

one-third from the present rate of deliveries, which would, in a year or two, be the result of continuing the current fiscal year's $1.5 billion military assistance appropriation or the $1.6 billion present request for fiscal year 1960, would amount to a fundamental change in U.S. national policy. It would imply a strategic retreat.

4. The amount of military assistance required for fiscal year 1960 has been considered in some detail by the Committee. Its subgroups visited many countries, including most of those receiving major amounts of military assistance. The Committee recommends that approximately $400 million be made available for new commitments, primarily for the NATO area, in addition to the $1.6 billion present request. This should not change significantly the estimated expenditures in fiscal year 1960.

5. The proposed economic assistance program for fiscal year 1960 is the minimum needed. Material reductions in the total might well restrict the United States to a disproportionately military approach, and thus make the Communist economic offensive more effective. In fact, a level of lending for economic development under the mutual security program at a rate of at least $1 billion a year will probably be needed by fiscal year 1961.

6. Certain features of the applicable legislation and procedures have tended to impede efficient administration of the mutual security and related programs. These should be reconsidered and improved in the interest of bringing these programs to maximum effectiveness.

7. The mutual security program is now and will remain an essential tool of foreign policy. Accordingly, the Committee proposes that the Congress and the executive branch take the necessary legislative administrative steps to put the mutual security program on a continuing basis. Specific recommendations will be made in our final report.

Respectfully submitted.

William H. Draper, Jr., Chairman; Dillon Anderson, Joseph M. Dodge, Alfred M. Gruenther, Marx Leva, John J. McCloy, George McGhee, Joseph T. McNarney, Arthur W. Radford, James E. Webb.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I am very glad the Senator from Illinois has just placed the report in the RECORD. I join with him in saying that it is an excellent report.

The Senator will recall that the Committee was appointed, at least partly in response to a request by the Committee on Foreign Relations that a study be made. I think some very able persons were appointed to the Committee. The Committee on Foreign Relations has had several meetings with the President's Committee, last fall and recently. I think the President's Committee has performed a valuable service. Its report got good coverage in the press yesterday. It was a favorable press, too. The Committee on Foreign Relations will certainly take into consideration everything the President's Committee has reported.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am delighted that the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations concurs in my views. First, the Committee is a distinguished one.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Oh, yes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. It was a diligent Committee.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is correct.

Mr. DIRKSEN. They went into every major area in the world. They did not sit here in Washington and get all their data and conclusions from statistical tables, books, and reports. They went out on the ground and made examinations. They had the competence to do so. That, I think, adds materially to the value of their report.

I think the Committee on Foreign Relations and its distinguished chairman are to be congratulated for cooperating with the President's Committee and assisting in bringing it into being. I think it will serve a useful purpose.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I hope the administration will not allow its preoccupation with a balanced budget to influence it too much if the recommendations by the President's Committee should entail a little more expenditure. I for one would be perfectly willing to support whatever expenditure may be necessary and certainly to report what I believe to be sound recommendations.

CIVIL RIGHTS

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights is holding hearings on civil rights bills, including bills drafted to carry out President Eisenhower's recommendations on this subject, of which I am a cosponsor.

I invite the Senate's attention to an amendment I have proposed to S. 960, the bill to extend for 2 years the life of the President's Commission on Civil Rights. My amendment would authorize and direct the Commission to study and investigate discrimination in employment and in labor organizations by reason of color, race, religion, or national origin.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a letter I have sent to the chairman of the Subcommittee on Civil Rights, the distinguished senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], be printed following these remarks, together with an editorial published in the Washington Post, entitled "Gap in the Reform Bills," which emphasizes the need of legislation in this area.

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

MARCH 16, 1959.

Hon. THOMAS C. HENNINGS,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR HENNINGS: I have observed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD your announcement that hearings on civil rights bills will be held by the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights, beginning on March 18.

In this connection, I desire to bring to your attention an amendment I have submitted to S. 960, the bill to extend for 2 years the life of the President's Commission on Civil Rights.

My amendment proposes an investigation by the Commission of the problem of discrimination in employment and in labor organizations by reason of color, race, religion, and national origin. A copy is enclosed for your ready reference, together with tear sheets from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which contain my remarks upon its introduction and a letter and memorandum submitted to the AFL–CIO by the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People.

I hope this matter will be thoroughly explored by your subcommittee. I have no personal knowledge of the extent to which the problem exists, although I am aware of good work being done in this field by the Connecticut Commission on Civil Rights in my own State. Consequently, I do not believe that I can add in testimony before your subcommittee to the statement I made on the floor.

I recognize that the amendment raises a subject in an area of extremely sensitive human relationships. Nevertheless, I am convinced that progress can be made through public education. Your subcommittee can assist in this process if the subject is examined in your forthcoming hearings by competent witnesses, including Mr. Roy Wilkins of the NAACP and representatives of the AFL–CIO and management groups, and if the Commission were directed to make the suggested study.

With kindest regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

PRESCOTT BUSH,
U.S. Senator.

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 16, 1959]

GAP IN THE REFORM BILLS

The Supreme Court's refusal to review the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen case focuses sharp attention on the discriminatory practices of some unions. The few unions which still admit only white members monopolize the right of bargaining with employers; yet they exclude from their membership substantial groups of workers who are as much interested in wages and working conditions as they are. This anomalous carryover from the past has no place in the present-day pattern of labor-management relations.

It is important to remember that the Supreme Court did not uphold this state of affairs. The effect of this action is to leave in effect a lower court decision based on the view that the brotherhood is a private organization which is not required under the Constitution to accord equal rights to everyone. But instead of underwriting this concept, the Court took the unusual course of stating that it was denying the petition for review because of the abstract context in which the questions sought to be raised are presented by this record. The Supreme Court has yet to speak on the issue.

The chief difficulty seems to be a dearth of statutory law on this subject. Congress has been understandably reluctant to lay down membership requirements for the unions, but when legislators actively intervene to buttress collective bargaining rights it seems to us that they have a corollary obligation to require unions to open membership to all qualified workers in the craft or industry in which they operate. Most of the unions, to their credit, already follow this practice.

Various bills now before Congress would lay new responsibilities upon labor unions to keep records, make accurate financial reports, hold democratic elections and so forth. These additional regulations can be justified by the unquestioned public interest in honest, efficient, and democratically controlled agencies of collective bargaining. The same interest demands, in our opinion, that these powerful economic units that are fostered, encouraged and protected by the Government be required to keep their doors open to all comers without regard to race.

SCULPTURE OF LATE SENATOR JOSEPH R. McCARTHY, OF WISCONSIN, TO BE UNVEILED IN APPLETON, WIS., MAY 2, 1959

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a letter dated March 16, 1959, which I have received from the Minutewomen of Connecticut, signed by

Mrs. Eleanor M. Hill, the chairman. Mrs. Hill calls attention to a ceremony which will be held on May 2 of this year, at Appleton, Wis., at which a sculpture of the late Senator Joseph R. McCarthy will be unveiled. The sculpture has been modeled by a distinguished sculptress in our State, Mrs. Suzanne Silvercruys Stevenson, of Norwalk.

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

MARCH 16, 1959.

Hon. PRESCOTT BUSH,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

SIR: As chairman of the Minutewomen of Connecticut, I am proud to announce to you that the first of the sculptures of the late Senator "Joe" McCarthy—which was done by our founder, Mrs. Suzanne Silvercruys Stevenson, of Norwalk, Conn., will be unveiled in Appleton, Wis., on May 2, 1959, the anniversary of his death, with appropriate ceremonies. All Members of the Congress are invited to attend.

May I ask that in our name you have this read into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD? Thank you.

Very truly yours,

ELEANOR M. HILL,
Chairman, Minute Women of Connecticut.

ILLUSIONS COST TOO MUCH—ADDRESS BY VICE ADMIRAL RICKOVER

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, Vice Adm. Hyman G. Rickover has a well-merited reputation as an incisive, root-of-the-matter person. Over and above the important work which he has been doing in the field of reactor development and nuclear propulsion for the Atomic Energy Commission and the Navy Department, Admiral Rickover has been taking time to think, speak, and write about some of the urgent problems which face the American people today. The address, entitled "Illusions Cost Too Much," which he delivered here in Washington on Monday of this week, contains much realistic and sober wisdom which deserves thoughtful consideration by all of us who are concerned about the future of the United States and the rest of the free world. For this reason, I ask unanimous consent that the text of Admiral Rickover's address be printed in the body of the RECORD, at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

ILLUSIONS COST TOO MUCH

(Remarks prepared by Vice Adm. H. G. Rickover, U.S. Navy, Assistant Director for Naval Reactors, Division of Reactor Development, U.S. Atomic Energy Commission, and Assistant Chief of the Bureau of Ships, for Nuclear Propulsion, Navy Department, for delivery at joint meeting of the Yale Club of Washington, D.C., and the Yale Law School Association of Washington, D.C., Washington, D.C., and also at meeting of the Yale Club of New York City, New York City, N.Y., March 16, 1959)

When athletes enter a race, they come prepared to the best of their ability; as near to physical perfection as native endowment and rigorous training can make them, their bodies lean, their dress adequate but light. Each has assessed his own strength and weakness and measured them against his opponents'; few indulge in illusions about their own or their competitors' competence.

The world today has become a gigantic stadium where races for supremacy in economic, cultural, scientific, political, and military competence are run every day. Since the end of World War II, power has polarized in two giant combinations constantly competing with each other. In the foreseeable future there is little prospect for permanent lessening of tension between the two; hence the race promises to continue for years, with now one side, now the other, ahead. This is an unhappy prospect for us who wish only to live in peace and tend to our national concerns, but one we cannot evade. The contest is a fact of international life which we must face intelligently and courageously so that we may make the right decisions and take the proper actions.

The first prerequisite is that we look at ourselves and at our opponents with the eye of an athlete who wants only to know the truth so that he may profit from it. This is assuredly not a time when we can afford to give ourselves over to complacent satisfaction with our present wealth and power. What we need is critical self-analysis so that we may detect any weaknesses we may have and rectify them; any traits or attitudes which might have been appropriate in the past when most Americans lived in rural communities and the United States was isolated from world events. Now that we occupy the center of the stage in world affairs such traits and attitudes may have turned into disabilities. The present is an age of lightning change in the fortunes of nations; when one major scientific discovery could alter long established power relationships; when one wrong step could upset the present equilibrium and plunge the world into nuclear war. In these perilous times we cannot afford to indulge in illusions about ourselves or allow our judgment to be clouded by the distaste we feel for our opponents' way of life. Illusions are a form of excess weight that hampers action and diminishes fitness. At this moment in history, when every ounce of strength is needed, illusions cost too much. They could cost us survival.

An illusion may be defined as a belief that has lost contact with reality. Illusions persist because they are ready-made substitutes for thought and, as James Bryce remarked, "to the vast majority of mankind nothing is more agreeable than to escape the need for mental exertion." All nations have illusions. Some cannot bring themselves to face the fact of their political and military weakness, and delude themselves about their real power; thus deluded they may then be tempted into aggression. Other nations underestimate the difficulties of managing a modern technological society and imagine it can be bought or begged from abroad and imposed ready-made upon an ancient and archaic way of life. When this fails, as it nearly always will, a disappointed and frustrated people may find solace in the illusion that it is being grievously wronged by other nations and, thus deluded, embark on disastrous foreign adventures. Our own illusions at least do not endanger the peace of the world, though they are harmful enough to ourselves and to our friends who depend on us for wise and strong leadership.

One does not have to be particularly perceptive, or exceptionally well-informed, or unusually intelligent, to discover, after some research into this matter, that certain of our national beliefs do not accord with reality. By clinging uncritically to these illusory beliefs, we needlessly handicap ourselves in the race that is being forced upon us by the totalitarian bloc. We persist in our illusions because as everyone else, we dislike having to rethink matters which we believe to have already been settled once and for all. The inertia of matter is no greater than that of the human mind—with both, the natural condition is rest; to move either produces friction and heat. With us, this general dislike for change is reinforced by a national trait that is becoming a liability—our habit of subjecting critics to opprobrium because they violate our unwritten convention that everyone ought to stick to his last and not "butt into the affairs of others."

This convention was not unreasonable when our country was sparsely populated and everyone depended upon himself alone, except in emergencies which were handled by voluntary community assistance rather than by Government action; the citizen was then hardly conscious of his Government. But today most of us live in crowded urban environments; our society depends increasingly on a well-ordered meshing of all human activities and hence on more and more Government controls and services. These are consequences of technology and human crowding and have little to do with political theory. In the manner we live today, many activities once considered private are now involved in national issues. I need hardly say that in democracies all citizens are legitimately concerned with such issues. They have both the right and the duty to criticize what they consider harmful to the national interest.

What we sometimes forget is that the critic in a democracy occupies a position that is quite different from the place he would hold in authoritarian countries. The minority that rules there without the consent of the people cannot tolerate any social criticism for this amounts to censure of its conduct. Criticism, if allowed, would in time undermine the power of the minority. The ruling minority therefore appropriates for itself the majesty of the sovereign state and brands all criticisms as lèse-majesty. Its personal desire to escape censure is thus camouflaged by making the voicing of popular discontent an unpatriotic act. At times something of this kind is attempted in democracies by groups claiming to speak for the nation—a false claim on the face of it for it is we, the people—all the people—who are the sovereign nation. In consequence, all social criticism in democracies is in essence self-criticism. Criticism and controversy do not endanger democracy; they are inherent in the right of a free people to discuss national issues; hence they are an essential part of the democratic process. The process is weakened if we are intolerant of those who question our beliefs; if we retain toward the critic an attitude that may have had its place in pioneer societies but that is no longer appropriate.

This attitude makes it particularly difficult to dislodge illusions in which various pressure groups have acquired what one might describe as a vested interest. In such cases, the lonely critic confronts powerful and wealthy organizations who fight unscrupulously for their favorite illusions. Illusions obfuscate national issues; they prevent the people from seeing the issues clearly. Were the issues fully understood, action might be taken to put the national interest above the particular group interest. But one of the main objectives of pressure groups is to prevent this from happening. Seldom do these groups realize that ultimately everyone suffers if the national interest does not prevail. Their eyes are fixed on the short-run advantages to be gained at all cost for themselves; not on the country's long-term interest. The most difficult problem in any democracy, as Madison clearly saw, was how to "break and control the violence of faction." And Theodore Roosevelt, greatest teacher of democracy this country ever had, reserved his most biting censure for special interest groups who tear the Nation apart by their determined effort to prevent the people from putting national above special interests.

In the long history of mankind, short and rare have been the periods when people were

privileged to govern themselves. Most of the time, man has been subject to government by the few who claim to possess superior knowledge of how to govern. Even now that democracy is accepted by many countries and has the secret allegiance of millions who are still suppressed by self-imposed minorities—even now democracy's friends are not certain that in any real emergency, when great knowledge, wisdom, and self-sacrifice must be demanded of a democratic people, they will justify their privileges and rise to the challenge.

Today democracy is being put to the test—perhaps the final and decisive test. An old authoritarianism in new clothing now claims that it alone can handle the problems of this technological and scientific age. The uncommitted world watches the contest. Upon us, as the strongest democracy, rests the responsibility of proving that a democratic people can govern wisely, act promptly, and voluntarily accept necessary sacrifices. In the contest between totalitarianism and democracy, we defend our Western way of life and not only our own freedom but that of all free peoples in the world.

In the hope that it will serve a useful purpose, I should like to explore with you some beliefs that—in my opinion—have become costly illusions. No more can be done in a short speech than to probe around the circumference of this large subject and essay a partial and tentative statement. It is not as important to list all our illusions as it is to recognize the need to take stock periodically and, if necessary, to readjust beliefs, habits, and attitudes to the realities of a rapidly changing world. I shall limit myself to a discussion of illusions that arise from what I believe to be misconceptions about our high standard of living.

To raise this standard year after year appears to have become our Nation's highest objective. It is widely believed that we have answered every question one might raise about the progress, power, or international position of the United States if we can but show that this year's gross national product exceeds last year's—never mind that this year's dollars have depreciated in value. I should like to state emphatically that I regard the belief that our high standard of living guarantees political and military supremacy—automatically, as it were—as potentially our most dangerous illusion.

The inference we draw is in the nature of a nonsequitur, or at least one that needs to be qualified in important respects. The proper conclusion to be drawn from the premise is that a high standard of living guarantees an exceedingly pleasant and agreeable life. It may also, provided proper action is taken, insure political and military supremacy. It all depends on how the Nation's industrial productivity is utilized. Of course, without such productivity no nation can today be powerful, for power depends upon ability to produce large amounts of complicated military hardware. But there the relationship between productivity and power ends. When industrial production is largely devoted to consumer goods and services, even a very productive country may find itself outpaced militarily by another whose overall productivity is smaller but concentrated in the military sector. It is now no longer possible quickly to convert manpower and industrial plants from civilian to military production when war threatens or has already broken out. Not only will there not be time enough to do this, but today's armaments must be produced in plants designed specially for the purpose. This is a consequence of a revolution in military technology that has enormously increased the complexity of armaments.

The nature of modern war gives an edge to totalitarian countries since they need not persuade their people to forego comfort for preparedness. The decision to do so is made by the small group who have arrogated to themselves the life-long job of ruling over their voiceless compatriots. It is natural for this group to look upon their country as a personal possession to be carefully developed so as to enhance its value. Given their avowed aim of world conquest, the development of military and political strength will necessarily take precedence over all other developments. Only insofar as it contributes to this strength will the desire of their people for goods and services take on importance. Ordinarily, modern methods of propaganda are sufficient to keep the civilian standard of living at a low level, for propaganda can delude people into believing that they are better off than others, or that sacrifice is necessary to defend the fatherland against imminent attack. Thus deluded they will work obediently for small personal gain.

We used to think that a totalitarian economy could never be as productive as a free one. We must now revise this belief. Such an economy can be more productive in items that enhance political and military power; it will probably never be as productive in items that enhance the people's comfort and well-being. It is the former, however, that counts most in the race for world supremacy.

In democracies the people decide—through their voting power—how much of the national product shall be collected in taxes and invested in the public sector of the economy; how much retained to support a high material standard of living for themselves. Except in periods of national emergency, it is hard for all the people to feel that their personal fate is inextricably involved with that of their country and that in any conflict between personal advantage and national strength, enlightened self-interest must choose the latter. On the other hand, for a small group of totalitarian rulers this sense of involvement with their country comes without conscious effort. Then again, it requires self-sacrifice of a high order for a democratic people to decide voluntarily that they will forego some of the fruits of their own productivity in order to safeguard the right of future citizens to live in freedom and decency, whereas it is easy for totalitarian rules to demand sacrifices of their people since the rulers themselves do not share in these sacrifices. This is only another way of saying that in a democracy the state exists for the people, whereas in a totalitarian country the people exist for the state. This fundamental difference must be factored into all our attempts to compare the technological and productivity levels of democratic and totalitarian societies.

What counts then is not productivity per se but how a nation's productivity is used. Strange as it may seem to us, at the present state of technological development, our high civilian standard of living may prove an actual liability in the contest with the totalitarian powers. And for the following reasons:

First, by combining a high technological level in the scientific and military sector with an almost preindustrial standard of living for the mass of their people, modern totalitarian countries in wartime get the best of both types of civilization—the technical advantages of an industrial nation with regard to ability to wage war, and the hardihood and resilience of a preindustrial society with regard to ability of the civilians to fall back upon their own resources if need be, and to survive under hardships that might break a more civilized people accustomed to modern amenities.

Self-sufficient communities, used to a simple and frugal life, give a country at war great civilian strength. To illustrate, let me refer to a book on "Soviet Strategy in the Nuclear Age," by Raymond L. Garthoff. He reports that, although Russia in but a few months during 1941 lost control of 40 percent of her population, 60 percent of her coal, iron, steel, and aluminum production; 40 percent of grain production; 95 percent of key military industries; 4 million soldiers and nearly two-thirds of her tanks and aircraft, she was not beaten but survived and eventually returned to the attack. This is not to minimize the importance of the help she received from us. It is merely to point out that Russia was able to bear destruction comparable to that of a nuclear war and rally again. We must not underestimate the military advantage that totalitarian countries possess because they combine advanced levels of technology in the public sector with frugality in the private sector of their economy.

It is true that people used to an affluent life have individual possessions on which they can draw when war cuts off or reduces the supply of civilian goods. But they have also become so used to comfort that they may have trouble maintaining morale and efficiency if wartime shortages lower their living standards too drastically. It would seem prudent to play it safe and count the low civilian standard of living in totalitarian countries as a plus factor for them which we must counterbalance in some way.

A second reason why our high standard of living may prove a liability is that the intricate system of interlocking economic relationships that maintains our affluent society can easily be disrupted by the breaking of but a few links. To illustrate this point, take the family car, a key item in the American standard of living. Because we prefer to ride to work in our own car, mass transportation is not commercially profitable and has, therefore, not been adequately developed. Obviously, transportation by private car costs a great deal more in oil and service than mass transportation, especially transportation by rail which utilizes fuel far more economically than automotive transportation. If the oil supply were shut off or limited by the enemy in wartime, some American communities would find themselves without adequate means to transport workers from home to plant or office.

Most Americans now live in huge metropolitan belts which are spreading across the countryside. When population density reaches a given point, there is simply not enough room within the modern megalopolis to accommodate both man and his private car. Flight from urban centers into the suburbs is no solution; it merely aggravates the morning and evening rush. Transportation by private car becomes increasingly costly in time and money. In peacetime this can be borne but in wartime our dependence on private transportation by automobile could prove a liability. So far we have not drawn the conclusion that when mass transportation becomes a vital necessity it must be provided, if need be, at public expense. Certain national attitudes, abetted by those interested in the status quo, prevent our facing this very real problem and dealing with it effectively. A return to public mass transportation would indeed lower the standard of living somewhat but more on the side of prestige than on that of real comfort and efficiency. Yet, this lowering of a single prestige factor would give the economy greater strength to meet emergencies.

It is advisable that we study the subject of transportation in the light of the population shift to urban centers. The totalitarian countries appear to have solved the problem in their usual ruthless but efficient way. We cannot copy them. We must devise our own solutions. The urgency of our problem is high lighted by the totalitarian solution of the problem for it gives them presently an advantage. Russia's industrial complexes are spread all over the country whereas ours

still remain centralized, though we are conscious of the vulnerability of this centralization and are trying to disperse. Each Russian complex is designed to be self-sustaining, with workers living close to the plants, and farms further out. This eliminates, or at least reduces, the cost of transporting the workers to and from their places of work. If need be, they can cover the distance on foot.

An even more decentralized, self-contained system of industrial-farm-residential communities is now being established in China whose rulers are planning to go much further than Russia along this line. China's 650 million people are being organized into "people's communes" in which absolute communism prevails and everyone works at his assigned industrial or farm task—even family kitchens are being replaced by communal messhalls. This anthill existence must surely be the lowest standard of life to which any human society has ever sunk. But the advantage to the state is obvious. Each of these communes will be small enough to need little in the way of mechanical transportation, but large enough to be agriculturally and industrially self-sustaining.

So much effort and so large a part of a country's natural resources must go into modern transportation systems that the housing of workers close to their places of work gives Russia and China an advantage. One can readily see that their communities are less vulnerable in wartime than the American metropolis surrounded by its bedroom suburbs, with the worker linked to his place of work by a car moving along highways that become inadequate almost the moment they are built.

The third reason why our high standard of living may become a liability is inherent in the nature of today's technological civilization. Ours is the first civilization in the history of mankind which rests upon utilization of resources that do not renew themselves; the first that consumes its very foundations and does this faster the more it succeeds in raising the material standard of living of all its people.

Everything nonliving is finite unless it is recreated by the power of the sun's rays. This we have trouble believing, for in all his past experience man was a puny Lilliputian whose impact on nature was insignificant and who felt lost in what seemed to him a vast, empty world. Previous civilizations were based on consumption of renewable resources—crops, trees, wind, water, and muscle power. They used nonrenewable resources either not at all or in such minute quantities that hardly a dent was made in nature's store of these treasures. Seventeenth century England, for example, consumed but 360 tons of steel annually. It is only in this latest second of man's hour on earth that a small percentage of the world's people have ceased living entirely off income and have begun using up resources capital.

Few of us are willing to accept the consequences of this revolutionary change in man's dependence on nature. We twist and squirm to avoid admitting that we must accommodate ourselves to a world finite in size and limited in resources. And so we delude ourselves by dwelling with satisfaction on the recurrence of raw material gluts on world markets and profess to see in them proof that resources exhaustion is a fable. Temporary surpluses are of course irrelevant to the basic fact that sooner or later even the largest store of capital will be exhausted if one keeps drawing from it. Market surpluses merely show that we have been overactive in scooping raw materials out of the earth, and have therefore collected them faster than we were able to transform them into machine-made goods.

Realists that we imagine ourselves to be, we have nevertheless invented a modern American fairy tale "The Curves That Never Cross." One is our population curve mounting upward in geometric progression—presently doubling in 40 years, tripling in 65, quadrupling in 80 years; the other is our nonrenewable resources curve, descending even more rapidly. We believe that in science we possess a genie in the bottle who will keep these two curves from ever crossing.

I am constantly astonished to what extremes intelligent people will go to avoid facing the limitations of mankind. I have seen it seriously proposed that the United States at one stroke solve its problems of population growth and resources exhaustion by packing 10,000 people a day off into space, there to dig for minerals which will then be sent back to earth. Like the suggestion that we can feed an infinite number of human beings on seaweed—which personally I find a most distasteful prospect—this solution to resources exhaustion disregards man's biological needs and limitations. He does not, after all, live on bread alone, or excuse me, on seaweed alone. He needs enough space around him to retain a sense of individuality and freedom; he needs contact with nature, and he will deteriorate as a human being if these necessities are denied him.

Even should we decide that man is to be reduced to but two functions, tending his machines and consuming their products, the space solution overlooks the fact that to supply the army of space-borne emigrants with enough food, oxygen, water, and fuel and to clothe them in the proper space suits would make such tremendous inroads into our resources capital that the whole thing strikes me as a highly fanciful venture. I don't believe we know yet just what we must provide to make sure these latter-day pilgrims will safely land on their space targets and be able to return to earth, should they wish to do so, but we can get an inkling when we remember that merely to get them into orbit will require about 100 pounds of fuel per pound of payload.

We cannot realistically appraise our position relative to that of our totalitarian opponents unless we eschew science fiction and accept the fact that we live on a finite earth; unles we are fully aware of our dependence on nonrenewable raw materials and understand that these resources are like uninvested capital—capital which draws no interest. We must fully comprehend that the rate at which this capital is used up is an exponent of population growth and the increase in living standards. Under these circumstances, the rate of capital consumption is obviously an important factor in the relative position of competing nations. For when national rates of capital consumption differ significantly, the nation that uses its capital faster than its opponent will in time be in a less favorable position; the long-run advantage lies with nations whose austere standard of life conserves their resources capital.

Our high standard of living makes such heavy inroads into our capital of nonrenewable raw materials that, because of it, we bequeath to future generations of Americans a diminished national inheritance, thus placing them in a weakened position in the contest with the totalitarian powers. Of course, we have a perfect right to do this for we are a free people. There is nothing to prevent us from emulating Madam de Pompadour and shrugging off responsibility with the frivolous phrase, "After us the deluge." But let us not delude ourselves. Let us face up to the fact that when we use up the Nation's capital in nonrenewable resources we mortgage the future for the sake of the pleasures of today.

Russia and the empire over which she exercises control now possess all the fuels and minerals needed for their industries. Our own raw materials position has been worsening in the last few decades.

From an exporter of copper, lead, zinc, petroleum, iron, oil, and lumber we have become an importer of these materials. Though two world wars have made great inroads, the main reason for this change from exporter to importer has been our lavish consumption of resources to sustain a continuously rising standard of living for our rapidly growing population. At mid-century we consumed annually 18 tons per person in materials; including 14,000 pounds of fuels and the metals winnowed from 5,000 pounds of ores. According to the Paley Report, "there is scarcely a mineral or fossil fuel of which the quantity used in the United States since the outbreak of the first World War did not exceed the total used throughout the world in all the centuries preceding." Not only are we consuming our own resources capital, we are also making heavy inroads into the resources capital of the rest of the world. Robert C. Cook in the symposium Perspectives on Conservation remarks: "we appear to have grievously impaired the rights of the people of many lands. The fantastic increase in the levels of living in the United States has been at the expense not only of our own resources, but of those of the rest of the world as well. The gargantuan scale of this drain of the world's resources was set forth by the Twentieth Century Fund in 1955." According to the Fund, with but 6 percent of the world's population, the United States consumes today as much of many raw materials as all others combined. This means that per capita we deplete irreplaceable natural resources eight times faster than the rest of the world.

Of course, we pay for these resources but this may be small consolation for the more thoughtful citizens of backward countries who watch this drain on their national resources. It cannot be halted because the money it brings is needed to keep the wolf from the door. But logic and reason have little impact on strong emotions. The native reaction is apt to be that here go the resources that might in the future have supported a higher technological civilization in their own country; they go to enrich still more what is already the richest country on earth. In a world where the majority of the people are undernourished and ill-housed, where most of them own fewer possessions than the average American family discards, the spectacle of our affluence is more likely to win us enmity than friendship. Our loss, of course, is Russia and China's gain. Their own standard of living is not so high as to cause envy, yet high enough relative to conditions in most backward nations that it can be made to seem effective proof of communism's alleged efficiency.

One might say that our very success in realizing man's age-old ambition to escape poverty and backbreaking toil works to our disadvantage because it arouses envy This is true but it is not the whole picture. Our material wealth is also resented because we seem to have carried it to excess. But most of all, perhaps, because we have been using our high material standard of living to support a claim that Americans are more intelligent, better educated, and all-around more competent than other people. As a Nation we thus take an attitude that is quite similar to one that used to prevail in class societies where the handsome, the rich, and the well born looked complacently upon the misery of the masses, firmly convinced that the misery was well-deserved and that their own favored circumstances were but the just desert due superior human beings.

In our personal lives, few of us would take this attitude. It runs counter to everything America stands for. The ancestors of nearly all Americans came here because they were certain that poverty was no sign of inferiority, nor wealth one of human excellence.

It is strange that in judging nations we now tend to feel that superiority is proved by ownership of more cars, telephones, or TV sets than are found elsewhere. We pay lip service to American ideals, but what has us virtually mesmerized is the sheer quality of all the material objects we possess. It is difficult for us not to be smug about this and to urge the poor countries of the world to do as we do so that they too will become as rich and advanced as we are.

Yet when one seeks for the causes of our affluence one is struck less by our alleged superiority than by our extraordinary good fortune. Three factors are mainly responsible for our standard of living—ample natural resources, a mass market, and modern technology.

Our wealth in resources is a fortuitous circumstance for which present-day Americans can take little credit. No other emigrants from Europe, setting forth across the seas, found so large and rich and virtually empty a land as those coming to the United States; nor one so favorably situated geographically and climatically. In taking the country from the Indians we concluded the most advantageous real estate deal in the history of mankind.

Our mass market comes through population growth and the historical accident that 17th and 18th century relations between England, France, and Spain were such as to preclude the carving up of this continent in the manner that Africa was carved up in the 19th century. When we won independence, this was already a huge country. The ease with which we expanded across the continent was a result of the weakness of the countries whose colonies we absorbed.

The third factor which produces our rich society—modern technology—is of European origin. To be brought to maximum use, technology needs a resources-rich area with a mass market. We were the first country large enough to make maximum use of technology. The European countries were too small to benefit fully by their own technical inventiveness. Not until Russia began to apply technology to the exploitation of her own vast land were we faced with competition on something close to equal terms. I need not remind this audience that for some years now Russia's industrial productivity has grown at a rate faster than our own. It remains to be seen whether Western European productivity will not catch up with ours once the European coal, iron, atom, and common market community is fully established.

Modern technology is thought by many Americans to be a unique American achievement. This illusion is nourished by our mass media, advertising having made of bragging a fine art. To look at the splendid color layouts and the jubilant reports of new discoveries, inventions, gadgets, and nostrums, one would never guess how much we owe to Europe in basic research—that fountainhead of technology—or how impressive is Europe's scientific creativity—the most important human talent in this scientific age.

What would you consider the single most important modern technical development? It is utilization of electric power. Our present way of life would grind to a halt if electricity ceased to flow. We have no other energy that could take over all the functions performed today by electricity. Europeans developed it. What are the other principal forms of energy we use?—steam, internal combustion, atomic energy. The first two were invented and developed by Europeans; in nucleonics they did nearly all the theoretical work. What are our most important modern weapons? The list is long but let me remind you that the tank, the jet fighter, and the guided missile originated in Europe; the atomic and hydrogen bombs were developed here, it is true, but largely by European-educated scientists. Or take transportation. Steam and diesel-driven locomotives, refrigerator cars, and the automobile—all came from Europe. Among means of communication, wireless, radar, and sonar were invented abroad. Most of our great medical discoveries came from there—more vaccines and inoculations are European than American; more antibiotics, too—such as the sulphas and penicillin. Reading the list of Nobel Prize winners in physics and chemistry is a sobering experience. During the first half-century that these awards were made, England received in proportion to population 2½ times; Germany, 3 times; Holland, 4 times; and Switzerland, 5 times as many awards as we. In the field with which I am most familiar—physics and nuclear power—nearly all the important theoretical work has been done by Europeans. In theoretical physics, Europe has produced some 15 to 20 men of high originality in the last 100 years against 1 American; of 12 important discoveries that contributed to our understanding of the atom and nuclear fission, 11 were made by Europeans, 1 by an American. Between 1934 when Fermi published his epoch-making report on fission and 1940 when war closed down many European universities and laboratories, 133 major scientific papers on atomic fission were published—only half a dozen of these by Americans.

Our contributions to basic research and invention have been relatively small because we have concentrated our efforts on applying modern technology to the production of more and better goods. We have done this so successfully that poverty has ceased to be the lot of the mass of our people. It survives among persons who have had exceptionally bad luck or who are mentally, emotionally, or physically handicapped to such an extent that they cannot meet the problems that normal people are able to handle. Having accomplished this, we ought to cease our intense preoccupation with production of material things and turn to other unsolved problems. There are many of these.

A good case could be made for using our surplus productive capacity and leisure to develop a mass culture on a level as high as any previously attained by privileged minorities. It seems doubtful that this can be accomplished on a commercial basis alone, even if private help is added. We may have to follow the example of other Western democracies where public support of cultural activities, notably universities, theaters, art galleries, and music, has long been accepted as the only means of supporting high level cultural activities.

Oscar Wilde once remarked: "Civilization requires slaves. The Greeks were quite right there. Unless there are slaves to do the ugly, horrible, uninteresting work, culture and contemplation become impossible." Modern technology supplies each of us with hundreds—even thousands—of mechanical slaves to whom we are shifting more and more of the world's dirty, debilitating, and routinely boring work. This gives us the means and the time for a vast upgrading of our nonmaterial standard of living. Instead we keep on collecting—squirrel-like—more and more goods. And so we miss the marvelous opportunities modern technology could give us, perhaps because of ancient fears rooted in centuries of human want and insecurity. It is as if we were the sorcerer's apprentice who forgot the word which would stop the magic broom.

Our machines keep grinding up the Nation's capital of irreplaceable resources and turning them into a flood of goods which overwhelms us. We no longer produce to supply what we need; we now consume in order to clear away what the machine produces—a topsy-turvy state of affairs. To dispose of the flood of machine-made goods we have had to create a new industry; a $10 billion industry to service the machine by persuading us to buy its products. We have the strange situation where gifted men devote all their time and their considerable talents in the art of communication to creating artificial discontent in others and to stilling the voice of prudence so that we will mortgage our children's and our country's future to buy more than we need. By investing articles designed to be of practical use with a spurious prestige value, these talented people induce us to discard what is still perfectly satisfactory and buy new models—planned obsolescence is the term for this bit of modern witchcraft.

Today thrift has become not only old-fashioned but antisocial; disinterest in material possessions is made to seem a kind of treason to the American way of life because it puts a brake on the speed with which we use up our resources capital and throw last year's models on the scrap heap. To do both as rapidly as possible has come to be considered a major objective of our native genius. Thus have we carried the noble aim of plenty for everyone to such excess that men become the servants of their machines.

Meanwhile two vitally important tasks are neglected; tasks that in my opinion are far more important than producing new gadgets, new models of existing gadgets, better packaged goods, and more and still more material things. These tasks are conservation of the material foundation of our civilization and development of our human resources. The first involves less wasteful utilization of raw materials and the invention of substitutes for vanishing resources; the second better education for our children. We must not delude ourselves into believing that because we were able to create the wealthiest society in history, we shall have no trouble solving these two other tasks as well. Quite different human qualities are needed and must be encouraged.

Today we still overvalue the producers of material goods and undervalue the preservers of the materials base of modern technology and the developers of our children's minds. Respect and wealth go to men who make their living using up our limited resources capital; we even favor them by tariffs and special tax benefits. But meager rewards go to men who by reason of their intellectual endowments and their long and arduous course of higher studies are able to help us find substitutes for exhausted resources. We support those who flood the market with unsaleable goods and neglect the institutions which train future scientists and engineers who may discover how to prevent future shortages of goods. The manipulator of our intricate machines is usually better paid than the inventor who built the machines. It is significant that we were one of the last great nations to join the International Copyright Union because for a long time we saw nothing wrong in a practical businessman making a profit by pirating the intellectual output of others. We have always favored those who know how to make money by using ideas and material over those who think up the ideas or create new materials.

Conservation, too, is something that rarely excites our interest. We shall not really buckle down to conserve efficiently and intelligently what is left to us until we face the fact that even this huge country is not limitless. Conservationists have been marshalling an abundance of facts to prove that we are running out of space and getting poorer in resources. But various groups who find that conservation measures make utilization of our resources less profitable to them have the contrary interest of perpetuating the illusion that we shall always have much space and vast resources.

Because we tend to measure everything by size rather than by quality, it is easy to

convince us by quoting statistics. A good case in point are forestry statistics which are often cited to prove that we now manage our forests so well that we actually have a surplus of new growth over what we cut annually. Let us not rejoice prematurely. What these statistics do not show is that our forests are still declining qualitatively—half a century after Theodore Roosevelt and Gifford Pinchot launched the great campaign to save our forests. The real test of scientific forest management is the softwood saw timber account. This remains well in the red. Moreover, it is still true that what we harvest is predominantly high quality saw timber cut from our few remaining virgin stands, while much of what we grow is the scrubby stuff that reseeds itself on cutover land and has little commercial value.

Nor do the statistics show the very large losses suffered by forest fires, insects, and the like—at least partly a result of less than perfect forest management. True, some forests are well managed today but many are in poor condition. We have a long way to go. Statistics which leave out the element of quality prevent our recognizing how far we still lag behind forestry standards that have long prevailed in Europe. There is a forest in Leiria, Portugal, that was planted 700 years ago and has been cut, and carefully replanted ever since. It is as beautiful and valuable today as it was in the 13th century.

All statistics are tricky and must be used with caution lest we be misled. Outgo and input statistics on timber are better today than 50 years ago, partly because we now use only half as much wood per capita as we did then. This reduction is a result of a shift from wood to fossil fuels and synthetics, that is, from renewable to nonrenewable raw materials. It is part of a general trend that is symptomatic of modern technological societies. Similarly, we have shifted from natural to synthetic rubber; from silk and cotton to "miracle" fabrics. These shifts to nonrenewable materials contribute to the rapid exhaustion of these resources and must be regretted from a long-range point of view, much as they may add to present comfort and pleasure.

Our tendency to disregard quality when we make comparisons has helped to perpetuate another illusion—the illusion that only this country educates all its children beyond grade school. Until recently, the deterioration of the quality of American public education has been hidden by statistics showing huge numbers of youngsters in their late teens still going to school and more of them obtaining diplomas and degrees every year. Had we given thought to the quality of the schooling they received and to the kind of scholastic performance represented by these diplomas and degrees, we should long since have stopped deluding ourselves that we have the best schools in the world.

This has been an unfair and one-sided speech. There has not been time to give a balanced picture of our own and our opponents' strength and weakness. I have dwelt only on our illusions, not on theirs. It has always seemed best to me to correct our own weaknesses rather than to look complacently on those of our adversaries.

I am convinced that our single-minded preoccupation with production and consumption of ever larger numbers of material things is a liability in the race that the totalitarians have forced upon us. I realize that the sanctity of the American standard of living is fiercely defended by a formidable array of groups and organizations whose economic well-being depends on the continuation of today's frenetic production and consumption of maufactured goods. To question the validity of a philosophy of continuous material growth is not popular. Of course, no sensible man will go counter to opinions held by the majority of his fellow citizens unless he believes that the reasons that once justified these opinions no longer exist; that persistence in holding on to what has now become an illusion is detrimental. It is not admiration for our opponents that induces me to bring out their strong points, but simply the desire to seek the truth; in searching for chinks in our own armor, I do not advocate that we copy slavishly what our adversaries do.

There are different ways to express devotion to one's country. For some people, love expresses itself solely in fulsome admiration of every aspect of the American way of life; for others critical analysis is part of all true devotion.

I have criticized our illusions because, in the present period of intense rivalry between democracy and totalitarianism, they prevent our making the fullest use of all our potentialities. But, in closing I should like to affirm my conviction that our potentialities are so great that, if we would but divest ourselves of illusions, seek out the truth no matter how displeasing it may at times be, and set our goals high, there is literally nothing we could not accomplish. Let us take full advantage of the opportunities offered us by this great land of ours and by our democratic institutions that enable us to develop what is best in us. Let us make full use of our greatest asset—the free human mind—which can work wonders if it is permitted to embark on voyages of discovery beyond the frontiers of knowledge.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey in the chair). The hour of 2 o'clock has arrived, and the morning hour is terminated. Further morning business is not in order, under the rule.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at this time I may submit some matters which ordinarily would have been submitted during the morning hour.

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

NEEDS OF 200,000 REFUGEES APPEAL TO CONSCIENCE OF AMERICA FOR RESETTLEMENT

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an eloquent and informative syndicated article by the distinguished writer, Roscoe Drummond, which was published in the Washington Post and Times Herald of March 18, 1959.

Mr. Drummond proposes the resettlement of some 200,000 refugees—mainly in Western Europe, but others are in China—who are seeking freedom and new economic opportunities in life. Mr. Drummond supports the humanitarian recommendations of the Zellerbach Commission, which has been directed so outstandingly by Harold L. Zellerbach and Angier Biddle Duke. These men are appealing to the conscience of America and to the rest of the free world. I join Roscoe Drummond in sustaining and backing up their appeal. I trust that my colleagues of the Senate and the House will agree that these refugees must be resettled if the collective conscience of mankind is to be vindicated.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article, entitled "Calling All Humanity," be printed in the body of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

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

CALLING ALL HUMANITY—PROGRAM TO RESETTLE 200,000 REFUGEES PROPOSED

(By Roscoe Drummond)

There is a precious instinct within the American people which causes us to better respond to a big challenge than to a little one, and to want to deal with it fast and cleanly—not halfway, but all the way, get it done and over with.

This was the mood and scope of the way we fought in World War II. This was the mood and scope of the Marshall plan by which we helped get Western Europe back on its feet economically.

Now there looms in front of us another challenge which is urgent, humane, and deeply in the interests of the free world to meet totally and head on.

It is, I believe, appealing and attainable. It is this:

To resolve completely, through a crash program to be finished in 24 months, the whole residual refugee problem in Western Europe, plus some European refugees on the Chinese mainland; simply wipe this whole festering sore from the body of the Western World by healing it.

If we are to grasp this opportunity to welcome and rehabilitate those who would rather risk their lives and lose all they possess than live under Communist tyranny, here are the facts we need to fix in our minds—and act upon:

There is no more reliable and realistic presentation of the facts on the European refugee situation than the current report of the Zellerbach Commission which has just completed its second public supported survey under the leadership of Harold L. Zellerbach and Angier Biddle Duke.

This report shows that in the entirety of Western Europe there are 165,000 nonsettled, in-camp and out-of-camp refugees, that probably 25,000 more will be added during the 2 years of a total solution program, and that there are 10,000 European refugees in China eager to escape to freedom. Total: 200,000.

What are the first steps? All of those who are closest to the facts are united in recommending a broad, generous, accelerated program. The Zellerbach Commission has submitted these specific recommendations, which in my mind make sense:

1. That the United States should join with the British Commonwealth and with the asylum and resettlement countries generally in calling a Western Nations conference to draw up an action program equal to the problem.

2. That Congress will need to give our own Government authority to take a decisive lead at the conference in proposing that in both immigration and finances we will take approximately a 2-to-5 share of solving the residual refugee problem fully in 2 years if the other participating countries will do their part.

3. That, as far as the 165,000 European refugees (probably half of them want to remain in Europe) are concerned, this would mean that the United States would take 25,000 nonquota refugees a year for 2 years.

4. That, to make this program possible, the United States invest between $5 and $6 million additional per year for 2 years to be matched several times over by others in total.

Who will lead? It would be logical for the President and the Secretary of State, having committed the United States morally to the world refugee year, to lay before the Congress soon a program which would not fall short of the goal. But many things press upon the White House and Secretary

Dulles cannot now give this adequate attention.

Fortunately there is in Congress an able and trusted leader in this field who has the confidence of the country and large prestige internationally. He is the chairman of the Joint Congressional Committee on Immigration and Nationality, Representative FRANCIS E. WALTER, Democrat of Pennsylvania.

I can think of no one who could help bring this off better, more practically and more intelligently than Representative WALTER.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may submit certain items of morning business, as in the morning hour.

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

RECOGNITION OF PUBLIC SERVICE OF ROBERT NUNAMAKER, OF ODELL, OREG.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, it is always a pleasure to honor a constituent who has rendered outstanding service to his community and his profession. An example of the type of public service which has received recognition is the granting to Mr. Robert Nunamaker, of Odell, Oreg., of such a commendation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a short account of the ceremony at which Mr. Nunamaker was named 1958 orchardist of the year, prepared by the Hood River Chamber of Commerce, be printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks.

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

HOOD RIVER HONORS ORCHARDIST

A crowd of over 350 Hood River, Oreg., residents turned out to honor Bob Nunamaker, who was named 1958 orchardist of the year on Wednesday evening, March 4.

The 41-year-old apple grower, educated in Odell schools and at Oregon State College, who started out growing prunes and filberts in Vancouver, Wash., was named to this valley's highest vocational honor. He is Bob Nunamaker, active bowler, Boy Scout adviser, and intently methodical fruit grower.

Nunamaker's award was the high point of the annual orchardist of the year banquet sponsored by the Hood River County Chamber of Commerce. The award winner was chosen from a wide slate of local orchardist candidates. Final selection of the winner was made by a panel of State college judges.

Speaker for the occasion was Dr. James Marshall, distinguished entomologist for the Canadian Department of Agriculture, Summerland, British Columbia. Dr. Marshall contrasted the growers' interdependence with the mass conformity caused by increased industrialization.

To Nunamaker went the handsome silver bowl symbolic of the coveted award. Last year's orchardist winner, Armas Jakku, was at the head table to offer personal congratulations to the 1958 winner.

Nunamaker, born here in 1918, came by his orchard skills as he grew up amidst the tree rows on his father's acreage near Odell. Like so many scions of orcharding families here, he went on to Oregon State College, then began orcharding among the filbert and prune plantings near Vancouver.

Back home, he began the business of raising his own trees, mostly apple plantings, with a young pear block planted in recent years. Besides the trees he has, with attractive wife, Gertrude, raised three sons on his 80-acre ranch just back of the experiment station.

The Nunamaker community service pedigree is substantial, weighed heavily in his favor when judges came to final selection. For 10 years he has been on the county irrigation board, for 5 years a member of the county unit school board.

A past president of the local Farm Bureau chapter, he has been headman of the Oregon State Horticultural Society and trustee of the Elks lodge here.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, is the morning hour concluded?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, is it in order that I be recognized at this time, to address the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is; and the Senator from Vermont is recognized.

THE PRESIDENT'S PROCLAMATION RESTRICTING IMPORTS OF CRUDE OIL AND ITS PRINCIPAL PRODUCTS

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, on March 10 the President issued a proclamation sharply restricting the imports of crude oil and its principal products into the United States.

Only a few days before, the New England Members of this body had urged the President not to take such action.

As one Member of this Senate, I do not intend to let silence indicate that I acquiesce in this action, but want the RECORD to show that I dissent vigorously from the order of the President.

This restriction on the imports of oil is, first, discriminatory to a populous region of the United States which has no natural fuels; second, it is a major contribution to inflation; third, it is conducive to unemployment; fourth, it is harmful to our relations with other oil-producing nations; fifth, it will place U.S. industry at a further competitive disadvantage in the world markets; sixth, it will weaken our national security; seventh, it will contribute to the growing domination of Government bureaucracy over industry and people.

I now wish to comment briefly on these several adverse effects of the President's order.

First. The order is discriminatory, in that it will require the areas of the United States which have no natural deposits of oil or coal to pay higher prices for these products than the rest of the country will pay. Domestic transportation costs have become excessive, and in some instances prohibitive, for these areas. With the reduction of competition from offshore oil, these costs are bound to increase.

Second. The order is a major contribution to inflation.

We have been repeatedly advised that domestic oil producers want more money for their products. If this were not so, they would not have urged the President to issue the order.

Within the past few months, New England has experienced an arbitrary increase of about 2 cents a gallon in the price of fuel oil. This is an increase of about 15 percent.

Mr. President, this is undoubtedly the result of putting into effect the voluntary restrictions on the importations of offshore oil.

Further increases in price, as contemplated by the order of March 10, are bound to further increase living costs at a time when some Government officials are already expressing concern over possible inflation.

I have before me the Oil Daily of Wednesday, March 18, 1959. That is today. I should like to read one paragraph which appears on the first page, under the dateline of Kansas City, March 17:

Increases in tank wagon dealer and consumer gasoline prices have spread through four additional States in the Middle West, a check of bulk plant postings of Standard Oil Co. (Indiana) indicated today.

Dealers and consumer tank wagon prices for gasoline were advanced today 0.5 cent per gallon throughout Nebraska, Kansas, western Missouri and Minnesota. This advance follows on the heels of increases of 0.5 cent throughout Missouri and 0.8 cent per gallon in the central region of northern Illinois and the metropolitan Chicago area.

So, Mr. President, these oil interests could not wait for the ink to get dry on the President's proclamation before they started raising prices. Price increases so far have been confined to the Midwest, but they are bound to sweep across the country toward areas that have no natural fuels. We are already seeing, as the result of this proclamation restricting the imports of oil, the triggering of another round of price increases.

Third. A rise in the price of fuels can conceivably contribute to unemployment in New England and elsewhere.

Already a high cost area, New England products have in some instances been priced out of the world market.

Any inflation in the price of fuel oils, or the price of coal would undoubtedly aggravate this situation, and possibly force a reduction in the working force.

Fourth. Further restrictions in the importation of oils will likely be harmful to our relations with other oil producing countries.

Even Canada, where oil production was developed during World War II with our assistance and at our urging, is not likely to appreciate further restrictions on her exports.

We have been encouraging exploration for oil in Latin American countries like Bolivia.

Now we take the position that even though oil might be discovered there, the market for such production would be restricted.

It does not make sense to conduct economic programs in friendly countries, or programs designed to increase their production, if at the same time we take measures to restrict their markets.

Only recently, the President has asked Congress to authorize a further subscription of $1,375 million to the International Monetary Fund and the removal of the ceiling on U.S. contribution to the Bretton Woods Agreement.

That bill will be reported, I expect, today or tomorrow. It was ordered reported by the Foreign Relations Committee yesterday.

The people of New England may rightly ask why they should contribute tax money to sustain the economy of foreign countries if at the same time our Government is taking measures which prevent those same countries from earning dollars of their own.

Fifth. The restriction on imports of oil into parts of the United States will have the effect of placing United States industry at a further competitive disadvantage in the world market.

While the price of fuels in the United States is increasing—it has started already—thereby adding to the cost of production in our industries, the cost of fuels in competitive nations will not increase, and may actually be lowered, as the oil-producing nations seek new and greater markets elsewhere.

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

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I commend the Senator from Vermont for his statement. I wish to associate myself with his statement, because we not only have the resulting problem created to which the Senator has alluded, but I am willing to predict this afternoon that it will not be very long before we get a negative reaction from the oil-producing countries of Latin America.

Mr. AIKEN. I am endeavoring to give a negative reaction at this time. I know the restrictions of importations of oil are particularly going to hit the section of the country represented in part by the Senator from Oregon.

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

Mr. AIKEN. I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. I want to express my great appreciation for the very able remarks being made by the distinguished Senator from Vermont. I agree with him. I want to be associated with his remarks. I want the RECORD to show that the people of my State are deeply disturbed by what is happening. They have traditional contractual arrangements, generally with Venezuela, for obtaining fuel oil for power companies, and for drying of our phosphate rock, and other necessary industrial uses.

This restriction will interfere with such activities. What is more, it will interfere without giving us any substantial opportunity to substitute other products in either adequate amounts or at similar prices.

We are far removed from the coal fields. We are far removed from the domestic oil fields. We are set up to use fuel oil. Our contracts for supplies involve not only commercial power companies, but many municipal power activities in Florida, such as in the cities of Jacksonville and Orlando which are among the most outstanding of the kind in the Nation. We are deeply disturbed by this matter.

We have, in addition, various industries whose rate for power is tied by their contracts to the price of fuel oil. So here we are cut off—a State which is growing by about 10 percent a year in its power needs—from an adequate supply of fuel. We are not tooled, if I may use that expression, to use coal. If we were set up to use coal, we are too far away from the source of production to use it economically. This step has been taken without apparent concern not only for the people of our State, who now number about 4½ million, and the growth of our State, but for numerous industries which are important to this Nation. For instance, our phosphate industry produces a little more than 70 percent of the phosphate supply of our Nation. I might mention other important industries. All of them are very seriously and deleteriously affected by this order.

We believe in the rule of live and let live. We do not want to hurt anybody in the coal-producing or oil-producing areas. But we find, on inquiry in the oil-producing areas, that in our country more and more of the supply of crude oil recovered from the ground is being used to manufacture the high-priced products—gasoline and other products which means less and less residual oil, bunker "C," and various fuel oils are available for use.

To our mind, this action which has been taken is a very definite blow at the prosperity and welfare of our part of the country.

I am glad to hear a Senator from New England speak up, because I believe the same statement applies to his great section of the country.

I am delighted to hear the Senator from Oregon join in the debate, because I believe the same comments apply to his area of the country.

I have not said anything about the deleterious effects upon our relations with other, friendly nations, such as Venezuela and Canada, with whom we are, of course, anxious to preserve the most cordial and mutual relations possible.

I think this step is ill-considered, ill-advised, unwise, and selfish in the extreme from the standpoint of seeking to render a service to a part of the country at the expense of the rest of the country.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator from Florida has given a very fine factual statement. I wish to thank him for it. It is not only the direct users of oil who will be affected by the order; it will affect everybody who does business in the United States or who does business with other countries.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one more interruption?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I think one of the most absurd features of the order, from the standpoint of the service of the petroleum people, who are in general the producers of natural gas also, is that they are straining every nerve at the present time. They are spending several hundred million dollars to bring natural gas to my State, and they will be doing so within the next few months or within the next couple of years at the most, to the more remote industries and power plants. Despite that, here is a blow which they would strike at the immediate or temporary prosperity and health of the very industries with which they hope to deal and with respect to which expenditures of hundreds of millions of dollars are being made by them in order to provide natural gas service.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, U.S. manufacturers have already been priced out of the market in many areas.

Why should we encourage this trend further? The President's proclamation will only speed the trend toward the loss of markets both domestic and foreign.

Sixth. The restriction of oil imports will not contribute to the national security. That was the excuse given for the proclamation, or one of the principal excuses, at least.

It is claimed that if the price of oil is high enough to provide an incentive additional exploration within our own boundaries will be promoted.

Frankly, if the drilling of more than 50,000 wells a year on the average for the past 5 years has failed to disclose inexhaustible supplies of petroleum within this country, is it not reasonable to believe that our domestic supply of oil is not inexhaustible after all?

We are told that for the period of 1954 to 1958, the domestic demand for petroleum products increased 15.5 percent, while domestic crude oil reserves were increasing only 2.8 percent.

If this is the case, how can it be in the interest of national security to use up our own known supplies of oil at the fastest possible rate and at the highest price obtainable?

Would it not be more in the interest of national security to conserve our own supplies and rely more upon the low cost oil from other countries while we are still able to get it?

The seventh point I wish to make perhaps is the most important of all.

Seventh. The order of March 10 leads straight down the road to greater bureaucratic control over U.S. industry.

Under the President's proclamation, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to "issue regulations," "provide for a system of allocation of the authorized imports," to "issue licenses pursuant to such system," and to "provide such restrictions upon the transfer of allocations and licenses as may be deemed appropriate."

This is a complete reversal of the welcome trend away from Government regimentation which we have enjoyed during recent years.

If this violent swing toward Government controls applied to the oil industry alone it would be bad enough, but the exercise of Government controls over the operations of oil importers can only lead to further controls over American industry and the American people.

We cannot stop with controls over one factor of our industrial and domestic economy alone.

We cannot eliminate competition and expect the competitive system to stand.

We may be headed straight for a system of price and wage controls for everyone.

The oil industry, once famed for its independence, is now, through its demand for greater special privileges, leading the way toward the loss of that independence.

This Executive order of March 10, 1959, is a classic in contradictions.

We cannot control inflation and promote it at the same time.

We cannot improve international relations by restricting the economy of other friendly nations.

We cannot promote the growth of our country by gearing its economy to 1957 conditions.

We cannot perpetuate freedom for the individual by bureaucratic regimentation.

We cannot insure national security by exhausting our vital national resources.

I urge the President to take steps to countermand the dangerous order of March 10 before irrevocable damage shall have been done to our economic and political system.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HARTKE in the chair). The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. PASTORE. First, I wish to compliment the distinguished Senator from Vermont for his very fine and eloquent statement on a pressing problem which affects the people of Rhode Island, the people of Vermont and, indeed, the people of all New England. I might enlarge that statement by saying that it refers to consumers generally throughout the United States of America.

Mr. President, I wish to address myself to the same subject, and perhaps repeat some of the same ideas and same thoughts in different words, but, after all, hardly too much can be said on this subject, and whatever may be said can be easily understood.

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

Mr. PASTORE. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I want to make it plain that there is no collusion or collaboration between the Senator from Rhode Island and myself. If we say the same things, it is simply because we are both telling the truth.

Mr. PASTORE. I hope that at least the repetition will have some effect, and bring conscious knowledge to those in whom the responsibility lies of the harm which is being done the consumers of America.

Reference to natural gas was made by the distinguished Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND]. I remember that only a short while ago we were discussing with the distinguished Senator from Illinois the famous natural gas bill. We said at that time there was an alliance between natural gas and oil. That alliance was economic. It is quite manifest that as the price of oil goes up so does the price of gas, and as the price of gas goes up so does the price of oil.

Mr. President, the recent action of the President in ordering mandatory controls on imports of oil and certain oil products is a matter of grave concern to the consumers of the State of Rhode Island. It is a matter of equal concern to the consumers in the entire New England area as well as other parts of the United States, who are dependent, in large part, upon imports of foreign oil products to meet their fuel needs.

I am particularly disturbed by the fact that the President has seen fit to include in the mandatory system of import controls those types of residual oils which are so necessary for home heating systems as well as for industrial use in my area of the country.

This action of the President has already raised a serious question in the minds of many informed economists as to its ultimate effect upon the cost of such oil products as well as upon the cost of certain other refined oil products which are consumer necessities in all parts of the United States.

Our domestic production of crude oil is not sufficient to meet our own rising consumer demands.

Mr. President, I desire to emphasize this point. Only a short while ago there was held before the Committee on Finance a hearing on the question of importation of wool tops from Uruguay. The testimony was abundant and the evidence was beyond any refutation that we had an ample supply of wool tops in the United States of America. What did the Treasury Department do? The Department refused to invoke countervailing duties on wool tops, of which, as I have said, there are an abundance in America. We demonstrated that if the Department did not impose the countervailing duty, it would destroy the wool top industry of the United States, yet nothing was done about the matter.

As a matter of fact, the Treasury Department took the adamant attitude that it would not change its plan not to institute the countervailing duty.

We are now confronted with this oil situation, when it is known there is not an abundant supply of residual oil and crude oil in the United States.

If there were questions, Mr. President, about an abundance of residual oil and fuel oil in the United States, or if we were importing oil to destroy an American industry, there would be a valid reason for the mandatory order. However, is is well known that this is more or less a favorable gesture toward the coal industry, as well as a gesture toward the big domestic oil interests of this country.

I repeat, if it were simply a question of using domestic crude oil and residual oil as against foreign imports, I would say, "All well and good." But that is not the case.

It has been shown that when most of our domestic oil is subjected to further refining, it goes into the better qualities of high octane gas. This refining practice leaves little residual oil. There has been a short supply of such residual oil, therefore, for heating purposes and electrical power purposes. We are adding insult to injury by resorting to a mandatory import restriction which will mean a smaller and smaller supply of residual oil and crude oil, resulting in the demand being greater than the supply. The natural consequence will be that the price will go up. That is how simple the process is.

The gap must be closed by foreign oil imports. Moreover, the practices of our own domestic refining industry limits the quantities of certain products such as residual oil which accounts for a scarcity of this product which can be filled only by appropriate imports from abroad, as I have noted.

Consequently, the situation which exists with respect to oil and oil products is quite different than that which obtains as to many other items of our domestic manufacture. Since there is a scarcity of domestic supply to meet the everyday needs of the oil consuming public, particularly in the New England area, which is far removed from the oil producing regions of the United States and which has no natural fuel resources of its own, it is clear that a limitation on imports inevitably leads to a further sharp reduction in the availability of a basic and essential commodity—an artifically created shortage.

Consequently, the most serious implication which inheres in this recent action of the President is that of the possibility of an immediate substantial price increase in both crude oil and refined products produced in the United States.

For example, I have observed that in the Wall Street Journal for last Thursday, March 12, various spokesmen for the domestic oil producers plainly indicated their intention to seek an immediate price increase for domestically produced oil and oil products such as fuel oil, gasoline and kerosene. While, at first, the President seemed to display some confidence that there would be no price rise resulting from this action, we have noted that the Government has now announced that it will keep its eye on the possibility of a rising general price level for oil and oil products.

And certain administration spokesmen have stated that if domestic prices threaten to rise higher than a level which the Government thinks proper, import quotas will be increased so as to allow the normal factors of supply and demand to take care of the situation.

In other words, the only promise we have is that after prices go up the lid on imports may be raised. In short, after the horse is stolen the barn will be locked.

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

Mr. PASTORE. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. The wording of the proclamation indicates that prices are expected to go up; and the promise is that if they go up over the moon somewhere the Government may conceivably take action, then, to allow more imports to come into the country.

But judging from what has happened, and what seems likely to happen, prices could go up to a great extent before anyone would make any move to stop them. In fact, if the administration had been interested in stopping the rising prices, it seems to me that it could have taken action not only with respect to petroleum products, but other things, before now.

Mr. PASTORE. I thank the Senator.

Mr. AIKEN. As the Senator is undoubtedly aware, the entire New England delegation has protested an increase in New England of 2 cents a gallon in the price of fuel oil which people burn in order to heat their homes. I have not

heard of any vigorous action being taken so far to prevent prices from rising.

Mr. PASTORE. Does not the situation seem rather strange to the distinguished Senator from Vermont? There are a number of separate oil companies in the United States. But let one oil company increase by 1 cent its price for gasoline, or increase the price of fuel oil 1 cent, and within a matter of minutes the increase becomes universal. It all seems to happen at the same time. We sometimes wonder just how it happens. The independent companies are constantly advertising over the radio and television their independence and allegiance to the free system of American enterprise. Yet let the price of oil go up 1 cent at one gasoline station, and within a matter of minutes it is impossible to buy it a cent cheaper at any gasoline station on that street. How does that happen?

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

Mr. PASTORE. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Possibly the Senator was not in the Chamber when I pointed out that the President's signature on this proclamation was hardly dry before the price of gasoline was raised eight-tenths of a cent a gallon in the Chicago area in Illinois. Only yesterday it went up in four other States.

Some may think that the price is going up only in the areas which depend on offshore oil. That is not true. If the people in the oil-producing States who are also oil consumers think their price will remain the same, they already have before them the facts to indicate that it will not.

Mr. PASTORE. Does not the Senator believe that this is a proper field for the Attorney General of the United States to investigate?

Mr. AIKEN. I wrote to the Attorney General the last of January and suggested that the increase of approximately 2 cents a gallon in the price of fuel oil in the New England area showed some indications of collusion. I received a reply from the Attorney General to the effect that his department was looking into the situation and was concerned over it. So far as I know, as yet there have been no practical results.

Mr. PASTORE. My fervent hope is that there will be results.

I repeat it is a sad commentary on our system of free enterprise that when one oil company raises its price by 1 cent, the increase becomes universal throughout the entire industry. I believe there is sufficient ground for suspicion in that one element alone to justify a very penetrating and vigorous investigation on the part of the Attorney General of the United States, to determine whether or not these price increases are economically justified or whether they are the result of anticompetitive practices.

Mr. AIKEN. I wish to make it clear that I do not for a moment question the good faith of the Attorney General.

Mr. PASTORE. Neither do I.

Mr. AIKEN. But when other important agencies of the Government are abetting those who wish to raise prices, the Attorney General really has a job on his hands if he tries to do much about it.

Mr. PASTORE. He can still investigate the situation.

Mr. AIKEN. I hope he will.

Mr. PASTORE. He can still determine the basic reason for uniformity in prices on the part of all the alleged competitive companies, which uniformity so vitally affects the public interest and the consumers of America.

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

Mr. PASTORE. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. First I wish to commend my distinguished friend from Rhode Island for raising his voice in this cause, which I believe is a cause in behalf of decent government.

Second, I remind him that in the previous session of Congress, or perhaps two sessions ago, the Senate went on record as recognizing the fact that his own area, the New England area, the high-priced-power area, was entitled to particular consideration, because we insisted upon one of the atomic reactors for the commercial production of power being located in that area.

Mr. PASTORE. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator from Florida recalls that he lifted his own voice in support of that proposal, because the Nation knows that New England is in the situation which has just been pictured by the Senator from Rhode Island and the Senator from Vermont.

In my judgment the decision in this instance was made, and the action was taken, without a careful appraisal of the vital needs of large parts of this Nation.

The Senator from Florida tried on three occasions to reach the former Governor of Iowa, who is the Administrator of Office of Civil Defense Mobilization, but was never able to reach him. Instead, he had to talk with lesser officials in that agency.

The Senator from Florida spoke with various officials in the White House. He did not wish to impose on the President himself, because of the fact that the Nation is in a difficult situation in international affairs requiring the President's constant attention.

I wish to emphasize the fact that I believe action of this kind should be taken only after giving every part of the Nation an opportunity to be heard clearly as to the needs of its own people. When we see great cities such as Jacksonville and Orlando in Florida, both of which operate municipal electric power systems, greatly crippled at this stage because of this order, when we see 13 or more REA organizations in Florida, all of which purchase power from commercial public utility companies, with contracts tied to the price of fuel oil, complaining because they know that their price will have to go up, and when we see great areas like New England and Florida, and other parts of the country, which have no hydroelectric power, treated in this way, without an opportunity to be heard, I believe it is time for us to call a halt to this kind of regimented administration, without proper hearings, and without a chance for the people and the vitally affected industries really to make their positions known to the officials who have the responsibility and claim the power to do something about it.

Mr. President, I register in the strongest possible terms my own opposition and complaint not merely to the issuance of this order, but particularly to the way in which it was issued, without giving a reasonable chance to be heard to millions of people and to their representatives in the Congress, when they knew these people would be badly hurt by this order. I thank the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Florida. I merely wish to add that the reason underlying the consideration which was given to the New England area in the amendment of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, with that area to be among the first to be considered, together with public power companies, with relation to research and development in the field of atomic energy development, was only because the cost of electric power in the New England area was the highest of any region of the country.

I repeat that we are adding insult to injury, because New England is practically wholly dependent upon residual oil and crude oil, and an increase in their cost makes a bad situation worse.

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

Mr. PASTORE. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I wish to point out that one of the principal producers of power in northern Vermont, the Burlington municipal system, is using coal as a fuel at this time because coal is the cheapest type of fuel they can get. The cost of that fuel is 6 mills per kilowatt-hour, and the total cost of power is approximately 14 mills per kilowatt-hour. For heaven's sake, how much do they want us to pay for power anyway? The step which has been taken is bound to increase the cost of producing power. There can be no other effect.

Mr. PASTORE. I thank the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. President, as I have noted, the ink is hardly dry on the President's new program when highly placed domestic oil men are already announcing that the price of oil and oil products is definitely going up.

As we all know, the Government has no price control legislation on its statute books which could be invoked swiftly in order to protect consumers from oil price gouging. The rather general and vague language of administration spokesmen which seems to offer some hope of consumer protection if oil prices rise higher than the administration thinks "proper" is, in my opinion, simply an illusion. It affords nothing but a visionary hope for some type of insufficient protection against a highly organized and profit-conscious oil industry.

Mr. President, if any substantial and immediate price increase follows this recent action of the President, I believe there will be many of us who will share

the view that the President ought to rectify his own mistake and either abandon this ill-advised restrictive trade program or move promptly to meet the problem with a system of regulated oil price control.

None of us likes controls—particularly price controls—but once we start with some measure of Government regulation in such a basic commodity as oil, it may be necessary to go further in the direction of regulation, particularly where consumer interests are endangered.

Mr. President, this country consumes more than nine million barrels of oil a day. The increase of a fraction of a cent a gallon in the price of fuel oil or industrial oils or gasoline means millions of dollars a day taken from the pocketbooks of American consumers who are becoming increasingly dependent upon oil as the basic fuel to meet their needs.

It would seem to me that the independent domestic oil producers of the United States could be better served and their interests better advanced if our Government moved vigorously to break up certain monopolistic practices of the major oil importing companies which have contributed to the discouragement of the smaller producers in certain areas of the United States. This would be a much more direct and beneficial move than the expedient adopted by the President of imposing mandatory controls on the importation of foreign produced oil.

Moreover, it would be a program in which the independent domestic oil producers of the United States would be advancing the best interests of all the country and not simply promoting their own provincial or area interests over those of millions of their fellow Americans who reside in the consuming areas such as New England.

Naturally there are other implications involved in this unfortunate decision of the President involving both conservation and reciprocal trade. All I intend to say on the question of conservation of our natural resources is that if a barrel of overseas Venezuelan oil will save a barrel of our domestic oil for some future emergency, it would seem to be a wise policy to continue to make reasonable use of such foreign production.

The foreign trade aspects of this Presidential action are most confusing. In the case of oil where a scarcity of domestic supply exists in the United States, the President chooses to limit imports of that product which are needed to fill the gap created by the ever-increasing consumer demands in the United States. I fail to comprehend the wisdom of this move which has already had a most unfortunate effect upon those friendly nations who have been furnishing us with these products.

This move occurs at the very moment when the administration is recommending and urging that we continue our policy of encouraging and assisting the economy of friendly countries, some of whom are adversely affected by this program. The so-called foreign-aid program is going to cost the American taxpayers $3,900 million in the forthcoming fiscal year. It will be paid for from taxes levied upon the citizens of the United States who have a right to question the logic of contributing tax money to sustain the economy of a foreign country while at the same time our Government moves to restrict the markets for the products of that economy built up by American tax money. The residents of New England have a perfect right to challenge such an illogical and expensive foreign-trade program.

I cannot help but compare the action of the administration in this regard with its refusal some few weeks ago to place a countervailing duty on Uruguayan wool tops when an abundance of domestic wool tops is being drastically undercut by such foreign imports. Unfortunately in both instances the action of the administration is a direct blow at the economy of our New England area. It seems to me that that inconsistency has us right in the middle; we get it coming and we get it going.

A recent editorial in the Providence Journal succinctly summarized these points and properly concluded that the action of the President in this regard is a sorry piece of business. The editorial expresses the definite opinion that the curb on foreign imports of oil and oil products will necessarily tend to raise the price of all fuels. This will include coal as well as oil, both of which are essential for the production of electric power in our part of the country.

Unfortunately, this action occurs at the very time when we in Rhode Island are attempting to attract new industry and to improve the industrial climate, which includes various manufacturing costs, so as to hold our present industries as well as to attract new ones.

I ask that this editorial entitled "The Ban on Oil Imports Is Unwise and Unnecessary" be printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I believe that the situation created by the action of the President in placing the importation of crude oil and other foreign petroleum products under mandatory Federal control should be kept under close congressional observation so that we may be prepared to move by means of legislation, if necessary, to protect the consumers of the United States from any serious adverse effects resulting from that action.

I repeat now what I said last week when I was first advised of this mandatory control program, that this action on the part of the President is nothing less than tragic for our New England area. And as matters now appear it may be tragic for consumers in many other parts of the United States.

EXHIBIT 1

[From the Providence Journal, Mar. 12, 1959]

THE BAN ON OIL IMPORTS IS UNWISE AND UNNECESSARY

President Eisenhower has just imposed mandatory restrictions on oil imports. The step was taken, the President has explained, for reasons of national security. It is essential, he said, "that we preserve to the greatest extent possible a vigorous, healthy petroleum industry in the United States."

What this means, in plain terms, is that the oil consumer in this country henceforth will get less oil from abroad, and thus will be more dependent on domestic supplies. It will affect every citizen who drives a car, rides a bus, depends on delivery trucks, or buys fuel to heat his home or uses electricity.

Senator PASTORE has protested against the oil-import curb. We hope others in Congress and millions of plain citizens will join in that protest. For this action was unnecessary, unwise, and indefensible.

In the first place, the curb will tend to raise the prices of all fuels. Defenders of the import curb say not, but any restriction on supply tends to raise prices and there is no conceivable reason to expect that the oil restriction will defy the laws of economics.

The President, himself, concedes the possibility of price increases. "In the event price increases occur while the program is in effect," he stated in his proclamation, "the Director (of the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization) is required to determine whether such increases are necessary to accomplish the national security objectives."

Thus a President who, over the years, has stoutly fought against governmental controls over any segment of the economy, now has imposed import controls over the oil industry and is suggesting that price controls may follow. With this action, Mr. Eisenhower has repudiated one of the basic points in his political philosophy.

Still another difficulty must be faced. Some of America's closest friends in the foreign community will be affected adversely by the oil import curb. Canada already has protested. Venezuela and other oil-exporting nations may be expected to follow. Thus the President has taken on a fresh set of diplomatic woes at a time when his State Department is overburdened with a mounting pile.

Indeed, the only single argument that can be found to support the President's action—the national security need for a vigorous and healthy domestic oil industry—is transparent and two-sided. It is transparent because the domestic oil industry already is both vigorous and healthy. It is two-sided because whatever gain is achieved by strengthening the domestic industry will be offset by the additional drain imposed on our supplies of oil in the ground.

Oil in the ground is like money in the bank. Left alone, it won't evaporate or drain away. If it's there today and is left alone, it will still be there when it may be needed in some future national emergency. But if it's drained off now to take the place of the imported oil we ordinarily would use, it won't be there for any future emergency. It follows that the President's action, instead of improving the national security, actually may produce the reverse.

It's a sorry piece of business. The arguments against the proposal so far outweigh any possible points in its favor, it is difficult to understand why the President chose to act as he did.

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

Mr. PASTORE. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I heard the observation made that it was difficult to get in touch with Director Hoegh, of the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization. Under the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, which Congress approved last year, he is mandated to make an investigation of the question of imports and to determine their impact upon our economy and to come to a conclusion and to render an opinion. That is the only guideline which was established in the statute. I know that that was done. I know that

his report was made to the Cabinet Committee, and that all matters had careful consideration. This was not, by any means, merely the judgment of an individual or any group, but certainly was also the judgment of the President of the United States.

I must point out that long hearings on the question of petroleum were held before the Committee on the Judiciary. When we talk about prices in the New England area, for instance, I remember raising that question with the head of the independent producers, a very distinguished oil enterpriser from the State of Wyoming, and the answer was that there should have been a price increase 3 or 4 years ago. His contention was that the oil producers were at the short end of the stick, and that long ago there should have been an increase, which obviously would have fallen on the consumers.

There is one other aspect of the matter which has to be taken into account. When imports were on a voluntary basis, there was a situation in Canada, a problem in a special region in California, and a problem in the New England area. But we also had the entire industry to consider.

When all the testimony had been presented to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the Committee on the Judiciary, and other committees, the result was that the defense provision was written into the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Extension Act. It is there today. It was on the basis of the impact upon our national security that the executive branch had to take action. When voluntary action was not sufficient, there was little choice except to make the program mandatory.

I have lived with this problem. I went to the White House with the distinguished Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] and the distinguished Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY]. We talked to the President about it. Within 30 days a voluntary program was on the road. It was hoped that everyone would cooperate. But difficulties began to arise. The independent producers—and 1,500 companies are in their association—came first before one group, and then before another, to ascertain the difficulties in the domestic industry at that time which had to be taken into account. All of those things were considered.

No less a person than the distinguished Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] pointed out to the Senate that within the past few months importations of oil have risen from, roughly, 850,000 barrels to 1,350,000 barrels. Parenthetically, I am drawing entirely on memory now, because I did not know this subject was to be discussed. But I think those figures are quite close to being correct.

So at once there came a hue and cry about the impact of those imports, not only upon the oil industry, far flung in some 32 States, but also upon our defense and security, as well.

I must refute any allegations that this matter did not have adequate attention in the executive branch. I do not for a moment contend that a mistake in judgment cannot take place, but I do say that every aspect of the matter was very carefully explored.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, in answer to the distinguished Senator from Illinois, I did not say that this order was summarily made. I believe that contention was made by the distinguished Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND]. All I said was that the order was absolutely unwise.

I simply know that an investigation has just been concluded concerning the economic decline in the textile industry in the United States. I do not know how many thousands upon thousands of jobs have been lost by American workers. We have shown beyond any question of doubt that during the past 10 years, while the economy of the Nation has been rising by leaps and bounds, the growth of the textile industry has remained stagnant; if anything the industry has even declined. We have been pleading with the President and the administration to take some action looking to the imposition of textile quotas. Our plea has gone into the right ear and come out the left. Nothing has been done.

But let the oil producers and dealers of America be in trouble. I just heard the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] say that the increase in oil prices should have happened 2 years ago, and that it is now being imposed in order to remedy conditions. So the oil dealers of America raise the price of oil 2 cents a gallon.

Mr. President, when are the consumers of America going to have their interests adequately considered and protected?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, to show how wrong the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island is the precedent was set when quotas were placed on zinc and lead, which had exactly nothing to do with the oil industry. Ask the Western Senators—most of them are on the other side of the aisle—how those quotas were imposed.

Mr. PASTORE. I will name the articles: zinc, lead, tungsten, agricultural products, and oil.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The Senator is now expanding the list.

Mr. PASTORE. The Senator from Illinois can expand it further, if he wishes. I think the quota system is important to the mining interests of the Midwest.

Mr. DOUGLAS. It was not the Midwest. It was the Far West. And the Senator from Illinois opposed both the proposed tariff on lead and zinc and the proposed import quotas.

Mr. PASTORE. The Senator can broaden it all he wishes. But let something happen to jobs in the Rhode Island or the New England textile industry, and nothing—precious nothing—is ever done.

I am not defending what any other Senator said in the Chamber. I stand behind everything I have said, and I will defend it until the cows come home. I say that we must always consider the consumers of America. I say to the distinguished junior Senator from Illinois that the investigators of the administration may have traveled the length and breadth of the Nation and talked with many people. But who represented the consumers of America when this order was made? Who talked to them?

The ink was hardly dry on the order when the price of fuel oil went up 2 cents. It will go up more. I am simply emphasizing this afternoon that we in Congress had better watch this condition very closely, because if we expect to avoid inflation and protect the pocketbooks of the housewives of America, that is the best way of doing it.

I yield the floor.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR McCLELLAN, BEFORE ECONOMIC CLUB OF NEW YORK

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the distinguished senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN] is one of the best known and most highly respected Members of this body. He is known in practically every home in the Nation because the fine work he has done as a public servant is common knowledge throughout the land.

On March 9, 1959, the distinguished Senator from Arkansas delivered an address in New York City before the Economic Club of New York. In my opinion, this outstanding address is worthy of the attention of the people of the country, and I ask unanimous consent that excerpts from the address be printed in the body of the RECORD.

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

EXCERPTS FROM ADDRESS OF SENATOR JOHN L. MCCLELLAN BEFORE THE ECONOMIC CLUB OF NEW YORK, HOTEL ASTOR, MARCH 9, 1959

Mr. Chairman, it is a distinct privilege and pleasure to address the members of a club that has for more than a half century provided a most useful nonpartisan forum for the timely discussion of subjects and issues that are of current and vital importance to the people. For that and other reasons your club has earned outstanding recognition and well-deserved admiration.

Representing as you do most all segments of business, industry, and finance, many of you, no doubt, have interests that are identified with and extend to enterprises throughout the United States and abroad. There naturally follows then, I know, your deep and constant concern about the affairs of state. In fact, one can hardly conceive of any comparable group of our citizens anywhere who would have a keener conception of, a greater stake in, or who should be more solicitous about, the quality and functions of our Federal Government than you.

* * * * *

At no time in our generation has our country faced more vital, intricate, and perplexing problems or graver dangers than those that now, and those that will, confront us in the immediate years ahead.

The myriad vicissitudes of our time, it seems to me, are of such gravity that they do not permit any of us, not even the least among us, to be insensitive or indifferent to their potential consequences as related to our welfare and security. They serve instead as a challenge to us—to all of us, whatever our station in life may be—to give and do our best in fully meeting the obligations of citizenship and in the performance of our official duties and public responsibilities to the end that our liberties shall not perish and that freedom as a way of life shall be preserved.

* * * * *

By reason of the present composition of the Congress, the primary and greater legislative responsibility for resolving these vital issues and solving these difficult problems rests squarely on the Democrats. We can neither escape nor evade it. And on how successfully we meet that responsibility may depend the destiny of our Nation and the fate of the free world.

Obviously, I cannot, within the propriety of time for my remarks this evening, cover the entire range of governmental problems; but I should like to identify and make some passing references to three, and then discuss a fourth—all of which I regard as being of major importance and coming within a grave danger category.

The first is the instability in international affairs. It involves the mighty cold war conflict that has raged for the past dozen years or more, and which still continues with unabated intensity, between the forces of totalitarian communism and the freedom-loving countries and peoples throughout the world. The issue of war or peace still remains supreme and paramount.

As President Eisenhower pointed out in his recent state of the Union message, "We cannot build peace through desire alone." We can achieve it only with the cooperation of others and at the price of eternal vigilance. Tragically, in our pursuit of peace we are compelled to cope with governments of low-order integrity, which by doctrine and practice disdain and repudiate as scraps of paper their solemn and international and treaty obligations.

Thus, the chief obstacle athwart the paths to peace and understanding in the world today is the manifest disregard of the Communists for their own pledges. Their demonstrated lack of good faith and unwillingness to resolve international problems are wholly responsible for the explosive tensions that pose the constant threat of another all-out war and universal catastrophe. In this unhappy situation we have no alternative—no choice—but to build and maintain a powerful arsenal of military strength and of deterrent proportions.

The cost we may have to incur—the treasure we may have to expend—in doing so, we cannot accurately calculate or foretell, but the price must be paid.

The Congress has the responsibility for making adequate appropriations to provide the military striking power that will insure victory and survival if another war should become inevitable. I have no doubt but that this responsibility will be fully met by Democrats and Republicans alike.

* * * * *

I wish I could feel equally confident and give assurances that the Congress will effectively meet its responsibility in dealing with the instability in our fiscal affairs. Habitual deficit spending, pyramiding the national debt, and the tolerating of a permanently unbalanced budget are factors contributing strongly toward a disastrous inflation. This is the second grave danger about which I am deeply concerned.

We must maintain sound fiscal policies and keep our economy strong. The strength that we shall surely need in the long struggle for supremacy in which we are now engaged with the Communist world cannot be found in a bankrupt Treasury.

I agree with the President of the United States—the budget should be balanced. The task of balancing it will not be easy. It is one of considerable magnitude, but it is the duty of Congress to stop deficit spending, just as quickly as it is possible to do so without jeopardizing national defense and security. Those who ridicule the idea, who scoff at a balanced budget, and who vote accordingly may well be inviting an inflation that could produce economic chaos and national insolvency.

* * * * *

The next danger to which I direct your attention is one that, in my judgment, threatens the very foundations of our Republic. It is the instability of the Supreme Court of the United States. This is so distressing to me that it is actually painful to talk about it.

Within the past 4 years the Court has rendered more than a dozen decisions that warrant severest criticism. Among other things, in these decisions it has usurped legislative powers vested in the Congress; tended to favor the Communist and criminal elements of this country; glibly overruled and set aside decisions made and precedents established at a time when the Court was composed of justices learned in the law and schooled in the rudiments of American jurisprudence.

The 10th amendment to the Constitution that reserves to the States respectively or to the people thereof all powers not delegated by the Constitution to the Federal Government is no longer respected. It is being ignored and nullified. It is certainly given no probative force in Supreme Court decisions.

The inevitable consequences of such decisions are frightening to contemplate. Unless these trends can be checked, the usurpation of legislative powers stopped, state sovereignty will be destroyed, and a centralized government enthroned by judicial fiat and decree.

I am unwilling to stand silently by, acquiesce in, and see the sovereign States of this Union reduced to a provincial status. I must protest.

Although the powers of Congress to apply remedies in this area may be limited, in my opinion, the situation is of such gravity that it calls for the exercise of all legislative authority that the Congress can exert.

* * * * *

The instability or lack of integrity prevalent today in labor-management relations in this country is appalling. And that is the last of the four dangers I shall mention. The disclosures made and practices revealed in the course of 2 years of investigations by the Senate Select Committee are so sordid and vicious that they have shocked the national conscience.

The task of this committee has been enormous; it has been arduous, difficult, and at times unpleasant to perform. We have had to deal constantly with people of low character or no character at all. We have had to deal with the worst kind of manipulators and conspirators (both in labor and in management), with crooks, mobsters, thieves, extortionists, and murderers.

In trying to develop the truth and get the facts, we have met with many hindrances and efforts at obstruction. We are repeatedly faced with perjurors, fifth amendment artists, and forgetfulness experts. Out of more than 1,200 witnesses examined during 225 days of public hearings, over 200 of these invoked the privilege against self-incrimination. Quite a number of witnesses who have appeared before us are among the Goliaths of underworld characters and organized crime.

The exposures we have made include:

(1) the misuse and pilfering of union, welfare, and pension funds;

(2) collusion, extortion, and bribery;

(3) violence, injury to persons and property, threats to employers, employees, union members, and members of their families;

(4) the keeping of fraudulent financial records and the willful destruction of records to cover up theft and embezzlement;

(5) denying union members the right to vote—rigging elections—calling strikes, and making sweetheart contracts without knowledge or approval of union members;

(6) placing unions in trusteeship unjustifiably and indefinitely, and appointing unreformed ex-convicts and known criminals to manage and operate such trusteeships;

(7) organizational picketing to coerce and compel a union shop, secondary boycotts, "hot cargo" contracts; and

(8) other acts that are in restraint of trade and a hindrance to commerce.

Many of these evils are outrageous, cruel, corrupt, and contemptible. That criminal elements, gangsters and racketeers have infiltrated unions and businesses in many areas and to an alarming degree has been definitely established.

These unwholesome practices must be corrected. Labor cannot clean its own house. They must be dealt with by law. It is the duty of Congress to enact remedial legislation.

* * * * *

Accordingly, I have introduced a bill (S. 1137) to correct many of these conditions. If enacted and properly administered, it will go far toward the elimination of racketeering, corruption, and the abuses of membership rights. It sets up minimum standards of ethical conduct and democratic processes for the protection of union members. It would require full reporting and disclosure of union business, financial transactions in which abuses of trust or authority, conflicts of interest, or other improper activities might occur. It would also regulate the imposition of trusteeships on local unions.

Title 1, the heart of the bill, defines the basic individual and collective rights of union members and provides minimum standards and requirements to safeguard and protect them. Among the rights guaranteed are equal protection of the members under prescribed rules and regulations; freedom of speech and assembly; free and fair elections; protection against arbitrary financial exactions, and against improper disciplinary actions; and the right of union members to bring suit against the union or any officer thereof in cases of breach of trust or failure to observe and enforce the rights of members as prescribed by law.

In addition to the rights of individual members to sue, other enforcement remedies are given to the Secretary of Labor. Many criminal penalties are provided, including penalties for the use of force, violence, threats, coercion, or intimidation to prevent union members from exercising and receiving the basic rights guaranteed to them by the provisions of the Act.

It is my position that all unions should be required to comply with and conform to, at least, certain basic minimum standards; and any union that fails or refuses to do so should be declared ineligible to serve as a bargaining representative of employees and denied the right to file and process unfair labor practice charges before the NLRB: and, further, they should also be denied the Federal income tax immunity now granted to them by law. I have so provided in my bill.

It is charged by some that these remedies are too drastic—that they are punitive in nature. But I submit that they are not drastic; they are preventive. They are not punitive; they are protective. No legitimate union properly administered by honest and decent officials would be penalized to any extent or degree whatsoever. If these provisions are enacted into law, however, the power and opportunity of crooked labor bosses and criminal elements to continue the abuse and exploitation of union members and working people in this country will be substantially curbed and reduced.

I maintain that there is absolutely nothing in the bill that is adverse or detrimental to the best interests and welfare of union members and their families. Everything in it is needed and required for their security and protection.

* * * * *

The bill I have been discussing will not do the full legislative job that is needed to remedy unwholesome conditions that now prevail in the labor-management field. It is not intended to do so. Other measures are necessary, and I shall this week introduce four more bills dealing with other aspects of the problem.

Existing laws are inadequate to protect innocent parties from secondary boycott abuses. I propose to amend the Taft-Hartley Act to prevent certain types of coercion of the employer and particularly to prohibit coercion by picketing at the premises of the secondary employer in order to prevent customers from doing business with the employer that may be involved in a labor dispute. Such practices are unjust and impose suffering and hardship on the innocent and those who are helpless to do anything about it.

I shall also seek to outlaw "hot cargo" clauses in collective bargaining contracts. They are, in practical effect, another form of boycott that should not be tolerated or sanctioned by law. Again the innocent are made the victims. There can be no equitable justification for this form of boycott.

I shall also undertake in one of these measures to deal with the perplexing jurisdictional "no man's land" problem. My bill will require the NLRB to accept jurisdiction, and where it fails to do so parties to a dispute will be at liberty to pursue remedies available to them under State laws and in the courts of the several States.

My fourth bill will prohibit organizational and recognitional picketing. Great abuses have occurred in this area. I do not believe that any employer or plant should be picketed until a majority of the employees, either in a NLRB election or by a majority petition to the employer, have selected a designated union as their bargaining representative.

Everyone agreees that shakedown picketing should be prevented, so should top-down organizing. This means too often has been employed by crooks, gangsters, and racketeers, under the cloak of unionism to shake down employers and extort money from them. It has also been used to compel the employer to place his employees in a union, either against their will or without their knowledge and consent. This tactic is often used also to secure a "sweetheart" contract, one that does little or nothing for employees but from which the crooked labor official and the employer benefit. This type of coercion and economic pressure is indefensible. It must be outlawed.

THE MODERN FALLACY AND THE ANCIENT FOLKLORE

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, on March 5 the distinguished senior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH] caused to be printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Modern Fallacy," which was published in the Wall Street Journal, and which undertook to expose as false certain economic views which I have had occasion to voice from time to time. I feel certain that it was an inadvertence on the part of the Senator from Connecticut that he did not advise me that he intended to do that. It was a day or two before I caught up with it.

Since that time the Wall Street Journal and I have had a little good, clean fun together, exchanging letters, and editorials. I have now concluded that in order to bring the matter to a head, and to have in one place an exposition of our conflicting economic fallacies, I should ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the editorial entitled "The Modern Fallacy," published in the Wall Street Journal of March 4, 1959, and an article in similar vein which I have prepared, entitled "The Ancient Folklore." I ask unanimous consent that the two items be printed in parallel columns in the RECORD.

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

[From the Wall Street Journal, Mar. 4, 1959]

THE MODERN FALLACY

For an insight into the modern political philosophy now dominant in Congress, consider some comments made by one of its more articulate spokesmen, Senator JOSEPH CLARK of Pennsylvania.

As quoted in the current issue of the Atlantic magazine, Mr. CLARK expresses annoyance that the word "government" is sometimes equated with "other nouns having an evil connotation—such as 'waste,' 'extravagance,' 'socialism,' 'bureaucracy.'" Such an identification, in the Senator's opinion, "is a pernicious tendency." More specifically, he objects to the "fallacy" that "private spending is inherently good and public spending is inherently bad—and therefore public spending should always be minimized and private spending increased."

Now, put in this somewhat negative way, the viewpoint seems innocuous enough. Obviously the concept of Government as such is not evil, and obviously public spending as such is not necessarily bad. We know of no thinking person who contends they are.

But the real point is the clearly implied one: That Americans should learn to regard growing Government and growing Government spending as positive and good things; as another of the "moderns" in Congress has expressed it, the danger may be not that we have too much Government but too little. Hence the effort to suggest that public spending is at least as good as, and quite possibly much better than, private spending; that anyway they are just two sides of the same coin.

Well, let's see. Some rather marked—and inherent—differences between public and private spending occur at once. Private spending comes from the money individuals are able to accumulate through their own work. Public spending cannot come from anything generated by the Government itself; it comes from what the Government is able to extract from those same individuals either in actual taxes or in the more sinister tax of inflation.

The more the Government spends, the more it must take through either of these routes, and the proportionately less the individuals have to spend or save as they see fit. Thus public spending is not merely another form of spending; it is a positive depressant on private disposition of income, as any taxpayer and/or inflation victim can readily attest.

Beyond these elementary differences are others. The vast bulk of public spending is non-productive; that is true not only of defense but of many other things the Government does. The Government is by and large a consumer of huge hunks of the economy, while private individuals are mostly producer-consumers. The latter combination is what makes the economy grow. Moreover, the bigger the Government becomes the more it competes with the private economy, and in this pressure against the available limit of supplies is a special inflationary force.

And because government operates without the built-in restraints of the private economy, it is a peculiarly powerful incubator for precisely the evils Senator CLARK thinks should not be associated with government—waste, extravagance, bureaucracy. The bigger the government the worse the evils.

THE ANCIENT FOLKLORE

(By JOSEPH S. CLARK, U.S. Senator from Pennsylvania)

For an insight into the archaic political philosophy still dominant in Wall Street, consider some comments made by one of its more articulate spokesmen, the editor of the Wall Street Journal.

As quoted in an article in the March 4 issue of that newspaper entitled "The Modern Fallacy," the editor expresses annoyance at those who challenge the assertion that private spending for whatever purpose is necessarily better than public spending for any purpose.

The real point is the clearly implied one: That Americans should complacently regard growing private spending for liquor, tobacco, cosmetics, Cadillacs, tranquilizers, yachts, and parties at the Stork Club as positive and good things; as others of the dinosaur descendants on Wall Street have often expressed it, the danger may be not that we have too little public spending for national defense, schools, highways, hospitals, housing, unemployment compensation, and flood control, but too much. Hence the effort to suggest that this type of private spending is at least as good as and quite possibly better than the types of public spending just mentioned; that anyway, they are just two sides of the same coin. Moral values have no place in economics or politics.

Well, let's see. Some rather marked—and inherent—differences between public and private spending occur at once. Private spending may come from the money individuals are able to accumulate through their own work; it may also come, as it does in my case, from my good fortune in selecting ancestors who thought they were developing a sugar plantation but turned out to be squatting on top of a salt dome surrounded by a rich oil pool. Public spending comes from taxes imposed by the elected representatives of the people for the purpose of preserving life, insuring liberty and making it possible for each individual citizen to pursue happiness in any way he sees fit, so long as he does not interfere with the equal rights of his neighbors to do the same thing.

Beyond these elementary differences are others. The vast bulk of public spending is for purposes without which life itself would have little meaning: protection against the threat of destruction by, or in the alternative slavery under, a Communist dictatorship; adequate education for our children to enable them to carry forward the torch of western civilization; and such mundane but necessary things as police and fire protection, water and sewer facilities, street construction and repair, the postal service, indeed all of that environment without which the editor of the Wall Street Journal could neither publish nor disseminate his strongly-held economic views.

And because our present tax laws are so full of inequitable loopholes, we have today a powerful incubator for what the editor of that newspaper, I am sure, thinks should not be associated with private enterprise—waste, extravagance, plutocracy.

Finally, what is the political result of discouraging all public spending without any consideration of its political, social or economic justification? The end result must be the destruction of western civilization and a return to the jungle from which our ancestors came.

There is an appalling air of naivete about the expressed views of some of the ancient

Finally, what is the political result of encouraging government growth and growing government spending on the theory that, after all, they are not really bad? The end result must be the triumph of the state over the individual, whether that condition be called socialism or something else.

There is an appalling air of naivete about the expressed views of some of the modern political philosophers. It is impossible that they are unacquainted with the history of man's struggle against the all-encompassing state, which is also the very heart of today's conflict with Communist tyranny. Can it be, then, that they are incapable of relating past and present human experience to their own country?

For men deliberately to propagate this fallacious philosophy would be regrettable. But it is perhaps even sadder if they truly cannot see that what they call modern and liberal are rooted in concepts most ancient and most illiberal.

political philosophers. It is impossible that they are unacquainted with the history of man's struggle to conquer nature and subdue the devil within himself—which is also the very heart of today's conflict with atheistic and amoral Communist tyranny. Can it be, then, that they are incapable of relating past and present human experience to their own country?

For men deliberately to propagate this fallacious philosophy would be regrettable. But it is perhaps even sadder if they truly cannot see that what they call sound and orthodox pronouncements are rooted in concepts so archaic and economically illiterate as to be laughable in the modern world.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, the extent to which the modern fallacy, so-called by the Wall Street Journal, is spreading, despite the efforts of journals of plutocratic opinion to stop it, is well shown by a poll taken by Elmo Roper and Associates with respect to the reception given by economists generally and trustees of universities who are businessmen to the extraordinary book entitled "The Affluent Society," written by John Kenneth Galbraith. I ask unanimous consent that the Elmo Roper summary be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

STATEMENTS AND REACTIONS: "THE AFFLUENT SOCIETY"

The central arguments of "The Affluent Society" were, for the purpose of this investigation, reduced to 12 major statements, and Professor Galbraith was asked if in his opinion these statements (1 to 12, below) reasonably set forth his major theses. He felt they did. A questionnaire embodying them was then mailed to economists and to businessmen who are trustees of colleges, universities, and foundations. (See "Who Was Asked?" which follows.) All questionnaires began: "We realize that thoughtful opinion can seldom be precisely represented in 'agree-disagree' answers. For that reason we ask only for your tendencies toward agreement or disagreement, inviting you then to add any major qualification in the space provided."

The spaces for qualification were generously used. On the fringe, there were a few violent denunciations (e.g., "This man would be welcome in the Kremlin") and a few expressions of high indignation which consigned Professor Galbraith and all his works to a region not nearly so cold as Moscow. In general, however, a majority of both economists and businessmen-trustees expressed agreement with Professor Galbraith's major ends, but tended in varying degrees to dispute the correctness of his means. The general tone of the discussion was moderate. Samples:

From a businessman-trustee: "I think this is important, and a much needed corrective both to some of the propositions of classical economics as well as to Maynard Keynes. Despite its importance and, I think, the beneficial influence it will have on the whole, I disagree with Galbraith."

From an administration fiscal expert: "I think Galbraith's best chance for getting an expansion of 'good' public services would be to urge a rapid expansion of total output. This is in contrast, of course, with his basic premise that we have enough production. I think here lies the main inconsistency of his brilliant book."

From a businessman-trustee: "We are just plain not affluent enough to meet at the same time both the requirements of the military, technological, and economic race against the Russians, and the domestic economic demands of the various pressure groups."

From a labor economist: "Out of increased production would come additional material resources to correct social imbalance, to raise the living standards of low-income families, and * * * to expand our international economic aid program to a size and scope more nearly compatible with our responsibilities in the world."

From a banker-trustee: "The only basic disagreement I have with Professor Galbraith is that he puts it on an either-or basis. I am for everything he is for, generally speaking, but to achieve what he wishes also requires maximum productive effort. It isn't an either-or proposition."

This latter view is, of course, in flat disagreement with the Galbraith thesis, which propounds that ever higher material production hinders more than it helps the cultivation of human resources.

As the complexities and hazards of our times increase, the clamor for those increased public services which "The Affluent Society" was written to demand seems bound to become louder. The debate on whether they are to be achieved is likely to be brief; the debate on how they are to be achieved is likely to last much longer.

Herewith, in terms of percentage agreements and disagreements from economists and businessmen-trustees, are the responses to Professor Galbraith's views on that major topic:

1. In an affluent society, such as we now enjoy in the United States, our preoccupation with the continuing high level production of material goods has become excessive.

[In percent]

	Economists	Trustees
Tend to agree	44	38
Tend to disagree	54	60
Undecided	2	2

2. The real reason for this country's continuing preoccupation with high production is not so much that we need all of the products themselves but more that we fear the unemployment which reduced production would bring.

[In percent]

	Economists	Trustees
Tend to agree	31	22
Tend to disagree	60	69
Undecided	9	9

3. With our present mastery of production, a supply of goods wholly adequate to consumer needs can now be produced in the United States at employment levels considerably below "full employment."

[In percent]

	Economists	Trustees
Tend to agree	47	51
Tend to disagree	47	31
Undecided	6	18

4. The present volume of production is maintained only by a "synthesis of desire" whereby consumers are led to consume a volume and variety of privately produced goods which is excessive.

[In percent]

	Economists	Trustees
Tend to agree	39	31
Tend to disagree	52	58
Undecided	9	11

5. Inflation, actual or threatened, is a constant and unavoidable concomitant of our preoccupation with high production and maintaining strong consumer demand.

[In percent]

	Economists	Trustees
Tend to agree	43	36
Tend to disagree	47	60
Undecided	10	4

6. Our preoccupation with high production also promotes a continuing social imbalance in American life whereby the private production of goods (automobiles, cosmetics, appliance, etc.) is kept at too high a level at the expense of the public production of services (adequate schools, parks, sanitation, public safety, etc.).

[In percent]

	Economists	Trustees
Tend to agree	52	13
Tend to disagree	41	78
Undecided	7	9

[This statement is the central thesis in the Galbraith work. It produces a heavy opinion split between the responding groups. A majority of economists agrees that the imbalance exists, although there is a tendency to ascribe it to "this country's sense of values." A heavy majority of businessmen-trustees sees no social imbalance; they also oppose any action which would enlarge the sphere of governmental influence.]

7. A much more liberal form of unemployment compensation should be introduced which would provide the worker with a reasonably satisfactory substitute for total dependence on employment in the domain of private production.

[In percent]

	Economists	Trustees
Tend to agree	34	2
Tend to disagree	55	82
Undecided	11	16

8. Unemployment benefits should be high in times of high unemployment, and low when jobs are plentiful. For example, at unemployment level of 4 million, the unemployed worker might receive a maximum of four-fifths of his last earned wage. But at

full employment (unemployment of 2 million or less), the unemployed worker might receive roughly half of his last wage.

[In percent]

	Economists	Trustees
Tend to agree	43	22
Tend to disagree	39	60
Undecided	18	18

9. A greatly expanded use of the sales tax by cities and States should supplement the present Federal income tax, for the avowed purpose of making private goods more expensive and public services more abundant.

[In percent]

	Economists	Trustees
Tend to agree	39	33
Tend to disagree	42	56
Undecided	19	11

10. It is the obligation of an affluent society to prevent the self-perpetuation of poverty by spending considerably more money than at present on schools and social services, to assure that no child will be deprived of physical health or full educational opportunity because of the poverty of his parents.

[In percent]

	Economists	Trustees
Tend to agree	79	53
Tend to disagree	14	31
Undecided	7	16

11. In an affluent society, work that has the connotations of pain, fatigue, boredom or other discomforts can and should be reduced to a minimum. The rapid expansion of a "New Class," to which work offers substantial personal and social rewards in addition to money income, should be a central goal of our society.

[In percent]

	Economists	Trustees
Tend to agree	63	47
Tend to disagree	16	38
Undecided	21	15

12. America's basic deficiency in facing the future is the inadequate cultivation and education of its human resources. We must therefore place less emphasis on material production and more on developing the applied intelligence and creativeness of our people.

[In percent]

	Economists	Trustees
Tend to agree	68	53
Tend to disagree	19	33
Undecided	13	14

WHO WAS ASKED

Economists: From the 1956 directory of the American Economic Association, each 50th name was selected to receive a questionnaire. To these were added a list of economists unusually prominent in business, government and the academic world. A resulting 228 questionnaires were sent out, and 116 (or 51 percent) were returned.

Businessmen-trustees: Names of trustees were gathered from current official publications of colleges, universities and foundations (45 separate institutions). These were matched against entries in Poor's Register of Directors and Executives; trustees not active in business were eliminated. The resulting list came to 142 names; of these, 45 (or 32 percent) responded.

Total: In all, 370 questionnaires were issued, and 161 were returned. Overall response: 44 percent.

Readership: Among economists 56 percent had read all or part of the Affluent Society; among businessmen-trustees 33 percent had read at least part.

ECONOMIC AND MONETARY POLICY

Mr. GORE obtained the floor.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, if the distinguished Senator from Tennessee will yield to me, at this time I should like to suggest the absence of a quorum, because I believe the Senate is about to hear one of the most important speeches to be delivered thus far during the 86th Congress, and I believe more Senators should be on the floor than are presently here.

Mr. GORE. I thank the Senator from Oregon; and I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Then, Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HARTKE in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the call of the roll be rescinded.

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

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, the serious economic problems with which our country is faced are, belatedly, forging to the front as a matter of deep concern. The requirements of national security and the social justice values of a full-employment economy serve to sharpen the issue and to highlight the need for new ideas and new programs in the field of economic and monetary policy.

The long-range economic aspects of the cold-war challenge must not be ignored. Recent reports which indicate that the Soviet economy is growing at an annual rate of 6 percent to 8 percent are impressive, particularly so when contrasted with our own much slower rate of economic growth since the period of the Korean conflict.

In the past 5 years, we have experienced two recessions. With almost 5 million Americans still fully unemployed, and many more partially unemployed, and with substantial portions of our industrial capacity idle, it is obvious that we have not yet fully recovered from the most recent economic downturn. It is now generally agreed that the rate of recovery, once thought to be rapid, has slowed almost to a halt. These facts bring into sharp question the economic policies and practices of our Government and of certain segments of industry and labor. Some of these policies must be subjected to searching examination and appropriate revision if we are to achieve the full potential of the free enterprise economy which has served us well in the past and which now stands as the bastion of freedom.

The policies which affect our national economy and the distribution of the benefits of our productive capacity, particularly those aspects of policy concerning monetary and fiscal management, have been wrapped in an incredible aura of mystery. Some of the most potent shibboleths and caveats in economic folklore have been used to justify the present policies and to obscure the causes and effects of these policies as they relate to our economy generally and to our monetary system specifically. It is time that this mask of mystery be ripped away, in order that the problem may be presented to the American people in understandable terms. It is in the hope of contributing in a small way to such understanding that I address the Senate today.

I wish to make it clear that I am not an economist, and I do not profess to have simple answers to the problems that we face. I do, however, claim some sensitivity as to what is the right approach and what is the wrong approach to these problems; and I do claim some sensitivity to the results which have been obtained; and I have some convictions as to the general principles which should serve as guidelines to be followed by government in the field of economic policy.

To begin with, we must recognize that, whether we like it or not, government plays a significant and necessary role in our economic system. It is not simply a question of whether we shall have government interference in our individual economic activities or whether we shall not. Action, or inaction, by government affects all citizens, every day.

Accordingly, Mr. President, it would seem appropriate and necessary for the Government of the United States and for individual Members of the Senate to have definite economic objectives for the Government. There is room for honest difference of opinion as to the advisable and necessary economic goals of government action. As for me, I would urge policies to promote the three following goals:

First. A rate of economic growth sufficient to meet the requirements of national security and to provide full employment for our people.

Second. The maximum degree of price stabilization and overall inflation control.

Third. Efficient and equitable distribution of goods, income, and wealth.

These goals, it seems to me, can be achieved, but not without careful planning and determined action—planning and action for the achievement of all goals, not just one of them. Indeed, governmental action for the achievement of one economic goal to the neglect of others will tend to unbalance, rather than balance, our economy; will tend to defeat, rather than achieve, the necessary goals.

The control of inflation is, as I have said, a necessary goal. But neither inflation control nor other economic goals can be achieved equitably and effectively by piecemeal measures or policies based upon an erroneous analysis of our economic problems.

Policies which have been followed by the Eisenhower administration have

been characterized by what appears to be an obsession with the idea that if we can but maintain price stability the other objectives will be automatically achieved, and that price stability can be achieved by tight money and high interest rate policies. Its policies have been singularly directed toward misguided and ineffective actions taken in the name of an asserted crusade against the evils of inflation. The policies of the administration have notably failed to prevent inflation. At the same time, these policies have retarded economic growth, helped bring about serious unemployment, and promoted imbalances, injustices, and inequities in our economy.

I submit the view, Mr. President, that restrictive monetary policies and high interest rates, under the conditions we now face, not only fail to achieve satisfactory inflation control, but are actually harmful to the economy generally.

According to economists, inflation may be fought by at least three principal types of Government action. First, there are fiscal measures. According to this theory, if the Government, through taxation, takes in more money than it spends, there will be less overall spending throughout the economy, and this will have deflationary effects. Admittedly, fiscal policy of this type must be applied with considerable severity in order to have any appreciable effect. It has, therefore, never really been tried. We hear much talk now about the so-called balanced budget for 1960. The budget which President Eisenhower has presented for 1960 has not even a semblance of realistic balance. Even if we did have a balanced budget, and there is certainly no prospect for such next year, despite the reams of propaganda to the contrary, merely balancing the budget under present circumstances would have little or no effect on the general level of prices. Certainly there is no prospect in the years immediately ahead of a budget surplus sufficient to have a noticeably depressing effect upon prices. Accordingly, speculation as to the effect of such a policy may be regarded as moot at this time.

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

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator from Tennessee has ably pointed out that the budget which the President has presented has not even a semblance of realistic balance for the year 1960. Is it not true that, amongst other things, the President is trying to have expenditures which will occur in 1960 shifted to the 1958 and 1959 budget, through supplemental appropriations, so that the deficit for 1958 and 1959 will be exaggerated, and so that he can then produce an artificial, paper balance in 1959 and 1960?

Mr. GORE. I believe the record shows that to be the indisputable fact.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is that not true so far as money for foreign-aid appropriations is concerned?

Mr. GORE. That is true.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The International Development Fund, for instance?

Mr. GORE. That is correct. But whether the authorization or appropriation or allocation is made in June or in July, or whether it is effective on the first day of June, or on the first day of July, which would put it over into the next fiscal year, there will be no appreciable difference in the actual expenditure rate.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is true, but if the authorization and the appropriation could occur in 1958 and 1959, and the main bulk of the expenditure could occur in 1959 and 1960, the President could then blame the Democratic Congress for the high deficit in appropriations for 1958 and 1959, and then say that any deficit in 1959 and 1960, so far as expenditures and receipts are concerned, will not be his fault, but will be the fault of the Democratic Congress. Is not that true?

Mr. GORE. I believe that is the best explanation I have heard of the spurious claim of a balanced budget for 1960; but the point I am trying to make is that to have a repressive influence on the price level, a budgetary surplus of considerable proportions would be necessary. Would the Senator agree to that?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes; that is correct.

Mr. GORE. I therefore was making the point that we may as well consider the inflation control aspect of fiscal measures as moot, because no serious attempt is being made to have a budgetary surplus. There will actually not even be a balanced budget.

I thank the able Senator.

A second method of fighting inflation, according to the economists, is by imposition of direct controls on credit, wages, prices, and commodity allocations. Some of these, such as regulation of installment credit, have proven effective but to some extent unpopular. For various reasons, including its unpopularity, the direct controls approach is not being tried.

A third method of fighting inflation, according to our textbooks, is through the medium of monetary policy. Those who adhere to the theory that monetary controls in and of themselves will prevent inflation say that if the supply of money is restricted, interest rates will go up, borrowing will be discouraged, saving will be encouraged, plant and capital goods expansion will be delayed, and price increases will be restrained. Conversely, it is argued that if the supply of money is increased, interest rates will go down, people will be encouraged to borrow and spend, and prices will consequently go up.

Monetary control may be a useful tool in combating inflation if properly applied, under conditions where such control can be effective. Generally, this type of control may be helpful and appropriate in situations where inflationary forces are caused by an excessive supply of money at a time when the available supply of goods is inadequate to meet the demand. Do we, in fact, Mr. President, have the classical type of inflation—too many dollars chasing scare goods and services?

We measure our money in circulation by the sum of cash and demand deposits. Today there is a total of about $143 billion in circulation, according to this definition. In 1952 the total was $129 billion. But when we relate the amount of money in circulation to the gross national product we find that in 1952 money in circulation amounted to 37.2 percent of the gross national product. In 1958 money in circulation was only 32.8 percent of the gross national product. Thus we have less money in circulation today in comparison with total goods and services produced than we had in 1952.

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

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator is making a very able speech. I wonder if he will yield for a question and possibly a comment.

Mr. GORE. I yield gladly.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not true, in measuring the total amount of money and credit offered for goods, that we must take into consideration not only the total of demand deposits and cash, but also the velocity of circulation; namely, the rapidity with which demand deposits and cash move from hand to hand?

I know that during this latter period we have had an increase in the velocity of demand deposits. I say this because I think the quantitative theory of money is one of the basic truths in economics, and sometimes attempts are made to refute it by showing that the movement of the total quantity of money does not bear an exact proportion to the total price level or the quantity of goods. We need to remember that the velocity of money and the velocity of credit are also factors.

If I may put it in an algebraic formula:

$$P=\frac{MV+M'V'}{T}$$

This should be clear to everyone.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, the formula is entirely unclear, but the facts which the able Senator has stated are clear. I thank the Senator for his contribution. I recognize the Senator from Illinois to be one of the Nation's eminent economists.

I should like to ask the able Senator a question. He has referred to the velocity of money. I agree that must be considered. Do monetary controls affect the velocity of money?

Mr. DOUGLAS. No. It might be argued that monetary controls, by affecting M prime, which is the symbol for credit, help to counteract an increase in V prime, which is the symbol for velocity of circulation of credit. In other words, monetary controls might not affect the velocity but might compensate for the velocity.

I do not, however, wish to interfere with the Senator's very able speech.

Mr. GORE. The Senator is adding light to a subject on which I cannot claim a great amount of learning.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator is doing extremely well.

Mr. GORE. I thank the Senator. I do not speak from any pride of learning this field. I speak because of concern for the Nation's welfare.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I understand.

Mr. GORE. I speak because of concern for the national security, because of concern for the inequities of widespread unemployment, and because of concern for the inequitable consequences which flow from a policy which has been wrongly applied. Because the condition of the country has been erroneously diagnosed, an incorrect remedy has been applied.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator is making a very able speech on a very important subject. I find myself in agreement with a large portion of what the Senator is saying, although not necessarily with all he is saying. I did want to bring out the importance of velocity.

I think I should make clear, with regard to the symbols I gave, that P refers to the general price level; M refers to the quantity of cash; V refers to the velocity of the circulation of the cash; M' refers to the quantity of demand deposits; V' refers to the velocity of circulation of the demand deposits; and T refers to the physical volume of production or preferably the real national income.

I suppose this is as clear as Einstein's celebrated equation $E=MC^2$, but I think it is as true, when properly understood, as Einstein's equation.

Mr. GORE. I thank the Senator. I accept the explanation as being true. Even though monetary controls have not been proved to be effective with respect to controlling the velocity of money, I find that in testimony before the Senate Committee on Finance, of which the able Senator and I have the privilege of being members, the Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board at one time apparently claimed to have been able to control velocity.

Much of our industrial capacity is idle. We could easily produce more houses, more automobiles, more refrigerators, and more of almost any commodity one might name if only a market for this additional production existed.

We have staggering surpluses of agricultural products.

And with serious unemployment, no one could argue that there is a shortage of labor.

Any realistic analysis indicates that we simply do not have a situation in which too much money is chasing too small a supply of goods. We do not, in fact, have the type of inflationary forces present in our economy for which monetary control constitutes an effective remedy, even in theory.

There are other factors prevalent in today's economy which prevent monetary controls from working as the administration insists they should. Tight money has little, if any, effect upon the pricing policies of those segments of industry which employ what have come to be known as administered prices.

In testimony before the United States Senate Finance Committee on July 11, 1957, I said:

> When such policies are applied to the conditions as they are today, in sharp contrast to what they have been assumed to be, these policies are disclosed to be fallacious and hurtful, because they create imbalance, not balance; instability, not stability; poorer, not better distribution; inadequate, not adequate economic growth and progress. All this is true, because these policies encourage rather than discourage the peculiar kind of selective price and income inflation combined with selective price and income deflation which continue to threaten our economy. What we have, as I see it, is a highly selective, nonuniform price and income inflation. I know of no better example, though there are others, than the current inflation in the price of steel.

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

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. PROXMIRE. First, I wish to congratulate the junior Senator from Tennessee on an exceedingly important speech. I know of no one who could make it better or more eloquently, or on the basis of more effective experience in the House of Representatives and in the Senate, than the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. I thank the Senator.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I should like precisely to document the general point the Senator has just made. As I understand, the general point is that we have a selective type of inflation which is very unjust and very discriminatory.

I ask the Senator from Tennessee if it is not true that this monetary policy has subjected farmers, whose income is already down, to a very painful kind of inflation. To a large extent farmers are debtors. Farmers must finance the purchase of their equipment, their land, their herds, or whatever else they invest in—and often their crops. Is it not true that the kind of policy which increases interest rates results in a very painful kind of inflation for farmers?

Mr. GORE. It increases the cost of doing business. It increases the cost of carrying the debt on the farm. It increases the cost of nearly everything the farmer must buy, particularly so if he buys on credit.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Is it not true that it does so at a time when the farm income is about 4 percent of national income, and farmers constitute about 12 percent of our population? So that farm income from farming is only about one-third on a per person basis of income off the farm.

Mr. GORE. It comes at a time when farmers are receiving a disproportionate share of the national income—an unfairly depressed share of the national income.

Mr. PROXMIRE. So farmers represent one segment of the economy to which, I presume, the Senator was referring.

With regard to the small businessman, it is my understanding——

Mr. GORE. Before the Senator discusses small business, I should like to point out that the income of all the farmers in America is now almost exactly what net income from interest is. That does not include corporate income from interest.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I think that is a shocking situation, in view of the fact that the income of farmers includes the income of all the fundamental, basic producers of food and fiber in the country. I believe this is perhaps the first time in the history of America when this kind of situation has existed. As recently as 6 years ago farm income was at least 50 percent higher than income from interest.

Mr. GORE. Meanwhile, farm income has gone down, but net income from interest has increased by more than 50 percent.

Mr. PROXMIRE. So the difference would be even greater than I have suggested.

Consider the small businessman, as distinguished from the operator of a large or medium sized business.

The one outstanding, clear, and distinguishing feature of small businessmen is that they need capital.

They need capital to finance their inventories. They need capital if they wish to expand their plants. They need capital with which to buy equipment. They are constantly going to the local bankers to borrow money. Is it not true that, so far as the small businessman is concerned, the monetary policy which we have been discussing results in a selective type of inflation which hurts him?

Mr. GORE. For the small businessman, or the new, struggling businessman, borrowing has been made more difficult, as well as more costly, whereas, as I shall show in a few moments, to a large extent big business has financed its capital expansion through price increases and consequent increases in profits.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I should like to touch on two or three more areas of the economy, in which I think our people have suffered very severely because of the selective type of inflation which our monetary policy has imposed upon them.

For the home buyer, interest constitutes a very important cost. If the home buyer is fortunate enough to have the home financed over a substantial period of time, the cost of interest may be very nearly as great as the cost of the home itself. So when the home buyer suffers an increase in interest costs, to the extent of an increase from 4 percent to 5 percent, or a 25-percent increase, it means that he buys far less housing. It means that he must cut down on the size of the housing he can buy. In many cases it means that he cannot buy a home at all. Is that correct?

Mr. GORE. I think that is unquestionably true. Many people have had that experience.

In that connection, I wish to tell the able Senator from Wisconsin that two homebuilders from Tennessee visited me today. They told me that GI home mortgages are now selling at discounts of from 8 to 10 percent, and that markets were not plentiful even at that—perhaps plentiful at 10 percent, but not plentiful at 8 percent.

Mr. PROXMIRE. In a recent issue of the Nation's Business, a very revealing chart dramatically shows that the real impact of the 1955 to 1957 monetary policy of the Federal Reserve Board, increasing interest rates, was starkly clear. What happened was that the number of housing starts, both VA and FHA, dropped very sharply. In fact, I believe they dropped to one-half what they had been. At the same time, business investment in plant and equipment during

precisely the same time sharply increased.

It seems to me that the figures are overwhelmingly clear. What happens with this use of monetary policy is that the homebuilding industry, the industry of the small businessman, the industry which is so important to people who want and need their own homes, has greatly suffered. The typical home buyer is the head of a struggling young family which wishes to get started. Those are the people who are really hurt. Those are the people who suffer the consequences.

Mr. GORE. I thank the Senator.

Monetary controls have their place. Monetary controls can have a decided influence, either for good or for ill. What I am trying to say thus far is that we have a situation which has been wrongly diagnosed, a situation in which monetary controls cannot be effective or satisfactory, even in theory, and less so in practice.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I think the Senator from Tennessee is making his point very well.

I conclude by pointing out that not only do farmers, small businessmen, and home buyers suffer seriously from this kind of monetary control, but automobile buyers also suffer. Municipalities are probably the most obvious sufferers from higher interest rates, whether they are building streets, or whether the school district is building schools. The policy is devastatingly destructive. It becomes necessary with heavier financing costs either not to build a school at all, or to build it at a much higher cost. The result is that the taxpayer is hit. This is true not only of the property taxpayer, but, as the Senator is well aware, it is true of the Federal taxpayer as well.

Mr. GORE. I thank the able Senator.

The one segment of our economy which seems to be not at all restrained by tight money policies, but which may even benefit from them, is the big business segment, consisting of industries in which the Big Threes and the Big Fours have a virtual monoply. My distinguished senior colleague from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] is now performing an excellent public service by demonstrating, in public hearings, that the Big Three's and Big Four's of industry can and do fix prices, with little or no regard for the so-called economic law of supply and demand.

Furthermore, monetary controls operate primarily through our commercial banking system. To the extent that corporations can borrow from intermediaries such as insurance companies and other types of institutions possessing large financial resources and thereby stay out of banking channels, they will not be directly affected by monetary controls imposed by the Federal Reserve Board.

Finally, it appears to me that monetary controls, if used as the principal tool against inflation, must be applied drastically if they are to be effective. If applied with sufficient severity to bring down prices, our economy would be so dislocated that recession, if not depression, would be almost inevitable. The inadequacy of monetary controls as an anti-inflationary weapon, particularly when used almost alone, is now partially admitted by some of the officials who have been associated with their application. Mr. Woodlief Thomas, chief economist of the Federal Reserve Board, in a letter to the Washington Post and Times Herald which was published on March 12 of this year, acknowledged that there were "unstabilizing forces in pricing actions of the private economy—on the part of both management and labor—that cannot be effectively controlled or corrected by governmental actions in the area of fiscal and monetary policies."

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

Mr. GORE. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I should like to point out that Mr. Ralph Young, Director of Research for the Federal Reserve Board, has also emphasized that the pricing action in the administered price section of our economy has become a very serious potential cause of the inflation and in the cost of the inflation.

I believe that the comments by Ralph Young and Woodlief Thomas become significant particularly because the Federal Reserve Board has had a kind of dignified detachment from this kind of development. It is a conservative institution. The men who constitute the Federal Reserve Board certainly have had a very high regard for monetary policies. However, the fact that even they are speaking out on this issue and that even they say that that situation is at least to a degree the cause of the inflation from which we are suffering, is very significant.

I should also like to point out to the Senator from Tennessee that the New York Times—the good, gray New York Times—which has as fine a reputation for constructive economic conservatism as any newspaper in America has also spoken out on the very serious consequences of administered prices in causing the kind of inflationary situation we have today.

Mr. GORE. I thank the Senator. I have read with approbation the recent editorials in the New York Times to which the Senator has referred. I agree with him that it is commendable that the staff members of the Federal Reserve Board should speak out on the ineffectiveness of monetary policy in restraining administered price rises.

So far there has been no indication of any relaxation of the tight money policies on the part of the superiors of those staff members. Indeed, as recently as March 5, of this year the Federal Reserve Board continued its misguided policies by decreeing a further increase in the discount rate.

Mr. President, again I point out that the administration has pursued its tight money policies for the asserted purposes of fighting inflation. I have indicated why such policies could not be effective for that purpose under existing conditions and the record shows that they have not been effective. The cost of living has risen by almost 10 percent since 1952, and has been relatively stable only in times of high unemployment.

Though tight money has not stopped inflation, it has had significant effects upon our economy, to some of which the junior Senator from Wisconsin has already referred. It has brought about drastic increases in interest rates which have imposed and which now impose great burdens upon the Government and upon the people. Since 1952 net noncorporate income from interest, as a percentage of total national income, has increased by more than 50 percent.

The cost of carrying the national debt has skyrocketed. For example, this cost is now almost twice as much as it was in 1946 when we had a debt of comparable proportions. The 1960 budget submitted by President Eisenhower contains an item of $8.1 billion in interest charges.

That is the interest payment on a debt of about $283 billion. This is the largest single item, other than national defense, in the cost of operating the Federal Government.

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

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. First of all I wish to thank the distinguished Senator from Tennessee for making available to those of us who are on the floor of the Senate an advance copy of his very splendid message. That copy has permitted us to do a little advance thinking about what the Senator is going to say.

With reference to the item just referred to, dealing with the interest on the national debt, could the Senator tell us what the difference is in the annual cost of financing the public debt in 1958, as compared with 1952; or, let us say, fiscal 1959, as compared with fiscal 1953?

Mr. GORE. In 1952 interest on the national debt was $5,934 million. The President's budget this year estimates a cost of $8,096 million. The indications are that it will be more than that.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is about a $2,200 million difference. Is that correct?

Mr. GORE. Yes; it represents enough money to pay for a great deal of the social services, public health operations, school construction and hospital construction in the country.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator's figures, of course, tell a very dramatic story of what has been happening in the case of managing the public debt. I saw a figure yesterday which I believe will be of interest to the Senator, since he has been one of the champions of the Rural Electrification Administration, the so-called REA co-ops. The Senator may recall that the administration has proposed a rather substantial increase in the interest rates on rural electrification loans, which are presently being made at the rate of 2 percent, whereas the administration desires to raise the rate to twice that amount, or more. I noticed that the figure for 24 years on REA loans—and this is the total amount which has been loaned to farmers since 1935—is about the same as the difference in the handling charge of the public debt from 1952 to 1959.

In other words, REA has loaned to the farmers about $2,300 million over the past 24 years. In 1 year under the Republican administration of Eisenhower and George Humphrey fiscal policies, the cost to the taxpayers has been about $2,200 million. In the instance of REA, of course, the money is all paid back with interest, and most of the REA's are ahead of their schedule of payments.

I thought the reference I have might appropriately go into the RECORD because the administration is making a big hue and cry over the necessity for increasing interest rates on REA loans, loans which totaled in 24 years less than the increased cost for 1 year of the hard money, high interest rate, fiscal policy of the Republican Party.

Mr. GORE. The Senator has given a striking illustration. I respond by calling to his attention the Economic Report of the President, transmitted to Congress in January of this year. If he will turn to page 198, he will find that the total expenditures recommended in the budget of the U.S. Government for all items other than interest on the national debt, the agricultural program, veterans' services and benefits, and national defense, amount to $12 billion. That includes a myriad of activities. It includes reclamation, navigation, harbor improvements, public health, highways, schools, and education. It includes the operating of airplanes and helicopters for civilian uses. It includes all activities of the Government except the four which I have mentioned.

Mr. HUMPHREY. What civilian uses did the Senator just speak of? He referred to the operating of airplanes and helicopters.

Mr. GORE. For the heads of departments.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I was not sure to what civilian uses the Senator referred. Civilian use of airplanes and helicopters by Cabinet officers, assistant Cabinet officers, and others?

Mr. GORE. And all others.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Oh, yes. I thank the Senator.

Mr. GORE. I was about to say that if we take the budget—it is about 4 inches thick—we will see that it lists every activity of the Government except the four to which I have referred, the cost of all these comes to about $12 billion. That is only 50 percent more than the carrying charge on the national debt at interest rates prevailing today. Here is the real inflation in the cost of government. It is a burden not only on the taxpayers of the Federal Government, as the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] has already stated; it is a burden on the State governments, on counties, and on cities which have had to postpone hospital and school construction, civic improvements, construction of sewerlines and new water systems, and the issuance of bonds for other worthwhile community projects. Not only has it been costly for government at all levels, but it has increased, as I expect to show in detail in a few moments, the price of everything we must buy, because the cost of money is an important part of the cost of anything which industry produces.

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

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I recall that on the occasion of the first issue of the so-called long-term bonds—the "George Humphrey Specials"—back in March 1953, it was the junior Senator from Tennessee——

Mr. GORE. Those were the "Humphrey-Dumphreys."

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes; but the "George Humphrey-Dumphreys."

I recall it was the junior Senator from Tennessee who rose in the Senate and forewarned the country what that meant. He said it was simply a preview of more to come. The Senator from Tennessee was far too modest and far too conservative in his estimates.

The Senator realizes, that the administration gives a weekly lecture on the pains and anguish, trials and tribulations, of inflation; in fact, the administration says that inflation is the greatest danger which faces us. That is what one of the administration spokesmen said recently. I guess that means that inflation is a greater danger than Khrushchev and communism; a greater danger than that involved in the Berlin situation. I do not agree with that evaluation, because I think those are greater dangers than inflation.

But is it not interesting that the same administration which likes to tell these horror stories to frighten adults and children is the same one which created Frankenstein; the same one which created the two-headed monster?

The largest single item in the increase in the cost of living since 1953 has been the cost of borrowing money. On the one hand, the administration says: "Look at the terrible, terrible thing called inflation." Then it moves into another room and makes another batch of it. This is going on all the time.

Mr. GORE. In certain instances, it has meant that the monthly payment of a workingman on a modest $10,000 home is $12 a month more. The Senator has referred to the "Humphrey-Dumphreys." The "George" variety, that is.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The George the first—and, I hope, the last.

Mr. GORE. I point out that that issue was offered at 3¼ percent. The statutory ceiling is 4¼ percent. Now the administration is hinting that it must soon come to Congress and ask that the statutory ceiling be raised, or else that the bonds of the U.S. Government be sold below par at the time they are issued.

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

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I wish the administration had the same enthusiasm for penetrating outer space as it has for penetrating the statutory ceiling on interest rates. We would be much better off. But we can always rest assured that the present administration knows how to get the interest rates up. They have proved it consecutively. I know of no other administration in the history of the Nation which has a better record of continuous success in "upping" the interest rates day by day, week by week, month by month, and year by year.

I recall the junior Senator from Tennessee pointing this out 5½ years ago. He showed what the Nation would have to face, as did the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] at the same time. Others of us also joined in the debate. We predicted that what has happened would come to pass. We said that the American people would be taken on a sort of interest lift; a kind of fiscal ski lift. I wonder what will happen at the end of the jump?

The junior Senator from Tennessee today is documenting again the same kind of authoritative, definitive statistical information which he produced some years ago. It is about time it was updated. I congratulate the Senator and associate myself with the general tenor of his remarks.

Mr. GORE. I am very grateful for the generous comments of the able senior Senator from Minnesota. Unfortunately, the apprehensions which I expressed at that time have been realized. Unfortunately, I have further apprehensions.

Perhaps the Senator will recall that only last month, when the Senate passed a bill to raise the interest rates on GI home mortgages, to be guaranteed by the United States Government, I again, together with the senior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], and other Senators——

Mr. HUMPHREY. And the Senator from Minnesota; I want to be with the Senator.

Mr. GORE. Including the senior Senator from Minnesota, pointed out that such an action if put into effect would increase the upward pressure on interest rates. What do we find? We find such mortgages drying up the market for Government bonds. Is there any mystery about that? It seems to me that if the senior Senator from Minnesota—if he will indulge such a pleasant thought—had $1 million to invest——

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator from Tennessee. That is a pleasant thought.

Mr. GORE. It would take quite a bit of persuading to induce him to buy Government bonds at 3 percent or 4 percent, when he could buy home mortgages guaranteed by the same Government at 5¼ percent, and, moreover, buy them at a discount of 6 or 8 percent. It seems to me that we must find a way to bring about cooperation between the agencies of Government, rather than to have one agency perform an action which, in turn, will put pressure on the other, with the result that the action of each pushes the interest rate higher and higher.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. YOUNG of Ohio in the chair). Does the Senator from Tennessee yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, of course, the Senator's analogy is very pertinent and very revealing, in the sense that what he has described is exactly the plan of the administration. These are what we call the built-in escalators for the interest rate. One agency competes against another, so that sooner or later—and generally it is very soon—the administration is able to say to Congress, "You cannot expect us to finance the public debt at 3½ percent or 4 percent interest, after you have raised the interest rate—at our suggestion and at our request—on other guaranteed mortgages." So the administration says, "You have gotten the economy out of balance over here; now get it out of balance over here." And up, up, up the interest rate goes. And in the meantime the moneylenders have had an increase of 62 percent in their net profits.

Yesterday, I spoke to a group of farmers at Springfield, Ill. They represented farming people from some 30 States of the Union. When I had a chance to discuss with them the 62-percent increase in the income for the moneylenders, all of them wanted to take out a bank charter. They were willing to forget the name "soil," and just to concentrate on the name "bank," because the soil was not doing them too well. [Laughter.]

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, if these policies were achieving laudable objectives for our people, then we could say that the objectives must be measured alongside the higher prices we are paying. But none of the laudable objectives of the Government to which I have referred earlier in my remarks are being achieved by the high-interest-rate policy.

Is full employment being achieved by it? Not at all. Instead, employment is being repressed, and the opportunity of our economy to achieve full employment is being discouraged and repressed by such policies.

Is the national growth sufficient to guarantee that national security will be brought about? Is that goal—for which we must pay so heavy a price—being achieved? Not at all. This is a restrictive and repressive policy that is forestalling adequate national growth.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield to me?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. GRUENING. I was present on the floor a few weeks ago when the Senator from Tennessee made a very fervent and logical appeal to hold down the interest rates on veterans' housing. It would appear that this administration policy falls heavily on everyone—on all consumers, including the purchasers of houses and automobiles and those who purchase on the installment plan equipment of various kinds. I should like to ask the able Senator what particular group, if any, in our society is benefiting by these higher interest rates.

Mr. GORE. Of course, some persons have benefited. As I said earlier, noncorporate income from interest has increased by more than 50 percent in the last 6 years. Income of those lending money has increased incomparably greater, proportionately, than the income received by any other major segment of our society. Corporate income from interest, for insurance companies, banks, other financial institutions, and other business institutions, has greatly increased also. At the moment I do not have before me the exact percentage figures in that connection, but the amount of the increase must be very great indeed.

So, undoubtedly, some institutions and persons, of a limited number, have greatly benefited from this policy.

But the mass of our people have been hurt badly. Our national economy and the progress in the development of community facilities in counties, cities, and States across the Nation have been greatly retarded. Furthermore, this policy has operated as a brake on the national economy.

Those who have been hurt worst of all are the 5 million persons in our country who are totally unemployed.

Mr. GRUENING. Then is it not fair to say that only a small, privileged financial elite have been benefited by this policy, at the expense of many millions of Americans?

Mr. GORE. I would say those who have benefited the most would fall in that category. Of course, there are many persons who draw very small amounts of interest. But the vast benefits certainly go to the very few.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I should like to associate myself with the very excellent and thought-provoking speech being made on the floor by my colleague, the distinguished junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE]. He has long been a veteran in the field of combating inflation.

I distinctly remember when he sponsored the original Baruch price-control bill, in 1940, as I recall. It would have avoided the 25 percent deflation of the dollar which occurred in the period prior to Pearl Harbor. His proposal received 63 votes, I believe, on the floor of the House, out of the 435 Members; and I pride myself for having joined him in that fight.

Mr. GORE. I thank the Senator from Oklahoma. I wish to express appreciation for his support then, and for his support now in this field. Perhaps he will recall that 1 year later the Congress voted overwhelmingly for an overall control of the type which he and I had advocated some 16 months earlier, when it would have been far more effective.

Mr. MONRONEY. Yes; if that action had been taken earlier, the 25-percent deflation in the value of the dollar could have been avoided. That is why I think the Senator from Tennessee is so well qualified to point out the failure of so-called efforts to retard inflation by means of a mistaken policy of the Federal Reserve Board, in its manipulation of the rediscount rate.

Mr. GORE. The fault is not only that of the Federal Reserve Board; it is also that of other agencies of the Government.

Mr. MONRONEY. Indeed so—including the Housing Administration and also including the Treasury itself, which broke the line on the 3¼ percent bonds, by means of the "Humphrey-Dumphries" that were issued then.

Mr. GORE. The Senator from Oklahoma refers to George Humphrey, of course.

Mr. MONRONEY. Yes, certainly not to Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY. I was referring to the "George Humphrey-Dumphries." In that way, they started the acceleration of the demand for interest rate increases.

Mr. GORE. If I may interrupt the Senator from Oklahoma for a moment, let me say that, if I correctly recall, at that time the former Secretary of the Treasury gave, as a primary reason for issuing those bonds, the excuse that he wanted to get more of the national debt into long-term obligations.

Mr. MONRONEY. That is correct.

Mr. GORE. In that respect, his program has been a total failure, because a far larger percentage of the national debt is now in short-term obligations.

Mr. MONRONEY. The interest rate, instead of being 3¼ percent—the rate he went up to—is now approaching 4¼ percent; and the Treasury is faced with the unhappy choice of raising even higher than 4¼ percent the statutory ceiling that has stood for 40 years under the Liberty Loan Act of World War I. In other words, the policy of this administration, initiated by George Humphrey, and followed through with help from the Federal Reserve, has first, completely failed in its purpose to bring about long-term money; and, second, it has succeeded in raising the interest rate on the soundest security on the face of the globe—namely, Government bonds—to rates that are threatening the 40-year-old ceiling which stood fast through all the vicissitudes of World War I, the great depression of the late 1920's, and the financing of the $400 billion World War II. Yet this administration, in peacetime, has by deliberate design, forced the country to the brink of financial disaster with a high-interest policy that is restricting our country's growth, is raising the cost of living, is diverting money which could be used to purchase raw materials to go into the GI housing, and, in effect, is taking one room off that housing, in order to pay for the extra cost of interest.

So employment is destroyed by taking away the value of the money which a veteran would pay and apply to the purchase of a house, and he applies a substantial proportion—some $3,000, on the average, today—for additional interest cost.

The Government sought, through the Capehart amendment to the housing bill, to increase its own interest rates on its own Capehart military housing from 4¼ to 5½ percent. I believe that is the ceiling to which the rate can be increased on houses now under construction or now being rented, on which interest is being paid, and which will eventually, in 25 years, be owned. The Congress also added 5 more years to the payments. The result was an additional

cost of $200 million on houses under construction today.

If that policy has such an effect on Uncle Sam, the best credit risk in the world, what effect does it have when we leave the areas of high concentration of capital and reach out to the home city of the Senator from Tennessee, or to my home city, or to the State of my distinguished colleague from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH]?

Mr. GORE. I have already shown some results of its effects on a man who must buy an automobile or a home. Anyone who buys or builds or engages in any activity of that kind has to pay more.

The Senator from Oklahoma has referred to the credit of the U.S. Government, and he has asked what the effect of the policy is in my home town. I wish to speak of that type of credit for a few moments. A few days ago a small banker who was in my office said to me, "Albert, I am a little uneasy. My small bank has capital stock of $50,000. If I were forced to cash in my Government bonds today, I would suffer a loss of $60,000."

That is the extent to which the value of this unblemished, this noble, obligation of the U.S. Government has gone below par. As a matter of fact, Victory Bonds sold at approximately $85 yesterday in New York.

Mr. MONRONEY. If, as the Senator has stated, the banker would have lost $60,000 on the value of the securities——

Mr. GORE. The bonds of his Government.

Mr. MONRONEY. The banker would have lost that amount not because of any miscalculation or mismanagement of his bank, or as a result of defalcation, but because of the direct, planned policy of this Government's administration. This is an invitation to disaster. On top of that, Government bonds are selling at 4¼ percent, and the request soon will be made to break that ceiling. When Government bonds, the best security in America, are sold at 4¼ percent, and interest rates in the big money centers of New York, Boston, and Chicago are 6 percent, then as we go to the far reaches of the country, interest will be charged at the rate of 10 percent before the next 6 months, because interest rates are magnified by the square of the distance as one gets away from the great financial centers.

So there is being fastened on this country a stranglehold of interest rates which will freeze small business. Such business cannot survive under 10 percent interest rates. There will be a stifling of employment by an operator who wishes to start a new small plant, or a logging operation, or a food processing plant, because 10 percent is an interest charge that free enterprise cannot possibly pay today.

It seems to me we are being given exactly the wrong prescription. The medicine which might cure our high blood pressure of inflation is only tending to raise the blood pressure higher to the point where the Nation's business will have a stroke.

I venture to say, if the high interest rate policy is not arrested by putting the Federal Reserve Board back into its open market operations and bringing sanity into the matter of interest rates which people will have to pay, we shall see a request made not only for 4½ percent interest, which probably Secretary of the Treasury Anderson will be requesting within 30 days——

Mr. GORE. Or perhaps a request to sell bonds at below par on the very day they are issued.

Mr. MONRONEY. Or a request that there be a tax exemption, as an inducement to purchase such bonds. We are not dealing with small operators. The people who control vast accumulations of capital are not novices. They know if they sit back and wait for the next rise in interest rates, and refuse to buy securities issued by the Treasury, or buy them only on 90 day terms, they can expect another rise in interest rates. If the 4¼ percent ceiling on interest rates is broken, as I am sure we shall be asked to do, and the interest rate is increased to 4½ percent, it will not break the cycle, because if the ceiling of 4¼ percent is broken, the same policy will also work in breaking the ceiling of 4½ percent. Before the present administration leaves office, I venture the prediction that we shall have Government money for long-term bonds at interest rates as high as 6 percent. When that happens, there will go into effect interest rates of 12 or 15 percent elsewhere.

Mr. GORE. If the pattern is to be followed, it will mean interest rates of 20, 25, or 30 percent in installment credit payments for automobiles or furniture.

Mr. MONRONEY. It will mean more unemployment in Detroit and more unemployment in North Carolina——

Mr. GORE. And more inflation in the cost of products which the people must buy.

Mr. MONRONEY. And why the men who conduct our fiscal policy——

Mr. GORE. Let us wait a moment. I agree with what I think the Senator from Oklahoma will say about the men who determine our fiscal and monetary policy; but I interrupt to say the Constitution of the United States places upon the Congress of the United States specific responsibility in this field. And here is a Democratic Congress, newly chosen by the people, enjoying a 2 to 1 majority. What is the policy of the Democratic Party on this important issue?

Mr. MONRONEY. I agree with my distinguished colleague. I think it is long past the time when the Democratic policy against these exorbitant interest rates, which are going to be ever, ever oscillating upward, so long as the present occupant of the White House is in office, must be enunciated by our party.

We are members of a party which goes back to the days of Andrew Jackson. Andrew Jackson had the courage to break the stranglehold of the Bank of the United States and to free America from the bondage of the men in Philadelphia who had kept it under their thumbs so long. In some way, through the years, this administration has climbed back under the thumbs of the same type of moneylenders.

By yielding the power which the Government has—the power which the Congress has—to the dictates of the men in charge of the money markets, and by bringing too many of the high-interest-rate proponents into the Government—Randolph Burgess, for instance, and a few others—the administration has forced up, by $2 billion, by Government mandate, the cost of financing practically the same public debt which we had under the Democratic administration, when we had reasonable interest rates.

No banker complained to me about the interest rates under President Truman. The bankers were pretty happy about the interest rates. Now, with respect to a group which was not even asking for price supports under moneylending or under interest, the administration, which denies price supports adequate to maintain a prosperous farm economy, is continually raising the price support under the cost of borrowing money. That goes upward and upward and upward. Where it will end, the Lord only knows.

If the moneylenders can sit out the situation—and they have proved they can, by withholding investment of their money in long-term Government bonds—then no matter what we make the statutory interest rate, it will be only a few months until it goes higher. We have seen that happen with respect to the GI housing interest rates, which were raised only last year. The moneylenders were back this year, only a few months later, with a request to raise the rates again.

The sitdown strike will work, so the interest rates will go up and up, which will mean a higher and higher and ever-increasingly cost to our Government.

I think this is one of the most important speeches the Senator has made in his life, and I wish all the Members of the Senate, who are concerned with our security and prosperity, could be present in the Chamber to hear it.

Mr. GORE. I thank the able Senator for his eloquent statement and for his generous remarks. I expect today to propose a program of action which, if undertaken by the Congress and by our Government, will call a halt to this spiraling interest cost. I shall not be content merely to point out the error of prevailing policies. I shall not be content merely to point to the drastic consequences of such policies. I shall undertake, in my limited way, to suggest programs of action which I think are necessary.

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

Mr. GORE. I yield to the junior Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I wish to say that the Senator from Tennessee has put his finger on what I think is the real issue. The issue of the failure of the Democratic Party in the Senate to determine policy. What is the policy of the Democratic Party on this matter? What is our policy?

The Senator from Oklahoma pointed out the fact that as long ago as the days of Andrew Jackson the policy of the

Democratic Party was one of low interest rates, interest rates to fit the needs of all our people and not to satisfy a privileged few.

We do not have to go back that far to learn the policy. We need only look at the platform of 1956. The platform of 1956 is explicit. It is a platform on which most of us ran for office, and a platform which I considered a solemn obligation, and it included a pledge that our party would work for lower interest rates.

It is extremely interesting and very constructive that the Senator from Tennessee is not making the usual kind of speech we hear in the Senate, or on the stump, or at Jefferson-Jackson Day dinners, denouncing high interest rates, but instead a speech proposing a program to do something about the matter. The Senator proposes an overall program, not simply a program of passing a resolution stating we favor lower interest rates. This is a program to demonstrate the interconnection of the various interest rate policies promulgated by various committees of the U.S. Senate.

I should like to make two points. One of them is that the distinguished occupant of the Chair, the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING] asked a question, which the Senator from Tennessee answered, "Who is benefiting from this program?"

The Senator from Oklahoma pointed out that we are talking about price supports for bankers. That is what we are discussing. I should like to point out that the facts are very clear. Two-thirds of all the wealth in this country is owned by 10 percent of the people. The other nine-tenths of the people have some savings and benefit a little bit from the higher interest rates, but they are primarily debtors and consumers. When those people buy homes, buy cars, or buy appliances, the interest they pay always exceeds the interest coming to them. This is true of an overwhelming majority of the American people.

The final point I wish to make is that if there is one fixed principle of the present administration, it is that the budget must be balanced at all costs. I should like to ask the Senator from Tennessee if it is not true that by far the largest proportionate increase in the proposed budget, compared to the budget of last year, is the increase in servicing the national debt? It is a 20 percent increase. I challenge anybody to show any other item in the President's budget of any substantial amount which has a provision for a similar increase.

Mr. GORE. I say to the able Senator that, unless the Congress takes firm and effective action, the cost of carrying the national debt will be much higher 2 years hence than it is now.

Mr. PROXMIRE. This is a responsibility of the Congress, is it not? The Federal Reserve is a creature of the Congress, is it not?

Mr. GORE. The Senator is correct.

Mr. PROXMIRE. And this is a Democratic Congress.

Mr. GORE. As I expect to say a little bit later, in greater detail, one agency of the Government, alone, cannot satisfactorily meet the challenge. The point I was trying to make a few moments ago is that, as the outstanding obligations mature, they are being refinanced under much higher rates of interest. With a moribund administration for almost 2 more years, the interest rates could, as the junior Senator from Oklahoma said, go to 6 percent on Government bonds. If the rate goes to 6 percent, we shall find that the cost of carrying the national debt will be much greater than the present costs of all the functions of the Federal Government combined, with the exception of programs covering national defense, agriculture and veterans activities. We must think of that.

The consequences of these policies are already dreadful, but unless the policies are checked their consequences to Government at all levels, to the people, and to the national economy will be much worse.

I hope what I am saying will not be taken as an expression of partisanship. I am genuinely concerned. I was genuinely concerned when I spoke out against the policy when it was first announced and inaugurated. We see now that my concern was justified. I am apprehensive that the costs in the future will be much greater.

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

Mr. GORE. I yield to the junior Senator from Idaho.

Mr. CHURCH. Let me say at the outset that the able Senator from Tennessee never rises in the Senate without rendering a fine service to the people. I commend him for the excellent address he is making this afternoon. He has demonstrated, as have the colleagues who have joined in the colloquy during the past hour, how frightful the cost of the high interest rate is to the people of the United States; but he has also pointed out that the high interest rate policy has been conducted, since the Republican administration took office in 1952, in the name of combating inflation.

It is clear that when the inflation is caused by an oversupply of money as against an undersupply of goods and services, there is some efficacy in the theory that by raising the interest rate we can place a damper upon the inflationary process. However, the able Senator from Tennessee has pointed out the incontestable fact that the inflation we are now experiencing is not that classical kind. We have 5 million people unemployed. Our major industries are operating at levels well below their capacities; and notwithstanding the odd facts which surround us, still inflation continues and prices increase.

It has often been observed that the real cause for the present inflation relates to manipulated prices. Perhaps the ancient law of supply and demand has changed in the past 7 years so that today it has quite another meaning.

The irrepressible cartoonist for the Washington Post has anticipated the excellent address being delivered on the floor of the Senate this afternoon. This morning, in a Herblock cartoon, two gigantic figures appear, labeled "Giant Industries." The caption on the cartoon reads, "Surely you have heard of supply and demand."

One of these giant industries is carrying a placard which reads, "We can supply plenty." The other figure carries a placard which reads, "So we demand higher prices."

I ask the distinguished Senator from Tennessee if this cartoon does not rather pungently describe the actual causes of the inflation which is now occurring, and if it does not demonstrate the impropriety of the policy of higher and higher interest rates as an effective device to combat this type of inflation.

Mr. GORE. I thank the Senator. I have seen the cartoon by the great Herblock. It does graphically illustrate the situation. Yet it is still said that we have too many dollars chasing scarce goods.

Where are the scarcities? Is cheese scarce in Minnesota? Are automobiles scarce in Detroit? Down my way if one lets it be known that he can make a downpayment on an automobile, automobile salesmen will run over one another in an effort to sell him a car.

Is there a scarcity of labor? There is a scarcity of jobs. There are 5 million unemployed.

Is there a scarcity of carpenters to build houses? On the way to the office yesterday morning I drove by the Trades and Labor headquarters. There was a long line of unemployed. Where are the scarcities which are being chased by too many dollars?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, does the Senator wish an answer to that question?

Mr. GORE. I know that the Senator can give an inimitable answer, and I yield for that purpose.

Mr. HUMPHREY. There is a scarcity of good sense in the administration, and it is busily engaged in chasing dollars. The Senator need not worry about that.

Mr. GORE. I have done my share of placing upon the administration the responsibility for these fallacious policies. I have done so again today. But now I should like to begin to outline a program of action, in which the Congress of the United States can play a responsible part, and with respect to which it has constitutional responsibility and obligation.

I do not claim to have the answers to all our problems. I am not an economist. I do not have an economist on my staff. However, I am undertaking, with my limited learning and ability, to make a contribution to the solution of this problem, which I think is vital to the future security of America and to a society of equity and social justice.

I do not presume here to blueprint and give details of an adequate and effective plan of public debt management. I do have some definite views as to basic essentials of a wise and effective public debt management policy and as to some actions that should be taken.

To begin with, the Government of the United States—and I mean here the legislative branch, the executive branch and

independent agencies—must unequivocably assert the sovereignty, the prerogatives and the constitutional responsibility of the United States Government in the monetary field. So long as the Government itself proclaims its helplessness, we can expect to be victimized.

There is no such thing as a free money market, and there cannot be so long as the Federal Government is faced with the problem of financing and refinancing a public debt of the present magnitude.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I do not wish unduly to interrupt, but I should like to ask the Senator a question.

Mr. GORE. First, let me say that I completely reject the philosophy and the policies so frequently expressed to the Senate Finance Committee by former Secretary of the Treasury George M. Humphrey, that the Government of the great United States is, and ought to be, as helpless in the management of its public debt and the sale of its debentures as a merchant "trying to sell a fur-lined overcoat in August." I reject that philosophy completely. The Government is not helpless.

I now yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I wish to call particular attention to one paragraph in the Senator's prepared statement. It reads as follows:

> There is no such thing as a free money market, and there cannot be so long as the Federal Government is faced with the problem of financing and refinancing a public debt of the present magnitude.

That point needs to be driven home again and again, because the myth has been perpetrated on the American people that the interest rates which the Federal Government pays are the product of the free movement of the money market, and that the interest rates the people pay for their private financing are the product of the so-called free money market, when, in fact, as the Senator is pointing out, when the Federal Government must refinance as much as $70 billion of public debt in 1 year, or $30 billion, or $50 billion, it is such a big user of money, and it has such a dominant control in the market because of the amount of money it uses, that the myth of the free market is the world's worst fairy tale.

The Senator has pointed out something which the people must understand. The Federal Government does not need to be helpless in the money market. The Federal Government is such a dominant force in the money market that if it exercises its constitutional responsibilities it can have a great deal to say about what it pays for the use of money.

Mr. GORE. I thank the Senator.

The big money boys like to call low interest rates "artificial." Interest rates are "artificially high" or "artificially low" because we have a managed currency. We have, and must have, management of the public debt. Interest rates, whether "artificially high" or "artificially low," are in large part determined by the action and the policy of the Government of the United States. If that is not so, it ought to be so, because under the Constitution the Government has the power to coin and regulate the money of the realm.

What is the next step that should be taken?

Next, it is absolutely necessary for the Government, the whole Government, not just one agency of Government, to adopt a policy of interest rate stabilization and to let it be known far and wide that this policy will be vigorously prosecuted. A firm policy for stabilization will in itself have a stabilizing influence. This in itself might be sufficient. Without it, nothing will suffice.

Conversely, a policy such as we now have is unstabilizing and tends strongly to dry up the market for Government bonds.

Our present policy has been called an open mouth policy. So long as high Government officials continue to proclaim the necessity for higher and higher interest rates to fight inflation, the market will not likely be stabilized. One must exercise vivid imagnization, indeed, to understand how investors will be encouraged to buy 4-percent Government bonds by repeated official notices that bonds bearing higher and still higher rates of interest will soon be issued.

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

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. It is interesting to note that the administration constantly talks about a higher bond market. As the Senator has noted and has pointed out in his address, it becomes rather difficult for the Government to have a good bond market for its securities when it is predicting that the interest rate will go up. By the same token, conversely, the same Government which talks up interest rates talks down the price of agricultural commodities. The same Government which is saying, "We must expect higher interest rates on the bonds," is saying, with respect to agricultural products, "You must expect a little less in price supports for agricultural products."

What has happened? Anyone with the mental intellect of a March hare will not be interested in agricultural products if he feels the price will drop. The other side of the coin is that anyone who has any sense at all about business will not buy bonds if he knows that next month the interest rate on the bonds will go up.

Therefore, we have the situation of the Government working both sides of the street and finding itself falling into the ditch on both sides. On the one hand it talks itself into paying more money, while on the other hand, so far as an important segment of our economy is concerned, namely, agriculture, it talks the price structure down. The result is that a good portion of the entire supply of agricultural commodities ends up in Government hands. The Government proceeds to store it and pays for the storage, when it knows that the people would have been glad to store their own crops, for their own inventory; yet the Government acts as the warehouseman of the agricultural commodities. At the same time it complains about the cost of the operation.

Mr. President, this result is something that can only be obtained by plan. It is no accident. One must work very hard to achieve such a result. It takes long hours of planning to bring about such a result and to dislocate our economy to such an extent.

Therefore, I wish to compliment the administration on performing this kind of Rube Goldberg operation with the interest rate on the one hand and its agricultural policy on the other. It has always been said that one could always tell when the Republicans were in power; that one really did not need to be told. All one needed to observe was whether interest rates were going up and farm prices were going down. If a man were to sleep as long as Rip Van Winkle slept, and on awakening he found that to be the situation, he would know which party was in control of the Government. The Senator from Tennessee is proving it again today with more recent, contemporary evidence, and we are very grateful to him.

Mr. GORE. I thank the Senator for his contribution.

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

Mr. GORE. I gladly yield to the distinguished junior Senator from Alaska.

Mr. GRUENING. The distinguished junior Senator from Tennessee is making a very important speech, and he is going to the very heart of what ails the country, at a time when the administration is pointing out the perils of inflation while it is pursuing policies which are increasing inflation and making it impossible to balance the budget in any way that is reasonable.

Mr. GORE. And while it is hampering the potential of the great free enterprise economy of our country, which, if released from such artificial and restrictive policies, could grow and afford employment opportunities to our people.

Mr. GRUENING. That is true. As has been pointed out by the distinguished Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] and other Senators, one could be asleep for as long as Rip Van Winkle was asleep and on awakening know which party was in power by the evidence to which the Senator from Minnesota and other Senators have referred. This kind of situation was not ended with Andrew Jackson. Franklin Roosevelt drove the money changers from the temple. They are back again, and they will always be with us as long as the Republican Party is in power.

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

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I hesitate to interrupt the Senator again, particularly because I do not wish to disturb the continuity of his very able speech.

Mr. GORE. It has been disturbed a number of times already.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I should like to make two points. If the administration sincerely wishes to follow a monetary policy which is calculated to stop infla-

tion, there are two things which it should do.

First, it should adopt policies which would keep the increase in the debt out of the hands of the commercial banks. Bankers and others recognize the fact that this practice monetizes, in effect, the national debt. It increases the supply of money. It is inflationary.

What has happened with respect to the Federal debt is that since this administration took over in 1953 the holdings of individuals have increased, the holdings of savings institutions have gone down, and the holdings of commercial banks have increased.

In the second place, as a member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, I was quite surprised to discover that the Federal Reserve now wants lower reserve requirements. Of course, if there is any policy which is calculated to increase the supply of money, it is a lowering of reserve requirements. What bankers want is the highest possible interest rate and the lowest possible reserve requirements. That is what the administration is giving them. These two policies, when put together, show the unfortunate hypocrisy of the administration in saying that what they are trying to do is to keep down prices.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Exactly.

Mr. GORE. That is a very lucid statement the Senator has made, and I thank him for his contribution to the debate. It is not enough merely to be against inflation. It is not enough merely to be against high interest rates. As a Member of the Senate I feel some responsibility in suggesting, as best I can, courses of action which can be taken to reverse this damaging policy.

I do not claim that the courses of action I suggest would have any more virtue than courses of action which any other Member might suggest, or which might be suggested by Members of the other body of the Congress. I share the responsibility, as do other Senators, and as do also Members of the other House of Congress.

There are certain actions which we can take, others which only the executive can take. I am setting forth 8 different courses of action which I believe might prove helpful. I hope other Senators will, in due time, make additional suggestions.

Third. The interest rate on Government bonds cannot be considered in isolation. All Government agencies must cooperate; and Government policies, economic and monetary, must be coordinated toward the goal of stabilization. It is necessary, for instance, not to make Government guaranteed home loan mortgages available at interest yields that dry up the market for Government bonds. This can be accomplished without injuring the housing program by renewing the very successful program followed by the Federal National Mortgage Association for 14 years prior to 1953. It seems to me that a prudent investor might be slow to buy a 4-percent U.S. Government bond when he could buy home mortgages guaranteed by the same Government at 5¼-percent interest and buy them, moreover, at 6- or 8-percent discount.

When obligations of the U.S. Government, not only those connected with the FHA and veterans' home loan programs, but others also—and a number of Federal agencies issue interest-bearing securities or guarantee payment of securities—compete with one another rather than cooperate with one another toward a national goal, then we have instability instead of stability.

All Government agencies, I repeat, must cooperate with an overall Government policy and program of interest rate stabilization.

Fourth. To avoid undue pressure on the monetary system while interest rates are being stabilized, some reasonable control and regulation of credit, particularly consumer credit, would, in my view, be a helpful, if not necessary, part of a program for monetary stabilization.

Fifth. It may be necessary to establish new machinery for the implementation of the policy I have outlined. At the very least, it will be desirable to modify and give new direction to the exercise of the broad, sweeping, regulatory powers which the Federal Reserve Board has arrogated to itself in the general field of attempted economic regulation through monetary controls. Nothing short of this will properly satisfy the constitutional responsibility of Congress in the monetary field.

Sixth, the Congress should promptly consider the application of utility type governmental regulation of the price of basic heavy metals. I refer particularly to iron and steel. I am not today prepared to suggest the details of procedure and guidelines of such a utility type regulation of basic metals or to reach a final conclusion as to its advisability. Only a careful committee study of such a legislative undertaking could properly develop such guidelines and final conclusions. I do suggest that we have found such utility type regulation of railroads, airlines, trucklines, and electricity in the national interest and that this might be an effective means of stopping the inflationary rise of administered prices in the field of basic metals.

No mystery surrounds the reason for recent increases in the price of steel. The chairman of the board of United States Steel advised the stockholders of the corporation at the annual meeting on May 7, 1956, that a projection of the financial needs of the company revealed the need of an additional $140 million. He then proposed to the stockholders that the method that should be used to get this expansion capital "is by raising prices from time to time as circumstances require and permit."

Similarly, the minutes of the Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey for the meeting of the board of directors on December 13, 1956, showed that "for the first time in many years" the company was faced with the probability that they would have to use something more than internal financing to "cover replacements, modernization, and expansion." However, this company was able to increase its prices to the extent that it was unnecessary for the company to resort to external financing.

This type of price inflation, primarily to finance expansion, is actually encouraged, not discouraged, by current Government policies. High interest rates and diminished possibility of competition, both created by current policies, encourage and invite big business concerns to finance their capital expansion and improvement in large part from inflated prices and consequent profits.

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

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. About 2 years ago, if my memory serves me correctly, an editorial was published in one of the Chicago newspapers—I believe it was the Daily News—which cited every point the Senator from Tennessee is making, namely, that much of the modernization, expansion, and improvement of some of the basic industries has been financed, not in the way which was customary under the capitalistic system, by borrowing or issuing new stock or debentures, but rather out of current profits, administered prices, and rigging the price structure so as to be able to take out of current earnings that which was required for long-term expansion, and to pay for it on an immediate, cash-on-the-line basis.

This kind of financing, within itself, defeats what is called competitive enterprise. It can result only in price fixing and administered prices. It can result only in ever-growing inflation.

The Senator from Tennessee is pointing out, quite properly, something which the executive branch, through the Council of Economic Advisers, should be pointing out; something which the Department of Commerce should be calling attention to; namely, that the very government which complains about inflation has, through its interest policies, its fiscal policies, and its failure to protect the consumers' interests, actually encouraged inflation.

I think it is about time we put the monkey of inflation smack bang on the back of the Eisenhower Republican administration. This is the costliest administration which has ever come to Washington, in more ways than one. It parades around the country as if it had some knowledge of economics. Its knowledge of economics is: Let the buyers beware. The kind of economics it practices is: Take all the market will give. Then, besides, it tries to control the market and rig it.

It is about time we said, again and again, that this administration is not against inflation. If it were, it would be against its own kin. This administration is the granddaddy and the foster parent of inflation. If the Senator from Tennessee can figure out any more relationships of this administration to inflation, I wish he would put them in the RECORD. This administration has caused inflation. It has signed, sealed, and delivered it. It is going around now hollering, "Thief, thief, thief."

The sooner we get this information to the American people, the sooner they

will understand the problem which besets them. The Eisenhower administration has created its own economic poison. It goes around telling the American people, "You are getting sick." Yet it dishes out more of the very poison which causes the trouble.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, the social injustice of this practice can be seen in the fact that the mass of our people are forced unfairly to pay higher prices for the products of big business, and forced, too, to contribute to the further disparity of wealth and income in our country.

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

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I defy anyone regardless of his position as a monetary economist, to show me any responsible economist or any Senator who would say that the monetary policy being followed by the present administration will not tend to increase the number of people who are out of work. It is that clear, and the situation is that obvious and that emphatic.

No one, regardless of his viewpoint, will say that by following a policy of increasing interest rates, discouraging business from borrowing, discouraging municipalities from building hospitals, schools, and other public works, unemployment will not increase. He might make that kind of argument, but such a policy, if effective, will keep people out of work. We may say it is not effective, but to the extent it is effective, it will increase the number of unemployed from 4,700,000 to 5 million or 5,500,000.

Mr. GORE. Those are the social injustices of unwise monetary policy. I was speaking specifically of the social injustice in the practice of big business financing its expansion by administered price rises, which requires the mass of the people who must consume the products to pay more in order to make big business bigger and richer.

That is the specific social injustice to which I was referring. The able senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] referred to some statistics, which he remembered, of, let us say, 2 years ago, which showed that a considerable amount of corporate expansion was being paid for by internal financing.

Mr. President, the actions of the United States Steel Corp. and the Standard Oil Corp. are, by no means, the only examples of such unfair gouging of the public by the big, the powerful, and the rich. Indeed, such action is characteristic of our current economy, and is encouraged and abetted by governmental policies. According to the statistics from the Securities and Exchange Commission, corporations spent $35.1 billion in 1956 for expansion. Of this amount, only approximately $10 billion came from long-term borrowings or new stock issues. The overwhelming proportion came from internal financing.

The story was repeated in practice in both 1957 and 1958. For the 3 years combined, corporations spent more than $89 billion on plant and equipment outlay. Of this amount, only $28.7 billion came from new issues of stock and bonds.

These figures show the extent to which corporate expansion has been brought about through internal financing. It would be interesting to see the exact extent to which it has been financed through administered price rises.

I hope my senior colleague from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] will be able to develop those facts as his hearing proceeds.

Mr. President, although expansion by profits is a sound practice, if conducted within reasonable limits, this extreme profiteering through administered price rises appears unconscionable; and the Congress should give immediate consideration to corrective measures.

Seventh, I suggest the creation of a Monetary Commission, composed of the best minds available, from the Congress, from the executive branch of the Government, and from various walks of life. Such a commission could, in due course, present recommendations for other or additional steps and procedures.

Meanwhile there are actions which the Congress should take.

Mr. President, now I come to the eighth suggestion, which concerns action which Congress should take—and take soon. The Congress should promptly consider appropriate tax revision, to assure sufficient revenue for essential Government expenditures.

It should be clear by now, Mr. President, that I believe we must make a realistic effort to get to the root of our economic ills, to use the powers of government for the good of all the people, and to promote a rate of economic growth necessary for our national security, while preserving the value of the dollar and maintaining the integrity of Government obligations. Our very survival may depend upon it. At the very least, justice and fairness require it.

Resistance to change, devotion to the status quo, and acceptance of economic nostrums that are antiquated, unsuited, and inadequate for our present-day problems, must not characterize our policies and actions. Adam Smith's theories may have been universally applicable in his day, under the economic conditions at that time. But this does not necessarily mean that they work the same way today. Wherever our textbooks and theories are wrong, let us reject them, and seek the truth.

There are other important phases and problems of the economic challenge with which we are confronted. Later, I shall undertake to discuss some of them. Today, I have undertaken to say that in the field of money and credit, it is both proper and necessary for the Government to take positive action to protect and support the integrity of its own obligations, to protect the interest of all ctizens, to promote the necessary growth of the national economy, to provide full employment, and to guard our national economy from those who would wrongfully exploit our difficult situation. Such positive action is required in the national interest.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I desire to join a number of my colleagues who currently are extending the hand of congratulations to the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] for his splendid message. Earlier today I said I had read the message, and had had an opportunity to study it carefully. I am delighted that it has been my privilege to have been here in the Senate Chamber during its presentation.

The message the distinguished junior Senator from Tennessee has delivered to the Senate represents a sound and constructive analysis of the present economic difficulties which confront us. It also lays before us a constructive program by which we can do something about the current economic problems, particularly the mismanagement of our fiscal and monetary policies.

Again the distinguished junior Senator from Tennessee has performed a distinctly valuable public service in behalf of a sounder, more prosperous, and more just American economy.

Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HART in the chair). The Senator from Minnesota.

ST. PATRICK'S DAY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, once again we are honoring St. Patrick and the many fine upstanding Irishmen who have contributed so much to our country's growth. And today we are especially happy to welcome to our midst their Excellencies, the President of Ireland and Mrs. O'Kelly.

This happy occasion is heightened by the fact that this year marks the 40th anniversay of the election of the first democratic Irish Parliament. It has indeed been fitting that the President of Ireland has visited with the President of the United States.

The Irish Constitution did not become truly effective until 1937, when Dr. Douglas Hyde took office as first President. This eminent Celtic scholar and his Gaelic League had originally inspired the Irish cultural renaissance, gave impetus to the movement for national independence among the Irish, and set the stage for the splendid record thereafter established by the Irish Republic.

We note that Irish history and experience show an early awareness of social responsibility by government. For example, one of the documents unanimously adopted by the original Irish Assembly in 1919, entitled "A Democratic Program," outlined the political, social, and economic aims of the Parliament. It contained a pledge not only to care for the weaker members of the community in Ireland, but also "to seek cooperation of the governments of other countries in determining a standard of social and industrial legislation with a view to a general and lasting improvement in the conditions under which the working classes live and labor." Is it not remarkable for a people back in 1919 to be talking about seeking cooperation with other nations?

Today, Ireland is a country in which private enterprise and small farms predominate, and where the Government has sponsored long-term programs to increase standards of national income.

Agricultural improvements include the relocation of small farmers from congested districts of the west to newly

equipped holdings elsewhere in the country, and the use of such vacated holdings to enlarge and consolidate adjoining farms. Famines and emigrations, like those of the 1840's, are gone, never again to return.

At the same time, the Government is promoting, under a 5-year-plan, economic development in the areas of tourism, fisheries, peat development, forestry development, modernized transportation pools, cooperative marketing policies, rural science courses throughout the school system, backed by adequate research, and last—but not least—housing for low income urban and rural groups.

I should like to discuss briefly this concern of the Irish with low-income housing. In a survey made last summer of Ireland's housing program, my good friend, Joseph P. McMurray, then State commissioner for housing of New York State, said:

> While much has been written of the housing programs in other countries, Americans have heard practically nothing about the amazing progress in Ireland. This relatively small country, though not rich in resources, has done more proportionately than any other country today, to provide decent housing for its people—wiping out city slums, and encouraging agricultural workers to remain on the farms.

Since 1932, Ireland has built 108,000 public housing units and 80,000 homes for middle-income families; and Government aid has been given toward the reconstruction of 70,000 old dwellings. Ireland's program for the encouragement of small suburban dwellings, which is without counterpart in any other country, provides for grants from the National Government, matched by grants from the local government, depending on family income. Thirty-five-year loans for the balance of the purchase price are arranged by the Government, at interest of one-half of 1 percent above what it costs the Government to borrow funds. There is a local tax exemption of 90 percent the first year, which is reduced 10 percent yearly until the property pays full taxes after 10 years. Downpayments of 5 percent, or $280, are required. Most houses have garages, and are architecturally as attractive as houses in our better suburbs.

Mr. McMurray found the Irish authorities using forms of housing aid that have not been thought of anywhere else. He has pointed to the newlyweds' program operated by the Dublin Corporation. There is a yearly drawing, at Easter, for which only newly married couples are eligible, and from which 300 winners result. The prize is good, new housing in which to start their family life, with the advantage of low rent. The national and local governments match grants, thus bringing the rents down to what the families can afford. An equally effective plan for small farmers provides low-rent cottages with an acre of land, on which the family may raise vegetables and keep a cow. A liberal tenant-purchase plan allows the farm tenants to work their way to home-ownership.

In addition, Ireland is working independently and through the agency of UNICEF and WHO for the relief of distress, malnutrition, and disease. Through such cooperative efforts, Ireland is striving to assist the growth of world peace, based on law, by helping to eliminate hatred and by spreading the spirit of tolerance and Christian charity. The Irish people believe that the particular interests of each country are best served by wholehearted cooperation in solving common problems, such as health, the preservation of the family unit, and the welfare of children everywhere.

This look at Irish national policies helps us better to understand one of the basic concepts of the free world—namely, that through the preservation of individual national cultures and economies, truly significant contributions to the welfare of human society can be achieved. The resilience, strength, imagination, and historic richness which man has accumulated during the ages are essential in a variety of ways in order to give force and meaning to labors for the world community.

The positive contributions of each member state, backed by the active interest and support of the peoples themselves, makes it possible for all men of good will, in both small countries and large, to contribute in this age of crisis to the reduction of world tension.

May we always have with us independent little countries like Ireland.

Mr. President, I salute the presence today in the Congress of the President of that fine country.

Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota has the floor.

THE CIVIL RIGHTS BILL OF 1959

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, at this time I desire to address myself to a subject matter which is before two of the congressional committees which currently are holding hearings.

I rise to wish Godspeed to the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], the chairman of the Constitutional Rights Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, in its hearings on civil rights proposed legislation, which have commenced this week. I am confident that the distinguished members of the subcommittee will work effectively and tirelessly to bring to the floor of this body a measure which will carry out the desegregation decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States, and will make every American a first-class citizen in law and in his daily life.

Mr. President, we have two ways of identifying ourselves with these legislative proposals. One is to address ourselves to the subject matter here in the Senate Chamber. The other is to do so before the subcommittee, during hearing.

I intend to ask that the remarks which I am making in the Senate today shall also be made a part of the testimony before the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights.

I also desire to commend Chairman CELLER and his subcommittee of the House Judiciary Committee, which has been holding hearings on civil rights legislation, H.R. 3147, since March 4. I am confident that the distinguished members of that subcommittee, like their counterparts in the Senate, will do all in their power to have Congress enact legislation that will carry out the Supreme Court's desegregation decisions and that will make every American a first-class citizen in law and in his daily life.

Mr. President, proposed legislation to do exactly that—with sympathy, understanding, firmness, and due deliberate speed—has been introduced in both the Senate and the House, and I am hopeful that both of these subcommittees will report favorably upon the bill introduced by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], S. 810, of which I have the privilege to be one of the 17 cosponsors. The enactment of such a bill is 4 years overdue. We owe it to ourselves, to the Senate, and to the Congress as an institution, to act this year. Enactment of this bill would be a national declaration of our faith in human equality and human dignity, and an international declaration that our great Nation, the leader of the free world, is able to mobilize the processes of democracy to make a living, daily reality of that faith in human equality and human dignity.

When the distinguished senior Senator from Illinois introduced our civil rights bill on January 29, 1959, I arose, as the first cosponsor of his bill, and as his partner in this, as in other, civil rights endeavors, to congratulate the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] upon the farsighted bill he was introducing. For Senator Douglas' bill is a model of thoughtful and careful work in an area where emotion alone is not enough, but has too long been the order of the day. I said then, and I repeat now, that the provisions of the bill are to encourage cooperation, to facilitate cooperation, to seek the ordinary methods of cooperation at the local level and to ask the Federal Government to take some initiative in doing all this, but to do so only in the light of local conditions and in cooperation with local officials, taking into account the time factor.

Yes, the bill of the Senator from Illinois is indeed a bill for cooperation between State and Federal Governments to do a job that neither can properly do alone. I hope that the Members of this body from all sections of the country will view this bill as a means of bringing about Federal-State cooperation and as a move toward cementing our great Nation, not dividing it.

The Douglas-Javits-Celler bill is a moderate measure, carefully designed to facilitate desegregation, without at the same time putting additional obstacles or irritants in the way of those States and communities whose laws and whose customs must now undergo such far-reaching changes. I repeat, this is a moderate measure that does not go one inch beyond the necessities of the hour; beyond what is absolutely required to carry out the law of the land as declared by the United States Supreme Court.

Let us take a quick look at exactly what S. 810, the Douglas-Humphrey-Javits bill, does.

Title I of the bill contains findings supporting the Supreme Court's desegregation decisions as expressing the moral ideals of the Nation, and pledges the Congress to carry out those decisions by all due and reasonable means. This title will make it clear to the Nation and to the world that Congress stands foursquare behind the Supreme Court's desegregation decisions, and accepts full responsibility for seeing that those decisions are carried out everywhere in the Nation.

Can anyone say that a congressional declaration of support for the Supreme Court's decisions is not a moderate proposal?

It seems to me it is not only moderate, but a fair, just, and long-overdue proposal.

Title II authorizes the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to render technical assistance to State and local governments in bringing about desegregation of the public school systems. Among other things, the Secretary is authorized to make and distribute surveys of desegregation progress and of successful case histories, to arrange conferences, to appoint advisory councils, to compile and distribute all types of information, and generally to be a helpmate to those State and local officials who are faced with the difficult task of changing a segregated public school system over into a unified one.

Can anyone suggest that such helpful and cooperative technical assistance is not a moderate proposal?

Title III authorizes the Secretary to make grants to State and local governments for additional school facilities, additional teachers, teacher training, and all the other things that will help ease the transition from a segregated to a desegregated public school system in America.

Can anyone say that such financial assistance is not a moderate proposal?

Title IV provides that the Secretary shall make every effort, through the use of technical assistance and grants-in-aid, to persuade States and local governmental units to carry on a program of desegregation, in accordance with the law of the land, and authorizes him, where these methods fail, to accept responsibility for initiating the development of desegregation plans with the fullest possible local consultation and participation.

Can anyone say that these efforts at persuasion and at seeking local cooperation in working out desegregation plans do not constitute a moderate proposal?

Title V authorizes the Attorney General to institute legal action to obtain compliance with desegregation plans worked out under title IV, but only when the Secretary certifies that all efforts to secure compliance by persuasion and technical and financial assistance have failed.

Can anyone say that this is not a moderate proposal?

Titles VI and VII authorize the Attorney General to bring injuction actions against those denying equal protection of the laws to anyone because of their race, color, religion, or national origin when there is a signed complaint and when the aggrieved person is unable to seek effective legal protection for himself. Please note and please note carefully that this law is not a roving commission to the Attorney General to bring actions wherever he thinks someone's constitutional rights are being violated. The Attorney General's authority is carefully limited; he may act to safeguard rights only under one provision of the 14th amendment, the equal protection clause, and he may act only where there is a signed complaint and where the aggrieved person is unable to secure effective legal protection for himself. All that this proposal seeks to do is to permit the Department of Justice, when someone is being denied the constitutional right to equal protection of the laws because of his race or color, and when the person so denied his constitutional rights has no effective way of protecting himself, to bring a civil action in court to restrain those denying the constitutional rights from continuing to do so.

Can anyone say that such a proposal—to permit the Federal Government to protect the constitutional right to equal protection of the laws when there is no other means of obtaining that protection—is not a moderate proposal?

Titles VI and VII represent a vastly improved version of the part III which was deleted from the 1957 Civil Rights Act. The 1959 version of part III that we are proposing in titles VI and VII is a much narrower and carefully developed provision than the one contained in the old part III in 1957. Yet the same administration which proposes part III in the first place, a part III which went far beyond what we are asking in the Douglas and Celler bills, now suggests that ours is not a moderate proposal.

But how, I ask, can something which was moderate in 1957, and which has been narrowed and restricted since then, be less moderate in 1959 than it was in 1957?

In all candor, I say that our proposal to allow the Attorney General to act when an individual cannot vindicate his own constitutional right to equal protection of the laws is a minimum proposal. The rights guaranteed by the Constitution must not be mere paper rights, good in theory but unattainable in practice; they must be rights in our everyday life. We must see that those who are themselves unable to vindicate their constitutional rights are given the assistance of our Government in doing so. Constitutional rights in America must become living realities. I submit that the enactment of titles VI and VII of the Douglas-Humphrey-Javits-Celler bills, will do more to put our democratic theory of equality into practice than anything this body can do.

Mr. President, the Leadership Conference on Civil Rights, representing 53 organizations in this area, has called the Douglas-Humphrey-Javits-Celler bill "the No. 1 civil rights bill," and the distinguished senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] put their statement into the RECORD earlier this month. I agree with the leadership conference that this is the No. 1 civil rights bill. But I go further. I say that this is not just a civil rights bill; it is something far bigger. The enactment of this bill now is an urgently needed demonstration of our democratic faith.

For the watching two-thirds of the world's peoples who are colored, for the watching one-third of the world's peoples who are today uncommitted in the contest between Communist expansionism and democratic freedom, the single act of adopting and implementing the bill I have described will revalidate our credentials as practitioners at home of the rights of the individual human being that we preach abroad.

Mr. President, I believe that the best politics, the best diplomacy, the most expedient course in the long run, is to do the right thing in the short run and to do it because it is the right thing. I believe an inexorable poetic justice operates for us all, as individuals among our colleagues, and as a Nation among the nations of the earth.

I believe, in a very real sense, that while evil may prosper for a season and grow as the green bay tree, in the end it is cut down and cast into the fire. I believe that in the present contest, in which Mr. Khrushchev has said he will bury us, neither he nor the philosophy of force and materialistic sacrifice of the individual can bury us if we add to our material strength the respect and defense of the value of each and every individual man, woman and child. This principle, written into our own Declaration of Independence, into our Constitution, into the Supreme Court desegregation decisions, is gently, thoroughly and firmly provided for in the Douglas-Javits-Celler bill.

If we must talk in the vocabulary of the moment, let us say that this bill, when made law, will have a blessed fallout that will be borne around the world on the winds of thought and human emotion. As our example and our fresh proof in our belief in our own preaching of the rights of man takes hold, democracy will be better strengthened, better defended and more secure here and everywhere in the world. It will penetrate where no weapon or missile can go—into the minds and hearts of the very people who today are uncommitted and who will either believe democracy's promise of both bread and freedom or accept Communist imperialism's promise of bread now and a caricature of freedom later.

But, basically, Mr. President, I hope that we will act now, in this session of Congress, because it is the right thing to do. I hope that we will have the fortitude to surmount the difficulty of strong differences within the committee and on the floor. I hope we will lay this bill upon the President's desk before we go home to face and report to the American people upon our stewardship and our performance upon our promises to them.

In civil rights, as in defense and economic strength, we must not fail the Na-

tion or the free world. We must be strong in all things now, or we shall be secure in none. Civil rights has never been a postponable legislative item. We have allowed it to be postponed at tragic cost in terms of people, of national strength, and of our standing among the nations of the world. This is clear now. We must postpone no longer. President Truman's Committee on Civil Rights said 12 years ago, "The time for action is now." That was true then. It is truer now. Let us act—with deliberate but effective speed.

Mr. President, I have made this statement today because I sincerely feel those of us who have joined as cosponsors of this proposed legislation have both a moral and political obligation to express our views at this very timely moment. The Houses of the Congress, both the Senate and the House of Representatives, have a responsibility to process the legislation and to bring it before us for debate and for a decision. I am hopeful the bill sponsored by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] and 17 of his colleagues, of which I am one, will be the basic structure of proposed law presented for Senate action, but whatever we may finally work on and whatever may be the final course of action, it is imperative that the Congress be given an opportunity to vote and to express its will in this vital field of human relations.

THE GENEVA CONFERENCE

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, the continued deadlock at Geneva only serves to emphasize the need for insisting upon sufficient latitude for our negotiators there. Congress cannot, of course, undertake to supplant the President in the conduct of these negotiations, nor can we direct their course from Capitol Hill. But we can and should suggest alternatives to the President, compatible with our national interests, that may prove useful in preventing the Geneva Conference from breaking up in failure.

With this purpose in mind, I took the floor of the Senate on March 2 to propose that the United States seek an agreement ending atmospheric tests only, within the framework of a trustworthy and sufficient international control system, should it become apparent that the broader objective, that of ending all types of nuclear testing, with adequate controls, is not now obtainable.

Reflecting a growing concern over the fate of the conference, a number of newspapers have editorialized the proposal I have offered. Several of these editorials have come to my attention. Two of them were published in newspapers of my State, the Lewiston Tribune of March 8, and the Caldwell Times of March 12. Another was published in the St. Louis Post Dispatch of March 8, while a fourth was published in the Washington Post and Times Herald on March 9.

I ask unanimous consent that these editorials, together with a letter of mine to the Washington Post and Times Herald, dated March 9, be printed in the RECORD at this point, in the order in which I have referred to them.

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

[From the Lewiston (Idaho) Morning Tribune, Mar. 8, 1959]

MUST FAILURE BE THE FRUITS OF GENEVA?

Those who have been watching it agree that if anything is to be salvaged from the stalled Geneva Conference it had better be soon; American delegates to the three-power talks on a nuclear-test ban were saying 2 weeks ago that they may as well pack their bags, and the United States is now believed ready at any time to call the delegates home.

Although talks have been under way since last October, nothing has been accomplished so far and it is questionable whether after this long anything can be salvaged. The United States and Great Britain are insisting that they will not agree to stop testing bombs until the Russians have agreed to an adequate inspection plan; the Soviet Union will not agree to the Western inspection plan because, the Russians say, it would permit spies to run all over the Soviet Union on the pretense that they were investigating explosions. The two sides have been at this standoff since last October, and there has been no indication lately that either side is going to give in. It has been suggested that Prime Minister Macmillan's conversations with Premier Khrushchev might improve the chances of ultimate agreement and that the United States would not seek to recess the Geneva Conference until after hearing Mr. Macmillan's report on the talks at Moscow. That report is expected soon, and it is possible that immediately thereafter, the U.S. delegates at Geneva may really pack their bags and call it quits.

Considering the worsening state of the world's atmosphere, this would be a calamity. In an attempt to avert it, Senator FRANK CHURCH, Democrat of Idaho, has proposed a compromise which could save something of value out of the crucial Geneva Conference. The Church formula, which was circulated within the State Department and later offered in a Senate speech, has received less publicity than it deserves, for it is apparently the best remaining hope for some sort of immediate nuclear order in the world. CHURCH told the Senate:

"As a last resort, to attempt the avoidance of a total failure, I strongly urge that the United States make this final proposal: An agreement to suspend further nuclear weapons tests in the earth's atmosphere, within the framework of a trustworthy and sufficient international control system, adequate to reliably detect and report any violation. Such a proposal would exclude for the present any agreement involving suspension or control of nuclear tests occurring underground, underwater, or in outer space, none of which contribute to the pollution of the air, the grave cause of so much concern."

Senator CHURCH actually is suggesting that the West no longer insist upon a corps of inspectors inside Russia, thereby meeting the Soviet Union's principal criticism of the Western inspection plan. For it is only to monitor underground or underwater blasts that such teams would be required; nuclear explosions in the atmosphere can be detected by instruments a great distance away.

This would give the United States and Great Britain—and the rest of the world, for that matter—much more than half a loaf. Should the Church plan be adopted and adhered to, the steady increase in aerial contamination would immediately cease, for it is the explosions in the atmosphere—those which would be monitored—that are causing it. Out of nothing, we should have got a respite of the world's most terrifying present burden: the fear of the gradual poisoning of the air we all must breathe.

The proposal has another advantage, and in this way is an improvement upon the suggestion Senator GORE, Democrat, of Tennessee, offered last year: It would make the benefits of test suspension the fruits of negotiation rather than of unilateral action. Senator GORE had proposed that in the absence of an agreement the United States should announce that it was suspending its nuclear tests, and do so, reserving the option to begin them again if the Russians should continue theirs. If this plan worked, the effect upon the atmosphere would be the same as the effect of the Church plan. But it would not mark any advance toward the main goal—disarmament—since there would have been no negotiation and subsequent agreement involved. An effective disarmament will require a great deal of difficult negotiation over a long period, and success will not come all at once but by degrees. "Progress will come fitfully, in little steps," CHURCH told the Senate. If there is a possibility of salvaging any agreement at all out of the Geneva Conference every effort should be made to achieve it, for every conference that ends in failure turns the clock back, while each successful conversation, no matter how inadequate of itself, marks a stride forward on the road to survival.

Finally, there is the matter of America's responsibility to the world as the first and greatest atomic power. The United States probably has had more to do than any other nation with the pollution of the atmosphere, and it owes the rest of humanity a little more effort—and a little more compromise if necessary—in keeping the planet clean. CHURCH told the Senate:

"If Geneva is to fail in its objective of creating a broad international control system that could adequately police the suspension of all furher nuclear weapons tests, the responsibility for that failure will be clearly Russian. But if such an eventuality cannot be avoided, I would earnestly hope that my country would make one final effort to salvage something of value, for humanity's sake, from the long labors that have brought us to this conference table."

It is possible that even the Church plan may not be acceptable to the Russians. But if we should offer it and they should turn it down, the world would know at once who is trying to negotiate and who is not. At any rate, this plan may be all the difference now between new hope and despair, not for us alone but for all the worried and endangered world. The conference table surely should not be abandoned without this last good effort.

[From the Caldwell Times, Mar. 12, 1959]

A CALL FOR SURVIVAL

Elsewhere in today's Times we present the full text of a major address delivered by Senator FRANK CHURCH on the floor of the U.S. Senate. Throughout the Nation, but not in Idaho, the Senator's speech received the attention it deserved. The exception in the Gem State was the Lewiston Tribune, whose editorial comment we reprint below.

We will not comment upon the lack of coverage of Senator CHURCH's speech. Suffice it to say that rarely, if ever, has an Idaho Senator spoken on a subject more vital to the survival not only of civilization, but of mankind itself. Living in proximity to the Nevada nuclear testing grounds, the subject is of crucial importance to Idaho.

There appears to be almost universal agreement that atmospheric radiation, atomic fallout, and nuclear byproducts are at least contributing factors in the tragic spread of cancer. Cancer is one of the most feared killers of our population. All its causes are not known, but radiation created by nuclear explosion has been established as one of many.

Tests on atmospheric conditions all over the United States have proven the increase in dangerous radioactivity in the air we breathe. Analyses conducted on wheat, milk and other basic foods have discovered alarmingly increased quantities of poisonous carcinogenic substances—such as strontium 90.

There is widespread agreement that a future nuclear war would leave no victors and no vanquished as atomic radiation would poison all mankind.

However, it will not take a nuclear war to cause radioactive death. Increasing tests of nuclear devices will, in the long run, cause a lingering extermination of the human race.

For that reason, the United States, Great Britain and Soviet Russia have been in conference since October 1958 to arrive at a ban on atomic testing.

The facts of Russian performance being what history has shown them to be, the West must insist on adequate guarantees to assure performance of any ban agreement. Russia, on the other hand, ever suspicious of the West, balks at full inspection.

The virtue of Senator CHURCH's suggestion is that the most dangerous experiments would be banned, while atomic experimentation could continue in part. Where underground and underwater detonations could be concealed without full inspection, open air detonations are detectable anywhere. And it is this type of nuclear test which is most poisonous, most destructive and most dangerous.

Enforcement of the ban would be easy. Any station even in the United States could ascertain an open air atomic blast in Russia. The Russians would have the same protection. The very danger of this type of test thus gives mankind the means of control.

Other types of nuclear work could proceed, subject to future agreement. However, the most immediate danger could be curbed.

We strongly urge that Senator CHURCH's proposal be presented to the conferees at Geneva.

Even if Senator CHURCH never again offers a major bill, the people of Idaho, the United States, and all other nations will have cause to thank the Gem State for sending him to Washington.

[From the St. Louis Post Dispatch, Mar. 8, 1959]

GENEVA'S 11TH HOUR

The Geneva Conference on suspension of nuclear tests is generally thought to be near a breakdown. After 4 months of talks, the great barrier to agreement remains what it was at the beginning—not the technical problem of devising a detection system to police a test ban, but the political problem of agreeing on international control and inspection.

Is the conference to be permitted to die with a whimper? The consequences would be so serious that every conceivable effort is called for to avoid such a tragic ending. This is the hour for a supreme act of statesmanship.

Senator FRANK CHURCH, of Idaho, proposed last week that, rather than accept total failure, our Government should offer to sign an agreement for the cessation of atmospheric explosions only. He felt that it might be possible to establish an international inspection system for such a partial test suspension now, and later extend it to cover underground, underwater, and outer space explosions. His plan is similar to that of Senator GORE, who suggested a unilateral suspension of atmospheric explosions for 3 years during which an attempt would be made to negotiate a controlled agreement.

Either the Church plan or the Gore plan would be better than nothing, but before resorting to them the West ought, we think, to make a supreme effort to solve the basic problem which blocks agreement on a full-fledged treaty—the problem of the veto in the control commission.

In a limited sense, something like the Gore and Church plans is already in effect. A de facto suspension of tests has been operative ever since the Russian's last explosions early in December. The nuclear powers have a duty to do better if they can.

Britain and America have been arguing for a control commission composed of seven nations—three Western, two Communist, and two neutral—which would operate by majority vote except in certain cases. Unanimity of the three nuclear powers would be required—which is to say that decisions could be vetoed—for the appointment of an administrator, the selection of sites for control posts, amendment of the treaty, and changes in operating methods of the inspection system. tOher decisions would be by majority vote.

But the Russians are afraid that the majority might be pro-Western and anti-Soviet. Their fear may be groundless, but it is understandable, for the majority would almost inevitably be non-Communist. If the shoe were on the other foot, would be the U.S. Senate ratify a treaty calling for a control commission ruled by a majority of Communist nations?

It is this impasse that requires an act of statesmanship to resolve. How to set up a truly international control commission which can function, and yet will not serve the interest of any particular nation. Perhaps the basis for a solution can be found in enlarging the role of neutrals on the commission, and in making any national obstruction of its operations cause for abrogation of the treaty.

Suppose a test ban were in effect, policed by a commission composed of the three nuclear powers and four neutrals. Suppose a control station detected earth shocks which led the inspectors to believe a nuclear explosion might have taken place in country X. The commission majority votes to send a survey party to the site. Country X votes "No" and bars the way. Would not that very act amount to verification of the commission's suspicions? Would it not amount to prima facie evidence that the treaty had been violated? And would not the other parties then be fully justified in withdrawing from the treaty, in taking measures against the violator, and in resuming tests of their own—especially if the treaty itself provided for self-abrogation in such event?

Perhaps the Geneva impasse is insoluble by any means. But Prime Ministers Macmillan and Khrushchev bound themselves last week to continue striving for "an agreement to stop nuclear weapons tests under an effective system of international inspection and control." The world cannot afford to let the conference die without the utmost effort to reach that goal.

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 9, 1959]

IF THE GENEVA TALKS FAIL

Senator CHURCH has proposed a useful plan for the suspension of atmospheric tests of nuclear weapons, but its application ought to be delayed so long as there is any hope of agreement with the Soviet Union at Geneva on an inspection system. Mr. CHURCH's plan is similar to the proposal last November by Senator GORE to end tests which produce substantial radioactive fallout while continuing tests of small nuclear weapons underground. The difficulty with this suggestion at the time was that it seemed to cast doubt upon the sincerity of the official American objective of an end to all nuclear weapon tests with an adequate inspection system. It also played into the hands of those who for varying reasons did not want a test ban.

The negotiations at Geneva have been placed under a cloud not only by Soviet intransigeance, but also by the new findings of American seismologists. These findings disputed the efficacy of the inspection system agreed upon in principle last summer to detect small weapon tests. Thus the United States has been in the position of having to argue against its position of last summer and in favor of a revised inspection system to exempt tests below a threshold of 20 kilotons of explosive force.

Whether this change of position has been the determining factor in the stalemate may be doubted, inasmuch as the Russians were raising objections even before the new findings were disclosed. The Soviet Union seemingly is preoccupied with the specter of espionage by mobile teams at the inspection stations on its territory.

It is barely conceivable, however, that the Soviet Union might yet agree to a combination of the threshold and the 180 worldwide inspection stations originally envisaged if the inspection teams remained at the stations and did not move around the country. Possibly British Prime Minister Macmillan explored this point in Moscow. Such a system would be by no means as desirable as one that permitted full mobility, but monitoring devices nonetheless could detect explosions above the threshold—and agreement on such a basis could be helpful in establishing at least the principle of control.

Whatever happens at Geneva, it will be important to have some sort of suspension of atmospheric tests. The concern over radioactive fallout is far from a negligible consideration. Recent disclosures by the Atomic Energy Commission and the Public Health Service, an independent survey by Consumers Union and a study by an expert at the University of Minnesota have shown the increasing general level of strontium 90 deposits and the concentrations in milk and wheat. Perhaps the general safety margin has not been exceeded, but the disclosures are disconcerting when it is recognized that the fallout comes from past tests and the radiation levels are still rising.

Thus the Church and Gore suggestions commend themselves for prompt adoption if nothing more develops at Geneva. Unilateral renunciation of atmospheric tests might be unwise, but it certainly would be in order for the United States to propose suspension so long as the Soviet Union refrained from conducting atmospheric tests (and violations could easily be detected by present methods). First, however, it is important to exhaust the possibility of a broader suspension and detection system, however slim that possibility may now seem.

"IF GENEVA FAILS"

I agree with the view expressed in your March 9 editorial that proposals for the suspension of atmospheric (as distinguished from subterranean or extra-atmospheric) tests of nuclear weapons ought to be considered only if the negotiation as presently cast should appear certain to fail.

However, I believe you leave a somewhat erroneous impression of the proposal which I have made when you state that its application "ought to be delayed so long as there is any hope of agreement with the Soviet Union at Geneva on an inspection system."

I stated to the Senate on March 2, that "the commencement of an international control system is the sine qua non of man's progress toward any feasible disarmament * * * An international control system which functions, however limited its initial scope might be, is the urgent need."

My proposal was to seek "an agreement to suspend further nuclear tests in the earth's atmosphere, within the framework of

a trustworthy and sufficient international control system, adequate to reliably detect and report any violation." It was for a multilateral inspection agreement, not unilateral test cessation. Senator ALBERT GORE himself summarized this distinction:

"The * * * Senator from Idaho has omitted from his suggestion the unilateral action. [He] * * * has emphasized the importance of establishing an international control system. He has given more emphasis to it than I did in my proposal; and in that respect I believe he is correct. It would be an important first step. If we were to take this important first step, the conference might be saved from failure and other steps might become feasible."

Furthermore, my proposal was intended, as I told Acting Secretary Herter, "as a last resort, in order that the conference might not break up accomplishing nothing."

I hope that this letter will clarify the fact that I support the American position at Geneva and that I concur with you that the important thing is to get an agreement with the Soviet Union on an inspection system.

Perhaps we can achieve such an agreement if we limit its scope to atmospheric tests, the broader agreement having been found impossible. If we don't succeed, at least we will have undercut the position the Soviets have heretofore taken, and we will have made it more difficult for them to maintain the objections by which they now make agreement impossible.

FRANK CHURCH,
Senator from Idaho.

FOURTEENTH YEAR OF SUBJUGATION OF RUMANIA BY THE SOVIET UNION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, March 6 marked the 14th year of subjugation of Rumania by the Soviet Union. The tragic fate of the Rumanian people has saddened free men everywhere. Those of us who are fortunate enough to have the right to participate in free elections can only be appalled that since the Communist regime in Rumania was installed by violence by the Soviet Army in March, 1945, there has only been a government of Soviet agents retained in power there—and it has been retained through tremendous Soviet political and military pressure.

Rumania has been made to bear more than her share of Soviet vengeance and exploitation, and the iron grip of the Kremlin has been even more ruthless because Rumania possesses the largest oil fields in Europe and important deposits of uranium.

We hope and we pray that one day, not too distant, Rumania will once again become an independent state and that the love for freedom which lives in Rumanians everywhere will become a reality.

LAKE MICHIGAN WATER DIVERSION

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, there will be before the Senate for determination the question of the reference of the bill coming from the House of Representatives known as the water diversion bill, H.R. 1. In that respect, Mr. President, I have prepared an analysis of the reasons why the bill should be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate.

Mr. President, this is a matter of great interest to the people of the State of New York, especially the people of western New York. Therefore, pending the debate on the floor and the determination of the matter, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a memorandum I have prepared as to the reasons why the bill should be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

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

WATER DIVERSION—H.R. 1

At a time when the eyes of the whole world are upon us and we are in Berlin and elsewhere relying upon the scrupulous maintenance of our treaty obligations to preserve peace and security, we cannot ourselves ignore these obligations in any area—especially where the interests involved are those of Canada, one of our closest allies. This issue is now before us in the form of H.R. 1, to permit the diversion of additional water from Lake Michigan through the Chicago Canal, which was passed by the other body on Friday, March 13.

This bill is similar to S. 308, which has been lying on the Vice President's desk since it was introduced here, and again brings before the Senate a problem which we have considered on a number of prior occasions and which has twice resulted in Presidential vetoes. There are many objections to this legislation, which involves the water and property rights not only of all the States bordering on the Great Lakes and the Mississippi River Basin, but also those of our great and friendly neighbor to the north, Canada. Water cannot be taken out of the Great Lakes on the American side without adversely affecting the water level on the Canadian side, too.

We should not take such action without considering the effect on our foreign relations, not merely with Canada, but with every other nation with whom we have obligations based upon treaty or past common interest and which would be watching carefully how we honor these obligations. In the field of water rights alone, we have a number of other agreements, such as those with Mexico regarding the Rio Grande and Rio Colorado, with Canada as to a number of the border lakes, the Columbia and St. Lawrence Rivers and Niagara Falls, and with the Republic of Panama involving the water required for the Panama Canal. We also have many other areas of joint interest with Canada at this very moment in which negotiations are under way and which will be affected by the approach we take in this matter. These include areas of international trade, finance, and defense policy, and such specific matters as tolls on the Welland Canal, Columbia River development, and St. Lawrence Seaway power.

The aspect of this legislation involving the interests of Canada is the one to which the least study has been devoted in past committee consideration, and the note of the Canadian Government of February 20, 1959, clearly puts this issue before us. In a reply to a State Department request for its views, the Government of Canada indicated that:

"Any authorization for an additional diversion would be incompatible with the arrangements for the St. Lawrence Seaway and power development, and with the Niagara Treaty of 1950, and would be prejudicial to navigation and power development which these mutual arrangements were designed to improve and facilitate.

"The point has been made repeatedly by Canada that every withdrawal of water from the basin means less depth available for shipping in harbors and in channels. Additional withdrawals would have adverse effects on the hydroelectric generation potential on both sides of the border at Niagara Falls and in the international section of the St. Lawrence River, as well as in the Province of Quebec, and would inflict hardship on communities and industries on both sides of the border."

The Government of Canada therefore protests against the implementation of proposals contained in H.R. 1.

The question which we now have before us is whether this legislation is to be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, where these problems can receive direct consideration in the light of our foreign policy problems with Canada and other countries, or to the Committee on Public Works, where similar legislation has gone in the past, and which does not have foreign relations jurisdiction. I believe that a referral to the Foreign Relations Committee will serve the best interests of the Senate and of the entire Nation.

One of the strongest arguments which may be made for such a referral is the fact that sending this bill to the Committee on Public Works, as was done in the past, can add nothing new. The Public Works Committee undertook a detailed study of the public works aspects of these proposals in the last Congress, and we have available to us the report of the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], in reporting a similar bill to the Senate. A similar referral of this bill will again leave the Senate without a report on the effect of such unilateral action by the United States on our relations with the Canadian Government, the Canadian people, and the governments and peoples of other nations of the free world which may take this as a precedent.

A look at the specific jurisdiction of the Committee on Foreign Relations in rule XXV shows that it is charged with consideration of matters dealing with "relations of the United States with foreign nations generally," with "treaties," and with the "establishment of boundary lines between the United States and foreign nations." What could be a better description of the issues involved in this bill? In contrast, nowhere in the rules relating to the Committee on Public Works is there any jurisdiction to look into the effect of propositions before it on the rights of foreign nations and upon our international relations generally.

Let us be clear about one thing. This is not an ordinary situation involving navigation, waterpower, pollution control or rivers and harbors. We cannot treat it as if it were. It is a matter which can throw a serious monkey wrench into our relations, at least with a nation like Canada whose friendship is signified by an open border thousands of miles long.

I would like to remind the Members of the Senate of some words spoken here by the distinguished senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] on the last day of the 85th Congress, when we last discussed this matter. He said:

"I am greatly disturbed over the type of discussion which is taking place with regard to the Chicago diversion bill. * * * A cold war is being waged everywhere with tension high in foreign countries, even in the Western Hemisphere. This afternoon the mutual security bill, which calls for many agreements with foreign countries, was passed. We already have agreements with other countries all over the world. While we are considering these agreements and talking about more agreements, it seems incredible that here, on the Senate floor, intelligent Members of this body would stand up and deliberately talk about violating a treaty with another country. Perhaps we take Canada for granted; but I do not believe Canada takes for granted the treaty we made with her 49 years ago.

"As we deliberate here tonight, I cannot help but think of the impact on the rest of

the world when Members of the Senate talk about friendships and then advocate taking resources from one of their best friends, Canada. I think we all agree Canada is that. What would be the effect on the Arab States and the Latin American States? Would they not be justified in saying, 'What is the use of making any agreement with the United States if they are not going to observe their agreements?' "

I would like to associate myself with these comments, for they clearly point out that this is a matter affecting deeply the foreign relations of this Nation, not only with respect to Canada, but as to the entire world.

I would also like to point out that any doubt as to Canadian views respecting this legislation have been resolved in the recent exchange of notes between our two nations. This is certainly no time for our Nation to treat such an expression of Canadian views lightly.

GROWTH OF SOCIAL WELFARE EXPENDITURES UNDER FEDERAL PROGRAMS

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, "Federal Spending Facts," a bulletin which deals with the budget and spending and states fairly well the shape we are in financially at the present time.

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

THE GROWTH OF SOCIAL WELFARE EXPENDITURES UNDER FEDERAL PROGRAMS

The great depression of the 1930's saw the Federal Government for the first time assuming a major role in social welfare activities. In fact, the Government in those years not only assumed primary responsibility for promoting and providing funds for welfare programs, but it actually made such programs the major activity of the Government itself. This is evident from the fact that the Roosevelt administration in its first two terms spent more money, and probably more official time, on social welfare than on any other matter including defense. But even then, expenditures under Federal welfare programs during the Roosevelt years were modest, indeed, when compared to amounts in recent years.

Expenditures which can properly be classified as social welfare totaled approximately $3 billion in each of the fiscal years 1935 and 1940. In Roosevelt's last year, fiscal 1945, they were only $2.3 billion, with the reduction being due to elimination of work relief spending which bulked large in the 1935 and 1940 totals. By 1950, however, the total had risen to $7 billion. During the next five years these expenditures rose over $5 billion more to $12.2 billion. And by 1960 the total will have risen an additional $9.4 billion to $21.5 billion.

With the exception of the 1960 amount, the above totals have been computed from analyses of social welfare expenditures which the U.S. Social Security Administration has prepared for the 1935–57 period. The 1960 figure was computed from estimates in the 1960 Federal budget. All of the programs which are included in this analysis as social welfare are also included in the Social Security Administration's analyses. But two categories of expenditures which are included in the latter are excluded from this study. They are expenditures for public and veterans' education programs, and operating and capital expenditures for military medical programs. The purpose of these exclusions is to bring the field encompassed by this study closer to popular conceptions of what constitutes social welfare activities.

DIRECT BENEFIT PAYMENTS ACCOUNT FOR BULK OF THE EXPENDITURES

By far the greater portion of the total expenditures under Federal social welfare programs has been in the form of direct benefit payments as contrasted to welfare services. With the exception of relatively small amounts of surplus food distributed to needy persons as direct relief, all of the direct benefit payments have been in cash. These direct benefit programs include the three payroll tax supported programs, namely, old-age, survivors, and disability insurance, railroad retirement, and railroad unemployment and disability insurance. They also include Federal civilian and military personnel retirement, unemployment benefit programs, workmen's compensation, veterans' compensation and pensions, public assistance, and work relief, and direct relief of needy persons.

The welfare services, as distinguished from direct benefit payments, include all types of health, hospital, and medical care programs except military medical and hospital activities. They also include the cost of financing administration of State employment security programs, vocational rehabilitation, school-lunch and child-welfare programs, public housing contributions, and several miscellaneous programs.

Following are the outlays for social welfare under Federal programs, segregated between direct benefit payments and welfare services, for selected years from 1935 to 1960:

[In millions]

	Direct benefit payments	Welfare services	Total
1935	$2,863	$79	$2,942
1940	2,976	219	3,195
1945	1,814	458	2,272
1950	5,040	1,954	6,994
1955	10,421	1,789	12,210
1956	11,671	1,952	13,623
1957	13,288	2,212	15,500
1958	15,579	2,332	17,911
1959 estimate	17,747	2,510	20,257
1960 estimate	18,939	2,607	21,546

OUTLAYS FOR RETIREMENT AND RELATED PROGRAMS RISING RAPIDLY

The growing numbers of eligible beneficiaries and repeated liberalizations of benefits have caused a sharp increase in expenditures under the Federal programs which provide retirement benefits to workers and death benefits to survivors of deceased workers. Included in this category are the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance program which also provides benefits for permanent and total disability, railroad retirement and Federal civilian and military personnel retirement.

Here is how expenditures under these programs have risen since 1935:

[In millions]

	OASDI	Railroad retirement	Federal personnel retirement	Total
1935			$90	$90
1940	$28	$117	107	252
1945	267	145	185	597
1950	784	304	433	1,521
1955	4,436	576	799	5,811
1956	5,485	603	935	7,023
1957	6,666	707	1,039	8,412
1958	8,247	730	1,145	10,122
1959 estimate	9,640	769	1,360	11,769
1960 estimate	10,745	815	1,545	13,105

The OASDI and railroad retirement programs are financed by payroll taxes divided equally between the employer and his employees. Self-employed persons under OASDI pay three-fourths of the combined employer-employee tax rate. Federal civilian employees' retirement and related benefits are financed by equal contributions of the Government and its employees, and military retirement benefits are financed entirely by the Government through annual appropriations.

The payroll tax or contribution rates of each of these programs have been increased several times since their inception. Also, the taxable wage base of both the OASDI and railroad retirement programs has been increased from the original base, with the OASDI wage base having been raised three times from the original level of $3,000 per year to the present level of $4,800. These increases in tax or contribution rates and in the wage base were effected in order to cover the growth in expenditures which has resulted from maturing of the programs and from repeated liberalization of benefits.

APPROPRIATIONS-FINANCED PROGRAMS ALSO SHOW BIG GROWTH

The Federal role in the 1930's was largely the provision of work relief and surplus food to the needy. Expenditures for these purposes in 1935 were $2,374 million, or 83 percent of total direct benefit payments in that year. Most of the remainder was accounted for by $390 million expenditures for veterans' compensation and pensions. By 1940 expenditures for work relief and other direct relief were down to $1,965 million, or 66 percent of total welfare benefit payments. Much of the reduction from 1935 was offset by the $279 million 1940 expenditures under the public assistance programs which were created by the Social Security Act of 1935. Veterans' compensation and pensions also rose somewhat to $448 million in 1940.

From 1945 on there have been no work relief programs, and other direct relief has remained at relatively modest levels under $100 million annually. But Federal expenditures for public assistance and for compensation and pensions have been rising significantly, as the following table shows:

[In millions]

	1945	1950	1955	1958	1960
Public assistance	$418	$1,096	$1,441	$1,760	$2,053
Veterans' compensation and pensions	756	2,093	2,712	3,140	3,350

A major portion of the public assistance expenditures each year is accounted for by the old-age assistance program. This program was created by Congress for the primary purpose of assisting needy aged people who would not be eligible for benefits under the OASI program for lack of wage credits. Thus, it was originally intended that the old-age assistance program would be temporary and would decline in importance and cost as the OASI program began to mature. But this has not occurred. On the contrary, the program's caseload remains at higher levels than during its first 10 years of existence and each year sees a new record of expenditures. Including costs of administration, Federal grants for old-age assistance have grown from $229 million in 1940 to $335 million in 1945, $825 million in 1950, $934 million in 1955, $1,058 million in 1958, and an estimated $1,157 million in 1960.

The principal factors accounting for the rapid growth of Federal expenditures for old-age assistance during the past two decades of almost continuous high employment have been the repeated liberalizations of the Federal matching formula and increases in the maximum State payments for which Federal matching funds are provided. From an original concept of 50–50 Federal-State matching, which was retained until 1946, the Federal share has been increased to four-fifths of the first $30 of the average monthly payment per recipient, plus up to 65 percent of the remaining average payments up to $65.

OTHER DIRECT BENEFIT PAYMENT PROGRAMS

In addition to the aforementioned major social welfare programs, there are several lesser Federal programs under which direct benefit payments are made. These include railroad unemployment insurance financed by a tax on employers and railroad disability insurance financed by employer-employee contributions. They also include unemployment benefits for veterans and Federal employees, and Federal employees' workmen's compensation, all of which are financed from general revenues.

Overall expenditures under these lesser programs were relatively small through 1945. In 1950 they totaled $324 million, and since 1955 they have ranged from a low of $268 million in 1956 to a high of $429 million in 1958, with the amounts depending largely on conditions of unemployment each year.

EXPENDITURES FOR WELFARE SERVICES RISING STEADILY

Expenditures for social welfare services totaled only $79 million in 1935. In the next 10 years they rose at a relatively modest rate to $219 million in 1940 and $458 million in 1945. After World War II, however, these expenditures rose sharply to $1,954 million in 1950, with most of the increase being accounted for by hospital, medical care, and other welfare programs for veterans.

In 1955 expenditures for welfare services receded to $1,789 million with veterans' programs accounting for all of the decrease. Since that year, however, the total has risen steadily with all programs participating in the rise as is shown below:

[In millions]

	Veterans' hospital and medical	Other health services	School lunch and child welfare	Administration of State employment security programs	Other welfare services	Total
1955	$755	$371	$177	$223	$263	$1,789
1956	751	424	235	236	306	1,952
1957	770	566	299	249	328	2,212
1958	804	642	250	296	340	2,332
1959 estimate	852	726	260	300	372	2,510
1960 estimate	887	747	260	312	401	2,607

With one exception, all of the above programs are financed from general tax revenue. The exception is the program of grants to the States for administration of their employment security programs which include unemployment compensation and public employment service operations. Technically, the funds for these grants also come from general revenues but their source is generally considered as being the Federal unemployment tax which is three-tenths percent of covered payrolls.

The most important of the other welfare services in the above table is the low-rent housing subsidy program. Under this program annual Federal contributions are made to cover the difference between rental income and operating costs (including debt service) of public housing projects. These public housing contributions have been rising steadily since the first projects were built pursuant to the Housing Act of 1937. They were quite modest until 1950 when they still amounted to only $12 million. Thereafter, however, annual contributions rose substantially due to the large number of projects built under the 1949 Housing Act. By 1958 the program cost $110 million and the estimate for 1960 is $137 million. Even without authorization of additional public housing units, these annual subsidies will rise for some years to come, and they will be a budget burden for the remainder of this century.

SOCIAL WELFARE EXPENDITURES IN THE YEARS AHEAD

Overall expenditures for social welfare under Federal programs will continue to grow substantially for many years to come even if no new programs should be started and if none of the existing programs should be liberalized further. This future expenditures growth is assured by the process of maturing of certain major programs such as OASDI railroad retirement, Federal civilian and military personnel retirement, and veterans' pensions. The Congress has no control over these expenditures through the annual appropriations process. So, the only way they could be reduced below levels they will otherwise reach would be through revising basic legislation to cut benefit amounts, or to tighten up on eligibility for benefits, or both. But except for some possible revisions in the veterans' pension laws, such a reversal of past liberalization trends in these programs can hardly be expected.

Assuming no further liberalization of benefits and assuming a constant level of wages and salaries, expenditures under the Federal retirement and pension programs will grow as follows according to actuarial estimates:

[In millions]

	1960	1965	1970	1975	1980
Old-age and survivors insurance	$10,237	$12,532	$15,251	$18,008	$21,145
Federal disability insurance	508	824	1,082	1,282	1,413
Civilian personnel retirement	825	1,320	1,540	1,870	2,090
Military personnel retirement	720	890	1,200	1,500	1,620
Railroad retirement	815	955	1,009	1,084	1,152
Veterans' pensions	1,213	1,516	1,665	1,873	2,275
Total, pension programs	14,318	18,037	21,747	25,617	29,695

The figures in the above table for old-age and survivors insurance and for Federal disability insurance are intermediate-cost estimates of Social Security Administration actuaries. The administrative costs included in the totals have been adjusted in recognition of the 1958 civil service salary increase. The civilian personnel retirement figures are based on 1957 actuarial estimates of the Civil Service Commission with 10 percent upward adjustments for the 1958 salary increase. Military personnel retirement projections are based on 1953 actuarial estimates of the Defense Department with 15 percent upward adjustments taking into account military pay increases of 1955 and 1958 and retirement experience since 1953. The projections for railroad retirement and veterans' pensions are the latest actuarial estimates of the Railroad Retirement Board and the Veterans Administration respectively.

Of the other social welfare programs, two major ones should begin to decline in cost because of decreasing case loads; provided, of course, that benefits are not further liberalized. They are the old-age assistance and veterans compensation for service-connected disabilities and death. With reference to old-age assistance and other public assistance programs, the President stated in his 1960 budget message that an advisory council was being appointed to study them with a view to shifting a larger share of the responsibility for them to the States and localities.

Most of the remaining social welfare programs have been showing a growth trend during each of the last 5 years or more. It is particularly pronounced in health, hospital and medical programs exclusive of veterans programs. In the aggregate they have doubled in 5 years from 1955 expenditures of $371 million to a 1960 estimate of $747 million. The growth in other welfare services has been steady but not so pronounced. How these health and other welfare services programs will grow, or recede, in the years ahead is impossible to predict since there is no actuarial basis for them as there is for the various pension or retirement programs.

PRESSURES CONTINUE FOR NEW AND BIGGER WELFARE PROGRAMS

In the span of just 10 years from 1950 to 1960, outlays for Federal social welfare programs will have tripled from $7 billion to $21.5 billion. Moreover, they will continue to grow at a rapid rate under existing laws for several more decades. But in spite of the tremendous growth in welfare expenditures already recorded and predictable in the years ahead, pressures are being brought to bear on Congress for expansion of existing programs, liberalization of present benefits, and creation of new programs.

It would doubtless be found from an examination of all bills introduced in this session of Congress that they include not only some new welfare programs but also measures for expansion or liberalization of benefits with respect to every single program covered in this study. Some of these proposals which will receive more than perfunctory consideration in the present Congress include:

1. Liberalization of existing OASDI benefits.
2. A new program of hospital and surgical benefits for persons on the OASI benefit rolls.
3. Liberalization of railroad retirement and unemployment benefits.
4. Liberalization of civilian and military personnel retirement.
5. Liberalization of veterans compensation and pensions.
6. Liberalization of public assistance.
7. Authorization of additional public housing units which would accelerate the rise in annual public housing subsidy contributions.
8. Increased appropriations (above the budget) for all types of health, hospital, and medical programs.
9. Increased appropriations for school lunches and a variety of other welfare services.

It is to be hoped that in considering proposals like those above, the Congress will look not only to their desirability in the eyes of proponent groups, but also to their actual need, their cost, and the effect on the economy of financing their cost. In considering these factors, Congress should not overlook the fact that additional taxes will be needed in the years ahead to finance expenditure growth which is already built into existing programs. A case in point is the OASDI tax which within 10 years will rise from 2½ to 4½ percent each on employer and employee and from 3¾ to 6¾ percent on the self-employed.

EUGENE F. RINTA,
Research Director.

PROPOSED CIVIL RIGHTS LEGISLATION—TESTIMONY OF SENATOR THURMOND BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, today the able and distinguished junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND] testified before the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary in opposition to the so-called civil rights bills under consideration by that group. His presentation was eloquent and convincing, and I ask unanimous consent that the text of his remarks be printed herewith in the body of the RECORD.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR THURMOND BEFORE CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS SUBCOMMITTEE OF SENATE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE MARCH 18, 1959

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I wish to comment in detail on the lack of merit of each of the so-called civil rights proposals under consideration by your committee. I shall address myself to the detailed provisions, subject by subject. First, however, I would like to comment briefly on the philosophy which apparently breeds such proposals.

The philosophy of which I shall speak is responsible for all of the bills on this subject, directly or indirectly, but is most evident in the provisions of S. 810. This proposal is extreme. It is punitive. It is flagrantly abusive. It is palpably and viciously anti-Southern. It would, in effect, treat the South as a conquered province, to be ruled over, insofar as race relations are concerned, by a czar in the person of the Attorney General of the United States. It is, in every respect, a conquered province bill.

That the bill has this sweeping purpose is not surprising to me, in view of the curious attitude exhibited toward the South by those who adhere to the philosophy which bred it. On occasions, I have heard those enslaved to this philosophy, when speaking with regard to the South's effort to turn aside, or at least to soften, some of the more extreme legislative blows aimed at it, remark, somewhat ruefully, that they sometimes wonder just which side did win the Civil War. Such a remark, spoken in a serious manner, reflects, I repeat, a curious attitude—an attitude which seems to be that the North, having been victorious in war, should by right, or might, have a free hand to work its will on the South; and that there is something altogether unreasonable, almost outrageous, or shocking—about the South actively offering any objections. There would seem to be almost a sort of resentment that the South should offer any resistance at all to Northern efforts to remake the South or to write new laws for it.

This strange attitude toward the South—which has become increasingly noticeable on the part, not only of certain political figures, but of various editors, authors, professors, and national labor leaders—is reminiscent of the attitude which prevailed in the North after the War Between the States and even long after Reconstruction.

This attitude on the part of the North was very ably described by a southern scholar, Frank Lawrence Owsley, who wrote on the subject nearly three decades ago. Mr. Owsley wrote:

"After the South had been conquered by war and * * * impoverished by peace, there still appeared to remain something which made the South different—something intangible, incomprehensible, in the realm of the spirit. That too must be invaded and destroyed; so there commenced a second war of conquest, the conquest of the southern mind, calculated to remake every southern opinion, to impose the northern way of life and thought upon the South, write "error" across the pages of southern history which were out of keeping with the northern legend, and set the rising and unborn generations upon stools of everlasting repentance. Francis Wayland, former president of Brown University, regarded the South as 'the new missionary ground for the national schoolteacher,' and President Hill of Harvard looked forward to the task for the North 'of spreading knowledge and culture over the regions that sat in darkness.' "

Wayland and Hill, of course, dealt with what might be called the educational and cultural front. Their counterparts on the political and governmental front were Thaddeus Stevens of Pennsylvania and Charles Sumner of Massachusetts; and the theoretical rationalization of the line of thinking—or of malice—on which Stevens and Sumner operated, in dealing with the South, is known as the "conquered province" theory. In essence, this theory held that the South, having been defeated in war, was a "conquered province," to be dealt with by the victorious North as the North saw fit.

The whole curious attitude toward the South reflects, it seems to me, something of this same attitude of treating the South as a conquered province. Certainly this bill, emphasizing as it does the forcible integration of southern schools, proceeds upon that theory. Certainly, beyond any possible dispute, this bill makes a mockery of the fundamental and once cherished principle, apparently now discarded from our governmental system of "government by the consent of the governed."

Speaking of this idea of "consent of the governed," I sometimes wonder if it has ever occurred to those Senators and others who are constantly proposing new methods of integrating southern schools that the people of each and every one of the Southern States could, at any time they should so wish, either through their legislatures or through amendment of their State constitutions, abolish segregation of the races in any sphere of activity controlled by their State? I further wonder if it occurs to the Senators that the reason why these States have not taken this action is that the overwhelming majority of the people of these States do not wish to take such action? I further wonder if it occurs to the Senators that, whatever may be the opinion of the majority of the people of the North as to integration, to force the integration of southern schools in the face of the obvious and manifest opposition of the overwhelming majority of the southern people, is the very negation of the principle of "government by consent of the governed"?

The philosophy, which breeds a conquered province bill, is a disgrace to our country's heritage. No such attitude has reared its ugly head after any other war in which we have engaged. Our attitude toward the Axis' powers following World War II was magnanimous. Yet, the conquered province bill is the offspring of the same philosophy which prompts Russia's treatment of its East European conquests and which we heartily—and correctly—condemn and deplore. Is the outgrowth of this philosophy any less despicable when evidenced in our own land? It would not be remiss to apply the words of the third verse of the seventh chapter of St. Matthew, "And why beholdest thou the mote that is in thy brother's eye, but considerest not the beam that is in thine own eye?" I sincerely hope that objectivity and reason will triumph over the philosophy which bred this conquered province bill, for only this mother philosophy can nurture the offspring, and without this philosophy the bill will die as it justly deserves.

I turn now to the lack of merit of the various proposals. Two of the proposals pending before the committee, specifically title I of S. 810, and S. 958, provide in varying degree for the endorsement by Congress of the Supreme Court's desegregation decisions.

I will not discuss the demerits of those decisions beyond saying that they ignore the existence of the Tenth Amendment to the Constitution, the doctrine of stare decisis, and the wisdom of all previous Courts; they are based solely on erroneous sociological theories rather than law, and they are a living exemplification of the lack of judicial restraint which has characterized the present Court. I would address myself, rather, to the foreseeable effects of a congressional endorsement of these decisions.

The endorsement by Congress of a Court decision, would, in the first place, constitute an invasion by the legislative branch of the functions of the judicial branch of our Government. Is this to set the precedent for Congress to express its approval or disapproval of each controversial decision of the Court? If we are indeed to so intermingle the functions of the legislative and judicial branches, I suggest that the committee is remiss for not already entering into a study to express congressional opinion on the cases mentioned and referred to last fall by the State supreme court justices in their report on the recent decisions of the Supreme Court, and also the pronouncements on Internal Security decisions issued recently by the American Bar Association.

Obviously, this endorsement has no purpose except to heap coals on the fires of divisiveness created by the decisions. It is an effort to add insult to injury, and to insure that the tremendous setback to race relations is magnified and perpetuated. It is an effort to commit the Congress, once and for all, to a course of punitive and arbitrary action, devoid of reason and understanding. This proposal has no constructive purpose; it seeks not a solution of the problem, but rather a compounding of the problem.

In this regard, I would digress for a moment. The thought has occurred to me that history is repeating itself. At the time of the Civil War, and subsequently during Reconstruction, many elements promoted the belief, to a large extent successfully, that the cause of that war was the issue of slavery. Slavery was played up as an emotional issue, and while it was a contributing factor, the basic cause of the war lay in the economic field. I believe it is somewhat analogous that the recent sudden outburst of righteous indignation over segregation in the South just happens to coincide with the emergence of a rapid industrialization of the South, perhaps to the economic disadvantage of other sections of the country.

This endorsement is the most basic issue in the proposals before the committee, for the action on this issue will decide whether the hate-dominated conquered province philosophy, or reason and judgment, is to control.

I turn now to the subject of titles II and III of S. 810 and S. 958, which would authorize Federal financial assistance to schools which desegregate, and also put tighter reins on aid to schools in federally impacted areas. I realize that S. 958 is not technically before this committee, having been referred, and I believe correctly, to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. The provisions of titles II and III of S. 810 cover the same subject, albeit more expansively, and it occurs to me that this portion of the bill S. 810 is equally within the jurisdiction of the Labor and Public Welfare Committee. Since these provisions of S. 810 are part and parcel of the bill under consideration by this committee, I shall address myself to them, and my remarks are also applicable to the

provisions of S. 958. The fact that I comment on the proposals in no way alters my conclusion as to this committee's jurisdiction.

Essentially, these proposals embody the concept that the apparently prevailing god—money—shall be utilized to bring the South to forsake its principles. It is apparently based on the belief that bribery will accomplish what force and bayonets failed to secure.

I have long suspected that the descriptions of our foreign policy as "dollar diplomacy" were more truth than fiction. Having failed in foreign relations, dollar diplomacy would now be applied to race relations. There has long been a hint of bribery in the Federal programs, which have accomplished the surrender of invaluable individual rights with a sugar coating of Federal grants, but the bribe offer appears in this proposal unveiled and naked, clearly recognizable in its most despicable form.

I think it is fitting that this proposal comes at a time when the financial condition of the United States is so embarrassed that the bribes would have to be borrowed before being offered. I am reminded of the words of John Ruskin, that "Borrowers are nearly always ill-spenders, and it is with lent money that all evil is mainly done, and all unjust war protracted."

Titles IV and V of S. 810 apparently recognize that the bribery proposed in earlier provisions of the bill will not seduce the Southern people, for it provides that should the money-bait fail—and I assure you it would—there would be a return to force.

Education, in all aspects, would be turned over to the Federal Government, and administered by the Department of Health, Education and Welfare. The tool proposed to be utilized to accomplish this unconstitutional step is the so-called "desegregation plan." It would have the Secretary of HEW proceed as far as possible by use of intimidation and threats, and to complete the process with a court injunction.

While the demerits of this proposal are almost unlimited, the destruction of education itself looms largest. I recall the hearings last year before the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare on the National Defense Education Act. If there was one point upon which almost all witnesses, from every field agreed, it was the essentiality of local control of the schools. To be sure, there were differences on how to maintain local controls, and even to increase local interest, but from all came the admonition that without local control, education would perish. It should be obvious, then, that the death of education is inherent in any proposal, such as this, which would give control of education to a Federal bureaucrat. There is difficulty enough in attempting to maintain our educational process at a level on which we can survive the threat of Communism and other false ideologies. To sound the death knell of education would surely be a folly, most aptly described as "cutting off your nose to spite your face."

Titles VI and VII of S. 810 can most accurately be summarized as the "National Police State" proposals. They would crown the Attorney General of the United States as Czar. The stature of this official, as proposed here, would be the equivalent to that of 1984's "Big Brother," who would be the caretaker of everyone's rights.

Section 601 would give the Attorney General the power to bring so-called civil rights suits on behalf of individuals or groups and prosecute these suits at Government expense.

Have the laws of our country degenerated to such an extent that an individual can no longer bring legal actions to protect himself? Some may answer that question in the affirmative, but the negative answer was practically unanimous at the time it was asked in regard to the victims of labor violence and bossism. Why the about face? Traditionally, we have relied on the democratic philosophy that it was the duty of government to provide only the opportunity and machinery for our citizen to protect himself—and I might add, our historical approach has been successful. Such a benevolent attitude, as is proposed to be implemented here, could only stem from a belief that basically, the American citizen is suffering from disabilities that go to the very heart of the soundness of self-government. It smacks of the instigation of officious intermeddlers and even barratry itself.

Section 602 of S. 810 would authorize the Attorney General to seek injunctions in Federal courts to prevent interference with officials who were proceeding with desegregation.

The Attorney General would be crowned, not only as the protector of the individual, but as the champion and protector of Federal, State, and local officials. The Federal Government already has sufficient statutes on the books to deal effectively with anyone who interferes with Federal officers performing their duties, although the conclusion that these statutes are unknown to Federal officials is strengthened by the recent incident when bayonets of the Armed Forces were the first resort. Similarly, the States and local municipalities have laws protecting their own officials in the performance of their duties. If the latter be less stringent than those of the Federal Government, it is easily understandable, for the laws of the States and local municipalities are more in accord with the consent of the governed, and extreme measures are less essential to the enforcement of laws which are not so repugnant to the citizenry.

This provision, section 602 of S. 810, raises some additional questions by virtue of its shotgun approach. Would a local official be interfered with if he were subjected to recall? Is his retention in office, against the wishes of his constitutents, a part of the protection which Big Brother Attorney General is to provide? If the official be appointed, could the appointing authority be enjoined from removing this official for failure to adhere to local and State laws? These are but a few of the dangers of this proposal. Lest anyone be complacent from the knowledge that this measure is aimed at the South, let me remind you that there are such things as backfires, ricochets, and just plain misses which "accidentally" strike bystanders. If you will play with loaded guns to frighten your adversaries, don't be surprise if you get your head blown off.

There is another feature of this particular section, which is similar to that of S. 955. The provision to which I refer is the part that deals with "threats" concerning court desegregation decisions or orders. Section 602 of S. 810 would authorize the use of injunctions in this connection, while S. 955 would deal in criminal offenses. They have at least one demerit—and that is an understatement—in common. Both these provisions would abolish the free speech guaranteed by the 1st amendment to the Constitution, the former through the threat or use of the injunction, the latter by threat or use of criminal prosecution. In neither proposal is there any contingency or condition hinged to either the commission of an overt act or the setting of a time certain for committing an act—these being the two dividing lines which have always been utilized to distinguish the realm of free speech from punishable trespasses. This reckless disregard of constitutionally-guaranteed individual liberty is typical of the philosophy which spawns these so-called civil rights measures.

Another part of Title VI of S. 810, specifically Section 603, is designed to negate the operation of State police power. The very appearance of this section, composed of one all-inclusive 125-word sentence, brings to one's mind the word "camouflage." If the smoke-screen words are brushed aside, there emerges a diabolical plot, the deviousness of which can best be illustrated by a specific example of what is apparently contemplated. For example, this section could be employed to prevent a Bar Association Grievance Committee from investigating allegations of barratry. It could also be used by big brother Attorney General to prevent criminal prosecutions based on State statutes or local ordinances about which there can be no doubt of validity from a constitutional or other standpoint. The only favorable aspect of this provision is consistency, for it conforms to the other proposals in this bill by ignoring limitations on Federal Government jurisdiction as provided in the Constitution, as well as being in derogation of the most basic safeguards of individual liberty. If, perchance, some might conclude that my characterization of this section be in the extreme, consider the language which authorizes the Attorney General to seek injunctions, etc., against, "any individual or individuals, who under color of any statute, ordinance, regulation, custom or usage, deprives or threatens to deprive any person or group of persons, or association of persons, of any right guaranteed by the fourteenth amendment of the Constitution." It is truly a sacrilege to use the word "Constitution" in such a context.

About Section 604 of S. 810, I can only say that this would authorize the Attorney General, by intervening in law suits, to pose as a judicially-despised, officious intermeddler, in derogation of real-party-in-interest statutes of the various States.

The all-powerfulness of the big brother Attorney General is emphasized by the provision of Title VII of S. 810, which would nullify the laudatory judicial principle that all administrative remedies must be exhausted before resorting to litigation.

The next general category of these proposals on which I should like to comment is that connected with the bombing of schools and residences. Let me say initially that I deplore any resort to violence, and bombing is one of the most despicable examples of an unforgivable crime. Nevertheless, I oppose each and every one of the proposals pending before this committee which deal with this question.

Several approaches are advanced to empower the Federal Bureau of Investigation with jurisdiction in this field. All of them ignore the fact that this particular specie of crime, like any other crime, is a local matter, and can be most effectively controlled and prevented by local authorities. If the Federal police force is given jurisdiction, there will be a strong inclination on the part of local authorities to wash their hands of the matter. Responsibility must necessarily go hand in glove with authority, and separation of the two in the field of law enforcement will result in deterioration of its effectiveness.

S. 188 gives the Federal Bureau of Investigation original jurisdiction of bombing cases by use of a statutory presumption that bombings are accomplished with explosives transported in interstate commerce. It ignores the constitutional test which has always been applied to statutory presumptions—to wit, that they must be based on a succession of circumstances which would reasonably and logically lead to the presumption. This test applies despite the fact that a statutory presumption is, by statute, made rebuttable. In fact, the very definition of the word "presumption" implies a

quality of rebuttability, so that this qualification in the proposal has no material bearing on the question. It would be a completely unrealistic stretch of the imagination, falling in the category of pure speculation, to presume that for every explosion, the explosive used had been transported across State lines. Anyone who has had a course in elementary chemistry is aware that an explosive can be compounded with the simplest of materials, available in the raw state within the boundaries of almost every State in the Union. For example, one of the most powerful of nonatomic explosives is nitroglycerin. This substance, which is a liquid, is made by treating glycolic acid with nitric and sulphuric acid. Obviously, nitrogen and sulphur exist in the raw state almost everywhere. Glycolic acid, the other component of this explosive, while readily, and usually, produced artificially, exists ready-made in unripe grapes, and also in the leaves of a common plant pest, the Virginia Creeper. With these materials, and the instructions found in any book on elementary chemistry, anyone can produce an explosion of great proportions without any importations. I might add that this illustration is not nearly so absurd as is the proposed presumption contained in this bill.

Can anyone really believe that the commerce clause of the constitution can be stretched to this point without destroying that document? Why limit the jurisdiction of the FBI to crimes where explosives are used? Is there not just as much reason to presume that a murder committed with a knife or a gun could be related through the weapon to interstate commerce? The logic would be much sounder if applied to any crime in which the automobile was used as an instrument to flee the scene, or for that matter to get to the scene of the crime in the first place. If we adopt this jurisdictional standard, we will have erased all distinction as to a crime which comes exclusively within the jurisdiction of the State. The commerce clause was never intended for use as a wedge for criminal jurisdiction.

With reference to the approach of S. 499, which would make a Federal crime of interstate transportation of explosives with knowledge that they are to be used for bombings, it is sufficient to say that no conviction would ever result, due to the very essential requirement of knowledge of the ultimate use during interstate transportation. Its only result would be that described previously, which inevitably follows the shift in responsibility for law enforcement.

The provisions of S. 956, which would create a Federal offense for interstate flight to avoid prosecution for bombing, can best be characterized as totally unnecessary. There is not one example known to me where a person has avoided prosecution for bombing any structure by flight across State lines. There is no reason to believe that persons guilty of this crime, to any greater extent than persons guilty of other crimes, will flee over State lines to avoid prosecutions, nor that there is any less likelihood of their return through normal extradition procedure. In the absence of a death resulting from an explosion, there is in fact less reason to expect interstate flight, than there is in the event of a murder or other serious crime, the penalty for which is more severe—often death itself.

The Federal system of government has many advantages, most of which we do not fully appreciate, and indeed, to some of which we appear oblivious. The advantage of having the machinery, by which our Federal officials are chosen, divided, as to control, between 49 separate entities is so effective in preventing a perpetuation in office of a President, that its importance is often overlooked. The necessity for this safeguard can be realized, if one will but consider the political history of some of our larger cities. Through effective control of the election process, many a political machine has bled a city for years, despite the efforts of the citizenry to escape its grasp. Too often such a machine has literally died of old age, falling only for lack of continuity from one generation to the next.

It is, therefore, with suspicion, that we should view any proposal for Federal authority in the voting process. History is replete with proof that the lust for power lies in the most unsuspected man, latent only so long as not the slightest opportunity for exercise is offered. An opening wedge is all that a would-be tyrant needs to remove him from the "would-be" class. Just such a wedge in our election process is proposed by both S. 957 and title III of S. 499, which would give the Attorney General subpena power over election records. The gravity of the consequences of giving the executive branch, or any other branch for that matter, even slight authority in this field should send shudders down the spine of every liberty-loving individual. To tamper with such a basic safeguard as the States' control of election machinery, is playing with fire, and I sincerely trust that in this case we shall avoid the proverbial approach with its painful lesson.

I would next like to comment briefly on the proposals of S. 960 and title II of S. 499, to extend the life of the Civil Rights Commission. I have previously stated my convictions at some length with regard to the creation of such a body. The idea behind the creation of the Commission is still dangerous. Despite the potential dangers, which may yet prove disastrous, the Civil Rights Commission itself has so far been somewhat of a joke, because the great flood of complaints from the South about civil rights denials, which were so widely predicted, somehow failed to materialize. Consequently, the Commission has had little to do. It has thus far been able to concentrate on making as much capital as possible out of two isolated cases it dug up in Georgia and Alabama. By far the better part of discretion is to let the Commission die.

There remains one proposal on which I should like to comment. S. 955 proposes to set up a Federal conciliation service, which would provide the same service in local race disputes that labor mediators provide in strike situations.

Now this is indeed a novel approach to the civil rights question. It reflects a line of thinking, a mistaken notion, which is prevalent among so-called liberals—a line of thinking, the fallacy of which ought to be obvious, I should think, to anyone who has had an opportunity to observe the racial situation as it actually exists in the South.

The uninformed so-called liberals refer to what they call the deteriorating race-relations situation in the South and call for Federal law and Federal action to remedy the situation. The impression sought to be conveyed is that, somehow, left alone and of its own accord, the status of race relations in the South has reached a terrible and serious pass, with the white and colored races lined up solidly in mutual opposition, with actual conflict imminent; and that, in order to save the situation and promote healthy race relations, positive action by the Federal Government is imperative.

Now, Mr. Chairman, anyone who has been familiar with the South knows that, left alone, the racial situation actually was very harmonious, very peaceful. Prior to 1954, certainly, probably nowhere else in the world, where two such different races inhabit the same territory in large numbers, have race relations been so peaceful and so harmonious. What deterioration has occurred since then, has been, certainly not an indication of any need of Federal action, but rather, the result of Federal action and Federal interference in the field of race relations—especially the Supreme Court's school desegregation decision of 1954.

But even though the past 4 years have seen some grave developments in the South, it should be emphasized that there is no such state of conflict between the white southerner and the Negro as the "liberals" seem to imagine. To the contrary, relations between the two races in the South are still good, by and large, and let us hope they remain so. Where in the South can one find what can properly be called a racial dispute? Where in the South are the white people and the colored people arrayed against each other?

The Southern Negro is not fighting the Southern white man. The white people of the South are not fighting the Southern Negro. We are fighting a vicious, white-led pressure group known as the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, and we are fighting a usurping power-mad Federal Government which is backing the NAACP down the line. Now, even though conflicting views on race, and conflicting theories about race relations may be involved, this fight between the South, on the one hand, and the NAACP and the Federal Government, on the other, can in no sense be termed a racial dispute. Oh, to be sure the NAACP, in violation of all the ancient legal traditions against barratry, makes use of handfuls of Negro children here and there as stooges; but to indict the whole Southern Negro people for this would be gravely wrong. To call these NAACP-inspired situations "racial disputes," implying that the white people and the colored people involved are fighting each other as groups, is to do a grave injustice to the Southern Negro, to the Southern white man, and to the truth.

Thus a Federal conciliation commission, set up to mediate local racial disputes in the South, would be about the most superfluous, the most totally unnecessary, agency anyone could think of.

Now it is true that in New York City, in Buffalo, in Philadelphia, in Chicago, and in some other cities in Northern States, there do exist situations which can truly be termed racial disputes; and it is possible that a Federal conciliation commission, such as that proposed by the Senator from Texas, might find some valuable work to do in those localities. However, being a believer in constitutional government, States rights and States responsibilities, I am firmly opposed to the creation of any such Federal commission. It is up to the State of New York, the State of Pennsylvania, the State of Illinois, and whatever other Northern States are troubled by racial disorders, to handle these situations; and I am confident that these States are perfectly capable of doing so, just as our Southern States are likewise capable of running their own affairs.

So much for specific proposals, but I would like to make a few general observations in closing.

Since the end of the Civil War, our country has survived many serious crises, including two global wars, a great depression, and we are now engaged in a life-and-death struggle with the godless forces of communism. During these crises, our citizens from all parts of the country have shown an amazing ability to work together, and when necessary, sacrifice together, for the common good of the country. No country has ever come so far toward harmony after such a long, bitter war between its own peoples. The South has borne the brunt of reconstruction, which enlightened persons consider to be the severest blight on our history by far. At the same time the South has made great strides

in dealing with the problems wrought by reconstruction—principally poverty, which in itself strained race relations.

In the last few years, there has been an astounding growth of the philosophy which bred reconstruction, and which has culminated in the conquered province bill before this committee. It is not a philosophy embraced by a majority of people in any major section of the country. It is the philosophy embraced and vociferously espoused by a minority of a few minority groups. The adherents of this philosophy would exploit by exaggerations the humanitarian instincts of the members of this body, among others. If, through appeal to emotions, they can gain their end, it is of no consequence to them, if, in the process, they sacrifice the most basic assets of our republican form of government and seduce our people to acts to which even the Communists would exhibit scruples.

It is my sincere belief that the majority of the members of this committee, the Senate, and Congress itself, in the inner recesses of thir own judgment, know and believe that the enactment of the measures pending before this committee today is not in the best interest of the country; but on the contrary, the enactment of such measures will actually aggravate the very problems they ostensibly seek to solve.

At the same time, I am aware of the force of practical politics. In all too many instancs, the adherents of the conquered province philosophy can control the balance of power in a given electorate.

In seeking objectivity, and the proper course to follow on the consideration of this question, I commend to each member of the committee, and indeed to each Senator and Member of Congress, the words of one of the earliest and stanchest of America's foreign friends, Edmund Burke, who stated to his British constituents, on November 3, 1774:

"Your representative owes you, not his industry only, but his judgment; and he betrays instead of serving you if he sacrifices it to your opinion."

Thank you for your attention.

CALL OF THE CALENDAR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in accordance with the order previously entered, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the call of the calendar for the consideration of measures to which there is no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana? The Chair hears none, and the Senate will proceed with the call of the calendar.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

THE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the order previously entered, the clerk will proceed to state the measures on the calendar to which there is no objection, commencing with Order No. 51.

PRESENTATION OF FIRST OFFICIAL FLAG OF THE UNITED STATES TO SENATORS AND REPRESENTATIVE FROM THE STATE OF ALASKA

The Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 19) authorizing the Architect of the Capitol to present to the Senators and Representative in Congress from the State of Alaska the first official flag of the United States bearing 49 Stars and which is flown over the west front of the U.S. Capitol, which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration, with amendments on page 1, line 5, after the word "the" where it appears the second time, to strike out "first"; in line 6, after the world "stars", to strike out the comma and "and"; at the beginning of line 7, to insert "first"; and on page 2, at the beginning of line 2, to strike out "University" and insert "Governor"; so as to make the joint resolution read:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Architect of the Capitol is hereby authorized and directed to present to the Senators and Representative in Congress from the State of Alaska the official flag of the United States bearing forty-nine stars which is first flown over the west front of the United States Capitol, for presentation by such Senators and Representative to the Governor of Alaska.

The amendments were agreed to.

The joint resolution, as amended, was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "Joint resolution authorizing the Architect of the Capitol to present to the Senators and Representative in the Congress from the State of Alaska the official flag of the United States bearing forty-nine stars which is first flown over the west front of the United States Capitol."

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 12) to expedite the utilization of television transmission facilities in our public schools and colleges, and in adult training programs, was announced as next in order.

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

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, I ask that the bill be passed over, it not being appropriate business for transaction on the call of the calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

REAPPOINTMENT OF ROBERT V. FLEMING

The joint resolution (H.J. Res. 198) to provide for the reappointment of Robert V. Fleming as citizen regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 611) for the relief of Harry H. Nakamura, was announced as next in order.

Mr. ENGLE. I ask that the bill be passed over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

ESTATE OF SINCLAIR G. STANLEY

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 607) for the relief of the estate of Sinclair G. Stanley, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment, on page 1, line 6, after the word "plus", to strike out "interest at the rate of 6" and insert "simple interest at the rate of 3", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the estate of the late Sinclair G. Stanley, of Cook County, Illinois, the sum of $33,333 plus simple interest at the rate of 3 per centum per annum from November 1, 1946. The payment of such sum shall be in full satisfaction of all claims of the estate of the said Sinclair G. Stanley for just compensation for the yacht "Seventeen", such yacht having been sold to the Navy in May 1941 for $1 by the said Sinclair G. Stanley who was mentally incompetent at the time of such sale: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on acount of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provision of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

STANISLAWA WOJCZUL

The bill (S. 102) for the relief of Stanislawa Wojczul was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Stanislawa Wojczul shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

PANTALEON IBARRA ALSO KNOWN AS ELMO GOMES ARCIBAL

The bill (S. 210) for the relief of Pantaleon Ibarra, also known as Elmo Gomes Arcibal was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of

America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Pantaleon Ibarra, also known as Elmo Gomes Arcibal, shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

ALEXANDER ANTONIOU

The bill (S. 244) for the relief of Alexander Antoniou was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Alexander Antoniou shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to make this brief explanatory statement in support of my bill, S. 244, for the relief of Alexander Antoniou. S. 244 proposes that Mr. Antoniou be lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence, has been reported favorably by the Committee on the Judiciary with the recommendation that it be passed.

Alexander Antoniou is a 57-year-old native of Greece who has been sailing on U.S. vessels as a merchant seaman for approximately 15 years. Mr. Antoniou served honorably on U.S. vessels during the critical war years.

He was unable to qualify for naturalization under the Nationality Act of 1940 because his actual sea time was a few days short of the required period. He cannot qualify under the Refugee Act because he was and still is a seaman serving on American ships and is no longer a resident of Greece.

During the period of consideration of this bill Alexander Antoniou is residing in Portland, Oreg., with his brother, who has made an affidavit of support in his behalf. He also has a brother in Bridgeport, Conn. Both brothers are naturalized citizens.

Mr. Antoniou has always paid Federal income tax on his earnings as a seaman and, as I have said, he served honorably on American vessels in combat areas during World War II. He has been highly recommended as an accomplished chef by every ship's master under whom he has served and would have no difficulty whatsoever in pursuing his profession in the United States. He has many sponsors among executives of large organizations in the city of Portland, is backed wholeheartedly by his family in this country, and has the support of the members and pastor of Holy Trinity Greek Orthodox Church in Portland, Oreg.

THEODORE BURTZOS

The bill (S. 319) for the relief of Theodore Burtzos was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Theodore Burtzos shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

DAVID FORBES

The bill (S. 323) for the relief of David Forbes was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, David Forbes shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fee.

JOHANN KALATSCHAN

The bill (S. 324) for the relief of Johann Kalatschan was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, notwithstanding the provisions of paragraph (6) of section 212(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Johann Kalatschan may, if he is found to be otherwise admissible under the provision of such Act, be issued a visa and be admitted to the United States for permanent residence, under such conditions and controls as the Attorney General, after consultation with the Surgeon General of the United States, deems necessary to impose: *Provided,* That a suitable or proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, shall be given by or on behalf of the said Johann Kalatschan in the same manner and subject to the same conditions as bonds or undertakings given under section 213 of such Act: *Provided further,* That this Act shall apply only to grounds for exclusion under paragraph (6) of section 212(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act known to the Secretary of State or the Attorney General prior to the date of the enactment of this Act.

ETHEL AUTH

The bill (S. 333) for the relief of Ethel Auth was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, notwithstanding the provisions of paragraph (6) of section 212(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Ethel Auth may, if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of such Act be issued a visa and be admitted to the United States for permanent residence, under such conditions and controls as the Attorney General, after consultation with the Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare deems necessary to impose: *Provided,* That a suitable or proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, shall be given by or on behalf of the said Ethel Auth in the same manner and subject to the same conditions as bonds or undertakings given under section 213 of such Act: *Provided further,* That this Act shall apply only to grounds for exclusion under paragraph (6) of section 212(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act known to the Secretary of State or the Attorney General prior to the date of the enactment of this Act.

BALBINA BORENSTEIN

The bill (S. 501) for the relief of Balbina Borenstein was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Balbina Borenstein shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

BENEDICT EREMENKO (BEN ZUKE) AND OTHERS

The bill (S. 537) for the relief of Benedict Eremenko (Ben Zuke), Victor Tatarnikov (Victor Kalin), Mikhail Ivankov-Nikolov (Michael Nikolas) and Victor Solovyev was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Benedict Eremenko (Ben Zuke), Victor Tatarnikov (Victor Kalin), Mikhail Ivankov-Nikolov (Michael Nikolas), and Victor Solovyev shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fees. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct the required numbers from the appropriate quota or quotas for the first year that such quota or quotas are available.

BEN CHASSIN

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 46) for the relief of Ben Chassin, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert: "That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended, Ben Chassin shall be held and considered to be

within the purview of section 354(5) of that Act."

The amendment was agreed to.

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

YAEKO INOUYE

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 110) for the relief of Yaeko Inouye, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert "That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Yaeko Inouye shall be held and considered to be a returning resident alien within the purview of section 101(a)(27)(B) of that Act."

The amendment was agreed to.

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

MARIE SILK

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 191) for the relief of Marie Silk, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment, on page 1, line 11, after the word "available", to insert a colon and "*Provided*, That a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the Immigration and Nationality Act", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Marie Silk shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available: *Provided*, That a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the Immigration and Nationality Act.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

SOFIJA LAICA

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 320) for the relief of Sofija Laica, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert "That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Sofija Laica shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee: *Provided*, That the natural parent of Sofija Laica shall not, by virtue of such parentage, be accorded any right, privilege, or status under the Immigration and Nationality Act."

The amendment was agreed to.

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

DR. STASYS SEREIKA

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 322) for the relief of Dr. Stasys Sereika, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment on page 1, in line 6, after the word "be," to insert "issued a visa and be," so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, notwithstanding the provisions of paragraph (6) of section 212(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Doctor Stasys Sereika may, if he is found be be otherwise admissible under the provisions of such Act, be issued a visa and be admitted to the United States for permanent residence, under such conditions and controls as the Attorney General, after consultation with the Surgeon General of the United States, deems necessary to impose: *Provided*, That a suitable or proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, shall be given by or on behalf of the said Doctor Stasys Sereika in the same manner and subject to the same conditions as bonds or undertakings given under section 213 of such Act: *Provided further*, That this Act shall apply only to grounds for exclusion under paragraph (6) of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act known to the Secretary of State or the Attorney General prior to the date of the enactment of this Act.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

CLARINDA VEIGA

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 192) for the relief of Clarinda Veiga, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments, on page 1, at the beginning of line 5, to strike out "Clarinda Veiga" and insert "Clarinda da Veiga", and in line 8, after the word "Act", to insert a colon and "*Provided*, That a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the said Act.", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, notwithstanding the provisions of paragraph (4) of section 212(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act Clarinda da Veiga may be issued a visa and be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of such Act: *Provided*, That a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the said Act. This Act shall apply only to grounds for exclusion under such paragraph known to the Secretary of State or the Attorney General prior to the date of the enactment of this Act.

The amendments were agreed to.

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

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Clarinda da Veiga."

PAULINE D. KIMBROUGH

The bill (S. 667) for the relief of Pauline D. Kimbrough was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Mrs. Pauline D. Kimbrough, widow of Col. J. Claude Kimbrough, deceased, is hereby relieved of all liability to repay to the United States the sum of $6,367.20, representing gratuity pay received by her upon the death of her husband; the Judge Advocate General of the Army having determined subsequent to such payment that the said Colonel Kimbrough's status at the time of his death was not that of a retired officer on active duty and that no authority existed for payment of such gratuity.

ENFORCEMENT OF CEASE AND DESIST ORDERS UNDER SECTION II OF THE CLAYTON ACT

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 726) to amend section II of the Clayton Act to provide for more expeditious enforcement of cease and desist orders issued thereunder, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments, on page 2, line 8, after the word "aside", to strike out "A copy of such petition shall be forthwith served upon the commission or board, and thereupon the commission or board shall certify and file in the court a transcript of the entire record in the proceeding, including all evidence taken and the report and order of the commission or board. Upon such filing of the petition and transcript the court shall have jurisdiction of the proceeding and of the question determined therein, and shall have power to make and enter upon the pleadings, evidence, and proceedings set forth in such transcript" and insert "A copy of such petition shall be forthwith transmitted by the clerk of the court to the commission or board, and thereupon the commission or board shall file in the court the record in the proceeding, as provided in section 2112 of title 28, United States Code. Upon such filing of the petition the court shall have jurisdiction of the proceeding and of the question determined therein concurrently with the commission or board until the filing of the record and shall have power to make and enter"; on page 4, line 5, after "(d)", to strike out "The" and insert "Upon the filing of the record with it the"; and, in line 11, after the word "of", to insert "the"; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) the first and second paragraphs of section 11 of the Act entitled "An Act to supplement existing laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, and for other purposes", approved October 15, 1914 (38 Stat. 735, as amended; 15 U.S.C. 21), are hereby redesignated as subsections (a) and (b) of such section, respectively.

(b) The third, fourth, fifth, sixth, and seventh paragraphs of such section are amended to read as follows:

"(c) Any person required by such order of the commission or board to cease and desist from any such violation may obtain a

review of such order in the court of appeals of the United States for any circuit within which such violation occurred or within which such person resides or carries on business, by filing in the court, within sixty days after the date of the service of such order, a written petition praying that the order of the commission or board be set aside. A copy of such petition shall be forthwith transmitted by the clerk of the court to the commission or board, and thereupon the commission or board shall file in the court the record in the proceeding, as provided in section 2112 of title 28, United States Code. Upon such filing of the petition the court shall have jurisdiction of the proceeding and of the question determined therein concurrently with the commission or board until the filing of the record and shall have power to make and enter a decree affirming, modifying, or setting aside the order of the commission or board, and enforcing the same to the extent that such order is affirmed, and to issue such writs as are ancillary to its jurisdiction or are necessary in its judgment to prevent injury to the public or to competitors pendente lite. The findings of the commission or board as to the facts, if supported by evidence, shall be conclusive. To the extent that the order of the commission or board is affirmed, the court shall issue its own order commanding obedience to the terms of such order of the commission or board. If either party shall apply to the court for leave to adduce additional evidence, and shall show to the satisfaction of the court that such additional evidence is material and that there were reasonable grounds for the failure to adduce such evidence in the proceeding before the commission or board, the court may order such additional evidence to be taken before the commission or board, and to be adduced upon the hearing in such manner and upon such terms and conditions as to the court may seem proper. The commission or board may modify its findings as to the facts, or make new findings, by reason of the additional evidence so taken, and shall file such modified or new findings, which, if supported by evidence, shall be conclusive, and its recommendation, if any, for the modification or setting aside of its original order, with the return of such additional evidence. The judgment and decree of the court shall be final, except that the same shall be subject to review by the Supreme Court upon certiorari, as provided in section 1254 of title 28 of the United States Code.

"(d) Upon the filing of the record with it the jurisdiction of the court of appeals to affirm, enforce, modify, or set aside orders of the commission or board shall be exclusive.

"(e) Such proceedings in the court of appeals shall be given precedence over other cases pending therein, and shall be in every way expedited. No order of the commission or board or judgment of the court to enforce the same shall in anywise relieve or absolve any person from any liability under the antitrust laws.

"(f) Complaints, orders, and other processes of the commission or board under this section may be served by anyone duly authorized by the commission or board, either (1) by delivering a copy thereof to the person to be served, or to a member of the partnership to be served, or to the president, secretary, or other executive officer or a director of the corporation to be served; or (2) by leaving a copy thereof at the residence or the principal office or place of business of such person; or (3) by registering and mailing a copy thereof addressed to such person at his or its residence or principal office or place of business. The verified return by the person so serving said complaint, order, or other process setting forth the manner of said service shall be proof of the same, and the return post office receipt for said complaint, order, or other process registered and mailed as aforesaid shall be proof of the service of the same.

"(g) Any order issued under subsection (b) shall become final—

"(1) upon the expiration of the time allowed for filing a petition for review, if no such petition has been duly filed within such time; or

"(2) upon the expiration of the time allowed for filing a petition for certiorari, if the order of the commission or board has been affirmed, or the petition for review has been dismissed by the court of appeals, and no petition for certiorari has been duly filed; or

"(3) upon the denial of a petition for certiorari, if the order of the commission or board has been affirmed or the petition for review has been dismissed by the court of appeals; or

"(4) upon the expiration of thirty days from the date of issuance of the mandate of the Supreme Court, if such Court directs that the order of the commission or board be affirmed or the petition for review be dismissed.

"(h) If the Supreme Court directs that the order of the commission or board be modified or set aside, the order of the commission or board rendered in accordance with the mandate of the Supreme Court shall become final upon the expiration of thirty days from the time it was rendered, unless within such thirty days either party has instituted proceedings to have such order corrected to accord with the mandate, in which event the order of the commission or board shall become final when so corrected.

"(i) If the order of the commission or board is modified or set aside by the court of appeals, and if (1) the time allowed for filing a petition for certiorari has expired and no such petition has been duly filed, or (2) the petition for certiorari has been denied, or (3) the decision of the court has been affirmed by the Supreme Court, then the order of the commission or board rendered in accordance with the mandate of the court of appeals shall become final on the expiration of thirty days from the time such order of the commission or board was rendered, unless within such thirty days either party has instituted proceedings to have such order corrected so that it will accord with the mandate, in which event the order of the commission or board shall become final when so corrected.

"(j) If the Supreme Court orders a rehearing; or if the case is remanded by the court of appeals to the commission or board for a rehearing, and if (1) the time allowed for filing a petition for certiorari has expired, and no such petition has been duly filed, or (2) the petition for certiorari has been denied, or (3) the decision of the court has been affirmed by the Supreme Court, then the order of the commission or board rendered upon such rehearing shall become final in the same manner as though no prior order of the commission or board had been rendered.

"(k) As used in this section the term 'mandate', in case a mandate has been recalled prior to the expiration of thirty days from the date of issuance thereof, means the final mandate.

"(l) Any person who violates any order issued by the commission or board under subsection (b) after such order has become final, and while such order is in effect, shall forfeit and pay to the United States a civil penalty of not more than $5,000 for each violation, which shall accrue to the United States and may be recovered in a civil action brought by the United States. Each separate violation of any such order shall be a separate offense, except that in the case of a violation through continuing failure or neglect to obey a final order of the commission or board each day of continuance of such failure or neglect shall be deemed a separate offense."

SEC. 2. The amendments made by section 1 shall have no application to any proceeding initiated before the date of enactment of this Act under the third or fourth paragraph of section 11 of the Act entitled "An Act to supplement existing laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, and for other purposes", approved October 15, 1914 (38 Stat. 735, as amended; 15 U.S.C. 21). Each such proceeding shall be governed by the provisions of such section as they existed on the day preceding the date of enactment of this Act.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, if I may have the attention of the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE], I refer to the provision on page 3, lines 6 to 8, of the bill which reads as follows:

> The findings of the commission or board as to the facts, if supported by evidence, shall be conclusive.

Senate Report No. 83 accompanying S. 726 at page 9—begins sixth from last line—showing changes in existing law, sets forth the following:

> The findings of the commission or board as to the facts, if supported by [substantial] evidence, shall [in like manner] be conclusive.

It would appear that the language of the bill thus departs from the substantial evidence rule which is generally required to be followed by the various agencies of the Goverment under the Administrative Procedure Act of 1946. I say that because the word "substantial" is stricken and the words "in like manner" are stricken. I shall appreciate the Senator's comment.

Mr. ENGLE. The language "The findings of the commission or board as to the facts, if supported by evidence, shall be conclusive" appearing at lines 6 to 8 of page 3 of S. 726 is identical to the comparable provision in section 5(c) of the Federal Trade Commission Act. Those words, as they appear in the Federal Trade Commission Act, have been consistently construed, since the passage of the Administrative Procedure Act, to require that findings be supported by substantial evidence even though the word "substantial" does not appear in the provision. This provision of the Federal Trade Commission Act having been so consistently construed, it would be appropriate to use the identical language in the proposed amendment of section 11 of the Clayton Act, inasmuch as the same construction would undoubtedly apply. While there is no strong objection to inserting the word "substantial" immediately before the word "evidence," there is the possibility that the introduction of language in section 11 of the Clayton Act different from that contained in section 5(c) of the Federal Trade Commission Act may result in the two acts being construed differently. The same substantial evidence rule required by the Administrative Procedure Act and by the Federal Trade Commission Act, as construed, is intended.

The theory is that if the language is changed after it has had judicial construction, the courts may say that we had something in mind which we did not have in mind. Therefore, it is better for us to use precisely the same language for the purpose of having the same construction of both acts.

Mr. MORTON. I thank the Senator. I withdraw my reservation.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, as one of the sponsors of the bill and as the one who reported the measure from the Committee on the Judiciary, I wish to join in the interpretation of the intent as expressed by the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE], for the purpose of the legislative record.

I should also like to point out that this is one of the proposed antitrust enactments which have been recommended by the President in his economic message to Congress of January 20. It is a very worthwhile measure which should have been passed a long time ago.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD at this point a statement on the bill.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR KEFAUVER—FINALIZATION OF CLAYTON ACT ORDERS

This proposed legislation would provide that orders issued by the Federal Trade Commission and other agencies under section 11 of the Clayton Act shall become final in the same manner in which orders issued by the Federal Trade Commission under section 5 of the Federal Trade Commission Act become final.

In the 85th Congress public hearings were conducted by the Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly of the Committee on the Judiciary, on April 1, 2, 24, and 25, 1958, on this proposal and other legislation, and testimony in support of this proposal was received from the Honorable John W. Gwynne, Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission, as well as Robert A. Bicks, assistant to the Assistant Attorney General in charge of the Antitrust Division.

The effectiveness of the Clayton Act, as amended by the Robinson-Patman Act, has long been handicapped by the absence of adequate enforcement provisions. Existing procedures are laborious, time consuming, and expensive. The Federal Trade Commission must investigate and after complaint prove on the record violations of the act before a cease and desist order may be issued. After the order to cease and desist has been issued the Commission must again investigate and again prove violations of the order and of the act before the Commission can obtain a court order commanding obedience to the Commission's order to cease and desist. Upon such proof the court enforces the Commission's order. Only then, if the respondent violates the act a third time does he become subject to penalty. Thus, before a respondent can actually be punished for violation of the Clayton Act, the Federal Trade Commission must conduct three successive investigations and must on three successive occasions prove violations of the law. S. 726 would put teeth in the Clayton Act orders and would fill the enforcement void which has existed for many years.

Judge Gwynne, in testifying in favor of this legislation, stated that it is clear that the Clayton Act, as amended by the Robinson-Patman Act, would be more effectively administered and would be of much greater value as a deterrent as proposed by S. 726, as amended. The Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, the Interstate Commerce Commission, the Civil Aeronautics Board, and the Federal Communications Commission support this proposal.

The committee is of the opinion that this bill has a meritorious purpose and accordingly recommends favorable consideration of S. 726, as amended.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a statement prepared by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN].

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR SPARKMAN

The bill before us today will enable the Federal Trade Commission to achieve speedy, effective compliance with cease and desist orders issued under the Clayton Act and the Robinson-Patman amendment. This measure is extremely important to the interest of small business, so frequently the victims of antitrust violations.

This bill strengthens the enforcement provisions of the Clayton Act in two important respects. First, the act's enforcement procedures are brought into line with those being used by the Commission to enforce orders issued under section 5 of the Federal Trade Commission Act. Second, violation of Clayton Act orders is made subject to the same civil penalties now applicable to violations of the Federal Trade Commission Act orders.

The attention of members of the Senate Small Business Committee has frequently been directed to the ineffectual manner in which the Federal Trade Commission has moved to enforce orders requiring respondents to cease and desist from violations of the Clayton Act. Study of many of these cases has convinced us that action toward compliance is seriously impaired by the cumbersome procedures which must be followed and by the lack of teeth in such procedures. These procedural defects become readily apparent when the enforcement system of the Clayton Act is contrasted with that available under the Federal Trade Commission Act.

An order issued pursuant to section 5 of the Federal Trade Commission Act becomes final and conclusive 60 days after its issuance, unless the respondent seeks review by a U.S. court of appeals. When court review is sought, the order becomes final upon the court's affirmance of the order. Once such an order has become final, either through lapse of time or court affirmance, its violation, for each and every day, is punishable by a fine of not more than $5,000.

On the other hand, Commission orders issued pursuant to the Clayton Act do not become final by a lapse of time. Nor is violation of a Clayton Act order subject to penalty until it has been adopted as a court order. Accordingly, in a case where a Clayton Act order is being flouted by the respondent, the Commission may informally attempt to obtain voluntary compliance. That course failing, the Commission is obliged to proceed to a U.S. court of appeals to prove that its order is being violated. But the court, instead of satisfying itself with proof that the order is being violated, may decide to undertake what amounts to a de novo consideration of the antitrust issues in the case. Then the court may issue a formal decree adopting the Commission's order as its own. Even at that point, however, court enforcement of the order does not commence forthwith. Rather, enforcement requires that contempt proceedings be instituted for violation of the decree of the court. Then, should the respondent be found guilty of contempt, the court may impose an appropriate fine. In other words, a defendant must be found guilty of violating the Clayton Act three times before effective sanctions can be invoked. All in all, the enforcement procedures applicable to Clayton Act orders are awkward, slow, and hopelessly complicated, and without meaningful sanctions.

In this light, it is readily understandable why contempt proceedings to enforce a Clayton Act order have been notoriously unsuccessful. Bearing in mind that Commission orders issued pursuant to the Clayton Act and its Robinson-Patman amendment are intended to remedy such antitrust wrongs as monopolistic mergers, exclusive dealing arrangements, and predatory pricing practices, such an enforcement situation is intolerable. Efforts to obtain full compliance with Clayton Act orders ought not to be hampered by legalistic difficulties. Rather, such efforts must be encouraged by the availability of streamlined enforcement procedures, suitably adapted to the important ends being sought. The guiding consideration should be that delayed justice in antitrust matters can only mean no justice at all to the small businessmen who are so often the targets of the prohibited practices. The practical effect of granting or inviting two free law violations for every one punished cannot longer be condoned.

I think it important to reemphasize that the bill in nowise proposes any deviation from the original intent of Congress when it enacted the Clayton Act and the Federal Trade Commission Act.

The purpose of the bill is, on the other hand, entirely consistent with the intention of Congress as embodied in these enactments.

As Senators well know, these statutes which were conceived as companion measures and were enacted in the same year, 1914, were and are aimed directly at preventing certain trade actions and practices considered by Congress as contrary to and harmful to our concepts of a wholesome and healthy climate for the commerce of our Nation.

In the light of experience, Congress, in these statutes, enumerated in a clear and unmistakable manner the kinds of practices it wished restrained and prevented. Congress attempted to confer upon appropriate agencies authority necessary to effectuate its will. It soon became evident that the enforcement authority in the area of cease and desist orders under section 5 of the Federal Trade Commission Act and under section 11 of the Clayton Act was not adequate. The Federal Trade Commission, in particular, found itself poorly equipped to discharge the responsibilities which the Congress had conferred upon it, either with respect to violations under section 5 of the Federal Trade Commission Act or section 11 of the Clayton Act.

Congress recognized the necessity for implementation of the Federal Trade Commission Act with respect to powers of enforcement. Proper implementation was provided with respect to the Federal Trade Commission Act in the passage of the Wheeler-Lea Act. But similar needed implementation of the companion measure, the Clayton Act, has never been provided.

Implementation of enforcement provisions of the Clayton Act is in order and urgently needed if the Federal Trade Commission is to perform with the degree of effectiveness expected of it by Congress and the American people.

Let me emphasize that the bill before us today proposes no new departure. Nothing new is sought to be injected into our well-established and proven concepts of intelligent, effective enforcement procedures. The bill attempts to confer no authority that is in anywise different from authority long exercised by the Federal Trade Commission under the provisions of the Wheeler-Lea Act. In fact, the bill proposes to confer upon the Federal Trade Commission, insofar as Clayton Act violations are concerned, precisely—and in almost exactly the same language—the enforcement authority and procedures which Congress conferred and prescribed with respect to the Federal Trade Commission Act as amended by the Wheeler-Lea Act.

The bill before us today can, in truth, be called a perfecting amendment to the Clayton Act. It has no other purpose than to

effectuate the will of Congress with respect to the role of the Federal Trade Commission in Clayton Act enforcement, in the same manner and to the same degree that the will of Congress was effectuated by the Wheeler-Lea amendments to the Federal Trade Commission Act.

The bill is aimed at meeting a situation of forbidden wrongs without adequate remedy, of conferred responsibility without sufficient recourse.

Such a situation, uncorrected, frustrates our national determination to preserve and strengthen free enterprise and our free competitive system.

I remind my Senate colleagues and congratulate them upon the fact that in the final days before the Congress adjourned last year the Senate acted forthrightly and passed without a dissenting voice an almost identical bill to S. 726 which is before us today. Unfortunately, there was not time for the House to act.

Let us today reaffirm our action of the previous session and approve the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

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

DONALD D. ELLIS

The bill (S. 243) for the relief of Donald D. Ellis, an individual trading as the Ellis Timber Co., was announced as next in order.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I should like to have the attention of the majority and minority calendar committees and the attention of counsel for the Committee on the Judiciary.

Recently, H.R. 2294, a companion bill, so far as the subject matter is concerned, was passed by the House. Shortly I shall move to substitute H.R. 2294 and to have S. 243 indefinitely postponed. However, first I should like to make a brief explanation. The House bill does not contain the standard Senate provision which is found at page 2 of my bill, S. 243, starting at line 11, which reads as follows:

Provided, That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim—

And so forth.

That is the standard form. Counsel for the Committee on the Judiciary came to me and discussed the matter with me when he learned of my proposed motion to substitute the House bill for the Senate bill. I assured him that the individual involved in the bill has never employed counsel, and I shall read a telegram from him to that effect. In view of those circumstances, we would be perfectly safe in substituting the House bill for the Senate bill. I now read the telegram which I have received on this point. It reads as follows:

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.:

Have not employed attorney or agent at any time in connection with my claim. I am not obligated to any attorney or any other person for any fee. Regards.

DONALD D. ELLIS.

PORTLAND, OREG.

Mr. Ellis is the president of the lumber company involved.

Therefore I see no practical reason why we should hold up the bill merely because the House bill does not contain the standard provisions to which I have referred, and have Congress pass two bills, with the necessity of going to conference on the matter, which would be a waste of time.

In further explanation of the bill I should like to say that the primary purpose of my bill, S. 243, is to provide justice and equality in the contract relationship between a small business operation and the Federal Government.

The bill is designed to prevent substantial losses to a small-business man, which otherwise would be caused because of the largest error ever made in the Government's estimate of the volume of standing timber to be sold under contract by its agency, the Bureau of Land Management.

In 1957, Donald D. Ellis, doing business as Ellis Timber Co., Portland, Oreg., entered into a contract with the Bureau of Land Management to purchase and log an estimated 535,000 board feet of salvage timber standing in a burned-over forest area. According to Senate Report No. 84:

The error in the present case grew out of the fact that the sale consisted of burnt timber or snags which we believed to have been fire killed in 1936. After the logging began it was learned that in addition to the 1936 burn, the trees had been damaged by an 1896 fire, with the result that there had been, not considered in the estimate, an additional 40 years of decay and insect attack. This fact could be determined, even by experienced timbermen, only after the cutting of the trees had begun.

The Comptroller General of the United States, in submitting a favorable report on Mr. Ellis' claim to recover for heavy losses occasioned by his performing the contract, frankly conceded that under the strict terms of the contract the Government would not be liable, but the Comptroller General added:

However, the record establishes that this contract contained the largest percentage of error ever made in the Government's estimate of volume of timber to be sold by the Bureau of Land Management; that normally a very small percentage of error may be expected in such an estimate; that despite the magnitude of the timber underrun, Ellis diligently performed the contract operations to completion; and that Ellis' felling of unmerchantable snags while performing the contract operations resulted in material benefits of substantial value to the Government.

* * * * *

In view of all the circumstances, the claim, in our judgment, appears to contain such elements of equity as to be deserving of the consideration of the Congress. We, therefore, recommend that an appropriation in the amount of $9,593.70 be made for payment of the claim and, in addition, we recommend that the waiver of the $2,118 remaining due and payable under the contract be authorized, based upon the determination that such relief represents no more than reasonable and sufficient allowance to place the claimant in the same position had the estimate of timber volume in the contract area been substantially correct.

Mr. President, not only the Comptroller General but the Senate Committee on the Judiciary recognized the inherent justice in preventing a small-business man from totally shouldering the burden of a gross error committed by the Government in its timber volume estimate. The case is important because I believe it establishes—and properly so—that there must be some element of reasonableness in the estimates submitted by the Government in such cases. This is particularly true where a small business operation, and not a large logging or lumber manufacturing concern, is involved. This case may be a bellwether case in establishing a rule of reasonableness—a rule which tells businessmen that they are entitled to rely on Government estimates in contracts of this type.

Mr. President, I now move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of H.R. 2294, and if that is done I shall move that S. 243 be indefinitely postponed.

The motion was agreed to, and the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate the bill (H.R. 2294) for the relief of the Ellis Timber Co., which was read the first time by its title, and the second time at length, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Comptroller General of the United States be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to settle and adjust the claim of the Ellis Timber Company on account of losses sustained in recovering salvage timber purchased from the Bureau of Land Management, Department of the Interior, pursuant to contract No. 14-11-001(14)-268, dated August 20, 1957, and to allow in full and final settlement of the claim the sum of not to exceed $9,593.70. There is hereby appropriated the sum of $9,593.70 for payment of said claim.

SEC. 2. That the Ellis Timber Company is hereby relieved of all liability to pay to the United States the sum of $2,118 which is due and payable pursuant to contract No. 14-11-001(14)-268 as the unpaid balance for salvage timber purchased under said contract.

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

The bill (H.R. 2294) was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, Senate bill, S. 243, is indefinitely postponed.

ELLEN B. MUELLER

The bill (S. 328) for the relief of Ellen B. Mueller was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Ellen B. Mueller shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fee: *Provided*, That a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescrbed by section 213 of the Immigration and Nationality Act.

ERMINIO NEGLIA

The bill (S. 330) for the relief of Erminio Neglia was considered, ordered to

be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Erminio Neglia shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

JAKOB LIBLANG, JR.

The bill (S. 331) for the relief of Jakob Liblang, Jr., was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, notwithstanding the provisions of paragraph (6) of section 212(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Jakob Liblang, Junior, may, if he is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of such Act, be issued a visa and be admitted to the United States for permanent residence, under such conditions and controls as the Attorney General, after consultation with the Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, deems necessary to impose: *Provided,* That a suitable or proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, shall be given by or on behalf of the said Jakob Liblang, Junior, in the same manner and subject to the same conditions as bonds or undertakings given under section 213 of such Act: *Provided further,* That this Act shall apply only to grounds for exclusion under paragraph (6) of section 212(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act known to the Secretary of State or the Attorney General prior to the date of the enactment of this Act.

MARTIN ALBERT

The bill (S. 332) for the relief of Martin Albert was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, notwithstanding the provisions of paragraph (6) of section 212(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Martin Albert may, if he is found to be otherwise admissible under the provision of such Act, be issued a visa and be admitted to the United States for permanent residence, under such conditions and controls as the Attorney General, after consultation with the Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, deems necessary to impose. A suitable or proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, shall be given by or on behalf of the said Martin Albert in the same manner and subject to the same conditions as bonds or undertakings given under section 213 of such Act. This Act shall apply only to grounds for exclusion under paragraph (6) of section 212(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act known to the Secretary of State or the Attorney General prior to the date of the enactment of this Act.

GIROLAMO NASELLI

The bill (S. 624) for the relief of Girolamo Naselli was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Girolamo Naselli shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

YASUKO KITANO

The bill (S. 633) for the relief of Yasuko Kitano was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of sections 101(a)(27)(A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Yasuko Kitano shall be held and considered to be the minor natural-born alien child of Mr. and Mrs. Eddie L. Williams, citizens of the United States: *Provided,* That the natural parents of Yasuko Kitano shall not, by virtue of such relationship, be accorded any right, status, or privilege under the Immigration and Nationality Act.

KONSTANTINOS A. KOSTALAS

The bill (S. 869) for the relief of Konstantinos A. Kostalas was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Konstantinos A. Kostalas shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

PENELOPE CARNAVAS KAFOS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 459) for the relief of Penelope Carnavas Kafos, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment in line 7, after the words "United States", to insert a colon and "*Provided,* That the natural parents of Penelope Carnavas Kafos shall not, by virtue of such parentage, be accorded any right, privilege, or status under the Immigration and Nationality Act", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of sections 101(a)(27)(A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Penelope Carnavas Kafos, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Christ and Jennie Kafos, citizens of the United States: *Provided,* That the natural parents of Penelope Carnavas Kafos shall not, by virtue of such parentage, be accorded any right, privilege, or status under the Immigration and Nationality Act.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

GORJANA GRDJIC

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 460) for the relief of Gorjana Grdjic, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert "That, notwithstanding the provision of section 212(a)(6) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Gorjana Grdjic may be issued a visa and be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that Act under such conditions and controls which the Attorney General, after consultation with the Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, may deem necessary to impose: *Provided,* That a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the said Act: *And provided further,* That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice has knowledge prior to the enactment of this Act."

The amendment was agreed to.

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

CWY PINKUSIEWICZ

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 327) for the relief of Cwy Pinkusiewicz, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment, on page 1, line 7, after the word "Act", to insert "*Provided,* That a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the said Act:", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, notwithstanding the provisions of paragraph (1) of section 212(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Cwy Pinkusiewicz may be issued a visa and be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if he is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of such Act: *Provided,* That a suitable and proper bond of undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the said Act: *Provided further,* That this Act shall apply only to grounds for exclusion under such paragraph known to the Secretary of State or the Attorney General prior to the date of the enactment of this Act.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

KLARCHEN HUEBNER

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 425) for the relief of Klarchen Huebner, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert "That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Klarchen Huebner, the fiancée of Specialist John J. McIntyre, a citizen of the United States, and her minor children, Carl Johann and Marie Claire, shall be eligible for visas as nonimmigrant temporary visitors for a period of three months: *Provided,* That the administrative authorities find that the said Klarchen Huebner is coming to the United States with a bona fide intention of being married to the said Specialist John J. McIntyre and that they are found otherwise admissible under the provisions of the said Act, except that section 212(a)(9) of that Act shall not be applicable in the case of the said Klarchen Huebner. In the event the marriage between the above-named persons does not occur within three months after the entry of the said Klarchen Huebner and her minor children, Carl Johann and Marie Claire, they shall be required to depart from the United States and upon failure to do so shall be deported in accordance with the provisions of sections 242 and 243 of the Immigration and Nationality Act. In the event that the marriage between the above-named persons shall occur within three months after the entry of the said Klarchen Huebner and her minor children, Carl Johann and Marie Claire, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of the said Klarchen Huebner and her minor children, Carl Johann and Marie Claire, as of the date of the payment by them of the required visa fees."

The amendment was agreed to.

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

The title was amended, so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Klarchen Huebner and her minor children, Carl Johann and Marie Claire."

TRANSPORTATION ON CANADIAN VESSELS BETWEEN PORTS IN ALASKA

The bill (S. 175) to provide transportation on Canadian vessels between ports in southeastern Alaska, and between Hyder, Alaska, and other points in southeastern Alaska, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, until June 30, 1960, notwithstanding the provisions of law of the United States restricting to vessels of the United States the transportation of passengers and merchandise directly or indirectly from any port in the United States to another port of the United States, passengers may be transported on Canadian vessels between ports in southeastern Alaska, and passengers and merchandise may be transported on Canadian vessels between Hyder, Alaska, and other points in southeastern Alaska, and between Hyder, Alaska, and other points in the United States outside Alaska, either directly or via a foreign port, or for any part of the transportation, unless the Secretary of Commerce determines that United States-flag service is available to provide such transportation.

ESTATE OF VERENTES BENT

The bill (S. 947) for the relief of the estate of Verentes Bent, deceased, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, 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 Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $10,000 to the estate of Verentes Bent, deceased. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the estate against the United States on account of the death of Verentes Bent caused when a vehicle owned by the United States and operated by the Navy Department collided with a public bus on July 27, 1946, near the city of Colon, Republic of Panama: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

MARIA BOGATKIN MANEA

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 458) for the relief of Maria Bogatkin Manea, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert "That, notwithstanding the provision of section 212(a)(6) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Maria Bogatkin Manea may be issued a visa and be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that Act under such conditions and controls which the Attorney General, after consultation with the Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, may deem necessary to impose: *Provided,* That a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the said Act: *Provided, further,* That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice has knowledge prior to the enactment of this Act."

The amendment was agreed to.

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

VIKTORS NEIMANIS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 758) for the relief of Viktors Neimanis, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment, on page 1, line 6, after the word "be", to insert "issued a visa and be", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, notwithstanding the provisions of paragraph (6) of section 212(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Viktors Neimanis may, if he is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of such Act, be issued a visa and be admitted to the United States for permanent residence under such conditions and controls as the Attorney General, after consultation with the Surgeon General of the United States, deems necessary to impose: *Provided,* That a suitable or proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, shall be given by or on behalf of the said Viktors Neimanis in the same manner and subject to the same conditions as bonds or undertakings given under section 213 of such Act: *Provided further,* That this Act shall apply only to grounds for exclusion under paragraph (6) of section 212 (a) of such Act known to the Secretary of State or the Attorney General prior to the date of enactment of this Act.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

PETER E. DIETRICH

The bill (S. 381) for the relief of Peter E. Dietrich was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, 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 Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Peter E. Dietrich of Cavalier, North Dakota, the sum of $48.75, representing the amount paid by the said Peter E. Dietrich to the United States as rental for a storage bin which he was unable to use because of unfavorable weather: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 1075) to provide for the reimbursement of Meadow School District No. 29, Upham, N. Dak., for loss of revenue resulting from the acquisition of certain lands within such school district by the Department of the Interior, was announced as next in order.

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

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, I ask that the bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will go over.

MISUSE BY COLLECTING AGENCIES OF NAMES, EMBLEMS, AND INSIGNIA

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 355) to amend title 18 of the United States Code so as to prohibit the misuse by collecting agencies of names, emblems, and insignia to indicate Federal agency, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments, on page 1, line 6, after the word "agencies", to insert "or private detective agencies"; at the beginning of line 10, to insert "or being engaged in furnishing private police, investigation, or other private detective services"; on page 2, line 10, after the word "than", where it appears the second time, to strike out "ten years" and insert "one year"; after line 11, to insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. 2. The provisions of this section shall become effective sixty days from the enactment thereof.

And, at the beginning of line 14, to change the section number from "2" to "3", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That chapter 33 of title 18 of the United States Code is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

§ 712. Misuse of names by collecting agencies or private detective agencies to indicate Federal agency

"Whoever, being engaged in the business of collecting or aiding in the collection of private debts or obligations, or being engaged in furnishing private police, investigation, or other private detective services, uses as part of the firm name of such business, or employs in any communication, correspondence, notice, advertisement, or circular the words 'national', 'Federal', or 'United States', the initials 'U.S.', or any emblem, insignia, or name, for the purpose of conveying and in a manner reasonably calculated to convey the false impression that such business is a department, agency, bureau, or instrumentality of the United States or in any manner represents the United States, shall be fined not more than $10,000 or imprisoned not more than one year, or both."

SEC. 2. The provisions of this section shall become effective sixty days from the enactment thereof.

SEC. 3. The analysis of chapter 33 of title 18 of the United States Code which immediately precedes section 701 of such title is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"SEC. 712. Misuse of names by collecting agencies to indicate Federal agency.".

The amendments were agreed to.

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

The title was amended, so as to read: "A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code so as to prohibit the misuse by collecting agencies or private detective agencies of names, emblems, and insignia to indicate Federal agency."

ROSETTE SORGE SAVORGNAN

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1207) for the relief of Rosette Sorge Savorgnan, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments, on page 1, line 8, after the word "section", to strike out "301 of the Nationality Act of 1940, as amended," and insert "310 of the Immigration and Nationality Act", and on page 2, line 1, after the word "section", to strike out "335" and insert "337", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Rosette Sorge Savorgnan, who lost United States citizenship under the provisions of section 2 of the Citizenship Act of 1907, and sections 104, 401, and 403 of the Nationality Act of 1940, as amended, may be naturalized by taking, prior to one year after the effective date of this Act, before any court referred to in subsection (a) of section 310 of the Immigration and Nationality Act or before any diplomatic or consular officer of the United States abroad, the appropriate oath prescribed by section 337 of the said Act. From and after naturalization under this Act the said Rosette Sorge Savorgnan shall have the same citizenship status which existed immediately prior to its loss.

The amendments were agreed to.

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

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the affidavits which are contained in the Senate report on S. 1207 be printed in the RECORD following the passage of the bill.

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

O'SULLIVAN RUBBER CORP.,
Winchester, Va., April 4, 1958.

MRS. ALESSANDRO SAVORGNAN,
New York, N.Y.

DEAR MRS. SAVORGNAN: It gives me pleasure and satisfaction to take this opportunity to set forth by letter to you a recapitulation of your contribution to the U.S. war effort through service with the U.S. Army in Rome during the months that I was assigned there and exercised supervision over your work.

You will recall that the Fifth Army entered Rome before dawn of June 5, 1944. The Rome Area Command, of which I was serving as military government chief of finance, was included among the early arrivals. By noontime I had sought you out as an American citizen recommended to me by some of the more reliable Italian bankers to request that you work in my office as secretary and interpreter, and also assist me to find other bilingual and reliable persons to work in the finance division.

You were entered on the payroll the next day and remained in the employ of the Rome Area Command, military government finance division, under my direct supervision for several months. When our operation was transferred to the Allied Control Commission and I became controller of financial institutions, you continued as my secretary and interpreter. You may recall that I was ordered to the advance party of the Vienna Area Command, United States-Austria, in January 1945 and left Rome for my new assignment. I was informed at that time that your services were much in demand by other members of the Allied Commission and you continued to be employed there.

One of the largest areas of our responsibility in the early days in Rome was to block and isolate all financial resources of persons sympathetic to the enemy including all known or suspected Fascists; also, to identify and protect for the property control officer all financial assets known or suspected to be formerly the property of citizens of any of the Allied Nations. Your keen awareness of the delicacy and the security responsibility of this operation enabled you to make an important contribution to its success.

At this juncture, I would like to take the opportunity to express my appreciation for the work of your husband as well. He joined our organization with the assignment of advising on Fascist and alien matters, making available to us his broad experience in the fields of foreign affairs, as well as his expert knowledge of Italian politics and law. He, too, made a valuable contribution to the Allied cause.

Although we first became acquainted on June 5, 1944, I claim competence to testify as to your qualities as an American citizen in view of our almost daily association in Rome for 8 months and our occasional contacts in the United States in later years. I was happy to assist your efforts in January and February 1945 to get back to the United States from which you had been cut off by war conditions for several years. I was greatly astonished when you told me subsequently that by a technicality some doubts had been raised as to your status as an American citizen. Your own good moral character, your fine family background in Wisconsin, the fine background of your husband's family in Rome, all lead to the conclusion that in fact as well as spirit you have been a good and loyal American citizen.

I cannot close without expressing again my warm commendation for the fine help you gave the U.S. Army and our allies when we worked together in Rome. You and your husband earned the thanks of the American people.

Best regards.

Sincerely yours,

VINCENT A. CATOZELLA,
Major, USAR.

STATE OF VIRGINIA,
County of Frederick, ss:

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 4th day of April 1953.

MARY V. ROSENBERGER,
Notary Public.

My commission expires October 3, 1956.

STATE OF NEW YORK,
County of New York.
To the Judiciary Committee of the U.S. Senate:

It has come to my attention that Mrs. Rosette Savorgnan nee Sorge is the subject of a pending private bill being examined by your committee, which bill is devised to restore to Mrs. Savorgnan her American citizenship.

On June 7, 1944, I entered Rome with the Allied Control Commission of which I was then Joint Chief of the Finance Subcommittee, holding the rank of commander, U.S. Coast Guard Reserve. It became necessary immediately to enlarge our staff to deal with the various financial problems of the Allied Forces, as well as the problems common to the Allied Forces and the Italian Government, and I sought bilingual personnel.

Mrs. Savorgnan was employed by me within the first 10 days of June 1944; prior to the confirmation of her appointment, her background, history and character were carefully scrutinized by the Counterintelligence Corps, U.S. Army, which rendered a satisfactory report, on the basis of which her appointment was continued.

Mrs. Savorgnan was assigned as secretary and assistant to captain, later major, Vincent Catozella, and served in this capacity until the end of December 1944, at which time I arranged the transfer of Major Catozella to the cadre of the Finance Group being prepared for work in Austria.

During this period I saw Mrs. Savorgnan daily and became well acquainted with her and her husband. On a short mission back to the United States in November 1944, I had the opportunity of talking with her parents and her brother, so that I also became acquainted with her family here in Wisconsin.

After Mrs. Savorgnan was released from duty with Major Catozella, she became my secretary and assistant, and worked with me in this capacity until I was detached from the Allied Commission and ordered back to regular naval duty on April 15, 1945.

During the entire period from June 1944 until April 1945, I tried to help Mrs. Savorgnan in her efforts to return to the United States, a matter which was extremely urgent at that time because of illness in her family. Unfortunately my efforts were unsuccessful despite numerous conversations with members of the staff of the U.S. Ambassador, of the political representative and after its establishment, of the consulate.

In my opinion Mrs. Savorgnan is a loyal American, who lost her citizenship through a legal technicality; she never should have lost the citizenship and in my opinion is fully entitled to have her citizenship restored.

One thing that should certainly be considered very much in her favor, is that Mrs. Savorgnan worked loyally and faithfully serving American interests, as soon as it was possible for her to do so during the war period.

JOSEPH JOHN LAWLER.

This 8th day of April 1953.

FRANK E. MARRA,
Notary Public.

Commission expires March 30, 1954.

STATE OF NEW YORK,
County of New York.
To the Judiciary Committee of the U.S. Senate:

It has come to my attention that Mrs. Rosette Savorgnan (nee Sorge) is the subject of a pending private bill being examined by your committee, which bill is devised to restore to Mrs. Savorgnan her American citizenship.

In November 1943 as a captain in the U.S. Naval Reserve, I was appointed by the Combined Chiefs of Staff as vice president of the Allied Control Commission (Italy), having entered Italy in September 1943 as a member of the Allied Military Mission to the Italian Government. In February 1944, I was appointed Deputy Chief Commissioner of the Allied Control Commission, and in June 1944 Acting Chief Commissioner of the Allied Control Commission. In November 1944 I was appointed Chief Commissioner, with the rank of commodore. In December 1944 I was promoted to the rank of rear admiral in the U.S. Naval Reserve, which grade I continue to hold. I continued as Chief Commissioner of the Allied Control Commission until its cessation in February 1947.

From February 1944 until April 1945, Comdr. J. J. Lawler, U.S. Coast Guard Reserve, not only served under me in the Finance Subcommission of the Allied Control Commission, but was a member of my personal mess, living in my house successively at Cava di Thieni, Naples, and Rome. I have read Commander Lawler's affidavit dated April 8, 1953, supporting the restoration to Mrs. Savorgnan of her American citizenship and am glad to verify in all respects the details set forth in his affidavit.

I have known Mrs. Savorgnan and her husband personally for several years and hereby attest to her loyalty and devotion to the United States and her faithful and loyal service on behalf of the United States in the Allied Control Commission from June 1944 until October 1945.

Mrs. Savorgnan is a lady of the highest standards and in all respect fully deserves the restoration of her American citizenship. I am glad to support her application and, if desired, I stand ready to appear as a witness on her behalf before your committee.

ELLERY W. STONE,
Rear Admiral, USNR.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 21st day of April 1953.

ROSS A. WAKEMAN,
Notary Public.

Commission expires March 30, 1954.

THE STATE OF TEXAS,
County of Galveston:

Before me, the undersigned, a notary public in and for said county, State of Texas, on this day personally appeared George D. Murphey, colonel, U.S. Army, retired, to me well known, and who, after being duly sworn, deposes and says that:

He was on active duty as a commissioned officer in the Regular Army of the United States from October 31, 1911, to June 30, 1950. He is now retired and lives at 12 Cedar Lawn North, Galveston, Tex. He is a native of Augusta, Ga.

From about October 15, 1943, to about July 1, 1945, he was on duty with the Allied Commission (originally, Allied Control Commission) in Italy. His status was that of Director, and Assistant to Director, of the Economic Section of the Allied Commission. The Economic Section(as the title implies) dealt specifically with the national (Italian) commerce, finance, food, utilities, transportation, and shipping.

During the deponent's assignment with the Allied Commission there came directly under his observation and supervision, the services of (Mrs.) Rosette Sorge Savorgnan. Mrs. Savorgnan, a native citizen of the United States, was sojourning in Rome when the U.S. Forces entered that city in 1944. As did many other American citizens, Mrs. Savorgnan identified herself to the U.S. forces as soon as Rome was occupied. With the establishment of the (Allied) military affairs government (a component of the combatant forces) Mrs. Savorgnan's services were engaged by that organization, primarily in connection with fiscal matters. These matters included the screening, release, and impounding of Italian funds and bank accounts, both private, and public. The very nature of these operations, obviously, demanded an esoteric knowledge of the situation, inherent honesty, Christian fairness, and utmost trustworthiness.

All of these qualifications Mrs. Savorgnan possessed and fully demonstrated. As a consequence, her position with the military affairs government was changed to a similar one with the finance subsection of the (Supreme) Headquarters of the Allied Commission shortly after the Commission moved into Rome. During the last 2 or 3 months of the deponent's tenure with the Allied Commission—April–June 1945—Mrs. Savorgnan served under his immediate supervision as his assistant. This assignment involved participation in the higher advisory, supervisory, and planning functions incident to the categorical operations (above indicated) of the Economic Section of the Allied Commission.

Mrs. Savorgnan rendered valuable services and contributed greatly to the attainment of the Allied Commission's objectives in Italy. For this her Nation, the United States, owes her its grateful appreciation. It is to be emphasized that Mrs. Savorgnan's services were motivated solely by the deepest patriotism and devotion to her native country. Her adequate circumstances abroad, especially with respect to affluence and social position, were alone proof that her loyal actions were void of any selfish or materialistic motives.

Early in 1945, the deponent learned that Mrs. Savorgnan had applied for U.S. passport, or visa, to return to the United States. This application had been made immediately upon the reopening of the U.S. consular service in Italy. Both the Navy and the Army of the United States offered Mrs. Savorgnan transportation to the United States, contingent upon clearance by the consular service. Being in Europe when the United States was precipitated into war (1941) Mrs. Savorgnan could not subsequently return to her homeland because of worldwide belligerency.

One of the cogent reasons for Mrs. Savorgnan's anxiety to return home was the desire to be with her parents (themselves natives and residents of Wisconsin). This daughterly instinct was made all the more impelling by being incommunicado through the heart-rending years of war exilement, and particularly by the mother's critical illness. This malady proved fatal before Mrs. Savorgnan could surmount the bureaucratic obstacles raised to obstruct her return. It would be idle to detail the well-known human yearning displayed by Mrs. Savorgnan to get back to the United States. Suffice it to say that the war conditions which enforced her overseas separation, likewise intensified her longing to return. Before the sojourn in question, Mrs. Savorgnan had not been outside of the United States. Hence, it is axiomatic that had the probability of war been foreseen prior to her departure, she never would have left the country.

Mrs. Savorgnan acquired her Italian name by marriage to Signor Alessandro Savorgnan, a member of one of Italy's finest families of long and eminent lineage. Mrs. Savorgnan met her husband in the Middle West (United States). He was then serving in that area as a member of the Italian consular service. Accordingly, she was married in the Middle West. Shortly after marriage, Italian consulates were summarily closed by Presidential order. Mr. Savorgnan, necessarily continued his consular vocation abroad. Naturally enough, Mrs. Savorgnan accompanied her husband. Months later, when war was declared between the United States and the Axis Powers, Mr. Savorgnan severed his consular connections. At this time he was stationed in Austria. His refusal to collaborate with the Germans was done, of course, at the risk of both his life and that of his wife. Inevitably, the Germans interned them. At length they escaped and finally made their way to the home of the husband's relatives in Rome. There they remained "underground" until the arrival of the U.S. forces in 1944. That Mr. Savorgnan today occupies one of the highest positions in the important consulate at New York is immutable evidence of his honorable standing with the Government of the United States, as well as with his own.

Before her marriage, Mrs. Savorgnan was Miss Rosette Sorge. She was born in the State of Wisconsin, in which State she lived with her parents throughout the years of her childhood. Her parents were also born in the United States. Descending from Christian parents of Protestant faith, Mrs. Savorgnan has adhered to the same religious tenets; this notwithstanding her husband's affiliations with the Roman Catholic Church. Mrs. Savorgnan received her schooling and college education in Wisconsin. She is the perfect personification of lofty parental nurture and fortunate advantages, Christian training, and American patriotism steeped in traditional American ideals. All of these qualities are enhanced by the virtues, culture, and other endowments of true ladyship. In brief, Mrs. Savorgnan is the epitome—the sine qua non—of the finest womanhood of the United States.

It is understood that Mrs. Savorgnan's U.S. citizenship is now under legislative consideration with a view to complete validation. This favorable action apparently is

being taken to rectify a chain of unfortunate circumstances starting with Mrs. Savorgnan's request for reentry into the United States upon the termination of war in Europe (1945).

As a matter incident to her marriage to a member of the Italian consular service, the Italian Government requested that Mrs. Savorgnan sign some routine document affecting her prospective status as the wife of an Italian official. She signed the document only as a matter of form, and as a natural acquiescence to facilitate her marriage. The document was signed, of course, in the continental United States. So inconsequential was this document, particularly to the United States, that it bore no recognizance, or attestation, of any U.S. officer or court, either State or Federal. It is proverbial that no native-born citizen, by private or secret act within his own country, can expatriate himself either unknowingly or even by deliberate scheming. Nevertheless the aforesaid document has been used as the primary, if not the sole, basis for depriving Mrs. Savorgnan of her multilateral rights of U.S. citizenship.

With extreme anguish, labor and expense, Mrs. Savorgnan has long demonstrated superhuman perseverance in fighting for her citizenship. She has battled every discernible opposition with all the means at her disposal. Even a Federal court decided in her favor. In spite of this clearance, adverse authorities have vitiated the vindication handed down by the court. That any authority could pursue such action against a native-born citizen, especially one so superior and exemplary as Mrs. Savorgnan, is beyond reason. Disregard for the rights and welfare of the individual citizen is a terrible violation of the fundamental ideology of the United States.

Only the truest and best Americanism could remain adamant after the treatment which Mrs. Savorgnan has received from her own Government. Understandably, her case has become international knowledge. Foreigners, as well as her fellow countrymen, no doubt marvel at her invincible national zeal and devotion to country.

The United States not only owes Mrs. Savorgnan its protection of her citizenship, but likewise its gratitude for the enduring record she has engrossed upon the fair pages of American patriotism.

The deponent further states that the above retrospective statements have been made necessarily without access to recorded or other precise data. Notwithstanding, the contents hereof are substantially true according to his best knowledge and belief.

GEORGE D. MURPHEY,
Colonel, U.S. Army, Retired.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 23d day of April A.D. 1953.

RAY O'NEILL,
Notary Public in and for Galveston County, Tex.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BARTLETT in the chair). The call of the calendar has been concluded.

What is the pleasure of the Senate?

Mr. MORTON. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. MCGEE], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], are absent on official business.

I further announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] is absent because of illness.

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] is necessarily absent.

LAKE MICHIGAN WATER DIVERSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

The Chair will now proceed to refer the bill, H.R. 1, the so-called Lake Michigan water diversion bill——

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, we cannot hear the Chair. May we have order so Senators can hear the Chair?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

The Chair will now proceed to refer the bill, H.R. 1, the so-called Lake Michigan water diversion bill, heretofore received from the House. Under the rule, the Chair is required to refer it, without debate, subject to an appeal, which is debatable.

This bill requires a study to be conducted of the effect of increasing the diversion of water from Lake Michigan into the Illinois Waterway for navigation.

Following a Supreme Court decision on April 21, 1930, concerning water diversion from the lake, the improvement of the Illinois Waterway, which includes the Chicago Drainage Canal, was authorized by the Rivers and Harbors Act of July 3, 1930, which is now underway.

The pending bill authorizes the State of Illinois and the Metropolitan Sanitary District of Greater Chicago to divert water from the lake for a certain period.

The Secretary of the Army, acting for the Corps of Engineers, has complete control and supervision over the amounts withdrawn, and, after the study has been made in cooperation with the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, is required to submit the report to the Congress.

The question now presented is one of reference, and not a discussion of the merits of the bill itself.

Where the jurisdiction of a committee is questioned, the Presiding Officer is required to refer a bill to the committee which has jurisdiction over the preponderance of the subject matter, subject to an appeal.

The Rivers and Harbors Act of July 3, 1930, was considered by the then Commerce Committee of the Senate, whose functions were transferred by the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 to the newly created Public Works Committee.

In the 83d, 84th, and 85th Congresses, at least six bills providing for the diversion of water from Lake Michigan into the Illinois Waterway were referred to that committee, and three House bills reported out. There has been no exception in references to the Pubic Works Committee.

The Committee on Public Works, under the Senate rule, has jurisdiction over, first, "improvement of rivers and harbors," and second, "public works for the benefit of navigation."

The question of water diversion into the Illinois Waterway is directly connected with the improvement for navigation of the waterway, authorized by the Rivers and Harbors Act of 1930.

There is no provision in the bill requiring negotiations to be conducted with the Government of Canada. In a letter, dated July 2, 1958, addressed to Senator CHAVEZ, chairman of the Senate Public Works Committee, on S. 1123, a bill similar to H.R. 2 of the 85th Congress, the Assistant Director of the Budget Bureau said:

> The Department of State has now completed discussions with the Canadian Government on the proposed increased diversion.

While the jurisdiction of certain other committees might be involved in some degree, the subject matter which predominates in the bill seems to fall clearly within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Public Works.

Under the rule, therefore, the Chair refers the bill to the Committee on Public Works.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I appeal from the ruling of the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Shall the decision of the Chair stand as the judgment of the Senate?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I regret deeply that circumstances have made it necessary to ask my colleagues to come to the Chamber this late in the evening.

For nearly 3 months we have had facing us the question of the reference of a bill of this nature. The proponents and opponents desire to be heard on the question. We gave due and adequate notice that we would attempt to get to consider the matter early today. Circumstances did not permit that to be done.

We have ready a very important piece of legislation, the International Monetary Fund legislation, reported by the

Foreign Relations Committee. The distinguished chairman of that committee is prepared to speak on it tomorrow. He will not be in the city after tomorrow, or next week. I thought we would take care of the question of the reference of the bill. That question does not go to the merits of the bill, but has to do with whether it should be referred to the committee to which it has been referred in several previous Congresses.

I have no opinion on the question. The Chair has stated the facts involved. I do not wish to try to influence any Senator. I hope we can dispose of the question of the reference of the bill, take up the International Monetary Fund bill, move to take up the area redevelopment bill, proceed to further consider it next week, and dispose of it. If we can do that, I think perhaps the Senate can recess for the Easter holidays next Thursday.

That is the plan of the Senate leadership. I have no desire to have Senators stay here late. I am very tired. I have been here mornings and afternoons, and I know other Senators have. But if we are going to be away for Easter, if we cannot have votes on Friday, if it is going to be difficult to get votes on Monday, if some Senators are not going to be here Tuesday or Wednesday, we are going to have to decide some time when to dispose of these matters.

I do not desire to lecture the Senate or suggest any particular course. I merely wish to lay the facts before the Senate.

The area redevelopment bill was ready to be reported a week ago. It took a week to get the minority views on it written. I do not know how long the debate on the bill will take. I want to allow ample time. I know the proponents are anxious to have the bill passed. Senators have brought delegations from certain areas of the Nation, saying it is very urgent to have legislation of this kind considered promptly. So I hope we can discuss the reference of House bill No. 1 and vote, one way or the other, as to which committee it should be referred. It is a matter for the Senate to determine now. The Chair has ruled. Then I hope we can take up the International Monetary Fund bill, and perhaps vote on it. There is going to be some opposition to that bill. The minority leader tells me that in 2 or 3 hours we can dispose of it. Then we hope to get to the area redevelopment bill and get an agreement to vote on that bill next week.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Several Senators have asked me to yield. I yield first to the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, the question being one merely of reference of the bill, I think our minds are made up. Does the majority leader know of any reason why we cannot obtain a unanimous-consent agreement to limit the time for debate and take a vote on the matter tonight?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. That is a matter for the individual Senators to consider. I am prepared to vote now, but I do not want to foreclose any Senator who desires to speak.

I now yield to my friend the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I should like to follow up the suggestion of the Senator from Rhode Island. I wish to say, on behalf of the proponents of the proposed legislation, we hope very much a unanimous-consent agreement will be reached. We would be willing to limit debate to 15 minutes to each side and to guarantee that we will not take more than 5 minutes on our side, yielding back 10 minutes, so that the other side will have three times as much time as we will have.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I have not discussed that possibility, nor have I explored it with anyone, but in order that Senators may have some idea of the wishes of the other Senators, I ask unanimous consent that there may be a limitation of time for debate of not to exceed 1 hour, 30 minutes to each side, the time to be controlled, respectively, by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], and any time not used to be yielded back.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield to my friend from Wisconsin.

Mr. WILEY. I noticed that the opinion related to S. 308. What about the bill which came over from the House of Representatives? Would that bill be referred to the committee also?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I understood the ruling was with respect to H.R. 1.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct. The Chair understands the bills are identical.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The House and Senate bills are identical?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is the understanding of the Chair.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The ruling of the Chair related to the reference of the House bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It related to one or to the other.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. As I understand the situation, the Presiding Officer, in accordance with an uninterrupted list of precedents, referred the bill to the Committee on Public Works, which committee has always considered the bill in the House and has always considered the bill in the Senate. The Senator from Wisconsin has appealed that reference. The question is whether we shall follow the decision of the Presiding Officer and the rules of the Senate or whether we shall decide to send the bill to some other committee. We have the power, by a majority vote of the Senate, to send the bill to any committee, notwithstanding the jurisdiction of the Public Works Committee under the rules.

Mr. WILEY. Is there an understanding that the two bills will follow the direction of the Chair, so that one bill will not go to one committee and the other bill to another committee?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I assume that if the Senate decides to send H.R. 1 to the Committee on Public Works the Presiding Officer will immediately refer the Senate bill to the Committee on Public Works also. I assume the same course would be followed in the event of a reference to another committee. If that was not done, the Senator could immediately appeal, and the majority would consistently follow its previous decision.

Mr. WILEY. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. WILEY. A question was asked as to whether we would give consent to limit the time for debate. I must object at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. WILEY. I wish to say that I was definitely notified to be present, and I have been in the Chamber all afternoon. I was told that I should be here after the morning hour. At 2 o'clock the morning hour started. We have been present, ready to argue the matter. To me, at least, it is a very serious matter.

The situation now is not the same as the situation in the past. We now have a definite and written objection by Canada in relation to the diversion of water. We have already observed that the city of Chicago has diverted three rivers, has taken 1,800 feet a second and 1,000 feet a second on top of that, and now wants another 1,000 feet a second.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, that is something which goes to the merits of the proposed legislation. Once the Senate decides which committee should hear the matter, whether it be the Committee on Public Works or the Committee on Foreign Relations, the committee can hear the testimony, and we will be glad to set aside whatever time is necessary to hear the arguments if the bill is favorably reported.

I wonder if we could not be fair to our colleagues and give them some indication as to when we can vote on this matter? I, therefore, ask unanimous consent that 2 hours be allotted to debate the reference of the bill, 1 hour to be controlled by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], if he desires to utilize that much time, and 1 hour to be controlled by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS].

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President——

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I make the request that we consider a limitation of 3 hours, 1½ hours to each side.

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

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, when would the vote be taken?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The vote would be taken at 9:25, if both sides used all their time. Is there objection, Mr. President?

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I should like to ask a question of the Senator from Wisconsin. Perhaps we can obviate the objection and arrive at a unanimous-consent agreement.

I am advised there is a precedent for sending the bills to two different com-

mittees. Would that procedure be satisfactory to the Senator from Wisconsin, on a 1-hour limitation of debate basis? Would that be acceptable to the leadership?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. It is not a matter for me to determine. It is a matter for the Senate to determine, on an appeal, now.

Mr. McNAMARA. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I am informed that one side will not use nearly all of its time. The request is for 3 hours. I want to tell Senators who are present that if the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], and the proponents of the appeal consumed all of their time, and if the opponents consumed the time I understand they will consume, the Senate could probably vote by 8:30.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I think I speak for my colleagues in saying we are willing to state our case in 5 minutes. The other side can use one and a half hours, if Senators desire to, or 2 hours, but I hope we can reach a decision tonight.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, that would require 1 hour and 35 minutes, so that we could vote about 8 o'clock. Will the Chair put the question as to the unanimous-consent request?

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

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. I have no objection to the Senate doing anything it wants about this matter, but several of us have other engagements. I am perfectly willing to come back at 8 o'clock, to come back at 8:30, to come back at 9 o'clock, or to come back any time up to midnight or later, but I do not think it is fair to leave the matter in such a state of flux that we do not know when the vote will be taken.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. If we can get a decision, and if there is no objection to the unanimous-consent request, I think I can tell the Senator very promptly about what time we will have the rollcall and the vote. We can give each Senator 30 minutes' notice.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Is there any assurance that the Senator from Wisconsin will take the full time allotted?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I will explore that matter if I can once obtain unanimous consent.

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, to make it very clear, the matter at issue is the reference of the bill only. If the bill goes to the Committee on Public Works it will then go to a subcommittee, which will take testimony. Then the bill will go to the full committee. The merits of the bill are not to be determined on the floor until the bill has gone through the entire committee procedure. The only question now involved is whether the bill shall go to the committee which considered it in the 82d Congress, in the 83d Congress, in the 84th Congress and in the 85th Congress, in an unbroken line of precedents.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, reserving the right to object——

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

Mr. BUSH. I certainly agree with what the Senator just said. Would not the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin permit us to vote now on the reference of the bill?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am ready to vote now.

Mr. BUSH. I refer to the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY]. Would the Senator not permit us to vote now? Do we all have to come back after 2 hours just to vote on a matter of reference of a bill? The merits of the bill are not involved. I beg the Senator to consider the fact that this does not involve the merits of the bill, but only a question of which committee should consider it.

Mr. WILEY. I will say to the Senator from Connecticut that some of the facts determine which committee should consider the bill. In my humble opinion the Senator should know the facts. I want all other Senators to know the facts.

I apologize, of course, but I did not get the Senate into this spot. The other side did that, after telling us to be present at 2 o'clock. I have been present ent all afternoon, ready to speak. I have been ready to give the Senators the facts which relate to the issue to which the Senator refers.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit us to have the unanimous-consent agreement, there are now more Senators present than have been present all afternoon, and he can give the Senators the facts now.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I have no control over speaking by other Senators. Senators can speak whenever they want to about whatever subject they wish to discuss. That is one of the fine things about the Senate.

All I can do is tell the Senate, as I did last week and again early this week, that we hope we can debate the matter of reference of the bill. We are now in a position to debate the matter.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. If the Senator will let the unanimous consent go through, then he can be immediately recognized and will have 1½ hours to talk. The other side will use 5 minutes. At the conclusion of that time we will have a vote.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, after hearing the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Texas and hearing also the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Illinois, I am satisfied that they have done considerable talking with Senators, which I have not done.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President——

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, let me say this——

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. No; I have the floor.

Mr. WILEY. No.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, who has the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas has the floor.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I will say to the Senator that I do not know what research he has done, but he is speaking without showing evidence of having done much of it.

I have not talked with a single Senator as to how he expects to vote on this question. That is a matter for each Senator to determine. If there is any Senator with whom I have talked about the reference of this subject, or about the merits of the question, I should like to have him rise. I have not discussed it with any Senator. I merely wish to have the subject debated, so that Senators can vote. One side says it will require 5 minutes. The other side says it will require an hour and a half. We could then vote at 8 o'clock.

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

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President——

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, there is an understanding. I agree with the Senator from Illinois that all the arguments in favor of the Chicago viewpoint could be presented in 5 minutes, so I assume that arrangement would be satisfactory.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That was not my point.

Mr. AIKEN. It seems to me that the viewpoint of the Senator from Wisconsin and other Senators who agree with him could then be presented. So I presume, if we are to vote at 8 o'clock that 5 minutes will be used for the presentation of the Chicago viewpoint, which should be ample, and an hour and 25 minutes should be given the Great Lakes proponents the opportunity to present enough objections so that the Senate will have a full understanding of the situation.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President——

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield to my friend from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I wish to subscribe to the views expressed by the Senator from Wisconsin, to the effect that we were told that this question would come before the Senate for consideration at 2 o'clock.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I have never told any Senator that.

Mr. LAUSCHE. That was my understanding. There has been certain discussion——

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, let me make it perfectly clear that I have not misled anyone. The only way to have an understanding as to when a vote is to be taken is by unanimous consent. That is what I am trying to obtain. If we can obtain unanimous consent we can all have an understanding.

Last week I announced that beginning today we could debate reference of the bill. The bill is at the desk, and any

Senator can move to take it from the desk at any time he desires to do so.

That is what I am trying to obtain an agreement upon, so that the Senator will have ample time to discuss the question.

Will the Chair put the request?

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

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. If the opponents think their case is so weak that they need more time, we are willing to give them 2 hours, and reduce our time to 4 minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, may we have the original request stated?

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

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. What is the request?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The request is for an hour and a half to each side.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, reserving the right to object——

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I believe, from the discussion which has been had, that it is very apparent that the cards are stacked against us so far as the committee is concerned.

Suppose that by 8 o'clock a vote were taken, and the ruling of the Chair should be sustained. Could there be an agreement that after consideration by the committee which considered the question last year under the dominating influence of the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] the bill should be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senate could do that by a majority vote, if it desired to follow such a course. The Senate can always work its will by majority vote.

I have been trying to protect the Senator from Wisconsin and other Senators by giving them an opportunity to be present before the bill is referred. That is rather difficult, because I am not present in the Chamber all the time.

If we can obtain a unanimous-consent agreement, the proponents of the bill will have ample protection, and whatever time they desire. Senators who have dinner engagements can keep them and return to the Chamber later to vote. I hope Senators will allow us to obtain the proposed unanimous-consent agreement.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, the point I am trying to make is that the entire afternoon was spent in the discussion of a subject which has been kicked back and forth on the floor of the Senate for the past 18 months.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator has just told me that, and I am aware of it. However, there was not a thing I could do about it.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Now we have before us a subject involving international relations with Canada. It involves interstate relations between States. The declaration is made that it is of such insignificance that we ought to dispose of it within 30 minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I have not made such a declaration. I do not know anyone who has.

Mr. LAUSCHE. May I complete my statement?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I want the RECORD to show that I made no such declaration.

I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The statement was made that the bill contains no provision which would require negotiation with Canada. That is the vice and the folly of the bill. It attempts completely to ignore the fact that we would be violating the rights of Canada. There is no recognition in the bill of that fact. In a high-handed fashion we are saying to Canada, "This is a bill which deals only with public works." Canada is saying to us, "We object to the implementation of the program by the passage of the bill."

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. That goes to the merits of the bill.

Mr. LAUSCHE. That does not go to the merits of the bill. It goes to the vital question involved, as to which committee of the Senate has the greatest interest in it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I would have no objection to that.

Mr. President, in the hope that this question can be disposed of——

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Let us have the request put.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Texas a question. The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] has just stated that he has no objection to the bill going to the Foreign Relations Committee.

Mr. DIRKSEN. No; I did not say that.

Mr. LAUSCHE. After it has been disposed of by the Committee on Public Works.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. That is a question for the entire Senate to determine when the bill is reported. Any Senator can move to refer it to the Foreign Relations Committee; and if the majority supports such a motion, as Senators know, the bill will be referred to that committee. But first we must determine where it is to go now.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair advises that when and if the bill is reported from the Committee on Public Works a motion for reference to the Committee on Foreign Relations would be in order.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I have so stated. I do not know whether the bill will be reported from the Committee on Public Works. I will make no statement as to what action that committee will take. But when the bill is reported to the Senate and is placed on the calendar any Senator can rise in his place and make a motion; and if the majority of his colleagues vote in favor of the motion, the bill can be sent anywhere the Senate wishes to send it.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] does not happen to be present in the Chamber. As the ranking Republican member of the Senate Committee on Public Works, I think I can safely say that if the bill is referred to the Committee on Public Works it will receive a fair hearing, and that the hearing will not be dominated by anyone or prejudiced in any way.

Moreover, if some new evidence has been discovered as to the attitude of the Canadian Government, that evidence will be given respectful, careful, and honest consideration. I do not want any Senator to think that if the bill is referred to the Committee on Public Works it will come before a prejudiced committee.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I renew my request that each side be allowed an hour and 45 minutes.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Within the rules of the Senate, does it lie within the power of a Senator to move that the bill be referred to the Public Works Committee, and that when that committee has concluded its hearing it be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I would object very strenuously to such procedure, before the bill is even received by a committee. We cannot anticipate what action will be taken by the committee.

If Senators who wish to refer the bill to the Committee on Foreign Relations have the necessary votes, it can be sent there tonight. If they have not the votes to send it there tonight, they can move to send it there if and when it is reported from the Committee on Public Works.

What I am trying to do is to get the bill to committee and get it off the desk, because it could be passed without going to a committee. We passed a bill under those circumstances not too long ago.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I have not had an answer to my inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will advise that such a motion would not be in order. An appeal is pending.

Mr. LAUSCHE. If I may, I should like to ask a further question. If the Senate has the authority to send the bill to the Committee on Foreign Relations after it is reported to the Senate by the Committee on Public Works, why does not the Senate now have the authority to direct that it be sent to both committees?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Such a procedure would be in violation of section 137 of the Legislative Reorganization Act, which requires the Chair, where there is a question raised as to the jurisdiction of a committee, to refer such bill without debate to the committee which has jurisdiction over the subject matter which predominates in the bill.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The appeal of the Senator from Wisconsin is pending before the Senate. I should like to have an understanding as to when the Senate will vote. I expect to leave the Chamber shortly, although I shall be available at any time. Nevertheless, I should like to have an understanding reached for the benefit of Senators who

may not be here. I renew my request that an hour and a half of debate be allowed to each side of the question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. McNAMARA. Reserving the right to object—and I wish to make it clear that I shall not object—as a member of the subcommittee of the Committee on Public Works I wish to join with the Senator from South Dakota, and I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] to withdraw his remarks in reference to the chairman of the subcommittee. I believe those remarks were derogatory.

Mr. WILEY. I thought it was a compliment. The Senator to whom I referred dominates in the subcommittee as he dominates on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. McNAMARA. This is becoming a little facetious. He does not dominate me as a member of that subcommittee. I believe the Senator's remark was a reflection on the other members of the subcommittee, and I hope the Senator will withdraw his remark.

Mr. WILEY. If it will please the Senator, and if he believes it was a reflection, that the Senator is dominated, I shall be glad to withdraw my remark. I have had a little experience with the Senator in question on one occasion, particularly, when he practically ordered me out of the committee room.

Mr. McNAMARA. I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HOLLAND. I understood that the distinguished majority leader would try to give us some assurance as to when we should return.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I shall be glad to do so if the Senator will give me a few moments.

Mr. WILEY. I shall take 20 minutes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. We shall take 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, before Senators leave the Chamber, I should like to modify my request so as to provide that 20 minutes be allowed to each side on the motion pending question.

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

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield me 5 minutes?

Mr. WILEY. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I shall speak very briefly. In my opinion, the seriousness of the bill is far greater than has been ascribed to it. Canada opposes its passage. With Canada objecting, it is my view that the bill does not further our international relations. I make my presentation now in the hope that at least after the Public Works Committee has acted on the bill and it comes back to the Senate, if it is the recommendation of the committee that it be reported, the Senate will then give serious consideration to sending the bill to the Committee on Foreign Relations. In the bill not only the rights of sister States are being affected, but also the rights of Canada, and it is on that basis, in my opinion, that the bill should be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, there is only one issue before the Senate at this time, and that is to which committee the Chicago diversion bills should be referred. I maintain they should be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations. During the course of the next 15 minutes I wish to say why.

It is interesting to note in the current press that at long last the Chicago sanitary district is talking about spending money to improve its own sewage purification plant. I have always contended that this is Chicago's problem, and that Chicago should solve it. I am glad to see that Chicago is talking about it.

I have in my hand an article published in the Chicago Daily Tribune of March 13, 1959. I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

SANITARY UNIT ORDER THREE SLUDGE PLANTS—COST OF PROPERTY PUT AT $25 MILLION

Plans for a $25 million program, to wit, the sanitary district No. 1 problem, sludge disposal, were disclosed Thursday by the district trustees.

They voted 7 to 1 to authorize the district engineers to draw up specifications for the construction of three plants to dispose of sludge, the solids that are removed from sewage during treatment.

PROBLEM CALLED ACUTE

"The need for additional sludging disposal facilities has been urgent for some years but now become acute," said Frank Chesrow, district president. "The district currently is capable of disposing up to 650 tons of sludge daily, but cannot dispose of 150 to 300 additional tons daily which must be placed in storage lagoons."

Chesrow said studies show that by 1970 the district disposal capacity must be boosted to 1,047 tons daily if it is to keep pace with growth of the Chicago area. He said, "The engineers have been asked to draw up blueprints for two disposal plants, a 300-ton and a 250-ton unit, at the West-Southwest treatment works, and a 75-ton unit at the Calumet works.

EXPERIMENTAL METHOD

A 300-ton unit at the West-Southwest works will be based on the Zimmermann process, an experimental method the district has been testing. The other two units will use the heat-digestion method, new to Chicago but used in many major cities.

William Dundas, district superintendent, gave the total cost estimate of at least $25 million.

Walter S. Baltis, who cast the dissenting vote, argued that the authorization to the engineers did not specify that first priority be given to the heat-digestion plan.

"There are tried and true plants for which materials are readily available," Baltis said.

"Their construction would be the fastest, most economical way to meet this crucial problem."

BASIS OF OBJECTION

"The Zimmerman process has never been proved to work in a large scale operation and I think construction of such plant should be the secondary objection of the district."

Trustee William Patterson said "that if the district doesn't act immediately, the sludge problem will become intolerable."

William Nordburg, another trustee, said that though it be costly any possible solution of the situation must be tried.

"This is a tremendous expenditure of taxpayers' money being proposed," Baltis replied. "I agree we must solve the problem but in justice to the citizens, we must do it judiciously."

Mr. WILEY. I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point an excerpt from Committee Report No. 191, of the House of Representatives, 86th Congress, 1st session. The report is entitled "Requiring a study to be conducted of the effect of increasing the diversion of water from Lake Michigan into the Illinois Waterway for navigation, and for other purposes." The report accompanied H.R. 1. The portion I wish to have printed in the RECORD shows the position of the Canadian Government.

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

On a number of occasions in the past, the Canadian Government has expressed its objections to proposals envisaging increased diversions of water from Lake Michigan at Chicago. Once again, and at the invitation of the Government of the United States through the U.S. Embassy's aide memorie of February 9, 1959, the Government of Canada is anxious to make known its views on legislative proposals now before Congress, such as bill H.R. 1, which are intended to authorize an increased diversion of water from the Great Lakes Basin into the Illinois Waterway.

While recognizing that the use of Michigan water is a matter within the jurisdiction of the United States of America, it is the considered opinion of the Canadian Government that any authorization for an additional diversion would be incompatible with the arrangements for the St. Lawrence seaway and power development, and with the Niagara Treaty of 1950, and would be prejudicial to navigation and power development which these mutual arrangements were designed to improve and facilitate.

The point has been made repeatedly by Canada that every withdrawal of water from the basin means less depth available for shipping in harbors and in channels. Additional withdrawals would have adverse effects on the hydroelectric generation potential on both sides of the border at Niagara Falls and in the international section of the St. Lawrence River, as well as in the Province of Quebec, and would inflict hardship on communities and industries on both sides of the border.

The Government of Canada therefore protests against the implementation of proposals contained in H.R. 1.

WATER DIVERSION JURISDICTION

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, it is important to many of us that the Chicago water diversion bill be considered, not merely from the point of view of local self-interest, but as part of the overall national and international picture.

Unfortunately, it has been most difficult to see that this is done.

I think I have put my finger on the reason.

AVOID WRONG COMMITTEE

It has been considered before the Public Works Committee which is primarily

concerned with the bill from the point of view of public works in a particular locality.

Though the bill superficially may seem to concern local public works, analysis shows that it does not concern public works at all.

The bill is not about the building of public works.

The bill is about studying the effects of an additional diversion of water where water is already being diverted. No additional works are required. Merely the larger opening of the gates already there.

SCOPE IS INTERNATIONAL

And what kind of effects are to be studied? The effects are upon navigation and commerce, upon the use of water which to a greater or lesser extent belongs to all countries and States bordering the Great Lakes, the effects on our international relations, particularly with Canada.

These are the major consideration involved in the bill. When Senators read what I have placed in the RECORD, they will realize how Canada feels on the subject.

The effect on international law which will be applied in such diverse parts of the world as Pakistan and India, Egypt and the Sudan, and the Northwestern part of the United States and the southwestern part of Canada where the Columbia River crosses the borders.

BASIC PRINCIPLE

It is not a small point which has been raised about the reference of S. 308 and H.R. 1. It is a matter of deep principle.

A bill should go to the committee with the greatest overall interest in the legislation, so that it may be fairly considered from all points of view.

FOREIGN RELATIONS COMMITTEE

The bill should go to the committee which has the greatest concern with its provisions. That is the Committee on Foreign Relations.

It concerns the interpretation of the Boundary Waters Treaty of 1909 which covers waters which affect the level of boundary waters, as well as waters which actually cross the border.

It affects the continuing discussions which we have with Canada about the use of water by the two countries. There is, as Senators know, an International Joint Commission constantly considering such matters. The work of such international organizations is, of course, within the jurisdiction of the Foreign Relations Committee.

The Foreign Relations Committee has a subcommittee on Canada suitable for handling matters of this sort.

The complex questions of international law involved in the bill, the Niagara Treaty of 1950 and the effect on the St. Lawrence Seaway, the legislation for which the Foreign Relations Committee handled; the maintenance of our friendly relations with the Canadian Government, consideration of an international agreement with Canada on this problem—all these matters are within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Foreign Relations.

HISTORICAL POLICY

The diversion at Chicago has had a long and controversial history.

Such a great statesman and judge as Charles Evans Hughes was, before he became a member of the United States Supreme Court, appointed special master by that Court to report upon the Chicago water diversion. He reported that the diversion at Chicago was not justified for pollution control—only for navigation, for which no more is now needed. Mr. Justice Hughes, as special master, reported that the diversion should be cut back to the present level which he considered ample for navigation purposes. This view was approved by the U.S. Supreme Court.

He also reported that Chicago had not done everything it could to handle its pollution problems, that it should set about doing so and should arrange to do so without further diversion of water, but it has never lived up to this injunction.

This view was approved by the U.S. Supreme Court in the case of *Wisconsin* v. *Illinois* (278 U.S. 367).

Chicago has already diverted three rivers from flowing into Lake Michigan. They are the North Chicago River, the South Chicago River, and the Calumet River. In addition they are diverting water out of Lake Michigan. How much does Chicago expect to get? I believe that national policy should prevail over local self-interest.

AN INTERNATIONAL QUESTION

The Boundary Waters Treaty of 1909, in addition to provisions about "boundary waters," contained provisions about "waters * * * which * * * would flow across the boundary or into boundary waters." It specified that any diversion of such waters would give rise to the private right to sue for injury.

It also reserved the Canadian Government's right to object to diversions of waters "which would be productive of material injury to the navigation interests on its own side of the boundary."

Those rights arise from the doctrine of international law that neighboring countries shall enjoy mutual beneficial use of contiguous waters.

So Canada not only has the right to object to diversion lowering the level of the Great Lakes (for a low Lake Michigan lowers the level of the boundary lakes) to the injury of its navigation thereof; but it has so objected.

The Canadian Aide Memoire of January 1958 has been supplemented by a more specific protest. This makes clear that Canada not only objects but protests against this legislation.

To what committee should the bill be referred?

Article II of the Treaty of 1909 contained this provision:

> It is agreed that any interference with or diversion from their natural channel of such waters on either side of the boundary resulting in any injury on the other side of the boundary shall give rise to the same rights and entitle the injured parties to the same legal remedies as if such injury took place in the country where such diversion or interference occurs.
>
> It is understood, however, that neither of the high contracting parties intends by the foregoing provision to surrender any right which it may have to object to any interference with or diversion of water on the other side of the boundary, the effect of which would be productive of material injury to the navigation interest of its own side of the boundary.

In its communication to the State Department under date of February 24, 1959, the Canadian Government said, among other things, that—

> Any authorization for an additional diversion would be incompatible with the arrangements for the St. Lawrence Seaway and power development, and with the Niagara Treaty of 1950, and would be prejudicial to navigation and power development which these mutual arrangements were designed to improve and facilitate.
>
> The point has been made repeatedly by Canada that every withdrawal of water from the basin means less depth available for shipping in harbors and in channels. Additional withdrawals would have adverse effects on the hydroelectric generation potential on both sides of the border, at Niagara Falls and in the international section of the St. Lawrence River, as well as in the province of Quebec, and would inflict hardship on communities and industries on both sides of the border.
>
> The Government of Canada therefore protests against the implementation of proposals contained in H.R. 1.

The bill in question would authorize the diversion of an additional 1,000 cubic feet per second. Chicago now diverts an average of 1,800 cubic feet per second for navigation, domestic and sanitary purposes, and takes 1,500 cubic feet per second in addition, all of which is discharged into the canal.

The reading of the debate in the House clearly indicates that the purpose of this additional 1,000 cubic feet—amounting to 2,786,400,000 gallons every day—plus the 3,300 cubic feet now being used is not in the interests of navigation, but in the interests of flushing sewage.

Six years ago the disposal plant in Chicago did a good job, almost as good as the disposal plant in Milwaukee now does and did then.

It might be emphasized that Milwaukee takes water from the lakes, uses it, and puts it back 95 percent pure.

Chicago, having taken three rivers and some 3,300 additional cubic feet, returns none of it to the lake. What she does is to take water from one watershed and put it into another.

Since the time of the efficient operation of the sewage-disposal plant in Chicago, we understand that many additional square miles of area, many people, and many plants have been added as an additional load to the city's purification plants.

In 1930, the Chicago Sanitary District covered 438 square miles, including the city of Chicago and 54 municipalities with a human population of 3,710,000, plus an industrial waste equivalent of 1,700,000.

Since then, the Chicago Sanitary District has been expanded so that the district includes in 1955, 920.14 square miles and a human population of 4,600,000 with an industrial waste equivalent of 3,800,000.

This addition of square mileage, human population, and industrial waste,

without additional plant capacity accounts for the system's defective operation from 1952 to 1958.

The Chicago Sanitary District now claims to have improved its purification percentage in 1958 to 90.4 percent. This would be in the right direction, but I fear that the apparent improvement may only be the result of excluding some territory from the district and its reports. For they now say they are down to 880.4 square miles. And I wonder what is being done with the sewage of the excluded area. Probably going into the canal to add to the sewage which the Federal Government is, by this bill, asked to flush out.

I think now that we realize that the purpose of this additional water is not for navigation, the question arises whether there is any authority in the Congress to authorize additional diversion for sewage purposes?

There are other questions. Whether the diversion constitutes a preference to the ports of the State of Illinois over those of other lake States, in violation of article I, section 9, clause 6 of the United States Constitution?

Whether diversion constitutes a taking of property of the injured lake States—Minnesota, Wisconsin, Michigan, Ohio, New York, and Pennsylvania—in violation of the 5th and 14th amendments to the United States Constitution?

Whether the Congress has the authority, when it is not in the aid of navigation, to authorize the diversion of waters of the Great Lakes to another watershed?

The Foreign Relations Committee is the place to work out this problem.

NOT PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE

If it be urged that the Senate Committee on Public Works should be given jurisdiction of this bill, it should be pointed out that no public works are necessary to divert the additional amount of water. It would simply be allowed to flow. The study does not involve the construction of public works. The proposed study involves the effect of such increased diversion upon commerce among the several States and navigation on the Great Lakes and the Illinois Waterway. Navigation is within the jurisdiction of the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. If waterpower and pollution are the real purposes of S. 308 and H.R. 1, it does not say so and its constitutional basis resting on navigation, would be undermined by referring it to the Public Works Committee. Moreover, H.R. 1 is a different bill from last session's H.R. 2 and should be treated differently.

Of the Senate committees, there are two others which have stronger and more valid claims to this bill than has the Committee on Public Works.

INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE COMMITTEE

Interstate and foreign commerce, navigation and the laws relating thereto, and inland waterways, are within the jurisdiction of the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, which also has jurisdiction over the merchant marine, the registering and licensing of vessels and small boats, and measures relating to the regulation of common carriers by water.

If the bill is really about the subject of the title given to it, it concerns navigation on the Illinois Waterway. If it does concern navigation on this inland waterway, then if it should not be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations it should be referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

Of course, the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs has a direct interest in and jurisdiction over the diversion of waters. The water law involved in the diversion of the Columbia River and its effect on irrigation will be directly affected by the consideration given to H.R. 1 and S. 308. The Interior Committee has jurisdiction over the Columbia River water controversy, and it has been carefully studying the proposal advanced in Canada for the diversion of the Columbia River before it reaches the northern border of the United States. It is, therefore, familiar with the dangerous implications of unwarranted diversion of boundary and contiguous waters.

CONCLUSION ABOUT JURISDICTION

The conclusion seems clear that H.R. 1 and S. 308 should be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, because of the bill's primary foreign relations impact and its overall scope.

The Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce is more concerned than is the Committee on Public Works, because of the bill's impact on interstate and foreign commerce and navigation.

The Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs also has more claims to H.R. 1 and S. 308 than has the Public Works Committee, because of the bill's concern with the diversion of waters in the Columbia and other rivers, and with interstate compacts which have been used in the past to provide for diversion.

The waters involved in the bill are international waters in which there are international rights and about which there are international disputes. The bill should go to the Committee on Foreign Relations. The interest which this project has aroused in international, legal and diplomatic circles manifests that it far transcends the idea of domestic public works, and it cannot properly be treated in such narrow confines. The Committee on Public Works has a lesser interest in the bill than any one of these committees.

PENDING SUPREME COURT CASE

A few weeks ago, the Metropolitan Sanitary District of Greater Chicago filed its answer in the United States Supreme Court to a petition by Wisconsin, Minnesota, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Michigan, and New York to force it to comply with the original order and to purify the water it uses, as other cities do, in order to return it to the middle of the Lake.

The Congress has authority under the Constitution to facilitate navigation, but not to control pollution. So we have no authority unless a navigation problem is involved.

The issue is now drawn between the litigants, and the forum is the United States Supreme Court. Briefs are due April 30. I do not think the Senate wishes to frustrate the jurisdiction of the Supreme Court in a pending case like this.

While we are waiting for the final decision of the U.S. Supreme Court, the Foreign Relations Committee should be given the opportunity to conduct a thorough survey of the impact of this proposal upon our international relations and upon international law.

NO STATUTE INVOLVED

Though some claim a Federal statute authorized the diversion, this is not supported by the history of the matter.

The Supreme Court ordered an unauthorized diversion cut back to the present flow. A routine public works bill happened to be passed soon afterward.

The paragraph involved—46th Statutes at Large, page 929—is merely a description of one of many pages of projects authorized by the act's first sentence—46th Statutes at Large, page 918—reading as follows:

> That the following works of improvement are hereby adopted and authorized, to be prosecuted under the direction of the Secretary of War and supervision of the Chief of Engineers, in accordance with the plans recommended in the reports hereinafter designated.

The reference in the paragraph to use of the water for navigation is purely incidental to the navigation works then being authorized (back in 1930) in order to authorize the engineers to use the water for navigation as long as it was available.

NO NAVIGATION NEED

Further diversion would not help navigation. According to testimony of the Army Engineers last session, added diversion is not needed in the Chicago waterways. And the effect of possible drought conditions in the upper Mississippi River have been cured by authorization of special retaining works near Alto, Ill. So there is not any reason for Senators from the Mississippi Valley to support this bill.

INTERSTATE COMPACTS

The bill is drawn as though the Federal Government could take water rights from one State and give them to another State. This would really be interference with the States rights—with a vengeance.

Where there has been diversion of water for irrigation and other worthwhile purposes, this has been successfully accomplished by agreement among the States concerned. They have negotiated and signed interstate compacts.

Incidentally, interstate compacts are specifically within the jurisdiction of the Committee on the Judiciary.

If this proposal were being handled through the traditional method of obtaining State consent, the Federal approval of the compact would come before the Judiciary Committee of which I am a member.

However, I believe that the Foreign Relations Committee has the greatest interest in the bill, and I urge that it be

referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

CONCLUSION

Mr. President, I repeat that there is a case pending in the Supreme Court raising the issue. I might say parenthetically that the Supreme Court has had jurisdiction in the Chicago water matter since 1926, when the case was started.

What is the pending case about?

The States of Wisconsin, Minnesota, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Michigan, and New York ask that the Chicago district be required to return to the lake, after it has purified the sewage, the water it now takes from the lake as domestic pumpage.

The Chicago district, back in 1952, purified its sewage to the point of 93.6 percent. Over the years, it degenerated until it purified only to 85.6 percent in 1957. This means that it has taken in additional territory but has not enlarged its plant. Let me quote what the Supreme Court said when a similar situation arose:

"It will be perceived that" the controversy "resulted directly from the failure of the sanitary district to take care of its sewage in some way other than promoting or continuing the existing diversion." 278 U.S. 367, 418.

It is very clear that if the Supreme Court required the district to build its plant so that it will take care of the sewage situation, and to return to the lake what it now takes from the lake, there is no ground on the basis of navigation, or any other, for a claim that additional water should be diverted.

There is also testimony before the House committee that sewage without treatment by the sanitary district is discharged now into the canal.

That should be the subject of special investigation by an unbiased agency which would report to the committee or to the Court.

To further buttress our position that this matter should go to the Foreign Relations Committee, let me quote the Court in 266 U.S. 405, 426, in 1925:

> With regard to the second ground, the treaty of January 11, 1909, with Great Britain, expressly provides against uses "affecting the natural level or flow of boundary waters" without the authority of the United States or the Dominion of Canada within their respective jurisdiction and the approval of the International Joint Commission agreed upon therein.

Back in 1913, Secretary of War Henry L. Stimson stated that the Boundary Water Treaty of 1909 did not sanction the Chicago diversion and that such question should, in accordance with the terms of the treaty, be placed before the International Joint Commission.

In 1926, Hon. Charles Stewart, then Minister of the Interior, stated in the House of Commons that the Canadian Government had never recognized the Chicago diversion and promised that it would "continue to protest against the entire principle of abstracting water from the Great Lakes to another watershed."

This whole matter could be settled by requiring the district to do what Milwaukee does, purify its sewage and return to the lake up to 95 percent in water purified.

Another question arises which makes it more important than ever that the matter go to the Foreign Relations Committee, and that is whether the diversion without the return of the water to the lakes constitutes a preference to the ports of the State of Illinois and against those of other Lake States in violation of article 1, section 9, clause 6 of the U.S. Constitution.

There is really no claim here that the purpose of the additional water is related to the ends of navigation. The real object apparently is to see whether the Federal Government should take from one navigable source—Lake Michigan—water to flush sewage into another watershed, but it is not to increase navigation in the second watershed.

Chief Justice Taft (278 U.S. 367, 417) in speaking for the Court said:

> The normal power of the Secretary of War under the statute is to maintain the navigable capacity of Lake Michigan and not to restrict it or destroy it by diversions. * * * Merely to aid the district in disposing of its sewage was not a justification, considering the limited scope of the Secretary's authority. He could not make mere local sanitation a basis for a continuing diversion.

And as Chief Justice Hughes said for the Court in 1932:

> After a full examination of the facts and considering the questions presented in all their aspects, the Court deemed it to be its duty by an appropriate decree to compel the reduction of the diversion to a point where it rests on a legal basis and thus to restore the navigable capacity of Lake Michigan to its normal level (289 U.S. 395, 401.)

The law then is very clear that the disposing of its sewage cannot be a justification for diversion. What the Chicago district needs is an improved sanitation plant.

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

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. I think this is a very serious matter because it may involve our relations with Canada, particularly as they concern the Columbia River. There has been much talk about the diversion by Canada of the waters of the Columbia River. If that occurs, it will mean that the great West of the United States will suffer by the action of Canada. Certainly we want to maintain the very best relations possible with our neighbor. I agree with the distinguished senior Senator from Wisconsin. He is rendering a great service by bringing this matter to the attention of the Senate at this time.

Mr. WILEY. I thank the distinguished Senator from North Dakota. He has raised a point which I have not the time to discuss at length now. But if the bill is passed, it will set a precedent for Canada to take the waters of the upper Columbia, and that will interfere with the development of the West, with all that that implies.

Mr. President, in brief, what is this problem all about? As I have said previously, Chicago has taken the waters of three rivers which used to flow into Lake Michigan. She first took 1,800 cubic feet a second. Then, she received another 1,000 cubic feet a second, making a total of 2,800 cubic feet a second from those three rivers. The result is that the level of Lake Michigan has gone down, down, and down.

But there is something else. Since that was done, the U.S. Government has spent half a billion dollars for the development of the St. Lawrence Waterway. In the lower regions of the river a half-billion-dollar plant has been built for the generation of electricity. The States of New York, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Minnesota, Wisconsin, and Michigan are all interested in making certain that this proposed water steal does not take place.

Pending before the Supreme Court of the United States is an application in which all the parties are involved. It goes to the very essence of the question whether even Congress has the authority to do what is sought to be done.

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

Mr. WILEY. I yield myself 2 more minutes.

The question in my mind is: Is there authority? The answer is and must be that water can be diverted from one watershed to another only if the question relates to the control of navigation. Is navigation involved in this measure? No. The question involved in this bill is getting rid of sludge, as is indicated by the statements I have placed in the RECORD.

So, in my humble opinion, because of the arguments already stated, the bill should be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield 3 minutes to me?

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I warmly support the position taken by my senior colleague. I do so for four reasons.

First, the Committee on Public Works has had the bill, as has been pointed out repeatedly by Senators on both sides of the issue, three times in three previous sessions of Congress. That committee has considered every public works aspect of the bill. They have explored the public works question fully and have published hearings on it. The hearings are available to the Senate. The public works considerations involved in the bill have been thoroughly explored in the testimony, the hearings, and the committee report.

Secondly, the one really new and significant development is that Canada has taken a different position this year from the position it took last year. Canada has now protested the bill.

I think this raises the third point, which is that the Committee on Foreign Relations is the committee of this body which is most concerned with foreign relations and is most expert on such matters. I think it is the committee which has the best access to a knowledge of Canadian affairs in every way. It has been concerned with Canadian-American relations over a period of time on many levels and from many standpoints.

Fourthly, in the debate which took place last year on this issue, the manager of the bill, the distinguished senior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], devoted at least 80 percent, and perhaps 90 percent, of his speech to the foreign relations aspect of the bill. He explained in great detail the implications of the treaties which are involved and the interest of Canada in the bill.

To sum up the four reasons: The proponents have admitted on the basis of their debate that the question of foreign relations is important; the Committee on Foreign Relations is the one committee which is constituted by this body to serve as our expert advisers on foreign relations; Canada has protested this year, although it did not protest last year, so this constitutes a new element and a strictly foreign relations element; and finally, the Committee on Public Works has already, not once, not twice, but three times, thoroughly explored all the public works aspects of this proposed legislation. So it seems to me that it makes good sense to have the Committee on Foreign Relations consider the bill this year.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield me 1 minute?

Mr. WILEY. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from New York.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, the State of New York is very much intested in the water-diversion problem. The previous Governor and the present Governor and all the legislators of both parties, on a completely bipartisan basis, support the position which has been presented by the able senior Senator from Wisconsin.

It is arguable as to which committee the bill should be referred. But certainly the recent aspect presented by the objections by Canada persuade me to the belief that the bill should be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

I strongly feel that the bill has aspects which should be considered both by the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Public Works, and that it would be desirable to have it reviewed by both committees. But I shall support the position taken by the able Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, let me ask the Senator from Wisconsin whether he desires to submit any further argument.

Mr. WILEY. Perhaps the Senator from Illinois will proceed at this time.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, we shall not take more than our total of 5 minutes.

At this time I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

The PRESIDING OFFICER [Mr. DODD in the chair]. The Senator from South Dakota is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. First, Mr. President, I should like to point out that the real question before us is one of committee jurisdiction in connection with the bill. The merits of the question dealt with by the bill are not now at issue.

It may be that a new factor has been brought into the case, one which would be considered by any committee to which the bill might be referred. If Canada has changed her position, that will be a matter for any committee which will deal with the bill to consider.

But, Mr. President, we should recall that on three prior occasions the bill has been referred to the Committee on Public Works. The rule which sets forth the jurisdiction of that committee reads in part as follows:

> 1. Flood control and improvement of rivers and harbors.
>
> 2. Public works for the benefit of navigation—

And so forth.

Mr. President, in my judgment, on prior occasions the bill has been properly referred to the Committee on Public Works, because of the general subject matter of the bill.

I wish to invite the attention of my colleagues to the further fact that the bill itself proposes to deal with the Rivers and Harbors Act of 1930. The very fact that the bill would be amendatory of a prior authority for the diversion of water, under the authorization of a prior rivers and harbors act, would suggest that the bill should be referred to the Committee on Public Works.

One of the provisions of the bill reads in part as follows:

> The Secretary of the Army shall not allow any water to be directly diverted from Lake Michigan to flow into the Illinois Waterway during times of flood in the Illinois, Des Plaines, Chicago, or Calumet River.

Mr. President, what jurisdiction does the Foreign Relations Committee have over floods in the Illinois, Des Plaines, Chicago, or Calumet River?

Clearly, from a jurisdictional standpoint, the bill should be referred to the Committee on Public Works, in harmony with all prior references and the precedents and traditions of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time yielded to the Senator from South Dakota has expired.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, in addition to the points which have been made by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] and those by the distinguished Presiding Officer, let me say that the Committee on Public Works is also given jurisdiction by rule XXV(N)4 of all matters dealing with "oil and other pollution of navigable waters." The pollution question is a very important one in this case, and is further justification for referring the bill to the Committee on Public Works.

So far as the Canadian question is concerned, let me say that Lake Michigan is entirely within the borders of the United States. The Straits of Mackinac which furnish the terminus of Lake Michigan lie at the northeastern extremity of that lake. The map which stands in the rear of the Chamber shows that this is very much to the west of the international boundary line. In fact, the expert witness who testified on this matter before the Public Works Committee stated, as shown on page 56 of the hearings:

> The U.S. Coast and Geodetic Survey reports that the nearest distance from Lake Michigan to the Canadian border is 38.2 miles.

So Lake Michigan is entirely an inland water of the United States, and has always been recognized as such.

Furthermore, Mr. President, my good friend, the Senator from Wisconsin, has carefully omitted to state the fact that Canada, in the letter which the State Department for some unknown reason stimulated from the Canadian Department of State, directly admitted this fact, when it said—and now I quote from the Canadian memoire: "Recognizing that the use of Lake Michigan water is a matter within the jurisdiction of the United States of America"—and so forth.

In other words, the Canadian Government admits that this matter is purely a domestic one, so far as the United States is concerned.

To my mind, the proposal of the Senator from Wisconsin really borders on the absurd. If his proposal were to be carried out, it would be necessary to have every matter dealing with an inland stream of the United States referred to the Foreign Relations Committee.

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

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

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I have used all my time; but I am very glad to yield additional time to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, if the U.S. Government has authority to divert water from the Great Lakes Basin, to the extent that such diversion would affect navigation and the Canadian interests, would the Senator from Illinois say that, thereby, Canada would have a right to divert water from the Columbia River Basin, to the extent of damaging the interests of the United States within U.S. borders?

Mr. DOUGLAS. This matter can be taken up separately; and if the Senator from Ohio is desirous of having good relations with Canada—as he says he is—it seems to me we should not try to buy good relations with Canada by making concessions to Canada in connection with a matter in which Canada has no legal right to such water, in order to recognize whatever legal rights Canada may have in the Columbia River.

I hope my good friend, the Senator from Ohio, is not suggesting that we should attempt to placate Canada by giving her a right to interfere in a matter that is no concern of hers, in order that we may then object to Canada's use of her own internal waters.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Am I then to understand that the Senator from Illinois takes the position that Canada has a legal right to divert waters out of the Columbia River Basin, to the extent that such diversion would affect the generation of electricity by the various hydroelectric generating projects in that basin?

Mr. DOUGLAS. No, I do not take that position. But I would say beware of robbing Naboth's vineyard.

Mr. LAUSCHE. And I would say that Chicago should desist from trying to take from Ohio, Pennsylvania, New York, and the other Lake States properties which belong to them, and do not belong to Chicago or Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Then, if the Senator from Ohio is arguing this as a domestic matter, the bill certainly should be referred to the Committee on Public Works.

What I am saying is that this is a domestic matter; that the waters of Lake Michigan—as is clearly shown on the map which is placed in the rear of the Chamber—are entirely within the continental limits of the United States; that the Straits of Mackinac are 38.2 miles west of the international boundary line; and that, as the Senator from Ohio well knows, Canada admits that this matter is purely one for U.S. domestic consideration.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The Senator from Illinois has not answered my question, let me respectfully say.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That issue probably will have to be fought out in the Canadian Parliament and in the negotiations between the U.S. State Department and the appropriate Canadian departments, and possibly in international tribunals. We cannot pass on it here.

Mr. President, I yield back all our remaining time.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a statement by me and a memorandum in regard to the matter on which I have spoken.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY

WATER DIVERSION JURISDICTION

It is important to many of us that the Chicago water diversion bill be considered, not merely from the point of view of local self-interest, but as part of the overall national and international picture.

Unfortunately, it has been most difficult to see that this is done.

I think I have put my finger on the reason.

Avoid wrong committee

It has been considered before the Public Works Committee which is primarily concerned with the bill from the point of view of public works in a particular locality.

Though the bill superficially may seem to concern local public works, analysis shows that it does not concern public works at all.

The bill is not about the building of public works.

The bill is about studying the effects of an additional diversion of water where water is already being diverted. No additional works are required. Merely the larger opening of the gates already there.

Scope is international

And what kind of effects are to be studied? The effects are upon navigation and commerce, upon the use of water which to a greater or lesser extent belongs to all countries and States bordering the Great Lakes, the effects on our international relations, particularly with Canada. The effect on international law which will be applied in such diverse parts of the world as Pakistan and India, Egypt and the Sudan, and the Northwestern part of the United States and the Southwestern part of Canada where the Columbia River crosses the borders.

Basic principle

It is not a small point which has been raised about the reference of S. 308 and H.R. 1. It is a matter of deep principle.

A bill should go to the committee with the greatest overall interest in the legislation, so that it may be fairly considered from all points of view.

Foreign Relations Committee

The bill should go to the committee which has the greatest concern with its provisions. That is the Foreign Relations Committee.

It concerns the interpretation of the Boundary Waters Treaty of 1909 which covers waters which affect the level of boundary waters, as well as waters which actually cross the border.

It affects the continuing discussions which we have with Canada about the use of water by the two countries. There is, as you know, an International Joint Commission constantly considering such matters. The work of such international organizations is, of course, within the jurisdiction of the Foreign Relations Committee.

The Foreign Relations Committee has a subcommittee on Canada suitable for handling matters of this sort.

The complex questions of international law involved in the bill, the Niagara Treaty of 1950 and the effect on the St. Lawrence Seaway (the legislation for which the Foreign Relations Committee handled), the maintenance of our friendly relations with the Canadian Government, consideration of an international agreement with Canada on this problem—all these matters are within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Historical policy

The diversion at Chicago has had a long and controversial history.

Such a great statesman and judge as Charles Evans Hughes, before he became a member of the U.S. Supreme Court, was appointed special master by that Court to report upon the Chicago water diversion. And he reported that the diversion at Chicago was not justified for pollution control—only for navigation, for which no more is now needed. And, Mr. Justice Hughes as special master reported that the diversion should be cut back to the present level which he considered ample for navigation purposes. This view was approved by the U.S. Supreme Court.

He also reported that Chicago had not done everything it could to handle its pollution problems, that it should set about doing so and should arrange to do so without further diversion of water, but it has never lived up to this injunction.

This view was approved by the U.S. Supreme Court in the case of *Wisconsin* v. *Illinois*, 278 U.S. 367.

Chicago has already diverted three rivers from flowing into Lake Michigan. They are the North Chicago River, the South Chicago River, and the Calumet River. In addition they are diverting water out of Lake Michigan. How much does Chicago expect to get? I believe that national policy should prevail over local self-interest.

An international question

The Boundary Waters Treaty of 1909, in addition to provisions about boundary waters, contained provisions about "waters * * * which * * * would flow across the boundary or into boundary waters." It specified that any diversion of such waters would give rise to the private right to sue for injury.

It also reserved the Canadian Government's right to object to diversions of waters "which would be productive of material injury to the navigation interests on its own side of the boundary."

Those rights arise from the doctrine of international law that neighboring countries shall enjoy mutual beneficial use of contiguous waters.

So Canada not only has the right to object to diversion lowering the level of the Great Lakes (for a low Lake Michigan lowers the level of the boundary lakes) to the injury of its navigation thereof; but it has so objected.

The Canadian aide memoire of January 1958 has been supplemented by a more specific protest. This makes clear that Canada not only objects but protests against this legislation.

To what committee should the bill be referred?

Article II of the treaty of 1909 had this provision:

"It is agreed that any interference with or diversion from their natural channel of such waters on either side of the boundary resulting in any injury on the other side of the boundary shall give rise to the same rights and entitle the injured parties to the same legal remedies as if such injury took place in the country where such diversion or interference occurs.

"It is understood, however, that neither of the high contracting parties intends by the foregoing provision to surrender any right which it may have to object to any interference with or diversion of water on the other side of the boundary, the effect of which would be productive of material injury to the navigation interest of its own side of the boundary."

In its communication to the State Department under date of February 24, 1959, the Canadian Government said, among other things, that "any authorization for an additional diversion would be incompatible with the arrangements for the St. Lawrence Seaway and power development, and with the Niagara Treaty of 1950, and would be prejudicial to navigation and power development which these mutual arrangements were designed to improve and facilitate.

"The point has been made repeatedly by Canada that every withdrawal of water from the basin means less depth available for shipping in harbors and in channels. Additional withdrawals would have adverse effects on the hydroelectric generation potential on both sides of the border, at Niagara Falls and in the international section of the St. Lawrence River, as well as in the Province of Quebec, and would inflict hardship on communities and industries on both sides of the border.

"The Government of Canada therefore protests against the implementation of proposals contained in H.R. 1."

The bill in question would authorize the diversion of an additional 1,000 cubic feet per second. Chicago now diverts an average of 1,800 cubic feet per second for navigation, domestic, and sanitary purposes, and takes 1,500 cubic feet per second in addition, all of which is discharged into the canal.

Attention is called to the following letter and telegram:

THE METROPOLITAN SANITARY DISTRICT OF GREATER CHICAGO,

Chicago, Ill., February 20, 1959.

Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: Your telegram requesting information as to our 1958 figures of B.O.D. removal, the percentage of solids removal, and the population and areas served in 1930 and 1958, was telephoned to my office at the very hour of my departure this week for Washington to present before the House Public Works Committee at the public hearing, our views in support of H.R. 1. Hence the delay in compiling and furnishing you with the requested information.

Below is the tabulation as requested:

	1958 (Percent)
Removal of B.O.D.:	
Entire district (weighted average)	90.4
Calumet works	86.8
North side	94.5
West-Southwest	89.0
Removal of solids:	
Entire district (weighted average)	88.0
Calumet works	87.3
North side	90.7
West-Southwest	[1] 83.4
Population served:	
1930 total	3,901,000
1958 total (estimated from 1950 census)	4,800,000

[1] April, May, and June low because aeration tanks out of service for construction.

TOTAL AREA SERVED

In 1930, 438 square miles.
In 1958, 880.4 square miles.
Respectfully submitted.

FRANK W. CHESROW,
President.

P.S.—We are unable to advise you as to the amount of water used by the industrial plants in 1930 and 1958.

F.W.C.

FEBRUARY 16, 1959.

FRANK W. CHESROW,
President, the Metropolitan Sanitary District of Greater Chicago, Chicago, Ill.:

Please wire me collect, today, 1958 figures on the sanitary district's percentage of B.O.D. removal and percentage of solids removal, both for the entire district and for each individual plant. Also population served by the district in 1930 and in 1958. Also amount of water used by industrial plants in 1930 and in 1958. Also whether combined area served by the district is now 920 square miles as compared with 438 square miles in 1930.

Senator ALEXANDER WILEY.

A reading of the debate in the House clearly indicates that the purpose of this additional 1,000 cubic feet (amounting to 2,786,400,000 gallons every day), plus the 3,300 cubic feet now being used, is not in the interests of navigation, but in the interests of flushing sewage.

Six years ago the disposal plant in Chicago did a good job, almost as good as the disposal plant in Milwaukee now does and did then.

It might be emphasized that Milwaukee takes water from the lakes, uses it and puts it back 95 percent pure.

Chicago, having taken three rivers and some 3,300 additional cubic feet, returns none of it to the lake. What she does is to take the water from one watershed and put it in another.

Since the time of the efficient operation of the sewage-disposal plant in Chicago, we understand that many additional square miles of area, many people and many plants have been added as an additional load to the city's purification plants.

In 1930, the Chicago Sanitary District covered 438 square miles, including the city of Chicago and 54 municipalities with a human population of 3,710,000, plus an industrial waste equivalent of 1,700,000.

Since then, the Chicago Sanitary District has been expanded so that the district included, in 1955, 920.14 square miles and a human population of 4,600,000 and an industrial waste equivalent of 3,800,000.

This addition of square mileage, human population and industrial waste, without additional plant capacity accounts for the system's defective operation from 1952 to 1958.

The Chicago Sanitary District now claims to have improved its purification percentage in 1958 to 90.4 percent. This would be in the right direction, but I fear that the apparent improvement may only be the result of excluding some territory from the district and its reports. For they now say they are down to 880.4 square miles. And, I wonder what is being done with the sewage of the excluded area. Probably going into the canal to add to the sewage which the Federal Government is, by this bill, asked to flush out.

I think that we now realize that the purpose of this additional water is not for navigation. The question arises whether there is any authority in the Congress to authorize additional diversion for sewage purposes.

There are other questions, for instance, the following:

Whether the diversion constitutes a preference to the ports of the State of Illinois over those of other Lake States, in violation of article I, section 9, clause 6 of the United States Constitution.

Whether diversion constitutes a taking of property of the injured Lake States—Minnesota, Wisconsin, Michigan, Ohio, New York, and Pennsylvania—in violation of the 5th and 14th amendments to the United States Constitution.

Whether the Congress has the authority, when the bill is not in the aid of navigation, to authorize the diversion of waters of the Great Lakes to another watershed.

The Foreign Relations Committee is the place to work out this problem.

Not Public Works Committee

If it be urged that the Senate Committee on Public Works should be given jurisdiction of this bill, it should be pointed out that no public works are necessary to divert the additional amount of water. It would just be allowed to flow. The study does not involve the construction of public works. The proposed study involves "the effect of such increased diversion upon commerce among the several States and navigation on the Great Lakes and the Illinois Waterway." Navigation is within the jurisdiction of the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. If waterpower and pollution are the real purposes of S. 308 and H.R. 1, it does not say so and its constitutional basis resting on navigation, would be undermined by referring it to the Public Works Committee. And H.R. 1 is a different bill from last session's H.R. 2 and should be treated differently.

Of the Senate committees, there are two others which have stronger and more valid claims to this bill than has the Committee on Public Works.

Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee

"Interstate and foreign commerce," "navigation and the laws relating thereto," and "inland waterways," are within the jurisdiction of the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, which also has jurisdiction over the merchant marine, the registering and licensing of vessels and small boats, and measures relating to the regulation of common carriers by water.

If the bill is really about the subject of the title given to it, it concerns navigation in the Illinois Waterway. If it does concern navigation in this inland waterway, then if it should not be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations it should be referred to the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs

Of course, the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs has a direct interest in, and jurisdiction over the diversion of waters. The water law involved in the diversion of the Columbia River and its effect on irrigation will be directly affected by the consideration given to H.R. 1 and S. 308. The Interior Committee has jurisdiction over the Columbia River water controversy, and it has been carefully studying the proposal advanced in Canada for the diversion of the Columbia River before it reaches the northern border of the United States. It is, therefore, familiar with the dangerous implications of unwarranted diversion of boundary and contiguous waters.

Conclusion about jurisdiction

The conclusion seems clear that H.R. 1 and S. 308 should be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, because of the bill's primary foreign relations impact and its overall scope.

The Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce is more concerned than is the Committee on Public Works, because of the bill's impact on interstate and foreign commerce and navigation.

The Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs also has more claims to H.R. 1 and S. 308 than has the Public Works Committee, because of the bill's concern with the diversion of waters in the Columbia and other rivers and with interstate compacts which have been used in the past to provide for diversion.

The waters involved in this bill are international waters in which there are international rights and about which there are international disputes. The bill should go to the Committee on Foreign Relations. The interest which this project has aroused in international, legal, and diplomatic circles manifests that it far transcends the idea of domestic public works, and it cannot properly be treated in such narrow confines. The Committee on Public Works has a lesser interest in the bill than any one of these committees.

Pending Supreme Court case

A few weeks ago, the Metropolitan Sanitary District of Greater Chicago filed its answer in the U.S. Supreme Court to a petition by Wisconsin, Minnesota, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Michigan, and New York to force it to comply with the original order and to purify the water it uses, as other cities do, in order to return it to the middle of the lake.

The Congress has authority under the Constitution to facilitate navigation, but not to control pollution. So we have no authority unless a navigation problem is involved.

The issue is now drawn between the litigants and the forum is the U.S. Supreme Court. Briefs are due April 30. I do not think that the Senate wishes to frustrate the jurisdiction of the Supreme Court in a pending case like this.

While we are waiting for the final decision of the U.S. Supreme Court, the Foreign Relations Committee should be given the opportunity to conduct a thorough survey of the impact of this proposal upon our international relations and upon international law.

No statute involved

Though some claim a Federal statute authorized the diversion, this is not supported by the history of the matter.

The Supreme Court ordered an unauthorized diversion cutback to the present flow. A routine public works bill happened to be passed soon afterward.

The paragraph involved (46 Stat. 929) is merely a description of one of many pages of projects authorized by the act's first sentence (46 Stat. 918) reading as follows: "That the following works of improvement are hereby adopted and authorized, to be prosecuted under the direction of the Secretary of War and supervision of the Chief of Engineers, in accordance with the plans recommended in the reports hereinafter designated."

The reference in the paragraph to use of the water for navigation is purely incidental to the navigation works then being authorized (back in 1930) in order to authorize the Engineers to use the water for navigation as long as it was available.

No navigation need

Further diversion would not help navigation. According to testimony of the Army Engineers last session, added diversion is not needed in the Chicago Waterways. And, the

effect of possible drought conditions in the upper Mississippi River have been cured by authorization of special retaining works near Alton, Ill. So there is not any reason for Senators from the Mississippi Valley to support this bill.

Interstate compacts

This bill is drawn as though the Federal Government could take water rights from one State and give them to another State. This would really be interference with the States rights—with a vengeance.

Where there has been diversion of water for irrigation and other worthwhile purposes, this has been successfully accomplished by agreement among the States concerned. They have negotiated and signed interstate compacts.

And, incidentally, interstate compacts are specifically within the jurisdiction of the Committee on the Judiciary.

If this proposal were being handled through the traditional method of obtaining State consent, the Federal approval of the compact would come before the Judiciary Committee of which I am a member.

However, I believe that the Foreign Relations Committee has the greatest interest in this bill and urge that it be referred to the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations.

Conclusion

Let me say, in conclusion—and I repeat—that there is a case pending in the Supreme Court raising the issue (and I might say parenthetically that the Supreme Court has had jurisdiction in this Chicago water matter since 1926 when the case was started).

What is the present pending case about?

The States of Wisconsin, Minnesota, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Michigan, and New York ask that the Chicago district be required to return to the lake, after it has purified the sewage, the water it now takes from the lake as domestic pumpage.

The district, back in 1952, purified its sewage to the point of 93.6 percent. Over the years, it degenerated until it purified only to 85.6 percent in 1957. This means that it has taken in additional territory but has not enlarged its plant. Let me quote what the Supreme Court said when a similar situation arose:

"It will be perceived that [the controversy] resulted directly from the failure of the sanitary district to take care of its sewage in some way other than promoting or continuing the existing diversion" (278 U.S. 367, 418).

It is very clear that, if the Supreme Court required the district to build its plant so that it will take care of the sewage situation, and to return to the lake what it now takes from the lake, that there is no ground on the basis of navigation, or any other, for a claim that additional water should be diverted.

There is also testimony before the House committee Mr. President, that sewage without treatment by the sanitary district is discharged now into the canal.

That should be the subject of special investigation by an unbiased agency which would report to the committee, or to the court.

To further buttress our position that this matter should go to the Foreign Relations Committee, let me quote the Court (266 U.S. 405, 426), in 1925:

"With regard to the second ground, the Treaty of January 11, 1909, with Great Britain, expressly provides against uses 'affecting the natural level or flow of boundary waters' without the authority of the United States or the Dominion of Canada within their respective jurisdictions and the approval of the International Joint Commission agreed upon therein."

Back in 1913, Secretary of War Henry L. Stimson stated that the Boundary Waters Treaty of 1909 did not sanction the Chicago diversion and that such question should, in accordance with the terms of the treaty, be placed before the International Joint Commission.

In 1926, Hon. Charles Stewart, then Minister of the Interior, stated in the House of Commons that the Canadian Government had never recognized the Chicago diversion and promised that it would "continue to protest against the entire principle of abstracting water from the Great Lakes to another watershed."

This whole matter could be settled by requiring the district to do what Milwaukee does, purify its sewage and return to the lake up to 95 percent in water purified.

Another question arises which makes it more important than ever that the matter go to the Foreign Relations Committee, and that is whether the diversion without the return of the water to the lakes constitutes a preference to the ports of the State of Illinois and against those of other Lake States in violation of article I, section 9, clause 6, of the U.S. Constitution.

There is really no claim here that the purpose of the additional water is related to the ends of navigation. The real object apparently is to see whether the Federal Government should take from one navigable source—Lake Michigan—water to flush sewage into another watershed, but it is not to increase navigation in the second watershed.

Chief Justice Taft (278 U.S. 367, 417) speaking for the Court, said:

"The normal power of the Secretary of War (under the statute) is to maintain the navigable capacity of Lake Michigan and not to restrict it or destroy it by diversions. * * * Merely to aid the district in disposing of its sewage was not a justification, considering the limited scope of the Secretary's authority. He could not make mere local sanitation a basis for a continuing diversion."

And as Chief Justice Hughes said for the Court in 1932: "After a full examination of the facts and considering the questions presented in all their aspects, the Court deemed it to be its duty 'by an appropriate decree to compel the reduction of the diversion to a point where it rests on a legal basis and thus to restore the navigable capacity of Lake Michigan to its normal level'" (289 U.S. 395, 401).

The law then is very clear that the disposing of its sewage cannot be a justification for diversion. What the Chicago district needs is an improved sanitation plant.

MEMORANDUM CONCERNING JURISDICTION OVER S. 308[1] AND H.R. 1, "A BILL TO REQUIRE A STUDY TO BE CONDUCTED OF THE EFFECT OF INCREASING THE DIVERSION OF WATER FROM LAKE MICHIGAN INTO THE ILLINOIS WATERWAY FOR NAVIGATION, AND OTHER PURPOSES."

This bill is "To require a study to be conducted of the effect of increasing the diversion of water from Lake Michigan into the Illinois Waterway for navigation, and other purposes."

This title recognizes, what the Supreme Court has held (*Wisconsin* v. *Illinois* (1928) 378 U.S. 367), that the Federal Government does not have jurisdiction over a stream except for purposes of navigation. If any other purposes are intended, they are purely incidental to the constitutional purpose of facilitating navigation.

But, as the title shows, the bill concerns "the effect of increasing the diversion." The bill does not involve how to divert the water, but what the effect would be. The diversion would affect international navigation in the St. Lawrence Seaway, international power production along the St. Lawrence and international diplomatic relations with Canada (both generally and with respect to water ownership and use of international waters).

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

For many reasons, S. 308 should be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The bill involves the interpretation of the Canadian-United States Treaty of 1909.

The bill involves complex questions of international law.

The Canadian Government has objected constantly to diversion contemplated by this bill.

The Foreign Relations Committee has a Subcommittee on Relations with Canada, and is conducting discussions with Canadian Parliamentarians about matters which are interfering with the continuing improvement of United States relations with Canada.

It would be embarrassing to this Senate subcommittee not to have jurisdiction over this bill.

Handling of similar bills in the past has shown little consideration for Canada's objections.

Although other Senate committees may have specific interests in certain limited aspects of this bill, only the Committee on Foreign Relations has sufficiently broad jurisdiction to include all of its effects.

The effect of the bill would be on the St. Lawrence Seaway, the development of which was authorized by a bill reported by the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The bill's effects will be broad and pervasive in our relations with Canada.

The Senate Committee on Foreign Relations has a preference in jurisdiction over S. 308. S. 308 would directely contravene a treaty by the United States and Canada which has governed our relations with reference to boundary and contiguous waters since 1909.

Our relations with Canada have been excellent, but they are likely to deteriorate if the dispute over boundary and contiguous waters becomes more heated. I believe that the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations could throw light on this subject as part of its jurisdiction over relations with Canada. It effectively handled the legislative problem of our relations with Canada in connection with the St. Lawrence Seaway and could do so in connection with this bill.

If the diversion were to be authorized, it should be done through treaty, and treaties are within the jurisdiction of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. So also was the establishment of the boundary lines which govern the use of waters under the treaty of 1909.

Problems of the use of boundary waters and of water affected by the use of boundary waters are under the International Joint Commission which is a kind of continuing international conference, and international conferences are within the jurisdiction of the Foreign Relations Committee. So also are measures to foster commercial intercourse with foreign nations and to safeguard American business abroad. Diversion of water away from the St. Lawrence Seaway would adversely affect commercial intercourse with Canada, and so should be considered by the Foreign Relations Committee.

No other Senate committee has jurisdiction over foreign relations, but foreign relations includes all the specific questions in the bill which might be of interest to other committees.

NOT PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE

If it be urged that the Senate Committee on Public Works should be given jurisdiction of this bill, it should be pointed out that no public works are necessary to divert the additional amount of water. It would just be allowed to flow. The study does not involve the construction of public works. The proposed study involves "the effect of such in-

[1] Reference to S. 308 in this memorandum also includes H.R. 1.

creased diversion upon commerce among the several States and navigation on the Great Lakes and the Illinois Waterways," navigation is within the jurisdiction of the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. If water power and pollution are the real purposes of S. 308, it does not say so and its constitutional basis resting on navigation, would be undermined by referring it to the Public Works Committee. And also, S. 308 is a different bill from last session's H.R. 2 and should be treated differently.

While the text of the bill might be construed to limit the scope of the study to the effect on commerce and navigation, the actual effect would be so much broader than an amendment would have to be considered in committee to broaden the scope of the "effects" authorized to be studied. It would be most unfortunate to overlook the effect this bill would have on neighboring Canada. This could easily occur if the bill were to be considered by a committee whose deliberations and actions were not attuned to the involvements of international relations.

Of the Senate committees, there are two others which have stronger and more valid claims to this bill than has the Committee on Public Works.

INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE COMMITTEE

Interstate and foreign commerce, navigation and the laws relating thereto, and inland waterways, are within the jurisdiction of the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, which also has jurisdiction over the merchant marine, the registering and licensing of vessels and small boats, and measures relating to the regulation of common carriers by water.

If the bill is really about the subject of the title given to it, it concerns navigation in the Illinois Waterway. If it does concern navigation in this inland waterway, then it should be referred to the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce (providing, of course, the suggestion that, for the benefit of international relations and overall consideration, it be referred to the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, cannot be followed).

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

Of course, the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs has a direct interest in the diversion of waters. Although its primary interest has been with water for irrigation and reclamation, the water law involved in the diversion of the Columbia River and its effect on irrigation will be directly affected by the consideration given to S. 308. The Interior Committee has jurisdiction over the Columbia River water controversy, and it has been carefully studying the proposal advanced in Canada for the diversion (to a considerable extent) of the Columbia River before it reaches the northern borders of the United States. It is, therefore, familiar with the dangerous implications of unwarranted diversion of boundary and contiguous waters.

CONCLUSION

The conclusion seems clear that S. 308 should be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, because of the bill's primary foreign relations impact and its overall scope.

The Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce is more concerned than is the Committee on Public Works, because of the bill's impact on interstate and foreign commerce and navigation.

The Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs has also more claims to S. 308 than has the Public Works Committee, because of the bill's concern with the diversion of waters in the Columbia and other rivers and with interstate compacts which have been used in the past to provide for diversion.

The waters involved in this bill are international waters in which there are international rights and about which there are international disputes. The bill should go to the Committee on Foreign Relations. The interest which this project has aroused in international, legal, and diplomatic circles manifests that it far transcends the idea of a domestic public works, and it cannot properly be treated in such narrow confines.

The Committee on Public Works has a lesser interest in the bill than any one of these committees.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, additional diversion from Lake Michigan should be authorized only after general agreement has been reached among all affected Great Lakes States.

Other peoples—those up my way, those bordering on the lakes—have something to say about this matter.

The Supreme Court of the United States has retained jurisdiction. Canada is not agreeable to additional diversion, and has entered a protest.

The United States State Department is opposed to the enactment of House bill 1.

The Canadian Government's official protest was made known to the committee prior to its executive session on House bill 1.

Enactment of House bill 1 would be unwise at this time, because of the potential adverse effect upon our national interest in negotiations with Canada.

Damages estimated to total $2 billion annually would be suffered by the Great Lakes' shipping interests of both the United States and Canada.

Additional diversion would be unwise at this time, because the Great Lakes are now at low levels.

Enactment of House bill 1 would result in preferential treatment to Illinois, to the damage of other Great Lakes States and Canada.

The diversion proposed to be authorized by House bill 1 would result in substantial power losses at Niagara and St. Lawrence hydroelectric plants.

The Bureau of the Budget is opposed to House bill 1.

Mr. President, that is a summation of the reasons why we believe this measure should be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, inasmuch as the bill involves international relations, and inasmuch as the Committee on Foreign Relations has jurisdiction of all matters involving relations between the United States and foreign nations generally.

In particular at this time of great stress and challenge, this matter involves the relations of our country with Canada.

So, Mr. President, for the reason stated I trust the bill will be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

I suggest the absence of a quorum——

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky will state it.

Mr. MORTON. Has all time on the question expired?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time on the question has been yielded back.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. 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 further proceedings under the quorum call be dispensed with.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, may we have the yeas and nays ordered?

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. As I understand, the question we are about to vote on is an appeal by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] from the ruling of the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. If the Senate desires to overrule the Chair, it would vote "yea" with the Senator from Wisconsin——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Shall the decision of the Chair stand as the judgment of the Senate? A "yea" vote would be a vote sustaining the ruling of the Chair. A "nay" vote would be a vote overruling it.

On the 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 Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senators from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT and Mr. MCCLELLAN], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY], the Senators from Wyoming [Mr. MCGEE and Mr. O'MAHONEY], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] is absent because of illness.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] would vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], is necessarily absent.

The Senators from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER and Mr. BEALL], the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL] are detained on official business.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senators from Maryland

[Mr. BUTLER and Mr. BEALL], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH], and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], would each vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] is paired with the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS]. If present and voting, the Senator from Colorado would vote "yea" and the Senator from New York would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 49, nays 21, as follows:

YEAS—49

Anderson	Gruening	Monroney
Bartlett	Hartke	Morse
Bible	Hayden	Morton
Byrd, W. Va.	Hill	Moss
Cannon	Holland	Mundt
Carroll	Hruska	Pastore
Case, S. Dak.	Humphrey	Randolph
Church	Jackson	Robertson
Cotton	Johnson, Tex.	Russell
Curtis	Johnston, S.C.	Smith
Dirksen	Jordan	Stennis
Dodd	Kefauver	Symington
Douglas	Kennedy	Talmadge
Dworshak	Kerr	Yarborough
Eastland	Kuchel	Young, N. Dak.
Engle	Long	
Frear	Mansfield	

NAYS—21

Aiken	Hart	Prouty
Carlson	Keating	Proxmire
Case, N.J.	Langer	Scott
Clark	Lausche	Thurmond
Cooper	Martin	Wiley
Ervin	McNamara	Williams, Del.
Green	Neuberger	Young, Ohio

NOT VOTING—28

Allott	Fulbright	Murray
Beall	Goldwater	Muskie
Bennett	Gore	O'Mahoney
Bridges	Hennings	Saltonstall
Bush	Hickenlooper	Schoeppel
Butler	Javits	Smathers
Byrd, Va.	Magnuson	Sparkman
Capehart	McCarthy	Williams, N.J.
Chavez	McClellan	
Ellender	McGee	

So the ruling of the Chair was sustained.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the decision of the Chair was sustained be reconsidered.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Illinois to lay on the table the motion by the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] to reconsider the vote by which the decision of the Chair was sustained.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask that Senate bill 308, the companion bill, also be referred to the Committee on Public Works.

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

AMENDMENT OF BRETTON WOODS AGREEMENTS ACT

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 98, Senate bill 1094. I announce that there will be no debate on the bill this evening.

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

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 1094) to amend the Bretton Woods Agreements Act.

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 Foreign Relations, with amendments.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the bill has been reported almost unanimously from the committee, with perhaps one vote against it.

I have discussed the bill with the minority leader, who desires to make a statement on it tomorrow, and with the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations.

I ask unanimous consent that the time be divided between the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations and the minority leader, and that the vote be taken not later than 3 o'clock p.m.

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

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT TO 11 O'CLOCK A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate convene at 11 o'clock a.m. tomorrow.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware rose.

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, the Senator from Delaware was on his feet seeking recognition for some purpose. Does the Senator from Delaware wish to make an objection?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. No. I was merely trying to find out what the agreement was.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The agreement was that a vote be had not later than 3 o'clock p.m. tomorrow on the International Bank and the International Fund resolutions coming from the Committee on Foreign Relations, and that the Senate convene at 11 o'clock a.m. tomorrow.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. What is the calendar number?

Mr. DIRKSEN. It will be Calendar No. 98. The reports will be available in the morning.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The bill has not even been reported?

Mr. DIRKSEN. It has been reported, but it is not on today's calendar.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Is it printed?

Mr. DIRKSEN. It is printed.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Will the bill and the report be available?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I think they are available now.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Nothing will be taken up until the bill and the report are available.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. If they are available tonight, I have no objection.

Mr. DIRKSEN. If they are available, there is no objection.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare may meet tomorrow during the session of the Senate.

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

COMPETITIVE BIDDING IN PROCUREMENT OF PROPERTY AND SERVICES BY ARMED FORCES—EXTENSION OF TIME FOR BILL TO LIE ON DESK

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, on March 12, 1959, I introduced the bill (S. 1383) to require the use of competitive bidding to the greatest practicable extent in the procurement of property and services by the Armed Forces through the establishment by the Secretary of Defense of specific standards governing the use of negotiated contracts for such procurement, and for other purposes. By order of the Senate of that day, the bill was ordered to lie on the table until tonight for the addition of cosponsors. At the request of two other Senators, I ask unanimous consent that the bill may lie on the table until the close of business on Friday, March 20.

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

THE GERMAN CRISIS—NATIONAL DEFENSE — MUTUAL SECURITY: THE FOREIGN AID PROGRAM

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the President really made three speeches; one on the German crisis; another on the state of our national defense; and a third to boost mutual security—the foreign aid program.

Few will disagree with what he said on Berlin and Germany. It was reasoned sound, and temperate, and showed a certain amount of flexibility. He said, in effect, that we will stand fast in Berlin but that we want negotiations, not war, as the way of solving the German problem. To that end, he said that we are prepared to listen to new ideas on the German problem and that we will be prepared to offer a few ourselves—at a Foreign Ministers' Conference and, later, at the summit. This approach is sound and in line with what the Secretary of State was trying to do before he went to the hospital. It may contain the initiative for peace which some Members of Congress and others have been urging. It remains to be seen what new ideas we will be prepared to listen to; more important, what new ideas we will be prepared to propose. One might hope that they will include some use of the U.N. in this situation.

As for his second speech—on the state of our defenses—the President says, in effect, that everything is fine. One hesitates to differ with his judgment—especially since he says he has had the best available advice on the subject and since he is an expert himself. But Members of Congress also have a responsibility and we have received conflicting testimony from the President's various military chiefs. One would hope that the President would convince these military chiefs that everything was fine; then it would be easier to convince Congress.

In this matter, it may be a case not of more money but of better utilization of appropriated funds. We may need more soldiers on the line and fewer generals in the Pentagon. We need less wild spending as a result of careless purchasing and pointless service rivalries—wild spending which has built up a waste of $60 billion in surplus military equipment which is now deteriorating in the warehouses and which the Government will now try to sell, probably at a fraction of cost.

The President's final speech was an out-and-out plea for the foreign aid program. Without denying the importance of this program, one must question the way it has been administered in recent years. We have reports of great waste, particularly in military aid; of private planes being built out of these funds for foreign generals; of overlapping and duplication in administration. Then, too, we have had outbursts of resentment against this Nation, often, in the very countries where foreign aid has been heaviest. All of this leads to a strong presumption that we need much less money and much more brains in the use of these billions under the foreign aid program. The Draper Commission has now come up with an interim recommendation, that the total amount requested by the President—$3.9 billion—now be increased by an additional $400 million for more military assistance. Congress will want to take a very careful look at the entire subject.

ADJOURNMENT TO 11 O'CLOCK A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, pursuant to the order previously entered, I move that the Senate stand in adjournment until 11 o'clock a.m. tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 7 o'clock and 38 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned, the adjournment being under the order previously entered, until tomorrow, Thursday, March 19, 1959, at 11 o'clock a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate March 18, 1959:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Carl W. Strom, of Iowa, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Bolivia, vice Philip W. Bonsal.

Ellis O. Briggs, of Maine, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Greece, vice James W. Riddleberger.

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE COUNCIL

William A. M. Burden, of New York, to be a member of the National Aeronautics and Space Council, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

Dr. John T. Rettaliata, of Illinois, to be a member of the National Aeronautics and Space Council.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Gen. Nathan F. Twining, U.S. Air Force, to be reappointed as Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Adm. Arleigh A. Burke, U.S. Navy, to be reappointed as Chief of Naval Operations for a period of 2 years.

Gen. Thomas D. White, U.S. Air Force, to be reappointed as Chief of Staff of the Air Force for a period of 2 years.

Gen. Lyman L. Lemnitzer, U.S. Army, to be appointed as Chief of Staff of the Army for a period of 2 years, vice Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor, U.S. Army.

U.S. ATTORNEY

Joseph Mainelli, of Rhode Island, to be U.S. attorney for the district of Rhode Island for the term of 4 years. He is now serving in this office under an appointment which expires July 27, 1959.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 18, 1959

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Paul J. Harrell, pastor, Memorial Baptist Church, Arlington, Va., offered the following prayer:

And God made from one every nation of men to live on all the face of the earth, having determined allotted periods and the boundaries of their habitation.—Acts 17: 26.

God of all nations and Father of all men, guide the leaders of this Nation and all nations that they may govern the people by Thy holy will, that they may lead them in the way which Thou dost point out; that they may turn them away from what is evil in Thy sight; that they may guard them carefully as a great treasure which Thou hast entrusted to them.

Out of love to Thy nations, Creator God, fill the leaders of the nations with fear of Thy judgment. Uphold them with the spirit of strength, wisdom, and purity. Let them find themselves sufficient for their task through looking unto Thee, the Leader of all leaders and the Lord of all lords.

Have mercy on us, all merciful God, and hear our prayer. In Jesus' name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

RECESS

The SPEAKER. The House will stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

(Thereupon at 12 o'clock and 3 minutes p.m. the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.)

JOINT MEETING OF THE TWO HOUSES OF CONGRESS TO HEAR AN ADDRESS BY HIS EXCELLENCY SEAN T. O'KELLY, PRESIDENT OF IRELAND

The SPEAKER of the House of Representatives presided.

At 12 o'clock and 18 minutes p.m. the Doorkeeper announced the Vice President and Members of the United States Senate, who entered the Hall of the House of Representatives, the Vice President taking the chair at the right of the Speaker, and the Members of the Senate the seats reserved for them.

The SPEAKER. On the part of the House the Chair appoints as members of the committee to escort His Excellency the President of Ireland into the Chamber, the gentleman from Massachusetts, Mr. McCORMACK; the gentleman from Indiana, Mr. HALLECK; the gentleman from Oklahoma, Mr. ALBERT; the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. ARENDS; the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. MORGAN; and the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. CHIPERFIELD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. On the part of the Senate the Chair appoints as members of the committee of escort the Senator from Texas, Mr. JOHNSON; the Senator from Rhode Island, Mr. GREEN; the Senator from Arkansas, Mr. FULBRIGHT; the Senator from Illinois, Mr. DIRKSEN; and the Senator from Wisconsin, Mr. WILEY.

The Doorkeeper announced the following guests, who entered the Hall of the House of Representatives and took the seats reserved for them:

The Ambassadors, Ministers, and Chargés d'Affaires of foreign governments.

The Chief Justice of the United States and Associate Justices of the U.S. Supreme Court.

The members of the President's Cabinet.

At 12 o'clock and 31 minutes p.m. the Doorkeeper announced His Excellency the President of Ireland.

His Excellency the President of Ireland, escorted by the committee of Senators and Representatives, entered the Hall of the House of Representatives and stood at the Clerk's desk. [Applause, the Members rising.]

The SPEAKER. Members of the Congress, it is a great pleasure to me, and I deem it a high privilege to present to you the representative of a great and a proud people, a people who have fought for freedom and liberty the world around.

I present to you the President of Ireland. [Applause, the Members rising.]

ADDRESS OF HIS EXCELLENCY SEAN T. O'KELLY, PRESIDENT OF IRELAND

President O'KELLY. Mr. Speaker, Mr. President, Members of the Congress, ladies and gentlemen, I am so filled with emotion, this warmth of welcome you offer me, and Ireland in my name, that I can hardly get my nerves calmed down enough to address you. [Applause.]

This is a wonderful occasion for me and for Ireland. I am profoundly grateful.

This is the first occasion on which a President of Ireland has addressed the Congress of the United States. [Applause.] It symbolizes in a striking way the enduring friendship and close kinship which exist between our two peoples. That friendship and that kinship will be the main themes of my remarks here today. But first perhaps you will forgive me if I say a few personal words of thanks.

My own public career is now drawing to its close. It has been a long career, extending in different forms over a

period of more than 50 years—some of them spent here in Washington. The invitation to address you comes as the climax of my term of service and is among the proudest experiences of my life. [Applause.] I am profoundly grateful for your invitation.

It is as representing the people of Ireland that you, representing the people of America, have invited me to address you here. It is about Ireland and America—Ireland's part in America's destiny and America's part in Ireland's destiny—that it is fitting for me to speak.

I think of two historic moments as especially suited, in the present context, to illuminate the historic relationship of Ireland and America. The first was in the year 1771. In that year an American traveler, whose name was already well-known, came to Dublin and visited the Irish Parliament. He was well pleased with his reception. "The Speaker," he tells us, "stood up and acquainted the House that he understood there was in town an American gentleman of—as he was pleased to say—distinguished character and merit" and he asked that Benjamin Franklin, for it was he, should be admitted to sit amongst them, which was unanimously granted.

I hope—

Wrote Franklin—

our assemblies will not fall short of them in this politeness, if any Irish member should happen to be in our country.

Franklin's hope, I must here acknowledge, has been more than fulfilled. [Applause.] You have been kinder to me than our Parliament was to him, for there is no record that he was invited by them to make a speech. [Laughter.] Perhaps the Irish Commons were afraid that their own oratory might be eclipsed, whereas you are deterred by no such fear. [Laughter.] The historian Lecky tells us that Franklin ever after retained a feeling of friendship for Ireland. He made friends in Ireland, and in the Irish Parliament, and the friends he made were, as we should expect, members of the patriot party, who were striving for the freedom of Ireland as he was striving for American freedom.

I found them—

He wrote in prophetic words—

disposed to be friends with America in which I endeavored to confirm them with the expectation that our growing weight might in time be thrown into their scale and by joining our interest with theirs a more equitable treatment * * * might be obtained for themselves as well as for us.

Franklin's words were to come true, but not in the way and in the time that he and his friends expected. In their lifetime America won her full freedom. Ireland not only did not gain independence but lost what degree of legislative freedom she had by the extinction of that very Parliament which had received Franklin. But many sons of Ireland did take part in the American War of Independence, and America continued to symbolize for Ireland the freedom toward which our people never ceased to aspire. [Applause.]

The second occasion of which I wish to speak took place more than a hundred years later.

The great famine of the forties had given the Irish Nation what many at the time believed must be its death-blow. Many hundreds of thousands of our people then, and in following decades, had made their way here, in the most adverse conditions, to grasp the hope which America offered. The consequences of their coming were momentous, both for your nation and for mine. And now in the late seventies of the last century the situation of the forties—famine and mass eviction—threatened to recur. The young Irish leader, who in February 1880, came here to Washington, did not come as an observer, but to look for help for a nation in urgent and desperate need. The Congress of the United States, your predecessors here, invited that young man to address them. He was the first who ever addressed you on behalf of Ireland. His name was Charles Stewart Parnell. [Applause.]

In honoring him, Congress chose to honor the representative of Ireland's demand for freedom. At that time, under President Hayes—who personally welcomed Parnell—the scars of your civil strife were beginning to heal and America, as a united country, was entering on the fulfillment of her great destiny. The part which Irishmen had to play in the destiny of your country was now acknowledged and important. The many Irishmen who had fought in the struggle for your national unity had worked their passage, so to speak, from the status of immigrant to that of American citizen. But although they had become Americans, they had not forgotten Ireland. No conflict of loyalties was there, or could be there. They knew that Ireland, in struggling for freedom, was struggling for an ideal dear to America, for which America herself had successfully fought. When Parnell went back to Ireland, therefore, he went back secure in the knowledge, not only that the Irish in America were behind him but also that America as a whole, represented in Congress, looked with sympathy on Ireland's struggle for freedom. [Applause.] It was the beginning of the fulfillment of Franklin's expectation "that our growing weight might in time be thrown into their scale."

It is now nearly 80 years since Parnell addressed Congress: years of world shaking events, of outstanding technical and scientific progress and of great political change. In Ireland there came, in Easter week, 1916, the moment of fate, when Pádraig Pearse and his comrades, drawing on the courage and tenacity of many generations, challenged an empire in arms. A few years later, Eamon de Valera, senior surviving officer of Pearse's force and elected leader of the Irish people, came here to America. He came as President of the Irish Republic to campaign in every corner of this great land in advocacy of Ireland's cause and in search of American help for our renewed struggle to achieve our freedom. That help, as I can myself testify from personal experience, was generously given. One part of it—a great dollar loan raised by public subscription—was of tremendous value at the time from both the national and moral points of view. And indeed it was a great happiness for us later to be able to repay it, capital and interest. [Applause.] The rest we can never fully repay: by that I mean the sympathy and understanding of our American friends, which helped us, and still helps us, toward the goal for which we have always striven: Ireland united and free, in a genuine unity of heart and mind, rooted in a common sense of nationhood—in the words of your own children's pledge to the Stars and Stripes, "One nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all." [Applause.]

In addition to the great and challenging problems of partition, we have, of course, many others, including economic and social problems. Our position does not permit of complacency but, speaking to you here in the perspective of history, I can only express thankfulness to Divine Providence for the great and even dramatic progress that has been made. The Ireland on whose behalf Parnell addressed the Congress, less than 80 years ago, was a country in which hunger was widespread: the Ireland of today, according to international statistics, is one of the best fed nations in the world. [Applause.] General Gordon, who traveled in Ireland at about the time when Parnell came here, said that the poverty of western Ireland in particular was worse than anything he had seen in the Middle East. The traveler in Ireland today sees a country, not wealthy certainly, but by world standards, relatively prosperous and comfortable.

Material progress cannot weaken—indeed in my view it can only strengthen—the spiritual and cultural contribution which has been the glory of the Irish nation in the past. Spiritually the nation, made Christian by Patrick, whose day was so gloriously celebrated yesterday in this great city of Washington [applause]—spiritually the nation, made Christian by Patrick, which evangelized so much of Europe some 14 centuries ago, and in modern times has been so important an influence on the religious life of your great country, continues its work for Christianity with no less ardor and devotion than in past centuries. In recent years young writers, writing in Irish, have shown rich new possibilities in our ancient and beautiful language. Indeed throughout the whole field of the arts there is vigor and movement, and literature and the theater continue to manifest that traditional genius which has made them world famous. And in cultural life, as in ecclesiastical organization, Ireland remains one country—an encouraging augury for the future.

In international affairs Ireland has tried to play the part required by her Christian heritage and her traditional devotion to the ideal of freedom. We know well, of course, that in international affairs, the effective field of action of so small a country as ours is very limited. Nevertheless our special position has, we feel, a useful relevance, in modern conditions, to the cause of peace.

At a time when so many new and emerging states have shaken off, or are beginning to shake off, European rule, one of the dangers that confronts mankind is an exacerbated antagonism between the so-called colonial and anticolonial countries. Ireland is a European country, not merely geographically but also by active participation in European affairs. She is a member, for example, of the Council of Europe and of the Organization for European Economic Cooperation—the body which had its origin in one of the most generous international initiatives of our time—perhaps the most generous of all time: the European recovery program with which the name of Gen. George Marshall must always be associated. [Applause.]

As well as being a European country, Ireland also is a country with a long and well-known history of stubborn resistance to foreign rule. She is a country, therefore, with certain titles to the confidence both of the old European states and of the new states, with some of which she has important ties of friendship, based on a common struggle for freedom. In that position Ireland can hope to play in the United Nations and elsewhere a useful part, by helping to dissipate unnecessary suspicions, and seeking to create a better climate for international understanding. In working in that sense we are inspired not alone by our own traditions but by yours also which we, like so many other nations, have taken to our hearts.

I think in particular of certain words pronounced by a very great American who was also one of the noblest figures in human history. I am thinking of Abraham Lincoln's words, spoken in Philadelphia in 1861. Those words are an important part of your political heritage and of the heritage of free men everywhere. He said:

> I have often inquired of myself what great principle or idea it was that kept this Confederacy so long together. It was not the mere matter of the separation of the colonies from the Motherland, but something in that Declaration giving liberty not alone to the people of this country but hope to the world for all future time. It was that which gave promise that in due time the weights should be lifted from the shoulders of all men and that all should have an equal chance.

[Applause.]

For my country, gentlemen, that has been the American message not alone in words but also in practice. Our deep-rooted friendship for the American people is bound up not only with ties of history and of blood but with the liberating spirit expressed in those words of Lincoln and it is to that spirit that we, as a nation devoted to freedom, try to make our own words and actions conform. [Applause.]

In the language of our ancient Irish nation, guím bail Dé ar an obair ríthabhachtach atá a dhéanamh ag an Oireachtas ardchéimneach seo d'fhonn saoirse agus síocháin a chur in áirithe don domhan. Translation: I pray for God's blessing on the vital work of this distinguished Congress for the preservation of the freedom and peace of the world. [Applause, the Members rising.]

At 12 o'clock and 53 minutes p.m. His Excellency the President of Ireland, accompanied by the committee of escort, retired from the Chamber.

The Doorkeeper escorted the invited guests from the Chamber in the following order:

The Chief Justice of the United States and the Associate Justices of the Supreme Court.

The members of the President's Cabinet.

The Ambassadors, Ministers, and Chargés d'Affaires of foreign governments.

JOINT MEETING DISSOLVED

The SPEAKER. The purposes of the joint meeting having been completed, the Chair declares the joint meeting of the two Houses now dissolved.

Thereupon (at 12 o'clock and 56 minutes p.m.) the joint meeting of the two Houses was dissolved.

The Members of the Senate retired to their Chamber.

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 2 o'clock p.m.

PROCEEDINGS DURING THE RECESS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the proceedings that occurred during the recess be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

RIGHT OF THE BLIND TO SELF-EXPRESSION

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, March 16, I introduced H.R. 5716, a bill "to protect the right of the blind to self-expression through organizations of the blind." My bill is identical with H.R. 14 introduced by the gentleman from Nevada [Mr. BARING]. Mr. BARING's bill has been cosponsored by more than 50 Congressmen.

This is good legislation; directly in the interest of the blind. It provides leaders of the blind with opportunities of being consulted, as far as is practicable, with Government agencies which are planning and executing programs for the blind.

I believe that capable blind men and women are able to be of tremendous service in this area of consultation. Many of them are competitively employed, and performing tasks alongside of their sighted neighbors. They are proving that blind people are no more or no less than a cross section of our population, but they are living with the problem of blindness, and are able to help with programs planned for the benefits of blind persons.

I am personally acquainted with blind persons in many fields of endeavor. They are leading independently economic lives in their own communities. They are breaking down the old attitudes that blind people need to be custodialized or are of necessity wards of the state. They are taxpayers instead of tax consumers.

I feel that these blind people in their various walks of life have much to contribute in the overall planning of future services to the blind. I would like to see H.R. 14 enacted to provide just such means of consultation.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Public Works may have permission to sit today during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 17]

Barden	Hoffman, Mich.	Powell
Bentley	Jackson	Rains
Brock	Jensen	Rivers, Alaska
Carter	Jones, Ala.	Rivers, S.C.
Celler	McDowell	Short
Davis, Tenn.	McGinley	Smith, Miss.
Dingell	Mack, Wash.	Spence
Durham	Martin	Taylor
Fountain	Monagan	Thompson, La.
Frelinghuysen	Philbin	Widnall
Hall	Porter	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 404 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

WHEAT SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker. I ask unanimous consent that the Wheat Subcommittee of the Committee on Agriculture may have permission to sit during general debate this afternoon.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON LABOR-MANAGEMENT AND SUBCOMMITTEE ON FAIR LABOR STANDARDS

Mr. LANDRUM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Labor-Management and the

Subcommittee on Fair Labor Standards, sitting as a joint committee, may sit during general debate this afternoon.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

ANNOUNCEMENT

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. SHELLEY].

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to announce to the Members of the House that the beautiful green carnations which were given to the Members today for the welcoming of the president of Ireland, were supplied by the Ancient Order of Hibernians through their National President Jeremiah T. O'Callaghan.

AMENDMENTS TO FEDERAL AIRPORT ACT

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 215 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution, it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 1011), to amend the Federal Airport Act in order to extend the time for making grants under the provisions of such Act, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed two hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider the substitute amendment recommended by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce now in the bill, and such substitute for the purpose of amendment shall be considered under the five-minute rule as an original bill. At the conclusion of such consideration the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and any member may demand a separate vote in the House on any of the amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or committee substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN], and myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 215 makes in order the consideration of H.R. 1011, to amend the Federal Airport Act in order to extend the time for making grants under the provisions of such act; it also provides for the consideration of a committee substitute amendment. This resolution provides for an open rule and 2 hours of debate.

The Federal Airport Act—Public Law 377, 79th Congress, in 60th United States Statutes at Large, page 170—approved in 1946, established a program of Federal aid to provide a system of public airports adequate to anticipate and meet the needs of civil aeronautics. Administration of the program was entrusted to the Secretary of Commerce. On January 1, 1959, the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency assumed this responsibility under the terms of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958.

Because extensive planning is required to build modern airport facilities, sponsors in 1955 asked Congress to establish a long-range program, setting out definitely the amount of Federal aid available over a period of years. After extensive consideration, the Congress in 1955 amended the basic act to authorize contract obligations of $42,500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and $63 million each for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1957, and June 30, 1958 and 1959. In recommending the contract-authority method of providing for Federal-aid grants, sponsors cited the Federal highway program, which has been operated on a contract-authority basis for many years.

Legislation to continue the Federal aid program at an increased level of $100 million a year through fiscal year 1963, with an additional authorization of $37 million for fiscal year 1959, was passed by the last Congress. That legislation was vetoed by the President.

The need for continuing the program of Federal aid to airports on a matching fund basis is almost self-evident. In no other way can we provide an adequate national system of public airports.

The administration itself sent up a bill which has been introduced by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BENNETT] which is H.R. 3267.

Air transportation is now a principal means of interstate commerce for persons, freight and mail. More passengers now are transported in interstate and foreign air commerce than by railroads and trans-Atlantic steamships. Growth of air commerce since the enactment of the Federal Airport Act in 1946 has been so rapid that many existing airport facilities are overtaxed, not only because more aircraft are in service, but also because of the increased speed, weight, design, and capacity of new-type aircraft.

Stated briefly, the committee substitute would make amendments to the Federal Airport Act for the following purposes:

First. To authorize Federal aid for airports totaling $297 million to become available over a 4-year period, beginning with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, for the various States, including Alaska and Hawaii, as well as Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands.

Second. To limit use of Federal funds in the construction of airport buildings to that portion of an approved project which provides space for use by Federal agencies. The Federal Government, at the discretion of the Administrator, could pay all the cost of providing such space. No funds could be used for passenger automobile parking facilities.

Third. To provide that Federal aid apportionments made to a State, if not obligated after 2 years, shall revert to the discretionary fund now existing under the act, so that they will be available for use by the Administrator without regard to State boundaries.

As I have pointed out, the committee substitute authorizes a total grant for the 4-year period of $297 million, which is $97 million in excess of the amount which would be available under the administration bill, H.R. 3267. However, for the fiscal year 1960 for which budget estimates have been submitted by the administration calling for $65 million, the committee substitute calls for $63 million, which is $2 million less than the amount recommended by the President's budget. So that the House may consider the provisions of the program recommended by the majority of the committee, as well as any other amendments which may be proposed, including the program called for in the administration bill, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 215.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, as I see it, the bill which this rule makes in order raises three questions. First, should Federal aid to airports be continued? The second question is, If we continue it, for how long shall we continue it? The third question is, If it is to be continued, what should be the amount and for what purposes? Those are the three questions involved in this bill.

The administration bill provides $200 million over a 4-year period. It does not provide for such items as restaurants, roadways, and things of that nature.

Originally, in the other body, Senator MONRONEY introduced a bill for Federal aid to airports that called for $575 million. It finally passed in the other body on February 6 in the amount of $465 million.

The original Harris bill provided for $437 million and provided for paving and for certain things that had nothing to do with the safety of a person from the time he gets on the plane until he gets off. The Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce reduced the original Harris bill of $437 mililon to $297 million. The main difference between the Harris bill and the administration bill is that the Harris bill, as finally reported by the committee, amounts to $97 million more than the administration bill.

It might be of interest to some of the Members to know that General Quesada, who is the Federal Aviation Administrator, is quoted as follows in the minority report. The report says:

> The committee has had the refreshing experience of being told by the Federal Aviation Administrator that he can do the job that is required for an amount very substantially below what the majority seeks to provide him. He has said very substantially below what the majority seeks to provide him. He has said very plainly that he can do the job for $200 million over the next 4 years. There is no factual evidence to the contrary in the record, nor have we heard from any other authoritative source any facts to refute this position.

Mr. Speaker, I think the Members of this body should be glad to hear that, because it does not occur very often that

an agency comes up here asking for less money than the majority of the members of the committee are trying to provide. Generally it is the other way around; these agencies ask for more than a committee wants to give them.

I cannot think of anyone who is better informed on the subject not only of military aviation but civil aviation than General Quesada. When he says he can do the job for $200 million, I cannot see how this body can justify raising it $97 million, which in my judgment is a considerable amount of money.

Mr. Speaker, I think this House should have some financial responsibility. Let us attempt to balance the budget, because if we do not, we have to borrow money. We do not have it in the Treasury. We have to borrow it and let our children and grandchildren pay off the loan. I think we are shirking our responsibility here every time we add anything like $97 million when the man who will have to administer the act does not need that amount and says he can do the job without that additional $97 million.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I find that I cannot support this bill as it comes to us from the committee.

I have had great interest in the past in the development of airports and safe aviation in this country, and I shall continue that interest. However, I must say, Mr. Speaker, that I believe this is irresponsible legislation, that it does violence to the rules of this House and to the Constitution. It could be amended to conform. If it is amended it will have my support.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the people of the country have been misinformed by various pressure groups in relation to this legislation. I, therefore, request permission to include with these remarks correspondence I have had with Mr. Fred L. Bailey, superintendent of the Akron-Canton Airport, which serves my congressional district. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Bailey sent me the following letter and you will note he sent copies to many other people:

AKRON-CANTON AIRPORT,
Akron, Ohio, March 4, 1959.

The Honorable FRANK T. BOW,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR FRANK: On behalf of the airport agency, and the boards of commissioners of Stark and Summit Counties, this letter is being written requesting your support of H.R. 1011, as originally written. The future of your airport's immediate and long-range improvement program could well depend upon the action taken by Congress within the next 48 hours. Your support is needed immediately.

The reduction in the level of Federal aid to airports is not only unacceptable but untimely. The cut in the program jeopardizes not only your local construction program but the orderly development of a safe, interdependent system of airports and airport facilities demanded by the public interest.

If the terminal building and other nonlanding field facility participation is eliminated as provided in the House committee's cut, then the entire method of Federal Government participation in FAP should be reevaluated. If Federal aid is limited to development of landing area facilities only, then Federal aid to airports should be placed on the same basis as the highway aid program (90 percent provided by the Federal Government—10 percent by local communities).

The frills of terminal building construction (bars, lounges, bowling alleys, etc.) have already been expressly eliminated from Federal participation in S. 1 and H.R. 1011 as originally written. Congressmen are way off base if Federal aid to terminal buildings is withheld for the reason "that the Federal Government should not participate in the construction costs of such facilities." The Government, by law, will not anyway.

We respectfully urge your support to back the passage of floor amendments to H.R. 1011 that would restore that bill's provisions as originally written.

Sincerely yours,

FRED L. BAILEY,
Superintendent.

(Copies to C. Blake McDowell, Summit County Commissioners, Stark County Commissioners, Canton Repository, Akron Beacon Journal, Alliance Review, Massillon Independent, Akron Chamber of Commerce, Canton Chamber of Commerce.)

To this letter from Mr. Bailey I replied as follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., March 10, 1959.

Mr. FRED L. BAILEY,
Superintendent, Akron-Canton Airport,
Akron, Ohio

DEAR FRED: This will acknowledge the receipt of your letter of March 4, 1959, in which you state in part:

"On behalf of the airport agency, and the boards of commissioners of Stark and Summit Counties, this letter is being written requesting your support of H.R. 1011, as originally written. The future of your airport's immediate and long-range improvement program could well depend upon the action taken by Congress within the next 48 hours. Your support is needed immediately."

I note also that you have sent copies of your letter to individuals, organizations, and newspapers in our area. I am sending copies of this letter to the same group.

As you know, I have been very close to the program to develop the Akron-Canton Airport. During my service in Congress I have spent many hours, and days, with agencies of the Government to assure proper concern being given to the welfare and safety of the public who use the facility.

As a member of the Appropriations Subcommittee handling the CAA and the newly created FAA, I have had a close working relationship with these officials. There have been occasions when I have had to rectify errors presented to these officials.

Unfortunately, a close liaison between the management of the Akron-Canton Airport and my office has been lacking. Plans, details, and problems that my office should have been advised of were not submitted to us. We were not kept abreast of developments. It seems that we have been called upon only when some crisis occurs and that generally at a very late hour. We have always urged that we be kept advised and at all times cooperated and offered our services.

You state further in your letter:

"The reduction in the level of Federal aid to airports is not only unacceptable but untimely. The cut in the program jeopardizes not only your local construction program but the orderly development of a safe, interdependent system of airports and airport facilities demanded by the public interest."

As you well know, Akron-Canton Airport has an allocation of $1 million from Federal funds already authorized. This allocation is now being reviewed and the study will soon be completed. It is anticipated that by May 1 of this year this grant will be made firm and funds will then be available for expenditure by Akron-Canton Airport.

I am pleased that I was able to be of service in securing this allocation for Akron-Canton Airport.

This grant is under existing law and will not be affected by the legislation that you seem concerned about.

I desire to call attention to another part of your letter which is misleading if not understood. You state:

"If Federal aid is limited to development of landing area facilities only, then Federal aid to airports should be placed on the same basis as the highway aid program (90 percent provided by the Federal Government—10 percent by local communities)."

Funds paid by the Federal Government on the highway aid program are from a "trust fund." This trust fund is created by taxes levied upon the users of highways, gasoline taxes, etc., so that the users are paying the 90 percent—not the Treasury of the United States (in other words, all the taxpayers).

If you can convince airport managers and all others interested in aviation to place a tax on the use of facilities and thereby create a trust fund for the payment of the expenses attributed to aviation, I will support you. Such a fund would save the taxpayers of this Nation hundreds of millions of dollars every year now being spent for aviation.

I think it might be of interest here to set forth the contributions made from the Treasury of the United States since the enactment of the aid to airport law in 1946:

Fiscal year	Estimate	Appropriation	Contract authorization
1946			
1947	$52,000,000	$45,000,000	
1948	65,000,000	32,500,000	
1949	40,000,000	3,000,000	$37,000,000
1950	40,000,000	3,500,000	36,500,000
1951	40,000,000	3,300,000	36,700,000
1952	24,000,000	18,700,000	
1953	17,600,000	14,321,154	
1954:			
Original	30,000,000		
Revised			
1955	22,000,000	22,000,000	
1956	11,000,000	20,000,000	[1] 42,500,000
1957			[1] 63,000,000
1958			[1] 63,000,000
1959			[1] 63,000,000
Total		162,321,154	341,700,000

[1] Authorized by Public Law 211, 84th Cong.

When we refer to airports and their cost to the taxpayers of the United States, we are not telling the whole story. Payments for all services to promote aviation are much higher. The total year by year payments from the Treasury (the taxpayers of the United States) for the past 5 fiscal years, excluding airports, have been:

[In millions]

1955	$243.1
1956	234.6
1957	274.5
1958	360.5
1959	627.9

In view of these great expenditures, I repeat if a trust fund can be established to pay these costs by user charges of those who use the facilities, I will support your 90–10 formula. Such procedure would take a great burden from the Treasury and the American taxpayers.

Now, as to your request that I support H.R. 1011 as originally written, this I cannot

do. The cost is much too high and extravagant. As pointed out to you, even if no bill passes at this time you still get your $1 million in Federal funds. The bill you ask me to support proposes to enable officials of the executive branch of Government to obligate the taxpayers in the amount of $297 million during the next 4 years for airport construction purposes. The language of the bill opens a 4-year charge account without regard to other financial requirements contained in the budget presented to Congress each year, and without regard to the ability of the Treasury to meet such financial obligations from year to year in the light of ever-changing needs and conditions.

Creating a 4-year license to obligate the Treasury in this manner violates orderly appropriations procedure as well as the spirit of the Constitution. It avoids the traditional process under which the various agencies of Government must account annually for their actions in advance of the granting of authority to financially commit the Government. It ties the hands of the President and the Congress in preparing and controlling the annual budget. While responsible officials will be required to appear before Congress each year to request funds to pay off the financial obligations previously created under the authority of this bill, the annual appropriation action will merely be ministerial in nature and will come too late to provide any control over the level of the program.

This proposal is another instance of the so-called backdoor approach to the Treasury. The language in the bill which reads "there is hereby authorized to be obligated by the execution of grant agreements" opens a Pandora's box to those who would arbitrarily demand that airport construction be accelerated each year without regard for the financial status of the Treasury. The minute such language is signed into law, it will transfer the control over this program for the next 4 years from the Members of Congress—the duly elected representatives of the people—to those who have no such direct accountability.

I consider this to be an abdication of the power of the purse by the Congress and a very dangerous trend away from fiscal responsibility. If we are ever to stop the gradual drift to financial disaster, the backdoor approach to the Treasury must be discontinued.

As you perhaps know, Congressman HOWARD SMITH, chairman of the Rules Committee, has introduced House Resolution 161 to prevent procedures of this kind. Many people of the 16th District have asked me to support House Resolution 161 and I may say to you it has my full support.

I am wholeheartedly in favor of economy in Government. We must reduce Federal spending and reduce it drastically and give our people tax relief. I must apply this economy at home as well as throughout the Nation. Reduction of spending of large sums in foreign aid would be helpful.

I have in the past, and will in the future, support proper and reasonable aid to airports and will support wholeheartedly funds which are necessary to provide safety in the air. I may say that I am more interested in safe travel in the air and safety in landing at airports than I am in plush terminals or fancy cocktail bars at the end of the trip.

You state: "Congressmen are way off base in some of their views." I can assure you that further off base are some of the pressure groups who try by scare letters distributed at random to force decisions which may be against the best interests of all the people and of the Nation.

I am sure that a careful study will substantiate the facts I have outlined above.

Sincerely yours,

FRANK T. BOW,
Member of Congress.

(Copies to: C. Blake McDowell, Summit County Commissioners, Stark County Commissioners, Canton Repository, Akron Beacon Journal, Alliance Review, Massillon Independent, Akron Chamber of Commerce, Canton Chamber of Commerce.)

I have included in these remarks, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Bailey's letter because I want to be fair to him.

I have also been asked by Mayor Charles L. Babcock, of Canton, Ohio, in my congressional district, to support this legislation. I hope sincerely that the mayor is acting without full and complete knowledge of the bill, for it would be most unfortunate if he were supporting irresponsible legislation which would further increase our national debt, which would undoubtedly add to the cost of living of those in our area who now find it difficult to make ends meet. If we believe in economy in Government, we must practice it at home as well as in the cities and districts of others.

I sincerely hope, Mr. Speaker, that this bill will be amended so that it may receive the support of those of us who believe in fiscal responsibility.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK].

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I have taken this time because I think it might be helpful if we understood a little better what the parliamentary situation is. I have also taken this time because I have had a number of Members inquire of me as to whether or not there will be an opportunity in the consideration of this measure to vote to reduce the amount of money that is provided in the bill, and also to make certain other substantive changes they deem to be important.

I am quite convinced that those inquiries addressed to me about an opportunity to reduce the spending in this measure come from people who are genuinely interested in avoiding excessive Federal spending because they know, as you and I ought to know by this time, that excessive Federal spending fuels the fires of inflation, which reduces the value of savings, adds to the cost-price squeeze on the farmer, who is already in too much trouble, and cuts into the buying power of the dollar for some 23 million people who are on some sort of Government retirement program. Beyond that, deficit spending is destructive of the hope that many of us have for some sort of equitable tax reduction in the future.

First of all may I say that the rule granted by the Committee on Rules is fair. The bill before us is in the nature of a complete committee amendment to the original bill as introduced, but the rule fairly and properly provides that the committee amendment shall be open to amendment as an original bill. It preserves the right, therefore, of anyone to offer amendments to change the provisions of the bill. The rule also preserves to the minority the motion to recommit with or without instructions.

Let me say to those of you who have inquired that after the general debate is concluded and the bill is open to amendment, amendments will be offered to bring this bill more nearly in line with the recommendations of the administration and the Federal Aviation Agency. Amendments will be offered to reduce the amount of money here provided to be spent. I sincerely hope that in the Committee of the Whole those amendments can be adopted, but if they are not adopted, then the motion to recommit will be along the line of the amendments to which I have referred. It will provide for reduction in the amount of spending and it will provide for other things that are deemed desirable in this legislation.

So far as I am concerned, I trust the motion to recommit will prevail. If it does not prevail, then I shall vote against the bill. I trust enough Members will vote against it out of opposition to excessive spending. Not only is the spending excessive, but in addition the committee amendment, as reported here, does not provide for the phasing out of this program that I think one day must be phased out. I believe the time to do that is now. Billions of dollars have been spent not only in airport construction but in providing navigational aids that are so necessary. Billions of dollars, I say, are spent. In connection with navigational aids, it is apparent to anyone that more money will have to be spent. Here we are dealing with airport aid and airport construction. Here we are on one of the first bills that is going to determine how we stand on the question of spending. We are going to divide the men from the boys. We are going to find out who the spenders are and we are going to find out who the savers are. I think the people of this country want to know about that. We are going to see to it, as we are going to see to it in every one of these bills that comes along. Wherever we have a chance we are going to call the roll and we are going to see where we stand. To my friends on the right, as was pointed out by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN] so well, I repeat, here is a man, General Quesada, head of the Federal Aviation Agency who has studied this matter. His testimony, in my opinion, ought to persuade anyone, and he says he can do the job for $200 million. Well, if he can do the job, let us give him the $200 million. Let us give that amount to the Agency. Let us start them out that way. Let us not start, in one of the first bills to come before us, to appropriate more money than has been asked for and, may I say, more money than is needed. If we can demonstrate here what we have in mind, I think it would be the greatest encouragement to the people of this country. I think it would do much to put our unemployed people back to work. That is what we need. That is what we need today. So let us make a start here and stand up and be counted for economy, which I believe the people of this country in an overwhelming majority are demanding of the Congress of the United States.

Just one further observation, Mr. Speaker, and then I will be through. We have been reading about the financial difficulties of many of the States. You know, they will have to match these funds 50–50. Now I do not know whether we would be doing them very much of a

favor, especially some States where they cannot even keep up their colleges or, apparently, where they are at the point of not being able to keep them going, and where many other things are falling by the wayside. I doubt if we would be doing them very much of a service by appropriating more money here than is really needed and hence putting the same sort of burden on them to appropriate more money than they are able financially to appropriate. So I say the administration proposal is fair and sound. It is all that is needed. So far as I am concerned, I am going to make the fight in that direction.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Indiana need not worry about a rollcall. There will be a rollcall. It is going to be interesting to see what the vote will be on the question of the passage of the bill, and not on the motion to recommit the bill. Because only a few weeks ago when my friend, the gentleman from Indiana, made the same kind of speech here in the well of the House against the GI housing bill and he made it a party matter, on the passage of the bill, 53 Republicans did not follow the gentleman's leadership. Now the people of the country are very much interested in this bill. There will be a rollcall and the test of the vote will be on the passage of the bill showing just how united the Republican Party is with the party divided and split down the middle. Even the other day, they repudiated "Modern Republicanism," as I believe I read in the paper, at a meeting in Washing recently. The great slogan of the President of 6 years ago now has been disavowed and repudiated and has been thrown on the political scrap heap. I see the gentleman from Indiana on his feet; does he want me to yield?

Mr. HALLECK. Yes, Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HALLECK. May I say, first of all, I disagree with the gentleman when he says the question of economy and of spending——

Mr. McCORMACK. I have not come to that yet. Now I have not come to that yet so the gentleman cannot disagree with something I have not said yet. The gentleman from Indiana, of course, is jumping the gun.

Mr. HALLECK. I am sure the gentleman from Massachusetts has many things to say, but he has undertaken to interpret my position.

Mr. McCORMACK. No, no, I did not undertake to interpret your position, I just simply stated what you stated your position was.

Mr. HALLECK. I say the gentleman was interpreting in this respect, that the vote on the motion to recommit to reduce the spending here is the real question.

Mr. McCORMACK. Oh, no, no—not for me. You are not kidding me, and you are not kidding any Member of the House. The real vote will be on the passage of the bill. A motion to recommit is a coverup, a hideaway. We know that, like when the social security measure was up. On the passage of the bill the Republicans voted for it, but they do not say they voted for the motion to recommit, which, if adopted, would have gutted the bill. So it is the passage of the bill that counts. The motion to recommit is that little legislative sneaker for the purpose of deceiving the public.

The only difference between this bill reported only by the committee, in dollar value, and the President's bill is $97 million. The President's bill called for $200 million, and the committee reported out over a 4-year period a bill involving $297 million. As a matter of fact, I think the committee reported out a bill providing for the expenditure of about the same amount, when we have in mind the protection of the American people who travel in airplanes; when we have in mind the number of accidents that are constantly happening, and which happened only in recent months. When the roll call comes I want the Republicans to know that when they vote "No" on the passage of the bill, a capable opponent against them next fall can call attention to that.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I am enjoying this. I am just talking practical now.

Mr. HALLECK. The gentleman has demonstrated just now what his position is, and his party, and what the Democratic Party's position will be, and that is that we are not spending enough and we ought to spend more.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK], of course, is an attempted master of the art of misinterpretation. I express my own views and I stand by them. The difference is $97 million over a 4-year period. As a matter of fact, the first year of the operation of the law there will be less spent than provided in the President's bill, but under the Democratic measure for the protection of human lives, there will be greater protection afforded by the bill reported by the committee than the President's recommendation, and his bill, and there will be greater distribution to the States than is provided in the President's bill.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. McCORMACK. One thing I never do. I never talk politics. I might say that there is no stronger believer in the United States in the two-party system than I. I want the Republican Party to exist. Notice I say "exist." But, believing as I do in the two-party system, I do believe that the American people are blessed indeed when the Democratic Party is in control of our Government.

Now the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] talks about a balanced budget. We have seen him come out of the White House and make those dramatic speeches when appearing before television. His ingenuity is rather admirable in some respects. Even the youngster who sells newspapers on the corner believes in a balanced budget. There is nothing brilliant about that. The President told us a year ago he had sent a balanced budget to the Congress. It is going to be unbalanced by June 30 over $13 billion. His guess was $13 billion wrong.

As I said, the youngster who sells newspapers on the corner wants to be sure we have in the world of today an adequate defense. Members of Congress do not have all the brains in the United States; the youngster who sells newspapers on the corner has brains too. Many years ago I used to sell newspapers on the streets. They know that a powerful national defense is of vital importance in the world today.

And the people of Indiana where the floods have taken place want flood protection—right in the State of my friend the minority leader. I wonder how they feel when they know the President says no new starts? Let the floods go on, we cannot afford to appropriate money to build dams to protect your lives and your property. Right in Indiana is taking place—no new starts. It is not only in Indiana but also it hits Ohio, and I heard my dear friend the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN], not long ago take the floor—and I admired him—condemning this policy of no new starts enunciated by President Eisenhower in connection with the fiscal year of 1960.

Sure, we are all for a balanced budget, certainly; but we are for national defense, and I am going to vote for money when anything comes up to help build dams in the State of Indiana to protect the rights of the people and the property there; I am going to vote for something when it comes up to do the same thing for the people of Ohio that my Republican friend, my genial friend, my outstanding friend, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN], made such a dramatic speech about recently.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. Oh, I see my dear friend rising.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Whose money will you vote?

Mr. McCORMACK. Just a minute, just a minute. So I am going to help out my friend from Ohio and when it comes up for Indiana, I will help my friend from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] who is opposing it now; I am going to take the floor and beg that we do something to protect the people of Indiana against future floods. I think my friend from Missouri does not want me to yield now.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I know of no further requests for time.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 1011) to amend the Federal Airport Act in order to extend the time for making grants under the provisions of such act, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to. Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 1011, with Mr. METCALF in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS] will be recognized for 1 hour, and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BENNETT] for 1 hour.

The gentleman from Arkansas is recognized.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 20 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce brings to you the bill H.R. 1011, to extend the Federal Airport Act.

The committee held hearings February 9 and 10 on this legislation, which would extend the airport construction program authorized by the Federal Airport Act of 1946.

I hold in my hand a copy of the national airport plan developed by the Civil Aeronautics Administration, now the Federal Aviation Agency, in accordance with the provisions of that act. This plan lists the airports needed to meet the needs of air commerce and general aviation of the Nation. The goal is to bring about consummation of this national airport plan.

The Congress in 1946 authorized a program to bring this about.

In the first year after the authorization $45 million was appropriated to meet this need. That was for 1947. Following 1947 the funds made available for the program for the development of airports on a 1-year proposition declined.

By 1953 there was no program. As a matter of fact, it was exactly zero dollars. In 1954, there was made available a total of $22 million to be allocated to the States and the Territories which was, as a matter of fact inadequate to meet anything like the need for Federal aid. Then, in 1955, in an effort to try to reach the goal set in 1946 and to meet the needs that everyone agreed were necessary a new program was approved by the Congress. That provided a 4-year contract authority program on a matching basis. It provided an allocation to the States of $60 million a year under the existing formula, and $3 million to the Territories, which made a total of $63 million a year available for a 4-year program.

Now, in view of the fact that there are four steps that are necessary, actually five, in building an airport, it takes more than a year, it takes more than 2 years, and sometimes it takes as much as 5 or 6 years to complete a job. As a matter of fact, most of the present funds have been programed.

Now, there are no new funds in the program after this year. We recognized that last year, and in view of the fact that it is necessary to have long-range programing the Congress held hearings a year ago and developed a bill which, from the hearings, was felt to be necessary to carry out the national airport program. There have been statements made and there will be other statements made that there is nothing in the record to justify what the committee has done in the bill presented here today. I am going to show you that the record we made in the hearings is replete with information. The Administrator's testimony before this committee shows that to carry out the program that was needed from their own survey would take $1.29 billion.

The committee feels that the Federal Government has a responsibility to continue Federal aid to airports to promote safety and to meet the needs of our expanding air commerce, so vital to the Nation's defense and its economic welfare.

There is no disagreement within the committee over the need for an adequate national airport program. There is some disagreement regarding the amount of assistance the Federal Government should provide.

As introduced, H.R. 1011 would have authorized a $437 million program.

After consideration of information developed in the hearings, the committee reduced the bill to $363 million, which included an $85 million discretionary fund. It was felt that this would be adequate to provide Federal matching funds for available local funds.

After further consideration of the problem in the light of reduced Federal funds needed for terminal building grants, the committee further reduced the total of the bill to $297 million, chiefly by a reduction in the discretionary fund.

The present program is $63 million a year. The amount provided in the bill as reported by the committee is in effect a 4-year continuation of the present program, plus the special additional discretionary fund of $45 million.

Although the amount recommended in H.R. 1011, as reported, is $97 million more than proposed by the administration, the committee and the administration are in rather close agreement regarding the use of funds for terminal building construction, one of the controversial points in the Federal aid program. The legislation sponsored by the administration would limit Federal aid to terminal buildings to space for traffic control towers, weather reporting activities, and air traffic control communications. The committee proposal would broaden that limitation only slightly to include space for other Federal activities, if the Administrator finds that would be in the best interest of the Government. This would permit Federal aid to provide space for such necessary activities as immigration, customs, health, and agricultural inspections. Under the committee proposal, the Federal share could go as high as 100 percent.

The committee bill would prohibit Federal aid to other terminal building construction and to automobile parking lots.

The committee did not go along with the administration on a recommendation to change the apportionment formula. Under existing law, 75 percent of the Federal aid is distributed to the States on the basis of population and area, with 25 percent going into a fund for distribution at the discretion of the Administrator of the FAA without regard to State boundaries. The administration wanted this changed to distribute 50 percent to the States and place 50 percent in the discretionary fund.

Early enactment of this legislation is needed to give local sponsors an opportunity to make plans. As has been stated, planning is a time-consuming operation.

Enactment of this legislation would not affect the President's budget for 1960. Grants authorized for fiscal year 1960 would be $2 million less than in the administration bill.

SUMMARY OF THE COMMITTEE SUBSTITUTE

Stated briefly, the committee substitute would make amendments to the Federal Airport Act for the following purposes:

First. To authorize Federal aid for airports totaling $297 million to become available over a 4-year period, beginning with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, as follows:

(a) For the States, $62,100,000 for each of the 4 fiscal years. In addition to Alaska, Hawaii would be included in the State program.

(b) For each of the 4 fiscal years, $600,000 for Puerto Rico and $300,000 for the Virgin Islands.

(c) For a new discretionary fund, to become available as follows: $20 million on July 1, 1961; $15 million on July 1, 1962; and $10 million on July 1, 1963.

Second. To limit use of Federal funds in the construction of airport buildings to that portion of an approved project which provides space for use by Federal agencies. The Federal Government, at the discretion of the Administrator, could pay all the cost of providing such space. No funds could be used for passenger automobile parking facilities.

Third. To provide that Federal aid apportionments made to a State, if not obligated after 2 years, shall revert to the discretionary fund now existing under the act, so that they will be available for use by the Administrator without regard to State boundaries.

HISTORY OF FEDERAL AID PROGRAM

The Federal Airport Act, approved in 1946, established a long-range program of Federal aid to provide a system of public airports adequate to anticipate and meet the needs of civil aeronautics.

The act authorized appropriations of $500 million for grants to State and local authorities and $20 million to the Territories for a 7-year period. An appropriation of $45 million was made for the first fiscal year under the act, but thereafter appropriations declined until the 1954 fiscal year when no appropriation was requested and none made.

Because extensive planning is required to build modern airport facilities, sponsors in 1955 asked Congress to establish a long-range program, setting out definitely the amount of Federal aid available over a period of years.

After extensive consideration, the Congress in 1955 amended the basic act to authorize contract obligations of $42,500,000 for the fiscal year ending June

30, 1956, and $63 million each for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1957, June 30, 1958, and June 30, 1959—Public Law 211, 84th Congress.

Legislation to continue the Federal aid program at an increased level of $100 million a year through fiscal year 1963, with an additional authorization of $37 million for fiscal year 1959, was passed by the two Houses in the last Congress—S. 3502, 85th Congress.

The President, however, withheld approval of that legislation and the problem is again before Congress for consideration.

At the beginning of this session, I introduced H.R. 1011, which was identical with the bill passed last year which the President did not sign. The committee has reported out a substitute for that bill, reducing the amount authorized from $437 million to $297 million.

In the hearings on H.R. 1011 and related bills to extend the program, we heard the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency and representatives of airport operators and users. All agreed that the Federal aid program should be continued, but there was a wide difference of opinion on the amount of Federal aid needed to provide the Nation with an adequate system of airports.

ESTIMATED NEEDS FOR NEW CONSTRUCTION

A national airport survey made by the National Association of State Aviation Officials, the Airport Operators Council, and the American Association of Airport Executives presented at the hearings shows that 1,138 airport projects are planned by U.S. communities during the next 4 years. Total reported cost for land acquisition and for landing area and terminal area development planned during this 4-year period is $1.1 billion. It is anticipated that $521 million of this cost will become available from local sources, and $68.5 million from State sources, for a total of $590 million. This leaves a deficit of $477 million.

The survey indicated that funds to meet this deficit of over $477 million will be needed as follows:

Fiscal year ending:	
June 30, 1959	$128, 657, 730
June 30, 1960	131, 792, 064
June 30, 1961	114, 915, 094
June 30, 1962	101, 920, 420

Detailed figures on this survey will be found on pages 148 and 149 of the printed hearings.

A "Summary of Required Airport Development" furnished by the Federal Aviation Agency will be found in the hearings beginning on page 104. This lists projects totaling $1,290 million.

NEED FOR PROGRAM

Adequate airports are necessary not only to provide an adequate air transportation system but to promote safety in air commerce.

Due to the speed and range of the modern airplane, its operation presents problems that only the Federal Government can meet.

Airports are more than a local utility. Each airport is an intregal part of our national airways system.

Air transportation is modern transportation. It is vital to the welfare of the Nation.

To have a sound air transportation system, we need a national airport system. The only way we can get that system is by Federal aid to airports.

Air transportation is developing faster than our airport system. The phenomenal growth of air transportation since the enactment of the Federal Airport Act has made it difficult for sponsors to meet the needs for additional facilities.

Air transportation is now a principal means of interstate commerce for persons, freight, and mail. More passengers now are transported in interstate and foreign air commerce than by railroads and transatlantic steamships.

Active aircraft using the airports and airways have been increasing each year. In 1957, the total was 67,153. Last year, the Civil Aeronautics Administration estimated, that figure had climbed to 72,500, a gain of 8 percent in 1 year.

In 1946, the Nation's domestic scheduled airlines carried 12,213,000 passengers nearly 6 billion miles. The CAA estimated that in 1958 this figure increased to about 49 million passengers who flew more than 26 billion passenger-miles.

While the millions or airline passengers using the airports are cited, it should be made clear that we are not building airports exclusively for the airlines. Airports are being built for all civil aviation and to meet national defense needs.

Significantly, the greatest growth in civil aviation has been in general aviation, which excludes commercial air carriers. Today, business enterprises own and operate more than 26,000 aircraft, which now range from single-engine aircraft to DC-3's, turboprop Viscounts and F-27's, and which will soon be supplemented by jet aircraft.

Today the general aviation fleet—including these business aircraft—exceeds 65,000 aircraft and according to a recent Government forecast will grow to 89,000 by 1965, and to 107,000 by 1970.

The same forecast indicates an increase in airline passengers to 66 million by 1960, 93 million by 1965, and 107 million by 1970.

Airfreight quadrupled in volume during the period from 1946 to 1957. Official predictions are that aircargo traffic will increase to 600 million ton-miles by 1960, and to 1.6 billion ton-miles by 1970. It is quite obvious from this forecast that airfreight is still in its infancy.

EFFECT ON 1960 BUDGET

If enacted as reported, H.R. 1011 could not affect the President's budget for 1960.

The budget estimate for fiscal year 1960 for aid to airports is $50 million. That is to take care of contractual obligations expected to come due during the year.

H.R. 1011 would authorize contract obligations of $63 million during fiscal year 1960. Those contract obligations would not come due for some time—that is, until the work is done.

The bill sponsored by the administration and submitted with approval of the Bureau of the Budget, would authorize contract obligations of $65 million for fiscal year 1960, $2 million in excess of the authority provided in H.R. 1011, as reported.

DISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS

The following table, prepared by the Federal Aviation Agency, shows the annual distribution of the authorization which would be provided by H.R. 1011, as reported by the committee:

Annual distribution of $63,000,000 authorization for fiscal years 1960, 1961, 1962, 1963

State or Territory	State percentage (50 States)	$63,000,000 authorization (75-25) (1960)
Alabama	1.718611	$800, 443
Alaska	7.989155	3, 720, 949
Arizona	1.791320	834, 307
Arkansas	1.350570	629, 028
California	5.649302	2, 631, 162
Colorado	1.850538	861, 888
Connecticut	.738876	344, 131
Delaware	.137718	64, 142
District of Columbia	.265985	123, 883
Florida	1.732768	807, 037
Georgia	1.936646	901, 993
Hawaii	.252601	117, 649
Idaho	1.326823	617, 968
Illinois	3.663605	1, 706, 324
Indiana	1.794808	835, 932
Iowa	1.628855	758, 639
Kansas	1.744506	812, 504
Kentucky	1.520419	708, 135
Louisiana	1.558000	725, 639
Maine	.766973	357, 218
Maryland	.940883	438, 216
Massachusetts	1.674698	779, 991
Michigan	3.416986	1, 591, 461
Minnesota	2.154682	1, 003, 543
Mississippi	1.374104	639, 989
Missouri	2.250862	1, 048, 339
Montana	2.189235	1, 019, 636
Nebraska	1.484515	691, 413
Nevada	1.550886	722, 325
New Hampshire	.302274	140, 784
New Jersey	1.709049	795, 990
New Mexico	1.873840	872, 741
New York	5.631222	2, 622, 742
North Carolina	2.056445	957, 789
North Dakota	1.162358	541, 368
Ohio	3.231140	1, 504, 908
Oklahoma	1.685442	784, 995
Oregon	1.817568	846, 532
Pennsylvania	4.092974	1, 906, 303
Rhode Island	.278294	129, 615
South Carolina	1.122208	522, 668
South Dakota	1.259783	586, 744
Tennessee	1.660099	773, 191
Texas	6.170840	2, 874, 069
Utah	1.378355	641, 969
Vermont	.255003	118, 780
Virginia	1.670120	777, 858
Washington	1.742633	811, 631
West Virginia	.990351	461, 256
Wisconsin	2.032160	946, 479
Wyoming	1.422885	662, 709
Total United States		46, 575, 000
Discretionary funds [1]		15, 525, 000
Total for continental United States		62, 100, 000
Puerto Rico		600, 000
Virgin Islands		300, 000
Total Territories		900, 000
Grand total		63, 000, 000
Additional discretionary:		
1961		20, 000, 000
1963		15, 000, 000
1964		10, 000, 000

[1] 75 percent of authorization is apportioned for projects in each State on an area population formula; 25 percent is discretionary, and may be allocated without regard to State boundaries.

As has been stated, we were told in the hearings that local sponsors could provide $590 million for the program. They are not only willing; they are ready to provide it if we will give them a program on which they can depend. In the hearings last year the sponsors told us that they needed $477 million additional to carry on and to meet the needs of our air commerce. That is how we arrived at the figure of $437 million that was included in the bill originally presented a year ago. Our bill,

which the Congress approved last year, included $37 million for 1959. This year, when we held hearings, we were so near to the end of this fiscal year, that we thought the added amount for 1959 should not be included.

After we held our hearings and found out what the requirements were and determined the issues involved affecting terminal buildings, the committee decided that the testimony justified further reductions because terminal buildings which had previously been authorized would not be included under a full 50 percent matching program. The committee decided that at the larger airports there were opportunities for commercial enterprises, and, therefore, through rental arrangements there would be sufficient income developed to provide the terminal buildings. Therefore we said that none of these funds could go for the purpose of constructing terminal buildings except for that part needed by the Federal Government.

In other words, let me say this to my distinguished friend who talked about safety. There is no more important part of this Federal aviation program affecting safety than to have adequate and efficient operation of traffic control towers, weather stations, and communication systems necessary to bring an airplane in and have it land and then to permit it to take off and get on its way. That is part of the safety program.

So our committee made it possible for the Federal Government to pay for that part of the terminal building it uses itself, that part which is to be exclusively used by the Federal Government. Without this provision the Government would have to make a rental agreement with the manager of the airport, which would saddle an annual obligation onto this Government that would continue from here on out.

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield to my distinguished friend.

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. I am sure the gentleman wants to be fair and factual in his statement.

Mr. HARRIS. Of course, the gentleman is going to be fair.

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. I am sure he will be.

Mr. HARRIS. But I do not care about any imputations that I would not be.

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. There is no imputation that he would not be. But it is a fact, is it not, that there is no disagreement among members of the committee on the subject which the gentleman is now discussing?

Mr. HARRIS. Oh, yes; there is disagreement, because the gentleman knows that he and others of the minority want to reduce the figure from the $297 million arrived at by the committee, under the facts developed in the hearings, to an arbitrary figure of $200 million.

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. HARRIS. Yes.

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. During the past 4 years $10 million has been spent of Federal funds for towers; that is the total amount. There was no indication in our hearings that any greater sum than that will be needed for the next 4 years, was there?

Mr. HARRIS. Of course the gentleman knows that in the hearings it was developed and agreed to as a matter of principle by General Quesada, the operators, the Airport Operators Council, and the municipalities, that there is justification for this program and it is needed. Actually they are trying right now to get the city of Los Angeles to foot the complete bill of a separate building for the Government, without the Government putting one penny into it. What you are also doing is trying to make Los Angeles put the money into the construction of this facility and taking away available funds needed to match Federal funds for other parts of the project. The city of Los Angeles has now gone to the point that it cannot issue any more bonds. So you are taking away funds that should go into the matching fund, and you would require them to provide this facility which the Federal Government is going to use. This, if carried out under the theory of the substitute proposal, will require the U.S. Government to pay a rental fee every year for these facilities. I do not believe we should be saddled with that obligation.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. The gentleman explained a moment ago that the present law is that on allocations made to the States heretofore, if that was not——

Mr. HARRIS. Let me proceed, and I will explain that to the gentleman.

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a correction?

Mr. HARRIS. The gentleman has an hour. He can explain it in his own time.

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. The record ought to be straight here, Mr. Chairman. There is a provision in the bill I introduced which provides Federal aid on a continuing basis for these safety factors about which the gentleman has been talking. As a matter of fact, I supported in the committee the gentleman's amendment in that regard, in his bill.

Mr. HARRIS. Yes; I appreciate that the gentleman did, but he knows that his bill does not carry authority to meet the situation called to our attention by the city of Los Angeles. There cannot be any difference of opinion on that because it is a fact.

What we do here, because of the adjustment in this program for terminal facilities and other related airport facilities, is to bring you a bill with a total of $297 million. We took into consideration the experience of the agency for the last 4 years, and we provide precisely the same amount, $63 million a year, for allocations to the States. The first year—I want my distinguished friend from Indiana to get this; he is talking about spending—the proposal we present here to you is under the budget proposal for 1960 by $2 million. We are trying to help you in connection with balancing the budget. I would encourage the gentleman to support us on this program.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. The distinguished majority leader spoke of the motion to recommit as a legislative sneak.

Mr. HARRIS. This is no legislative sneak here.

Mr. HALLECK. I certainly would not refer to it as a sneak. But I think, and maybe not using that kind of word, because a motion to recommit has always been used here, and I hope it always will be used, it affords a real opportunity on many occasions to see where people really stand. But, I must say the gentleman has a pretty good gimmick—I will not say "sneak"—in his bill.

Mr. HARRIS. I take exception to your calling my bill anything that has a gimmick in it. I am trying to tell you that what we are proposing here is something that the gentleman's administration ought to take. All of you should vote for it. We want to help you in balancing the budget so we reduced your figure by $2 million. If you will just help us, we can get down to a figure. And there is another thing that would bring about what you desire and which is the objective of all of us, and that is a sound, balanced budget.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield briefly to the gentleman.

Mr. HALLECK. I shall always be brief. I would like to say that what the gentleman says with respect to the next fiscal year is true.

Mr. HARRIS. I want to make it very clear to the gentleman that it is not a gimmick.

Mr. HALLECK. Yes; well, all right. But, from then on you are looking forward to more spending. Actually, that is going to have to do with the future and whether or not the country can look forward to some tax reduction sometime. In my opinion, in spite of your position in respect to the next fiscal year, the argument is persuasive.

Mr. HARRIS. Let me get to that point. We provide for the second year to meet the problems of the jet age and in order to accommodate the jet planes provide an additional amount to be used by the Administrator in the discretionary fund. You are going to need some additional funds if we are to meet the need of the new airplanes today that are coming in this year and next year. And the following year, we are going to have plenty of them in the air. So we provide for them. General Quesada provided for it, too. But here is what he would do and what you would do by your substitute bill. You would take 50 percent of the total available and put it in the discretionary fund for the Administrator to use as he sees fit. You would reduce the amount allocated to the States the first year by one-half of $65 million which would be $37½ million, and in the second year one-half of $55 million which would be $27½ million. Now you start allocating

to the States with that amount of money for the development of airport projects and then, gentlemen, you are going to find yourselves trying to explain to your municipalities how they are not able to get matching funds to meet their needs. You would destroy the formula 75–25 that has been in existence since the first national airport plan was developed. That is just how serious it is and that is the difference we have here. That is the reason, I say, to meet the needs and the requirements of this plan the amount provided in this bill is necessary. Oh, yes, you say you have a plan, too, but we need a real plan and if we meet it, we are going to have to provide the money. I think, as a matter of fact, we have gone even below the minimum. But, the committee has decided that that is what it is. We are going to do our best to get this kind of bill through in order that this airport program may continue.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. When that program was adopted in 1946, I wonder how many people at that time envisaged a debt in this country of more than $285 billion. Would the gentleman care to comment on that?

Mr. HARRIS. Yes. I will say to my distinguished friend, I believe that at that time we had a national debt which went almost to that figure. That was immediately following the war.

Mr. GROSS. Of course, everyone expected after the war that this would be reduced.

Mr. HARRIS. I share that feeling.

Mr. GROSS. And that it would be reduced after the war, but not because of the economy, particularly.

Mr. HARRIS. I share the gentleman's views with reference to the need to reduce it, but let me tell you something, I also share the gentleman's views, I know, on providing safe transportation in this jet age.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. May I ask the gentleman this question: How much of the $97 million will go into safety features?

Mr. HARRIS. All of it.

Mr. GROSS. All of the $97 million above the $200 million?

Mr. HARRIS. Yes.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. I understand from the gentleman's statement that the allocations made heretofore under the Federal Airport Act to the States still stands until used. Is that the law at this time?

Mr. HARRIS. The law at this time is that after a period of 2 years funds allocated to the States revert back to the Administrator for reallocation. We make a change here to provide that after 2 years the unused balance reverts back to the Administrator to go into the discretionary fund. The reason for that is that there are about 14 States who found that they could not utilize the money allocated.

Funds made available under existing law and under the proposed legislation remain available until used.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Under section 28 of the proposed bill it says, "Which amounts have been obligated by the execution of grant agreements before July 1, 1959."

Mr. HARRIS. Let me explain that. Funds for certain projects have been set aside or programed but the final grant agreement has not been signed. A lot of the present program is in the pipeline. It will take at least until 1963 or 1964 for it to be completed. If we do not put that provision in there, it would disrupt the programs that are already underway—projects that have been programed but not put under grant agreement. Therefore, we do not disrupt the present program, but we apply the new policies beginning after July 1 this year.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. But if we have a program which is not reduced to an agreement on or before July 1, 1959, then do we lose the money?

Mr. HARRIS. This applies after next July 1.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. This says, "Amounts obligated by the execution of grant agreements before July 1, 1959." The point that bothers me, that these programs may be in the making, as in my State, we have a bond issue coming up. It will not be reduced to an agreement before July 1, 1959.

What I want to know is, if the money that has been made available to that area, which has not now been committed to a written agreement—are we going to lose it if we adopt section 8 and if we do not get it in writing before July 1, 1959?

Mr. HARRIS. Any grant agreements executed after next July 1 would have to be made under the terms of the new legislation but your State would get an allocation of funds under this legislation as in the past.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. But this is the old program, and you in effect say that the amendments shall not apply with respect to projects which have been obligated by the execution of a grant agreement before July 7, 1959. The allocation is made to the States. Discussions have been had with the Administrator, but no firm agreements have been made or executed at this time, nor would we be able to execute one on or before July 1, 1959. If we do not lose it, I want to be fully satisfied.

Mr. HARRIS. The necessity of this amendment is to protect those sponsors who have projects in the making but not actually under grant agreement. If we do not have this provision in it, then these programs that are underway might be disrupted.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Although they are not reduced to writing and executed? This says "The execution of a grant agreement."

Mr. HARRIS. I see.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. I just wanted to make sure that we have this.

Mr. HARRIS. That is the intention of the bill.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I wanted to ask the distinguished and able chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce a question. The gentleman will recall that on February 18 of this year I wrote a letter concerning the application of Public Law 801 of the 84th Congress by the Bureau of the Budget to show that personnel costs of the manpower requirements of the bill now under consideration. The gentleman immediately contacted the Federal Aviation Agency for that information. Having not received it, I would like to ask the gentleman if that information is available.

Mr. HARRIS. I recall the gentleman's letter, and I referred it to the agency for reply. I have not received a reply yet. We have discussed it with them. A reply in detail is in preparation. As I understand, under the administration bill there would be no increase in personnel, as the program would be gradually reduced. Under H.R. 1011, as reported by the committee, I am told there would be no appreciable increase in manpower needs.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Do I understand that this legislation does not involve the use of any additional manpower or personnel?

Mr. HARRIS. That would have to be determined as in the case of other programs by the agency.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I thank the gentleman.

I had felt that the degree of expansion of airport facilities proposed in this bill, H.R. 1011, will have considerable manpower implications. I have been interested to know if it will increase our Federal personnel or if the requirements of this proposed legislation can be met with our existing staffs?

Mr. Chairman, there have been too many instances in the past where the Congress has authorized legislation and voted the funds for new or expanded functions when in final analysis an excessive percentage of the funds are for personnel and administrative overhead rather than for the program itself. It is for this, among other reasons, that as chairman of the Manpower Utilization Subcommittee I plan to follow through on the manpower aspects of all proposed legislation to see that the requests support the requirements found in Public Law 801 of the 84th Congress (70 Stat. 652).

Public Law 801 simply requires that reports to Congress from the executive branch on pending or proposed legislation which, if enacted, would involve expenditures over $1 million and call for additional or expanded functions should include information on the number of civilian officers and employees required to carry out these new functions.

Compliance with this statute should not be an onerous task, for I cannot understand any department or agency not having the information necessary to meet the requirements of this law. If the responsible agency does not have the manpower data available for a proposed piece of legislation, it would appear to me that the Congress has all reason to question the reliability of the costs involved in the bill. I am sure

you will concur that it is far better to make the determination and reach an understanding prior to the enactment of the legislation, than to later find we have created a new empire of Federal personnel.

On February 18, 1959, I indicated by letters to the Director of the Bureau of the Budget and to my colleague, Hon. OREN HARRIS, chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the importance of the Congress knowing the personnel requirements of any proposed legislation prior to its enactment, as for example, the subject matter before us today.

Mr. HARRIS on February 23, 1959, indicated by letter to me that he has asked the Federal Aviation Agency to furnish the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce all possible information on this matter.

Yet to date we have not received any further information on personnel for this airport bill. Certainly both the responsible agency, the Federal Aviation Agency and the Bureau of the Budget should have this manpower information. The problem is now one of the Congress also knowing fully the manpower requirements of any proposed legislation.

Mr. Chairman, I insert at this point as a part of my remarks my letter of February 18, 1959, to the Director of the Bureau of the Budget on the manpower implications of this bill.

FEBRUARY 18, 1959.

Hon. MAURICE STANS,
Director, Bureau of the Budget,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. STANS: During our manpower utilization hearings in December 1958, we questioned your Assistant Director, Mr. Elmer Staats, concerning the compliance of the departments and agencies with Public Law 84-801. Mr. Staats, at that time, indicated the agencies were required to supply the information to the Bureau of the Budget. Despite this fact I have seen little or no evidence of compliance with the statute.

In view of the continuous pressure of the departments and agencies for more personnel and for new and/or expanded authority and functions, I believe we need a much closer coordination between your Bureau and the Congress in fulfilling the intent of this legislation.

As for example, bill S. 1, Amendments to the Federal Airport Act, which recently passed the Senate and has been referred to the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, provides for a sizable expansion of existing functions without any indications of the additional manpower requirements.

It would appear reasonable to assume that the degree of expansion of airport facilities proposed in S. 1 could have considerable manpower implications varying from new and additional construction inspectors to Civil Aeronautics Authority personnel to man the airport facilities. I am this date also advising the chairman of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee of our interest in the manpower implications of this proposed legislation.

Compliance with this statute certainly should not be an onerous task, for I cannot understand any department or agency not having the information necessary to meet the requirements of this law. It would appear the problem is basically one of coordinated communications between our committee and your Bureau and that I am sure can be solved without trouble.

We appreciated having Mr. Staats appear as a witness in December before our committee and we were especially impressed by his apparent earnest and desired cooperation.

With best wishes, I am,
Sincerely yours,

JAMES C. DAVIS,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Manpower Utilization.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I urge the adoption of the bill as reported by this committee. The hearings are replete with justifications of the amounts contained in the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Arkansas has consumed 29 minutes.

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SPRINGER].

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, to amend the Federal Airport Act I am offering the administration bill, H.R. 3267, in lieu of H.R. 1011, which is the Harris bill as reported by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce; and may I say to my colleagues of the House that they should be under no illusion that this bill came out of the committee unanimously or anywhere near unanimously. My recollection is that the vote was 14 to 12 in favor of reporting this bill; had there been one more vote against it would have been tied and this bill would not have been reported.

I am calling that to the attention of the House because I believe it does truly reflect the difference of opinion that there was in the committee on which one of these two philosophies ought to prevail.

One of these philosophies, and it is carried in the bill which is now under consideration, is that we should continue indefinitely to build airports for communities which either do not have them or to expand existing airports and terminals of all kinds.

The other philosophy, which is contained in the bill I intend to offer as a substitute at the proper time, is that gradually the Federal Government ought to get out of the business of building terminals and should confine its efforts only to the field of air safety. This is a policy better known as "door to door." That is, our duty extends from the time the passenger gets on the plane in the airport until he leaves the plane at the terminal airport, that everything else is the responsibility of the local community.

May I say that there is precedent in history for this. I think all of us realize that a hundred years ago we started many of the railroads of this country under a normal subsidy system for those days where we granted the railroads—in my own district, the Illinois Central Railroad, which crosses my district—a mile on each side of the right-of-way. That was to be sold and the money used as a subsidy which was granted to the railroad to start operations. That continued for only a short time.

We have been in this aviation business for almost 20 years in one phase or another and show at the present time no sign of ever stopping these Federal subsidies—even when this aviation business is in competition with other nonsubsidized forms of transportation.

As I see it, there are several advantages in the administration bill over H.R. 1011 in its present form. First, H.R. 1011 authorizes Federal aid for airports totaling $297 million, whereas the administration's proposal is for a total of $200 million. The savings in cost is one of the advantages I see.

Further, I have determined from an examination of the bills that there is greater flexibility in administration of aid to airports by the administration bill and, under such circumstances, it is most reasonable to agree that there can be a substantial savings in cost where there is such flexibility in administration.

Along this same line of flexibility, I find that the administration bill is much less complicated than H.R. 1011 and that the simpler form of approach provided by the administration bill offers many advantages.

Under the Federal Airport Act as it is now written, 75 percent of funds are apportioned to States on the formula with which you are all familiar, and 25 percent is apportioned to the discretionary fund. Under the administration's proposal, 50 percent would be apportioned to the States, and 50 percent would be apportioned to the discretionary fund.

This would permit the Administrator to make grants for urgent airport development that he would consider essential to a national aviation facilities system adequate to meet the present and future needs of our national defense and the development of civil aeronautics. He is charged with these responsibilities and it is important that he have the greater flexibility than this 50-50 approach would give him.

Then, too, as I have indicated, the administration bill provides for a simplification with respect to the handling of unused funds that have been appropriated under the formula. Under the Federal Airport Act as written, funds are apportioned and held there for a period of 2 years, with an additional year period for reapportionment where the funds are not used. The administration proposal simplifies this process and provides that the appropriated funds would revert to the discretionary fund after the 2-year period.

H.R. 3267 adopts what we term the "gate-to-gate" policy, which means that moneys will be confined to the development of that portion of the airport system which is directly needed for safe and efficient aircraft operations, including runways, taxiways, aprons, tower facilities, and so forth. Federal funds will not be used under this proposal for terminal buildings and terminal facilities which are revenue producing.

Finally, H.R. 3267 revises the definition of "airport development" along the line of the gate-to-gate policy which I have just mentioned.

The record does not contain evidence to support the need of funds as provided under H.R. 1011 as reported; but the record does have the testimony of the Administrator of the Federal Aviation

Agency that he can do the job and meet the real needs for a total of $200 million over a 4-year period, and I cast my judgment with that of his because we are meeting the safety needs and we are benefiting the taxpayer.

May I come now to the question of the $297 million. Does anyone sitting here today believe this bill as finally sent down to the White House, if it is, is going to be $297 million? I need only to recall that the other body has already acted on a bill which calls for $465 million, or 2½ times what the administration has requested and believes is necessary to carry out all of the functions that the Federal Administrator has set out.

If this bill is passed providing $297 million I think most of you who have sat in conference between the other body and the House knows what is going to be done. In my estimation, this bill will end up with not less than $350 million and probably more nearly $400 million. I expect to be on that conference committee and I shall stand for the bill that I am asking to be substituted today in the House. If that does not prevail, I certainly will stand for the lowest figure that is set by the House today.

But, I do want to point that out because I believe it is most important to know that if you pass this bill for $297 million, it certainly is not going to come back to this body at anywhere near that figure.

There is a second feature which I think has been lost sight of by most of the Members of the House. This $200 million for airport construction, so to speak, is only a very small figure. Actually, practically all of the safety factors, including approximately 65,000 employees of the Federal Aviation Agency, are taken care of under a separate appropriation which this year will reach almost $600 million. So, when I say to you that we are subsidizing airport construction to the tune of $200 million, you should not be under any misapprehension that this is the appropriation for the Federal Aviation Agency in 1960. It is not. That is yet to come, and that will be $600 million which you are going to vote to support the Federal Aviation Agency which includes the safety in aviation.

Now, I would like to touch on just one thing that the chairman mentioned, and that was the example of the Los Angeles Airport Authority. He said the administration bill, or the administration Federal Aviation Agency was in effect trying to get the city of Los Angeles to bear the cost, we will say, of tower construction in which the Federal Aviation Agency safety people would be housed. And, why, in that instance, were they asking the city of Los Angeles to bear that cost? Do you realize, my colleagues, that the city of Los Angeles Aviation Authority, that is, the airport in Los Angeles, last year made between two and a quarter and two and a half million dollars on subsidies largely which you have voted them in previous years. So, here we have a situation where we are giving to a community money with which to build terminals, to extend terminals, to carry on functions of all kinds, and they, through their own corporation, are making a profit on that and are using it for their own purpose instead of devoting it to these things which they ought to be doing and bearing local responsibility for it.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I wonder if the gentleman would comment on this business of subsidizing terminals, because before your committee comes the problem of other transportation facilities, such as railroads, and many of us are concerned about the job aspect of the railroad companies. Would the gentleman comment on that?

Mr. SPRINGER. Yes. At the present time we are in the midst of hearings on that very problem. I was talking about one phase of railroad employment where we are being asked to expand the unemployment compensation. And, may I say in connection with that it is largely through the subsidy of airline fares—and that is in effect what you are doing—that it is possible, and it was last spring, for me to send my wife and my young daughter to Chicago at a fare roughly $13 less, may I say, than they could take a Pullman train from Washington to Chicago. And think of this. In an airplane you are getting premium transportation of 2 hours and 12 minutes from the Washington airport to Chicago Midway. I say to you that those fares are largely the result of subsidies which you have been granting to airlines in recent years in the form of cheaper license fees to airlines.

Last spring we had before us the executive secretary of the Air Transportation Association, and I asked him specifically this question, if air fares were too cheap today, and he said, compared with other forms of transportation, there was no doubt about it. That air fares were much cheaper than they ought to be compared with other forms of transportation.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS. The gentleman does not try to say that this bill provides any kind of subsidy for terminal buildings as was indicated by the gentleman from Missouri; does he?

Mr. SPRINGER. I will say this, that to whatever extent we do give money to these terminal authorities with which to expand, we do it to that extent; yes.

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Just to correct the chairman's statement: The chairman's bill, the original bill, did provide money for terminal facilities in addition to the safety features that we are talking about, and the committee took it out.

Mr. SPRINGER. That is correct. Going further into the matter that the gentleman from Missouri mentioned a minute ago: Those of you who have these labor executives coming to your office, why not raise this question with them? I certainly have.

There are over 48,000 employees of railroads less than there were this time last year. Eight trains have been taken off of railroads in my district. Every one of those was a passenger train and they are losing their passenger service largely to this air subsidized transportation.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRINGER. I am glad to yield to my distinguished chairman.

Mr. HARRIS. Is it not true that the gentleman himself has supported every one of these bills to which he is referring affecting the airline industry, since he has been in Congress?

Mr. SPRINGER. I will say this, that as to each one of those I have entertained reservations on the particular matters that I have set out. I believe it is time that this Congress did something about this question of subsidy to airports, which is not needed, in order for us to have good, safe transportation. I think it is about time that we were phasing out our subsidies to this form of transportation as compared with other forms of transportation that do not have the subsidies.

May I say that the other day I had occasion to go down to Charlotte, N.C. Here was a railroad station that in my estimation was practically ready to fall down. It was not getting any subsidy to rebuild. I came back to Washington by air. Here was a beautiful new airport in Charlotte, and the marble inside the airport was at a level higher than my head. I am not saying that that is wrong. Certainly, Charlotte has every right to build any kind of an airport it wants. I am just saying that these airports are receiving subsidies that are going to the ultimate benefit of the airlines.

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. I yield.

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Chairman, I wish the gentleman would clear up a statement that our chairman made to the effect that the $97 million additional was entirely for safety.

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I am glad the gentleman asked that question. There is no difference of opinion among the members of the committee on the question of safety. In fact we tried to limit this bill so that it would provide for safety only and take out those provisions for terminal and other luxury facilities. I hope that answers the gentleman's question.

Mr. Chairman, the $297 million provided in this bill is totally unrealistic. It is not geared to anything except a reduction from the original amount in the chairman's bill of $437 million. How did he get the figure $437 million originally? No one knows, except that over in the other body someone introduced a bill to increase the amount that had been previously provided.

Let me say that this is a continuation of the existing 4-year program which has

authorized some $63 million a year, or a total package of $250 million. No one, so far as I know, is opposed to a continuation of the airport program for another 4 years. I think, as a matter of fact, it ought to be phased out at the end of that time. The Federal Government has done its share for the aviation industry. We think the airlines now should be able in some degree at least to stand on their own feet, just as other forms of transportation have been required to stand on their own feet. The majority leader attempted earlier in the debate to say something about money to be provided for floods, as though that question had any relation to this legislation, and the chairman of our committee emphasized safety, as though there was a division in our committee on that issue. As a matter of fact, in his testimony before our committee General Quesada reiterated time after time that what he wanted to do in this program was to limit it primarily to things that go to safety; in other words, to assure that an airplane gets off the ground at one airport and lands safely at another airport. Those are the things that are provided for in the administration bill.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to have the attention of the chairman of our committee because he has used, erroneously, some figures to support the premise that the funds provided in this bill are necessary. He has predicated his bill on an airport plan which was presented to the Federal Aviation Agency in 1958. That is true.

Mr. HARRIS. I said 1957, and I hold it here in my hand for the gentleman's observation, if he should like to see it.

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. The plan was renewed and presented in 1958. It was presented again in 1959. We are talking about the same plan, with revisions. What it showed was that in the opinion of 3,000 local airport authorities there was an estimated need for an overall program of some $1,200 million, of which the Federal Government would be required to provide $477 million. If the chairman's bill has any substance and can stand on its own feet at all, it is predicated upon this so-called national plan. What does that plan consist of? It is merely an estimate on the part of some 3,000 airports around the country suggesting what in their opinion would be ultimately needed as far as their airports were concerned. These estimates from local owners, coming in response to a request from the Federal Government, naturally, were optimistic in nature; I will not say exaggerated, but the estimates were undoubtedly inflated as I shall later demonstrate. There has been no study or verification made by the Federal Aviation Agency upon the validity or justification of these estimates or the need for the entire program. Yet these unverified and unjustified figures provide the basis for our chairman's bill. There is nothing in our record which indicates any commitment on the part of these 3,000 local airports to come forth with the necessary matching funds, in the event the FAA approved their plans. In other words, I think, as General Quesada describes it, these estimates were more or less a "gleam in the eye" of the local airport operators, something they would like to have but giving no assurance whatsoever that if Federal funds were available the people in their localities would or could provide the necessary matching funds prerequisite to getting Federal aid.

In spite of the fact that 3,000 airports participated in this national plan the Chairman has talked about repeatedly, and upon which his bill is based, in spite of the fact that 3,000 of those airports submitted figures, when the time came to submit actual plans and specific programs only 591 airports asked for Federal aid, about 20 percent of the entire group.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from California for a question.

Mr. MOSS. Would the gentleman show us where in the record a different study is used by the Administrator as the basis for his request to the Congress?

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. The basis for the Agency's estimate of funds, as the gentleman knows, and as he can find if he refers to the hearings and to the statements of General Quesada are the specific plans that have been submitted by the States and localities themselves. That is the only basis upon which he can commit Federal funds.

Mr. MOSS. Does not the statement of General Quesada start with the study and then tend to discount it step by step as the basis for his own conclusions?

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Let me say this in answer to the gentleman. For the past 4 years, Congress provided some $63 million a year for this program. All of that money was not spent. Why? The Federal funds were available. They were apportioned to the 48 States. The sum of $11 million is presently unspent. Why? Because some 14 to 18 States have not used the money. They have not had funds or for some other reason, were not interested and have not participated in the program. I can give you a list of the States and the amounts. These are just round figures:

Arkansas	$104,889
Colorado	900,000
Delaware	+45,000
Idaho	1,000,000
Kansas	1,300,000
Maine	308,000
Montana	2,300,000
Nebraska	250,000
New Mexico	870,000
North Dakota	1,125,000
Oregon	190,000
South Carolina	330,000
South Dakota	1,136,000
Wyoming	882,000
District of Columbia	275,000

These figures are illustrative of the point I am making; that in spite of the fact that the chairman has predicated his figures, both in his original bill and the present bill, or the fact that some three thousand airports around the country sent in estimates of what they would use, they have not in fact been able to use any such amounts. Moreover, there is no reliable evidence that any greater percentage of airports will qualify for assistance under the pending legislation.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. I yield.

Mr. SPRINGER. Is it not true, may I say to the gentleman from Michigan, that out of 3,000 airports presenting figures or cost estimates, which was figured in the CAA last year, there are only, and this is taking the very maximum, only 591 even eligible for Federal aid; is that not correct?

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Only 591 have come forth with concrete plans upon which the Federal Government could approve a program—that is 20 percent of the total number submitting estimates. Now the fact is and this is in the hearings and it is not disputed, only 45 percent of the proposed programs by local airports actually come to fruition or to the stage where matching funds are assured and where the Federal Government was in a position to allocate its share. It is undisputed that almost half of the airports that could qualify under this program will never come up with concrete plans to implement their programs. This is based upon factual experience during the past 4 years. Accordingly you take 45 percent of the $477 million which is the estimated need in Federal funds, you come up with a figure of approximately $260 million.

Terminal facilities have been removed from the committee bill. The cost of these facilities during the past 4 years has amounted to $65 million or approximately 30 percent of the program. If you deduct 30 percent from the $260 million figure you arrive at a total need for the program of less than $200 million or an amount even less than the administration bill.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. I yield.

Mr. AVERY. While the gentleman is commenting on the number of airports that might become eligible under this bill, it might be well to point out that we are pretty well agreed on the airports we are trying to accommodate first. Will those airports accommodate the jet planes? I think I recall from the hearings there are 24 such airports out of 3,000 that can now accommodate jet aircraft. There are only about 78 that will even apply for it to the extent that they could accommodate jet aircraft. So what we are bringing this down to is the difference between 24 and 78 airports across the Nation.

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. I was interested in the statement by the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS] that the city of Los Angeles is bonded to the limit and cannot produce matching funds. Can the gentleman tell me what provision would be made in this bill for the city of Los Angeles?

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. None at all, except for land strip extensions, towers and safety items. Those are re-

tained, but there would be no provision for further money for so-called terminal facilities, which includes restaurants, bars, barbershops, and so forth.

But I would like to comment on that, because the presentations of the city of Los Angeles and other large cities turned out to be quite amusing.

Mr. HARRIS. Before the gentleman goes into that, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. I yield.

Mr. HARRIS. The gentleman has left implications about erroneous statements I have made and about what the hearings showed. I will not take the time to read it, but I ask anyone in the House and the gentleman himself to read page 49 of the hearings and General Quesada's own statement with reference to the total amount necessary to complete the national airport program. In addition, the gentleman has made statements about my alleged erroneous statements. Let me read you what the Administrator said.

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. The gentleman may read it if it is not too long.

Mr. HARRIS. It is one short paragraph.

General Quesada, in a letter addressed to the committee on March 12, made this statement; under the 4-year program which is just now terminating as of June 30:

> Assuring that all programed projects are placed under grant agreement by June 30, 1959, it is estimated that there would remain an unobligated balance of contract authority funds of approximately $12 million, of which $11,900,000 would be unobligated States' apportionment and $100,000 of unobligated discretionary funds.

That is the amount that is available for the next 2 years, to be utilized by the States as they are programed. So I say to the gentleman, my statement stands correct.

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. It is all the more reason why less money is needed than is provided in this bill.

I want to go back to big city terminals for a minute. Five or six of the biggest cities in the United States had their representatives before our committee to ask for increased Federal funds, and almost without exception they admitted that the complete airport operations in their cities is operating at a profit—the City of Los Angeles Airport is making $2½ million-plus per year net profit, even after substantial provisions for depreciation. What are they making their profit with? A part of the capital investment upon which they are making this net profit has been provided with Federal funds. Yet even though the venture is profitable, the Federal Government never gets any return of its capital.

I have voted for many hundreds of Federal grant programs, and I probably will vote for many more, but I do not know of any such program where the grants are given to profitmaking organizations without obligation to reimburse the Government. Yet that is what has been happening under this program.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has again expired.

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 additional minutes.

I want to conclude, Mr. Chairman, by saying we are not, I am not, and I do not believe anyone on our committee is against the continuation of this program for another 4 years; let there be no doubt about that. I think everybody on our committee favors it. We favor the safety parts of the program; as a matter of fact that is what we have been trying to limit the bill to. In addition to what we provided here there will be some $500 million spent this year for airway safety improvements in which not one locality or airline contributes. For this purpose we have spent $2 billion since 1937. In addition the Federal Government has contributed $2.6 billions for the civilian airport program, during that same period. I am not talking about safety, I am not talking about radar systems or guidance systems for landing, or that type of safety device; I am talking about airport development only. I ask: Has that been in the interest of aviation? Has the Federal Government been remiss in its duty in helping this great industry get on its feet and become the greatest force in our transportation system at the present time?

What have we done in addition to that? We have spent $1.5 billion since 1937 in safety devices, navigational aids, for which the airlines and the local airports have contributed not one dime—and I do not think they should contribute a dime.

What have we done in addition to that? We have spent, since 1938, in subsidy payments to the airlines $952 million—nearly a billion dollars.

What else have we done for the airlines?

In the last 2 years this Congress has passed two bills, one to give the airlines tax credit, special tax credit exempting from the capital gains tax, equipment sold and therefore not charged against their subsidy; second, we provided during the last session, I believe, the 100 percent guaranteed loan program for them to buy new equipment.

Does anyone think it is not time that the airlines themselves should make some additional contribution to this program, which is primarily for their benefit.

We are giving this money to an agency that cannot use it. There will be a dozen programs this year on which every Member of this House will have a chance to vote where the money is urgently needed and can be justified; where it will be used, and where adequate justification has been provided.

Why obligate $97 million of precious money which we do not have, over and above the reasonable and necessary requirements of the airport program.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan has consumed 20 minutes.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. STAGGERS].

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAGGERS. I yield.

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Chairman, airport development is the key to future economic progress in West Virginia and indeed throughout the entire Nation. The passage of the bill to amend the Federal Airport Act is of paramount importance to the future of our country. I believe that the industrial development of West Virginia and the Nation rest to a considerable extent on an enlightened program of expanded air transport.

The Ohio River Valley, now in the process of great industrial development which is making it the American Ruhr, has vast potentialities which cannot be unlocked if we cramp the development of our airport facilities. The airport serving Huntington, W. Va., and Ashland, Ky., is known as the Tri-State Airport and it services western West Virginia, the eastern portion of Kentucky, as well as the southeastern area of the State of Ohio. The Parkersburg airport, known as the Wood County Airport, serves not only portions of West Virginia but also Marietta in Ohio and other sections of Ohio across the Ohio River.

Mr. Chairman, the Tri-State Airport at Huntington, like other West Virginia airports at Charleston, Morgantown, and Clarksburg, was built by leveling a mountain top. In our mountainous State, so pleasing to the vacationer, hunter, and fisherman, we need not only men but money to move our mountains. For 30 years after World War I, the Huntington Chamber of Commerce and various public-spirited groups and individuals worked to raise the money which built this airport. When the site was finally secured, it was necessary to blast away the hilltops to build the runways.

Therefore, the difficult terrain sends the cost of airports up even higher than the hills for which my State of West Virginia is noted. And now that we need newer and longer runways for the proper installation of glide slope, and to cover the safety factor for jet landings and takeoffs, we are faced with the stark fact that it will cost us $100,000 per hundred yards of runway.

The tremendous cost of constructing highways in mountainous country has forced my State to limp along with a road network which has many shortcomings. This, coupled with a recent decline in railroad passenger and freight facilities, means that air travel in West Virginia has and will assume rising importance.

The airport at Huntington was formally dedicated on November 2, 1952. The final success in building the airport at Huntington was cited as one of the important factors in winning for my home city, just last month, the coveted designation of "All America City." The citation applauded Huntington for a decade of progress, with the airport a major achievement.

But, unfortunately, in their moment of glory, Huntington has cause for sober reflection on the future. The airport opened so proudly in 1952 has, in 7 short years, become too small for future service.

Traffic has soared from a total of 32,240 inbound and outbound passengers in 1953—first full year of operation—to

a total of 81,356 in 1957. That's an increase of about 150 percent, and another 8 percent is expected to be shown in the 1958 final totals, not yet compiled.

The airfield, in fact, already is operating on express classification status, although it was built as a trunkline airport.

The Huntington area is doing its best to expand and improve its airport on its own. In just a few days, bids will be opened on a new administration building and tower, along with new terminal facilities.

But it cannot really provide such facilities as it will need all alone. The airport manager, A. O. Cappadony, has provided me with a list of anticipated development costs drawn up by the American Association of Airport Executives.

By the end of fiscal 1963, it is estimated the airport will have needed a total of $4,575,000.

This sum would go largely for new glide-approach system, total cost $1,350,000, and an alternate cross-runway system, total cost $2,030,000. These requirements should be met if the area is to have safe, efficient airway service.

Of this sum, the Tri-State Airport estimates it will be able to secure but $2,287,000, only half the amount required.

If additional money is not forthcoming, serious problems may develop. Two of them deserve special mention.

At present, the airport has requested north-south service to supplement the existing routes, all east-west. If it cannot be demonstrated that the airport has the means and capacity for growth, this vital action may be denied or rescinded. And I believe that north-south service would aid materially in the industrial development of the whole Ohio Valley area. Furthermore, it is estimated that approval of north-south service would increase the airport's business another 50 percent.

At Parkersburg, W. Va., the Wood County Airport is serving the booming area which, like the Huntington area, is rapidly expanding in its industrial development. The growth of this airport, which has been operating since 1946, has also been rapid and great.

In 1953, only 17,019 passengers passed through Wood County Airport, and port receipts were only $51,325.18. By 1958, these figures rose to 45,924 passengers and $223,063.59 receipts. Considering also the fact that airfreight business almost quadrupled in those 5 years, it is easy to see that the 1946 plans for the airport are no longer adequate.

The airport hopes to lengthen its runways from 4,439 feet to 5,100 feet in the near future, and to install a high-intensity lighting system and an instrument-landing system. The longer runway is badly needed to accommodate larger planes now in service, and the lighting and landing systems are vital to the safety and efficiency of flight operations.

Particularly needed is the lighting and landing systems, because adverse weather often closes the State's other airfields, many of them built at high altitudes. Their installation would permit landings at the lowest ceilings in the State, and might avert a future disaster of great proportion.

The Wood County Airport has only $50,000 to $75,000 a year allotted to it for these and other important improvements. Assuming that such funds will continue to come in, it still would be at least a decade before the needed allotments could be installed—financed by local funds alone. And by then, we may safely assume that other improvements would be needed—or else that the jet age would have bypassed the area entirely.

Parkersburg is becoming an air center for a great number of industries relocating in the valley, among them Du Pont, Union Carbide, American Cyanamid, Olin-Mathieson, Borg-Warner, Goodrich, and Johns-Manville. These corporations must have adequate air accessibility to their Ohio Valley operations. Only a decent and safe airfield at Parkersburg can provide this.

It would appear that West Virginia, a State where air transportation is a necessity in many cases, would suffer heavily if the far-reaching program of Federal aid to airports is now allowed to wither away.

Our State needs desperately to expand its horizons. The airplane is a vital instrument in that effort. We can grow, if shortsighted people do not kill our chances by killing programs the people want and need.

Unfortunately, some people have taken the attitude that the age of rapid growth is over in our airfields. They would propose now that our airports stand on their own feet. I suggest that an oculist would term such nearsightedness and shortsightedness at worse than 20/500—in everyday language this means the ability to see at 20 feet what a normal person can view at 500 feet.

When America's railroads first marched across our great continent, they were aided by land grants along their rights-of-way. The Federal Government, although it played a much smaller role in the lives and welfare of our people in those times, helped the railroads in the development of our national destiny.

Years ago, the principle of Federal aid to highways was firmly established. We are now engaged in creation of our vast Interstate Highway System to meet the challenges of the rapidly expanding age in which we live.

And despite satellites that beep, talk, and perform cosmic legerdemain, the fact remains that America's defense needs remain closely linked to a fast-striking air force. Surely an administration prepared to lay out over $40 billion for defense purposes can recognize the desirablity of adequate civilian airports for emergency defense needs and the training of a Ready Reserve Force.

It would appear that some opponents of this program are traveling ideologically in a Flying Jenny when the jetliner is with us already. The 85th Congress did its best to alter such thinking, but to no avail. A reaffirmation of the bill passed in the last Congress is needed to serve notice that the people want and are interested in this legislation.

West Virginia, landlocked and too mountainous for easy land travel, wants to move forward with the jet age, and wants the rest of the Nation to move forward, too.

But unless our airfields get the help they need and deserve, this great leap forward may become a halting, hesitant hop.

The men of vision who are urging airport expansion are knowledgeable, dedicated, efficient experts in their field. They have already demonstrated that they will move mountains to accomplish their objective.

For example, so anxious is the Wood County Airport at Parkersburg to gain extra money for needed facilities that they even have ventured into a sideline.

Wallace Bennon, airport manager, tells me they are planting Christmas trees to sell and thus supplement the airport's income. Even this Christmas season, they hope to sell 10,000 trees to add to their meager expansion funds.

While I admire the initiative and enterprise of our Parkersburg people, I must say that if the administration forces airport authorities to go into the Christmas tree business to get money, then soon the only thing airborne over West Virginia may be Santa Claus.

Mr. Chairman, when a plane takes off from a runway into the air, we should not think of that plane as a pleasure craft, or a means of enriching some private company. For that plane is contributing to the development of business, industry, and commerce in an entire region. And the construction of these important airport facilities are essential to the future development of the region. For this reason, I say in conclusion, I hope that the House may pass a bill which is more nearly like the Senate bill than the bill reported by our own committee. I feel it is necessary for the future of West Virginia and America.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, I do not expect to take the full 5 minutes, but I do want to say that I think the chairman of this committee has made a very factual presentation of the provisions of the pending bill, and I agree with him in the statements he has made. I do not believe that there is a trunk airline in America today that is under subsidy. I believe the last one was canceled out about a month ago. We are subsidizing some of the small feeder lines into our cities where we do not have railroads come in and where we are trying to get transportation in and out.

We built our transportation system in America by subsidizing our railroads. We started out by subsidizing our airlines. In 1912 we adopted a program to subsidize the highways of America and that was a 50-50 matching plan. We have been doing it ever since. Just recently we passed a bill that will cost this country some $38 billion before it is completed. We are not only matching the State government funds but we are putting up 90 cents for every 10 cents that is put up by the States for our interstate highways. Nobody is kicking about that because it is for the expansion of this great land of ours.

For that reason we are going to have to do something about airports and our airlines because we are in the jet age. We cannot afford to look backward and talk about the time when we used to drive a horse and buggy to town. We are talking about an era today when the jet airplanes cross this country in about 4 hours. We are talking of a program in which we are going to have to provide airports for jet planes all across America, not for those just flying from coast to coast. We need some in my home State of West Virginia and we should provide these for every other State in America because the jet age is with us.

I believe the total of $297 million as provided in this bill will, every cent of it, be spent for safety, the way I have analyzed the bill. We have knocked out all of the frills. We have knocked out the terminal buildings. We are not going to build any more terminal buildings under this bill at all. We have said that when the Federal Government needs an air control tower or a communication center which adds to safety or a customs house on our borderline, they can put those in the airport. But there is not one cent provided for the restaurants, the cocktail bars, or even the places where they sell the tickets. The airlines have to provide that. We are providing this money to expand and extend the runways to make it more safe for each Member of Congress and every other citizen, when he goes home in the future, if he goes home in a jet airplane, so that there will be room for the plane to land and also to provide adequate lighting systems to make it safe.

In talking to the city officials of the city of Morgantown in the State of West Virginia, where our great university is located, they say that they need right now $1 million and they hope to get $500,000 to extend the runways so the jet planes can come in. In the city of Elkins they hope to get funds for a lighting system to make the airport safer.

It is said that we are subsidizing the commercial airlines. I would have you know that the commercial airlines of America only use the airports and the runways 28 percent of the time. The military planes of America use these airports 21 percent of the time. In the last war they took over the airports almost completely. Are we going to deny to our Air Force adequate facilities in time of war? This is a part of the decision we will have to make. In fact, I believe the amount authorized in this bill is not sufficient to fill the needs in this jet age.

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. YOUNGER].

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Chairman, our distinguished chairman referred you to page 49 of the hearings, and I would like to read one paragraph from Mr. Quesada's statement before the committee:

> Now the question arises, why is $200 million in Federal aid enough, when the Federal Aviation Agency shows in its 1959 national airport plan, as an overall indicated need, a global figure of $1,290 million?
>
> In the first place, the Federal Aviation Agency collected and compiled the plans of some 3,000 airports in the United States and its Territories. These plans represented everything considered desirable over the next 4 years, with no basis for knowing the intent or the ability to perform on the part of local communities. At some locations, the plans were mere glints in the airport operator's eyes. Some plans, especially at the larger airports, were better prepared.
>
> The plans included everything—land, grading and draining the terminal sites, buildings, control towers, lighting, paving, and miscellaneous items such as parking lots, and so forth. This 4-year projected total of unanalyzed and unconfirmed needs came to a grand total of $1,290 million. I must repeat that this projection does not represent a willingness, ability, intent, or commitment on the part of the local communities to proceed accordingly.
>
> This global figure needs to be examined very closely to determine its true significance. For one thing, in the 1958 national airport plan, we listed 2,700 airports—and of these 2,700 airports only 591 asked for Federal aid. The rest either could not produce matching funds, or were able to do work without Federal help, or were uninterested.

Now, on page 66, referring to this report which the chairman held up, Mr. Quesada said:

> Only as it might reflect a historical background. I would not recommend it as the basis upon which to consider the bill before us now. No; I would not.

And when he was being questioned by the gentleman from California [Mr. Moss] he made this statement:

> Mr. QUESADA. We, the Federal Aviation Agency, are required to develop each year a national airport plan.
>
> Mr. MOSS. Have we that plan, is that encompassed in this $1,290 million?
>
> Mr. QUESADA. That is the plan.
>
> Mr. MOSS. It is of little use if it is so badly overstated.
>
> Mr. QUESADA. I agree.
>
> Mr. MOSS. Isn't there some better formula which could be employed to give us sounder advice.
>
> Mr. QUESADA. Yes; there is.

Now, I would like to take up the question of the Los Angeles airport, which was referred to. Bear in mind that the city of Los Angles is developing a new airport. What happened down there was, they had a charter amendment and they obligated all of the revenue from the airport back of the bonds which they issued under that agreement and charter amendment. Then after the plan had been developed, the FAA required that the runways be extended to meet the jet age, which cost some $8 million, as I recall the figures. Now, having already pledged all of their income back of the bonds, they had no funds with which to build these additional runways. So, in the hearings, on page 130, and talking to Mr. Belding, I asked this question:

> Mr. YOUNGER. I also understand you would be better off, your airport would be better off, if the Administrator of FAA had more discretionary allowance in these funds?
>
> Mr. BELDING. We certainly could because 2 years from now, 3 years from now, when our terminal is completed, our problems are over. Now they are acute.
>
> Mr. YOUNGER. In other words, whether Congress appropriates $400 million or $200 million or whatever it is——
>
> Mr. BELDING. That is right.
>
> Mr. YOUNGER. You would rather see a large proportion, say 50 percent, in the discretionary fund rather than in the 75–25 apportionment?
>
> Mr. BELDING. Yes, we would; because our problems are immediate and serious.

As a matter of fact, under the apportionment for the States in the first go-around, no one airport can secure more than $1 million. That is not going to help that particular airport. If they had additional discretionary funds then the administrator could provide additional funds which the airport in Los Angeles needs.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute in order to reply to the statement of the gentleman from California [Mr. YOUNGER] with reference to the limitation of $1 million for an individual airport. It is a fact that under regulations issued by the administrator they have limited any one individual airport to $1 million. It is not a requirement of the law.

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FOLEY. I should like to ask a question concerning testimony at page 50 of the hearings where General Quesada makes this statement:

> In terms of dollars, then, the realistic requirements for airport development in which the Federal Government should participate come to about $500 million, not $1.29 billion.

I would like an explanation of General Quesada's statement, because I cannot find it in his further testimony.

Mr. HARRIS. I will say to the gentleman that it is very difficult to find an explanation of any of these figures presented by General Quesada. There is nothing in the record as to what a State or municipality would get under the allocation program proposed toward meeting the needs. That would be left entirely up to the administrator for $100 million, 50 percent of the total now proposed.

Mr. FOLEY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 1011, as reported by the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, to amend the Federal Airport Act in order to extend the time for making grants under the provisions of this act.

On the opening day of the 86th Congress, I joined in sponsorship of legislation to extend this vital act, by introducing H.R. 1056, authorizing $437 million for the next 5 years for necessary airport construction projects on a matching fund basis with local governments.

The Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee conducted comprehensive hearings on this legislation and, in its prudence, favorably reported the bill H.R. 1011, calling for a reduced, $297 million program over a 4-year period.

Mr. Chairman, I deeply feel the significance of this legislation. It is my firm

belief that only through enactment of legislation such as this can America's airports keep pace with the explosive growth of air transportation and meet the crying air safety needs. Requirements of modern aviation, and the challenges of the jet age in which we have already entered, demand a substantial step-up in the program of improving airport facilities.

In a decade, airplane movements and airplane passenger miles have quadrupled. In 1957, domestic airlines carried 45 million passengers over 25 billion passenger miles.

Total domestic air cargo ton-miles in the year 1957 swelled to 474 million, an increase of 15 percent over the previous year.

It is highly important, particularly in my estimation, that the needs of safety and service be served. We must provide sufficient facilities in sufficient airports to handle the increasing use of jet airplanes and the other aircraft of this booming industry. To fail to do so is to invite disaster, and to see the repetition of the terrible air tragedies we have witnessed in recent years, the most recent of which occurred only a few weeks ago at LaGuardia Airport in New York.

Mr. Chairman, as a member of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, I know of the long hours and the hard work that have gone into the preparation of the committee bill now before the House. We have cut the authorizations of this measure to the barest necessities to provide the safety and service demanded.

Last year, when the Congress took the initiative in passing an airport bill, it was returned by the President with the statement that local and State authorities should shoulder this burden. The fact is that our local governments are doing right now their share in this regard, and it is impossible for them to go it all alone. At the end of 1955, funds spent for airport development in 19 of the 21 major hub areas exceeded $579 million. Of this $388 million came from local sources.

Traditionally, the Federal Government has seen its responsibility for helping provide an adequate transportation system, since this is vital to the productivity and growth of our country. Inland waterways, highway systems, the railroads—all come in for Federal assistance. Our airlines, now exceeding railroads and buses in intercity passenger-miles, must be insured adequate airport facilities, and it is within the Federal jurisdiction.

The Federal Government in the past has been a great help in the airport aid program. I know that in my home State of Alabama, we have made fine progress with the $6.7 million in Federal aid money which has been put with local funds in the past 12 years. But the need is increasing, not diminishing.

Alabama, for instance, will need at least $22 million during the next 4 years, according to estimates of the Federal Aviation Agency. The national needs figure is set at $1.29 billion during the same period.

I have personal knowledge of what this program has meant during the 12-year period just ending. In the Fourth Alabama District, Federal airport funds have gone to Anniston Municipal Airport in the amount of $55,000; Selfield at Selma, $71,247; and Elmore Field at Wetumpka, $1,211. The contribution to the development of these airports has been invaluable.

To withdraw or diminish the prospects of airports like these obtaining additional assistance, particularly when we realize that we are on the verge of a complex new jet era, would put an intolerable burden upon local governments. Moreover, it seems unthinkable to me that we would court danger by not providing for adequate airport safety.

I urge the extension of the Airport Act to the extent provided in the committee version of H.R. 1011, and I hope this House will act with dispatch so that the program will not expire on June 30.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. Moss], a member of the committee.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Chairman, I think we should reexamine what we are discussing here this afternoon. From some of the statements by those who oppose the bill recommended by the committee I would assume that we are discussing a matter which is not before us. We are talking about a bill and a difference of $97 million in a program extending over 4 years. How did we arrive at the $297 million figure which the committee has reported? We arrived at it arbitrarily in an effort to compromise as far as we could, in good conscience, with the administration. How did they arrive at $200 million? Well, your guess is just as good as mine, because there is nothing in the record to indicate how they arrived at that amount. The agency charged by law with developing a program and presenting it to the Congress, after giving us the benefit of their study, candidly admitted that the study was absolutely worthless and meaningless. Then the Administrator substituted his own opinion, and that is how we come by this $200 million sum. I say to the gentleman from Illinois there is just as much evidence to support a request of $400 million as there is of $200 million. Either could be arbitrarily arrived at on the basis of the best testimony we could get from General Quesada.

Will this difference have any impact upon the communities around the Nation? Yes, it will, and let us put the record straight here on this point. I note that the distinguished minority leader indicated that perhaps the funds had not been supplied because of the critical financial condition existing in some of the States. The States do not match the dollars. They are matched by the local airport authorities, whether at the municipal level, whether it is a combination of agencies, or whether it is a distinctly separate agency. That is where the matching funds come from, usually from a general obligation bond. So we do not want to confuse this issue.

Let us now take a look at what happens under the two programs. In my State of California under the program proposed by the committee there would be an annual contribution of $2,631,162. Under the proposal of the administration in the next fiscal year we would have $1,174,369; in the next year of operation $1,515,000; in the third year $1,246,000; and in the fourth year $962,000.

Again I say, let us not delude ourselves that we are building airports with Federal dollars. We are not doing that. We are giving a minimum of assistance to the local communities. They are investing the dollars at a rate many times in excess of that proposed to be contributed here by the Federal Government.

Another thing, I think we should understand very clearly that under the committee's bill we are not building terminal facilities, we are only permitting the administrator, where he finds that a part of a terminal is required for Federal use, to make a contribution at that point to underwrite that Federal cost. It is not mandatory, and the administrator, if he can negotiate a lease more advantageous than the actual payment of the additional cost of the facility, is at liberty to do so. This is not imposing any onerous requirements upon him.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOSS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. In order that the record may be completely straight with regard to the Los Angeles Airport, if the committee bill is passed the Los Angeles Airport can receive additional funds provided the limiation now imposed by the commission itself is also removed, and that is not a matter of legislation but is a matter for the executive branch of the Government.

Mr. MOSS. That is very true. It can receive it both under the allocation to the States and under the Administrator's discretionary fund.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MOSS. That would be true of any airport in any State in this Nation. They will get more under the committee bill. Remember that there is nothing sacrosanct about the figures given us by the Administrator. On his own admission his study is of little value. I think his conclusions in this instance can be challenged in good conscience. It is a matter of opinion and nothing more.

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. AVERY].

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Chairman, I regret to have to come to the floor this afternoon in disagreement with my distinguished committee chairman. As I recall, this is the first time I have come to the floor when I have been in disagreement with him on a bill from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. As much as I hope that the position of the minority will prevail, I take no particular satisfaction in establishing our viewpoint over here.

I do not want to be repetitious, but I think there is one thing that should be repeated here this afternoon and that is that the money in this bill is just a small

portion of a bill that will be made available for air navigation and airport support from the Federal Government for the next fiscal year. Now we are talking about $200 million or $290 million. We are going to find out pretty quick how much we are talking about. But, in addition to that there will be over $500 million spent by the Federal Aviation Agency to stabilize and improve navigational controls. Let me go one step further. We are going to spend $500 million next year, but we are also going to spend $500 million in that field for the next 3 fiscal year, making a total of $2 billion in the next 4 years for navigational aids in addition to the bill that we have before us here this afternoon.

One other matter that probably should be touched upon and has not even been mentioned, and I am surprised that it has not because there were additional minority views in the committee report, and that is the question of the method of financing. You have heard some discussion on the floor this year about front-door financing and back-door financing. We have a new one in this bill. This is side-door financing.

By that I mean this. We have our regular means of appropriating funds that come from the Committee on Appropriations and in direct contrast to that we have a procedure, and I use that word advisedly in the FAA provision, which authorizes the Treasury to sell their notes. That is the back door. In this particular bill, under the Federal Airport Act of 1955, we have provided that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce can bring legislation to the floor establishing legislative authority for the FAA Administrator to obligate the credit of the Federal Government, but subsequently the Committee on Appropriations does have the privilege to review that. But, we are already committed to the contractual obligation of the Federal Treasury. Now just one note of history. How did we get into this airport building industry anyhow? That is sort of interesting. Under the original Airport Act of 1946 all we did was build runways. Primarily, that was it. We made a contribution on a 50–50 basis to build runways. In 1950 or thereabouts, the city of Fort Worth, Tex., was developing a plan to build an airport. After they got their plan pretty well developed, they found out that they were $250,000 short. Do you think they went back to Fort Worth to raise that money? No, they did not. They came before the Congress and the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce brought in an amendment to the Federal Airport Act on the floor of the House authorizing the Congress to participate in acquiring a site for the airport. That was in 1950. That is the first time the Federal Government ever participated in financing airport construction. Then about 2 years later, apparently the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce looked at this matter again. I was not on the committee at that time because I was not a Member of the Congress. They said, "Well, we are helping to buy the site. This program is not moving along as fast as we think it should. Therefore, let us start building airports." That is the way we got into this business through the backdoor approach that we have now and in the position we are now in. I think it is time that this Congress or this House of Representatives, anyhow, went on record as saying that we have fulfilled our full responsibility in this area. When the motion will be offered to substitute the administration bill, I hope that it will prevail.

It is necessary, I think, at the beginning of my statement to reassert the administration's position, and certainly my own, on the principle of Federal aid to airport development. It has been said this afternoon and will probably be repeated, that the administration and our side of the aisle is advocating the eventual termination of such Federal aid. I cannot foresee, nor has any spokesman for the administration ever stated, that the Federal Government would be able to completely withdraw from financial responsibility in airport development. By the very interstate nature of aviation, it is apparent that there will be a continuing need for a reasonable amount of Federal aid to local airports. It appears to me that a continual need for modernization will in fact follow the same pattern of the continuing need to modernize our highways.

I also want to emphasize the point that the money contained in this bill before the House this afternoon is but a small portion of the Federal Government's contribution to air transportation. You will recall that just last year Congress passed the Federal Aviation Act providing for the modernization of air control and for the establishment of a central control system for all aircraft, military, and civilian. To initiate this program it is estimated that in excess of $500 million will be spent in the fiscal year 1960.

There will be continuing appropriations in the following three fiscal years for that program with the final cost to modernization of air traffic control and to increase air safety, approaching a total cost of approximately $2 billion. This cost is borne 100 percent by the Federal Government and it is properly their responsibility. By the Civil Aviation Act of 1938 the Federal Government preempted all navigation control for air traffic and since such control has been assumed by the Federal Government it is only logical that the cost of such should be borne at the national level.

In addition to the cost of this modernization program, we have also subsidized commercial air lines to the extent of approximately $1 billion over the past 20 years. Not including funds under the WPA program, $2,681 million has been spent to aid and assist civil airport development. So you see, the bill we have before the House today to authorize a continuing program of Federal aid to airport development is but a small portion of the overall cost of aviation to the Federal Treasury.

It is necessary at this point that some explanation should be made as to the justification for the various amounts that have been proposed for this program. With the advent of jet propelled commercial aircraft there arose an immediate need for longer runways and other improvements in our safety program. The Federal Aviation Agency has conducted an extensive survey as to the needs for the modernization of the entire airport system in the United States. On the basis of this study, and obviously it could not have been entirely accurate, the Federal Aviation Agency estimates that approximately $1,290 million will be needed to complete this program. Under existing law 50 percent of that amount must be provided by the local communities served by the airport. This leaves a net estimated cost to the Federal Government of $645 million over a 4-year period.

Terminal facilities and runway maintenance authorizations that are included in this overall estimate have now been eliminated from the bill. With the elimination of those two provisions there is a further reduction in estimated amounts that must be paid. Based on the experience of the Federal Aviation Agency that all Federal funds will not be matched by the local communities and therefore the annual need for Federal funds will not be equal to the amount that had been estimated in the survey.

To further amplify this factor, I want to remind the Committee that the Federal grants must be matched by local funds and those local funds are almost always raised through the sale of municipal bonds which must be approved by referendum. Frequently the taxpayers have different ideas when it comes time to vote for the 50 percent of this cost which must be borne by them. Frequently schools, libraries, and other municipal improvements are given higher priority than the improvement of airport facilities. By experience the Federal Aviation Agency can reasonably well estimate the anticipated demand for the Federal funds that will actually occur. Federal funds cannot become obligated or finally committed until such bond elections have been held and a contract is entered into between the local municipality and the Federal Aviation Agency.

Admittedly at this point it becomes a matter of personal judgment on the necessary Federal funds to continue an adequate modernization and safety improvement program. We had most persuasive testimony from the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency that this program could be adequately carried on for the next 4 years at a total cost of $200 million.

There was no coordinated testimony before the committee to substantiate the need for a greater amount of Federal funds that was proposed in the administration bill. Naturally the direct recipient of the benefits from a larger appropriation appeared before the committee and asked that it be increased, but they were not able to present facts nor statistics from a study that would justify the figure in the original bill, H.R. 1011. Most of the witnesses requesting a larger amount were airport operators familiar

only with their own local operation and some of them were not even too familiar with that.

Throughout the United States there are approximately 3,000 civilian airports. These 3,000 airports support approximately 70,000 aircraft, including commercial and private craft. At the present time 24 of these airports can accommodate jets without restriction and the Federal Aviation Agency estimates that not more than 78 will finally attempt to expand their facilities in order to accommodate these jetplanes as regular equipment for commercial airlines. It is further estimated that these 78 can be modernized to accommodate such craft by 1964. Overall it is estimated that only about 600 airports of the 3,000 can qualify and will request Federal funds. Although there is some flexibility in the rule which qualifies a local airport to apply for Federal funds, as a general rule 10 aircraft must be permanently based at the airport to qualify for Federal grants.

I would further like to point out the history of Federal participation in the cost of terminal construction. Sometime before 1950 the city of Fort Worth, Tex., was perfecting a plan to develop a new airport. The hearings divulge that Fort Worth was about $250,000 short of the necessary funds to continue the program and as a result an amendment was proposed to the Federal Airport Act by the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee providing that the Federal Government could contribute toward the purchase of a site as well as contribute toward the cost of building a runway.

Shortly after 1950, the hearings reveal that it was the opinion of the committee that if the national aviation program was to meet the public need and the needs of national defense, it was just as important to have terminal facilities and control towers as it was to have runways and airports and, in turn, Congress authorized the Federal Government to participate up to 50 percent of the cost of these terminal facilities.

That is the history of Federal participation in airport development. As a general statement I think it is agreed that since 1950, that of the Federal cost toward airport development, approximately 30 percent of those funds have gone toward the construction of terminal facilities.

As has been clearly pointed out, that authority has been modified by this bill to include only the portion of the cost of the terminal that would represent the space occupied by Federal agencies such as control towers, Weather Bureau and Immigration Bureau and any other such Federal agency as was deemed appropriate by the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency.

There is one further point which I want to emphasize regarding the administration bill. You will recall that I previously stated that the administration does not propose that Federal participation in the construction of airports should end, but there should be a gradual reduction from the present level at which time we are modernizing for new air control and to accommodate the jetpropelled craft.

The administration proposal provides that the amounts should be gradually reduced that are authorized in this bill for the succeeding fiscal years. Generally speaking, the amounts authorized are $65 million, $55 million, $45 million, and $35 million for the fiscal years of 1960, 1961, 1962, and 1963. Under the committee bill the amounts for fiscal year 1961 are higher than for 1960 and there is only a slight reduction for the succeeding fiscal years.

In other words, the inference will not be clear that local communities should anticipate a reduction in the amounts available from the Federal Government. The administration bill is adequate, there is no evidence to show that it is inadequate; and, therefore, to maintain a balanced budget this year and to restrict authorizations conducive to a balanced budget next year, the administration bill should prevail.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY].

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, I have asked for these 2 minutes for the purpose of indicating my approval of this measure and plead with my colleagues to approve this legislation as it was reported from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. I do this on three basic grounds.

One, as a matter of good faith; second, as a matter of good service; and, third, as a matter of good economy.

On the first point may I remind you that when the present program, which is expiring on June 30 of this year, was initiated by Congress, my native city of Clarksburg, W. Va., initiated a program to extend the runways. They have been cooperating by a regular program with the Federal Government, in which the county supplied 50 percent of the matching moneys for this purpose. That program is not finished. The runways are not completed.

As a matter of good faith, the Government should continue operating until that project is finished.

As to the matter of service, in all north and south West Virginia there are no adequate airports other than Charleston, W. Va. No airport on the north to Pittsburgh; no airport on the west to Parkersburg, and no airport on the east to Washington, D.C.

Here is a great area of the country, not only in West Virginia but in three adjoining States that have no airport service. If a Congressman wants to come to Washington, he has either got to go to Pittsburgh or to Charleston, W. Va.—travel three or four times the distance he should travel if these airports were extended so that a plane could be used.

As a matter of good economy this airport construction is located in the areas of the heaviest unemployment. As much as 24 percent of the labor force is unemployed. Here is an opportunity to provide jobs for them in the construction of these airports. It is good economy.

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. COLLIER].

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Chairman, we have been on general debate about an hour and a half. We have spent many hours on this bill in the committee. I feel that if we spent several additional weeks on this legislation we would not arrive at any conclusion as to what is an adequate sum of money needed under this program.

As a matter of fact, every time the Federal Government hangs any given sum of dollars on the Federal Christmas tree, just as we are doing in this program, there are always those who "lick their chops" and are right there to get their gift.

This bill is no exception.

I might give you a little example of a comparatively new airport just north of my own district that has just recently, knowing full well its needs as for expansion and development to meet modern transportation problems, floated its own bond issue. The airport authority and city of Chicago sold bonds to the tune of $128 million to take care of their own responsibilities. There is absolutely nothing in this bill that requires the local airport authority to meet its own needs in this manner before coming to Uncle Sam for help. This is not unusual. This is the situation we have in so many of our subsidy programs, where folks simply bring their problems to Washington and dump them on the front steps of the Capitol and let the Federal Government take care of them.

You have heard a great deal of discussion on what sum is needed to provide adequate safety. I do not think at this point anyone can determine what is needed to provide this safety. But people engaged in the air transport business are pretty resourceful people. I am convinced now if the figure was $297 million spent instead of $200 million provided by the administration bill, that no airport would be any safer 4 years hence that it is today. Certainly, in this bill and in future bills we must develop some sense of fiscal responsibility. If we do, perhaps the money that we would appropriate for long-range programs would go further. Because of the spending tactics which we have employed in the past, we are devaluing the dollar so that the money appropriated will be worth less and will consequently provide less in the inflationary economy created by deficit spending.

Let us spend a little less and exercise a little more fiscal prudence in these subsidy programs. By doing this we will be able to buy more for less money in the future.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. WIER].

Mr. WIER. Mr. Chairman, about half an hour ago I received a telegram, and according to the wire I presume all the other members of the Minnesota delegation received a like telegram. At the time of its receipt I was not too familiar with the provisions of the bill before the House, so I came down to the floor on receipt of this wire and made

the usual arrangements with the Chairman of the Committee for a couple of minutes, because I wanted to read this telegram and get the reaction of the Committee to the contents of the wire. This telegram comes from Robert Aldrich, executive director of the Minneapolis-St. Paul Metropolitan Airports Commission, and reads as follows:

ST. PAUL, MINN., *March 18, 1959.*
Representative ROY W. WIER,
House Office Building, Washington, D.C.:

Re H.R. 1011, Federal aid to airports, now up for your consideration. If this bill as reported by committee is not amended to include public passenger terminal buildings we will be required to divert runway extension moneys to complete loading piers and fingers of this building to protect public from aircraft and weather and ramp equipment, plus propeller and jet blasts and noises. Funds anticipated in our planning were stopped by veto of 1959 Airport Act. Two million dollars Federal is required to complete this necessary construction above and beyond our other airport aid requirements. This wire being sent all Members Minnesota congressional delegation account importance of Wold-Chamberlain Field development to air transportation needs of entire State.

ROBERT ALDRICH,
Executive Director, Minneapolis-St. Paul Metropolitan Airports Commission.

I think I have the answer to my inquiry since I have been here during the last half hour of debate. I think it is terminal facilities that are in trouble, in both the committee as well as the administration bill for $200 million. Is that correct?

Mr. HARRIS. That is correct.

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. DEROUNIAN].

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Chairman, let me reiterate that there is no argument about the need for air safety; we are all for it, but I should like to feel that when I want some advice I go to an expert. The gentleman from California [Mr. Moss], said there was nothing sacred about the figure of $200 million. I say there is nothing sacred about the figure of $297 million. The bill that came over from the other body provided for $437 million. This figure was seemingly so unjustified that our chairman on his own motion amended the bill by reducing it to $365 million. Subsequent amendments reduced it still lower, to $297 million.

Now just who is this Mr. Quesada? I think there is no doubt that he is probably the most qualified man for this position in the United States; he is no joker, and he is no fool. He is charged with the responsibility for safety in the air. In fairness to him it must be stated that he just started with this Agency the first of the year.

What is the position of us on the minority side? I will quote General Quesada:

Now let us have a look at the situation from another angle. We take the position that the Federal Government should not help communities build money-making terminal buildings at airports. We believe that Federal aid should be concentrated on the safety facilities of airports to enable Federal dollars to go further in those areas where funding from other than Federal sources is not readily available. This would eliminate wasteful dissipation of Federal funds on costly terminal buildings, which are properly the responsibility of local and State authorities and which, if properly managed, can provide sufficient revenue upon which to arrange financing.

In a nutshell, the $200 million, General Quesada says, is adequate for our 4-year program to get maximum safety. If you vote $297 million it is not going to get you any more safety, because this extra sum is not necessary. I point out to you what some of the shrewd business people will do at the expense of the Federal taxpayers. For example, at the Washington National Airport in 1958, revenue for auto parking alone was $348,000, food sales $328,000, insurance $182,000, other concessions, $91,000, ground transportation $338,000. Why should the taxpayers of the country pay for those money-making propositions in these terminal facilities?

You get the safety feature for the $200 million. Why spend $297 million.

To those of my colleagues from New York I say, as usual, we under this program pay out more than we see. For instance, under this bill in the next 4 years New York gets about $10,500,000 but we will put in over $50 million in the same 4 years. In the State of California, the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT], was told he would get more money for his State under my chairman's bill, but, as is true in the case of New York, California is also going to have to pay more money into the program.

I favor the administration substitute and hope it will be enacted into law.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. SISK].

Mr. SISK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the committee bill and to commend the chairman and members of the committee for having brought this bill so expeditiously before the House on this occasion.

I want to read a few excerpts from a letter written by the superintendent of my hometown airport where we have some very grave problems. The Fresno air terminal is the alternate terminal and has been so designated by the FAA as an international alternate for jet power transport airplanes used both by domestic and foreign airlines. We are concerned with an extensive development program in order to take care of this situation.

Here, I might say, we have a man who has been involved in this program for a great many years and one that I believe has some understanding of the problems. It is his opinion that the present $297 million that we are talking about is wholly inadequate rather than the statement of the gentleman from New York that $200 million is adequate. Certainly the great preponderance of evidence would indicate to me that we are not doing the job that is necessary for the safety of our people concerned with air traffic if we reduce the figure below the $297 million that is provided in this bill.

I want to call your attention to one statement he made in this letter which I believe is worthy of great consideration:

Each airport in this Nation is an intricate part of the air transport system and each serves an area much larger than the boundaries of the political subdivision which owns and operates the airport; therefore, it is difficult to see how the administration can justify a $39 billion Federal highway program with the Government contributing 90 percent of the total costs, on the one hand, and stating that the improvement of individual airports which serve all users regardless of where they live is the sole responsibility of local government and of no concern to the Federal Government.

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. DEVINE].

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Chairman, I wish to digress just a moment from the technical aspects of this bill and talk about the basics for a few moments. You know, when we talk about the Federal Airport Construction Act, we have to look at the purpose. The purpose, as I understand it, is to comply with new jet age transportation; that is, to provide facilities across this Nation to take care of a new type of equipment that requires landing facilities in the way of runways and things of that nature. It is desirable for the Members of the House to have a large airport with long runways in every nook and cranny of this Nation. But that is not the purpose of this legislation. General Quesada has testified we have completed in this Nation 20-odd airports where jet facilities are available; that is, airstrips of over 10,000 feet are presently in operation. And, in adopting the administration bill, as will be proposed later as an amendment, he said that the $200 million figure would be sufficient to develop across this Nation 70-odd facilities to take care of the jet areas, and that would certainly be most practical and sufficient for our purposes.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEVINE. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Would the gentleman explain to me, then, how the Federal Government comes along and tells the city of Los Angeles that we must spend $8 million to extend these runways and then refuses to go along with lifting the limitation which would make it possible for us to do so? The reason seems to be that they do not have the money. Now, if they have the money, if we could raise it to $297 million, they will not have that excuse. But, certainly it does not seem to me that Mr. Quesada answered that argument at all, but he has imposed upon us the necessity of building these longer runways.

Mr. DEVINE. I am not aware where my colleague gets the $8 million figure.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. That is in the testimony.

Mr. DEVINE. The testimony shows that there are 24 facilities now, and 78, I think, is the number that will complete the program across the Nation, and that that would be encompassed in this $200 million program.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I think he will find in the testimony by the mayor of Los Angeles there is this specific amount mentioned, and it has not been challenged. And, there is no way that we can get the money to do that without increasing the amount in the bill.

Mr. DEVINE. Unless by use of local funds.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Unless we use local funds which, of course, are not available, because we have already passed the bond issue and had to draw on it last year because of the President's veto.

Mr. DEVINE. Going back to the Member awhile ago who mentioned terminals, General Quesada made this comment, and I think it is cogent to the principle involved here. He says he has flown every conceivable type of aircraft beginning with the old World War I Jenny to the present jet equipment and he said that during those 30 years every conceivable type of accident has happened to him. We were talking about safety features. He said that motors had fallen out and that everything possible had happened during that 30-year period, and he did not remember once that he was in the air when he was in trouble, when he wished they had a terminal building.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I am glad to join my colleagues in giving a hand to one of our new Members on the committee, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. DEVINE], on his maiden speech in this House on this legislation. I now yield 3 minutes to a member of the committee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'BRIEN].

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Chairman, the bulk of the discussion today has revolved around the question of whether $200 million or $297 million should be the amount appropriated. I think that is fine, and there is an honest disagreement, obviously. But, early in this debate a note was injected which I did not consider fair. The suggestion has been made that unless we, the great committee of the House, or the Members of the House, take a figure arbitrarily given to us by the President or his advisers, that then we are to be classed as spenders and wasters and against economy. I suggest that if the figure which emanated from the White House was $100 million, we would have an amendment offered here today limiting the appropriation to $100 million. I do not know if $297 million is the exact figure which will do the proper job. I do know that my position to support that figure is based upon my own decision and that I do not stand here as a puppet on anyone's strings. I think that as this Congress proceeds, we are going to have more and more suggestions that unless we take a magic figure from the White House, that we are spenders. Speaking for myself, I intend to exercise my personal judgment on whether any of these amounts are the proper amounts and the adequate amounts.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Chairman, there has been so much said about the need or requirements, I take this time to read into the RECORD the statement of the Administrator of the agency of this administration which outlines the requirements for the national airport plan. I want to read from the latest report issued by the Civil Aeronautics Administration. It is called the National Airport Plan for 1958:

Each location listed herein has been justified in accordance with the Planning Standard for Public Airports as necessary to meet the needs of air commerce and/or general aviation. The Planning Standard for Public Airports states that it is the CAA policy to include in the national airport plan only existing and proposed public airports serving communities which have a substantial aeronautical requirement, and which require airport development within the period covered by the plan. The planning period under which the 1958 national airport plan has been developed, extends to 1965.

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT].

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 1011 since I introduced a similar bill to amend the Federal Airport Act in order to extend the time for making grants and so forth.

In my congressional district in Pennsylvania, comprising the counties of Blair, Centre, and Clearfield, the communities of Altoona, Du Bois, Philipsburg, and State College are interested in the pending legislation.

For your information, Altoona is served by the Altoona-Blair County Airport located at Martinsburg, Pa. At this moment the airport is undergoing expansion, and it is estimated that at least another $315,000 of Federal assistance will be needed to complete the modernization program.

The following letters reveal the deep interest in approval of the airport bill now before us:

BLAIR COUNTY AIRPORT AUTHORITY,
Altoona, Pa., February 4, 1959.

Congressman JAMES E. VAN ZANDT,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR JIMMIE: I am writing to call your attention to Senator MONRONEY's bill to provide Federal aid matching funds for terminal buildings and hangars as well as runway construction.

We are in the process of completing plans and specifications for a new administration building and hangar facilities in our local airport program, and as far as we are concerned, this whole program could not proceed unless the county, which is sponsoring the project, is assured of obtaining the matching funds to complete the work.

Your attention to this subject will be greatly appreciated by us.

Cordially yours,

G. STANLEY RUTH,
Secretary Treasurer.

COUNTY OF BLAIR,
Hollidaysburg, Pa., February 5, 1959.

Hon. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT,
Representative in Congress,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR JIMMIE: An airport bill in the Senate, known as the President's airport aid bill, would rule out Federal aid matching funds for terminal buildings and hangars.

I am sure you realize what this would do to our program in Blair County and I urge you to vote against this bill and vote for the adoption of Senator MONRONEY's bill, S. 1, which will include all these items.

Kind regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

EDWARD J. FLANAGAN,
Blair County Commissioner.

In the case of Du Bois, Pa., the airport is under construction at this time with an estimated $300,000 in Federal funds being needed to complete the airport and make it operational.

According to Mr. William H. Korb, secretary of the Du Bois Airport Authority, the approval of H.R. 1011 is of vital importance to the completion of the Du Bois Airport.

At Philipsburg, Pa., the Black Moshannon Airport will need at least $100,000 in Federal funds to complete badly needed improvements, including a terminal building, and so forth. The following letter from Luther L. Warsing, chairman of the aviation committee of the Philipsburg Chamber of Commerce, cites the need for this legislation:

PHILIPSBURG CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
Philipsburg, Pa., January 11, 1959.

The Honorable JAMES E. VANZANDT,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR JIMMIE: Thank you for your letter of January 2, 1959, requesting information on the amount of money necessary to complete the program at the Black Moshannon Airport during 1959 and 1960.

As you are aware, the present facilities at the airport are totally inadequate to accommodate the steadily increasing flight activity. After giving careful consideration to the problem and consulting with Mr. John MacFarlan, director of the Pennsylvania Aeronautics Commission, we recommend the following major improvements to provide adequate facilities:

1. Terminal building: The present structure is inadequate in every respect to serve as a terminal in addition to being improperly located with respect to the runways for safety and service consideration. Estimated cost of a new building is $60,000.

2. Paved aircraft parking area and loading ramp: This is required to service the relocated passenger terminal. Estimated cost, $60,000.

3. Automobile parking area: No auto parking facilities presently exist. Estimated cost (including considerable required grading) is $50,000.

The total estimated amount required is $190,000. We feel that this additional expenditure is essential to the full utilization of the existing investment of several million dollars.

I am confident with the cooperation we are receiving from you and the Pennsylvania Aeronautics Commission we will see the local deteriorating economic picture be rejuvinated through our only major medium of transportation—aviation. We realize the importance of Federal financial aid for air development so we are again requesting your support in passing the airport aid bill that means so much to this area.

It gives me great pleasure to be able to present these recommendations and hope they meet with your approval.

Respectfully yours,

LUTHER L. WARSING,
Chairman Aviation Committee.

At State College, Pa., the site of the Pennsylvania State University, accord-

ing to communications I have received, the amount of $100,000 in Federal funds will be needed to expand an existing and inadequate airport.

Mr. Chairman, in my three-county area the need of modern airports is acute.

It is common knowledge the area is mountainous and the rail service we once enjoyed is rapidly diminishing. In the wintertime travel by highway is extremely difficult.

At the present time, the area is serviced by a feeder line known as the Allegheny Airlines. In order to obtain full benefits from this feeder line service, adequate year-round airport facilities are necessary.

Mr. Chairman, the communities of Altoona, Du Bois and Philipsburg which sponsor these airports through airport authorities find it impossible even with State aid to finance the expansion and construction of airports. Therefore, without Federal assistance the program of airport construction and expansion will come to a standstill. It is for that reason that I am supporting H.R. 1011 and urging its approval.

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. NELSEN].

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Chairman, one of the questions that was asked by the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FOLEY] relative to the $500 million figure shown at page 50 of the hearings I do not believe has been adequately answered. I would like to call attention once more to the fact that the report that has been referred to so many times as being in error reminds me a little of the days when I was the Administrator of Rural Electrification. About the only way you could arrive at a figure was to inquire of those who were borrowers how much money they would need. You then compiled their reports, and from that you gathered some information. This report is no different.

Three thousand airports replied, for a total of $1,290 million. And of the 3,000 only 591 were eligible for Federal aid. We then eliminated the terminal buildings and the inflationary factor and came up with a figure of $500 million.

One factor that has been referred to has been the division of funds. We, too, had a formula for distribution of funds in the rural electrification program, allocating funds to States. We abolished the formula because we found we were tying up millions of dollars that we could not use in keeping with the needs of the program in areas where it was needed.

Under the airport program today we have about $12 million that has been locked up in 18 different States, and with a more liberal formula for distribution, that $12 million could possibly be used and a total of lesser dollars could be used in the total program to do the same kind of job. So I think the bill we have offered has attempted to provide adequate funds, has attempted to give us a formula that would permit us to do a better job. I am confident that the bill is a good bill as provided by the report of Mr. Quesada and the administration.

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, may I say to the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT], who asked a question a few minutes ago about the airport at Los Angeles, that the administration bill would provide a more liberal matching formula for an airport of that type than the bill reported by the committee. I do not mean to infer that I have any great sympathy for the plight of the Los Angeles city airport, which is making tremendous profits on the operation of its facility and is perfectly able through sources other than the Federal Government to finance any additional improvements necessary to the operation of the airport. If it is not, it might try putting some additional tax burden on the airlines, which also are making money using that airport.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. That is a philosophy I think the gentleman would find rather difficult to justify on the basis of the operations of the airlines. If the gentleman will read the financial reports of the airlines, he will find they have just recently come out from under a Federal subsidy. It would seem to me that now to suggest we start taxing the airlines beyond what they have to pay for the use of these airports is wholly unrealistic. I would also say to the gentleman that if he would look over the finances of the city of Los Angeles, which is growing at such a rate that we have a tremendous financial problem on our hands, I think he would realize his suggestion is improper.

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. If the rest of the city of Los Angeles is being operated at as big a profit as the airport you would have no financial difficulties.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield the remaining time on this side to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. FLYNT].

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Chairman, in closing the debate on the bill H.R. 1011, the amendments to the Federal Airport Act of 1959, I shall briefly summarize the bill as it is reported by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. It can be summarized in three major parts.

Part 1 authorizes Federal aid for airports totaling $297 million to become available over a 4-year period, beginning with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960. Those funds, of $297 million, are divided into three principal categories:

Category (a). For the States, under a formula which is spelled out on page 57 of the committee hearings of this bill, $62,100,000 for each of the 4 fiscal years. In addition to Alaska, Hawaii would be included in the State program.

FEDERAL AID AIRPORT PROGRAM

ATTACHMENT A.—*Annual distribution of $62,100,000 authorization for 4 fiscal years*

State:	*Apportionment*
Alaska	----------
Alabama	$838,180
Arizona	939,544
Arkansas	670,938
California	2,734,099
Colorado	955,269
Connecticut	340,256
Delaware	64,980
District of Columbia	120,271
Florida	851,856
Georgia	942,419
Idaho	694,985

ATTACHMENT A.—*Annual distribution of $62,100,000 authorization for 4 fiscal years*—Continued

State:	*Apportionment*
Illinois	$1,721,651
Indiana	852,738
Iowa	800,327
Kansas	882,263
Kentucky	733,174
Louisiana	760,599
Maine	385,768
Maryland	439,214
Massachusetts	767,282
Michigan	1,654,594
Minnesota	1,072,185
Mississippi	676,053
Missouri	1,096,682
Montana	1,157,301
Nebraska	759,013
Nevada	827,050
New Hampshire	147,216
New Jersey	781,667
New Mexico	985,691
New York	2,606,233
North Carolina	989,458
North Dakota	605,945
Ohio	1,511,101
Oklahoma	841,462
Oregon	932,127
Pennsylvania	1,902,130
Rhode Island	127,157
South Carolina	542,723
South Dakota	657,256
Tennessee	798,404
Texas	3,093,777
Utah	719,824
Vermont	126,216
Virginia	803,025
Washington	868,070
West Virginia	475,132
Wisconsin	993,906
Wyoming	754,789
Hawaii	----------
Total State apportionment	46,200,000
Discretionary funds	15,000,000
Total funds for 50 States	61,200,000
Territory:	
Puerto Rico	600,000
Virgin Islands	300,000
Total	900,000
Grand total	62,100,000

NOTE.—These figures may vary between 0.5 and 1.0 percent because of the difference between $62,100,000 and the $63,000,000 figure upon which the above formula was first based. The discretionary fund increases the second year.

Category (b). For each of the 4 fiscal years, $600,000 for the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico and $300,000 for the Virgin Islands.

Category (c). Provides for a new discretionary fund, to become available as follows, in the discretion of the Administrator: $20 million on July 1, 1961; $15 million on July 1, 1962; and $10 million on July 1, 1963.

The second major provision of the bill as reported out by the committee limits the use of Federal funds in the construction of airport buildings to that portion of an approved project which provides space for use by Federal agencies. The Federal Government, at the discretion of the Administrator, could pay 100 percent of the cost of providing such space. All other funds must be matched by funds from local sources. No funds could be used for passenger automobile parking facilities or other

strictly terminal facilities which are in no way connected with the activities of the Federal Government.

The third major provision of the bill as reported by the committee provides that Federal aid apportionments made to a State, if not obligated after 2 years, shall revert to the discretionary fund now existing under the act, so that they will be available for use by the Administrator without regard to State boundaries.

The ranking minority member of the committee and those who have spoken in behalf of the administration proposal which will be offered as a substitute to the committee bill would have you believe that the only difference between the committee bill and the administration substitute is the figure of $97 million in the funds which may be obligated by contractual agreement of the Administrator. This is not the case. There is a major difference wholly unrelated to the figure of $97 million, which is the dollar difference between the two proposals.

That major difference is in the bill reported out by the committee, the Congress, and not the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency, determines the manner and ratio in which at least $248,400,000 of the $297 million authorized in the bill will be spent. Under the administration proposal, which will be offered as a substitute for the committee bill, $100 million is allocated by States, instead of the $248,400,000 allocated by the committee bill, and the remaining $100 million or 50 percent of the entire amount authorized in the administration substitute proposal is left to the discretion of the Administrator. It is not appropriate to permit one-half of the entire amount to be spent in the discretion of any one person.

Mr. Chairman, I feel the committee has gone into thorough and adequate detail in providing the ratio and establishing the formula by which this money is to be spent and has provided that the bulk, indeed, the overwhelming major portion of the money provided by this act shall be distributed among all of the 48 States rather than to provide for at least 50 percent of it to be in the discretionary fund to be handled and awarded by the Administrator, as he sees fit.

Mr. Chairman, there has been questions raised about the matter of safety and the safety provisions contained in the bill and in the administration substitute. It is to the safety considerations that I would like to devote the remaining time in this debate. The White House during the 6 years has had at least two commissions appointed to report back on this major and very important subject. The last one was made in 1957 by the Commission headed by Mr. Edward P. Curtis. The report states and I quote from it:

> Airports are an integral part of the system of aviation facilities. However, unlike other elements of the system, airports are designed, built, financed, and operated by the local authorities. The increase in overall traffic will require modernization of airports and an increase in their numbers. This imposes the necessity for coordinated national and local efforts to insure that airports do not become a neglected element of the system and thus be a future bottleneck.

Mr. Chairman, the administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency in testifying before our committee stated that there would be within the next 4 years a need for 78 airports in this country that can accommodate the jet commercial transport. At the present time there are only 24 which can adequately accommodate the Douglas DC-8 and the Boeing 707 jet transports. It is for the purpose of providing the very optimum in safety regarding the operation of airports through our aviation network that this fund is necessary and there is more involved than the difference between $200 million over a 4-year period and the committee figure of $297 million. If we are to provide the necessary safety for landing and takeoffs of this new mechanical agent which is entering the aviation field in this country, the jet aircraft which will soon be flying into and out of as many as 78 commercial airports, it is necessary that the funds provided by this bill be made available to provide the maximum safety possible and airport facilities in the next 4 years. The statement has been made as to how much of this $297 million will be used for safety purposes. I think it can be said, and said conservatively, that practically all, if indeed not all of the funds provided, will be used to make flying and commercial air travel safer for the American flying public.

Two members of the committee who have preceded me in general debate on this bill have raised the question of whether the figures contained in either the committee bill or the administration substitute are "sacred." So far as I know, the majority of the committee makes no claim that the $297 million figure is sacred to anybody. It is, however, undeniably arrived at as the result of a carefully worked out formula which provides the necessary information to enable the States and the airport planners to know within a few percentage points the minimum figure that they can expect to receive in Federal grants for airport improvement purposes during the next 4 years. For example, the table contained on page 57 of the committee report gives almost to the dollar the minimum amount that will be made available to each of the 50 States. The maximum amount can and will be determined after adding to the amount provided in the discretionary fund to the amount which is not used under the formula and reverts to the discretionary fund by operation of law. These amounts may not be adequate to provide the total airport improvements necessary in each of the States, but the table and the formula applied to it gives a reasonable figure that each State can use for planning purposes. Under the administration substitute proposal there is not a single State, expecting to use any of the matching funds, which they can know with any reasonable degree of certainty the minimum or the maximum amount that it will receive during the next 4 years, because one-half of the total amount is not subject to any table or formula, but is in the discretionary fund.

Those of us who sustain the majority position of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce which reported out the committee bill, urge the approval of the bill as reported by the majority of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and we urge that the administration substitute proposal be rejected.

Do not be misled by the almost persuasive arguments that the only difference between the committee bill and the administration substitute is a monetary difference of $97 million. The more important difference is the application of the formula which spells out with reasonable certainty how these funds, whatever the amount, will be allocated among the States. If the administration substitute proposal should be adopted, chaos would take the place of orderly processes through which the States and municipalities can efficiently, wisely, and economically spend the matching funds which are provided by the Federal Government.

The committee bill has eliminated entirely the once objectionable provision whereby Federal funds might be used indiscriminately to build and construct profitmaking parts of the terminal facilities. This is completely out of the bill and there is no question of using any of these funds for other than bona fide airport improvements. These matching funds under our interpretation of the committee version of the bill are limited to runway construction improvement and extension, land acquisition, ramps, loading and unloading areas, and other similar purposes which are directly connected with enplaning and deplaning and with landing and takeoff activities.

That part of construction of airport facilities which will be paid 100 percent by the Federal Government include such activities as control towers, weather-reporting activities, communications activities relating to air-traffic control, or any other activity of the United States with respect to which the administration determines that it is in the best interest of the Government to provide facilities therefor. All of these activities may be said to be directly related to providing additional safety measures in the operation of airports. No Federal funds provided by H.R. 1011 as reported by the committee can be used for either frivolous or unessential activities.

Mr. Chairman, we respectfully urge that the administration substitute proposal be rejected and that the committee bill be approved.

THE AIRPORT PROGRAM AND BONG AIR FORCE BASE

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Chairman, while we are considering H.R. 1011, which sets up $75 million a year for the Federal-aid airport program throughout the country, we might compare this cost with that of the Richard Bong Air Force Base being built at Kansasville, Wis., at an estimated total cost of $83,464,000. Of this amount, $44,570,130 has already been allocated through fiscal 1959, and

an additional $21,533,000 has been requested for fiscal 1960.

Here is a huge Air Force base being planted right in the middle of one of the busiest, most congested air trafficways in the United States—right between Milwaukee and Chicago—some 20 miles south of General Mitchell Field at Milwaukee and 40 miles north of Chicago's O'Hare Field.

There is no question that Bong is going to create serious additional air traffic and air safety problems in the Milwaukee-Chicago area. The Air Force admits it. The Federal Aviation Agency admits it.

The FAA assures me that, even with Bong in operation, the area can and will be made safe for flying, through imposing various regulations and controls. But these will mean added restrictions on flying in the area—commercial flying, private flying, and military flying. As one example, Bong's existence will mean additional mileage and additional time for a flight from Milwaukee to Chicago, because you will have to fly a sort of great circle route around the Air Force base's reserved airspace. This naturally means added costs to the commercial airline or the private flyer. In effect, this means no one will ever be able to fly in a straight line between Milwaukee and Chicago as long as Bong is there.

How did the Bong Air Force Base get where it is in the first place?

Bong started out to be an Air Defense Command base, to get the interceptor aircraft out of Chicago's O'Hare Field. The Air Force insisted that, for the defense of Chicago, the new interceptor base had to be located within 60 or 70 miles of Chicago. Early in 1955 the Air Force proposed the Kansasville site.

It is important to note that the Civil Aeronautics Administration originally opposed the Kansasville location, in the following language quoted from the 1955 Kansas City Regional Airspace Meeting No. 117:

> The CAA reviewed this problem and determined that confliction in use of airspace would result from the construction as proposed. Various runway alinements were studied to determine if this confliction could be resolved. The study indicated that the construction of an Air Force base in the Kansasville area would increase traffic control problems and would definitely require certain restrictions on traffic operating into and out of the Chicago-Milwaukee terminal area, the CAA recommended that consideration be given by the Air Force to the construction of the base north of Milwaukee and possibly in the Green Bay area in lieu of the Kansasville site. This recommendation was made considering primarily the traffic control problems. It was pointed out that more independent operations could be conducted in the vicinity of Green Bay than will be possible in the Kansasville area. It was recognized that the transfer of military activity from O'Hare to Kansasville will improve traffic control in the Chicago area. The Air Force member advised that, due to a number of factors, it was necessary to construct the Air Force base in the Kansasville area.

The Air Force continued its insistence that the new interceptor base had to be within a short distance of Chicago. When the matter went before the Washington Airspace Panel on March 23, 1956, it was the Air Force view that prevailed. The following is from the minutes of that meeting:

> The Commerce member recognized that the military Air Defense objective has limited the maximum distance from Chicago which may be considered suitable for locating a proposed new Air Defense base. Although transfer of Air Defense operations from O'Hare Airport, Chicago, to the proposed Kansasville base will improve traffic control conditions in the immediate Chicago area, operations of this type at Kansasville will introduce some additional air traffic control problems.
>
> In the event that the Air Force elects to remain within this distance from Chicago in order to properly carry out its assigned mission, it is believed that the Kansasville site, with runway alinements as recommended by CAA, is as good as can be found in the general area.

I want to emphasize that the decision approving the Kansasville site was based completey on the understanding that the Bong base was to be an Air Defense Command interceptor base. It was on this basis that Congress authorized construction and appropriated funds for it.

Mr. Chairman, Bong is not going to be an Air Defense Command base at all. It will not have a single interceptor on it, although its location was chosen, over CAA objection, just because it was to be an interceptor base.

The Air Force now lists Bong as a Strategic Air Command base in the medium bombardment category.

When Bong's mission was changed from an interceptor base to a bomber base, it seems to me logical that the location should have been changed, or reconsidered. It is one thing to build an interceptor base in the Chicago-Milwaukee area to defend that important target area. It is quite another to build a bomber base—itself a major enemy target—in the already attractive Chicago-Milwaukee target area.

Why did not the Air Force find a new site farther north, as the CAA had recommended, when the Bong mission was switched to bombers?

At a recent meeting on this subject, Air Force representatives stated that time was the major factor—when the mission was changed to bombers, the land on the Kansasville site had been acquired, the Air Force was ready to build, and could not afford the time to go out and acquire a new site.

No doubt the Air Force felt that way. I seriously question, however, whether the time saved was enough to justify the hazards and the air traffic disruptions that the Bong base will create in the Milwaukee-Chicago area, and the folly of building a brandnew $83 million bomber base in this target area. In addition, Bong is located in an area of high land acquisition costs. A site in northern Wisconsin would have been much less expensive although more remote from the entertainment centers of Milwaukee and Chicago.

If Congress had known 3 years ago what we know now about Bong, I do not think we would have permitted the base to go there. Nevertheless it is going there. Some $40 million has already been committed to the project.

Last summer I proposed that work on Bong be halted, and a review made of the entire situation with a view toward relocating the base. Unfortunately the wheels had ground too far. I was unable to stop the project then. I would not ask the Congress to stop it now.

Nevertheless I cannot help but feel that the Bong Air Force Base case is a perfect example of the poorest kind of planning. In the name of national defense, we have forged ahead with a project which I fear no one is going to be happy with.

We are spending $83 million for a bomber base that will not be in operation until late in 1960, if then. I don't know when manned bombers will be obsolete, but as our missile programs develop, surely our requirements for bombers will be greatly reduced. It seems perfectly possible that the Bong Base may be obsolete only a few years after its completion.

Under the circumstances, it is not too early to start thinking about what might be done with this $83 million airport when the Air Force does not need it anymore.

With the rapid urbanization of the entire lakeshore area from Milwaukee to Chicago, and with the development of new aircraft of various types, it is possible that Bong could become the major domestic and international airport for the entire area. As President Eisenhower has recently reported, over 500 military airport facilities, have been declared surplus and turned over to the cities, counties and States for airport use.

How about Bong? At least the thought of such a possibility takes some of the bitterness out of the present Bong pill.

Right now, it appears that the commercial airlines, private flyers, and the people of Milwaukee, Racine, Kenosha, Chicago and vicinity, are just going to have to live with the Bong Air Force Base and try to make the best of a generally unfortunate situation.

The Members of Congress representing this area are alert to the problem. We are going to do everything we can to make certain that the best possible safety regulations and controls are worked out. We hope that this can be done with a minimum of interference with both civilian and military air traffic. And we hope that the existence of Bong Air Force Base will not in any way hold back the development and expansion of commercial and private flying in the Milwaukee Chicago complex.

Mr. Chairman, the Federal Aviation Agency, its Chief, Gen. E. R. Quesada, and his deputy, James T. Pyle, are fully aware of the difficulties Bong is going to create. The FAA will do its best to solve them, and we hope its best will be awfully good.

The Air Force also knows that Bong will create lots of problems. The FAA must have the Air Force's full cooperation in this matter. It is my understanding that Bong Air Force Base will be of a ready or alert nature, not to be used for intensive training purposes, thus minimizing its adverse impact on the already crowded airspace in the

area. The Congress, I believe, should have firm assurance of this from the Air Force. Without such assurance, the air traffic and safety problems connected with Bong would be tremendously magnified.

Mr. Chairman, I continue to have misgivings about the location of this Air Force base. But it is there. I cannot conceive that it will ever be a blessing. Whether it becomes a curse is up to the Air Force and the FAA.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this bill to authorize Federal aid for airports totaling $297 million to become available over a 4-year period, beginning with the fiscal year 1960 which starts July 1, 1959.

I want to make it clear now that I am not opposed to aviation progress, and I recognize the need of adequate and safe aviation facilities in this infancy period of jet passenger aircraft. I believe that the Federal Government and the Congress has a responsibility to financially aid in the construction and installation of navigational and landing approach electronic aids, and modernization of airport facilities essential to the safety of the public.

LEGISLATION WOULD COST TOO MUCH

However, I think this bill before us goes too far and that there is not adequate evidence to support the $297 million expenditure over a 4-year period. Actually, the members of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee filing a minority report stated that the cost of this bill is far in excess of what the Federal Government will need as matching funds for airport aid.

Mr. Chairman, Gen. E. R. Quesada, the Federal Aviation Administrator, has testified that he can do the job that is required in airport modernization for $97 million less, or for the $200 million asked for by President Eisenhower.

WILL UNBALANCE PRESIDENT'S BUDGET

If we go along and vote for the committee bill, when there is inadequate evidence to support this huge expenditure, then we are certainly going to help throw the President's budget out of balance. This bill will cost about $25 million more than the President asked for in the next fiscal year beginning July 1, 1959, and a total additional cost of $97 million more than requested by the administration for the next 4 years.

MASSACHUSETTS TAXPAYERS WILL PAY

Mr. Chairman, if we are going to continue at this spending pace called for in this airport bill when the evidence does not justify the $297 million, the first thing we know every little hamlet in the United States will be putting in applications for Federal airport assistance. This, I submit, is not the responsibility of the Federal Government. These small airports should be a local responsibility and they should be self-sustaining. I do not know why the taxpayers of Massachusetts should begin paying for these subsidies for small airports, airports all over the country.

WOULD VOTE AGAINST BILL

This is my position on the bill before us, Mr. Chairman. I regret that I will be unable to remain on the floor for the balance of the debate and the rollcall vote, but I must be in Springfield, Mass., tonight to keep a speaking engagement. If I were to be here for the rollcall, I would vote against this bill. Meanwhile, I have asked to be paired against this legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the Clerk will now read the substitute committee amendment as printed in the reported bill as an original bill for the purpose of amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 5(a) of the Federal Airport Act, as amended (49 U.S.C. 1104(a)), is amended to read as follows:

"(a) For the purpose of carrying out this Act with respect to projects in the several States, there is authorized to be obligated by the execution of grant agreements pursuant to section 12 of this Act the sum of $40,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and the sum of $60,000,000 for each of the fiscal years ending June 30, 1957, June 30, 1958, and June 30, 1959, and the sum of $62,100,000 for each of the fiscal years ending June 30, 1960, June 30, 1961, June 30, 1962, and June 30, 1963. Each such authorized amount shall become available for obligation beginning July 1 of the fiscal year for which it is authorized, and shall continue to be so available until so obligated."

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Substitute amendment offered by Mr. SPRINGER to H.R. 1011 as amended: Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following: "That the Federal Airport Act, as amended (60 Stat. 170; 49 U.S.C. 1101), is further amended as follows:

"SEC. 2. That section 2(a)(3) of the Federal Airport Act is amended to read as follows:

"'"Airport development" means (A) any acquisition of land or of any interest therein or of any easement through or other interest in airspace which is necessary for development, operation, or maintenance of any public airport or portion thereof, or which is necessary to remove or mitigate, or prevent or limit the establishment of, airport hazards and (B) any work involved in constructing, improving, or repairing a public airport or portion thereof, including the removal, lowering, relocation, and marking and lighting of airport hazards, but excluding construction, improvement, alteration or repair of any building or portion thereof, other than those required to house air traffic control activities, weather reporting activities and communications activities related to air traffic control and further excluding automobile parking areas and entrance roads: *Provided,* That this provision shall not operate to alter, restrict, or otherwise interfere with carrying out any work programed prior to enactment of this Act.'

"SEC. 3. Sections 2, 3, 7, 9, and 10 of the Federal Airport Act are amended by deleting the term 'the Territory of Alaska' wherever it appears and by deleting the term 'the Territories' appearing in section 3(a) and substituting in lieu thereof 'the Territory of Hawaii.'

"SEC. 4. Section 4 of the Federal Airport Act is amended to read as follows:

"'In order to bring about, in conformity with the national airport plan prepared and from time to time revised as provided in this Act, the establishment of a nationwide system of public airports adequate to meet the present and future needs of civil aeronautics, the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency is authorized, within the limits of the obligation authority provided in section 5, to make grants of funds to sponsors for urgent airport development considered by the Administrator to be essential to an adequate national aviation facilities system as hereinafter provided.'

"SEC. 5. Sections 5(a) and (b) of the Federal Airport Act are amended to read as follows:

"'(a) For the purpose of carrying out this Act with respect to projects in the several States, there are hereby authorized to be obligated by the execution of grant agreements pursuant to section 12 of this Act the sum of $40,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, the sum of $60,000,000 for each of the fiscal years ending June 30, 1957, June 30, 1958, and June 30, 1959, and the sum of $63,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, the sum of $53,500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, the sum of $44,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and the sum of $34,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963. Each such authorized amount shall become available for obligation beginning July 1 of the fiscal year for which it is authorized, and shall continue to be so available until so obligated: *Provided, however,* That such portion of the amount authorized to be obligated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, as shall be allocated to the discretionary fund by section 6(b)(1) of this Act, as amended, shall become available for obligation upon the date of enactment of this Act and shall remain available until obligated.'

"'(b) For the purpose of carrying out this Act with respect to projects in the Territory of Hawaii, and in Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands, there are hereby authorized to be obligated by the execution of grant agreements pursuant to section 12 the sum of $2,500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and the sum of $3,000,000 for each of the fiscal years ending June 30, 1957, June 30, 1958, and June 30, 1959; the sum of $2,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960; the sum of $1,500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and the sum of $1,000,000 for each of the fiscal years ending June 30, 1962 and June 30, 1963. Each such authorized amount shall become available for obligation beginning July 1 of the fiscal year for which it is authorized and shall continue to be so available until so obligated. Of each of the amounts authorized by this subsection, 45 per centum shall be available for projects in the Territory of Hawaii, 35 per centum for projects in Puerto Rico, and 20 per centum for projects in the Virgin Islands.'

"SEC. 6. Section 6 of the Federal Airport Act is amended to read as follows:

"'(a) As soon as possible after July 1 of each fiscal year for which an amount is authorized to be obligated by section 5(a), 75 per centum of the amount made available for each of the fiscal years ending June 30, 1956, through June 30, 1959, and 50 per centum of the amount made available for each of the fiscal years ending June 30, 1960, through June 30, 1963, shall be apportioned by the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency among the several States, one-half in the proportion which the population of each State bears to the total population of all the States, and one-half in the proportion which the area of each State bears to the total area of all the States. Each amount so apportioned for a State shall, during the fiscal year for which it was first authorized to be obligated and the fiscal year immediately following, be available only for grants for approved projects located in that State, or sponsored by that State or some public agency thereof but located in an adjoining State, and thereafter any portion of such amount which remains unobligated shall be

transferred to and become a part of the discretionary fund established by subsection (b)(1) of this section, and be available in accordance with the provisions of subsections (b) (2) and (3) of this section. Upon making an appointment as provided in this subsection, the Administrator shall inform the executive head of each State, and any public agency which has requested such information as to the amounts apportioned for each State. As used in this subsection the term "population" means the population according to the latest decennial census of the United States and the term "area" includes both land and water.

"'(b)(1) Twenty-five per centum of the amounts authorized by section 5(a) to be obligated for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1956, through June 30, 1959, and 50 per centum of the amounts authorized by section 5(a) to be obligated for each of the fiscal years ending June 30, 1960, through June 30, 1963, shall, as such amounts become available, constitute a discretionary fund.

"'(b)(2) Such discretionary fund shall be available for such approved projects in the several States as the Administrator may deem most appropriate for carrying out the national airport plan, regardless of the States in which they are located. The Administrator shall give consideration, in determining the projects for which such fund is to be so used, to the existing airport facilities in the several States and to the need for airport projects essential to an adequate national aviation facilities system.

"'(b)(3) Such discretionary fund shall also be available for such approved projects in national parks and national recreation areas, national monuments, and national forests, sponsored by the United States or any agency thereof, as the Administrator may deem appropriate for carrying out the national airport plan; but no other funds authorized under authority of this Act shall be available for such purpose. The sponsor's share of the project costs of any such approved project shall be paid only out of funds contributed to the sponsor for the purpose of paying such costs (receipt of which funds and their use for this purpose are hereby authorized) or appropriations specifically authorized therefor.'

"SEC. 7. Section 9(d) of the Federal Airport Act is amended to read as follows:

"'All such projects shall be subject to the approval of the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency, which approval shall be given only if he is satisfied that the project will contribute to the accomplishment of the purposes of this Act, that the project is urgently required for and essential to the development or establishment of an adequate national aviation facilities system, that sufficient funds are available for that portion of the project costs which is not to be paid by the United States under this Act, that the project will be completed without undue delay, that the public agency or public agencies which submitted the project application have legal authority to engage in the airport development as proposed, and that all project sponsorship requirements prescribed by or under the authority of this Act have been or will be met. No project shall be approved by the Administrator with respect to any airport unless a public agency holds good title, satisfactory to the Administrator, to the landing area of such airport or the site therefor, or gives assurance satisfactory to the Administrator that such title will be acquired.'"

Mr. SPRINGER (interrupting the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read, but be printed in the RECORD.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, and I shall not, I think it should be made very clear that this is the Bow substitute we have been discussing during general debate and debate on the rule this afternoon that is offered on behalf of the minority for the administration.

Mr. SPRINGER. Yes. May I say this is the administration bill of $200 million.

Mr. HARRIS. For a 4-year program.

Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, my understanding is that when we reached this point the gentleman would prefer to wait until tomorrow before discussing the substitute. Am I correct?

Mr. SPRINGER. The distinguished chairman is correct.

Mr. HARRIS. Since that is the understanding—I believe it has been suggested by the leadership—I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. METCALF, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1011) to amend the Federal Airport Act in order to extend the time for making grants under the provisions of such act, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to extend their remarks on H.R. 1011 and amendments to the Federal Airport Act.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

HOUR OF MEETING, MARCH 19

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Government Operations may have until midnight tonight to file a report and recommendations made during the 85th Congress as a result of deliberations of the Committee on Government Operations, and that the same permission may be given with respect to the filing of minority views.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, was this cleared with the minority members?

Mr. McCORMACK. I may say that I personally have not talked with any minority member except after this memorandum was handed to me I contacted the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DAWSON], and specifically asked him the question. He told me this matter was taken up in committee. I was at the committee meeting this morning, but this was taken up after I had left. The gentleman from Illinois told me the matter was taken up in the committee and that it was agreeable.

Mr. HALLECK. Very well.

Can the gentleman tell me what the program will be for tomorrow?

PROGRAM FOR MARCH 19

Mr. McCORMACK. Tomorrow's program will be a continuation of consideration of the airport bill. Thereafter we will take up the Treasury-Post Office appropriation bill. In view of the problem presented to us by the recess a week from tomorrow, the leadership very strongly hopes—the leadership, of course, never undertakes to dictate or impose—but the leadership expresses the strong hope that both bills can be disposed of tomorrow.

Mr. HALLECK. May I say to the gentleman I concur in that hope, and I see no reason why both of these matters cannot be disposed of tomorrow.

From what I have been able to discover here, the substitute which is pending to the airport bill can be debated for a reasonable amount of time. It has been debated in general debate and on the rule and a vote can be had on that. I do not think there would be any objection to having the rest of the bill considered as read and open for amendment. There is one series of amendments that could be considered en bloc. There is an amendment that deals with another matter. I see no reason why we cannot in a short time conclude the airport bill and get on the appropriation bill and conclude the consideration of that one, too.

Mr. McCORMACK. I may say in connection with Friday that there are three or four other bills to be disposed of. If possible, I would like to do so. The gentlewoman from Missouri [Mrs. SULLIVAN] acting majority leader last evening, referred to them at page 3929 of yesterday's RECORD. One is H.R. 5132 relating to retention of Reserve officers, H.R. 2575, authorizing an appropriation of $500,000 for Pan-American games in Chicago, and H.R. 3366 relating to the loan of certain naval vessels to Italy and Turkey. I imagine those bills can be acted on with some degree of expedition. It is hoped that we can dispose of them, but if not, we will do the best we can on Friday.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK]?

There was no objection.

FEDERAL AIRPORT ACT

Mr. RIEHLMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RIEHLMAN. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to express my personal views on legislation which will be considered in the House today.

When H.R. 1011 was introduced, it contained two major provisions that were personally unacceptable. It would have permitted the use of Federal funds for projects far outside the rightful and logical scope of Federal responsibility. It would have appropriated funds far beyond the amount deemed necessary by the administration and requested in the President's budget. Although the bill before us today is a vast improvement over the original, I would hasten to add that I have not seen sufficient improvement to merit my support.

The original bill would have excluded from construction at Federal expense only automobile parking facilities and those parts of airport buildings to be used as bars, cocktail lounges, nightclubs, theaters, private clubs, garages, hotel rooms, commercial offices and game rooms. The construction of costly terminal and freight buildings, which are properly the responsibility of local and State authorities, would have been permitted. The Federal Government's responsibility, which never included the appropriation of funds for railroad and bus terminals, would have been extended to include airport terminals and freight buildings which are undeniably civic improvements that contribute not one bit to the efficiency and safety of air travel. For these purposes, in addition to those items which contribute directly to air safety—and this is where proper Federal responsibility lies—the original bill called for $437 million over a 4-year period.

The administration takes the position that proper Federal responsibility extends only to the making of grants for construction of urgent airport projects essential to an adequate national aviation facilities system. Federal funds would be devoted to runways, taxiways, aprons, tower facilities, and so forth. They would not go beyond the gate for purposes comparable to the building of city streets or civic auditoriums. The Federal Aviation Agency has said to Congress that it can meet these needs and perform the proper Federal functions for $200 million over the next 4 years.

In consideration of the original bill, the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee very ably amended it to cover—and I quote—"the costs of constructing, altering, or repairing that portion of any airport building required to house air traffic control activities, weather reporting activities, communication activities related to air traffic control, or any other activity of the United States." For this exercise of courage and responsibility, I commend the members of the committee. Regarding the uses to which these Federal funds might be put, the committee and the administration are in substantial agreement.

The committee bill aims at accomplishing essentially the same program that the administration desires. The Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency testified before the committee that he could provide for these essential programs with $200 million. The committee has made a noble effort in reducing the fiscal year 1960 expenditures to the level requested by the President. At this point, however, the logic and wisdom of the committee's actions become difficult to see. The committee bill would appropriate funds on a level for fiscal years 1961, 1962 and 1963 that would raise total expenditures to $297 million. Both H.R. 1011, as amended, and the administration bill profess to accomplish the same results, the Agency that has the experience—the Agency will administer the program—says the job can be done for $200 million, yet the committee would ask us to obligate almost half again as much money to do this same job. I have seen no evidence that would contradict the Federal Aviation Agency's contention that the necessary safety features could be provided for $200 million. If I thought for one instant that the elimination of these $97 millions would in any way hazard the safety of air travel, then I would support H.R. 1011, as amended. If sufficient evidence is presented in debate today that this extra $97 million is justified, then I will support the committee bill. But, in this day of billions, is $97 million the amount we can spend without at least some justification? Is $97 million such an insignificant sum that we are to disregard it? Has Congress grown so accustomed to spending-for-spending's-sake that it cannot accept the recommendation of an agency that such a project can be completed for less money? I sincerely hope we will demonstrate to the American people that we have not reached this stage. I hope we will give evidence to the public that we are still the guardian, and not the indiscriminate emptier, of the public purse.

A BILL TO CONSOLIDATE FOREIGN AID FUNCTIONS IN THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced H.R. 5816, "a bill to provide that all programs of economic aid to foreign nations shall be administered by the Secretary of State" and "to simplify administration of such programs."

For some years I have been struck, both here in Washington and abroad, with the waste and inefficiency which comes from scattering our foreign aid operations over a number of agencies, and then attempting to coordinate their scattered efforts.

Our foreign assistance dollars are precious. To enable them to go the farthest and to do the most good, we need to assure the most effective kind of foreign aid organization. In my opinion, foreign assistance should in general be carried out by the Department of State, and by our regular diplomatic establishments abroad. H.R. 5816 accomplishes the following main purposes:

First. Dissolves the International Cooperation Administration and the Development Loan Fund, and gives their Washington functions to the Secretary of State, and under him to the Undersecretary of State for Economic Affairs, acting through the Deputy Undersecretaries and Assistant Secretaries of State. Wherever possible, the work would be carried out by the regional and country desk sections of the State Department. In the field, these foreign aid functions would be carried out by the United States Ambassador, or other chief of mission. The chief of mission would continue, as at present, to coordinate those activities, such as military assistance and foreign information, which he does not directly carry out himself. Thus defense support, technical cooperation, the various forms of special assistance—such as the President's fund and special grant programs—and development loans would be conducted, as they should be, by our regular foreign policy establishment.

Second. Continues military assistance, to the same extent as at present, in the Department of Defense.

Third. Transfers activities under the surplus agricultural commodity program—Public Law No. 480—to the State Department and our diplomatic missions, except for retaining in the Secretary of Agriculture the determination of what agricultural commodities are "surplus."

H.R. 5816 has been prepared at my request by Mr. James M. Menger, Jr., Assistant Counsel, Office of Legislative Counsel, House of Representatives, who has done a most painstaking job of threading his way through our complex legislation on foreign economic relations. For example, "Legislation on Foreign Relations, with Explanatory Notes"—Senate Committee Print, 85th Congress, 1st session, December 1957—has 324 pages of legislation and Executive orders on foreign relations.

The text of H.R. 5816 follows:

A bill to provide that all programs of economic aid to foreign nations shall be administered by the Secretary of State; to simplify administration of such programs; and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) subsection (a) of section 521 of the Mutual Security Act of 1954 is amended by striking out "and section 413(b)(4)".

(b) Such section 521 is further amended by striking out subsections (b) and (c) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(b)(1) Except as provided in paragraphs (2) and (3), the President shall exercise the powers conferred upon him by this Act through the Secretary of State.

"(2) Paragraph (1) shall not apply with respect to the powers conferred upon the President by chapter I and sections 141, 413(b)(1), 415, 416, 451, 522, 533, 535(b), or 545(d) of this Act.

"(3) Paragraph (1) shall not apply with respect to the powers conferred upon the President by sections 142(a)(7), 142(a)(10), 403, 409(d), 501, 503, 511, 526, 527(a) and (e), 528, and 529 of this Act insofar as the powers conferred upon the President by those sections relate to the administration of chapter I of this Act."

(c) Section 525 of such Act is repealed.

SEC. 2. Section 523(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954 is amended to read as follows:

"(b)(1) Except with respect to his functions, powers, and duties which relate directly to chapter I of this Act, the Secretary of State shall exercise the functions, powers, and duties conferred upon or delegated to him under this Act, the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, and the Mutual Defense Assistance Control Act of 1951, through the Under Secretary of State for Economic Affairs. The Under Secretary of State for Economic Affairs, acting through the Deputy Under Secretaries and Assistant Secretaries of State, and with the assistance of other appropriate officers of the Department of State, shall exercise such functions, powers, and duties at the country level through the Chief of the United States Diplomatic Mission for each country. In any country in which the United States has no Chief of United States Diplomatic Mission, such functions, powers, and duties shall be exercised through such officer in the Department of State as the Secretary of State may designate.

"(2) The Chief of the United States Diplomatic Mission in each country (or other officer designated pursuant to the last sentence of paragraph (1)) shall supervise, direct, and control the conduct of all programs and activities in such country which are the responsibility of the Secretary of State under this Act, the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, and the Mutual Defense Assistance Control Act of 1951. He shall be responsible for assuring the unified development and execution of such programs and activities in such country. He shall also coordinate with such programs and activities in the programs and activities of the representatives of other United States agencies (including military assistance advisory groups and foreign information staffs) in such country engaged in carrying out programs which are not the responsibility of the Secretary of State, and shall assume the responsibility for assuring the unified development and execution of such programs in such country."

SEC. 3. The Development Loan Fund is abolished. All functions, powers, duties, personnel, property, records, unexpended balances of appropriations, allocations, and other funds (available or to be made available), assets, and liabilities, of the Development Loan Fund are hereby transferred to the Secretary of State.

SEC. 4. (a) Title III of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"SEC. 306. (a) Except as provided in subsection (b), the President shall exercise the authority conferred on him by this Act through the Secretary of State and his subordinates.

"(b) Subsection (a) of this section shall not apply with respect to (1) the authority of the President under subsections (b), (c), (f), (i), and (j) of section 104 of this Act, (2) the functions of the President with respect to making reports to the Congress under section 108 of this Act, and (3) the authority of the President with respect to designations under the last sentence of section 203 of this Act."

(b) The second sentence of section 106 of such Act is amended by striking out "Secretary of Agriculture" and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary of State".

(c) Section 303 of such Act is amended by striking out "Secretary" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary of State".

SEC. 5. This Act shall take effect on the first day of the first calendar month which begins more than ninety days after the date of enactment of this Act.

The case for H.R. 5816 is set forth far better than I can in the staff study prepared at my direction by Mr. Halford L. Hoskins, Senior Specialist in International Relations, Legislative Reference Service, Library of Congress. Mr. Hoskins' admirable study, dated March 2, 1959, follows:

NEED FOR THE CONSOLIDATION OF FOREIGN AID FUNCTIONS

INTRODUCTORY CONSIDERATIONS

Foreign aid in the national character

Foreign aid has long been a factor in United States foreign relations. Indeed, in one form or another foreign aid has been a characteristic feature of the American way of life throughout the adulthood of the Nation. Altruistic impulses inherent in the character of the American people long ago were manifested in forms of private aid to underdeveloped or underprivileged groups overseas, often in the form of missionary or relief or educational undertakings. Not a few of such activities still are being carried on under private auspices.

From the beginning of the present century, as the Nation's range of interest widened, the United States Government itself found occasion to provide aid to peoples elsewhere, not so much as a calculated feature of foreign policy as for the manifestation of a friendly spirit in special circumstances. As a case in point, in 1908 it returned to China a considerable portion of the American $25 million share of the Boxer indemnity and concurred in the establishment with the proceeds of a scholarship fund for the education of Chinese students in the United States. After World War I, foreign aid, government style, began to take on a political complexion. The cancellations in 1932 of the unpaid balances of much of the $10 billion that had been loaned to some 20 war-ravaged nations is illustrative. Under the Good Neighbor policy enunciated in 1933 foreign aid began systematically to enter into United States relations with the Latin American countries.

Effects of World War II

As World War II and its aftermath of troubles supplied evidence of the ever-increasing interdependence of nations, emphasized by the continuing threat of totalitarian aggression, foreign aid came more and more to be relied upon as an instrument for the implementing of foreign policy. The responsibilities which devolved upon the United States in post-World War II years brought with them needs for aid both on a greatly increased scale and in much greater variety. Some of these needs, such as those of the Western European nations which had borne much of the brunt of the war, were mainly of a short-term economic nature. The constructive results of the European Recovery Program over a period of roughly 4 years from June 1947 were of such a nature, however, as to suggest that economic aid of one kind or another might continue to be an efficacious means of achieving foreign policy objectives in other critical situations. The outcome of a program of aid in multiple forms to Greece and Turkey in the early postwar years contributed to the same view. Thus, various types of foreign aid—all of them in the last analysis involving an outlay of American dollars—became so closely associated with national political objectives as to constitute, to all intents and purposes, a standard feature of United States foreign policy.

For the past 15 years the United States has been providing economic and military assistance to other countries on an unprecedented scale. The multiple purposes of this assistance, the varying objectives, the several types and magnitudes of assistance, when taken into consideration with the makeup of the U.S. Government, have rendered the administration of such assistance extremely difficult. Under the circumstances, it is not surprising that arrangements and procedures have been shifted repeatedly in an effort to improve the organization of assistance programs at home and performance in the field. The arrangements that sufficed for lend-lease operations during World War II were not so well suited to the postwar task of administering assistance for the European recovery program. Likewise, after the beginning of the war in Korea, when the United States was confronted with the necessity for undertaking a worldwide program of military assistance, further adjustments in the governmental machinery for administering economic assistance were called for.

Since the end of the Second World War several surveys have been made of the organizational problems to which expanding foreign assistance has given rise. Fundamentally, these reappraisals have become matters of necessity owing to the changed position of the United States in the world especially since World War II and to the new objectives that have had to be served in consequence. In the background of these reappraisals are diverging currents in American public opinion with reference to the proper role of the United States in the international community. Considerable segments of the American electorate as represented in Congress have held that foreign aid should be employed only in critical situations and hence should be only temporary and expedient in character. A much larger segment has come to believe that, in a seriously divided world, the security and well-being of free peoples is to a considerable degree dependent on meeting adequately the challenge of rising expectations among the underdeveloped peoples and that it behooves the United States not only to take a long-range view of foreign aid but also to find ways and means of making the American dollar perform more effectively in future than in the past in its effort to build up situations in the less developed countries resistant to the appeals of communism. From such considerations have come the more recent proposals for improved administrative procedures as applied to foreign assistance.

POSTWAR EXPERIENCE IN FOREIGN AID ADMINISTRATION

Since the close of the Second World War, the United States has provided nearly $70 billion in foreign assistance of all kinds. Even though this huge sum represents less than 3 percent of the gross national product of the United States in any year since 1946, it cannot be regarded as an inconsiderable item of national expenditure as long as the national budget fails to remain in balance and while the cost of military defense tends to mount annually. The figure takes on still another meaning when the relatively slight results of many forms of foreign aid are considered. If the achievement of even a substantial part of the objectives of the total of foreign aid programs is to require the application of funds greatly in excess of those which have fallen short in accomplishment heretofore, it is clear that the Nation cannot afford any scheme for the administration of foreign aid that is not as efficient and effectual as it is possible to arrive at within the context of our basic style of government.

Phases of postwar aid administration

Administrative arrangements for foreign assistance have passed through five identifiable phases since the end of World War II. There was, first, the period of postwar reconstruction and interim aid, lasting from the close of the war to the creation of the Economic Cooperation Administration in 1948. The second period embraced the activities of

the Economic Cooperation Administration, a temporary agency charged with the handling of emergency economic aid to Europe. It ended with the enactment of the Mutual Security Act of 1951. The Mutual Security Agency, set up under the act of 1951 to furnish military, economic and technical assistance to friendly nations in the interest of international peace and security, represents the third phase. It was abolished by Reorganization Plan No. 7 of 1953. In August 1953, the functions of the Office of Director of Mutual Security, the Mutual Security Agency, the Technical Cooperation Administration, the Institute of Inter-American Affairs, and other foreign assistance activities were transferred to the Foreign Operations Administration. This agency, covering the fourth period, was abolished by Executive order in May 1955. It was succeeded by the International Cooperation Administration, a semiautonomous agency set up within the Department of State in June 1955, the beginning of the fifth and current period.

Each of these intervals represented a concept—or a series of related concepts—as to the most practicable administrative scheme relative to foreign assistance apparent at the time, taking into consideration the kinds and importance of the needs to be served, the personnel required at home and in the field, the relation of kinds of services to be performed to the character of the existing permanent Government agencies, and the presumed proper relationships between policymaking and functional or operational branches of Government. All of these administrative arrangements which were made from time to time necessarily were experimental in some degree owing to the unprecedented needs growing out of American foreign relations, the rapidity of change in the world environment, and the necessarily complicated nature of foreign assistance programs. In each of the several periods of administrative trial the organizational setup reflected the prevailing view of the legislative and executive branches as to the extent to which the different types of aid might best be parceled out among the existing departments of Government or brought into an integrated pattern in a central agency endowed with some measure of independence in its powers of action and procedures. As the rapid succession of administrative reorganizational steps suggests, none of the earlier schemes was found long to be entirely satisfactory, partly, as has been indicated, because of shifting circumstances in U.S. foreign relations and in changing needs or in changing attitudes toward needs for assistance in the outer world. Useful experience was gained in each of the administrative experiments, nevertheless—experience which now can be applied to the obvious need of placing the handling of the various forms of assistance on an integrated, long-term basis to the end that duplication of effort, monetary and personnel waste, and ineffectiveness may be reduced to a minimum, yet with the retention of enough flexibility to admit of continual adaptation to changing circumstances as reflected in U.S. foreign policy.

Early postwar arrangements

This experience in the administration of foreign aid has been gained the hard way. It is seldom in the history of modern states that such chaos has been endured in any line of administration as that which has characterized our foreign aid programs during most of the interval since World War II. Some of the causes of this situation have been touched upon. It may be noted further that much of the difficulty has resulted from exigencies in U.S. foreign relations which have led to the assumption of one kind or another of foreign assistance which had to be assumed by one government agency or another on a purely ad hoc basis. The inevitable confusion attendant on bringing a world war to successful conclusion and adjusting governmental functions again to peacetime activities in a changed world explains a great deal. For instance, the splintering of administrative responsibility for foreign aid undertakings that followed the dismantling of the wartime Foreign Economic Administration will help to explain why so little was accomplished for a time with so much effort and expense. While a good many of the functions of the former agency were then transferred to the Department of State, the War Department and its successor, the Department of the Army, became responsible for assistance in the occupied areas. The negotiation and administration of postwar loans came under the influence of the Treasury Department as well as the Department of State. For a brief period after 1945 the United States undertook to channel much of its contribution toward the relief of suffering and the rehabilitation of devastated areas through international agencies, such as the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration, although some assistance was made available through strictly bilateral financial agreements. After the termination of UNRRA in 1947, various emergency programs were set up. These included post-UNRRA aid, headed by a special assistant to the Assistant Secretary of State for Economic Affairs but co-opting the services of several other executive departments and agencies, a special coordinator's office in the Department of State for administering the program originating from the Greek-Turkish Aid Act of 1947 with the help of an interdepartmental committee, and the War Department program for Government and Relief in Occupied Areas. Still other forms of foreign assistance were handled through the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, the Export-Import Bank, and the Institute for Inter-American Affairs, which became an instrument of the Department of State after 1946. This does not complete the story, but it will serve to indicate both the ramifications of assistance needs at a crucial period and, because of their complexity, the variety of expedients resorted to, often tentatively, in an effort to meet the more serious needs of a world disrupted by war.

The point to be noted particularly is that, during the earlier stages in the development of our programs of foreign aid, administrative responsibility was scattered hither and yon through the Government departments and agencies partly because of practical necessity, partly because of the belief that the projects of the day were temporary, in any case. Committees of coordination not infrequently were provided for but seldom were effectual, since ultimate authority was either vague or remote. In the successive stages of administrative reorganization since the early postwar period some improvements have been made in the way of centralizing authority and coordinating activities. The creation of the Economic Cooperation Administration in April 1948, after much discussion, was a long step in the direction of systematizing a variety of foreign assistance activities. ECA proved to have some fundamental shortcomings, however. While it was given a large measure of autonomy, was headed by an administrator of Cabinet rank, and was empowered to place its own staff overseas, the agency was envisaged as being temporary in character. Moreover, while its legislative charter made provision for consultative liaison with the Department of State with reference to questions of foreign policy, there was no assurance of coordination between these two departments of foreign affairs, one permanent and devoted primarily to political relationships, the other temporary and charged with economic functions.

Changing criteria for foreign aid

The growing threat of Communist aggression which gave rise to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization in 1949 also brought out the need for broadening foreign assistance, particularly in military forms. The powers and duties contained in the Mutual Defense Assistance Act of 1949, even to the military assistance program, were vested in the Department of State, although these functions were to be guided by a Coordinating Committee representing State, Defense and ECA. High-level problems were expected to be dealt with by the National Security Council. The act for International Development of June 1950, and the setting up of the Technical Cooperation Administration within the Department of State further widened the scope of foreign aid and has a logical bearing on further efforts to improve and streamline the administration of an increasing variety of foreign aid commitments.

By 1951 the chief emphasis in foreign assistance programs designed for Europe and Asia had shifted from economic—that is, relief—to defense objectives. This shift, added to other pressures, called for a more thorough integration of all forms of assistance programs. During the next 4 years, consequently, beginning with the Mutual Security Act of 1951, an effort was made to counteract the centrifugal tendencies in the administration of foreign aid programs. Initially, central direction and coordination of all forms of foreign assistance were placed in the hands of a Director of Mutual Security, who was established in the Executive Office of the President and expected to participate in meetings of the Cabinet and the National Security Council. At the outset, operations were divided among the Department of Defense (for military assistance), the Mutual Security Agency (for economic assistance), and the Technical Cooperation Administration in the Department of State (for technical aid). This functional arrangement had many drawbacks and presently was replaced by an arbitrary geographical arrangement, which had drawbacks of its own. In the underdeveloped countries there were technical and economic assistance programs administered by two agencies with different personnel systems, both drawing on the same functional agencies for technical services, with different degrees of responsibility for overall lines of foreign policy.

Shortly after taking office, President Eisenhower thought to improve the situation by embodying the recommendations of a special advisory committee in his Reorganization Plan No. 7, which was submitted to the Congress on June 1, 1953. In keeping with this plan, the Mutual Security Agency was succeeded by the Foreign Operations Administration, which absorbed all technical assistance operations previously carried on by the Department of State. The director of FOA retained the general coordinating functions of the Director for Mutual Security at the departmental level.

Chiefly because of congressional dislike of the handling of economic assistance, still another administrative scheme was written into the Mutual Security Act of 1954. This placed directly on the President himself responsibility for justifying and organizing future programs of military and economic assistance. The President, accordingly, in the light of past experience and in the belief that "the functions and the need for cooperative development of economic and military strength among the free nations are continuing and integral parts of the fabric of our international relations," reaffirmed as basic considerations: (1) The primacy of the Secretary of State in matters of foreign policy, (2) the desirability of bringing related mutual security operations within a single organization under a single management, and (3) the avoidance of a dispersal of operating responsibilities. Thus he proceeded

to establish the International Cooperation Administration as a semiautonomous unit within the Department of State under a key official who would report to the Secretary of State. At the same time, the Secretary of Defense was given operational responsibility for direct forces support and military assistance, the Department of State receiving authority to determine the value by country of programs of military assistance administered by the Department of Defense. This has remained the basic framework of administration of foreign aid down to the present day.

SHORTCOMINGS IN THE CURRENT PLAN

The purposes which were implicit in the Mutual Security Act of 1954 undoubtedly were laudable. They aimed at a greater degree of administrative efficiency through a considerable degree of centralization of authority. With that in view, the International Cooperation Administration was made responsible for all general economic assistance functions. It assumed primary responsibility for presenting military and economic assistance programs to the Congress, the coordination of military and non-military aspects of the program, and the appraisal of value of any country program administered by the Department of Defense. Economic assistance was defined as including defense support, development assistance, and technical cooperation.

Overlapping and conflicting functions

Two major shortcomings have characterized this administrative arrangement, however. In the first place, several important forms of foreign aid were not brought into the central administrative scheme. The category of aid termed "military assistance", including military equipment, supplies and training, continued to be administered by the Department of Defense, subject to the overall direction of the President and oversight by the Secretary of State with respect to foreign policy objectives. To this category was added, in 1955, "direct forces support", which somewhat broadened the concept of military assistance. Numerous other forms of aid still were left largely to the Departments of Agriculture (under Public Law 480), Interior, Commerce, Health, Education and Welfare, and even the Atomic Energy Commission (for the atoms-for-peace program). Although some provision was made for the coordination of these functions with the lines of policy determined in the Department of State, there have been many shortcomings in practice.

In the second place, the placing of the International Cooperation Administration within the Department of State only partially met the need for the centralization of administrative authority. While the ICA was technically within the Department of State, it was still, in most respects, a separate agency. It has been the occupant, in fact, of a kind of twilight zone, in which the functions of the agency came in touch with those of the State Department in theory only at the level of the Secretary of State—in practice, that of the Under Secretary. As between this situation and that of the former Foreign Operations Administration there has not been much to choose. This becomes the more apparent as the contrasts in personnel policy between State and ICA are observed.

Need for greater coordination

In these circumstances, since some measure of coordination of activities of the several departments and agencies is indispensable to the conduct of foreign relations, we have simply a perpetuation of the arrangement that has proved to be so impractical during the earlier stages in our national experience in the administration of foreign aid—namely, coordination by committees at various levels. It is not necessary to enter into detail to gain a fair idea of the degree of administrative confusion that presently characterizes our foreign aid operations when viewed as a system. There is, at the top, the National Security Council, created by the National Security Act of 1947. This is presided over by the President and constitutes the senior advisory group on national security affairs, including, of course, the political objectives of all forms of foreign assistance. While the Secretaries of State and Defense are members of this council, the Director of the International Cooperation Administration is not, although he may attend meetings and be heard. The Director is, however, a member of the National Security Council Planning Board and he participates as well, in foreign assistance matters, in the work of the Operations Coordinating Board, concerned with the integrated implementation of national security policies.

Two major Cabinet committees also deal with foreign economic policy: the National Advisory Council on International Monetary and Financial Problems and the Council on Foreign Economic Policy. To these may be added the Interagency Committee on Agricultural Surplus Disposal. Inevitably there is considerable overlapping of responsibility and duplication of effort in all this. Experience has shown that there is only more duplication of effort, less consistency in the implementing of basic foreign policy, and greater wastage of the national substance where the degree of autonomy is greater among the several agencies concerned with the administration of foreign aid. The conclusion, therefore, is inescapable: now that foreign aid is bound up essentially with national security considerations, it should be viewed as a concomitant of foreign policy and administered in that light.

PROPOSED INTEGRATION OF FOREIGN AID ACTIVITIES

Realigning of the International Cooperation Administration

This naturally would properly begin with the full merging of the functions of the International Cooperation Administration with related Department of State operations. There is now a clear parallelism of structure between the geographic divisions of the ICA and those of the Department of State. There is a considerable degree of similarity, too, between their functional operations. Both agencies are concerned with various aspects of transportation, communication, promotion of trade and exchange of persons. There is likewise a distinct similarity in administrative organization with respect to budgetary staffs, personnel, congressional relations, and other administrative matters. A merger undoubtedly would result in avoidance of duplication and hence in increased efficiency in all of these categories.

Moreover, such a merger would eliminate most of the present three-way consultation among the Departments of State and Defense and the International Cooperation Administration. Similar simplification would apply also to relations with other agencies, such as the Departments of Agriculture, Commerce, Interior, and Labor, all of which have overseas assistance functions. A move of this nature would augment the position of Under Secretary of State for Economic Affairs. This Under Secretary would logically become the Director of International Cooperation Administration activities and would have as his programing and policy staff for foreign aid the organization of the present International Cooperation Administration. This, of course, would end the present anomalous situation of the ICA, which is in but not of the Department of State, and would still preserve all of the advantages of a unified grouping of foreign assistance functions.

As Under Secretary, the Director of the foreign aid program would have direct access to the Secretary of State. Further advantage would follow from the consolidation of the staff of the Special Assistant for Mutual Security Coordination with that of the International Cooperation Administration, which would aid materially in coordinating military assistance with economic aid.

Military assistance

Inasmuch as military assistance forms part and parcel of the national defense program, the Department of Defense naturally will continue to administer assistance in this form. Defense support, however, which is essentially a form of economic assistance, can be handled logically only among the functions of an expanded Department of State.

Development Loan Fund

The Development Loan Fund, established by Congress within the International Cooperation Administration in 1957, to be operated under the general supervision of the President and the policy guidance of the Department of State, likewise ought to be brought wholly within the framework of the Department of State. The Fund is no less an instrument of American foreign policy for being incorporated and thus it requires to be under the foreign policy direction of the Secretary of State. The close relationship between the kinds of service performed by the Development Loan Fund and the Export-Import Bank gives strong support to the view that a single agency administering both loans and grants for developmental purposes would be in a far better position than two separate agencies, even though linked by coordinating arrangements, to appraise a country need and to make certain that assistance is not given as grants where loans are feasible. A merger would make sure that the development lending function, previously performed by the Export-Import Bank, would adhere more closely to the basic developmental policies formulated by the International Cooperation Administration as the voice of the Department of State.

Technical assistance

All recent studies of technical assistance appear to agree that this form of aid should be continued substantially as at present within the Department of State. It should be administered quite apart from development assistance, however, lest the specific purpose of the two forms of assistance might become obscured and technical assistance become confused with the more urgent needs of foreign policy. The program of technical cooperation, although relatively small in terms of dollar costs, is virtually worldwide in scope and essentially long term in nature. To be effective, it requires stability in financing and in administration, for its eventual returns are likely to be of great significance.

Public Law 480

Few forms of foreign aid are more in need of streamlining than that involving the use of U.S. agricultural surpluses as embodied in Public Law 480. As developed in the President's Executive Order, Public Law 480 activities are assigned primarily to the Department of Agriculture. At the same time, the Executive order makes clear that, in matters relating to foreign policy, the preeminence of the Department of State always must be recognized. The whole program, said the President, "must be carried out in accordance with and in furtherance of our foreign policy objectives." The Department of State consequently was assigned the task of negotiating sales agreements with foreign countries in order to advertise the State Department's "central responsibility" in this field of activity. The President was aware that the programs embraced by Public Law 480 already involved the services of a number of agencies other than the Departments of Agriculture and State: these diverse functions received recognition in the Executive order. Associated in the complex workings of the act

were the Bureau of the Budget, the Treasury Department, the Office of Defense Mobilization, the General Services Administration, the Department of Defense, the Commodity Credit Corporation, and the International Cooperation Administration as apart from the Department of State, which latter agency was given specific functions in addition to policy formulation. In order to achieve coordination among so many agencies, the Interagency Committee on Agricultural Surplus Disposal was created. Even so, the steps necessary to the analysis of need in a foreign country and the process by which agreements involving agricultural surpluses have been proposed, recommended, negotiated, and finally carried out has been extremely complicated, involving many delays and, not infrequently, setbacks. Very often aid thus supplied tended to invade the area of other forms of aid provided by this Government.

Since in all likelihood the form of aid represented by Public Law 840 will continue indefinitely to be made available, now that it has proved to be a potent means of strengthening our foreign relations, it is high time that its administration be improved. The most practicable method of approach to this difficult task would appear to be the centralization of responsibility for this, along with other forms of foreign aid, in the Department of State, thus carrying into practice both the spirit and the intent of the President's Executive Order implementing the enactment of Public Law 480 in 1954.

CONCLUSION

Consensus of special studies

Studies which have been made of foreign assistance in its various forms with references to its multiple origins, the actual administrative experienced gained thus far in the postwar period, and its probable role in the future[1] have set forth in exhaustive detail the steps by which the present extremely complicated legislative and administrative pattern of foreign assistance has evolved. While these studies have sought only to analyze the various stages in this evolutionary process without attempting to arrive at final conclusions which would serve as unerring guides to improved methods of administration in future, the analyses rather clearly supports the view that the principal shortcoming in each of the administrative plans thus far devised and put into operation, despite the provisions made for the coordination of the several features of each program, has been the lack of unity; that is, the lack of integration in each administrative plan as it has worked out in practice. This has been due not so much to the lack of special policy instructions as set forth in the basic foreign assistance legislation nor to the absence of coordinating machinery in the form of joint boards and committees. Obviously it has been owing in large part to these difficulties and handicaps:

1. A multiplicity of interdepartmental committees and subcommittees with overlapping and conflicting jurisdiction in the various realms of economic foreign relations. This reflects, perhaps, a tendency toward the arbitrary separation of policy and operating functions.

2. Unclearly defined functions of the departments and agencies of administration themselves. As an apt example, note the commodity and production responsibilities that range through a number of agencies, such as the Interior Department, the Department of Justice, and the Tariff Commission; or the distribution of powers involving petroleum policy among the Departments of Interior, Commerce, and State.

3. The lack of a single focal agency with primary responsibility for the administration of all foreign aid, which has resulted in makeshift arrangements and unworkable compromises in interdepartmental relations.

Thus, on balance, there appears to be a clear and present need for bringing the entire foreign aid program into a single comprehensive and integrated administrative arrangement and, at the same time, into consistent alinement with foreign policy objectives.

Mr. Speaker, the need for something like H.R. 5816 was recognized in the penetrating testimony given at a public hearing of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on February 18, 1959, by Mr. Harlan Cleveland, dean of the Maxwell Graduate School of Citizenship and Public Affairs, Syracuse University. I include relevant excerpts from Mr. Cleveland's testimony:

THE ADMINISTRATION OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS

The many programs we have overseas—military and economic aid, international and private philanthropy, business and educational contacts by the thousands—give us an unparalleled opportunity to relate ourselves effectively to the coming leadership of the uncommitted areas of the world, and the (temporarily) committed areas, too. But the use of all these fingers is paralyzed by the extraordinary confusion in our bureaucratic shoulder muscles. We are doing many admirable things in the world, but we have yet to relate them effectively to each other and to the central purposes of our foreign policy.

Take the military aid program as an example. The able generals and colonels in charge of most Military Assistance Advisory Groups abroad now carefully limit their functions to training troops in the use of new weapons and advising on military organizations and tactics. Yet in a dozen countries or more, the arms and advice we supply and the military officers we thereby build up are almost bound to have a powerful (often, as we have seen in the Middle East, a controlling) voice in determining the political composition of the government, the direction of economic development, and the foreign-policy posture of newly independent countries.

Similarly, the impact of our "technical" and economic aid is important in determining the direction of domestic politics in several dozen nations. A Minister of Health may ride to the premiership on a malaria eradication program or a carefully distributed network of rural health clinics. In this progress-conscious era, a rising leader looks not for a white horse but for a popular plan of economic development.

Yet if, in most countries, you ask the technical-assistance people about these political impacts, you will generally be told that these are matters for the political people over at the Embassy. The trouble is that the political people are not in contact with the rising class of Army officers and economic planners. Moreover, many of our Ambassadors are ill-equipped by training or inclination to provide the executive leadership of the large group of U.S. operating programs—nor is it clear that Congress or the President wants them to assume this role.

The difficulty of executive leadership in the field is compounded by the charming pluralism of our operations in Washington. Administrative decisions are generally taken with a careful eye on jurisdictional lines in Washington, and only the vaguest sort of notion as to how our many foreign-aid operations look to the other countries.

We see no particular damage, for instance, in setting up a new agency every time we get a new idea about how to finance public investment abroad, or want to start a specialized new program of technical assistance. As things now stand, the leaders will normally deal with 16, 18, and often more than 20 different agencies purveying various kinds of assistance to their development plans. In our enthusiasm for modernizing every economy we can reach, we have tended to close our eyes to the administrative burden which we place on the governments of the less developed countries by proliferating the independent agencies we create to "help" them.

* * * * *

There is some voluntary cooperation among these agencies at headquarters level and in the field. But by and large it is up to the Government receiving the aid to coordinate the aiders. Governments which are far from being able to coordinate the effective use of their own resources; governments which are, indeed, receiving advice on public administration from several technical-assistance agencies because of their very inability to man the professional and administrative tasks the modern world thrusts upon them; these governments are expected to mould into an integrated program the knowledge, skills, prejudices, and weaknesses of hundreds of foreigners, most of whom are unaware of the history, politics, or even the language of the country whose domestic policies they are influencing.

And the situation is getting worse, not better. In most countries, the number of Americans and U.N. agency advisers is almost certainly increasing more rapidly than the local government's capacity to cope with them. The time for consolidation of our efforts in this respect is already overdue.

Mr. Speaker, the House Committee on Foreign Affairs has just started its annual hearings on the foreign assistance program. I intend at the appropriate time to offer H.R. 5816 as an amendment to this year's mutual security authorization. I hope that all Members who share my uneasiness over the present organization of our foreign assistance establishment will suggest ways of improving H.R. 5816 so that it may accomplish its purpose more effectively.

FOREIGN CLAIMS SETTLEMENT COMMISSION

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a new bill relating to an unfinished matter which I have discussed on the floor of the House many times in the past. It is a matter which goes to the very conscience of this country.

Once again, Mr. Speaker, I am addressing myself to the unethical, unprincipled, and unjust manner in which leg-

---

[1] The Administration of Foreign Affairs and Overseas Operations: A Report Prepared for the Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President. The International Studies Group. The Brookings Institution, 1951.

Organization and Administration of Technical Assistance Programs; Staff Study No. 2, Printed for the Committee on Foreign Relations; 84th Cong., 1st sess., 1955. Foreign Aid: Report of the Special (Senate) Committee To Study the Foreign Aid Program; 85th Cong., 1st sess., 1957. Foreign Aid Program: Compilation of Studies and Surveys. Prepared under the Direction of the Special Committee To Study the Foreign Aid Programs, U.S. Senate: 85th Cong., 1st sess., 1957. The Mutual Security Act of 1958: Report of the Committee on Foreign Relations on H.R. 12181: 85th Cong., 2d sess., 1958.

islation enacted by the Congress has been implemented by the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission.

Specifically I have reference to Public Law 615, 83d Congress. The purpose of this law was to compensate those veterans of the Korean war who were incarcerated by the enemy and who suffered inhumane treatment as prisoners of war. The only condition upon which this compensation was dependent, quite properly, was that the recipient could not knowingly and without duress have collaborated with the enemy.

The bill which I have introduced today, Mr. Speaker, would provide judicial review for nearly two dozen Korean prisoners of war whose claims for compensation have been denied by the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission.

When Public Law 615 was enacted, no provision for judicial review was included because it was felt that the compensation in question was not being given as a matter of right, but more as a matter of grace from a grateful Nation. Furthermore, and much more relevant at this point, is the fact that assurances were received from the man who is now Chairman of the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission that there would be numerous appellate procedures to assure claimants every possible safeguard against arbitrary decisions.

Unhappily, Mr. Speaker, there are a number of instances where failure to establish proper procedures has resulted in the most grisly kind of deliberate injustice. The actual fact of the matter is that some claimants have had their claims denied on the basis of collaboration with the enemy without being accorded so much as a full and fair hearing before the Claims Commission.

The bill which I offer today, Mr. Speaker, is offered on the basis of documentary evidence of dishonest and fraudulent procedures instituted by the Chairman of the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission and tacitly agreed to by other members of the Commission.

If hearings on this bill are scheduled, I promise to produce uncontrovertible evidence of the dishonesty and fraud with which I charge the Commission, including witnesses who have had first-hand experience with the Commission's quicksand concept of justice—witnesses who will give testimony on the unchecked procedures which have allowed American boys to be branded as traitors to their country without so much as a hearing at which to defend themselves.

Mr. Speaker, the Congress never intended Public Law 615 to result in serious miscarriages of justice at the hands of the Claims Commission. For the Congress to have closed its eyes to these injustices as they have been practiced in recent years is difficult to understand. But it will be even more incomprehensible if we compound this past negligence by refusing claimants under Public Law 615 the opportunity of defending their honor in a court of law.

It occurs to me, Mr. Speaker, that all of us are prone to bypass unpleasant situations whenever we can do so. Perhaps the Congress is guilty of this same human foible. But maybe if something is said about this particular unpleasant situation for a long enough time, the 22 boys who have been accused of betraying America will be given the dubious privilege of trying to prove their innocence. This is a country where free men are assumed innocent until proven guilty.

It is with this in mind, Mr. Speaker, that I promise to take the floor of the House of Representatives and speak further on this matter at least once a week from now on until some action is taken to treat with minimum fairness the 22 claimants who have had their prisoner-of-war benefits denied by the Claims Commission on the basis of collaboration with the enemy.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I want to insert in the RECORD a letter to Mr. Whitney Gillilland, Chairman, Foreign Claims Settlement Commission, from Joseph L. Rauh, Jr. Mr. Rauh has served for several years without compensation as attorney for one of the 22 claimants mentioned above, Mr. Joseph Hammond, formerly of Toledo, Ohio, and now a resident of California.

WASHINGTON, D.C., *March 2, 1959.*

Mr. WHITNEY GILLILLAND,
Chairman, Foreign Claims Settlement Commission of the United States. Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. GILLILLAND: Enclosed please find memorandum submitted pursuant to your order of October 1, 1958, the oral discussion before the Commission of November 6, 1958, and your letter of December 18, 1958. In accordance with the statement in your letter of December 18 that "there is certainly no requirement that you obtain statements from witnesses throughout the country," we are submitting our offers of proof as a statement by counsel as to what he would hope and expect to prove at a hearing if one were granted.

In our letter to the Commission dated December 8, 1958, we indicated that we were seeking funds from a foundation so that we would be in a position to make the requested offers of proof in as detailed a fashion as possible. No such funds have been forthcoming and our offers of proof are necessarily limited by the absence of any resources whatever, not only for counsel fees (counsel is serving without fee), but also for such rudimentary essentials as travel costs or even long-distance telephone calls. Even as thus limited, however, we confidently believe that the offers of proof demonstrate the overwhelming merit of claimant's case and the absolute necessity for a full and fair hearing.

We would like to repeat the request, made in our petition for rehearing of June 27, 1958, that the Commission appoint an outside hearing examiner of undisputed stature such as Supreme Court Justice Stanley Reed, Supreme Court Justice Sherman Minton, Supreme Court Justice Harold Burton, Court of Appeals Judge Learned Hand or one of the many other outstanding jurists who would undoubtedly be willing to undertake the chore of such a hearing. Because of the hostility of the Commission, and particularly of its chairman, to claimant Hammond's case and to Congressman ASHLEY who befriended Hammond, it would seem particularly advisable that an independent third party be brought into the case at this point.

The Commission's order of October 1, 1958 states that "the hearing will be public or private as the claimant may elect." Claimant elects public.

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH L. RAUH, Jr.

MEMORANDUM (FCSC CLAIM NO. K-251435)

I. JURISDICTION

The Commission's order of October 1, 1958, addressed to claimant's petition for rehearing of June 27, 1958, states "that hearing be and is hereby granted for the purpose of reexamination of the question as to what jurisdiction, if any, the Commission may continue to have in the matter." In the Chairman's letter of November 18, 1958, there is a further reference "to the important question of jurisdiction" and a statement that the Commission was looking forward to our brief on this point.

Claimant's counsel is at a total loss as to just what the Commission desires in the way of a brief on the question of jurisdiction. Claimant's counsel states in all sincerity that he sees no legal problem whatever concerning the Commission's jurisdiction to right the incredible injustices done in this case.

Claimant's position on the issue of jurisdiction was stated in his letter to the Commission, dated October 24, 1958, as follows:

"Has any question been raised concerning the Commission's jurisdiction in this matter and, if so, what is the question and by whom was it raised? Since the Commission obviously had jurisdiction over this matter, and since nothing appears anywhere in the record that would have caused the Commission to lose jurisdiction, we do not understand that any substantial question of jurisdiction is involved in this matter. If what the Commission has in mind is whether the claimant has pressed his claim with due diligence, we most respectfully assert that Mr. Hammond had been unusually aggressive in presenting this matter, and, furthermore, due diligence is not a jurisdictional issue anyway. In view of our repeated efforts over the years to obtain a reconsideration of this case, it is hard to think of any jurisdictional problem that could presently arise."

At the oral discussion on November 6, 1958, claimant's counsel made the identical point. No clear statement as to who was raising the issue of jurisdiction or how the Commission could possibly have lost the jurisdiction which it once admittedly had, was ever given in response to counsel's request. Since we know of no authority, precedents, or reasons depriving the Commission of jurisdiction of claimant's case, we are at a loss to file a brief on this point and can do no more than once again to restate the facts demonstrating this Commission's jurisdiction.

On December 23, 1955, the Commission handed down its decision adverse to claimant. On January 4, 1956, the undersigned, having been retained by Hammond, petitioned the Commission for a rehearing. On January 9, 1956, the rehearing was denied on the ground that a year had elapsed since the filing of Hammond's claim and this resulted in a "want of jurisdiction by the Commission pursuant to section 6(e)(5) of the War Claims Act of 1948." On April 12, 1956, the undersigned filed a second petition for rehearing, calling to the attention of the Commission certain cases wherein reconsideration was given to claims more than a year after they had been filed. On April 26, 1956, the Commission admitted its error on the 1-year cutoff date on which ground the first petition for rehearing had been denied, but denied the second petition for rehearing on the ground that the Commission's "rules do not provide for rehearings." This latter point was not only irrelevant since the Commission's rules did not prevent the Commission from holding rehearings under general principles of administrative law, but was in direct conflict with the testimony of the Commission Chairman on June 7, 1954, in hearings on the War Claims Act Amendments of 1954, that "under our present regulations there are a whole series of rehearings, and reviews before the Commission itself * * *

within the agency itself there are all kinds of chances to get another bite at the apple." Hearings Before a Subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, House of Representatives (83d Cong., 2d sess., p. 36). In its April 26, 1956, letter, the Commission, apparently recognizing the weakness of its answer that its rules do not provide for rehearings, stated that it would reexamine the claim and notify the claimant if any change in result were indicated. No notification, favorable or unfavorable, was ever forthcoming.

On November 22, 1957, the undersigned consulted Chairman Gillilland concerning the possibilities of a rehearing and the Chairman clearly intimated that a rehearing would be forthcoming, particularly if the independent investigation of the facts then being conducted by Mr. William Peters of Redbook magazine supported Hammond's story. On May 8, 1958, after the publication of Peters' article in Redbook completely substantiating Hammond's story, a third petition for rehearing was filed. This was rejected in a letter from Chairman Gillilland dated May 20, 1958, apparently on the ground that an insufficient case had been made out for the rehearing. That third petition for rehearing had been extremely abbreviated and informal because counsel had been led to believe that there would be no difficulty in obtaining the rehearing if the Redbook article sustained Hammond, as it did. A fourth detailed petition for rehearing was filed on June 27, 1958, to present the full case to the Commission. On October 1, 1958, the Commission entered an order granting the petition for rehearing at least in part.

This brief review of the facts makes abundantly clear that the Commission had jurisdiction and that claimant has done nothing to cause the Commission to lose jurisdiction. We cannot believe that any administrative agency would assert that claimant should be denied his rights because the Commission took, or omitted, some unspecified action which it now asserts to be the cause of losing jurisdiction without any fault on the part of claimant.

Claimant has been diligent in urging his rights. There can be no possible claim of laches against him and none has ever been asserted by the Commission. Nor is laches in any sense a jurisdictional issue.

The issue before the Commission is not whether Congress will appropriate funds to pay claimant his claim or to reimburse him for the additional wrong which this Commission has done to him; the issue is whether the Commission will hear the claimant and clear him of its finding that he was a collaborator and thus a traitor. One would have thought that the Commission would be anxious on its own accord to grant claimant a fair hearing before an impartial examiner; certainly one hopes and believes that it will do so now at the behest of a loyal American citizen so long and so wrongfully branded as disloyal.

We respectfully suggest that the editors of Redbook magazine were correct when they pointed out that "the actions of an official Government body in this (Hammond) case, we feel, constitute a serious abuse of individual rights and demonstrate the need for safeguards against the kind of procedure by which Joseph Hammond was deprived both of the compensation due him as an American prisoner of war, and of his good reputation." We respectfully urge the Commission to come forward now and provide those safeguards itself by presenting the case to an independent examiner and letting the chips fall where they may.

II. OFFERS OF PROOF

1. Claimant offers to prove through William Peters, the only man who has ever made a thorough, independent, and impartial study of Joseph Hammond's case, that Hammond never gave aid to or collaborated with or in any manner served the enemy. On the contrary, claimant offers to prove through said Peters that claimant suffered incredible hardships from the enemy precisely because he would not "go along" with his captors. As to times, places, and details of what will be proved through said Peters, we submit his article in the April 1958 Redbook magazine and offer to prove through his testimony each and every statement therein. We also offer to prove through said Peters, and as corroboration of his testimony, that the Chairman of the Commission in effect conceded the truth of the article by refusing the opportunity offered to him to comment upon it.

2. We offer to prove, through Major, now Colonel, John McLaughlin, that the article tendered in paragraph 1 above is true and correct in all material respects. We offer to prove through Colonel McLaughlin (and the editors of Redbook magazine) that the article was shown to him prior to publication and that he informed the editors that he could detect no departure from the truth of what actually occurred. We offer to prove further, through Colonel, then Major, McLaughlin, that he was the senior officer in the prison camp at the time of the events in which the Commission seems so interested and supported the men in their various pretenses at indoctrination and "going along." A possible further officer who might be helpful in this connection, but whose whereabouts we have not yet obtained, is Capt. William Sinapan.

3. We offer to prove, through Derek Kinne, the incredible hardships of Joseph Hammond during his captivity. Kinne, a British soldier captured in Korea, has written a book about the tortures, beatings, and inhuman privations that ensued during his years as a prisoner. Kinne tells in his book how the end of the long road of unbelievable horror for himself was being placed in a wooden box. Then he continues (p. 160):

"With my gradual recovery from the beatings and the comparative inattention of the guards, I began to take more notice of my surroundings. After long hours of peering through knot-holes in the door and peeping out of the latrine, I discovered the whereabouts of three other prisoners, also in solitary confinement. With one of them, I established communication by finding a note from him in the latrine. His name was Joe Hammond."

The name of the book is "The Wooden Boxes" by Derek Kinne, published by Frederick Muller Ltd., London, and is available at the Congressional Library. Kinne's book evidences nothing but hatred of collaborators and informants and yet he has only kind words for both Hammond and Conte, Hammond's closest friend. Describing Conte's group, Kinne has this to say of them (p. 79):

"Men who had not been inside the camp 5 minutes before they were planning to resist our common enemies, our captors, by one means or another. Some were NCO's; some were not. All were men of outstanding courage and determination; men whose love of the way of life they believed in was sufficient to take them to the furthermost ends of the road of resistance and suffering."

4. We offer to prove, through the Commission's own records and by interrogatories and requests for admissions, (i) that the Commission has awarded full POW compensation to scores, if not hundreds, of other POW's charged with the same items of derogatory information as Hammond (such as contributing to the camp newspaper, signing the peace appeal, etc.), and (ii) to others, such as a Colonel Fleming (convicted by court martial), who had actually collaborated with the enemy, while Hammond did not collaborate and received an honorable discharge. We further offer to prove from the Commission's own records that, while a substantial number of claims were initially denied by the Commission, by this time practically all claims have been paid and that the sole reason for the failure of the Commission to reverse itself on Hammond's claim is the hostility which has developed to this case by virtue of friendly congressional interest therein.

5. We offer to prove, through the Commission's own records and by interrogatories and requests for admissions, that the Commission had at one time the policy of making partial awards where the claimant had suffered greatly during a substantial part of his captivity, but that this policy was revised in favor of awarding POW benefits for the entire period in such cases, and further that, pursuant to this change in policy, the earlier partial grants were amended into payments in full.

6. We offer to corroborate the offers of proof in paragraphs 4 and 5 through the testimony of Andrew J. McGuire, General Counsel, and Joseph H. DeWitt, Executive Director, of the Commission.

7. We offer to prove, through Eugene Kinkead, author of "In Every War But One," that one in seven of those taken prisoner in Korea was guilty of serious collaboration. Taken together with the offers of proof in paragraphs 4, 5, and 6, above, we offer to prove that the singling out of Hammond's case for denial was arbitrary, capricious, and unconstitutional.

8. We offer to prove, through claimant and his closest army friend, Salvatore Conte, that (i) claimant was not a collaborator during the very short period of time that the Commission asserts he was (less than 10 percent of the total time he was a prisoner); and (ii) claimant was subject to inhuman treatment for substantially his entire captivity and that this treatment all but cost him his life.

9. We offer to prove, through claimant and Conte, that each and every item relied upon by the Commission (Christmas Party, U.S.S.A., Peace Appeal, and New Life) were either intended as jibes at the Chinese, were changed by the Chinese without claimant's consent, or were done by him out of genuine fear for his life. In particular, we offer to prove, through claimant, Conte and McLaughlin, that the so-called Peace Appeal was signed by all prisoners with the support of Major McLaughlin and that claimant's chairmanship of the committee, which apparently is at the root of all his trouble, was due to the following absurd circumstance:

"In the fifth week of indoctrination * * * two men from each squad met to elect a central committee to draft the appeal, which the Chinese were promoting as a 'final examination.' Hammond was elected to the committee. At the committee's insistence the senior American officer served as an adviser. The group met only twice. When the Chinese demanded the election of a chairman, each member nominated the man on his right; then each nominee withdrew in order. Hammond, nominated last, withdrew last; but the Chinese insisted he serve."

10. We offer to prove, through claimant, and the prosecutor and the defense attorney at the trial of Sgt. William H. Olson that claimant was persuaded by the prosecutor to give testimony, in an effort to obtain a conviction of Olson, which painted a picture of claimant's activities wholly at variance with the total picture. We offer to prove that claimant's efforts to carry out what he had been persuaded was his patriotic duty and to testify for the prosecution by stretching everything to help the Government and never explaining or justifying his actions has now been used by the Commission to support its unwarranted denial of his claim.

11. We offer to prove, through Gus Dunis, who was in the same squad with claimant at Kangee, that claimant tried and did talk the Chinese into medical care for the sick and wounded when no one else did; that, while the young prisoners of war fought among themselves, Hammond tried and succeeded in holding them together; that a lot of the prisoners would have died if it had not been for Hammond; that Hammond cried all night because the Chinese wanted him to do something that Hammond felt would be an act against his country and that when the Communists kept the pressure up, Hammond got mad and said that they could shoot him but he would not do it. We offer to corroborate, through Gus Dunis, the material in paragraphs 8 and 9 above.

12. We offer to corroborate all of the above through one or more of the following or others: Captain Harrison, William R. Knipple, Ray Hikida, D. C. Richards (praised by Kinne as part of Conte's group), Herman Whalen.

III. CONCLUSION

It is respectfully submitted that, in accordance with the order of October 1, 1958, the hearing be set on 4 weeks' notice before an independent examiner.

Respectfully submitted,

JOSEPH L. RAUH, Jr.

AMENDMENT TO NATIONAL DEFENSE EDUCATION ACT OF 1958

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced today an amendment to the National Defense Education Act of 1958 to prevent the exploitation of one part of this program by the Soviet Union, and I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks on this subject.

The National Defense Education Act of 1958 authorizes $280 million in Federal grants for the purchase of scientific equipment by schools and junior colleges. This program is now getting underway. To coincide with this development, the Soviet Union has started exporting Russian-made scientific equipment to our country for use on the secondary school and junior college level. The equipment is priced so low as to force itself upon the attention of our school people. For even with the 40-percent duty which applies to most of this equipment, this Soviet scientific equipment is priced to sell here at one-quarter or one-fifth the price of comparable American products.

There is no question of meeting price competition in this situation. It is obvious that the Soviets have priced this equipment for political and propaganda purposes. Their goal clearly is to flood our schools with Soviet scientific equipment and so create a great impression among our school-age youth. What a propaganda target this is for the Soviets, to have American youth receive science training with Soviet equipment.

In addition to its propaganda goal, this latest maneuver by the Soviet Union ranks as another of its schemes to damage another segment of our economy by usurping the market. These hit-and-run economic tactics are forming a clear pattern of Soviet strategy in the economic war it has declared against us. Profit and loss considerations are of no concern to the Soviets on products which they select as weapons in their economic warfare. The political, propaganda, and economic advantages justify any cost in the Soviet system.

I believe we should recognize these tactics for what they are and meet them head-on. I do not believe that we should aid and abet these Soviet maneuvers by appropriating Federal funds for the purchase of these politically priced goods. Therefore, I have introduced a bill today to prohibit the purchase of this Soviet scientific equipment with grants made from funds appropriated for the National Defense Education Act of 1958. This is a matter which commands the attention and concern of all of us.

CREDIT UNION LEGISLATION, H.R. 3674 AND 3675

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the entire year of 1959 has been designated Anniversary Year by the international credit union movement, which is now serving more than 12½ million people throughout the United States and many other parts of the world. I would like to call attention to the credit union movement's remarkable record of achievements during the past half century. By fulfilling the twofold objectives of teaching people the real meaning of thrift and by making available a low-cost source of personal credit, it has helped people of all areas of the world, and of all races, colors and creeds, to help themselves to a greater share of financial independence and economic security.

As one part of this year's Anniversary Year celebration, the credit union movement is celebrating the 25th anniversary of the first Federal Credit Union Act, which was enacted on June 26, 1934. This act has enabled millions of Americans, from Alaska to the Canal Zone and from Maine to Hawaii, to join together in credit unions to save and to provide each other with a constant and convenient source of low-cost credit.

One of the most amazing facts about this activity is that the Bureau of Federal Credit Unions, which charters and supervises the Federal credit unions, is completely self-supporting, obtaining its income from supervision fees paid by the Federal credit unions.

The other anniversaries that will be celebrated by the credit union movement during 1959 are the 50th anniversary of the first credit union in the United States, the 50th anniversary of the first State credit union law in the United States, and the 25th birthday of the Credit Union National Association (CUNA), the nonprofit voluntary organization of the more than 25,000 credit unions operating in the world today.

The first credit union in the United States was organized in Manchester, N.H., in 1909, by a Canadian legislative reporter, Alphonse Desjardins, who brought the credit union idea to this continent in 1900 when he organized a credit union in Levis, Quebec. Desjardins had picked up the idea from Europe where it was first developed by a German, Friedrich Wilhelm Raiffeisen, and carried throughout Europe by people of other nationalities. This international flavor of the credit union idea is being furthered today by CUNA, as it promotes the development of credit unions and the democratic idea of self-help through cooperation throughout such underdeveloped areas as the Fiji Islands, southeast Asia, Africa, and South America. This work has made many friends for the United States in these areas, and has given some of these people their first teachings in our democratic way of life.

The first credit union law in the United States was passed in the State of Massachusetts in 1909, largely because of the efforts of two great Americans, Pierre Jay, then banking commissioner of Massachusetts, and Edward A. Filene, a prominent Boston merchant and philanthropist, who first saw in credit unions a method by which people of small means could gain a larger share of control over their own economic destinies.

Today half of the credit unions in this country are federally chartered. There are almost 10,000 of them and they serve more than 5 million of our citizens.

Operating on the theory that an individual's most valuable asset is his character, these Federal credit unions have marked up an outstanding record in the field of personal finance. During the past 25 years, less than one-fifth of 1 percent of the millions of dollars they have loaned has not been repaid by their members—a record that any financial institution would be proud of.

Although the Federal Credit Union Act has proven to be a remarkably effective instrument during the 25 years of its existence, it has not kept pace in many respects with the changes in our economy and the evolving needs of credit unions and their members which have arisen during this period. In view of that situation our distinguished colleague from Montana [Mr. ANDERSON] introduced H.R. 12819 in the last Congress. I introduced H.R. 12877 and H.R. 13871 in the last Congress.

These bills have received wide publicity resulting in much attention being given to this important subject matter.

As a result, both Representative ANDERSON and I have received considerable correspondence with reference thereto.

During the recess and since the convening of this Congress, we have had the opportunity to meet and consult with many persons and association representatives familiar with the operations of credit unions.

After many months of independent research and close consultation, on January 29, 1959, I introduced a bill—H.R. 3674—designed to modernize and recodify the act. Congressman ANDERSON of Montana, who has long been a student of credit unions, on the same day, introduced an identical bill—H.R. 3675. Both bills are being supported by the Credit Union National Association and by credit unions throughout the country.

We invite our colleagues to join us in urging enactment of this important and worthwhile legislation.

I am pleased to set forth here a copy of the letter sent to me by the Credit Union National Association, Inc., the original of which was sent to our distinguished chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee, Mr. SPENCE, which reads as follows:

CREDIT UNION NATIONAL ASSOCIATION, INC.,
Madison, Wis., February 19, 1959.

Hon. BRENT SPENCE,
Chairman, House Banking and Currency Committee, House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPENCE: On January 29, bills were introduced by Congressman MULTER (H.R. 3674) and Congressman ANDERSON (H.R. 3675) which are identical in all respects and propose a number of amendments designed to modernize and recodify the Federal Credit Union Act. These bills are supported by the Credit Union National Association, which represents the organized credit union movement.

As you know, we are this year celebrating the 25th anniversary of passage of the Federal Credit Union Act. Although credit unions have made a remarkable record of achievement, the law under which they function has not undergone a major revision during this time. The amendments contained in the Multer and Anderson bills are designed to allow Federal credit unions to serve the evolving thrift and credit needs of their more than 5 million members in a more effective manner.

Therefore, on behalf of the approximately 9,000 Federal credit unions and their members, we respectfully request that your committee consider these bills at the earliest possible convenience. We also request the opportunity to submit a statement and appear before your committee at that time. If possible, we would appreciate your advising us as to the approximate date when the Banking and Currency Committee could consider the proposed legislation.

We regret that we did not have the opportunity to honor you in person at our congressional dinner in Washington on February 4, as 1 of the 28 present Members of Congress who were instrumental in passing the original Federal Credit Union Act in 1934. However, we are grateful for your continuing interest in and contribution to the credit union movement through the years.

Sincerely yours,

H. VANCE AUSTIN,
Managing Director.

ADDITIONAL FUNDS NEEDED FOR SCHOOL MILK PROGRAM

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I know my colleagues whose schools in their States are facing the same problem as the public schools in my State of California, that is, the lack of funds to continue the special milk program in the remainder of the current school year, will be as pleased as I am that the Committee on Agriculture has favorably reported an additional $3 million authorization.

Only yesterday I appeared before this committee to urge prompt legislative action to preclude the discontinuance of this important nutritional program. The Committee on Agriculture should certainly be complimented on its prompt action to supplement the annual appropriation of $75 million.

Mr. Speaker, under Public Law 85–478, the special milk program was extended for 3 years, from July 1, 1958 to June 30, 1961 with an annual authorization of $75 million. The success of this program has meant that this authorization is not sufficient; therefore, I respectfully urge my colleagues to give support to legislation to increase this annual appropriation. There are several bills, differing in amounts, which propose to increase the funds for this program. It is my hope that Congress will authorize sufficient funds in order to allay in the future the emergency or crisis situation which we are now facing.

This year's emergency situation has been created by the fact that the special milk program has been well received, thus resulting in expenditures equaling the fund allotments granted to the States. For example, more than 30 States, including my State of California, are faced with the problem of insufficient funds—from relatively small amounts to large amounts—to meet the estimated needs for fiscal 1959. Thus there is an urgency to meet these adjusted requirements, based on total apportionment of funds as against estimated needs, by offering a supplemental appropriation. The simple issue is, will the Congress make sure that no child will be forced to do without milk at the lunch hour? In my own State the program will come to an end by early May if additional funds are not forthcoming.

I urge my colleagues to give full support to additional funds now and to authorize for the future a realistic increase above the presently inadequate $75 million annual authorization.

THE CHALLENGE OF BERLIN

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. STRATTON] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise with some hesitation as a new Member of this body to address myself for a few moments to the very serious situation facing our Nation in the Berlin crisis. While making no pretension to being any expert either in foreign policy or in military policy matters, I believe that each Member of this body—even a freshman Member—bears a certain measure of responsibility for the safety and security of our Nation, and in a time of crisis, though none of us may have the final or complete answer, each of us has a duty to speak out on any matter that seems to us to be vital to that national safety and security.

I want to say that I share fully the views already expressed publicly by the Speaker of this House that we in this House, regardless of party, must stand solidly behind the President in his determination to meet the Berlin crisis with firmness. I have been greatly pleased to see that in responding to the Berlin crisis there has been a far greater measure of political unanimity in the Congress than there was last year in the Quemoy crisis.

But there are still several aspects of the Berlin crisis, Mr. Speaker, that have disturbed me and that I feel need to be mentioned in this House.

In the first place, I have been disturbed by the views expressed by some of our allies that we in the United States should be willing to negotiate with the Soviets, that we should not stand rigidly on our rights, but should instead embrace what has been referred to as flexibility. The President has ably presented our position on this matter on his television address Monday night; but I think it deserves to be reemphasized on this floor.

I gather from the press that the Prime Minister of Great Britain, who will arrive here in a few days, is coming with the express objective of persuading us to engage in some such flexible negotiations with the Soviets over Berlin. In fact in some quarters the impression is being given that if we refuse to bend or to compromise on this issue, then we ourselves will be responsible for any unfortunate results that may occur.

This is no doubt precisely the kind of propaganda line the Soviets would like to sell the American people and our allies. And as the May 27 deadline draws closer we may anticipate that this kind of campaign will increase.

Of course, we must stand ready at any time, as indeed we do, to negotiate with the Soviet Union over the future of Germany. But let us first be crystal clear just what it is we are prepared to negotiate about, just which matters are properly subject to compromise, and which ones, on the other hand, can never be compromised no matter how crudely the Soviet dictator may threaten us.

The Soviet dictator has announced that he plans to renounce the series of wartime and postwar commitments under which the nations of the West are today in Berlin. He has said he will do this on May 27 this year, and he has said he intends to do it on his own initiative whether we like it or not. If we like, we are invited to negotiate a new Berlin settlement with him to replace the one he is discarding. If we do not like, then he will go ahead with his own plans anyway.

Mr. Speaker, this would be gunpoint diplomacy, negotiating with a pistol in our ribs. One principle which we can never retreat from, as the President made clear Monday night, is the principle that existing international commitments to which great nations are parties, in this case vital wartime and postwar agreements which followed upon the successful conclusion of World War II in Europe, can never be terminated

unilaterally. For us ever to agree that Mr. Khrushchev or anyone else has the right to wipe out such agreements completely on his own, whenever it pleases him, would be to renounce our rights and objectives as a sovereign nation.

This, Mr. Speaker, is what is first and foremost at issue in the Berlin crisis, and why it is so important that we in this country—as well as our allies—must stand firm, as the President has said.

We can no more sit idly by in 1959 and let the Communists discard the understandings that brought an end to the European war, than we could sit idly by and let them discard by military aggression, as they tried to do in Korea in 1950, the agreements that ended World War II in the Pacific. To let the Communists tear up these agreements on their own initiative would have spelled the end for any system of international law or understanding. President Truman saw clearly what was at issue back in 1950, and the Nation sent troops to Korea to defend our basic right. In my judgment, we are faced with precisely the same situation today in Berlin, and we must be prepared to do no less to protect ourselves. President Eisenhower, like President Truman before, has clearly recognized the nature of this threat and so, too, have the leaders of this Congress. But have our allies fully understood? And do the American people fully realize just what it is that makes Berlin so important and why, even at the risk of war, we must stand firm on that faraway city?

If Mr. Khrushchev really wants to negotiate about Germany or Berlin, of course, we ought to negotiate with him. But we ought not to sit down across the table from him until he is first willing to demonstrate his good faith by publicly subscribing to the principle that no power has the right to tear up the Berlin agreements until all of the powers who first negotiated them are willing to accept the changes. If Mr. Khrushchev will accept this principle in advance, then perhaps we can have a useful and satisfactory discussion of the whole German question. If not, we would be wasting our time even to talk. What assurance would we have that any new agreement would last any longer than the present one?

And so I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that as a result of the Camp David conferences, the President persuade Mr. Macmillan, who will arrive in Washington tomorrow, to join with him in making this essential, forthright, and positive proposal to Mr. Khrushchev. I suggest that they join in challenging Mr. Khrushchev, as a condition for any negotiations in Berlin, to agree that the understanding under which we are presently in Berlin shall be altered only by agreement of all the participating powers.

But there is a second matter that disturbs me, Mr. Speaker, and that is whether we as a country are prepared militarily and psychologically to meet any consequences that may follow from our decision. Let us make no mistake about it. President Eisenhower and Gen. Maxwell Taylor have both indicated clearly that it is possible our decision at Berlin might result in war, even nuclear war, if the Russians go through with their announced plans. If we are to run the risk of nuclear war, can we at least fail to do everything that needs to be done to be fully and completely prepared? Only 2 months remain before the Soviet ultimatum runs out, and yet there seems to be little evidence around us of a real sense of urgency in the mobilization of our military power. Can we really face the threat of nuclear war so casually? Can we really move into such a fundamental crisis, where so much is at stake, and still keep on reducing the size of our Army and our Marines? Can we really move into this kind of military crisis on the Continent of Europe and at the same time suggest that our ground forces stationed there are virtually worthless, as was done the other day at the President's press conference? Can we really expect to alert the American people to what might lie ahead by referring to sober efforts to strengthen our defenses as mere hysteria?

We were unprepared when Pearl Harbor hit. We were woefully unprepared again when Korea broke out. Can we be so certain then that we have really done all that needs to be done to be ready for May 27? Only the other day Gen. Lauris Norstad, our NATO commander in Europe, asked the Pentagon to rush troop reinforcements and new tanks to Europe to bolster his forces in the face of the Berlin crisis. Adm. Arleigh Burke has just told the Preparedness Subcommittee of the other body that if the Berlin crisis continues to get worse the United States would have to expand its Armed Forces, perhaps within a month. Indeed our whole strategy in Berlin is based on the principle that we must convince the Soviets of our determination to stand by our commitments as firmly as we have said we will stand. But how can we possibly convince them if we are unwilling to provide all the military might our experts tell us is needed to do the job?

President Eisenhower has now made it clear that he would not shrink from resorting even to nuclear weapons in the Berlin situation if that course becomes necessary, and I for one would support him if he felt that decision were necessary. But I am disturbed, Mr. Speaker, by indications that the President has already ruled out any other possible form of military reaction. Can we really put all of our eggs in one basket? Can we really go along with the President in maintaining that ground forces have no useful purpose in the Berlin situation? I do not think that General Taylor believes that and I do not think the Members of this House believe it either. Surely we cannot deliberately refrain from using any possible type of military response or retaliation in defense of our position in Berlin.

I have today introduced a resolution to place this Congress on record in support of the President of the United States in his decision to stand firm in Berlin and to resist as fully as he indicated the other night on television he intended to do any decision by the Soviet Union to overthrow on its own initiative the postwar and wartime agreements which underlie our presence in Berlin. My resolution would also call upon the administration, as the first step in preparing our country for what might occur in Berlin, to suspend scheduled force cuts until the Berlin crisis has passed. Third, my resolution would call on the President to reinforce the garrisons overseas with such troops as might be deemed needed by our military leaders, and fourth, it would urge the adoption by this Congress of policies designed to move toward closing the serious missile and antisubmarine gaps that now exist between this country and the U.S.S.R.

During the Easter recess several members of the Committee on Armed Services have been asked by the chairman to visit Berlin and report back on the State of our combat readiness there. As a member of this group I look forward to the opportunity to assure myself that we are in fact doing everything possible, as I believe we must, to be prepared along the lines I have suggested here. I hope to be able to report further on this subject to the House when we return.

This is not a program of hysteria. It is a program offered solemnly in the hope that we as a Nation may not only continue to stand together in this crisis as we have been standing together in the past, but that we may also face up frankly and realistically to the possible consequences of that decision. Only in this way can we be certain of success.

The challenge which faces every one of us today is a challenge to which we cannot fail to respond, and respond quickly. In the words of Winston Churchill for another hour:

> Let us then to the battle, to the toil, and to the task, each in his own way, each to his own station. Let us move forward together. There is not a week, not a day, not a moment to be lost.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STRATTON. I am happy to yield to my distinguished colleague from New York.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. I would like to compliment the gentleman from New York on a very fine and very thoughtful statement.

I think he was overly modest when he said he does not pretend to be an expert either on foreign policy or military policy matters. I happen to know of my own knowledge that the gentleman was a great student of both of those matters before he came to Congress in January of this year.

I was particularly impressed by the gentleman's call for solid support of the President in this moment of crisis, a support which also, as he says, has been urged upon us by the distinguished Speaker of this House and other eminent Americans. I think we will all agree that when the gentleman suggested that we should do certain things to be ready for that crisis he was speaking in a strictly nonpartisan way.

If the gentleman will permit me to say it, I think the fine example of nonpartisanship he has displayed here today and which has been expressed so often by the Speaker of this House might be

extended a bit further. I think it might be an excellent idea in these particular times if we had a complete political moratorium in this country upon such grave matters. I do not suggest that the moratorium be a one-way street. We are standing behind the President. I think the President and his advisers and the members of his party might well consider that when suggestions are made by Members of Congress for a stronger defense they are not intended to be and should not be political. I should like to see this two-way street extended a bit further in this moment of crisis, and see the President of the United States without regard to party or politics summon to his side some of the distinguished leaders of this country of another party who led us through past crises.

Again I congratulate the gentleman from New York upon an excellent statement.

Mr. STRATTON. I thank the gentleman from New York for his very generous remarks and for his statement. Certainly when he refers to nonpartisanship, the way in which he was instrumental in bringing the Hawaiian statehood bill through the House was an outstanding example of nonpartisanship.

I think the gentleman has made a very significant point, one that I think needs to be emphasized. I agree with the gentleman that we should be nonpartisan in this matter. I am delighted that the gentleman has reemphasized the point that when some of us take the well of this House or take the floor of the other body to make suggestions with regard to strengthening our military procedure that ought not to be considered as a partisan action. Certainly when even our top military leaders disagree on matters of this type, nobody can ever be absolutely sure that he has the final answer.

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STRATTON. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. DADDARIO. I also wish to commend the gentleman from New York on the sober, serious, and objective analysis he has made of one of the most serious problems that has affected this Nation for some considerable period of time. May I ask the gentleman, in connection the strengthening of the Reserve and the tightening up of the forces which we must call on, if he is also referring to the strengthening of the Reserve and the National Guard, and doing away with the tendency that there seems to be to diminish the utilization of these units and the effort to prepare them so that they may be used in the event that this emergency becomes more serious than it now is.

Mr. STRATTON. I would say to the gentleman that certainly this is the kind of thing that is contemplated in my resolution. I have not specifically included the Reserve forces, but I would certainly feel that scheduled cuts in our Reserve components at this time are exceedingly dangerous, just as are cuts in our active duty forces.

Mr. DADDARIO. I also wish to ask if in your statement and in your resolution, where you are referring to the agreements already made, do you not feel that there now exists between this country and the other allies who were successful in World War II an agreement which will continue and which should continue without any question or doubt until Germany is completely unified by a plebiscite, and by no other means short of that?

Mr. STRATTON. The gentleman has stated exactly my position, that the agreements under which we terminated the fighting ought certainly to be continued until there is agreement on some further settlement as to the future of Germany. Certainly, no one country ought to have the right to throw this out on its own. That is the real principle involved in Berlin, as I see it.

Mr. DADDARIO. And if we take the London Conference and the agreements made at Potsdam and Yalta, they certainly give us the basic understanding of this whole problem, and anything else is a sideshow to divert us from the main effort and from the main show which is before the world today.

Mr. STRATTON. I agree completely with the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STRATTON. I yield to my distinguished friend, the gentleman from New York and my colleague on the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. BECKER. I thank my friend. There is one comment I would like to make in respect to what my distinguished colleague from New York [Mr. O'BRIEN] said. We have been friends for a great many years. I think his statement as to getting away from partisanship on the matter of the Berlin crisis and the aid program is a very laudable one. Unfortunately, as I will say in my remarks following the gentleman who now has the floor, it has not been other than partisan for the past 2½ months. I might say to the gentleman from New York that we have heard since January 1 the most bitter attacks made on the President of the United States and his defense policies all during these past months by members of the Democratic Party, both in the party and in the other body. I think when we come to a crisis of this nature, and I shall detail these remarks in my statement that I am going to make, I think it is fine that we recognize that some day when it comes to our military posture and our defense we should set aside our partisanship. I believe in that firmly, but I cannot sit here idly and let this attack go on for 2½ months without today answering a part of this attack and reviewing the record of some of the past history of the lack of defense policy in these past years that have brought about this crisis.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STRATTON. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. The gentleman from New York has mentioned my silence during the last 2½ months.

Mr. BECKER. I beg the gentleman's pardon, I did not mean the gentleman directly, but I meant the Democrats and the Democratic Party; the gentleman knows that.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. I might say: Better late than never. If any member of my party is quarreling with the President of the United States on defense matters for political reasons, I disassociate myself from that member of my party. I do not condone it any more than I condone the vicious attacks which were made upon a former President of the United States when he was carrying the burden of some of the past crises of this country. I say, let us stop gnawing over old bones and have a fresh, bipartisan approach to this whole matter.

Mr. STRATTON. I thank my colleague from New York for that statement.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STRATTON. I am glad to yield to our distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. I was rather interested and somewhat amused, but particularly was I interested, in listening to the remarks of the gentleman from New York [Mr. BECKER], the acting minority leader, in relation to politics. The gentleman from New York is the one who injected politics and a political note into this discussion. And when I say the gentleman from New York, I mean the gentleman on the Republican side. The gentleman from New York on the Republican side, I think, fails to evaluate the significance of the situation in the Congress of the United States and in the country. In Great Britain, the Labor Party is attacking the party in control, favoring some form of disengagement or coexistence. You do not find that situation here in the United States. Here you find the Democratic leadership and the Democratic Party solidly supporting the President as far as the President goes—and that means there is complete unity. But, the Democratic Party says that we do not think the President goes far enough. So, looking at these problems from an overall point of view and comparing our situation here in the United States with conditions in other countries, as I have pointed out, you see that the Democratic Party is certainly showing its leadership on a nonpartisan basis and giving the President of the United States bipartisan support.

We say that we are for you, Mr. President, but we are for something more; we are for plus something.

Last year the Members of Congress, and this was done by both parties, I am sure—I do not know how the gentleman from New York [Mr. BECKER] voted, but I am sure he voted for it—we put into the bill about $900 million more than the President recommended to keep our Army at 900,000 officers and men and to keep a Marine Corps of 200,000 officers and men.

Mr. BECKER. It was $90 million to keep the additional 30,000 men.

Mr. McCORMACK. Just a minute; we put in a little over $900 million for greater national defense. That included keeping the Army at 900,000 men and the Marine Corps at 200,000,

with 4 more submarines of the *Polaris* type; and it provided for some additional airplanes.

That was done, as I remember, by Members on both sides of the aisle; and if my memory serves me right, I think the gentleman from New York [Mr. BECKER] voted for it. I would be surprised, knowing that he stands for strength in national defense, if he were to tell me he did not vote for it.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STRATTON. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I cannot help but remember—of course, I was not a Member at the time, but the distinguished majority leader was—in the Republican 80th Congress when a President of the party of the gentleman from Massachusetts was loath to ask for what Congress believed was enough in the way of air strength. If one can believe the newspapers, the Republican 80th Congress at that time voted much more money than the President asked for and in fact practically instructed him to establish a certain number of wings of air strength.

My only point is that if what the gentleman from Massachusetts is saying is what I think he is saying it means that the Congress has the authority to ask the President to increase the strength of the Armed Forces, and it cuts both ways.

Mr. McCORMACK. I remember the incident to which the gentleman refers. I was for the stronger Air Force.

There was also involved the freezing of a million dollars by our Secretary of Defense. I opposed that. So there is no politics involved in that. Those on the Republican side and those of us on the Democratic side who believe that there should be greater defense supported it. Certainly nobody accused the Republicans of playing politics at that time. I remember it well, as I said, because I was for the greater defense.

Now, when we Democrats are for greater defense—and, of course, I was not referring to the gentleman from Arizona, but was referring to my other friend, the gentleman from New York [Mr. BECKER], who injected the political note—when we Democrats urge stronger defense they accuse us of playing politics.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. BECKER] who intends to make a speech probably will leave himself wide open to being accused of being incapable of objectively evaluating the true situation as it exists.

I have not the furthest thought in the world of politics; I am concerned with the preservation of this country; I am concerned with the next generation of Americans; I am concerned with these youngsters that I see frequently in the corridors and on the streets; and I am concerned with those who will come after me. My life is pretty well over. I hope the good Lord permits me to remain quite a few years longer, but I have taken the major part of the journey of life, and I am concerned with the kind of life the next generation is going to live. Their life is being decided today. The kind of world they are going to live in is dependent on the soundness of the judgment of those in positions of responsibility here and on how courageous they are in carrying out their policies.

One thing is certain—I have said it throughout the years, and I am going to continue to say it—that if I err in judgment with the world in the situation it is in today, if I err in judgment on the question of military preparedness, I would rather err on the side of strength than on the side of weakness; and I do not think I am playing politics now.

As a matter of fact, from a political angle I am taking probably a position that is not wise politically, as I have done so many times in the past. For example, in the extension of the Selective Service Act which passed this body by 1 vote, when only 21 Republicans voted for it, I did not accuse those Republicans who voted against it of playing politics. I have said repeatedly that they are just as good Americans as I am. But I wonder if they had won and Selective Service had been defeated, with Pearl Harbor happening 3 months later, how they would have felt? If I were one of those who voted against the Selective Service Act and it was defeated and then with Pearl Harbor happening 3 months later, and my Government's existence was affected as a result of my vote, I would be the most disgraced person in the world. I do not know what I would do to try to escape that being upon my conscience. So, when the gentleman from New York [Mr. BECKER] injects the question of politics he is just talking wildly and recklessly, he is making statements that are not consistent, in fact are inconsistent with the truth, and as a Republican and with a Republican in the White House he should not make statements of that kind.

Before I conclude, Mr. Speaker, may I just add this further word: I desire to commend the gentleman from New York [Mr. STRATTON] for the very fine, ringing American statement which he has made here this afternoon on the floor, and which has stimulated this discussion.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STRATTON. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. I wonder if we might get back on the original track. The gentleman from New York [Mr. STRATTON], who spoke originally on this subject said, as I recall it, that he and the rest of us were supporting the President of the United States in the Berlin crisis?

Mr. STRATTON. That is correct.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. That certainly is not political. Then he suggested or advanced his own ideas for improving our defense posture. I do not think that is political. I may add that if the President of the United States disagrees with the gentleman from New York [Mr. STRATTON], I will not think that disagreement is political either. I think we ought to sponge out this whole politics matter and start anew as a united people, and an intelligent people.

Mr. STRATTON. I thank the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'BRIEN] for his statement. I agree with him that when the Representatives of the majority party in this body have indicated very clearly, as they have, that we are standing behind the President, and when the resolution which I offered indicates, as it does, that the Congress stands behind the President in such action as he may deem it necessary to take in Berlin, it is pretty hard to say that anybody is playing politics. I know that before our committee have come a variety of military judgments and it is hard to think that any one of us has the final answer. Certainly we should be able to offer a variety of constructive suggestions without playing politics in any way.

THE SAFETY AND WELFARE OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. THORNBERRY). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. BECKER] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, in opening may I say that the very distinguished and respected majority leader must realize that with my years of service in this House and in other legislative bodies, I have not been used to making wild or unfounded statements. Nor do I intend to make any in this statement here today. It is because I am very much interested in leaving politics out of our national defense affairs and our foreign affairs that I intend today to detail a history of the lack of understanding on the part of the Democrats of the past and of the present. Today and for the last 2½ months they have been violently criticizing the Eisenhower defense policy.

Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time today reluctantly. I have believed all my adult life, as has President Eisenhower, that the safety and welfare of our Nation should not be subject to partisanship and that Members of this body have a sworn trust to guarantee this.

Almost since the day the 86th Congress convened, Democrats have carried on the most bitter partisan assault on the defense policies of this administration. It pains me to stoop to a political level in discussing such vital matters, but the party of the majority leaves no choice.

The most recent political assault by the Democrat party on our security problems have come in the form of criticism of President Eisenhower's military policies. At its base, is the question of the Berlin crisis.

I am reminded of another March crisis which occurred 11 years ago when the Communists suddenly and violently seized power in Czechoslovakia. At the same time Palestine was on the verge of war and the United Nations faced a serious and embarrassing crisis where American military aid might have been needed. Reverberating criticism of the Truman administration's ability to meet

these crises were not solely confined to the Republican Party. Franklin Roosevelt, Jr., son and namesake of the former President, took actions tantamount to an open revolt against the Truman administration by preparing a statement calling for a draft of General Eisenhower as the Democratic presidential nominee.

It was that tireless, sincere, and great Secretary of Defense, James Forrestal, who forewarned General Eisenhower of Mr. Roosevelt's intentions. I quote from the account in Mr. Forrestal's diaries:

> I called Eisenhower about 2:15, reported these facts to him, and he said that he would be willing to call. He called back in about 10 minutes and said that he had got hold of Roosevelt and said that any action of this kind now, in the middle of very delicate situations in various countries abroad, could have the most dangerous consequences and might negate American policy. He said that he would personally urge in the strongest possible terms that any statement which might be interpreted abroad as implying failure to support the President at this most critical time or to indicate deep and serious splits in public opinion would be detrimental to the country.

Plainly, the Democrats do not have the same sense of values in the March 1959 crisis that General Eisenhower expressed in March 1948, and always has held sacred.

Despite the partisanship of recent Democrat criticisms, I do not intend the record of fact which follows to be a witch hunt into the past, nor shall I attempt to obscure its relationship to our present issues on national defense. I earnestly feel, however, that the Democrat defense record during the previous Democrat administrations, and the Democrat obstructions to the defense policies of the present administration, alarmingly reflect a dangerous misunderstanding of Soviet strategy to destroy America.

I sincerely wish that the tragedy which resulted from such misunderstandings in the past could remain merely as an incontestable part of history. Unfortunately, there are two factors which prevent this. First, the Democrat Party continues to debase the ethical approach to national security so ably expressed by General Eisenhower in March 1948. Second, and far more important to our survival, is the fact that present Democrat spokesmen on defense matters are the same people who were responsible for the disunities which formerly existed in the Department of Defense, the cancellation of our long-range missile program in 1950 and the suspension, following World War II, of H-bomb development.

Clearly, then, it is my sworn duty to our Nation's safety to contribute whatever I can to meet these assaults and beat back attempts which very easily again could weaken our defenses and invite attack by the most fearsome and sadistic enemy the world has ever known.

Had these critics of President Eisenhower just a modicum of introspection, Mr. Speaker, they would ask themselves whether—despite the teachings of the past—they do not understand the long-range nature of the Soviet threat. They may ask themselves, too, whether their present action is not just a re-application of an analysis which resulted in the vast forfeitures made to Russia by them in the past.

Good football coaches, before each important game, thoroughly scout the opposition. Failure to do so is to subject one's team to miserable defeat, even at the hands of inferior players.

I agree with the Democrat-controlled Committee on Un-American Activities that one of our best scouts of Russian strategy is Dr. Robert Strausz-Hupé, the eminent director of the Foreign Policy Institute located at the University of Pennsylvania. I highly recommend to critics of Mr. Eisenhower's policies that they read and ponder the May 20, 1958 testimony on the Communist Strategy of Protracted Conflict given by Dr. Strausz-Hupé and his associates to this committee. I quote in part:

> The strategy of protracted conflict prescribes the annihilation of the opponent by a long series of carefully calibrated operation, by feints and maneuvers, by psychological and economic warfare, and by diverse forms of violent and nonviolent conflict techniques, and fuses them into a weapons spectrum which begins on the left with the seemingly most innocuous political activities, such as clandestine distribution of leaflets, and terminates on the right end of the spectrum with the megaton bomb.

Democrat defense policies ever since the days of Yalta reflect that they have not understood the Communist strategy of protracted conflict. Indeed, their defense philosophy is suitable only to the 17th and 18th centuries, when the nature, date and weapons of pending wars were predictable. Preparedness necessitated no more than the money necessary to employ more mercenaries.

Dr. Strausz-Hupe pointed out after referring to Mao Tse-tung's book, "On the Protracted War":

> The Communist strategy never has been, and is not now, a strategy of limited war such as that which has preoccupied many Western writers in recent years.

At another point, Dr. Strausz-Hupé astutely notes:

> (The Communists) are, however, armed with one powerful weapon which has thus far proved effective enough to neutralize, and in many instances to defeat, our policies. This weapon is a central doctrine of conflict, which integrates all political, social, economic, psychological, technological, and military activities into one organic scheme of conflict.

The Democrat defense record since Yalta clearly indicates that the party which now so brashly attacks President Eisenhower's policies has never comprehended the integrated Soviet strategy of protracted conflict. Time and again, the Democrats have tried to gear our national defense to the theory that they knew the date, place, and weapons of the next war. They have thought—and still think—of our survival only in terms of another appropriation for missiles, for divisions, or for ships. They grossly ignore both the totality of the Russian threat and the rapidity of the developments of modern technology.

For exactly these reasons, the Democrats cannot now comprehend that a balanced budget and a sound dollar is just as much a part of the totality of our national security as are missiles and ships which can only be bought by those dollars. Plainly, the Democrat Party has isolated one aspect of national security from another, when all aspects are mutually dependent.

In support of these statements I have made, I shall now show how the Democrat misconception of the Soviet strategy of protracted conflict produced defense policies which both disarmed us militarily and surrendered the initiative to Moscow.

Discussions at Yalta and Potsdam clearly demonstrated that to meet the protracted conflict strategy, the United States would have to maintain a balanced and flexible military establishment, while maintaining a progressive and unrestrained research and development program. Apparently misunderstanding Russian strategy, however, the Democrat administration demobilized the most powerful military force in world history. Our forces were cut from a strength of more than 11 million men at the beginning of 1945, to where the Army did not have one full-strength combat division at the outbreak of the Korean war.

I cannot emphasize enough, however, that the lesson pointed up by this fiasco was not in quantitative, but in qualitative terms.

Today, as then, flexibility and variety in the deterrent system is what counts. The Democrats lacked this sense of balance in the late 1940's; just as they apparently lack them today.

Perhaps I should refine my comment. This blindness to balance existed among Democrats in the 1940's whose will prevailed in shaping defense policies. And, as I have noted, these are the same Democrats who today attack President Eisenhower's defense policies. There was, on the other hand, one Democrat who possessed such perspective and vision that Mr. Truman never really understood him. I refer to the late Secretary of Defense, James Forrestal, whose published diaries can shed light on our paths today just as vividly as can Dr. Strausz-Hupe's comments.

Mr. Forrestal served under a President unaware of the need for a balanced deterrent to thwart the Russian protracted strategy. The 1948 Communist coup in Czechoslovakia had clearly demonstrated the need to increase the capabilities of our various Armed Forces. And for the Armed Forces to be at all effective, a high degree of unity was needed in the newly established Department of Defense.

On the other hand, Mr. Forrestal had serving under him as Secretary of the Air Force a man who saw defense only in terms of the B-36 bomber, one who reacted with a blind partisanship in favor of the Air Force, and whose entire attitude ignored the character of the Russian strategy of protracted conflict. Today, as an influential Member of the majority in the other body, he is displaying this same lack of understanding and vision. He is among the most outspoken Democrat critics of the President's policies.

Mr. Forrestal worked tirelessly to team all of the Secretaries together for the

good of the overall Defense Establishment, and the national security of the entire Nation. Forrestal saw that deficit spending and inflation could wreck the economy, destroy our ability to finance the defense effort, and expose us to the Russian threat through bankruptcy. And, he realized that real preparedness demanded balance, flexibility, and quality.

As the editor of the Forrestal diaries noted, Mr. Forrestal finally "averted the danger that the whole rearmament effort would be swept, by the public enthusiasm for airpower into an expansion of the Air Force, which might be necessary for fighting a third world war but was of little use in the current job of preventing one."

Mr. Forrestal tactfully worked with several Congressmen on the House Armed Services Committee to obtain a reasonable balance and perspective. About one Member of this body who mentioned that the Air Force had originally planned to procure 100 B-36 bombers, Mr. Forrestal wrote:

> I felt constrained to tell him that I regarded this as a wise decision—that the B-36 had been built for World War II and that the change in the order was simply an effort to find out if it could be adapted to the changed conditions of a future war.

Blind to the Soviet strategy of protracted conflict and the needs for a balanced system of deterrents, the then Secretary of the Air Force, who today is so critical of administration policies, demanded before the House Armed Services Committee a 70-group Air Force. It apparently did not occur to him that he was demanding that the United States place all its eggs in one basket, that the United States appropriate millions of dollars to fight an unknown war at some unknown date with hundreds of B-36 World War II type aircraft.

The Secretary of the Air Force gave vent to his partisanship before a group of 500 aviation engineers in a speech that led the conscientious Secretary Forrestal to demand an explanation.

The leading military critic, Hanson Baldwin, noted the act of official disobedience and personal disloyalty in these words:

> Unification becomes a joke when the Secretary of the Air Force goes over the head of the Secretary of Defense and of the President himself.

The sad sequel to this story is well-known. Mr. Forrestal, whose vision was never appreciated by the White House leadership or the Secretary of the Air Force, soon was forced to resign. The new Secretary of Defense was especially selected to terminate the balanced preparedness program of Mr. Forrestal.

This leads us to the tragic story of how the Democrat administration of the 1940's thwarted attempts of American scientists to develop an H-bomb while Russian scientists made the most dynamic progress in their history. I again must conclude that the Democrat leadership made no effort towards H-bomb development because of an astounding incomprehension of Soviet aims.

In 1945, Dr. Robert J. Oppenheimer was chairman of the General Advisory Committee of the Atomic Energy Commission. As early as the fall of 1945, Dr. Oppenheimer had successfully urged the discontinuance of attempts to develop the H-bomb. Now, it is perhaps possible that a scientist and specialist like Dr. Oppenheimer would not be able to visualize the long-range threat that Soviet Communists posed to America. It is not understandable, however, that the Democratic administration should share similar blindness and should approve the Oppenheimer policies which led to the total demobilization of our efforts to produce a deterrent even more absolute than the A-bomb before the Soviet Union did.

In those days of retreat before communism, however, there were heroic men of courage, balance, and vision who, like Mr. Forrestal, deeply feared the catastrophic consequence of this dimsightedness. Foremost among these was Dr. Edward Teller, who violently disagreed with Dr. Oppenheimer that it was neither feasible nor important to develop a super-deterrent. Dr. Teller was supported by the intrepid Adm. Lewis Strauss, then an Atomic Energy Commissioner, and by Drs. William Lawrence and Luis Alverez. But the united efforts of these men were not great enough to move the triumvirate of Acheson, Lilienthal, and Oppenheimer.

One would think that an explosion of a Soviet A-bomb in 1949 would immediately have shaken these gentlemen from their dream world. Despite Admiral Strauss' warnings that the Soviet was rapidly catching up with our own nuclear development, the Democrat administration continued to block Dr. Teller's efforts to start work on an H-bomb.

Then came the ominous confession of Dr. Klaus Fuchs, formerly of the Los Alamos Atomic Laboratory, that he had leaked atomic secrets to Russia from 1942 to 1949. Now, the question was whether the Russians might develop an H-bomb before the United States did. Since Lilienthal still opposed Admiral Strauss and Dr. Teller, these latter had to find sympathetic and wise Senators like McMahon and Hickenlooper to catapult the complacent Democrat administration into action.

The total demobilization of H-Bomb research and development after World War II again demonstrates that the Democrat leadership completely lacked a grasp of the protracted strategy of conflict which the Soviet Union was employing. Admiral Strauss had predicted that, once the Russians had the A-bomb, Communists' aggression again would blaze forth. In June 1950, in Korea, Admiral Strauss' prophecy tragically came true.

Let us consider next the missile record during the Democrat era of demobilization. After World War II, 86 German scientists, including Dr. Wernher von Braun, came to this country ready and willing to contribute their utmost abilities toward American development of ICBM's. General Eisenhower listened to these scientists and learned how the Germans, toward the end of the war, had planned construction of a hundred-ton rocket with a 6-ton warhead which would be capable of crossing the Atlantic Ocean.

The Chief of Staff immediately put these talented scientists to work. But the Democrat administration's failure to comprehend the Soviet protracted threat was reflected in its total disdain for the long-range missile program.

True enough, the Army started to rebuild the German V-2 for use as a first-stage booster rocket with the already developed WAC Corporal as the second-stage rocket. Meanwhile, the Air Force commenced the MX-774 program to produce an ICBM.

But these good beginnings were short-lived. The Democrat President acted decisively, but tragically in the wrong direction. He impounded $75 million a Republican Congress in 1947 had appropriated for this vital research and development.

Of these funds, $17 million had been specifically earmarked for Air Force missile development. Gen. Curtis LeMay called the impounding "the straw that broke the camel's back." He sternly pointed out that the program had been designed to keep the United States militarily ahead of other nations.

President Truman was just as impervious to this warning as he was to that of Gen. Eisenhower who said:

> In the field of guided missiles, we must keep abreast of the rest of the world. Neglect to do so could bring our country to ruin and defeat in an appalling few hours.

But the Democrats had not yet begun to cut. To them, Russia had no designs on the United States. Consequently, in fiscal 1950, the President impounded some $735 million of Air Force funds. ICBM and IRBM development was again halted. The only research of this type that year was carried on by private funds of the Convair Corporation.

It was not until 1951 that the Atlas project again was resumed by the Government, but with a very low priority.

Admiral Radford's comments on the subject are not surprising:

> In the period of 1945 to 1950, Defense Department appropriations were pared way down. We lost a lot of time that we could never make up moneywise on research.

And what was the Soviet Union doing these years? Unlike the Democrats, Stalin personally became highly excited over the rocket work of the German scientists. Stalin had production begun on hundreds of V-2 rocket missiles. In 1947, when he heard about the rocket theories of the German scientist, Sanger, then in France, Stalin became almost hysterical in his efforts to have Sanger move to Russia. Stalin set up a top priority commission to expedite the development of an intercontinental rocket such as Sanger had proposed.

Colonel Gugori Tokaev, who helped coordinate the efforts of this commission, and who later defected to the West, said Stalin desired nothing so much as development of an intercontinental rocket.

The best summary of U.S. missile efforts during the years of demobilization

after World War II has been given by Dr. von Braun:

The United States had no ballistic missile program worth mentioning between 1945 and 1951. These 6 years, during which the Russians obviously laid the groundwork for their large rocket program, irretrievably lost—thus our present dilemma is not due to the fact that we are not working hard enough now, but that we did not work hard enough during the first 6 to 10 years after the war.

It was not until the advent of the Eisenhower administration that our entire guided-missile program was reviewed and placed on an urgent basis. Over 99.9 percent of total missile expenditures to date have been made under a Republican administration.

I am not giving these figures to embarrass the Democrat leadership. Rather, I use these unfortunate and tragic events to document my statement that the Democrats have never really comprehended the Soviet strategy of protracted conflict as President Eisenhower comprehends it today.

Unfortunately, this Democrat blindness was not confined just to the days when Democrats controlled the White House and Congress. Democrat opposition to the missile program again manifested in May 1957. The Democrat-controlled Appropriations Committee attempted to slash $2.5 billion from our defense budget.

President Eisenhower's reaction against cutting the muscle instead of the fat from national defense clearly illustrated that our military needs are more important to him than is a balanced budget. In a radio and TV appeal to the Nation, the President said:

I believe the country would be taking a needless gamble. For myself, I have seen unwise military cuts before * * *. I am determined to do all I can to see that we do not follow that foolhardy road again.

Plainly, we see the President's sense of proportion and balance in meeting the Soviet threats. In 1957 he stanchly opposed the attempted destruction of vital missile efforts. In 1959 he stanchly opposes spending money for defense fat which can in fact be a handicap.

Unlike the Democrat leadership, President Eisenhower possesses the sense of timing to know when to spend and when to conserve. He has never in the past "nicked" any essential defense program. And whenever he conserves the taxpayers money, he does it in order to increase the overall posture of our position vis-a-vis Russia.

Considering the protraction and the variety of Soviet threats, it is extremely shortsighted for anyone to say that the President ignored the needs of national security when he proposed a balanced budget. Economic health is a part of national security.

Not only has disregard of unbalanced budgets undermined the war effort of many nations, but it has been the stepping stone since the days of Rome for the rise of dictators.

Today the decline in value of the defense dollar is shooting up the cost of weapons and sapping strength from our research, development, and procurement programs. Constant adjustments must be made to allow for the rise in prices; extra management money must be spent to keep up to date on adjustments.

A sound defense program over the years must spring from a sound economy. Spurts of energy and temporary breakthrough perhaps can be achieved by crash programs and emergency goals, but in the protracted war Russia is waging, such crash-and-crisis measures boomerang.

The principle of divide and conquer is as old as war. If Russia can for several decades keep our economic efforts warring with our military efforts, and our military efforts warring with our psychological and spiritual efforts, she will have divided and splintered the totality of our means for survival. All links in the chain are necessary; each link is mutually dependent.

The Democrat spending philosophy can open up our economic flank. It can play into the Russian trap. It would substitute mass for quality and stereotyped solutions for flexible leadership. It would exaggerate certain direct Soviet threats and ignore the more indirect ones.

President Eisenhower has challenged the Congress and the people to strip the fat from Government spending and to make the sacrifices necessary for a balanced budget. For he sees Soviet indirect and direct threats, not piecemeal, but as part of one protracted cold war.

If the Democrat-controlled Congress feels that more funds should be allocated to the military, it should make proportionate reduction in nondefense spending programs, or else have the courage to raise taxes.

But those who fear for our long-range national security should rejoice that today this Nation is led by one of the greatest strategists of all times. He understands that the Soviet protracted threats are economic as well as military, spiritual as well as political, and he meets each new Soviet move with a sense of balance and proportion.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BECKER. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ALLEN. I want to compliment the gentleman from New York for his nonpartisan and his extremely patriotic and sound speech. I think the gentleman will agree with me that the President of the United States has dedicated himself to two main objectives: one, a world of peace; the other, a stable economy at home. Now, in regard to the military phase of it, I cannot conceive of anyone who could possibly have the information that the President of the United States has in regard to the military. He has access to the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the various branches of the services, and all the physicists and chemists engaged in the missile program.

He has Mr. Dulles, the head of the Central Intelligence Agency. He brings these people into conference as no other man can possibly do. After listening to these people and talking with these people he sincerely and conscientiously brings in a program with regard to the military with the realization, of course, that one of the most important things in connection with national defense is a solvent government.

Some of these people come in and want to raise the ante $5 or $6 billion in the overall picture, seemingly without realizing that no nation can be successful militarily speaking unless they have a solvent government. We see our Treasury now finding it difficult to borrow money; bonds are down. These people who offer these reckless schemes not only with respect to military matters but other matters, these schemes for extravagant spending, are doing a great disservice to our country.

Mr. BECKER. I thank the gentleman for his observation. I am in entire agreement with him and appreciate his comments.

In closing, may I say that I have made this statement for the RECORD to bring it up to date and I sincerely hope, as was expressed here today by my colleague from New York [Mr. O'BRIEN], and so eloquently by the distinguished majority leader, that in the interest of the defense and security of this Nation and the free world the partisanship and the attacks that are made on the program could better be made to the President or to the military committees of both Houses rather than explored in the news media of the country.

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BECKER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman has presented a scholarly and historically accurate statement concerning the administration's military policy and that of this Nation during and after World War II and through the Korean conflict. Although I must agree with him that our national security should be nonpartisan politically and I can understand the reluctance with which he spoke, I nevertheless feel he touched a bit too lightly on the failings of the former Secretary of the Air Force who, now, as a Member of the other body from President Truman's native State of Missouri, is among the least qualified critics of Mr. Eisenhower's policies.

This Member of the other body exercised all his efforts when he was Secretary of the Air Force to build a huge fleet of bombers which would become obsolete, as all experts knew they would, within a few months and gave advice to President Truman which led to the curtailment of our rocket and missile program.

We all recall that, in 1947, General Eisenhower, then Chief of Staff, recommended $75 million for missile research. The Republican 80th Congress appropriated this money but President Truman impounded these funds.

I am going to recall for the gentleman and the other Members of this body a phrase which has been used many times since: That the Truman administration spent more for peanuts between 1947 and 1952 than it did on intermediate and long-range missiles.

I should refresh the memories of those on the other side of the aisle who seem to

conveniently forget such embarrassing things about their party's past, that during those years the Democrat administration gave the peanut growers of the South $117.7 million, but appropriated less than $1.7 million for the development of ICBM's and IRBM's.

Today, as the gentleman so ably pointed out, these same voices shout that their judgment should be heeded completely on defense matters.

In view of the miserable failure of these same Democrat experts, then how can we be impressed by their military theories—much of it politically motivated—now?

I will follow President Eisenhower, who has been more successful in warfare than in peanut tossing.

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. BARRY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman's presentation is one all new Members on the other side of the aisle might well study carefully. In it, they will find the factual history of what has happened to this Nation militarily under their party's leadership. The gentleman has shown how well the Eisenhower administration has pulled us up by the bootstraps, on matters affecting the military.

The foolhardiness of putting our entire military budget into the development of weapons which we cannot use, was very ably pointed out by our Chief of Naval Operations, Adm. Arleigh A. Burke, in an address in Charleston, S.C.

I shall quote a brief passage from Admiral Burke's address to emphasize what the gentleman from New York has said:

> There is no point trying to equate our requirements and capabilities with the enemy's. Our requirements are entirely different and our capabilities must be developed around our own needs. We do not need to engage in an endless arms race with the Soviets in ballistics missiles, any more than we have attempted to race them in numbers of submarines or army divisions.
>
> The really important thing about a deterrent force is not numbers but invulnerability, not total numbers built, but numbers we will be able to use. In making our retaliatory forces secure from enemy attack, we do not need great numbers of missiles and bombers.
>
> Whether the U.S.S.R. has one half or as many or several times as many missiles as the United States, is really academic as long as we have the assured capability of destroying Russia, and as long as the Soviets know it and are really convinced of it.

A 5-year-old knows that a pistol is capable of killing a burglar and that 12 pistols would not make him any deader. It is beyond my comprehension that this basic reasoning cannot be grasped by the budget busters of the Democrat Party.

Because those of limited knowledge of the strategy of warfare have not taken time to learn the military facts of life, it would set the record straight to review the relative military capabilities of the U.S.S.R. and the United States.

First. That Russia, because of its geographic location, could launch a nuclear attack against the United States by only three means: (a) by missiles fired from submarines, although she as yet has not developed such weapons; (b) by intercontinental ballistic missiles, which she does not yet have in readiness for such an attack, and (c) by bomber assault across the polar regions, although our own bomber capabilities are far superior to those of the Soviet.

Second. The United States, on the other hand, has several avenues of attack and all are more efficient than anything Russia has. We can (a) launch intermediate and shorter ranged missiles, both more accurate than ICBM's, from a series of bases that now ring the Soviet; (b) launch jet attacks from aircraft carriers at sea on three sides of the enemy; (c) launch bomber attacks either from here or our oversea bases; (d) fire such atomic missiles as the Regulus, which now is operational, and the Polaris, soon to be on the firing line, from subs off Russian coasts, or beyond the polar icecap in atomic-powered submarines, which Russia does not yet have, and (e) strike with long-range missiles, such as the Snark, which is now operational, and the Atlas, soon to be ready, which can counter anything the Soviet has.

Since the inception of Government there have been legislators and department chiefs who wanted more money than was called for in the budget. It is, however, only a realistic understanding of such facts as I have mentioned which keeps spending within reason.

As previously stated, buying 12 pistols to kill 1 burglar just does not make sense if you have 1 pistol capable of accomplishing the task.

The sooner those on the other side of the aisle who want to spend money just for the sake of spending understand this, the better off our national security will be.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BECKER. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I want to compliment the gentleman from New York on making what I consider to be a very important statement. I dislike bringing the comments of the gentleman from Massachusetts into this particular colloquy because he is no longer on the floor; however, he made a remark in his previous colloquy with the gentleman from New York which I would like to mention and ask the gentleman if he knows what the gentleman from Massachusetts meant.

The gentleman from Massachusetts, and I think I quote him correctly, said that the Democrat Party wanted to have the President's armed services program, the defense program, "but something more"—but something more. Does the gentleman from New York have any idea what the gentleman from Massachusetts meant by "something more"?

Mr. BECKER. I have not the slightest idea. I was wondering about that myself, and I hoped the gentleman would be here so I could have asked him what he meant. I do not know.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Well, I am not going to put words in the mouth of the gentleman from Massachusetts. I have too much regard for him to do that. But, I wish to draw this parallel, if I may. The airport bill which was up in the House today is a bill in which the majority party seeks to spend some $297 million for airport construction in the next 2 years. The administration has asked for $200 million. This is a $97 million increase. This might be "something more" that the gentleman talks about, if we could draw an analogy. And, this is done in view of the fact and in spite of the fact that General Quesada says we only need $200 million to do the job. Now, that may be the "something more," in other words, which they offer in the airport bill, which is more than the experts request. Perhaps there is "something more" as far as defense is concerned. It is also more than the experts request. And, I think the gentleman will agree with me, and I am sure that the gentleman from Massachusetts would have to agree if he were here, that the gentleman who is now the President of the United States is certainly more knowledgeable in this field than probably any other living American and is certainly capable of acknowledging the defense needs of this country as well as the needs of the economy. Now, the gentlemen on the other side of the aisle have, for years, since I have been in Congress, at least, been very adept at straddling the issue merely by saying "This is good and we must have it." We have seen it happen in the housing bills; we have seen it in the airport bill; we have seen it happen time after time when the gentlemen from the other side say we are niggardly, we are pennypinchers, and they, in turn, are liberals, and they merely put out that "something more." To me, of course, the speech that the gentleman from New York gave, more adequately than I ever could, pointed out the fallacy of such a thing. Of course, any nation to defend itself must defend itself militarily and economically, and one of the best ways to fall economically is by an unbalanced budget, runaway inflation, and all of the things which we might have from a kind and generous heart, with the best of intentions of people like my good friend from Massachusetts. Again I say I am sorry he was not here. I would like to have him engage in this colloquy so that we could really tell what he meant by "something more."

Mr. BECKER. I want to make this point. I appreciate what the gentleman has said. You see the scope of the talk I made today. It is not a point of criticism for the sake of criticism, but what I have tried to do here is to point out the lack of understanding and the necessity for understanding of what this protracted Soviet strategy is and that it cannot be met on a crisis and a crash basis. It must be met by a flexible, overall deterrent basis of weapons concept, and the President knows this and has known it and has acted upon that basis. Others, who apparently disagree with his basis, do not understand.

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BECKER. I yield to the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. DIXON. The gentleman is to be congratulated upon his factual and rich background for his story of our military preparedness and unpreparedness. Everyone in America should know it. They must have it, and they must see clearly what the facts are. Yes, military might must be sustained by gilt-edged credit. It must be sustained by economic strength. It will fall if this country has not the credit. And, there is a threat to the Nation's credit today due to too much spending for things that are not absolutely necessary. The gentleman has shown, through his story, occasion after occasion where our President has pointed the right way. In every case he has demonstrated his great wisdom.

In every case he has given us full warrant and justification to follow his advice. I, for one, want to follow that advice.

I am pleased to hear the gentlemen from both sides of the aisle express the same conviction. You know, there is great power in organized intelligence. There is tremendous weakness in dissension and in backbiting. If we have suggestions, let us make those suggestions constructive and I am sure they will be considered by our President. Let us not make them openly as criticisms which weaken our country. I thank the gentleman for his courtesy in yielding to me.

Mr. BECKER. I appreciate the gentleman's contribution.

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BECKER. I yield to my colleague from New York.

Mr. SANTANGELO. I was very pleasantly surprised at the extent of the information that the gentleman from Nassau has regarding the Armed Forces. I listened with interest to his talk, as well as the talk made by our colleague from Schenectady, [Mr. STRATTON], with whom I should like to associate myself in his remarks.

It matters little to me whether the gentleman who now has the floor is right or whether he is right as to whose fault it was. It matters little to me that since 1952, when the President came into office, not until 1958 did we put a statellite into the air.

We are faced with the same problem. This is a problem which confronts all of us. The majority leader said that we should cast aside, we should set aside partisan politics. Let us take lesson from him and let us gain something from his greater knowledge through the years. West Berlin today represents a conflict. It is, perhaps, the Armageddon where the forces of right will be opposed by the forces of evil. We do not gain anything by talking about who is at fault. We know we have a struggle. Let us face it as Americans and let us forget partisan politics.

Mr. BECKER. I think the gentleman is absolutely right, and if he will be good enough to read my remarks in the RECORD tomorrow he will see that at no point have I attempted to place the blame on anybody, except to point out where time and time again there has been shown a lack of understanding on the part of the constant critics of President Eisenhower's defense policies and their lack of understanding of the Soviet-Communist strategy through the years, by which they have brought on so many of these crises. They have shown a lack of understanding of the protracted conflict strategy, the Communist overall strategy, which does not amount to all-out war, but which is intended to destroy us by many types of movement, operating in different directions and all at one time.

I believe President Eisenhower has the right idea in trying to provide a type of flexible defense as a deterrent to this Communist threat. That is why I am willing to back him all the way down the line. I have resented the attacks of some of these people, such as the former Secretary of the Air Force, who has made them constantly, week after week, since the first of the year, when he was critcized by his own Secretary of Defense for his lack of understanding of the very problem that I have depicted in the statement that I have made today.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BECKER. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the gentleman from New York is as amused as I am when the gentlemen on the other side of the aisle talk about, "Let us not look back; let us not try to go over what happened in the past; let us look forward." I am sure the gentleman remembers, as I do, how members of the Democratic Party ran against Herbert Hoover for 20 years.

Mr. BECKER. That was nonpolitical.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Oh, that was completely nonpolitical. But now, when the gentleman from New York and a few of us point out some of the errors which were made in the past, not in a political sense, but in an attempt to make sure they do not happen again, then they say, "Oh, do not look at that; let us look ahead. Do not look back." It depends on whose ox is being gored. It is very simple.

It seems to me that this whole matter boils down to a very definite issue, and I want to say to my friend from New York that this is not politics, this is talking issues. It all can be summed up by the two words of the majority leader, "Something more."

The people on this side of the aisle know full well that we have to have defense, but we have to have defense which will allow us to maintain an adequate posture of economic progress as well. This means that we have to be able to support it. The gentlemen on the other side are making an issue over spending money, for what reason we do not know. The experts say we need this amount. The gentlemen on the other side say we need more.

It is sort of like a man going to a doctor and getting some medicine. It says on the bottle, "Take a teaspoonful three times a day." Somebody says, "Gee, if that is good, maybe we had better take three teaspoonfuls three times a day." The experts said not to, but they think if one is good, they ought to have more. It makes just about that much sense to me. I wonder what the gentleman from New York thinks about it.

Mr. BECKER. I am rather inclined to agree with the gentleman. We cannot accomplish anything by saying we should do more. It is a question of what we need and what is the right type.

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BECKER. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. IRWIN. I should like to commend the gentleman from New York on the voluminous facts he has cited here today. I should also like to address my remarks to the gentleman from Arizona. He has said he wished the majority leader were here to answer what he meant by "a little more." Considering the way the majority leader addressed himself to this body, I suspect he could have given the gentleman from Arizona a good answer. I expect he could do it without reading a statement that was prepared for him by somebody else.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Just a minute; I want the gentleman to realize that I do not have anything before me, that everything I have said today was right out of my heart and off the cuff. As far as the majority leader is concerned, I know very well he could answer me. He could probably answer me very well. I am just sorry he did not stay on the floor to do it. He made a remark in the colloquy with the gentleman from New York which he should have known would possibly cause some comment. I am very sorry he is not here. Maybe some other time we can get together and have a little tete-a-tete and get an answer to that.

Mr. BECKER. The gentleman referred to a speech prepared by somebody else. Maybe he has not been around here long enough to know that some of us can make a talk without having anybody urge us to or prepare anything for us. We do seem to have a little knowledge on the subjects about which we talk. We do not try to be experts. I hope the gentleman will remember that.

Mr. IRWIN. I am certainly sure that is true. May I also say I did notice that the gentleman from Arizona spoke on his feet without a prepared statement.

WHAT'S WRONG WITH FEDERAL REGULATORY COMMISSIONS?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. EVINS] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, within the last 5 years more and more Members of Congress have from time to time expressed concern about the declining prestige and the declining efficiency of our independent Federal regulatory agencies. Much of this concern stems from the public criticisms which have been directed against the conduct of those agencies. This criticism has ap-

peared in the press, over television, radio, and through other means of communication.

Recently our distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCormack], inserted in the Congressional Record, a copy of a speech by the Honorable Robert T. Bartley, a member of the Federal Communications Commission, dealing with this subject. I commend that address as an informative statement about what is wrong with our Federal regulatory commissions.

It appears to me, as one who has studied these problems of the Federal regulatory commissions, that a large measure of the trouble lies in the fact that the executive department has been extending its control and influence upon and over our independent regulatory commissions in a crippling manner. This has been done through the exercise of control over the fiscal affairs of these agencies and encroachments upon other important functions of the agencies, including the requirement that the agencies secure prior approval of the executive department before making recommendations to Congress for new legislation. In any event, we see evidence on all sides of such influence. Moreover, it is clear that much of the declining prestige and efficiency of these agencies, respecting which so much criticism has been made, are traceable in no small way to this extension of control as well as influence over the agencies by the executive branch of the Government.

These commissions were created as arms of the Congress in specific delegated areas—not arms of the executive. But for unwarranted executive action in extending undue influence over the agencies there would have been less criticism of the agencies. Therefore, we should not allow the blame for this fault to be shifted to the Congress.

The independent regulatory commissions need help from the Congress. That help, in part at least, should take the form of action removing the regulatory agencies from the undue influence of the executive branch. A large measure of this relief could be realized if legislation were enacted along the following lines:

First. Authority to name the chairmen of these commissions should be placed in the commissions themselves—as formerly—instead of with the Executive. For years, the ICC and Federal Trade Commission rotated the chairmanship among their members, and this arrangement worked exceedingly well.

Second. That these independent regulatory agencies should coordinate with but not have to secure the approval of the Bureau of the Budget for their requests for appropriations.

Third. That they should not have to secure the approval of the Bureau of the Budget—and the Executive for their requests for information from the industries they regulate.

Fourth. That they should not have to secure approval of the Bureau of the Budget for their legislative proposals.

Fifth. They should be allowed to seek Supreme Court review of lower court decisions without being subject to the veto power of the Solicitor General.

Unless these areas of influence and control are removed we may expect the supposedly independent agencies to follow the wishes of persons in high position in the executive branch, whether or not the wishes are in accord with the public interest.

Much criticism has been directed against the agencies because of their failure to adhere to ordinarily accepted standards of legal ethics in the conduct of proceedings before them. One reference to such criticism was made in the February 3, 1959, issue of Look magazine, where, commencing on page 47 of that issue of the magazine is a dramatic presentation regarding the lack of adherence to ordinary standards of legal ethics in proceedings before Federal administrative law agencies. There the presentation appears under the title, "The Further Adventures of Mr. Goldfine."

Action should be taken to build confidence of the public in efficient, fair, and independent operation of the regulatory agencies which administer vital provisions of administrative law. Records of hearings regarding the manner in which proceedings are handled by a Federal Regulatory Commission have demonstrated the need for this action.

During the 84th Congress, I had the honor of serving as chairman of the subcommittee No. 1 of the Select Committee on Small Business, House of Representatives. Hearings before that subcommittee and the more recent hearings before the Subcommittee on Legislative Oversight, of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, House of Representatives, during the 85th Congress, produced evidence pointing to the need for corrective action in this respect.

Our colleague, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. Harris], on February 19, 1959, introduced H.R. 4800, which is directed to the enhancement of the confidence of the public in proceedings before the Federal regulatory agencies. That bill would, among other things, require adherence to standards of legal ethics by all involved in administrative law proceedings before the Federal regulatory commissions and agencies.

The question arises: How did it happen that a situation was established that permitted the disregard of ordinary legal ethics in proceedings before the Federal regulatory commissions? In answering this question it is pertinent to look back at some legislative and administrative history. One factor was a curious oversight in the enactment of the Administrative Procedure Act, approved June 11, 1946. Section 5(c) of that law provides that—

> No officer, employee, or agent engaged in the performance of investigative or prosecuting functions for any agency in any case shall, in that or a factually related case, participate or advise in the decision, recommended decision, or agency review pursuant to section 8 except as witness or counsel in public proceedings.

That provision of the law apparently has been complied with. The recent disturbing criticisms in this regard have not been directed to the conduct of officers, employees, or agencies engaged in the performance of investigative or prosecuting functions. Instead, they have been directed to the conduct of private persons and firms who have acted for, or on behalf of, themselves, or other persons, or firms charged with violations of law. The charge is that they have attempted to influence votes and decisions by the regulatory commissions through the use of secret and devious methods. In the parlance of barristers, these secret and devious methods have included ex parte, off-the-record discussions with the judges by interested parties.

Strangely, the Administrative Procedure Act of 1946 did not by its terms prohibit such ex parte, off-the-record discussions with the judges by private interested parties. It is now recognized that the Administrative Procedure Act of 1946 is defective because of the failure to include such a provision in it.

H.R. 4800, introduced February 19, 1959, by our colleague, the gentleman from Arkansas, Congressman Harris, will remedy this defect in the Administrative Act. For example, section 103 of H.R. 4800 specifies that—

> The Congress hereby recognizes that it is improper for any person, for himself or on behalf of any other person, to influence or attempt to influence any vote, decision, or other action by the Commission.

Section 104 of the bill provides that—

> No person shall communicate, orally or by writing with any member or employee of the Commission concerning the issues, merits, or disposition of any proceeding before the Commission, with the intention that any participant or participants in such proceeding will not receive knowledge of such communication.

In my opinion the enactment of these provisions would go a long way toward insuring adherence to ordinary standards of legal ethics in the practice of administrative law before the Federal regulatory commissions and agencies. I sincerely believe these efforts to improve legal ethics in the practice before administrative law agencies deserve our unanimous and wholehearted support. We want the standards of those ethics so high and so free from violation that all of us will be proud of our association with the legal profession and particularly that part of it involved in proceedings before Federal regulatory agencies dealing with administrative law.

Reclaiming for these agencies a status independent of the executive branch, and the enactment of legislation which would insure the application of high standards of legal ethics in the conduct of proceedings before them will not remove or correct all the trouble. The agencies stand accused of undue delay and protraction in the length of the proceedings before them. This is a matter for the agencies themselves to remedy with the help of Congress.

Much can be accomplished toward the solution of this problem if the agencies should reexamine their present activities and determine how they square with the intent of Congress that these agencies

serve as arms of the Congress in implementing the legislative framework covering the regulation of commerce. This implementation of the legislative process is to be distinguished from the resolution of issues in a proceeding brought to enjoin violations of laws and regulations thereunder. The injunctive proceedings are and should be of a judicial nature. Proceedings to make rules and regulations are legislative in character. This type of proceeding should be used more to establish rules thereby lessening the need for so many judicial types of proceedings.

During the 85th Congress, Subcommittee No. 1 of the Select Committee on Small Business, House of Representatives, made a study of law enforcement activities affecting small business. Much of its attention was directed to the records of activities of the Federal Trade Commission. Our subcommittee made a report—House Report No. 2714—in which findings and conclusions were made and later approved by the Select Committee on Small Business of the House of Representatives. Those conclusions are noted as follows:

III. CONCLUSIONS

1. Prompt positive action should be taken to eliminate undue delays in undertaking and concluding antimonopoly actions.

What can be done to eliminate and prevent undue delays in the handling of antimonopoly cases? Some have proposed that we remove all antimonopoly litigation from the regular courts and from the Federal Trade Commission and vest in a new antitrust court or administrative court the jurisdiction for hearing and deciding antimonopoly cases. It has been argued that to place such jurisdiction in a single court would give rise to a special expertness in that court for the handling of antimonopoly cases.

We are not convinced that the establishment of a new special court to handle antimonopoly cases is the answer to this problem. Likewise, we are not convinced that it would be wise to relieve the Federal Trade Commission from its duty of hearing and deciding antimonopoly cases.

According to recent reports made by the Director of the Administrative Office of U.S. Courts, the Federal courts in 1958 experienced the heaviest workload in history. Despite the fact that they disposed of one of the largest number of cases on record, the year 1958 ended with an increase of some 10 percent in the backlog of pending cases over the number pending at the end of 1957. As a consequence, at the present time a litigant cannot get a trial in one district in a Federal court for almost 4 years after he institutes his suit; in other districts it requires from 2 to 3 years. This is several times the amount of time which the Judicial Conference of the United States estimates that a case should take in reaching trial. In our opinion, this deplorable situation cannot be remedied by transferring the trial of antimonopoly cases from Federal district courts and from the Federal Trade Commission to a special Federal antitrust court. This view is based on the fact that the trial of an antimonopoly case in any court must be subjected to full judicial processes with all their attendant procedural delays.

In view of these circumstances, what can be suggested as a remedy?

These delays should not be attributed to any particular person or organization. Instead it appears that they are inherently a part of a system. In turn, the system is one that has grown, like Topsy, over the years. Largely, the delay proceeds from the fact that the present system requires an administrator in one of the Federal regulatory agencies or commissions to treat each administrative law problem as a case at law. Of course, we are all agreed that cases at law should be made subject to judicial process and be judicially determined. However, it would be a travesty on justice and upon commonsense to try to fit each administrative law problem into the mold of a case at law. The ultimate logical conclusion would be to make a case at law out of each allotment or quota for wheat or cotton made to a farmer under programs administered by the Department of Agriculture. Of course, if that were done, the year for which each of those allotments had been made would be past before the case at law would be adjudicated.

It seems to us that we have lost sight of the original concept of the administrative process which was in the minds of the framers of the legislation creating the Federal regulatory agencies and commissions. That concept provided for agency heads to make determinations and take administrative actions implementing legislative processes. In other words, the legislative process should be implemented to the greatest extent possible through the use of the rulemaking process. It is our view that it was never intended that the procedures of courts be used exclusively in the performance of those tasks.

In order to emphasize the great difference in the amount of time involved in the use of administrative rulemaking process as against the use of the judicial process, permit us to cite a couple of examples. In 1887, the Interstate Commerce Commission was established. At that time it undertook the consideration of the problem arising because of differentials in the railroad rates. It was called upon to determine whether a shipper shipping 30,000 tons of coal annually should pay a substantially lower rate per ton than smaller shippers who were shipping in carlots and less than carlots. At that time, Judge Cooley was Chairman of the ICC. The problem to which we refer came before the Commission for consideration and decision in the matter of the *Providence Coal Co.* v. *The Providence and Worcester Railroad Co.* (1 I.C.C. 107). Judge Cooley and his colleagues on the Commission applied an administrative process instead of a court-case process in the disposition of that matter. It was in that case that the important principle was announced that the lowest applicable quantity railroad rate shall be that of a carlot rate. It required the ICC (through the application of the administrative-law process) only about 30 days from the time it received that matter until it made final disposition of same. The principle established by the decision in the matter has stood the test of the times.

Contrast the ICC coal proceeding with a proceeding brought by the Federal Trade Commission in 1947 under the Robinson-Patman Act. The latter proceeding was for the purpose of considering and disposing of a problem relating to differentials which applied in connection with sales of rubber tires in various quantities. Under the present system, the FTC, in effect, made that matter a "case at law." In effect, it applied, to a degree, a judicial process in the handling of the matter. As a result, 10 years have been spent in handling and litigating that matter. The result is not only unsatisfactory, but it is "out of season," for many of the small business men affected have been destroyed in the meantime by the practices which gave rise to the proceedings in the first instance.

It is our view and hope that the appropriate committees and subcommittees of the Congress will have the opportunity to probe, study, and perhaps report upon the possibility and the feasibility of Congress considering anew the matter of entrusting to independent regulatory agencies and commissions the congressional prerogative of regulating interstate commerce. It should be considered whether such regulation can be accomplished through greater application of the administrative rulemaking processes and with a lesser dependence on the procedures utilized in the courts of law. Some remedies along these lines, to reduce the present long delay in arriving at decisions would, in our view, represent a most valuable contribution to the preservation of small business and our free and competitive enterprise system.

More is needed in antimonopoly cases than mere simplification of procedures. There is need also for augmentation of substantive law.

We agree with the proposition that President Wilson placed before the 63d Congress in 1913 when he said:

"We are sufficiently familiar with the actual processes and methods of monopoly and of the many hurtful restraints of trade to make definition possible, at any rate up to the limit of which experience has disclosed. These practices, being now abundantly disclosed, can be explicitly and item by item forbidden by statute in such terms as will practically eliminate uncertainty, the law itself and the penalty being made equally plain."

Therefore, it is our view that, where experience has demonstrated that particular actual processes and methods of monopoly and hurtful restraints of trade destroy small business and threaten free and competitive enterprise, we should not hesitate to forbid them, item by item, by statutes in such terms as will practically eliminate uncertainty and thereby promote expeditious handling of antimonopoly cases.

In view of the foregoing, it is urged that the Department of Justice and the Federal Trade Commission study this problem with the view to making recommendations to the Congress for simplification and strengthening of antimonopoly law enforcement.

2. Great care should be exercised to insure that more of the limited resources available to antimonopoly law-enforcement activities are used on really important matters even if it should result in a smaller number of cases instituted.

Review of the records of cases instituted under antimonopoly laws leads to the conclusion that a great number of those cases have contributed very little toward preventing the growth of concentration and monopoly since the enactment of the Sherman Act in 1890, the Federal Trade Commission and the Clayton Acts in 1914, and the Packers and Stockyards Act in 1921.

How much worse the situation might have been without the legislative acts and the enforcement activities we have noted is a matter of speculation. We do know that despite this effort concentration and monopoly has grown apace. On July 12, 1957, Senator JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY presented a report of the Subcommittee on Antitrust and Antimonopoly, Committee on the Judiciary, U.S. Senate, entitled "Concentration in American Industry." That report presents statistics gathered by the Bureau of the Census. For each of a number of the basic industries, this report shows heavy concentration in the top three or four concerns. For example, in 1954, 94 percent of the production and sale of motor coaches was in the hands of the four largest companies. At the same time 84 percent of the production and sale of gasoline and 93 percent of the production and sale of unfinished oils and lubricating oil-base stock were in the hands and under the control of the 20 largest companies.

Now, what about the production and sale of TBA (tires, batteries, and automobile accessories) items? By 1954, 93 percent of the production and sale of vulcanized fiber, 52 percent of the synthetic rubber, 79 percent of the synthetic fibers, and 78 percent of tires and inner tubes were in the hands of the four largest companies in this industry.

Eighty-one percent of camelback and tire-repair materials were being produced and sold by the 20 largest companies. Also, by 1954, 93 percent of the production and sale of electric lamps (bulbs) and 99 percent of the jeweled domestic watch movements were in the hands and under the control of the four largest companies, while the four largest companies in these industries controlled two-thirds of the production and distribution of storage batteries.

Small and independent business is receiving a decreasing share of manufacturing in all lines of business. At the end of 1952 the few corporations, having more than $100 million of assets each, owned 51.5 percent of all of the assets of the manufacturing corporations of the United States. At the end of 1955 this percentage had grown to 57.1 percent. In other words, the big business share of the total business of the Nation had increased by more than 10 percent in that period. In 1956 their share of the total manufacturing assets had increased to 59 percent. According to 1957 reports of the Federal Trade Commission and the figures published by Fortune magazine, about one-half of 1 percent of the manufacturing corporations in the United States had 57 percent of the sales made by all manufacturing corporations, leaving only 43 percent for all others—large, medium, and small manufacturers.

The failure of antimonopoly law-enforcement activity to prevent the growth of concentration and monopoly should not be allowed to obscure certain very solid accomplishments of the Antitrust Division, Department of Justice, the Federal Trade Commission, and the Secretary of Agriculture in a number of important antimonopoly cases instituted by them. The Antitrust Division and the Federal Trade Commission are to be commended on their brilliant accomplishments in some of those cases. For example, the recent court decisions in the Du Pont-General Motors case and in the Youngstown-Bethlehem Steel case are landmarks. Likewise, the decision by the Federal Trade Commission in the Crown Zellerbach antimerger case is significant. However, we repeat that more of our limited antimonopoly resources should be diverted from the less important to the more important cases.

3. Important antimonopoly cases should not be settled through the entry of consent decrees and orders where the price paid involves the foregoing of needed relief.

It has been noted that in some of the important and significant antimonopoly cases consent decrees and orders have been entered which did not provide for important elements of relief prayed for in the complaints. A striking example of that is the consent judgment entered in the recent case of *United States* v. *American Telephone and Telegraph Company*.

Decrees and orders entered in antimonopoly cases should not only provide for the relief from practices found to be in violation of our antimonopoly laws but also should provide the relief in terms which can be relied upon to stop such practices effectively. For example, a decree in a case enjoining a combination and conspiracy should be so drawn to effectively bring to a halt not only the conspiracy but also the methods and means found to be part and parcel of it for its effectuation.

4. Decrees and orders entered in antimonopoly cases should be enforced.

It is of little moment to enter decrees and orders purporting to forbid practices and conditions found violative of our antimonopoly laws unless compliance with such decrees and orders is enforced. Reference has been made to the fact that a decree was entered in 1916 purporting to enjoin the National Cash Register Co. from engaging in and carrying on certain practices found to be violative of Federal antitrust laws. On two separate occasions since that decree was entered, defendants in the case have been fined for violating provisions of the decree. Recently, in November 1958, smaller competitors of National Cash Register Co. concluded it necessary for them to file a civil proceeding seeking to enjoin National Cash Register Co. from practices similar to those it allegedly had used for as long ago as 1916.

This report has detailed references to the few actions in which the law-enforcement agencies have sought to enforce compliance with decrees and orders entered in antimonopoly cases. There, too, reference is made to the fact that in the few instances where proceedings have been instituted to punish violators of decrees, the results obtained apparently have not provided sufficient deterrence to future violations.

5. Where needed to simplify and strengthen enforcement, new legislation should be enacted.

Reference has been made to a number of legislative proposals which would simplify and strengthen substantive provisions of our antimonopoly laws. During the past session, members of the House Small Business Committee and others have introduced a number of bills toward this objective. As previously pointed out, the enactment of Public Law 85-909 was one of the most significant recent steps of the antitrust law. Other legislation, however, is still needed and in the following section we recommend additional specific legislations.

Mr. Speaker, often overlooked is the fact that Congress set a statutory course for our independent Federal regulatory commissions and agencies to follow. At times some of these agencies have been inclined to wander off that course. At times some of them have been too prone to wrap themslves in judicial robes and as oracles look down and speak down to all—even to the Congress.

Lest these agencies and others forget that they are creatures of the Congress and that a major part of their function is in the service of the people as an arm of the Congress, perhaps we should remind others of the statutory course set for them by the Congress. There can be little if any dispute that the major function for these agencies is that of implementing the legislative process. In the performance of that function it is beyond dispute that these agencies are arms of the Congress. Nothing could be clearer than the provision in the Constitution of the United States, which gives to the Congress, and to the Congress alone, the authority and the power to regulate commerce. No part of that power is extended to the executive or to the judiciary. The Congress is utilizing its power in this respect by enacting broad legislative frameworks within which the independent regulatory agencies are to operate. The general legislative enactments which made unlawful "unjust rates," "unfair competition," "unfair discriminations," and many other unwholesome acts and practices, left it to the agencies to implement these broad legislative frameworks by filling in the details regarding which acts and practices are to be included and which are to be excluded from the framework. The performance of such function is neither executive nor judicial. It is legislative in character. In performing this function, these agencies act as arms of the Congress.

In addition, Congress has seen fit to empower these agencies to adjudicate specific matters alleged to be in violation of the statutory provisions implemented by the agencies' rules. In the performance of this particular function of adjudication, the agencies will and should be regarded as truly independent. In the performance of this function they are said to be quasi-judicial. In its performance they should not be subservient to either the legislative, executive or judiciary branches of the Government. In that area they are to be restrained only by the "law of the land" and their conscience.

Because they are called upon to perform quasi-judicial functions, some members of these agencies at times seem to resent the claim that the agencies are arms of the Congress. Blindly they argue for their position solely on the basis of their quasi-judicial function. Just as blindly they overlook the statutory course set for them by the Congress for the performance of their most important function, that of implementing the legislative process. It is this defect in their thinking to which House Report No. 2714 is directed in part.

It is thought that these agencies are in a position to improve their position and remove much cause for the criticism directed against them if they, with the help of the Congress, would move toward reestablishing themselves as arms of the Congress in the area of implementing the legislative process in the public interest.

In this connection, Mr. Speaker, quite recently Mr. Marvin Caplan, an outstanding Washington reporter, contributed a series of articles to the newspapers of the Fairchild Publications, Home Furnishings Daily and Women's Wear Daily. These articles are entitled, "What's Wrong With the FTC?" Although Mr. Caplan's writings deal with this single agency, they are thought-provoking on the general subject to which I have just directed my remarks. I ask unanimous consent to include these articles by Mr. Caplan at this point with my remarks.

The articles referred to follow:

WHAT'S WRONG WITH THE FTC?—PREOCCUPATION PROBLEM OF DELAY TACTICS CITED

(First of a series: "The Critics and the Criticisms")

(By Marvin Caplan)

WASHINGTON.—Automatic elevators are being installed in the Federal Trade Commission building.

A Commissioner who was taking his first ride in one remarked, "What a pleasure. Those old elevators used to take as long as some of our cases."

In this casual observation he expressed one of FTC's gravest preoccupations: The problem of delay.

A history of the changes in FTC procedures during its 45 years of existence could be written in terms of the agency's valiant attempts to speed enforcement. Nevertheless, when you ask people who know and study the Commission what they think is wrong, a ready criticism is that some of the cases, particularly antitrust cases, take too long.

The situation is ironic. Congress established FTC in 1914 in the belief that an independent agency could proceed against unfair competition faster than courts or legislative bodies. But, in the beginning, the

Commission had only two laws to administer: The Federal Trade Commission Act, which defined its structure and broad powers, and the Clayton Antitrust Act. FTC shares enforcement of the second law with the Justice Department's Antitrust Division.

FUNCTIONS EXPANDED

Since then, Congress has greatly expanded the agency's functions. It amended the FTC Act in 1938 with the Wheeler-Lea amendment to give the agency power to prevent not only unfair methods of competition, but also "unfair or deceptive acts or practices." It increased the scope of the Clayton Act twice: In 1936, through the Robinson-Patman Act, which gave the Commission new responsibilities in the field of price discriminations; and in 1950, by an amendment to section 7 that gave FTC broader power to proceed against monopolistic mergers.

Congress also has given FTC nine other laws to administer, mostly notable because of the way they have increased the agency's workload, the Wool and Fur Products Labeling Acts.

Yet, with all these added powers, the Commission is trying to fight deception and monopoly with a staff and budget not much larger than in its early years.

STAFF OF 800

In 1918, for instance, it had a staff of 669. Today the staff, after dropping below that figure occasionally, is 800, an alltime high. And its current budget is—for FTC—a record $6 million.

The Commission is charged by Congress to keep competition free and fair in an economy whose gross national product—the total output of goods and services—has been growing from $39.5 billion in 1915 to a possible $480 billion this year. And it has attempted to enforce truthfulness in advertising during a period in which annual advertising expenditures have jumped from $200 million in 1909 to more than $11 billion.

What FTC said of itself in its 1952 annual report, when it had 672 employees, is still true:

"The Commission resembles a city which, while doubling in population and tripling its volume of trade, has slightly reduced the size of its police force and fire department."

HOBBLED

The Commission also is hobbled by the complexity and insufficiencies of some of the laws it has to work with.

The U.S. Supreme Court, on several occasions, has criticized the complicated draftsmanship of the Robinson-Patman Act. And FTC has for years unsuccessfully urged Congress to amend the Clayton Act, to make it easier to stop violations of that law. At present, the Commission has to prove three violations of a Clayton Act order before it can get a court injunction with teeth in it and subject a violator to penalty.

Inadequate staff and inadequate laws are clearly matters beyond FTC's control. But critics of the Commission say, even so, there is much within the agency that could be improved.

One remediable cause of delay, they claim, is the Commission's procedures. These critics believe they are too old-fashioned and legalistic.

LIKE A COURT

The Commission, which was meant to hand out speedier justice than the courts, these critics say, now functions too much like a court. They feel it treats too many of the matters that come before it as full-scale lawsuits. They are also critical of some of the agency's attempts to speed up its handling of cases.

Stipulations, constant settlements, trade practice conferences, its new staff guides on deceptive pricing, tires, and cigarettes, have grave flaws in them, and sometimes even impede swift justice, the critics maintain.

Once past the problem of delay, on which there seems to be fairly general agreement, critics tend to fault the agency in terms of their own special fields.

INSUFFICIENT DATA

In the realm of antitrust, for example, economists say FTC is gravely handicapped by insufficient data on the Nation's economy.

In its rulemaking procedures, some attorneys say, it has gone too far and arrogated too much legislative function to itself.

Businessmen have their own special criticisms to make, once they go beyond grumbling over how long it takes FTC to complete some of its cases against their competitors.

FTC, they say, harasses businessmen. It inflicts publicity needlessly, they continue, and is overzealous in cracking down on technicalities. It picks on a firm here and there in an industry, businessmen say, and leave untouched competitors who are guilty of the same illegal practice.

And finally, the charge goes, it is subject to influence.

In short, FTC is either too weak or too strong. Yet some of these criticisms are not without substance. Following articles will explore them further.

WHAT'S WRONG WITH FTC?—AGENCY FINDS CENSURE WALKS TWO-WAY STREET

(Second of a series: "How Justified Are the Criticisms Businessmen Make?")

(By Marvin Caplan)

WASHINGTON.—For several weeks last summer, the Federal Trade Commission—which some businessmen say uses publicity in a needlessly punishing way—was subjected itself to a glare of public attention.

Commission officials picked up their morning papers without pleasure and read detailed accounts of the dealings between Bernard Goldfine, Boston textile manufacturer, and various agency executives at the time he and some of his mills were under charges of mislabeling wool fabrics.

Embarrassingly, the FTC section most involved was its Division of Textiles and Fur. In and out of FTC, it is considered one of the hardest working and most efficient units in the agency.

Fully one-third of the FTC's complaints these days charge violations of the Fur and Wool Products Labeling Acts. The Division's share of complaints is sure to be increased within the next 2 years as it takes over the policing of the new Textile Fiber Products Identification Act.

How much influence Mr. Goldfine's telephone call to former Presidential Assistant Sherman Adams had on those FTC officials within earshot of it, and the propriety of former FTC Chairman Edward F. Howrey's unilateral report on the case to the White House, are debatable matters,

But now that Mr. Adams is gone from the White House, it seems evident that much of the furor over the case was whipped up by those who were out to get him. The case itself was a routine one of mislabeling.

That it was settled by consent—the mills and Mr. Goldfine agreeing to a cease-and-desist order without admitting any violation—is a proof of that. The great majority of labeling cases are disposed of that way.

Much has been made of the fact that an FTC staff attorney's recommendation for criminal prosecution was turned down. But that recommendation was reviewed by at least five FTC officials, two of whom swear they had never heard of Bernard Goldfine, and it was rejected, FTC officials insist, because the agency has found criminal prosecution to be expensive, time consuming, and no more effective than its cease-and-desist orders.

It seldom uses such power—since the Wool Act went into effect in 1941, FTC has recommended only five cases for criminal prosecution, and only three were actually filed and tried.

CONSIDERABLE EXCITEMENT

A lot of the excitement over the case arose from lack of knowledge of FTC procedure. The same accounts for some of the gripes businessmen develop against the Commission—of harassment and undue publicity.

A businessman under complaint by FTC is often like a fish on a canning factory conveyor belt. In both instances, it is difficult to halt or reverse the process.

About 85 percent of the complaints FTC receives originate with a businessman's competitors or in the anguish of his customers. They protest to the Commission, and the process begins. The complaints—3,600 during the last fiscal year—are usually channeled first to the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

If the complaint does not duplicate something already in the works, and seems to have some substance, it is assigned for study to one of FTC's 32 project attorneys. If he finds evidence of a possible violation, the matter may then be sent to one of FTC's nine field offices for investigation.

AVAILABLE FOR CHECKING

One hundred and ten field investigators, 14 working exclusively on wool, fur, and flammable fabrics cases, are available for checking a complaint at first hand.

If a matter survives their study, it returns to the Commission for one of three possible dispositions: If it is not serious, it can be closed out almost at once, without publicity, by a letter of assurance from the businessman that he will correct the situation. If it warrants stronger action, it may be settled by stipulation, which is a bit more punitive since that becomes a matter of public record. And if FTC feels only prosecution will help, it issues a full-fledged complaint.

CREATES MISUNDERSTANDINGS

The time it takes between investigation and formal complaint sometimes creates misunderstandings. The unlucky businessman, who, faced with a set of charges, says, "But I stopped that practice 6 months ago, as soon as your agent called it to my attention," is simply caught in agency process.

FTC has no way of knowing how bona fide his discontinuance is, and issues the complaint to be sure the practice will not be resumed.

The businessman who feels he has reached an understanding with the field investigator should know that these agents have no authority to close out a matter. They can recommend dismissal of charges in their reports; they can cite previous settled cases as a guide to a businessman's future action, but that is about all.

PREPARES RELEASE

Once a formal complaint is issued, it is sent to FTC's Bureau of Public Information and a release is prepared, checked by staff attorneys, and timed to reach the newspapers a day or so after the complaint reaches the alleged offender.

No other aspect of FTC's procedure, probably, causes more cries of outrage than its issuing of press releases.

It has been suggested that FTC follow some rule of reason in using releases: That it weigh the harmful effects publicity may have on a well-known firm charged with a relatively minor misdemeanor. But FTC issues about 1,250 releases a year. It has no time to stop and weigh. And such considerations might result in unequal treatment of respondents.

An alternative suggestion, that FTC issue no press releases until a case is finished, also is considered unsound. FTC has tried that. In the beginning it heard cases and issued orders without publicity. It found the procedure ineffectual. The "shock" of publicity, it discovered, had therapeutic effect.

In issuing press releases, FTC is following the advice of two mentors: Woodrow Wilson, who in 1912 envisioned the agency as an "instrument of information and publicity," and the late Supreme Court Justice Louis D. Brandeis, who in a conference with FTC officials in 1915 advised them, when they had a strong case and public interest was affected, to try for "as much publicity as you can get."

What of the charge that FTC harasses businessmen in its investigations? It does seem hard on a retailer, right at the peak Christmas selling season, for example, to have an investigator walk in and study his records for four days.

LEGAL PROCESS AT WORK

But again, the inexorable legal process is at work. Most investigators have no animus against the firm they are investigating. But their work must be done and they can't delay.

As for the charge that FTC is often guilty of "overzealous enforcement of technicalities," as one retailer put it, it usually rises from such strong emotion that its objectivity may be questionable.

For instance, the man who made the quoted charge was a furrier. An examination of FTC's records showed the complaint he objected to was issued only after FTC had written several letters to him, failed to obtain correction of practices administratively, and finally lost patience.

The complaint it issued against him did charge violations that could be considered technicalities. But in objecting to them, the furrier made no mention of the other charges in the complaint, such as one of fictitious pricing that is not dismissed by FTC officials as trivial.

Within the bounds of its laws, the Commission tries to be lenient.

The whole machinery it has set up for informal adjustment of small violations, its consultative services which offer a businessman advice based on past decisions, are examples of that.

The trade-practices conferences, which it established without explicit authorization from Congress, are an attempt by calling all members of an industry together to work on a code, to educate them in the requirements of its laws and try to erase the need to proceed against one firm at a time for something all of its competitors are doing.

Now, to darken the picture a bit with two questions: Is FTC subject to outside pressure, and to what degree does it respond to it?

Pressure is certainly there. The Goldfine case may be an instance of White House pressure.

"But I've seen plenty of Congressmen in these halls," an agency veteran said.

MUCH MORE FAMILIAR

The routine call from a Senator or Representative, asking how a case against a constituent is progressing, is much more familiar to FTC officials than a call from a Sherman Adams.

Considering that Commissioners are political appointees, named by the White House for 7 years and confirmed by the Senate, it is evident that FTC, like almost every agency of Government, is subject to outside influence.

To what degree does it respond? Very little, observers said. There may be instances of favors and gift-giving, but they believe there is little serious corruption. For one thing, a former official pointed out wryly, the Commission has nothing to give away—neither TV channels nor air routes.

Yet it is not entirely free from influence. But then in Washington, no Government agency is.

Within a realistic frame, businessmen may concede FTC does a pretty good job. They may think it is weak and ineffectual—and it often is. They may think it takes too long with a case against competitors.

"But even the retailers who complain the most," said a spokesman for one business association, "don't want to see it go. They need it. They depend on it."

WHAT'S WRONG WITH FTC?—CRITICS FEEL AGENCY ACTS TOO MUCH LIKE A COURT

(Third in a series: "The Legal Side of FTC")

(By Marvin Caplan)

WASHINGTON, February 17.—There's a story in the Federal Trade Commission that the five heads of that agency, not too many years ago, bought themselves black judicial robes and prepared to add this note of formal elegance to their proceedings.

At the last moment, some word of caution, some saving sense of humor stopped them, and the robes were never worn.

The story indicates the ambivalence with which even Commissioners look upon the agency. FTC is not a court. But, some critics say, it functions too much like a court. The Commissioners are not judges—though attorneys often address them as your honors—yet, say the critics, all too frequently they have tried to act like judges.

FTC can be defined as a quasi-judicial agency. Some people feel the emphasis has been heavily upon the judicial side from the start. Then, in 1914, administrative law was comparatively new and not equal in stature to law as practiced in the courts and Congress.

The Interstate Commerce Commission, the first of the present-day regulatory agencies (1887), grew out of the need for an agency that could regulate an aspect of the economy more rapidly and effectively than legislatures and courts. FTC was set up for much the same reasons.

The Commission recalls that in order to prevent monopoly in its incipiency, a new regulatory body was created, the Federal Trade Commission, which was given two basic types of powers, legal powers to issue cease-and-desist orders and broad economic factfinding powers. The economic powers have been progressively curtailed. Emphasis has been upon its legal powers, and on the formal aspect of them, rather than informal administrative procedure. FTC's rules were drawn up by Commissioner George Rublee, who is said to have thought of the Commission primarily as a court. They were implemented for many years by general counsels who shared his views.

Today, FTC's formal procedure bears a strong resemblance to court procedure. A complaint is issued. The respondent is given 30 days to answer. If he denies the charges and the complaint comes to trial it is argued before a hearing examiner of the Commission and testimony is presented, much as in a court of law, in hearings.

Much has been made of the fact that FTC is judge and prosecutor: The examiner who hears the case and the attorney who appears in support of the complainant are both agency employees. But in practice it appears to work fairly and well. Anyone hearing an examiner take issue with an FTC attorney will recognize the familiar antagonism that often exists between judge and counsel.

EITHER MAY APPEAL

After the evidence is in and the record closed, the examiner issues his initial decision and order. It is not final; either side may appeal it to the full Commission, or the Commission itself can schedule hearing on it.

After argument before the full Commission, a final decision is rendered which may be carried to a U.S. Court of Appeals by the respondent and eventually, up to the U.S. Supreme Court. But a former agency official pronounces the procedure antiquated.

The Commission, he says, "operates as though it is presenting a case before the king's bench, three hundred years ago." He and others insist the procedure could be streamlined and shortened without loss of effectiveness.

FTC has tried to speed up its procedures. Its trade practice conference work is an attempt to get an entire industry to observe its laws. Its stipulations and consent settlements are attempts to administer quick justice. All three procedures have shortcomings.

The rules that issue from trade practice conferences do not have the force of law. They are only advisory interpretations of the laws FTC administers. Their value is chiefly educational.

STAFF GUIDES

FTC's new staff guides, like the one it issued in October, 1958, on deceptive pricing, are another educational device the Commission is experimenting with. The guide has been enthusiastically received by a number of business groups. But it is too early to estimate its effectiveness as a law enforcement tool.

Stipulations have long been a subject of hot agency discussion. They are a middle step between informal, private settlement of a case and formal prosecution.

A businessman who signs a stipulation with FTC merely agrees that the document correctly describes a particular practice, and that he will discontinue it. He does not admit he has violated the law and no order is issued against him. FTC makes this public in a press release. If he violates the stipulation, FTC has to begin proceedings against him all over.

Debate over the value of stipulations goes on within the Commission and reflects a basic difference in enforcement philosophy: Between those who believe it possible for businessmen and law-enforcement agents to reason together, and those who believe the only lasting enforcement is strong enforcement.

PRACTICE GROWS

Consent settlements—a procedure in which the respondent agrees to the issuance of a cease-and-desist order against him without admitting he has done anything wrong—have grown enormously in popularity at times. They have long been available, but usually only in deceptive practice cases. They reached their greatest use under President Eisenhower's first appointment to the Commission, former Chairman Edward F. Howrey, who in less than 2½ years on the Commission recast the agency's structure. Under Mr. Howrey, FTC's rules were changed so that any case, antitrust as well as antideceptive, can be settled by consent and, another innovation, can be settled at almost any stage of the proceeding.

This extension of the consent settlement procedure has been viewed with qualms by some attorneys, mostly those in favor of a strong enforcement policy. No consent settlement order has ever been reviewed by a court. Such orders cannot be used, as orders in fully litigated antitrust cases can be, as the basis for private treble-damage suits. No record is developed, and little information about the firm under charge ever becomes public.

FTC attorneys insist the consent order is as final and binding as an order issued after full litigation. Unquestionably, time and money are saved. But it may present at least one danger to the public interest. Sometimes in the course of negotiating settlements, an official says, FTC bargains away from the vital point and comes up with less relief than it sought in the complaint.

A good example is FTC's recent case against American Chicle Co., maker of Rolaids.

FTC attacked television ads for Rolaids, including the fostered impression that the medical profession generally prescribes or recommends Rolaids. FTC's own sampling survey of 65,000 physicians showed that no

more than 3,600 at the most had ever recommended Rolaids as a specific for acid indigestion.

American Chicle then consented to an order barring it from saying doctors prescribe Rolaids unless the representation is limited to the number of doctors not greater than has been ascertained to be the fact.

Now, American Chicle can, and does, proclaim that a Government survey shows 3,400 doctors recommend Rolaids; and FTC can do nothing about it.

WHAT'S WRONG WITH FTC?—LACK OF ECONOMIC DATA HAMPERS MERGER ACTIONS

(Fourth in a series)

(By Marvin Caplan)

WASHINGTON.—Much alarm has been expressed, in Government and business quarters, over the rapid growth of mergers in this country. Some talk worriedly of creeping monopoly. The actual situation may be worse than anyone knows.

FTC and the Justice Department are instructed by section 7 of the Clayton Act to stop mergers in certain areas of the economy, where the effect may be substantially to lessen competition, or to tend to create a monopoly.

The trouble is that both agencies operate with such insufficient economic data they are sometimes forced to choose, entirely by chance, what mergers they will proceed against. And some important business mergers probably slip right by them.

In 1957 former U.S. Attorney General Herbert Brownell, Jr., estimated that Justice missed about 30 percent of current mergers.

LOW ESTIMATE

FTC Chairman John W. Gwynne said then he was "inclined to think it (the figure) was something like that." There is good reason to believe the estimate is too low.

When it comes to knowing what mergers are being consummated in the U.S. economy—in fields other than banking and transportation, where they have no jurisdiction—FTC and Justice are limited, like most people, pretty much to what they read in the newspapers.

Both agencies have other sources, of course, besides newspaper and private reporting services, like Moody's and Standard & Poor's.

Informaton is picked up from the many reports American business must make to the Government. A notable source are filings made with FTC's fellow regulatory agency, the Securities and Exchange Commission.

But, even here, there is a gaping hole. A company needs report to SEC only those acquisitions which represent 10 percent or more of its assets. Government economists point out that a company like General Motors Corp., with total assets of approximately $7.5 billion, can and probably does make some sizable acquisitions and never reports them officially.

COMMISSION AWARE

FTC has long been aware of how little it knows, not only about mergers, but about many aspects of the U.S. economy.

It does not even know such an apparently elementary fact as the names of the biggest U.S. corporations. Some years ago the Commission went confidently to work on a report it planned to call "The 1,000 Largest Companies." It issued the report in June 1951, under the more modest title of "A List of 1,000 Large Manufacturing Companies."

"We still do not have a definitive list of the top companies in the country," an FTC economist says flatly.

Fortune magazine issues an annual supplement on the 500 largest industrial corporations. Justice and FTC rely on it in preparing their anti-trust cases. Yet FTC's staff has reason to believe about 100 of the largest United States corporations are missing from that list.

CRUCIAL GAPS

Since FTC's economic fact-finding and reporting have long been recognized by Congressional committees and anti-trust authorities as important instruments of antimonopoly action, these gaps are of crucial importance in any enforcement program.

FTC and Justice know this, and it is one of the impelling reasons in their pleas to Congress for a premerger notification law. This would require sizable corporations, subject to the jurisdiction of these agencies, to report their merger plans before any deal is closed. Such a law was introduced in the 85th Congress but failed to pass. It has been introduced again this term. Even if it passes, it will fill only one gap in the Government's economic data. Are new laws needed to fill them all?

There are people at the commission who think not. They say even the premerger notification law isn't necessary, that all the authority FTC needs, to get any economic information, is already contained in section 6 of the FTC act.

This section gives FTC power to compel American business to supply information it needs for its work. At present, it is principally invoked to require businessmen to fill out questionnaires used to compile the quarterly financial reports on United States manufacturing corporations that FTC issues jointly with SEC.

COURT UPHOLDS SECTION 6

A former top FTC economist feels the power of section 6 has never been used sufficiently. The Supreme Court in its decision in the Morton Salt Case in 1950, gives powerful support to this sentiment by saying of section 6 "* * * we find nothing that would deny its use, for any purpose within the duties of the Commission * * *"

A few years ago there was a move within the Commision to use the section in a way that would have produced the systematic economic data FTC needs for its enforcement programs. Nothing came of it.

It is hard to know why. Some explanation might lie in the differing emphasis that Commission old-timers say Democrats and Republicans put upon the agency's work.

According to this theory, when the Democrats are in power, they tend to concentrate on antimerger and antitrust work and go lightly on deceptive acts and practices. When the Republicans are in the theory continues, they crack down hard on deception—the agency's current drive against fictitious pricing is considered an instance of this—and ease up on antitrust prosecutions. In fairness to the present administration, there is also reason to believe antideceptive work was spurred on by reports issued last year by a Congressional subcommittee.

REASONS DIFFER

This view might seem refuted again by the increased number of antitrust cases brought within recent years. But some FTC attorneys—Democrats obviously—feel this has been due more to congressional prodding and an increase in the Commission's appropriation for antimonopoly work than to any real crusading zeal within the agency.

It appears true that increased antitrust work has received very little support in the way of basic factfinding activity. The apparent reluctance to pursue the agency's powers under section 6 is one instance of that.

Another is FTC's disinclination to study, as it might have done in its early years, certain significant aspects of the U.S. economy. Jointly held companies are a good example. Such companies are not new. But, in recent years, their number has mushroomed tremendously. Government economists do not understand their significance. They may very well be perfectly legal arrangements. Yet, they produce such fairly awesome aggregations as General Motors Corp. and Standard Oil (New Jersey) jointly owning Ethyl Corp. Presumably an agency, whose job is to keep an eye on economic concentration, would want to take a look at such poolings of interest. No one at FTC is watching.

SMALL ECONOMIC STAFF

It must be conceded, however, that the Commission is limited in what it can do by its small economic staff, no more than 3 percent of total personnel today. That small number is evidence of a trend since the 1920's, to reduce FTC's economic functions and to concentrate on its legal efforts. This is a departure from the original concept of the Commission, in which the economist was to play as important a role as the attorney. Early in the Commission's history, the economists outnumbered the lawyers. In 1918, primarily because it was required by the exigencies of World War I to supply other agencies with cost information, 70 percent of FTC's personnel was in its economic division.

Curiously enough, it was a Republican member of the agency who, in recent years, showed the greatest interest in expending FTC's economic work.

HOWREY'S TECHNIQUE

Former Chairman Edward F. Howrey, quite early in his term, stressed the need for considering all relevant economic data in antitrust cases. He even discussed attaching a permanent economic adviser to his staff. His critics say he emphasized these economic aspects in an attempt to delay antitrust cases, by clogging their records with superfluous data. It is understood that sharp congressional criticism of his "rule of reason" approach to antitrust work with the concomitant stress on economics, was a principal reason for his resignation before his term expired.

Nevertheless, other Commissioners, not Republicans, took and take a sympathetic view of what Howrey professed to attempt.

"Why," one former Commissioner declares, "economics is the lifeblood of the damn Commission."

If he is right, the agency nowadays is afflicted with anemia.

WHAT'S WRONG WITH FTC?—EXTREME REMEDIES PROPOSED FOR FAULTS

(Fifth and last of a series: "What Can Be Done To Improve the FTC?")

(By Marvin Caplan)

WASHINGTON.—Two extreme remedies are sometimes proposed for the faults of the Federal Trade Commission. One is to abolish the agency. The other is to give it a great deal more money and expand its powers and staff.

The first point of view has many vehement, eloquent, and powerful adherents, most of them in the American Bar Association.

For some time they have been pressing for the establishment of a nationwide system of administrative courts that would strip from the Commission its major functions, particularly in the field of antitrust.

WITH ABA BACKING

A bill to set up such a new system is expected to be introduced again at this session of Congress, with ABA backing.

It has little chance of passage. It is doubtful that any present attempt to abolish or scale down the Commission will succeed. During the late 1930's, a major drive was mounted in Congress to divest FTC and other regulatory agencies of much of their power. It failed, and the agencies seem more firmly established than ever.

If it is assumed that something like the Commission is needed for the proper functioning of the American economy, then the second proposal, to expand the size and power of the agency, apparently has much to recommend it.

"No other major regulatory agency is faced with so huge a task as the Commission with such feeble weapons," a report of the House Small Business Committee observed in 1951: "More and better men, and hence more money, are basic to the necessary enhancement of the effectiveness of the antitrust laws."

But Congress has shown little disposition to act on such advice. While it has increased FTC's appropriation in recent years, much of that money has been absorbed in pay increases and in the administrative responsibilities imposed on the agency by the labeling laws.

The Commission has shortcomings and irritations that could be corrected with more money. It is enough, perhaps, to mention a small but exasperating thing: The shortage of stenographic help for its legal staff.

FTC lawyers tell of having to stay after hours to get out their own mail, or of waiting days for a stenographer to type an important paper.

But even within its budget limitations, present and former staff people say, FTC could attempt more than it does. According to this view, one thing wrong with the Commission is simply a lack of imagination in men who head the agency, and an unwillingness to experiment with the power it already possesses.

PROBLEM OF DELAY

It is impossible, in this serious of articles to discuss a sweeping reorganization of the Commission. But take the problem of delay alone. There is a feeling at staff level that much could be done about delay through relatively simple changes.

One change might be to ask Congress to strengthen FTC's rulemaking powers. Another might be revamping of the entire complaint procedure along lines already authorized by the FTC Act. A third might be a more efficient use of examiners and attorneys.

At present, most of the rules FTC issues—notably its set of trade practice rules and its recent staff guides on deceptive pricing and other matters—are only interpretations of the laws it administers.

These rules themselves carry no force of law. Industry members violate them, but the violation of a rule, in itself, provides no basis for action.

THROUGH ALL STEPS

It cannot be mentioned in the complaint as the reason for FTC's charges. The offense can only become a basis for Commission action after it is carried through all the steps of conventional agency process.

But if FTC's rules had the force of law, the first suggestion runs, the agency could stop a host of practices more simply and speedily than it does now. A former FTC attorney, a proponent of this view, said:

"Get a statute giving FTC power to make rules with the force of law. There are limitations on this. But it could be used to stop fictitious pricing, lotteries, a number of other practices."

FTC already has such rulemaking power under the Wool and Fur Products Labeling Acts and under the new Textile Fiber Products Identification Act. These laws certainly give it a stronger basis for action.

RAPID DISPOSITION

The rapid disposition of fur and wool act cases argues in support of greater rulemaking power. And the new labeling act suggests Congress may be disposed to give FTC more of this kind of authority. Some FTC attorneys see a trend toward such legislation.

Another suggestion for cutting down delay is that FTC exercise, in a different way, the powers it has under section 5(B) of the FTC Act.

This is the section that authorizes the agency to issue complaints against anyone it suspects of an unfair method of competition, or an unfair or deceptive act or practice.

It says that the party named in the complaint shall have the right to appear at a place and time fixed by the Commission "and show cause why an order should not be entered by the Commission * * * to cease and desist."

TO SHORTEN ACTIONS

According to some Commission attorneys, this phrase could be used to shorten present FTC actions. Instead of following the customary courtlike procedure, they said, the agency could summon a respondent straight before the Commission, present him the charges and have him show cause why an order should not be issued.

Full trial would be held only if FTC could not prove its charges.

"The only trouble with the idea," noted one of the attorneys who suggested it, "is that everyone wants to try lawsuits." As for delay, "delay is the greatest stock in trade of civil practitioners. Delay is always on the side of the defendant."

The third suggestion for cutting down the case time involves changing FTC's present method of making assignments to its 11 examiners.

HANDLE MORE CASES

The suggestion came from a former examiner, who estimated he could have handled twice the caseload he did.

The chief difficulty with the job, he said, is that so much time is wasted on the road. FTC attorneys and examiners travel all over the country taking testimony on a complaint. An examiner will all too often find himself in San Francisco with a hearing he can dispose of in half a day, and use the rest of the week getting back to Washington.

The situation could be corrected to a great extent, the examiner believed, if assignments were made on a geographic basis. If the examiner in San Francisco also could schedule hearings on cases involving respondents in Los Angeles and Seattle and bring the witnesses into San Francisco the week he is there, he could handle three cases instead of one.

Too often, however, purely extraneous considerations enter into the assignment of cases. For instance, one examiner with a married daughter on the West Coast gets there on assignment at least twice a year.

These three proposals for combating delay—rulemaking power with the force of law, revision of the complaint procedure, and more efficient staff assignment—are not offered as a panacea.

Each of them, their advocates point out, contains controversial elements. But they have been proposed a number of times by men who know the Commission intimately, and would like to see it function better.

If they have not received careful study, it may be, as their advocates suggest, that the fault lies in a condition of apathy, a lack of will to explore and examine just what the agency can do.

Surveying the Commission today, a former FTC attorney, who works with a watchdog congressional committee, thinks it is doing a much better job than it did only a few years ago, but needs bolder, more imaginative direction.

There is a sequel to the story about the FTC Commissioner who rode the new automatic elevator in the agency and wished FTC's cases would all move as fast.

A week or so later, the elevator developed bugs, missed floors, stuck, shut its doors either too slowly or too abruptly.

"Goldarn," said an attorney entering and shaking his head. "This thing never works the way you want it."

It was almost as if he spoke for the many people who work diligently and devotedly in the Commission's cause and expressed their deepest sentiment about the agency itself.

MORE AGREEMENT THAT TIGHT-MONEY POLICY IS A BAD REMEDY FOR ADMINISTERED PRICES

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, many Members of this body are gravely concerned over the way the Federal Reserve System is regulating this Nation's economy. And they should be concerned; this is one of the central issues, if not the central issue, of our times.

Certainly it is the central problem on the domestic front. It involves such questions as how many people will have jobs, how many farmers will be dispossessed, what kinds of schools and other public facilities the Nation will have. Finally, it raises a question whether our so-called free enterprise system really is the best system after all. Certainly, too, this question of how our economy is being regulated, and with what effects, cannot be unrelated to this Nation's success or failure in the international arena.

If our system is such that we must have long periods of stagnation, rather than the rapid economic growth which new advances in technology and worker-productivity make possible, then many other nations must wonder whether the Western World will long continue to lead in industrial strength.

If we must have these severe and prolonged recessions in creative activity, other nations must doubt, as we must doubt, whether we will win out in the race for scientific and technical supremacy. There are many Members who, like myself, are not experts in foreign affairs and we are wondering about this: Since our business and financial leaders seem to believe that our economic system can function properly only with about 6 percent of our working population unemployed, will people in other parts of the Western World really wish to copy our free enterprise system and form their intellectual and spiritual alliances with us. These questions are passing on the minds of many of us.

There are some guides to be found, I think, in two letters by distinguished economists which recently appeared in the Washington Post and Times Herald. One is a letter written by Mr. Woodlief Thomas, who is economic adviser to the Federal Reserve Board. The other is written by Mr. Leon H. Keyserling, who is the former Chairman of President Truman's Council of Economic Advisers, commenting on Mr. Thomas' letter.

TIGHT MONEY POLICY SQUEEZES OUT COMPETITION; BRINGS MORE POWER TO ADMINISTER PRICES

Both of these are good and thoughtful letters. Both show a devotion to the public interest and to those particular values with which most of us would agree. It seems to me that as compared to the amount of the agreement between the two views expressed by these economists, any differences between them are extremely minor.

There now seems to be wide agreement on all sides on these points:

First. Increases in the price level which have taken place since the Korean period have not been the result of a monetary inflation. In this period the underlying demand was not present to bring about a proliferation of credit in excess of productive capacity. These price increases have resulted. in short, from arbitrary price-making in the administered price industries. In other words, these industries have sufficient monopoly power to jack up prices and have jacked up prices, even at times when they were suffering from a serious decline in business.

Second. Present methods of squeezing money and credit are not effective in checking price increases of this kind. Indeed, tight-money policies applied on such a mixed economic system as we have—consisting of both monopoly activities and highly competitive activities, and all shades in between—may cause such distortions and upsets in the system as to make the cure worse than the disease.

The fact is, as I see it, tightening money actually causes the administered-price industries to raise prices. Tightening money means raising interest rates which brings about an increased cost. And more often than not, the administered price industries shift any and all increased costs on to the consumers. In truth, they usually shift more than the increased cost, because there is a general tendency to set prices as a percentage mark-up over costs. So there is a tendency not merely to shift the increased cost, but to set prices so as to take a profit on the increased cost. Fighting inflation in these industries with tight money is like fighting fire with gasoline.

I do not contend that the tight-money policy has not caused price decreases in the competitive segments of the economy. On the contrary, it clearly has done so. Over these last several years when the big-business industries were making price increases and pushing up the general price index, the tight-money policy was shrinking the hides of the farmer and the small-business man. Tens of thousands of small-business people were pushed into bankruptcy and their inventories have been liquidated at distressed prices. And the profit margins of other small businesses have been squeezed. These bargain prices which small business has had to offer in the course of its general exodus from the business system have disguised to some extent the full measure of the big-business price increases. The overall Consumer Price Index does not show the full effect, because small-business people and farmers are paying for the tight-money policy.

Furthermore, the Nation is continuing to pay, and will continue to pay, for many years to come. At the same time small firms were being pushed to the wall, giant corporations were expanding. They were buying up and merging smaller companies; they were building bigger and more efficient productive plants; they were building supermarkets and distribution outlets of all kinds; and they were spending huge sums—usually Government money—on research and experimentation to acquire and control new and improved business techniques. In brief, the tight-money policy has left the Nation with a greater concentration of economic power, a stronger monopoly control over markets and production techniques, and it has left consumers with poorer defenses against administered prices.

Yet, in spite of this practical experience with a theory which did not make sense in the first place, the Federal Reserve System has now embarked upon a new tight-money policy. Why? That is the question, Why?

LETTERS OF WOODLIEF THOMAS AND LEON KEYSERLING

The letters submitted by Messrs. Thomas and Keyserling are as follows. I believe they contain much from which we can profit:

FEDERAL RESERVE'S ECONOMICS

Dr. Woodlief Thomas' communication of March 12 is commendable for its statement (a) that the evil of administered prices moving upward "is not so much that they create inflation but that they tend to retard growth and to increase unemployment" because they create "distortions," and (b) that these private pricing actions "cannot be effectively controlled or corrected by * * * fiscal and monetary policies," and that "any attempt to avoid these distortions by monetary policies might increase the distortions and lead to a more severe adjustment."

But is the Federal Reserve System benefiting by the sage advice of Dr. Thomas? In early 1957, the FRB was insisting that the inflation was of the classic variety resulting from demand in excess of supply, and that the tightening of monetary policy was the best way to fight it, even though it was abundantly apparent that the slack plant and manpower was already much too large and showing clear signs of increasing rapidly, and that the only type of inflation then in being was administered price inflation.

And today, the FRB is again tightening up on money. when unemployment is still increasing, when there has been virtually no price inflation for almost a year, and when the only price inflation threat in the foreseeable future is that administered prices may again be raised long before key industries are subjected to any high pressure of demand against available productive capacities.

Dr. Thomas does present the FRB argument that stricter monetary policies are now needed to prevent an actual or threatened expansion of credit which might result "if monetary policy should undertake to finance whatever demands for credit are made upon the banking system, or permit itself to be used to justify all decisions made by producers."

Monetary policy can be used effectively on the credit front. But the defect in the FRB position has been failure to recognize that, just as the distortions in the price structure are more serious than rising prices per se, so distortions in the credit structure are of central significance.

To illustrate, in 1957 the economy was not threatened by an excess of total investment, but rather by a rather typical investment boom in plant and producers' equipment running far ahead of demand for products. Meanwhile, investment by States and localities in schools and other public services, investment in housing, and investment by the Federal Government for national defense and essential domestic programs, were running much too low to meet the great priorities of our national needs, or even to lift total investment to levels consistent with maintenance of a high and stable rate of economic growth.

Yet the tight money policy in 1957 increased these distortions by repressing further the types of investment (and private consumption) which were already too low. The policy had virtually no restraining effect upon the investment boom in plant and equipment, which came to an end only when industry recognized that productive capabilities had run way ahead of effective demand.

Today, we suffer greatly from the deficiencies in certain types of public investment and private consumption referred to above. In addition, we now need expansion of fundamental investment in plant and equipment generally, which will not occur until there is a sufficient expansion of private and public demand; overall investment and credit are expanding much too slowly.

The current tight money policy is again repressing those things which we urgently need to expand first, and is having very little effect upon those things which can expand only thereafter. It is also throttling the small entrepreneur further, and hurting all marginal groups who ought to be helped.

Thus, while the FRB should be praised for its belated belaboring of administered price increases, this should not absolve the FRB from its share of responsibility for inadequate economic growth or high unemployment, nor divert attention from needed changes in FRB policies.

And if it is appropriate for the FRB to be concerned about administered prices because all private and public economic policies interact, then it is at least equally appropriate for the executive branch and Congress to be concerned about monetary policies, which raises the question of just how "independent" the FRB should be.

LEON H. KEYSERLING.

WASHINGTON.

THOSE ADMINISTERED PRICES

(A communication from Woodlief Thomas)

(Woodlief Thomas, author of this communication, is the economic adviser to the Federal Reserve Board.)

Recent discussion of the influence of administered prices, stimulated by Gardiner Means' statement before the Kefauver committee (Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary), has made a significant contribution to a better understanding of the problems of inflation and fluctuations in economic activity and employment. This contribution is in pointing out that there are unstabilizing forces in pricing actions of the private economy—on the part of both management and labor—that cannot be effectively controlled or corrected by governmental actions in the area of fiscal and monetary policies.

The columns of the Washington Post have covered much of this discussion, beginning with Bernard Nossiter's lucid presentation on February 8. Gardiner Means placed major—and apparently undue—emphasis on the role of administrative decisions by

powerful corporations and labor organizations in fixing prices and wages without due regard to economic forces or public interest. He also expressed the view, which was not supported and is inconsistent with his major thesis, that restrictive monetary policies brought on the recession in 1957. Eugene Havas in his letter of February 19 to the Washington Post pointed out the effects of pricing policies on the profits of steel companies and expressed the view that monetary and fiscal policies, though sound in themselves, cannot stop inflation spurred by administrative price increases. Ralph Young, in his letter to Senator PROXMIRE and also in his more recent appearance before the Kefauver committee, pointed out the various demands and other market factors that have influenced price movements in recent years. Harold Dorsey, in some of his recent excellent Monday columns in the Post, has also presented a realistic analysis of recent price changes and their possible effects in contributing to economic instability.

Objection to administered prices, it may be concluded from these discussions, although not precisely stated in any of them, should not be so much that they contribute to inflation but that they interfere with the proper functioning of the price mechanism and lead eventually to unemployment of resources.

Prices should serve as a means for obtaining the most effective allocation of resources and maintaining a balance between output and use. In a free-market economy, there should be no objection if an industry or a company or an individual endeavors to obtain the highest prices obtainable for its products or services in the light of existing and foreseeable circumstances. Such a policy stimulates investment in increased productive capacity and tends to restrain demand.

One of the considerations in fixing prices, of course, should be what price can be sustained and whether markets might be lost for a longer period by asking the highest possible price for any short period of time. Criticism arises with respect to administered prices when they are not adjusted properly in response to supply and demand forces. They are harmful if prices are raised so as to choke off demand and lead to reductions in output or if prices are held up in the face of declining demand when lower prices might sooner or later stimulate some demand. The result is that production and employment are reduced more and kept down for a longer period than would otherwise be the case. Such a result is harmful to those responsible for the bad judgment in setting prices as well as to the general public interest.

Consumers have the privilege of deciding whether or not to buy a product or a service that is offered at the price demanded. Higher wages or other cost increases are not a decisive reason for raising prices, if consumers won't buy the output that can be produced at the higher prices asked. An economic system cannot be expected to operate on the principle that a seller can always obtain any price he wishes to ask for his product. In order to maintain sustainable economic growth, it is the task of the seller to adjust his prices or his product so as to stimulate demand. Otherwise it is to be expected that resources will be allocated to other uses, but this is a time-consuming process and results in unemployment. Much of the unemployment existing today can be attributed to distortions and inflexiblilities in the price and income structure.

It is most likely, for example that some wages and prices were raised or kept up too high in 1957 and thus choked off demands. Moreover, they have not been adjusted downward sufficiently to stimulate demand since then. This is particularly true of the automobile industry with respect to styling as well as to prices. The principle is the same in either event. It is no doubt also true of the steel industry. At present the threat of further increases in steel wages and prices may be stimulating a surge of buying that might not last after the event.

Consequences of such distortions and inflexibilities in the price and income structure cannot be avoided by monetary and fiscal policies. Any attempt to do so would not remove the basic difficulty but might increase the distortions and lead to a more severe adjustment. Nor should monetary and fiscal policies be blamed for recession and unemployment that result from incorrect pricing policies of management and labor. They might alleviate some of the consequences and should endeavor to do so. Monetary policy, however, operates within a limited area and is concerned primarily with commercial bank credit. As Ralph Young pointed out in his statement before the Senate subcommittee:

"If monetary policy should undertake to finance whatever demands for credit are made upon the banking system, or permit itself to be used to justify all decisions made by producers, whether correct or faulty, it would become an engine of inflation, not a force for stability and sustainable growth. Monetary policy must be concerned with the interests of all the people, consumers as well as producers, not with particular interests or industries. * * *

"Obviously, monetary and credit policy cannot do everything needed to attain stable growth; it must be supported by appropriate fiscal and other public policies, as well as by prudent private policies. During periods of expanding demands, accompanied by speculative psychology and expectations of creeping inflation, monetary policy has no option but to assume a restrictive posture. If it did not assume such a posture, widespread expectations that prices and costs would be steadily raised might indeed lead to further spiraling of costs and prices. Individual or group efforts then to hedge against or by escalation to protect against inflation would tend to aggravate inflationary forces rather than to bring them into balance."

In conclusion, the objection to administered prices and wages is not so much that they create inflation but that they tend to retard growth and to increase unemployment. Inflation might be created if monetary and fiscal policies attempt to validate such prices, but eventually these attempts will only make the inevitable collapse more disastrous.

WOODLIEF THOMAS.

CHEVY CHASE, MD.

TO VIOLATE THE LAW IS TO TEAR THE CHARACTER OF ONE'S OWN LIBERTY

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, it has been said that the only real democracy is that of the dead; that there is neither rank nor station nor prerogative in the republic of the grave. While this is a maxim to be taken into account, it is also a fact that in life some of our noblest citizens have practiced real democracy. Such was true throughout the life of Judge N. Porter Sims.

On March 13, 1959, while dining with friends in Frankfort, Ky., Judge Porter Sims suffered a massive cerebral hemorrhage, with death resulting in a matter of minutes. Before going to Frankfort as a commissioner of the court of appeals—our highest court in Kentucky—Judge Sims had served for 8 years as city attorney of Bowling Green, and as judge of the Warren Circuit Court from 1928 to 1938. He was first elected to the court of appeals in November 1942 and to successive terms in 1950 and 1958. Twice did he serve as chief justice of our highest court. He died at the age of 72.

The bar of my home city of Bowling Green, Ky., has always been composed of men whose legal attainments have been of the highest order. During my lifetime three of our outstanding lawyers were elevated to the court of appeals, namely, Judge Warner Ellmore Settle, Judge Marvel Mills Logan, and Judge Porter Sims. Like his two predecessors and friends, Judge Sims, in every respect upheld and maintained the traditions of the law. He was a scholar of the law who found belief in his profession. It was my good fortune to begin the practice of law when Judge Sims was judge of the Warren Circuit Court, and, like many another young man, I was privileged to sit at the feet of a gentleman who set up a rigid code of legal ethics from which he never deviated. To violate the law, in Judge Sims' opinion, was to tear the charter of one's own liberty. He truly felt that the basic theory of the American political system was the equality of all before the law and that laws lose their force if they are not justly, courageously and wisely administered. Though rigid in his interpretation of the law, Judge Sims was a man of compassion, particularly with respect to the rights of citizens, where persons were at the mercy of the court, or in cases where children were involved. He was without personal fear, but he possessed a kind and considerate nature. In every aspect of his life he practiced true democracy.

In these changing and tumultous days through which we are passing, bitter criticism has been directed at the members of some of our highest courts. But at no time was criticism ever leveled at the opinions handed down by Judge Sims, nor at his integrity, legal or otherwise. Judge Sims lived up to the standards which should be inherent in members of our judicial system. By temperament, training and education he was qualified to sit on any court in the United States. Through his kindness and tolerance he drew people to him, and a friend once gained was never lost.

In the death of Judge Porter Sims the State of Kentucky has been deprived of a great jurist. But the principles which he advocated by precept and example shall continue to be felt by our entire legal profession, and shall prove a factor in maintaining the scale of justice in more certain balance.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. HARMON, for balance of the week, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. EVINS, for 20 minutes, today, and to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. PERKINS, for 30 minutes, on tomorrow.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona, for 1 hour, on Monday next, March 23, 1959.

Mr. POWELL (at the request of Mr. GIAIMO), for 60 minutes, on Monday and Tuesday next.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mrs. SULLIVAN.

Mr. HERLONG and to include a speech.

Mr. RUTHERFORD (at the request of Mr. NATCHER).

Mr. O'KONSKI in two instances.

Mr. HALPERN.

Mr. SCHWENGEL.

Mr. FORD.

Mr. BOSCH (at the request of Mr. HALLECK) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HALLECK in two instances and to include an address by Mr. WEAVER, of Nebraska, and an address by Postmaster General Arthur Summerfield.

Mr. KOWALSKI.

Mr. BOLLING in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. FEIGHAN.

(At the request of Mr. GIAIMO, and to include extraneous matter, the following:)

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan.

Mr. METCALF in three instances.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 1776. An act to amend the act of June 28, 1958, to provide for a National Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 34 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, March 19, 1959, at 11 o'clock a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

735. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated January 22, 1959, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a review of reports on Pascagoula Harbor, Miss., requested by resolutions of the Committees on Public Works, House of Representatives, and U.S. Senate, adopted August 16, 1950, and June 10, 1957. This report includes a study of the engineering and economic feasibility of the plans authorized in the River and Harbor Act approved September 3, 1954, and an investigation to determine whether additional project modifications may be advisable at this time (H. Doc. No. 98); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with one illustration.

736. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated January 15, 1959, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on an interim report on northwestern Alaska, authorized by the Flood Control Acts approved June 30, 1948, and May 17, 1950 (H. Doc. No. 99); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with one illustration.

737. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a report of the number of officers on duty with the Department of the Army and the General Staff on December 31, 1958, pursuant to Public Law 581, 81st Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

738. A letter from the Director, Legislative Liaison Department of the Air Force, transmitting a copy of the Air Force's report entitled "Semiannual Research and Development Procurement Action," for the period July 1 through December 31, 1958; to the Committee on Armed Services.

739. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the examination of the pricing of Department of the Navy negotiated contracts and subcontracts with Librascope, Inc., Glendale, Calif., for model MX-1295 periscopes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

740. A letter from the executive secretary, American Chemical Society, transmitting the annual report of the American Chemical Society for the calendar year 1958, pursuant to Public Law 358, 75th Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

741. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders entered in the cases of certain aliens, pursuant to the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

742. A letter from the Acting Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a report that the appropriation to the Department of the Army for "Operation and maintenance, Army, 1959" has been apportioned on a basis which indicates the necessity for a supplemental estimate of appropriation, pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 665); to the Committee on Appropriations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. KILDAY: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 296. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Defense to lend certain Army, Navy, and Air Force equipment and to provide transportation and other services to the Boy Scouts of America in connection with the World Jamboree of Boy Scouts to be held in the Philippines in 1959; and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 221). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. KILDAY: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 7. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Defense to lend certain Army, Navy, and Air Force equipment and provide certain services to the Boy Scouts of America for use at the Fifth National Jamboree of the Boy Scouts of America, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 222). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. VINSON: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 5674. A bill to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 223). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 224. Report on the disposition of certain papers of sundry executive departments. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. SPENCE: Committee on Banking and Currency. H.R. 4452. A bill to amend the Bretton Woods Agreements Act; without amendment (Rept. No. 225). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana: Committee on Science and Astronautics. S. 1096. An act to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for salaries and expenses, research and development, construction and equipment, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 226). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. GARY: Committee on Appropriations. H.R. 5805. A bill making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments and the Tax Court of the United States for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 227). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DAWSON: Committee on Government Operations. First report on results from recommendations made during 85th Congress in reports of Committee on Government Operations (Rept. No. 228). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ABBITT:

H.R. 5775. A bill to provide for the disposition of certain lands above the 320-foot contour of the John H. Kerr Dam and Reservoir to the former owners, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BRAY:

H.R. 5776. A bill to regulate the foreign commerce of the United States by amending section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H.R. 5777. A bill to amend the Federal Credit Union Act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BRAY:

H.R. 5778. A bill to protect consumers and others against misbranding, false advertising, and false invoicing of decorative hardwood or imitation hardwood products; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 5779. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to remove the limitation upon the amount of outside income which an individual may earn while receiving benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CELLER:

H.R. 5780. A bill to amend section 1552, title 10, United States Code, and section 301 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 to provide that the Board for the Correction of Military or Naval Records and the Boards of Review, Discharges, and Dismissals shall give consideration to satisfactory evidence relating to good character and exemplary conduct in civilian life after discharge or dismissal in determining whether or not to correct certain discharges and dismissals; to authorize the award of an exemplary rehabilitation certificate; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. COOLEY:

H.R. 5781. A bill to incorporate the Agricultural Hall of Fame; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CORBETT:

H.R. 5782. A bill to establish recognition and observance by classified employees in Federal Government of all State holidays; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 5783. A bill to provide for Government contribution toward personal health service benefits for civilian officers and employees in the United States service and their dependents, to authorize payroll deductions for participants, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DAWSON (by request):

H.R. 5784. A bill to amend the Government Corporation Control Act, as amended; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H.R. 5785. A bill to provide for the adjustment of the legislative jurisdiction exercised by the United States over land in the several States used for Federal purposes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. DOOLEY:

H.R. 5786. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to permit railroad corporations to take full advantage of tax relief measures enacted or granted by the States and their political subdivisions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 5787. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, so as to strengthen and improve the national transportation system, insure the protection of the public interest, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GARMATZ:

H.R. 5788. A bill to require the expenditure of 75 percent of the funds expended for the conversion, alteration, and repair of naval vessels to be expended with private ship repair yards, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. GEORGE:

H.R. 5789. A bill to incorporate the Agricultural Hall of Fame; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRANT:

H.R. 5790. A bill to amend section 377 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, so as to make permanent the provision for automatic preservation of acreage history; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HAGEN:

H.R. 5791. A bill to equalize the pay of retired members of the uniformed services; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 5792. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, to provide coverage for employees of large enterprises engaged in retail trade or service and of other employers engaged in activities affecting commerce, to increase the minimum wage under the act to $1.25 an hour, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. LANE:

H.R. 5793. A bill to amend the Japanese American Evacuation Claims Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H.R. 5794. A bill to provide for the reclassification of certain distribution clerks at airport mail facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H.R. 5795. A bill to bring employees of agricultural stabilization and conservation county committees within the purview of the Civil Service Retirement Act and the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. NORBLAD:

H.R. 5796. A bill to punish the use of interstate commerce in furtherance of conspiracies to commit terroristic crimes and activities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OSTERTAG:

H.R. 5797. A bill to amend the National Defense Education Act of 1958 to provide that payments made under title III of that act may not be used to acquire equipment manufactured in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. SHELLEY:

H.R. 5798. A bill to extend pension benefits to persons who served on certain vessels operated by the Army during the war with Spain, the Philippine Insurrection, and the China Relief Expedition; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of Mississippi:

H.R. 5799. A bill to repeal the excise tax on amounts paid for communication services or facilities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 5800. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to eliminate certain restrictions on the crediting of self-employment income for old-age, survivors, and disability insurance purposes, so as to permit such income to be retroactively credited (upon payment of tax) to the same extent as wages; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SMITH of Iowa:

H.R. 5801. A bill to protect the right of the blind to self-expression through organizations of the blind; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. TAYLOR:

H.R. 5802. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp commemorating the town of Waterford, N.Y., originally the "Halfmoon", for 1959 in conjunction with the 350th anniversary of historical events in the Hudson-Champlain area; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. TELLER:

H.R. 5803. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, the Railroad Retirement Tax Act, and the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act, so as to provide increases in benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. TOLL:

H.R. 5804. A bill proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GARY:

H.R. 5805. A bill making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments, and the Tax Court of the United States for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, and for other purposes.

By Mr. ASHLEY:

H.R. 5806. A bill to amend Public Law 587 by permitting the withholding by the Federal Government from wages of employees of certain taxes imposed by municipalities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 5807. A bill to amend section 11 of the War Claims Act of 1948 to provide judicial review of certain actions of the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FULTON:

H.R. 5808. A bill to authorize the National Aeronautics and Space Administration and the National Science Foundation, to conduct research programs for the study of various propulsion systems and the use of various fuels and their derivatives in relation to space vehicles, rockets, and missiles, and for the study of structural, container, and ablating materials; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mr. HOLIFIELD:

H.R. 5809. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide a more liberal definition of the term "disability" for purposes of entitlement to disability insurance benefits and the disability freeze; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McGOVERN:

H.R. 5810. A bill to amend the Federal Employees Salary Increase Act of 1958 to grant certain increases in compensation to employees of the agricultural stabilization and conservation county committees, to bring employees of agricultural stabilization and conservation county committees within the purview of the Civil Service Retirement Act and the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 5811. A bill to provide that certain lands shall be held in trust for the Crow Creek Sioux Tribe in South Dakota; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 5812. A bill to place in trust status certain lands on the Crow Creek Indian Reservation in South Dakota; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. METCALF:

H.R. 5813. A bill to amend the act of August 1, 1958, to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to undertake continuing studies of the effects of insecticides, herbicides, fungicides and other pesticides, upon fish and wildlife for the purpose of preventing losses of those invaluable natural resources and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 5814. A bill to provide for cooperative unit programs of research, education, and demonstration between the Federal Government of the United States, colleges and universities, the several States and Territories, and private organizations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of New York:

H.R. 5815. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in commemoration of the 350th anniversary of historical events in the Hudson-Champlain area; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. REUSS:

H.R. 5816. A bill to provide that all programs of economic aid to foreign nations shall be administered by the Secretary of State; to simplify administration of such programs; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. VANIK:

H.R. 5817. A bill to provide for the recognition of the Polish Legion of American Veterans by the Secretary of Defense and the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. WHARTON:

H.R. 5818. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in commemoration of the 350th anniversary of historical events in the Hudson-Champlain area; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DIXON:

H. R. 5819. A bill to provide grants to the States to assist them in informing and educating children in their schools about the harmful effect of tobacco, alcohol, and other potentially deleterious consumables; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 5820. A bill to amend section 1 of the act of June 14, 1926, as amended by the act of June 4, 1954 (68 Stat. 173; 43 U.S.C. 869); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 5821. A bill to encourage and stimulate the production and conservation of coal in the United States through research and development by creating a Coal Research and Development Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. PELLY:

H.R. 5822. A bill to amend title 28, entitled "Judiciary and Judicial Procedure," of the United States Code to provide for the defense of suits against Federal employees arising out of their operation of motor vehicles in the scope of their employment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BERRY:

H.J. Res. 313. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:

H.J. Res. 314. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution prohibiting a State from taxing certain income of a nonresident; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHELLEY:

H.J. Res. 315. Joint resolution authorizing and requesting the President to issue a proclamation with respect to the 1959 Pacific Festival, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of New York:

H. Con. Res. 104. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the recognition of the grave of Samuel Wilson, progenitor of the symbol "Uncle Sam," in Oakwood Cemetery, Troy, N.Y., as a national shrine; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. STRATTON:

H. Con. Res. 105. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress in standing behind the President's policy of firmness in the Berlin crisis and calling for certain actions to strengthen the Armed Forces of the United States abroad and at home; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. TAYLOR:

H. Con. Res. 106. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the recognition of the grave of Samuel Wilson, progenitor of the symbol "Uncle Sam," in Oakwood Cemetery, Troy, N.Y., as a national shrine; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. COOLEY:

H. Res. 216. Resolution to amend House Resolution 93; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. KARTH: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Minnesota memorializing the Congress of the United States to adopt the Blatnik amendment to the Federal Water Pollution Control Act; to the Committee on Public Works.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Colorado, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to safeguard and preserve established State and individual rights to the use of water within the separate States; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BATES:

H.R. 5823. A bill for the relief of Mae Ja Ward; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BERRY:

H.R. 5824. A bill for the relief of Francis Janis and certain other Indians; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOYLE:

H.R. 5825. A bill for the relief of Eugeneusz Ruszkowski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COHELAN (by request):

H.R. 5826. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Cecelia Cellino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DORN of New York:

H.R. 5827. A bill for the relief of Gilbert Gibson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H.R. 5828. A bill for the relief of Lily Yuk-Wah Ho; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FEIGHAN:

H.R. 5829. A bill for the relief of Terry Shirley Stueber; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H.R. 5830. A bill for the relief of Salim Menashi Eliahoo Reuben; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FULTON:

H.R. 5831. A bill for the relief of Irene Varverakis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HÉBERT:

H.R. 5832. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Rosa Perez Garcia de Covelo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JACKSON:

H.R. 5833. A bill for the relief of Barbara Iris Patrick; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JARMAN:

H.R. 5834. A bill for the relief of Paciencia Ilagan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHANSEN:

H.R. 5835. A bill for the relief of Velios D. Nikolaou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KILDAY:

H.R. 5836. A bill for the relief of Dorothy E. Green and Thelma L. Alley; to the Committee on the Armed Services.

By Mr. TEAGUE of California:

H.R. 5837. A bill for the relief of Tai Ja Lim and Tai Chung Lim; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VANIK:

H.R. 5838. A bill for the relief of Maria Mariani Guidi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Dr. Flemming's Famous Formula

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEE METCALF

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 18, 1959

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Flemming, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, has devised the now-famous Flemming formula whereby he says 75,000 classrooms will be built to alleviate partially the need for 140,000 classrooms to properly house our boys and girls. Dr. Flemming's formula is to change the constitutions, statutory debt limits, and tax procedures of the various States. But these are minor obstacles according to Dr. Flemming and, with their change, thousands of classrooms can be built next year.

Now that he has solved the classroom shortage, Dr. Flemming can put his considerable talents to work in other fields. One of the sports that has enjoyed a rapid growth in popularity is golf, perhaps in some measure due to the interest Dr. Flemming's boss takes in the game. But hundreds of new players have to forgo the pleasure of making a hole-in-one. Applying Dr. Flemming's formula, by changing golf rules slightly and modifying the equipment somewhat, all players can make a hole-in-one. Each golf ball is to be equipped with a guidance mechanism modeled after that in our most advanced missiles, and each hole on the golf course will be outfitted with radar and tracking devices that will guide the ball to the hole. Golf is an ancient game so the rules are obviously obsolete and it will not be difficult to change them in order to use this improved mechanism. But getting the guidance mechanism down to the size and weight of a golf ball; and the radar and homing devices to a size that will fit in the hole on the green will be a little more difficult. But these are minor obstacles and it can be safely predicted that millions of golfers on every modern and properly equipped golf course in America will be making holes-in-one next summer.

St. Patrick's Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 18, 1959

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement I have prepared regarding St. Patrick's Day.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR KEATING

Yesterday all America celebrated St. Patrick's Day. All Americans, regardless of their creed or land of origin, paid their respects

by the wearing of emerald green in their hearts and on their clothes.

Today, we in Congress have been honored by the presence of that great representative of the Emerald Isle, President Sean T. O'Kelly of the Republic of Ireland. I have had the distinct pleasure of meeting President O'Kelly, and can therefore testify at first hand to his wit, his charm and his general embodiment of the fine characteristics we have come to associate with his justly famed native land.

President O'Kelly's visit to the United States will do much to strengthen even more the already firm bonds of friendship between Ireland and the United States. This recognition and mutual liking results from our understanding of the great contributions made by peoples from both lands to the progress of each land. We in this country have been blessed with many hearty sons of the Emerald Isle. In every walk of life, they have made valuable contributions to the building of America.

Among their greatest qualities, the Irish have brought to our land a deep and reverent love of God, and a firm resolve to oppose all philosophies and forms of government which seek to destroy man's faith and freedom. They have brought their unique qualities of humor and musical talents. And they have infused into all sections of our land their infectious laughter.

While we pause to pay tribute to the Irish who have done so much to help establish our Government, it would be well also for us to pause in recognition of him whose name March 17 bears. St. Patrick's selfless devotion to his fellow men—a quality so often reflected in his countrymen—has served as an inspiration to men the world over.

For surely, St. Patrick belongs to all the world, not just the Irish alone. He belongs to all men who look upon service of good and love of man as our chief duties on this earth. The evocation of his name, and the observance of the day which bears his name, thus carries the deeper significance that every man should give of himself so that others might benefit.

That is the great lesson of March 17. That is the great lesson we would all do well to ponder and put into practice throughout the year.

Shame on Us

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 18, 1959

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, and now we have come to this: Trafficking in other people's rings and watches. Intruding into the intimacies of family relationships. Taking heirlooms.

These tawdry personal effects, confiscated private property, are being sold in America's name. Your name and mine.

The guilt of the former owners? Principally, being born German or Japanese.

Our guilt? So far—idly standing by.

At what point should revulsion begin to set in?

OFFER FOR SALE BY THE ATTORNEY GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Notice inviting citizens of the United States of America to make offers to purchase from the Attorney General all his rights, title, and interest in and to seven lots of personal property vested in the Attorney General pursuant to the Trading With the Enemy Act, as amended, described as follows:

Lot 1. One man's watch, yellow metal.

Lot 2. One man's watch, yellow metal with chain and Masonic emblem set with six diamondlike stones.

Lot 3. One Zeiss Ikon camera with leather case. One tripod in leather case. One box of camera filters.

Lot 4. One lady's yellow metal ring set with a diamondlike stone.

Lot 5. One cocktail shaker (stainless chrome). One matching tray and four cocktail glasses, one broken.

Lot 6. One man's diamond ring.

Lot 7. One man's diamond ring (about 1½ carat). One lady's diamond ring, Tiffany setting (about 1½ carat).

Dated at Washington, D.C., this 3d day of March 1959.

WILLIAM P. ROGERS,
Attorney General of the United States.

Admission of Hawaii

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 18, 1959

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, it is a heartwarming experience to witness this historical culmination of the aspirations of the people of the Territory of Hawaii for statehood. I have long supported this deserving cause, and I say with all humility that it is a truly memorable experience as a freshman Representative, to participate in history in the making.

As a Representative from one of the Thirteen Original States, I welcome our newest sister. This moment of profound importance to the Nation provides an opportunity to reflect with pride upon our magnificent national heritage, for the admission of Hawaii is inseparably linked to every event in our past by which this mighty Republic was irretrievably forged into a whole.

Numerous speakers have already eloquently referred to the many, strong arguments supporting Hawaiian statehood. I do not propose to retrace the ground which they have so ably covered.

What is especially important to me are the consequences and benefits which will accrue from this momentous action.

Mutual interests and growing common ideals have bound the mainland and Hawaii increasingly together for over 100 years. Now, at last, Hawaiians will have the opportunity to wholly establish their own State government, and to participate, through their elected representatives, in the Government of the United States. They will now have the chance to vote for a President and Vice President. They will attain the full rights of citizenship.

These blessings of freedom are particularly significant at a time when the world is engaged in a desperate struggle to contain the dark forces of totalitarianism.

For the rest of us and for the peoples of the world, the admission of Hawaii is graphic and striking evidence of the dynamism of the great principles of the Declaration of Independence and the American Constitution. This is living proof of the vitality of our belief that all men are created equal.

This is our faith and our message. Let the rest of the world perceive and rejoice.

The dignity of man, good will, and democracy under law will take on new meaning, new clarity, new luster to those who can see their reflections among the peoples of our newest State.

This is the clarion example of the dynamic strength of freedom. Let it be a beacon and an inspiration for all mankind.

Political Emphasis Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GERALD R. FORD, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 18, 1959

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, our colleague, the distinguished gentleman from Maine [Mr. COFFIN], yesterday on the floor of the House presented an excellent report on the Political Emphasis Week which was held at St. Olaf College, Northfield, Minn., March 12, 13, and 14. It was our honor and pleasure to attend and participate in certain portions of this excellent program. I can assure each of you that both of us, one representing the Democratic Party and the other the Republican Party, were tremendously impressed with all aspects of this interesting and enlightening effort to create among our youth of today, the leaders of tomorrow, a more vital interest in State, National and international politics.

The gentleman from Maine, [Mr. COFFIN], most ably described the atmosphere which prevailed and the workings of the mock house of representatives. I join him in commending the 200-plus students of this fine liberal arts college who diligently and intelligently studied seven major issues now before the U.S. Congress—all basic problems which must be considered and be resolved by the 86th Congress. However, I sincerely believe that Dr. Clemens M. Granskow, president of the college; Dr. James R. Klonoski, head of the political science department; and other members of the faculty deserve high praise for initiating and successfully guiding this overall effort.

In 1958 the political emphasis week concentrated on the United States in the Middle East. The program a year ago included three sessions of a mock united nations general assembly with three major addresses by authorities in the field of the Middle East. The lively student interest and the constructive results prompted the college officials to continue the political emphasis week in 1959 with mock house of representatives sessions.

In addition to the actual mock sessions of the house of representatives, I

found the entire atmosphere and activities at St. Olaf very stimulating. It was my pleasure to attend a political science class under Dr. Shepherd where our Nation's mutual security program was discussed in considerable detail. The informal Thursday luncheon with student questions and answers by Dr. Stephen Bailey, professor of Public Affairs, Princeton University, and myself was very interesting. The afternoon tea and reception at one of the dormitories illustrated the intense faculty and student concern with the problems on the agenda of political emphasis week.

In closing my remarks may I congratulate Dr. Bailey who gave the convocation address and Dr. Robert E. Van Deusen, of the National Lutheran Council office in Washington, who was also a principal program speaker. Their contributions were outstanding. The combined efforts of many made this a memorable experience for me, and I am deeply indebted to those who invited me to be a participant. I wish to reemphasize and reiterate my praise for those at St. Olaf, both students and faculty, who made such a tremendous effort for a most worthwhile project.

Address by Senator Moss Before the Hibernian Society of Savannah, Ga.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN E. TALMADGE

OF GEORGIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 18, 1959

Mr. TALMADGE. One of the principal annual events of the historic city of Savannah, Ga., is the St. Patrick's Day celebration of the Hibernian Society of Savannah. This year the society had the good fortune to have as its principal speaker for this colorful occasion the distinguished junior Senator from Utah [Mr. Moss]. His excellent address was enthusiastically received, and I ask unanimous consent that the text of it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

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

ADDRESS BY SENATOR FRANK E. MOSS, DEMOCRAT, OF UTAH, BEFORE THE HIBERNIAN SOCIETY OF SAVANNAH, GA., MARCH 17, 1959

One of the most pleasing aspects of my work in Washington is the opportunity it gives me to widen my acquaintance with people from every part of America. And I am looking forward to other occasions like this one which will enable me to come to know firsthand some of the intensely interesting areas of our great Nation. I am mindful of what day this is, and of the honor bestowed on anyone invited to participate with the Hibernian Society in the celebration of St. Patrick's Day.

And as a native of the 46th State to enter the Union, I appreciate this opportunity of coming again to Savannah, and of addressing your distinguished society in this, the 4th State to ratify the Constitution.

A new Senator in Washington is particularly conscious, often for the first time, I suspect, of this difference in the years in which the States were admitted to the Union. There is a very good reason for this; so many prerogatives in the Senate are based on seniority. Everything from membership and position on committees of the Senate, to choice of office space, even to parking space for your car, is decided on how long a Member has served. As between those elected the same year, other things are taken into consideration: Whether he served as a Governor of his State, or as a Member of the House of Representatives—and, finally, the year his State was admitted.

Now it just so happens that Utah was almost the last to come in—only Oklahoma and Arizona were admitted later. Many portions of the original Utah Territory became States sooner—Nevada, Idaho, Colorado, California, Wyoming. But a little difference of opinion as to how many wives per husband was in the public interest made it hard for Congress to decide what to do with Utah. We thought the question was one for the men of Utah to decide—women didn't vote then—and we weren't suggesting that men in other States should have more than one wife, you understand. But Congress apparently thought the idea might catch on, so through 40 years of trying, and on 6 separate occasions, we were denied statehood, and it was not until 1896 that a star went into the flag for Utah.

Despite my friendship for Joe Ryan, and my previous visit to Savannah, I must confess that my knowledge of the Hibernian Society has been sketchy indeed, and it has been a matter of great interest to read—all too briefly, I must say—of the very high purpose—that of aiding your fellow countrymen who were less fortunate—that led to its founding 147 years ago today.

As you know, the tendency to organize groups of citizens for all kinds of purposes is peculiarly American, and is restricted to no part of the United States. The French writer, Alexis De Tocqueville, who came to this country during the presidency of Andrew Jackson, and who wrote the famous volume, "Democracy in America," recognized this organizational tendency as something he had not seen in Europe.

He mentions it in these words: "In no country in the world has the principle of association been more successfully used or applied to a greater multitude of objects than in America. Besides the permanent associations which are established by law under the names of townships, cities, and counties, a vast number of others are formed and maintained by the agency of private individuals."

De Tocqueville visited Georgia during his travels, and, since your society was already in existence, it may well have been one of those upon which he commented so favorably. And it may interest you to know that the Hibernian Society of Savannah is 35 years older than the first settlement in the Salt Lake Valley, the place from which I come.

Anyone who has been active in politics and public service as I have all my life would, of course, be fully aware of the great contribution the Irish have made to government and politics in their adopted land. Being energetic, personally engaging and eternally interested in public affairs, and—particularly in our large centers—being anti-English foreigners who still spoke the prevailing language—they have been in positions of power in American Government since the first Irishman set foot on the continent.

Which reminds me of the story of the businessman of British extraction and the name of Cromwell who had wares to sell to the state and municipal governments of one of our populous States. Since Irishmen were in control of the government, he had his problems, and finally concluded that a change of name might help.

Accordingly, he petitioned the court to change his name from Cromwell to O'Brien. His petition was granted, and he went forth to do business.

About a year later he petitioned to have it changed again, this time to O'Flaherty, and found himself facing the same judge.

"Aren't you the man that wanted to be O'Brien only 1 year ago?" asked the judge. O'Brien admitted that he was.

"Didn't the change help your business?" asked the judge.

"Well, Your Honor, said the petitioner, "O'Brien is a fine name, and I am very happy with it. But when I call on my prospects, they ask me two questions. The first is 'What's your name?' When I say 'O'Brien,' they ask: 'What was it before it was O'Brien?'"

It has likewise been pleasant to refresh my memory on the founding of Georgia and Savannah, of the activities of Gen. James Oglethorpe, of his wise measures for governing the colony, of its growth and prosperity, and of the courageous actions of your patriots during the struggle for independence.

And, in preparing remarks on my subject, "The United States," my thoughts turned to the adoption of the Constitution, the effects of the formation of the Union, and the subsequent rise of America to the position and responsibilities of a world power.

As the framers foresaw, ratification of the Constitution gave the Nation the strength it needed. With an effective National Government, it was less temptation to the grasping nations of Spain, France, and England. The removal of trade and exchange restrictions between the States was a great economic stimulus, preparing the way for the development of the greatest market and the most productive economic system the world has known. And other quarrels, such as those over the division of the territory to the west, were speedily settled.

So, for 150 years, our isolated position and our great productive machines rendered us invulnerable to successful attack from without, and gave us the opportunity to devote our energies exclusively to internal problems and development.

The new Republic became a model for liberty-loving peoples everywhere. The royal houses of Europe were quickly overthrown, and following our example, constitutional governments were set up. Our economic influence likewise began to be felt abroad, and our methods copied, and it appeared that the adoption by all nations of what we call the American system would be only a matter of time.

Now, in our lifetimes, a profound change has occurred. No longer may we rely on our geographical position as the cornerstone of our defense. No longer do we expect that our way of life will be, as a matter of course, adopted by the rest of the world.

The most famous of living English historians, Arnold Toynbee, has pointed out how the formerly backward nations of the world are beginning to use the mass-production methods developed by the West; and how—if they succeed in developing productive economic systems—their tremendous advantage in numbers is bound to tell against us.

In one of his articles advocating ratification of the Constitution, Alexander Hamilton noted that the people of this country and of his time had had it fall to their lot to decide whether societies of men are capable or not of establishing good government by reflection and choice, or whether they must always depend on accident and force for their political constitutions.

In the same way, it has fallen to our lot to decide whether a Republic like ours can build a military machine capable of defending us against a ruthless dictatorship armed with modern weapons, and still preserve the individual liberties of the people. It has fallen to our lot to lead the effort to preserve the free world.

If we are to succeed in this endeavor, we must divest ourselves of emotionalism. We must face our world as it exists—not as it used to exist, or as we would like it to exist. We must develop our program in specific terms.

First, we must realize that the greater part of the effort must be made through the instrumentality of the Federal Government. Defending ourselves in the age of nuclear bombs means great power in Washington, and large Federal expenditures, much as we may dislike seeing them.

It is the worst sort of complacency to allow ourselves to be deluded into thinking that the great expansion of Federal expenditures in the last decade and a half has been the result of a plot to destroy our liberties. The great bulk of those expenditures are for war or result directly from the war and subsequent defense measures.

It is also a delusion to suppose that we can substantially reduce those expenditures until we solve the problem that gave rise to them. We must cure the infection, not rail at the symptoms. And the infection in this case is the explosive international situation.

This is not to say that the great Federal budget is no problem, or that we should not make every effort to reduce it where such reduction will be in the public interest.

One change that might help us to see the Federal financial picture more clearly, and an idea that is getting some attention in Washington these days, is a more business-like accounting system for the Government. The plan is to separate, as businesses do, items that represent capital investments and self-liquidating projects from expenditures for regular expense items. It might be that defense items could be placed in still a third category. This would make discussion of budget items more specific, and enable us to comprehend this complicated subject more clearly. It is hoped that it would promote greater public understanding and interest in the Government's fiscal affairs.

Since World War II, the Soviet Union has increased its territory, expanded its world influence, and greatly improved its productive capacity. Such victories as we have had have been purely defensive.

The men in the Kremlin know what kind of world they want it to be 20 years from now. They boldly plan for that world, and channel their resources, their educational facilities and their diplomatic maneuvers to making it that kind of world.

It is true we have made efforts—great efforts—to stem the totalitarian tide. And in these endeavors the statesmen of the South have been among the wisest and most farseeing of our leaders. Yet most of our actions are taken on an emergency basis. When the Kremlin strikes, we react; and we approach the problem each year as though we expected that year to end it.

But it well may be that neither the decision by arms which we all fear, nor the collapse of the Soviet system which would solve our problem for awhile, may occur. It is possible that our condition for the next many years may be just what it has been for the last 10—a continuing struggle to decide—through economic and political pressure whether our system or theirs will win. Perhaps we should emulate the Soviet example and make an all-out effort to win without a war.

If we are to win in this kind of struggle, we must project our program ahead—we must decide what kind of world we want it to be 20 years from now. And within the framework of democratic individual liberty, make the necessary effort to create that kind of world.

In any case, in the next very few years we are going to have to decide—or let someone else decide for us—such vital questions as what will be done about providing nuclear weapons to Germany, whether we are to be equipped to fight smaller or all-out wars, and how great an effort we are to make to rescue the backward nations from poverty and communism.

Another question that must be decided, and one that is very much in the news just now, is whether we are going to try to become first in the development of missiles and the conquest of space.

We must also make some decisions on the direction American economic policy is to take. I am sure there is no question that the great development of the South and the West will continue and be accelerated—merely our population increase would make that inevitable. And this very growth in population itself complicates our problem.

We must decide whether our irreplaceable resources upon which our prosperity has been built—land, water, minerals, forest, and the others—are to receive the attention they must have to retain and enlarge their productive capacity. We must decide whether the American city is to be allowed to continue to decay, or whether Federal and State Governments will allow sufficient tax sources, grants-in-aid, and political autonomy to allow that problem to be solved.

Coming from an area which must carefully use its water to survive, I am particularly conscious of the necessity of preserving this resource. Water was once an exclusively western problem. Our falling water table has now made it a national one. The Congress wisely decided to build the great Colorado River storage project which will enable the basin States to get many times the value from that river resource than is now realized, and to develop great power, industrial and recreational facilities in the West.

Gentlemen, I have stated our problem as I see it. I am aware that many of the things I have said are not the most pleasant to think about. But we are in a giant struggle—not of our making—not of our choosing. The men in the Kremlin care nothing for cost accounting, nothing for human liberty. They are interested only in results.

In Washington and elsewhere we hear the questions asked, "How much does it cost?" "Can we afford to keep ahead in all the weapons?" "Will our economic system stand it?" Let me remind you that the patriots of the War of Independence did not ask the cost. They had lived under tyranny. They wanted freedom, and whatever the cost, it was worth it. So with us. The cost of winning this struggle can never be as great as the cost of losing it.

Our task may be burdensome—but our resources are great. We have 50 States instead of 13, 150 years of experience with democratic government, and the most advanced economic and educational systems in the world. With them—if we have the will—we can win. We can bequeath to our posterity our most precious possession—the blessings of liberty.

Sammy Davis, Jr., Receives Mnookin-Brown American Legion Post's Americanism Award for Distinguished Service in Bettering Human Relations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD BOLLING

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 18, 1959

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, the Mnookin-Brown American Legion Post of Kansas City, Mo., performs a great service to my district and the country as a whole in the presentation of their annual Americanism award for distinguished service in bettering human relations.

In 1948 the Mnookin-Brown American Legion Post No. 468 established its annual memorial scholarship awards to honor those men and women who gave their lives in World War II to preserve the four freedoms and for the purpose of recommemorating the cause for which they died. The awards are made to high school seniors in the Greater Kansas City area who have distinguished themselves in the field of human relations in home, school, and communal life.

As a result of this scholarship program and other human relations work, the Mnookin-Brown Post is one of the most active organizations in Kansas City, having this highly worthwhile project as its driving force. The post is constantly striving toward the establishment of more human relations instruction in the regular school curriculum in Greater Kansas City. It has become known throughout the United States for its work in this field and should be commended therefor.

On March 30, 1959, this post will honor Mr. Sammy Davis, Jr., by presenting to him the coveted 1959 Mnookin-Brown Americanism Award for distinguished service in bettering human relations. Mr. Davis will interrupt his film and nightclub commitments to appear in Kansas City and receive this award. All America, as well as the entertainment world, should be deeply proud of Mr. Davis for his tremendous gifts of time and talents to philanthropic, civic, and humanitarian causes. His help has brought comfort and health to countless thousands of adults and children. In the last 4 years alone he has received more than two dozen major public service awards in the field of interfaith understanding and assistance to wounded veterans, orphans, youth, and the aged. He is recipient of the fight-for-sight award and numerous citations for fighting muscular distrophy, cancer, asthma, and juvenile delinquency. This record speaks for itself and more than indicates Sammy Davis, Jr.'s worthiness to receive the Mnookin-Brown Americanism Award for 1959 for distinguished service in bettering human relations.

Birthday of Amerigo Vespucci

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK KOWALSKI

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 18, 1959

Mr. KOWALSKI. Mr. Speaker, the supposed rivalry between Christopher Columbus and Amerigo Vespucci has too long been allowed to stand in the foreground of our view of Vespucci, and block out our true view of him. Really, Columbus and Vespucci were no rivals, but close associates and intimate personal friends, throughout the period

from 1492 to Columbus' death in 1506, and the bitterness and detraction common in later historians writing about Vespucci is completely absent from the testimony of the sons of Columbus. It is difficult to imagine a warmer tribute of personal friendship, or of trust, than is contained in Christopher Columbus' letter, written shortly before his death, introducing Amerigo Vespucci to his son Diego. And this, it must be borne in mind, was written 2 years after Vespucci had published his generalized account of the New World, called Mundus Novus, and a year after his letter to Piero Soderini describing his four voyages.

On the birthday of Amerigo Vespucci, more than half a millennium after he came into the world, let us remember and repeat in his honor the warm words spoken of him by the great navigator and discoverer, Christopher Columbus: "The bearer of this, Amerigo Vespuchy, is going there to the court where he has been summoned in connection with matters of navigation. It has always been his desire to give me pleasure; he is a man of good will; fortune has proved contrary to him as to others; he has not profited from his labors as justice would demand. He is acting on my behalf, moved by a great desire to do something which shall be to my benefit if it lies within his power. From here I do not know what I can enjoin upon him that will be to my benefit, because I do not know what they want of him there. See there what would be advantageous, and work toward that end, and he will do everything and talk and put it into effect; and let all this be done secretly so no one gets wind of it."

Amerigo Vespucci lives today in the name given in his honor to two continents, North and South America; let him live also in our hearts as the man to whom the great and good Christopher Columbus paid this tribute of confidence in his discretion, in his judgment, in his good will and personal affection. Nowhere on the continents named for him is there a monument to Amerigo Vespucci, and our historians speak of him with scorn and disbelief. Perhaps what Columbus said is still true, after the passage of almost five centuries: "He has not profited from his labors as justice would demand."

Establishing Cooperative Research Units

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEE METCALF

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 18, 1959

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, I have just introduced a bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to permit the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and other agencies within his Department to enter into cooperative agreements with other Federal agencies, colleges, and universities, State and Territorial fish and game departments, and nonprofit organizations for the conducting of research, training, and demonstrational programs through the establishing of cooperative research units, which may be named for the various States and Territories in which they are formed.

The research work authorized under this program definitely would constitute valuable training for graduate students who are required to perform field research as part of their formal educational training. This kind of a program, confined largely to wildlife units and which was started in 1935, now is in operation in 16 of the land-grant colleges and universities—among them Montana—throughout the United States. My bill would stabilize, strengthen, and broaden this program.

The present cooperative research unit program, which has been operating successfully for more than 23 years, has proved itself to be a highly valuable and economical method of getting research work done while training men for future professional careers in fish and wildlife research, management, and administration.

The 16 colleges and universities affiliated in the present cooperative research unit program have bestowed 2,964 bachelor, master, and doctor degrees upon wildlife students since the program started. A high percentage of these graduates are employed in State and Federal agencies and educational institutions in all parts of the country. The existing unit program, which merits greater stability, has created splendid cooperation between the Federal and State agencies and colleges and universities. Such local units are effective and have functioned in the public interest.

West Point Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 18, 1959

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I have prepared a statement regarding the celebration of March 16 as West Point Day throughout New York State. I ask unanimous consent that the statement be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR KEATING

March 16 was celebrated throughout New York State as West Point Day. Carrying on the tradition of his predecessors, Gov. Nelson A. Rockefeller issued a proclamation in honor of the anniversary of the establishment of the U.S. Military Academy.

We in the Empire State are proud that this bastion of our military strength is located in our midst. We are proud of the fine record established by graduates of the Academy, for over the years they have written their names boldly and gloriously on the pages of our Nation's history. In war and in peace, their distinguished performances have reflected great credit on their alma mater. For at West Point, these young men learn not only the skills of war, but the ability to lead in time of peace.

Often, I believe, we tend to overlook the many, many ways in which our Army contributes to the Nation's welfare in peacetime by means other than strictly military activities. Through the Corps of Engineers and numerous other programs, the Army contributes greatly to our internal strength.

As Governor Rockefeller noted in his proclamation:

"In the new challenges which confront us, West Point men are in the vanguard of those not only coping with today's problems, but also preparing to meet those of tomorrow."

We in the United States can truly look to the future with confidence, secure in the knowledge that West Point graduates, in cooperation with their fine brothers from the other service Academies, will be constantly on the job.

I am proud to take this opportunity to salute the men and traditions of the U.S. Military Academy. As we pause to observe another West Point Day, we can be confident that the Academy's future graduates will continue to hold high the famed heritage which has brought security and progress to our Nation.

Security in the Free World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

Hon. EVERETT McKINLEY DIRKSEN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 18, 1959

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, President Eisenhower's report to the people on Monday night, March 16, over all American networks, on the subject of Berlin and security in a free world, was tremendously reassuring. I ask that it be included in the RECORD.

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

SECURITY IN THE FREE WORLD

(Text of the report to the American people by President Dwight D. Eisenhower, delivered in the President's office in the White House and telecast and broadcast by all American networks from 9:30 to 10 p.m. e.s.t., Monday, Mar. 16, 1959)

Tonight I want to talk with you about two subjects:

One is about a city that lies 4,000 miles away.

It is West Berlin. In a divided world it has been, for a decade, a symbol of freedom. But recently its name has come to symbolize, also, the efforts of imperialistic communism to divide the free world, to throw us off balance and to weaken our will for making certain of our collective security.

Next, I shall talk to you about the state of our Nation's posture of defense and the free world's capacity to meet the challenges that the Soviets incessantly pose to peace and to our own security.

First, West Berlin.

You have heard much about this city recently, and possibly wondered why American troops are in it at all.

How did we get there in the first place? What responsibilities do we have in connection with it, and how did we acquire them?

Why has there developed a situation surrounding this city that poses another of the recurring threats to peace that bear the stamp of Soviet manufacture?

Let's begin with a brief review of recent history.

We first acquired rights and responsibilities in West Berlin as a result of World War II. Even before the war ended, when the defeat and capitulation of Nazi Germany were in sight, the Allied Powers, including the Soviet Union, signed agreements defining the areas of occupation in Germany and Berlin which they would assume.

As a result, Germany and the city of Berlin were each divided into four zones, occupied by American, British, French, and Soviet troops.

Under the wartime agreements I have mentioned, the Western Allies entered into occupation of West Berlin and withdrew our Armies from the Soviet Zone. Accordingly, the boundary of the Soviet Zone, like our presence in Berlin, was established upon the basis of these same agreements.

Also by agreement among the occupying powers, the Western Allies—the United States, the United Kingdom, and France—were guaranteed free access to Berlin.

Here in my office is a map of Germany. The light portion of the map is West Germany—the darker portion is East Germany. The lighter gray lanes are the air corridors to Berlin—and the dotted lines show both the main roads and railroads that give access to the city. Notice that the city of Berlin is 110 miles inside East Germany.

Shown also is the territory, now in East Germany that was taken by our Army in World War II and was turned over to the Russians by political agreement made before the end of the war.

At the end of World War II our announced purpose and that of our wartime associates was the pacification and eventual unification of Germany under freedom.

We jointly agreed to undertake this task. Ever since that time, the United States has continuously recognized the obligation of the Allied Governments under international law to reach a just peace settlement with Germany and not to prolong the occupation of Germany unnecessarily.

The public record demonstrates clearly that such a settlement has been frustrated only by the Soviets. It quickly became evident that Soviet leaders were not interested in a free unified Germany, and were determined to induce or force the Western Powers to leave Berlin.

Ten years ago Senator John Foster Dulles, now our great Secretary of State, called attention to the basic purpose of the Soviet Government. He said that purpose was "no less than world domination, to be achieved by gaining political power successively in each of the many areas which had been afflicted by war, so that in the end the United States, which was openly called the main enemy, would be isolated and closely encircled."

The current Berlin effort of the Soviets falls within the pattern of this basic purpose.

The first instance of unusual pressure, clearly evidencing these purposes, came in 1948 when the Communists imposed a blockade to force the protecting Western troops out of Berlin and to starve the people of the city into submission.

This plan failed. A free people and a dramatic airlift broke the back of the Communists' scheme.

In the end the Communists abandoned the blockade and concluded an agreement in 1949 with the Western Powers, reconfirming our right of unrestricted access.

Then last November, the Soviets announced that they intended to repudiate these solemn obligations. They once more appear to be living by the Communist formula that "Promises are like pie crusts, made to be broken."

The Soviet Government has also announced its intention to enter into a peace treaty with the East German puppet regime. The making of this treaty, the Soviets assert, will deny our occupation rights and our rights of access. Both morally and legally it is, of course, clear that no so-called "peace treaty" between the Soviets and the East German regime can have any effect upon our rights.

The Soviet threat has since been repeated several times accompanied by various and changing suggestions for dealing with the status of the city. Their proposals have included a vague offer to make the western part of Berlin—though not the eastern part, which the Soviets control—a so-called free city.

It is by no means clear what West Berlin would be free from, except perhaps freedom itself. It would not be free from the ever-present danger of Communist domination. No one, certainly not the 2 million West Berliners, can ignore the cold fact that this part of Berlin is surrounded by many divisions of Soviet and Eastern German troops and by territory governed by authorities dedicated to eliminating freedom from the area.

As a matter of principle, the United States cannot accept the right of any government to break, by itself, solemn agreements to which we, with others, are parties. But in the Berlin situation, both free people and principle are at stake.

What, then, are the fundamental choices we have in this situation?

First, of course, there is the choice which the Soviet rulers themselves would like us to make. They hope that we can be frightened into abdicating our rights—which are indeed responsibilities—to help establish a just and peaceful solution to the German problem—rights which American and Allied soldiers purchased with their lives.

We have no intention of forgetting our rights or of deserting a free people. Soviet rulers should remember that freemen have, before this, died for so-called scraps of paper which represented duty and honor and freedom.

The shirking of our responsibilities would solve no problems for us. It would mean the end of all hopes for a Germany under government of German choosing. It would raise, among our friends the most serious doubts about the validity of all the international agreements and commitments we have made with them in every quarter of the globe. One result would be to undermine the mutual confidence upon which our entire system of collective security is founded.

This, the Soviets would greet as a great victory over the West.

Obviously, this choice is unacceptable to us.

The second choice which the Soviets have compelled us to face, is the possibility of war.

Certainly, the American and western people do not want war. Global conflict under modern conditions could mean the destruction of civilization. The Soviet rulers, themselves, are well aware of this fact.

But all history has taught us the grim lessons that no nation has ever been successful in avoiding the terrors of war by refusing to defend its rights—by attempting to placate aggression.

Whatever risk of armed conflict may be inherent in the present Berlin situation, it was deliberately created by the Soviet rulers.

The justice of our position is attested by the fact that it is ardently supported with virtual unanimity by the people of West Berlin.

The risk of war is minimized if we stand firm. War would become more likely if we gave way and encouraged a rule of terrorism rather than a rule of law and order. Indeed, this is the peace policy which we are striving to carry out throughout the world. In that policy is found the world's best hope for peace.

Our final choice is negotiation, even while we continue to provide for our security against every threat. We are seeking meaningful negotiation at this moment. The United States and its allies stand ready to talk with Soviet representatives at any time and under any circumstances which offer prospects of worthwhile results.

We have no selfish material aims in view. We seek no domination over others—only a just peace for the world and particularly, in this instance, for the people most involved.

We are ready to consider all proposals which may help to reassure and will take into account the European peoples affected.

We are willing to listen to new ideas and are prepared to present others. We will do everything within our power to bring about serious negotiations and to make these negotiations meaningful.

Yet there must be a clear understanding of what we cannot do.

We cannot try to purchase peace by forsaking 2 million free people of Berlin.

We cannot agree to any permanent and compulsory division of the German nation, which would leave Central Europe a perpetual powdermill, even though we are ready to discuss with all affected nations any reasonable methods for its eventual unification.

We cannot recognize the asserted right of any nation to dishonor its international agreements whenever it chooses. If we should accept such a contention the whole process of negotiation would become a barren mockery.

We must not, by weakness or irresolution, increase the risk of war.

Finally, we cannot, merely for the sake of demonstrating so-called flexibility accept any agreement or arrangement which would undermine the security of the United States and its allies.

The Soviet note of March 2 appears to be a move toward negotiation on an improved basis. We would never negotiate under a dictated time limit or agenda, or on other unreasonable terms. We are, with our allies, however, in view of the changed tone Soviet note, concerting a reply to that note.

It is my hope that thereby all of us can reach agreement with the Soviets on an early meeting at the level of Foreign Ministers.

Assuming developments that justify a summer meeting at the summit, the United States would be ready to participate in this further effort.

Our position, then, is this: We will not retreat one inch from our duty. We shall continue to exercise our right of peaceful passage to and from West Berlin. We will not be the first to breach the peace; it is the Soviets who threaten the use of force to interfere with such free passage. We are ready to participate fully in every sincere effort at negotiation that will respect the existing rights of all and their opportunity to live in peace.

Today's Berlin difficulty is not the first stumbling block that international communism has placed along the road to peace. The world has enjoyed little relief from tension in the past dozen years. As long as the Communist empire continues to seek world domination we shall have to face threats to the peace, of varying character and location. We have lived and will continue to live in a period where emergencies manufactured by the Soviets follow one another like beads on a string.

Whatever the length of that period, we shall have to remain continuously ready to repel aggression, whether it be political, economic or military. Every day our policies of peace will be subjected to test. We must have steadiness and resolution, and firm adherence to our own carefully thought-out policies.

We must avoid letting fear or lack of confidence turn us from the course that self-respect, decency and love of liberty point out.

To do so would be to dissipate the creative energies of our people upon whom our real security rests. This we will never do.

To build toward peace and maintain free world security will require action in every field of human enterprise. It can only be done by the nations of the free world working together in close cooperation, adjusting their differences, sharing their common burdens, pursuing their common goals. We are carrying out just such an effort. We call it mutual security.

We recognize that freedom is indivisible. Wherever in the world freedom is destroyed, by that much is every free nation hurt.

If the United States, alone, had to carry the full burden of defending its interests from the Communist threat, we would have to draft a much larger portion of our manhood into the armed services, spend many more billions of treasure, and put a more intense strain on all our resources and capabilities. We would become more and more like a garrison state.

Fortunately, we do not have to adopt such a desperate course. Nearly 50 nations have joined with us in a cooperative effort to protect freedom.

This system of mutual security allows each nation to provide the forces which it is best able to supply.

What is the strength of these forces? What are we contributing to the joint effort? What can we count on from our allies?

Let's look first at our own contribution. Let us look at it from the viewpoint of our own security.

Of late I—and I am sure the American people—have heard or read conflicting claims about our defenses.

We have heard that our military posture has been subordinated to a balanced budget, to the jeopardy of our national defense.

We have heard that our defenses are presently—or they will be sometime in the future—inadequate to meet recurrent Communist threats.

We have heard that more manpower in our forces than I have recommended is essential in the present circumstances, for psychological reasons if for no other.

My friends, such assertions as these are simply not true. They are without foundation. It is not likely, however, that such assertions will lead the Soviet Union to miscalculate our true strength—and this is indeed fortunate.

The design of our defense is the product of the best composite judgment available for the fulfillment of our security needs.

We are devoting great sums for the maintenance of forces capable of nuclear retaliatory strikes. This capability is our indispensable deterrent to aggression against us.

The central core of our deterrent striking force is our Strategic Air Command with its long range bombers. They are reinforced by naval aircraft and missiles of varying types, and tactical fighter bombers. This array will soon include weapons of even greater power and effectiveness.

The capacity of our combined striking forces represents an almost unimaginable destructive power. It is protected by a vast early warning system and powerful air defense forces.

More and more this great retaliatory force will feature intermediate as well as long range missiles capable of reaching any target on earth. As we steadily go through the transition period from bomber to missile as the backbone of this striking force, we nevertheless continue replacing bombers, powerful as we know them now to be, with others of greater power, range and speed. In this way we take care of the needs of this year and those immediately ahead, even as we plan, develop and build for the future.

We are engaged in an endless process of research, development and production to equip our forces with new weapons.

This process is tremendously costly, even should we consider it only in terms of money. If we are to master the problems of security over a prolonged period of time, we cannot forever borrow from the future to meet the needs of the present.

Therefore, we must concentrate our resources on those things we need most, minimizing those programs that make less decisive contributions to our Nation. Effective defense comes first.

Today there is no defense field to which we are devoting more talent, skill and money than that of missile development.

I'd like to have you look at three lists of missiles.

The first list shows 17 different types of missiles now in use by our Armed Forces.

The second list shows missiles that will be available for use in 1959. There are 11 different types.

The third list shows 13 more types of missiles now in the research and development stages. In all there are 41 types of missiles.

There is, of course, a constant parade of improvement, with newer and better weapons constantly crowding out the older and less efficient ones.

The first model of any new piece of equipment is always relatively primitive. The first sewing machine, the first typewriter, the first automobile—left much to be desired. And even the rockets that dazzle us today will soon become the model T's—the Tin Lizzies—of the missile age.

We must never become frozen in obsolescence.

In addition to the forces comprising our retaliatory striking power, we have potent and flexible naval, ground and amphibious elements. We have a growing array of nuclear-powered ships, both submarines and surface vessels.

Worldwide deployment of Army divisions, including missile units, increases the ability of the U.S. Army and the Marines to rapidly apply necessary force to any troubled area. At home, the Strategic Army Corps is ready and able to move promptly as needed to any area of the world.

I believe the American people want, are entitled to, can indefinitely pay for, now have and will continue to have a modern, effective and adequate military establishment. In this overall conviction, I am supported by the mass of the best military opinion I can mobilize, and by scientific and every other kind of talent that is giving its attention to a problem to which I personally have devoted a lifetime.

As all thoughtful citizens know, our own security requires the supplemental and reinforcing strength provided by the free world's total.

In the Far East, nations with which we are associated in a common defense system have over a million trained soldiers standing watch over the free world frontiers.

In Europe, the efforts of 15 nations are united to support freedom.

In global totals, our friends are contributing over 200 ground divisions, 30,000 aircraft, and 2,500 combatant naval vessels to the task of defending the free world.

For every soldier we have under arms, our free world allies have five.

Through each of these stout efforts we strengthen the bonds of freedom.

Our mutual security program supports this joint undertaking by helping to equip our partners with the weapons they cannot by themselves provide, and by helping them keep their economies strong.

This mutual effort provides a constructive, long-term answer to the recurrent crises engineered by the Communists. It strengthens the stability of free nations, and lessens opportunities for Communist subversion and penetration. Its supports economic growth and gives hope and confidence to the cause of freedom. It is America's strongest instrument for positive action in the world today.

Last Friday I sent to the Congress a special message presenting my recommendations for this important part of our defense and security program for the coming year. In my judgment, there is no better means of showing our resolution, our firmness, and our understanding of the Communist challenge than to support this program in full measure.

These funds are vital to our national and free world security.

Any misguided effort to reduce them below what I have recommended weakens the sentries of freedom wherever they stand.

In this conviction, also, I am supported by the military experts of our Government.

Fellow Americans, of one thing I am sure: that we have the courage and capacity to meet the stern realities of the present and the future. We need only to understand the issues and to practice the self-discipline that freedom demands.

Our security shield is the productivity of our free economy, the power of our military forces, and the enduring might of a great community of nations determined to defend their freedom.

We have been, from the beginning, a free people—people who by their spiritual and moral strength and their love of country provide the mainspring for all we have done, are doing, and will do. In these truths we place our faith.

Together with our allies we stand firm wherever the probing finger of an aggressor may point. Thus we lessen the risk of aggression: thus we shall with resolution and courage, struggle ever forward to the dream of a just and permanent peace.

God helping us, we shall stand always equal to the challenge.

Thank you, and goodnight.

Type	Now in use	Available in 1959	Active research and development
Air to air	Genie. Sidewinder. Sparrow I. Sparrow III. Falcon GAR I. Falcon GAR II.	Falcon GAR III. Falcon GAR IV.	Falcon GAR IX. Falcon GAR XI. Eagle.
Air to surface	Bullpup.	Zuni.	Corvus. Hounddog. Quail.
Surface to air	Nike-Ajax. Nike-Hercules. Terrier. Talos.	Hawk. Bomarc.	Tartar. Nike-Zeus.
Surface to surface	Honest John. Corporal. Redstone. Regulus I. Matador. Thor.	Little John. Lacrosse. Mace. Jupiter. Snark. Atlas.	Sergeant. Pershing. Polaris. Titan. Minuteman.

Let's Face Our Responsibilities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. O'HARA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 18, 1959

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under the Employment Act of 1946 it was recognized that the Federal Government has a responsibility to promote maximum production, employment and purchasing power. To achieve these goals requires policies designed: First, to promote adequate growth and productive capacity; second, to insure high and steady use of labor and natural resources; third, to maintain reasonable stability in the general level of prices.

These are coordinate objectives of public policies, however, and undue emphasis on one without regard for the others is detrimental to the public interest. Changing economic circumstances require shifts in the relative emphasis to be given these objectives.

At the present time we are in a recession. Almost half of the major labor markets of the Nation are suffering from substantial unemployment. Our rate of economic growth has come to a virtual standstill. The consensus of expert opinion is that we can expect relatively stable prices in the coming months.

Refusing to take cognizance of these facts, the administration places absolute priority on balancing the budget. They say that to do otherwise would be inflationary. I recognize the danger of inflation, but it is not the danger that is confronting us. The problem is not the level of government expenditures but the character of the activities for which the budget provides.

Unless the Federal Government follows policies which result in expansion of employment and production, it will be derelict in its duties under the Employment Act of 1946. It will have abdicated its responsibilities to provide for the Nation's security. It will have relinquished the leadership of the free world.

Mr. Speaker, unemployment in February again showed an increase over the preceding month. It now stands at 4.7 million which is in excess of 6 percent of the total labor force. Adding to this, the full-time equivalent of involuntary part-time unemployment raises that total by another million. Over 7.2 percent of our labor force is therefore currently unemployed. These alarming statistics are further evidence of the critical situation of our Nation's economy in spite of the rosy predictions regularly published by the administration. The time for action was yesterday and tomorrow may be too late.

Since the administration has refused even to recognize the existence of this problem much less recommend measures to effectively deal with unemployment and economic stagnation, it is incumbent upon the Congress to act and to act now.

A few days ago we passed a measure extending, for a short period, temporary unemployment compensation benefits. This legislation, which I supported, does nothing for those who have already exhausted temporary benefits or for those not presently covered by unemployment compensation insurance.

It is no substitute for long overdue reforms in the unemployment compensation system. The Karsten-Machrowicz bill to establish Federal standards for unemployment compensation is needed more now than ever before. I am hopeful that there will be no unnecessary delay in bringing this measure before the House.

But Federal standards for unemployment compensation are not a cure-all. It is but one of a battery of measures that should be brought to bear upon the stagnation afflicting our economic life. National bankruptcy will not result from Federal expenditures and capital outlays that recognize the needs of a great people, but it can result from reliance upon an outmoded economic dogmatism having as its first principle a belief that the best course of action is no action at all.

We must adopt a program to meet two imperative needs.

First. Alleviating the effects of unemployment.

Second. Eliminating the unemployment.

The first involves measures to cushion the hardship, misery, and economic impact of unemployment. The need for overhauling our unemployment compensation system has been mentioned. The distribution of surplus commodities has been of assistance but leaves much to be desired. Enactment of a workable food stamp plan to improve distribution of a greater variety of foods, including meat, poultry, and other items acquired through surplus removal programs is badly needed. A review of surplus food distribution eligibility standards should be undertaken by the appropriate committees of the Congress.

However, these steps are no substitute for full employment, production, and purchasing power. If we face up to our responsibilities in the fields of education, water resources, defense, public health, resource development, public facilities, and economic and technical assistance to undeveloped nations, we need not fear underemployment of America's productive resources. Here, too, Congress must take the lead and I am confident that the American people, when the facts are made known to them, will applaud our efforts.

I am convinced that such a course of action is more apt to balance the Federal budget than is a program of retrenchment. The Members of this body need not be reminded that the huge Federal deficit for the current fiscal year is principally attributable to the decrease in tax revenues resulting from underemployment. The administration's budget proposals would, if anything, intensify this unhappy situation.

The most promising of the measures designed to promote economic growth and prosperity is the Douglas-Flood area redevelopment bill. This measure, with a relatively small Federal investment, would give impetus to the industrial redevelopment programs of communities which because of industrial migration, technological change, or other reason are suffering serious and persistent unemployment. It is in the enlightened self-interest of the Nation as a whole to expedite the implementation of the depressed areas legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that the sentiments expressed in this short statement are shared by almost every Democratic Member of Congress, and I am confident that the 86th Congress will realize its obligation to exercise the vision, resolution, and courage expected of us by the people who elected us and that it will provide the public framework within which America will realize its greatness.

The Berlin Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. HALLECK

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 18, 1959

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an exceptionally fine address by Representative PHIL WEAVER, of Nebraska, delivered before a Founders Day luncheon at Lincoln, Nebr., on Monday, March 16, 1959:

ADDRESS BY REPRESENTATIVE WEAVER

In just 72 days we will face a major crisis in Berlin. Last August it was Beirut. Next September it could again be Formosa.

Every time a crisis arises, there are those in the Senate and House, and the calamity columnists and commentators who plead hysterically for a national mobilization—a nationwide girding of our loins.

But unlike the men of the Old Testament, too many of these latter-day prophets of calamity would have us abandon principle. They would have us go to Berlin shaded by Neville Chamberlain's umbrella.

We have faced crises before. Yet under the leadership of that valiant fighter, John Foster Dulles, who is even now demonstrating that his physical bravery matches his moral courage, we have come through because we have held steadfast to the right. We have placed freedom for ourselves and all who love freedom as our goal and the only solution for which we will settle.

There are those who plead for flexibility at any price. My call is for freedom at any price.

What, really, is flexibility? If you listen to some in the Senate and to some of our nationally syndicated faint-hearted friends, it means a readiness to compromise other people's freedom—and eventually our own. Is this flexibility? Or is it moral cowardice?

To my mind, flexibility does not involve the ability to concede on principle. We had that kind of flexibility at Yalta and at Potsdam. But rather it means the ability to change the rules of the game to force the Communists to meet us on our own terms—whether in Berlin—or Formosa—or Beirut—or wherever they attempt to launch their next regional or limited war of nerves.

The arena will change—but the game and the players—and the coach—will be the same. This is a dirty game, and so far they have made the rules to suit themselves. Their ambition is to bleed us white at every point—to force us to spend our productive genius in every little skirmish. Then when they choose to push the button, we will be exhausted. We will have spent our main energies and be at their mercy.

To play in this game and win, we will have to have two things—

One, a diamond-hard adherence to the principle of freedom. And by that I mean a stanch belief in the ideals that forged this Republic and made it great, the things our fathers had—and which we want our children to enjoy.

Secondly, we must enter the arena strong—with a good team and plenty of trained reserves on the bench—including a strong National Guard.

As a member of the House Appropriations Subcommittee on Defense, it is my grave responsibility, along with 16 others, to see to it that we are strong and remain that way.

We are spending a great deal of money for defense. I want that money to go for building real strength to defend America to keep the pace and keep the peace against all aggressors. I do not want one dime to be spent on building a private empire for generals and admirals who practice a kind of nepotism based on a class ring from Annapolis or West Point or, now, Colorado Springs.

I do not want a single dime to go for buying new fleets of Cadillac limousines—and one day recently I saw nine of them lining the curb near the Capitol.

I do not want one nickel to go for paying the salary of a full colonel who came before our committee—to run a motion-picture projector at a cost of $55.97 a day—when a private could have done the same job just as well. I don't believe it takes a West Point education to learn to run a motion-picture projector.

Nor do I want your defense dollars to pay the salaries of the 24 commanders I saw trailing an admiral and two captains to a committee hearing.

I don't believe your tax dollars under normal circumstances should be used to establish huge public housing projects on military bases. Good homes are available for sale or rent to military personnel in many communities near the bases. To have mutual understanding between our friends on the base and the people in our towns, they should join together in community life whenever possible and help save tax dollars.

I want a strong defense, but I don't want to see a bumbling bureaucratic military empire waste us away and fumble our chance of survival down the drain.

If it comes to a choice between the kind of defense we need and some project here at home, I am going to choose defense every time. I am not going to play politics with the freedom of generations of Americans still unborn.

We can have that defense. We are in the process of developing the kind of defense that has the courage and imagination to put aside that which is outmoded. We can also have an America which is developing with imagination and determination our productive power—our natural resources.

We can have both.

We cannot have either if we allow ourselves through vacillation to play into the hands of an aggressor who has no principles of his own—but fears those who do and who will stick by them.

We cannot have either a strong defense or a vital, growing America if we allow waste and the frittering away of our resources by a military which has adopted a do-it-as-usual philosophy.

We have at present in the White House in Dwight D. Eisenhower a man who will not sacrifice the principle of freedom simply to satisfy those who have placed the flexibility of compromise and equivocation above every American ideal.

I can assure you—there are still some of us in Congress who want a national defense that doesn't bulge at the waistline with self-satisfied generals and admirals whose main worry is to expand their own domain.

These, I think, should be the goals of the Republican Party.

These are the goals for which I am fighting in the 86th Congress.

These are the principles on which I am willing to stake my political life. These are the principles upon which the life of America itself must depend.

Any man in Washington fighting for these goals needs support—not only political support but also moral support. As loyal Republicans, here today, I know you will provide this kind of staunch support from the very grassroots of America.

With this kind of solidarity, let our enemies not be in doubt.

"Meet Me in St. Louis" Set as TV Spectacular

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 18, 1959

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I have just been informed that the Columbia Broadcasting System on Sunday, April 26, plans to present a 2-hour spectacular based on the motion picture, "Meet Me in St. Louis," which we in St. Louis feel was just about one of the best pictures ever produced.

The people connected with the CBS show assure me the TV production will be modeled closely after the Judy Garland movie. The cast sounds wonderful—Tab Hunter, Jane Powell, Myrna Loy, Ed Wynn, Walter Pidgeon, and Jeanne Crain.

Normally, I would not utilize the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to call attention to an entertainment on television, but it seems to me—in view of the many Federal programs now under way in the St. Louis area including some of the largest and most ambitious urban redevelopment projects in the Nation—that Members of the Congress and others will find it well worthwhile to watch this TV program for an indication of the spirit and warmth of a great city where friendliness and neighborliness are traditional.

As I remember the 1944 movie, centered in the Kensington Avenue section of St. Louis in my congressional district, I was struck by the similarities in outlook and attitude of our present day St. Louisans with the delightful family scenes of 1903 depicted in the movie. Yes, we still feel the same way about St. Louis—as the best place in the world to live.

May I, therefore, Mr. Speaker, urge that every Member of Congress who is able to do so that evening, watch the CBS production of "Meet Me in St. Louis" on Sunday, April 26. If they do, I am sure we will have no difficulty at all in convincing the Congress that a city with that kind of spirit and friendliness well merits the cooperation we ment in flood control, urban renewal, and the majestic Jefferson National Ex- are receiving from the Federal Government pansion Memorial commemorating the Louisiana Purchase and the opening of the great West.

The Society of the Friendly Sons of St. Patrick of Washington, D.C.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. S. HERLONG, JR.

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 18, 1959

Mr. HERLONG. Mr. Speaker, last evening I was indeed happy to attend the annual dinner of the Society of the Friendly Sons of St. Patrick at the Mayflower Hotel. This society antedates the American Revolution, having been founded in Philadelphia on March 17, 1771. Three Presidents of the United States have held or hold active honorary membership in this historic and great society: George Washington, Harry S. Truman, and Dwight D. Eisenhower.

President Eisenhower was present at the dinner last evening when the president of the society, James Francis Reilly, bestowed honorary membership on the Honorable Sean T. O'Kelly, President of Ireland.

The society's annual citation was awarded to its secretary, Simon F. McHugh, Esq.

In my opinion, however, the highlight of this fine dinner was the inspiring, dynamic and challenging address of the distinguished junior Senator from Arizona, the Honorable BARRY M. GOLDWATER. In all my experience and public life, I have seldom seen a speaker receive such attention from his audience or the lengthy standing ovation which he received at the conclusion of his speech. I am proud to insert Senator GOLDWATER's address in the RECORD and urge all my colleagues to read it.

President Reilly, Mr. Chief Justice, Mr. Secretary McHugh, on introducing Bishop Hannan, Jim mentioned something to the effect that he was concerned over what his father in heaven might be thinking with him being president of the Friendly Sons of St. Patrick, when his father was a good Hibernian. I couldn't help wondering what some of my ancestors in heaven might be thinking with one of their brethren addressing this group. I wonder, for instance, what that Russian Jew who came to the shores of California 110 years ago, and to Arizona 100 years ago, would be thinking of his grandson addressing this auspicious group of Irishmen; and then I could not help but wonder what my uncle, whose only mistake in life was to found the Democratic Party in our territory, might be thinking of his nephew, a Republican. I have come to the conclusion that they would both be happy.

It has been said that this is the one day of the year when the world is divided into two classes—those who are Irish and those who would like to be Irish.

To me, a festive occasion such as this is a display of Americanism at its best. For here we are—men whose forebearers came to this land from all parts of the world—helping to celebrate the feast of St. Patrick with our friends of Irish descent in our own American way.

This is, indeed, the fabric and pattern of our great country.

And I pray that good people everywhere, armed with the love of God and following the example of St. Patrick, can provide a stimulus and a hope to those less fortunate in other lands so that they, too, may one day breathe the grand, free air that blows over Ireland.

I am sure you know that scholars still wrangle over the subject of just exactly where St. Patrick was born. Some say France. Some say Scotland. Some say Wales. It is definitely known, however, that he spent his young manhood in Ireland.

Fourteen centuries have passed and yet the memory of St. Patrick remains as green as the living shamrock itself.

It was St. Patrick who changed the character of the Irish people from pagan to Christian; from a chaos of marauding bands under rival chieftains, stealing and destroying, to a land of order and peace.

This proves conclusively to me that if St. Patrick was not indeed an Irishman himself, he was at the very least a Republican.

Now, those Republicans of Irish descent in Congress may be outnumbered, but they yield to no one in being endowed with the missionary spirit of St. Patrick.

Actually, they have so much missionary work to do before 1960 that they're plugging hard for a divine intercession.

As a matter of fact, right now you can't find an unlit candle in any church in town.

In this respect, I would like to counsel moderation among those of you who are Democrats of Irish descent.

Just because a fellow named KENNEDY will be in the picture, there's no reason to lose your heads.

And to those of you who happen to be Republicans of Irish descent, I give you my solemn word that among the membership of the United States Senate, you can count on O'JAVITS, O'DIRKSEN, O'BRIDGES, and O'GOLDWATER to be in there pitching for the cause.

And I would also tell you this: Lest there be overconfidence on the side having the greater numbers, let it be said that the fighting Irish may be outnumbered, but never outfought.

St. Patrick's Day is a day for remembering. Today across our land and around the world, the hallowed names of Ireland will be honored, honored as they rightly should be. The towns and villages, the lakes and the rivers, the names of her scholars, her patriots, and her leaders will be properly called to the attention of the world—Donegal and Tyrone; Kildare and Dublin; Limerick and Galway; and the names of men who made the Irish proud: Cormack, O'Conner, Murray, Plunkett, Hyde, and all the other leaders of Ireland.

Today the world will remember and more greatly appreciate the great loves of the Irish, out of which the rich character of her people has grown. Their love of their native land, of its towns, and its people. The love of political freedom and the love of learning. Their love of things spiritual. The love of religion and their recognition of its place in their lives. We will remember those loves, because love is a sacred tenet of religion and a charge of God.

People are prone to recognize their own assets, but the rest of the world will pay tribute to the meekness and humility that mark the virtues of the Irish. Because in these times when more stress and value are placed on the material things, we should rightly remember that St. Patrick conquered Ireland meekly, and made of those conquered humble champions of Christ, men who, with these virtues, went forward with nothing but the Cross and their faith and conquered and made friends.

Here in America today the contributions of the Irish to our freedom can most properly and thankfully be recognized. It would take days to recite all the contributions, but I mention just a few. It was an Irishman named Patrick Henry who said, "Give me liberty, or give me death."

It was a group of 29 Irishmen, all members of the Friendly Sons of St. Patrick, in the city of Philadelphia, who gave a half-million dollars when it was sorely needed to our fight for independence.

To mention a few of the Irish signers of the Constitution we recall Pierce Butler, who was born in County Carlow; Daniel Carroll, an ardent supporter of the Constitution's first amendment, which provides for religious freedom; Thomas Fitzsimmons, who recruited and led a patriotic band of volunteers; James McHenry, who was born in County Antrim, as was William Patterson; George Read, of Maryland, whose father was an Irishman; and Richard Spaight, of North Carolina, who was also the son of an Irishman. These are names connected with our early fight for independence, and in just recent days Gen. "Wild Bill" Donovan, a hero and a leader in two wars for the preservation of freedom, passed on to his Maker.

Thus, today, as the world stands troubled and quaking in fear, we can remember Ireland's long fight for freedom. Seven hundred years of invasion by the Danes, the Normans, and the English, during which time her answer was to absorb the invader and make him more Irish than the Irish themselves.

All of these are hallowed memories of name and places and deeds and they will be dealt with by voices far more able and eloquent than mine, so to them the challenge of adding luster to the names and history that already shines with the brilliance of a midday desert sun in my Arizona.

This evening I suggest that all Americans might learn something from the Irish, and it is to this that I wish to direct my remarks. That something would be gathered and constructed from the many facets of Ireland and her people on which I have briefly touched. It would include the love of her people for their country and their love of political freedom. It would include the virtues of humility and meekness, and it would include what to my mind is already a distillation of those virtues and loves—a determination expressed in her fight for freedom. This something would become a lesson to us all in that area in which we profess such devotion and yet display such apathy.

The freedom of America has the same fundamental and basic sources that freedom everywhere achieved has had, including the freedom of the Irish. That is man's instinctive desire to be free; to be able to say what he thinks; to be able to print what he says, to be able to worship in the religion he chooses; to be able to associate himself with those of his picking; to be able to earn property and retain it; and to be able to walk God's earth with dignity because of the possession of these freedoms.

Like the Irish, our forefathers knew what they wanted and what they sought, and they knew this from the oppression they had lived with. Our forefathers came to a raw, new country, and fought those forces from abroad who would deny them success in the achievement of freedom. The Irish for 700 years devoted themselves to that fight on the soil of their homeland, and won. Our forefathers devoted themselves to this same fight on our new soil, against the same forces, and won. In our determination to rid ourselves of oppression and achieve freedom, we accepted as freedom's source the words of Thomas Jefferson, in the Declaration of Independence, "That we hold these truths to be self-evident; that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness."

We based our freedom, then, on the same grounds on which the Irish had fought for many years before we found that base ourselves, namely a spiritual one. In less than 200 years we have, through this spiritual strength acquired freedom never before known by any people, and because of this freedom a material power that has never been known by any civilization in history.

Strangely, though, as we were enjoying the heights of this freedom and its many benefits, at about the same time the Irish won their freedom, we began to lose ours. We fought and won wars for freedom and then lost them at the peace table, mainly because of a misunderstanding as to what kind of peace the world was looking for. Ours was a conception of material peace, when the world wanted the comfort and assurance of a spiritual peace, out of which a material one could grow.

People have always wanted liberty, and people today want liberty. They want us to show them the way to liberty and the peace that comes under it, rather than to show them how to obtain more dollars, more automobiles and the other hard goods materialism.

This weakness of the material has been further manifested by more and more of our people looking to a paternalistic government to do for them those things they could better do for themselves.

Slowly materialism began to be our goal, and even to some of our people, their God, and we find ourselves more and more willing to sacrifice our basic principles for the material attainment our people would settle for.

We laugh at laws, and coddle the hoodlums, the gangsters, and the crooks. We allowed the Communists to crawl into our lives. Then when their intent became evident, those who spoke out against them and would have removed them were chastised. You know of whom I speak: John Flynn, Dean Manion, Frank Hanighen, every one is an Irish name. And then there was another Irishman, Joe McCarthy.

There is a peculiar difference in this situation involving these Americans of Irish name and their ancestors, because instead of acting together as their ancestors did in fighting a common enemy—the English—these Americans are arguing with other Americans over how an announced enemy and destroyer should be treated. Should he be coddled and banqueted and respected, or should he and his forces be denied access to American soil and American people?

We have come to that point where we blandly and rather ignorantly say that a little socialism isn't bad; that a little inflation won't hurt; and that an already tax-sick people can be taxed more.

Public servants who swear on the Bible to defend and protect the Constitution have allowed the freedom of association, the freedom of choice, and the freedom of property to be denied the working people through an act of compulsion that requires membership in an organization regardless of the desires of the workingman, in order that that man may support himself and his family.

By this same action, they have legalized violence and corruption and graft; and yet Americans ho-hum the whole dangerous display, admitting that something is wrong but being afraid to do anything about it, and putting off the time for decision until their children and grandchildren will be concerned, this despite the fact that one of the basic desires of all people, be they Irish or not, is to leave for their sons and daughters something good and fine and decent, by which they will be remembered.

Instead of that drive today in this country we find weak-kneed excuses as to why fathers and mothers will not rise up and demand a stand of courage on the part of our leaders in order that these things be corrected in our time before the devastation

cannot be corrected in the time of our children.

We hear the taunts of people who have been lied to by Communists about us. We have witnessed our Vice President spat upon by people the Communists have brainwashed. We have not helped those who would stand up to this godless philosophy. Yet we propose further meetings with these devastators, when in practically every instance of agreement and promise—in fact, all with the exception of two—they have lied and cheated their way out of their responsibilities.

Yes, our freedoms are slowly being whittled away, and yet we, as a people, go on and on like the country boy who never learns that the pea isn't under any of the shells he is playing with.

The frightening thing about our situation, both within our country and without, is that history records that every government since man's first attempt to govern himself as having approached the identical situation and not having had the courage to make the proper decisions and movements. There is no new magic we have discovered that can bridge this crossroad. There is no new formula that has been devised by which our path can be made easier and at the same time our freedoms more secure. Ours is the greatest philosophy of government ever developed, and it was developed by people from every country and added to during the years when the friendly invasions of peoples added to what we called, "the melting pot."

Today, though, there are those among us who feel that we have an entirely different situation; that man's problems are now material problems and not problems of the spirit. Those are the people who look upon the harnessing of the atom as being so fearful that no force of the spiritual can overcome it, forgetting at the same time that problems of equal importance have come before man during our history and they have been conquered by the faith of man in his God, his country, and himself.

So I wanted to talk briefly tonight about what we Americans might learn from the Irish, and I think that it can be summed up by saying that we can look across the waters to that green island and to her people, and to the great lesson that freedom is not only man's goal—it is God's goal for man. That we have had freedom and we still have a large share of freedom, we know, but that we are losing it, and that it will not be lost in one afternoon or morning by the appearance of material forces from the outside, but that it will be lost by the termitelike chewing away from the inside by people who have lost faith in their God, their country, and themselves, we won't recognize.

We again look to Ireland's 700-year struggle for freedom and recognize that freedom is something that must be fought for to be attained, just as our forefathers discovered the same thing. Then we can look to Ireland and see a people who have not gone on the American dole, who have built up in their country a free economy, and who have maintained the spiritual ideals which gave them the strength to fight a desperate battle for freedom for more than 700 years.

Yes, we can learn from the Irish. We can learn to defeat the enemies of religion and our Republic. We can learn to protect our Constitution. We can learn from them how to perpetuate liberty. If we study the Irish and their many attributes I think we will find that dominating their lives is a sense of love, not only for their fellow men but for the principles of life and for the country in which they live, be that Ireland or America.

We need men of that quality; men who love their God and who love their country; men who are proud of our Nation and who do not hesitate at any moment to extoll its virtues, even though they may be criticized for feeling too deeply about their country. Today people who feel too strongly that the United States is the best country in the world are actually criticized. They are told that national feeling should be subjugated to one of broader vision. Well, I say to you I will take the Irish approach and join with them in declaring to all that America is the best place to live.

We need men who feel so deeply about principles that they will not compromise for evil for one moment's delight. We need men who believe that, simple as it is, the spiritual basis is the only basis on which true liberty and freedom can live. We need men whose eyes will moisten as they see their flags pass by, men who do not require the reminder we see on the parade ground at West Point, "Gentlemen will remove their hats when the flag goes by." We need men who are strong and who will never bow down to an aggressor be that aggressor weak or strong.

These lessons are the lessons of the Irish. They are the lessons drawn from everything that has made the Irish and their sons around the world what they are today—men of warmth, men of love, men who are humble and meek, but men in whom these qualities have developed a strength of character that is reflected down through history in man's search for freedom. I, as a descendant of a family who came from another part of the world but who, nevertheless, became just as strong Americans as I am today, join with those not of Irish extraction in offering a prayer to God that the qualities of the Irish will be forever perpetuated on this earth, so that liberty may have a chance to live forever, and be born where it does not live today. The lessons of the Irish are truly lessons of liberty.

Salute to the Campfire Girls

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 18, 1959

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I have prepared a brief statement regarding the 49th anniversary of the founding of the Campfire Girls. I ask unanimous consent that the statement be printed in the RECORD.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR KEATING

Yesterday marked the 49th anniversary of the founding of the Campfire Girls. From modest beginnings, this outstanding organization has grown to the point where today it has over 500,000 members.

By providing recreational programs for girls between the ages of 7 and 18, the Campfire Girls not only teach valuable skills, but encourage these young people to contribute innumerable services to their communities. They learn in many ways how to become useful and valuable citizens.

Of particular concern to this organization is the preservation of our natural resources and the protection of our wildlife. All too often, these valuable aspects of our national life are overlooked in the hustle and bustle of our everyday activities. The Campfire Girls' theme, "She cares—Do you?" helps teach these young people the tremendous need for conservation in our land.

I am pleased to join with their many friends and admirers in saluting the Campfire Girls on the occasion of their anniversary. May this fine organization and all its members continue to grow and prosper in all their endeavors which are doing so much to make a better America in which to live.

Education Act Test Oath Ineffective and Detrimental

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 18, 1959

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, on March 16 I introduced a bill to repeal section 1001(f) of the National Defense Education Act of 1958. This section requires a person obtaining payments or loans under the act to swear to an affidavit that he does not believe in, or support any organization that believes in, the violent or unconstitutional overthrow of the United States Government.

Why, it might be asked, should anyone want to eliminate this provision from the act? Certainly, it has a valid purpose—to prevent the granting of benefits by the Government to persons bent on destroying it. I am in complete agreement with that purpose. However, I do not think that the disclaimer affidavit will accomplish that purpose. Moreover, I believe that if the provision is allowed to remain, it will do more harm than good in carrying out the general purpose of the act in stimulating and helping to satisfy the educational ambitions of the country's youth.

The justification for any law's existence should be found in the answer to the question: "Will it promote the general welfare?" Unless this can be answered in the affirmative, a law has no reason for being and is better off repealed. Clearly, a law which is ineffective—which is destined not to accomplish its purpose—cannot meet this test. Section 1001(f) of the National Defense Education Act is such a law.

I agree with the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare when he said that the requirement of section 1001(f) will not uncover any persons who seek or who belong to organizations that believe in or teach the overthrow of the Government by force or violence. For, as Secretary Flemming further pointed out, such persons have no scruples about signing an affidavit or taking an oath.

Moreover, I believe that this section, in addition to being ineffective, is actually detrimental. Some colleges have refused to participate in the programs offered under the act because they find this section so obnoxious. The students at these colleges have thereby been denied the benefits offered them under the act, principally those contained in the student loan program.

I have not, by the way, been able to find a satisfactory answer as to how this provision found its way into the act or who is responsible for its being there. All that the legislative history shows is that it first appeared in the bill produced by the committee of the opposite body.

My guess is that some clerk in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare thought that this would be nice to have in the act, and that this suggestion was passed on and accepted without receiving proper consideration by the committee members.

I see no reason why students and educators should be put in the position of affirmatively denying subversive affiliations in order to participate in the programs available under the act. The natural implication of this requirement is that they are a particularly suspect group. I have not been shown one shred of evidence to back up this implication. I can justly sympathize, therefore, with the many objections which they have raised against the affidavit.

This is why I have introduced my bill and I intend to offer my complete support to the present effort to delete this ill-conceived requirement from an otherwise outstanding piece of legislation.

Flexibility Means More Cowardly Appeasement, Nothing Else

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 18, 1959

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, for a thousand years the leaders of Irish independence declared they would stand by their principles "Until hell freezes over." It was a picturesque way of saying "never."

Now we would like to suggest a modern paraphrase: "When Pope John goes to Moscow, that will be the day." It, too, means "never."

Nobody in this world expects Pope John to go to Moscow to beg for peace or negotiate for mercy or to plead for cooperation. And why do they not? Because they know that to try to make a deal directly with atheistic murderers, mass killers, unprincipled destroyers of the people's liberties, liars, and persecutors of religion would be unthinkable for the Pope, the leader of Catholic Christianity.

This is so because the Pope has taken an inflexible, unchangeable and absolutely firm stand on the question of the existence of God. He does not believe there could be any compromise on that important matter. Any flexibility on that issue would of course destroy the church, the Christian religion and indeed our whole civilization. There can be no coexistence agreement between God and Satan, and you cannot reconcile good with evil. Neither can you reconcile democracy and freedom with communism and slavery.

But if it is unthinkable for the Pope, why is it not for the leaders of Christian nations, of religious peoples, of free institutions? Why does Prime Minister Macmillan trot obligingly off to Moscow at the behest of the evil Khrushchev and permit himself to be slapped in the face with insult and treachery? Why does President Eisenhower even consider going to Moscow or sending Vice President NIXON as his emissary to the Kremlin to receive the same rough treatment? Why does Dag Hammarskjold, Secretary General of the United Nations, plan a trip to Moscow where he, too, can only expect to be received with calumny and sneers?

Do you know why? Because they are afraid not to go. That is all there is to it. Khrushchev, the dictator of a backward and brutal tyranny, has become like a Roman emperor in our world, calling in the neighboring kings to be exhibited scornfully to the jeering crowd of onlookers just to prove that he is master of the world.

By these craven missions to Moscow the leaders of the free world are acting like those European and Asiatic ambassadors who trekked across the Russian plains to the abode of the great Khans to grovel and beg for mercy when these Mongol tyrants were sweeping half the world before their murdering cavalrymen. But Khrushchev is no Ghengis Khan. Nor is his force so irresistible. As Adm. Arleigh Burke told us the other day, the United States of America has the power to destroy the Soviet Union should Khrushchev trigger an attack. Our Nation is the most powerful nation, with or without allies, in the world.

But power, without the will to use it when necessary, is useless. The British and French discovered this when they faced a daring and rearming Hitler across the Rhine—and ended up with appeasement at Munich and war. The Romans, centuries before them, discovered this when their great and glittering empire was assaulted by the barbarian tribes from the north who coveted their riches. The Babylonians, with their brilliant but decadent civilization, had the same experience when "The Assyrian came down like a wolf on the fold, and his cohorts were gleaming in purple and gold."

Are Americans or Europeans no different from these faded civilizations which have risen to the heights only to die in the depths when they lost their will to independence and freedom from barbarous tyranny? Will we, too, quail before the rough and arrogant barbarian ruler who now tells us that he intends to bury us and all we hold dear?

The Communists in the Soviet Union are openly bent on the destruction of free Europe and the United States. They have told us, as repeatedly as Hitler told his neighbors what he intended to do to them, that they will make us Communist captives if they can. Yet while we still have the power to resist and defeat them, while we have the strength to protect our liberties and secure our nationhood against these terrors, we accept with honor and hospitality Khrushchev's suave and cunning Ambassador Mikoyan, the murderer of thousands of Hungarian patriots. The British Prime Minister went on his pilgrimage to Moscow only to be rudely insulted while he was forced to listen to our own leaders being reviled. And still some of our legislators in Washington entertain thoughts of accepting this tyrant's term for a summit conference and the Berlin seizure, calling it flexibility. There can be no flexibility when compromise and surrender mean tyranny and slavery.

Flexibility is just a new diplomatic word for cowardly appeasement.

It is better to die on your feet, if you must, than to live on your belly. It is better for the United States to revive its old Revolutionary slogan, "Don't Tread On Me," and face the consequences of a brave and determined policy against communism than meanly to give away, a bit at a time, our pride, the liberties of our friends, our treasure, and finally our independence as a nation.

St. Patrick and the New Barbarians

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 18, 1959

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted, I insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an address I delivered in Cleveland yesterday on "St. Patrick and the New Barbarians":

On this St. Patrick's Day it is our time-honored pleasure and privilege to lay aside the cares and worries of the day as we proudly wear the green. Our songs and cheers, parades and banquets, boasts and tears, all bear testimony to a rich heritage bestowed upon us by our patron saint. But it is more than that. Beneath the precious sentiment we express so well today, there stirs in the heart of every Irishman a gentle reminder of the special mission in life that is his by birthright. That mission is the spiritual enrichment of all mankind.

For 15 centuries the Irish have been faithful to that mission. In the Dark Ages when all civilization in Europe, the cradle of Western culture and thought, seemed certain to perish, it was the Irish who lighted the way out of the darkness. An island of saints and scholars, she has given her sons and daughters to almost every quarter of the globe. They have carried with them the same light and word which St. Patrick brought to Ireland so long ago, that all mankind might be lifted up to the dignity which befits his nature. In keeping faith with this noble purpose in life, the Irish have prospered wherever they have raised the banners of St. Patrick. So, too, have the many lands to which they have gone prospered under the watchful care of this great saint.

This, then, is the unending mission of the Irish to the world. It is unending because the lessons of the ages teach us that from time to time evil forces arise which challenge the dignity of man and seek to overthrow the divine plan which secures that dignity.

In our times we are faced with this challenge, on all sides we find evidence of the dark ages in this 20th Century. The human values which mankind has won at such great sacrifice are being trampled under the heavy boots of Russian barbarians. At this turning point in history we are faced with a series of choices at the core of which rests the fundamental question, "are we willing to sell our birthright for a mess of pottage?"

In a world torn by strife and tension we are told we can have peace if we are willing to pay tribute to the new barbarians. The peace they offered in return, is no peace at all, it is the strange peace of human slavery. Justice, the only basis upon which peace can be built, is rapidly losing its place in the affairs of nations, because it permits no compromise on the dignity of man. A peace without justice is the certain formula for war, a war which no thinking man may countenance.

What is the tribute demanded of us by the new barbarians as the price for an unjust peace?

First, they are asking free men, particularly in the United States, to acquiesce in their enslavement of 35 percent of the people who inhabit the earth. They are trying desperately to drag the spokesmen for the Western World into another summit conference. At this conference they expect to force recognition of a status quo, that is, recognition of their right to enforce the darkness of despotism and slavery upon humanity. They want free men to guarantee to them that their evil work will go unmolested, that the conscience of the West will not be moved by the sad plight of so many of their fellow men. As they hear the millions of our brothers, now persecuted as martyrs to our cause, cry out for justice, they are fearful that these cries will be answered by a world enraged by man's inhumanity to man. Evil works quietly in the shadows, always fearful of arousing the forces of righteousness.

That is what lies back of the present Berlin crisis, precipitated by the barbarians of Moscow. First we are told that unless we desert the people of free Berlin we will be driven out by force. When we responded to the threat by declaring our intention to stand fast in our defense of freedom, the Russians began a series of retreats. Pressed by the deadline which they were so bold to make, and in the face of our determination to be firm, they have now taken the position that if we agree to a summit conference they will not cause a war over Berlin. This is apparent from the fact that only a few days ago the Kremlin spokesmen stated the deadline of May 27 would be extended if preparations were under way for such a meeting. But, as always, there is a catch. The continued Russian insistence that no agenda be prepared in advance of the conference gives ample evidence that they intend to limit discussion to those items which force recognition of a status quo.

It is strange indeed, that at this point in our history, when free men have advanced so far in knowledge and accomplishments, we should be ordered about by the crude barbarians. We must ask ourselves, Has our civilization lost its sense of high purpose, have we surrendered our mission to the world? There is mounting evidence that something is missing from our national life which, in past generations, made our country the beacon light and great hope of the world.

Not many months ago we had a strange visitor come to our country, allegedly on a vacation. He was the eyes, the ears, and the spokesman for the new barbarians. Every schoolchild in America knew who he was and what he represented. Yet, this same individual was wined and dined by influential segments of our national life. He shrewdly dangled the prospects of huge profits before the eyes of those industrialists and businessmen who willingly paid him homage. He made no mention of the fact that he was simply carrying out the orders of Lenin who held that when the time came the biggest capitalists would be anxious to provide the rope with which they were to be hanged by the new order. Nor did he mention the plan to destroy the hard-won gains of free labor in the United States by putting it in competition with the products of his slave empire. Few voices were raised in protest to this spectacle and those who did raise their voices to the danger were branded as extremists and not representative of traditional American hospitality. Few asked, Since when has it been the tradition of our free people to extend hospitality to a person who has the blood of martyrs on his hands, to a person whose whole life has been dedicated to the destruction of those priceless values which we hold to be as dear as life itself? This emissary of evil left the United States with the false impression that we are a divided people, that we are more interested in material things than in spiritual and human values. He could no more understand the American people and our way of life than could Hitler in his time. The tragedy is that the false impressions gathered during Mikoyan's short visit to our country will make our role in world affairs more difficult and increase the dangers of war.

Now one hears the call for compromise on Berlin from quarters and individuals who should know better than to ask the impossible. What do we have to compromise? All we have ever asked for is the right of the German people to determine their destiny by the process of free elections. We are fully prepared to accept the results of these elections because we believe in the right of all people to self-determination. It is the Russians, the new barbarians, who refuse to accept the verdict of the people directly involved. How can we compromise this position we have taken? There is nothing to compromise unless we are prepared to abandon our position of moral leadership in the world.

There are other disturbing signs of free men growing weary and tired of the struggle for survival. For the many years of the cold war it has been our national policy to bring comfort and hope to the oppressed through the media of international broadcasts. Broadcasting to the people in the countries now overrun by the new barbarians in their native tongues, we have been able to keep alive their hopes for a better life, and a return to the civilization of which they are a part. This has proven to be a work of peace, because, so long as they could hope, they could not abandon the heritage of freedom, they would not, in desperation, accept things as they are and make accommodations with the despots. Now, we see this policy in the process of change, a change which bodes evil for the future. Gradually there are being eliminated the many voices which carried his message of hope. The Russian language, the language of the oppressor, is beginning to monopolize the "Voice of America" programs beamed to the darkened lands behind the Iron Curtain. This tactic can only alienate our proven friends in these many lands and drive them into the camp of the enemy. Frequently I have asked myself whether this results from ignorance or from a secret agreement already entered into by the Eisenhower administration to accept a status quo; that is, to recognize the permanent occupation of these once free lands by the new barbarians.

There are ominous signs of the times; they threaten the precarious peace which now hangs over a tired and weary world. They are dangerous because the appetite of the aggressor cannot be satisfied by concessions, he must have everything or nothing. He understands firmness and courage, though he lacks it himself. The bully is always a bluffer and he dominates none but the timid.

But there are other signs of our times in which we can take comfort. A very large segment of our people have come to recognize the full meaning of the crises of our times. This awakening to the harsh realities of our divided world is being stimulated by the growing pressures put upon us. More and more our people are seeking their strength of purpose from that deep spirituality which is our heritage. When all is said and done, the strength of our country rests firmly in the hands of our people. It is within their power to use that strength as we face the test of our worthiness to lead the cause of peace, with justice. In generations past we have not feared to face responsibilities, nor have we feared the threats and boasts of tyranny on the march. We as a nation have learned well that man lives not by bread alone.

So, on this St. Patrick's Day let us, one and all, rejoice in the knowledge that the spirit of our patron saint has a place in the hearts of all who know the blessings of human freedom. This gift shall give us strength as we carry on our happy mission to bring spiritual enlightenment to all mankind. We must be doers of the word, carrying the light which shall take all mankind out of the darkness of materialism.

The Need for a Strong Marine Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. T. RUTHERFORD

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 18, 1959

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Mr. Speaker, we have read and heard a great deal in recent weeks of the responsibilities of Congress in the creation of our Nation's military policy. We have read and heard some misinformed commentators who seem to believe that the responsibility for the military policies and posture of our Armed Forces rests solely on the Executive. As we know, nothing could be further from the truth. The Constitution makes the role of this great body perfectly clear.

I know of no finer example of the marked success Congress has enjoyed in its rightful role of military policymaking and in creating forces to implement that policy than the United States Marine Corps.

As all of you know, we don't maintain the Marine Corps, the Army, the Navy, or the Air Force out of pure sentiment. In today's market military power is far too expensive to be perpetuated for reasons of sentiment or in memory of past glories.

Congress has insisted upon maintaining a Marine Corps—and an Army, Navy, and Air Force—because we know they are needed. We know that these forces are necessary tools in a world where the survival of freedom must depend upon our ability to meet the challenges of Communist aggression with determination, but also with precision and restraint.

What do we demand of these forces which we create? In particular, why do we insist upon a Marine Corps of three combat-ready Marine divisions and three air wings? What place does the Marine Corps hold in our military posture?

The United States is an island nation. Our land borders are touched by only two nations, Canada and Mexico, both good friends and good neighbors.

The most easily used, the most economical, and the most practical high-

ways between us and the rest of the world are the seas. The seas of the world are the arteries along which flow the commerce and the strength which bind the countries of the free world into the great alliance it is. The seas of the world are the highways over which we can come to the aid of our friends with supplies and military power in meaningful quantities.

We must control and use these highways if the free world is to survive.

We control the seas through the intelligent use of seapower. But without the ability to project that power ashore, promptly and efficiently, the meaning of seapower is lost; these great highways are useless. Amphibious operations are the means by which we project naval power ashore and secure the benefits of these highways.

Without this ability to project our power from the sea to the land, much of the significance of seapower is lost—to our friends and our enemies alike.

The key to victory in our last two wars lay in our ability not only to control the seas, but to project our military might from the sea onto the land.

Our ability to do this rested upon the doctrine and the techniques developed by the Marine Corps between World Wars I and II. These techniques must change constantly with the refinement of weapons and machines. The necessity for maintaining this art is not gone. If anything, the need is greater than ever before.

Congress decided after World War II, with the lessons of that great conflict still vivid in its mind, that the continual development of the art of amphibious warfare was a full-time job—not a sideline for one of the larger services, but a job for a comparatively small organization that could devote its full efforts to the art and always be ready to use it at a moment's notice.

In an effort to insure that we would continue to develop new techniques and doctrine for this highly specialized military art and would continue to have a force constantly ready to execute such operations, the Marines were assigned this mission by law after World War II.

Assignment of this function to the Marine Corps was and is a perfectly natural solution to the problem. This mission involves a close and absolutely unique association with the Navy; one that makes the business of getting aboard ships and away—fully ready for combat—an instinctive thing. This unique relationship is the product of over 175 years of close association. It's the result of living with the problem for generations.

In developing this capability over the course of many years, the Marine Corps became the Nation's force-in-readiness.

This too was a natural development. In its close teamwork with the Navy and its increasing efforts to provide amphibious forces that were always trained and ready to go, the Marines provided a force that was expert and available in one package. Their forces did not need to be collected, trained, and equipped as each emergency arose. They were in existence, fully trained, and an integral part of the fleet. To put it simply they filled a need in our defense structure.

Congress was quick to recognize that our country has a continuing need for such a versatile, highly trained, always ready force. But, for various reasons, there have been those outside Congress who refuse to recognize this need, or claim that the need can be filled by other forces. As a result, in spite of the clear prescriptions of law, the Marines were steadily whittled down after World War II until by 1949, on the eve of the Korean conflict, they had been reduced to six battalions.

With the lessons of Korea unmistakably clear to all who would learn, Congress sought again in 1953 to insure that the country would never again be without the services of an amphibious force in readiness.

In approving legislation that would require the maintenance of a Marine Corps of a specified combatant size and capability, the House Armed Services Committee made the intent and the aims of Congress clear beyond argument. The committee stated the purpose of the legislation as "to require the maintenance of a versatile expeditionary force in readiness, always combat ready."

To further expose the need for such a force the committee stated:

> American history, recent as well as remote, has fully demonstrated the vital need for the existence of a strong force in readiness. Such a force, versatile, fast moving, and hard hitting, will constantly have a very powerful impact in relation to minor international disturbances. Such a force can prevent the growth of potentially large conflagrations by prompt and vigorous action during their incipient stages.

These reasons for maintaining a strong Marine Corps are just as valid today as they were when they were written in 1952.

The need for a Marine Corps of not less than three combat divisions and three air wings is, if anything, greater today than it was in 1952.

The place of the Marines in our national military posture is best expressed in simple terms. If we did not have a Marine Corps—we would have to go right out and get one.

They provide, as an integral part of the balanced fleet, the force-in-readiness which is essential to a flexible military and foreign policy.

Studying the Effects of Pesticides, Herbicides, and Other Chemical Poisons on Fish and Wildlife

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEE METCALF

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 18, 1959

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, I have just introduced a bill to increase the amount authorized by the act of August 1, 1958, to enable the Secretary of the Interior to accelerate the studies of the effects of pesticides, herbicides, and other chemical poisons on fish and wildlife. The purpose of the 1958 act, which I cosponsored, is to prevent losses of invaluable fish and wildlife resources following application of poisonous materials for insect and plant control and to develop basic information on the various chemicals so that forests, croplands, wet lands, rangelands and other lands can be sprayed with minimum losses of fish and wildlife, barnyard poultry, cats, dogs, and other farm animals.

My bill would increase the amount authorized for these needed investigations from $280,000 to $2,565,000 annually. This is the sum that actually is needed to enable the Secretary of the Interior to study various aspects of the pesticides problem in order to assure that the future use of chemical controls shall not inflict irreparable damage on the Nation's fish and game resources, and farm animals. This amount is by no means inordinate; it represents less than 1 percent of the wholesale value of the chemical sprays that were produced commercially in this country in 1956. It is a modest investment for the protection of fish and wildlife resources which, in 1955, generated nearly $3 billion in sales of goods and services to the Nation's more than 30 million hunters and fishermen.

The use of sprays for forestry, agricultural and other purposes has grown phenomenally since 1940. Chemical controls that year had a wholesale value of $40 million. Their 1956 wholesale value was $290 million, and is expected to rocket to more than $1 billion by 1975.

About 3.4 million acres of forest land were sprayed in 1956 and more will be treated in coming years. In 1956, more than 55 million acres of croplands—no less than one-sixth of the national total—were treated with some 3 billion pounds of pesticides.

These figures illustrate only part of the story of the tremendous upsurge in usage of those powerful chemicals. This increased use has been accompanied by the development of poisons that are many times more lethal than earlier commercial products. Before World War II relatively small amounts of only a few chemicals such as nicotine, rotenone, pyrethrum, and some arsenicals were used for insect control. More recently developed chemicals, which are being used in control programs ranging over millions of acres, are from 15 to 200 times more toxic than earlier formulations. Many have an added killing effect in that they remain toxic in the soil for 3 to 5 years after application. More than 200 basic pesticides and more than 6,000 brand-named products now are on the market.

Some of the more potent formulations are being used by agencies of the U.S. Department of Agriculture in large-scale insect control and so-called "eradication" programs. Early, but very limited research by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service showed that the maximum amount of DDT, the first of these new types of insecticides, that could be applied in control programs without massive mortality to animal life was 2

pounds per acre. Heptachlor, an insecticide which is from 15 to 20 times more toxic to wildlife than DDT, now is being used at the same rate—2 pounds per acre—in the controversial multimillion-acre fire ant "eradication" program in the South.

The act which my bill would amend came into being largely because of widespread public alarm over the loss of fish and game resources following several large-scale insecticidal operations. In two areas that were treated with heptachlor for eradication of the imported fire ant, birds were reduced 75 to 85 percent—quail and rabbit populations were virtually wiped out. Fire ant eradication work in Monroeville, Ala., last July was reported in the Montgomery Journal to have resulted in the deaths of hundreds of chickens, more than 50 dogs, many cats, some birds, and and undetermined number of turkeys, ducks, and squirrels. Veterinarian O. L. Poitevint, of Climax, Ga., has stated that the deaths of upwards to 100 head of cattle and large numbers of chickens, turkeys, goats, and sheep, and reproductive failure in 100 to 150 brood sows, resulted from fire ant treatment around that community. No similar deaths occurred in surrounding, untreated areas, the veterinarian said.

Experimental work has shown that pheasants and quail, when exposed to sublethal quantities of commercial poisons in food materials subsequently have a greatly lowered reproductive capacity. The young produced by the experimental birds are weak, and most failed to live more than a few weeks. Larvae of aquatic insects and earthworms, which are foods of many fishes and birds, concentrate some of these poisons in their bodies. The tissues of some fish have been found to harbor high levels of DDT many months after temporary concentrations of the poisons were introduced into their stream environments.

These are a few examples of why biologists, sportsmen, naturalists, and a large segment of the general public are concerned about the pesticides-wildlife problem. Millions of acres of land are scheduled for aerial spraying in the next few years in the fire ant eradication program. Gypsy moth spraying in New York and New England, Dutch elm disease control in the Midwest, forest insect control in many parts of the Nation, and grasshopper poisoning in the Great Plains show what is in store. Additional millions of acres of private crop and timber lands will be sprayed by individual landowners.

Let there be no misunderstanding, no one thinks that the Federal agencies or private groups are deliberately setting out to kill fish and game with pesticides. The use of economic poisons for insect and pest plant control is an accepted and necessary agricultural and forest management practice. What I am saying is that some control programs have resulted in alarming losses of fish and game. Insect control personnel presently have little knowledge of how the toxic materials can be used to achieve desired results without causing serious and perhaps prolonged damage to fish and game resources. This factor alone justifies enactment of my bill.

This obvious lack of knowledge was brought out in hearings held by House and Senate committees last year on the act which I now seek to amend. Little actually is known about the relative and actual toxicities of commercially available poisons, the proper times and methods of their use so as to minimize loss of fish and game; the direct and indirect effects of poisonous materials on those animals; and many other factors.

We are fortunate, Mr. Speaker, that the 85th Congress initiated a few studies and provided a little money to get them going. I say we are fortunate because that action has enabled the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service to get a clearer and more definite view of the serious problem that faces the Nation. For the first time that agency was able to survey the magnitude of the danger, designate logical areas of investigation, and estimate program costs. I now find that the annual cost of a basic program of investigation and research both for sport fisheries and wildlife and for commercial fisheries is $2,565,000. This figure represents an investment of less than 1 percent of the wholesale value of all commercial pesticides produced in 1956.

My colleagues should know that the sum of $280,000 per annum as provided in the act of August 1, 1958, was recommended to the House by the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries as a provisional and initial sum to get the program underway. That committee in its report, No. 2181, advised:

> The committee in its considerations of the bill, amended it to provide an authorization for an expenditure of $280,000 per year. That was done for two reasons: First, that it is unlikely that the program could be started at a higher level than that set by the amendment, and second, that its inclusion will insure that the Congress will be furnished with prompt and specific information as to the progress of the program if the Department wishes to expand it beyond the maximum figure specified. Although the Department of the Interior in its report recommends against the inclusion of such an authorization on the ground that an adequate program might exceed such cost in certain years, it does not appear to be unreasonable to require the Department to seek additional moneys as an alternative to giving it a blank check. Also, it should be noted that departmental witnesses testified at the hearing on the bill that the specified amount would support a minimum research program.

It is my firm conviction, Mr. Speaker, that the planning and programing in the Department of the Interior has reached the point where this increased appropriation is in order and will be put to good use. The act of August 1, 1958, was invaluable in permitting that department to focus its attention on the pesticides problem and to formulate a specific program to obtain the basic information needed to protect fish and game resources by the development of guides for the proper use of pesticides. The time has come for the Congress to expand the program, as suggested by the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, because the need for such expansion has been manifested over and over during the past few months.

Considerable aerial spraying has been done over salt water marshes, particularly in the South. Important commercial and sport fishes such as menhaden, shad, striped bass, croakers, and weakfish spend their early stages of life in the coastal shallows. Shrimp, crabs, oysters, and clams are present in this inshore environment during a part of their lives.

There are four major lines of scientific investigation that should be pursued by the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries. These and their estimated annual cost are as follows: laboratory research on toxicity and tolerance levels for chemicals now in use, $85,000; field tests of chemicals now in use, $105,000; the effect of present insect and pest control programs on fishery resources, $170,000; and testing new chemicals, $65,000.

Increased appropriations would facilitate a 14-point program for wildlife research by the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife. The areas of investigation and the amounts that would be required initially are: the effects of fire ant control formulations on animal life, $175,000; the effects of rodenticides on important mammals and song birds, $75,000; the effects of chemicals applied in the Dutch elm disease control program, $80,000; studies of forest insect programs, $125,000; the effects of orchard spraying on animal life, $25,000; the impact of formulations used for mosquito control on fish and wildlife, $75,000; crop and forage treatment with pesticides other than grasshopper control, $50,000; study of the effects of herbicides on the habitat of birds and mammals, $70,000; the relationships of fungicide, nematocide, and miticide treatments to wildlife, $50,000; pesticides and migrational movements of birds, $150,000; pesticidal contamination of water areas, $25,000; the effects of chemicals on food chain organisms and their storage by resistant invertebrates, $75,000; penned animal experiments, $100,000; and the relationship between sterility in the bald eagles and pesticides, $50,000.

A nine-point investigation program is suggested for sport fisheries research. Major areas of study and the estimated annual costs are: determination of toxicity and tolerance levels for fish and fish-food organisms, $100,000; bioassays for ingested pesticides, $90,000; identification of pesticidal products in the tissues of fish and other aquatic organisms, $60,000; development of techniques to measure pesticide concentrations in the tissues of fish, $70,000; the effects of temporary and sustained exposure to pesticides on the habits, reproduction, growth, and vitality of fish, $80,000; studies of the absorption, concentration, and storage of pesticides by fish, $65,000; determination of the immediate and long-range effects of pesticidal programs on fish, $200,000; experimental application of chemicals in field tests, $85,000;

and coordination of the research program and publication of the results of the investigations, $80,000.

These research projects would give us the kind of information that is so desperately needed. As it stands, there is no assurance that we are not poisoning all living creatures to a point of sterility. If this Nation is determined to use billions of dollars of highly toxic chemicals each year, then we better be finding out how those powerful poisons should be handled. The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service is charged with the responsibility of conducting these studies, and it is imperative that this essential research is started without further delay.

The Story of Cooperation in Boulevard Village, Kansas City, Mo.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD BOLLING

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 18, 1959

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I should like to report a success story on a housing project in Kansas City, Mo. This project had failed under rental operation. A housing cooperative purchased the project and has achieved remarkable results with mutual home ownership by the residents.

I. SUMMARY OF COOPERATIVE ACHIEVEMENTS

There are striking contrasts in every aspect of this project before and after cooperative ownership. These may be summarized as follows:

First. The success of cooperative ownership and the prompt payment of mortgage and other obligations, in contrast with the previous failure as a rental project where repeated defaults led to foreclosure.

Second. The achievement of full occupancy under cooperative ownership, in contrast with substantial vacancies under rental operation.

Third. The improvement and excellent maintenance of the housing under cooperative ownership, in contrast with its previous state of disrepair.

Fourth. The reduction in monthly housing costs by more than 20 percent under cooperative ownership in contrast to charges under rental operation.

Fifth. The new spirit of neighborliness and the stimulation of community and recreational activities under cooperative ownership, in contrast with previous attitudes where renters were strangers to each other.

II. DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT UNDER RENTAL OPERATION

The project was originally financed with an FHA-insured mortgage under section 608. It was completed in 1950 and contained 192 apartments in 48 buildings of 2-story height. After its initial period of operation, it became involved in serious financial difficulties. Vacancies increased to a point where only about 60 percent of the apartments were occupied. With reduced income, the properties fell into a state of disrepair. The owners failed to meet their mortgage payments and FHA was compelled to acquire the property by foreclosure late in 1956.

After FHA acquired the property, it made a survey of its physical condition. FHA determined that extensive repairs and improvements were necessary which would cost more than $75,000. These included repairing steps, walks, roofs and downspouts; refinishing all buildings and halls, replacing hot water heaters and improvements in grading and landscaping.

Normally, when FHA acquires a project through foreclosure, it makes these repairs and then advertises the property for sale through public bids. The purchaser then tries again to make the project into a successful rental operation. Ordinarily, the purchaser makes a downpayment of about 5 percent and FHA accepts a 95 percent purchase money mortgage, payable over a period of 40 years. In such cases there is, of course, the hazard that a project, having once failed as a rental project, may again face a failure during the 40-year mortgage period. If this should occur and the project ceases to be a profitable operation, the purchaser would not be likely to invest additional money to keep the project and meet mortgage obligations, particularly since he makes only a limited equity investment in the purchase.

Instead of following this normal course, FHA responded to requests to convert the Kansas City project to cooperative ownership. Let us now examine the results achieved under cooperative ownership.

III. RESULTS ACHIEVED UNDER COOPERATIVE OWNERSHIP

In March of 1957 a program was launched to achieve cooperative ownership. The cooperative program was aided by the FCH Company, Inc., a subsidiary of the Foundation for Cooperative Housing—a nonprofit organization with headquarters in New York and Washington. As part of the cooperative purchase program, the cooperative and its advisers undertook the responsibility for directing the management and improvement of the project prior to the passage of title. It carried out a program for necessary repairs and improvements. In addition to the improvements originally contemplated by FHA, some basements of the walkout type were fixed up for use as community meeting, recreational and hobby rooms by the members. Play areas were provided for the children. The residents began to serve on committees and participate in programs to improve the livability of the community. In these ways the project has now been physically transformed into an attractive community typified by the bright new colors in exterior painting.

Occupancy increased steadily as the program continued, so that when the cooperative took title in February of 1958, after 51 percent of the apartments had been purchased by residents, occupancy had reached 95 percent. Since that time full occupancy had been achieved. Today 80 percent of the residents are cooperative owners. By the end of this year it is expected that almost all residents will be members of the cooperative, sharing in the ownership of their homes.

As to rents prior to cooperative ownership, tenants paid $80 a month for a typical 2-bedroom apartment. The monthly carrying charges under cooperative ownership are now only $62 for such a 2-bedroom apartment. On a typical 3-bedroom apartment, monthly charges were reduced from $94.50 to $72 under cooperative ownership. These lower carrying charges were made possible because of the following favorable factors:

First. The cooperative purchased the property under a 40-year mortgage of $1,100,000 with level payments of $4,770 per month for principal and interest. This reduced monthly carrying charges for each member. Under cooperative ownership it is recognized that the homeowners take better care of property, so that such long-term mortgages are appropriate and justified.

Second. The operation of the project on a nonprofit basis eliminated profits and other charges that the former landlord had to include in the rents.

Third. Cooperative owners do some of their own work, such as interior decorating to suit their own tastes.

Fourth. Vacancy and collection losses are largely eliminated.

Even though the monthly payments by the members were lower, they included substantial reserves. Thus, an operating reserve of 3 percent of all income is set aside as a protection against contingencies. In addition, a reserve for replacement is provided so that moneys will be on hand to make necessary replacements of roofs, hot water heaters, and other things in the buildings by the time their useful life expires.

Under the cooperative ownership all mortgage and other financial obligations have been fully met each month, with payments having been made on time for principal and interest on the mortgage, taxes, insurance, replacements, and other reserves.

Besides this record of financial responsibility, the physical properties now constitute a sound mortgage security. This is not only due to the fact that they have been repaired and improved, but also because the apartments are now fully occupied.

IV. COOPERATIVE FINANCING TO HELP MEMBERS WITH THEIR DOWNPAYMENTS

Many of the tenants and other persons who wanted to become cooperative purchasers did not have enough money to make the required cash investment of $560 for a 1-bedroom apartment, $690 for a 2-bedroom apartment, and $840 for a 3-bedroom apartment. With the approval of FHA, a plan was developed under which purchasers obtained financing from the cooperative for the payment of the balance of their downpayment in monthly installments over a period of 3 years. The notes executed by the purchasers were deposited by the cooperative as security for its supplemental

note of $55,000 delivered to FHA. This supplemental note represented the balance of the payment on the purchase price and closing adjustments.

The supplemental note to FHA was to be paid off by the cooperative within 3 years. During the first year a total of $27,551 has been paid to FHA on this note, so that the balance has now been reduced to $27,449. At this rate the FHA supplemental note will be fully retired in 2 years instead of the prescribed period of 3 years.

Payments on this supplemental note are derived from collections on the notes of the cooperative members. They have been completing their downpayments by meeting the monthly installments on their notes when due. This was facilitated because the amount of the monthly payments on their individual notes equals the savings which the members enjoy under cooperative ownership. Thus, on a 2-bedroom apartment, where the member formerly paid a rent of $80, he now pays $18 less each month. This sum of $18 is the monthly payment on the note of the member. In about 3 years, when the member has completed building up his cash investment of $690 on his 2-bedroom apartment, monthly payments will be only $62.

V. NEW COMMUNITY SPIRIT AND ACTIVITIES OF MEMBERS

The cooperative community now has a new spirit of neighborliness. Members are active in many clubs and recreational functions for children of all ages and adults. To express this change in attitude, the name of the development was changed to Boulevard Village. Instead of referring to their residence as the Van Brunt project, cooperative owners now say they live in the village. It is no longer a project. It is a community of friendly neighbors.

Before the cooperative took title to the project, it held a meeting of its members to elect a board of directors from among the membership living in the village. This elected board of directors has full control at all times of the program and activities of the cooperative. Membership meetings are held frequently. In addition, members of the cooperative serve on various committees, such as house and grounds, membership, publications, and social. A monthly newspaper, the Boulevard Villager, is published by and for the residents of the village. Reading through this community newspaper, one is impressed by the growing spirit of neighborliness and group endeavor that characterizes this entire program.

VI. RECOGNITION BY FHA AND RESIDENTS OF CONTRIBUTION MADE BY COOPERATIVE TO BETTER COMMUNITY LIVING

The cooperative members have a sense of pride in their community and its accomplishments and are fully aware of their responsibilities. This attitude on the part of the members was eloquently set forth in a letter to Mr. Norman P. Mason—then Commissioner of FHA and now Administrator of HHFA—signed by the board of directors of the cooperative at the time they took title to the property. I quote that letter in full, as it represents a direct expression from the people who participated in the transformation of this community from a rental project to a community of cooperative homeowners:

BOULEVARD VILLAGE, INC.,
Kansas City, Mo., February 20, 1958.

The Honorable NORMAN P. MASON,
Commissioner, Federal Housing Administration, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MASON: As members of the board of directors elected by the membership of Boulevard Village, Inc., we are writing to express our sincere appreciation and gratitude for your notable accomplishment in achieving cooperative ownership for our housing development in Kansas City with all of the benefits for the people which this entails.

By common admission, this project was deficient in construction, in a state of disrepair, and generally unattractive. As a result, occupancy had fallen to a point below 60 percent. The Government had been compelled to foreclose on the property which faced an uncertain and hazardous future.

Through conversion to cooperative ownership and the use of income to make much-needed improvements, Boulevard Village has been transformed into an attractive community. Major construction deficiencies have been corrected and repairs made. Exteriors of the buildings have been repainted in attractive colors, along with the repainting of halls and interiors.

Even more significant than the physical transformation of the properties, there has been a change in the character of the community and its occupancy. The rate of occupancy has been steadily increasing until we are now above the 90-percent level and shortly expect to achieve full occupancy. A majority of the dwellings are occupied by members of the cooperative corporation which owns the property and we look forward soon to occupancy solely by cooperative owners. Above all, we and other members of this community are proud to live here and count ourselves as owners responsible for the future improvement and development of our community.

There is a new spirit of neighborliness which accompanied our cooperative efforts. Many of the residents have served on committees to promote the welfare and improvement of our community. We have held social functions for people who had been strangers. Our members have developed a sense of belonging to a community which is their own. We are making plans for other cooperative activities, including a nursery school, teenage and adult recreational rooms, playgrounds, and buying clubs.

We are making this report to you about our activities and progress because you have made this program possible. On behalf of all of the members of our cooperative, may we express our everlasting gratitude for your leadership, initiative, and foresight in enabling us to achieve cooperative ownership of this housing community.

Respectfully yours,

ROBERT LE HEW, *President.*
REUBEN D. SINEX, *Vice President.*
B. R. DRYDEN, *Secretary.*
NEIL THORNBURG, *Treasurer.*
FRIEDA PROVINCE, *Assistant Secretary.*
JOSEPHINE KLEIN, *Assistant Secretary.*
GLENN L. ANDERSON, *Assistant Treasurer.*

Equally significant is the reply sent by Mr. Mason to the president of the cooperative. I quote that reply in full as showing a recognition and appreciation by FHA of the contribution which cooperatives can make to better housing:

MARCH 6, 1958.

Mr. ROBERT LE HEW,
President, Boulevard Village, Inc.,
Kansas City, Mo.

DEAR MR. LE HEW: I want to thank you for the fine expression of appreciation contained in the letter signed by you and the other six members of the board of directors of Boulevard Village.

We all had our moments of concern during the pioneering days of your project. However, we had no doubts that the cooperative technique would serve a good purpose here, since it has so well proven its worth in cooperative housing elsewhere. The question is always present, Will people make the proper use of it, and will there be good leadership which will develop good communities?

Judging from all reports I have received, your group has risen to the occasion and is giving a good account of itself. We thank you again for your letter and assure you it is a real pleasure to have been of service to you. One of the jobs of the FHA is to help people help themselves. In this, both your group and FHA can take pride in Boulevard Village.

May you long enjoy your community of cooperative homes.

Sincerely yours,

NORMAN P. MASON,
Commissioner.

VII. CONCLUSION

It is gratifying to observe an agency of Government which was prepared to take leadership in encouraging cooperative ownership of a distressed property. FHA's action made sense as a matter of good business, since a property which was in grave financial difficulties was converted into a sound investment. The mortgage of the cooperative is adequately secured by improved properties which are occupied by cooperative homeowners. The record of prompt fulfillment of mortgage and other obligations demonstrates the business wisdom of the transaction. Moreover, the properties were sold by FHA for the full market value as appraised by FHA, so no subsidies were involved.

FHA's action also made good sense as a matter of public policy, since cooperative ownership provided better homes for less money. It also produced a community with a wholesome environment for families with children, who participate as friendly neighbors in many educational and recreational activities in their village.

Welfare and Pension Funds Legislation Needs Clarification

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT H. BOSCH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 18, 1959

Mr. BOSCH. Mr. Speaker, I have just read with a great deal of interest that the Department of Labor's 1960 budget

request to handle welfare and pension plan reports under the 1958 Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act is almost $1 million—$938,000. This is based on the rather shaky grounds that only 250,000 reports will be filed—the minimum estimate of the Secretary's range of estimates, from 250,000 to 1¼ million plans.

I should like to bring to the attention of my colleagues that during congressional debate on this act last year, I protested that the Department of Labor's estimate of $1.3 million in annual costs to administer the far more detailed Senate bill (S. 2888) was too low—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 104, part 13, page 16424. Further, during this debate, the following colloquy took place between the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor and myself:

Mr. BARDEN. Let me go a little further with this. As far as we are able to figure, there is no expenditure of Federal money involved, except possibly space for two copies of the summary.

Mr. BOSCH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARDEN. I yield.

Mr. BOSCH. Will the gentleman agree with me that it would be quite some space with an estimate of 1,250,000 plans? Two times that is 2,500,000 copies which would have to go to the Secretary of Labor, and I think there will be a tremendous cost to the Government in cataloging and indexing these plans.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 additional minutes.

Let me say to the gentleman: Let us not go off the deep end. Here, after all, I think the filing of those copies with the Secretary of Labor—and I am not so sure that the distinguished gentleman does not agree—is another safeguard to make them available for an employee.

Mr. BOSCH. I agree wholeheartedly with the gentleman. What I was trying to point out was that he said there would be no cost to the Government.

Now, here we have it—S. 2888 would have required the Department to check, investigate, and enforce. The current act gives the Secretary no investigating or enforcement powers yet it is costing approximately $1 million annually.

Today, the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act, which states that those plans are exempt which cover "not more than 25 employees" and defines "employee" to mean any individual employed by an employer, is being interpreted unofficially by the Department of Labor in a series of "interim" memorandums to include in the "25" figure retired employees as well as current employees and to include even former employees who "may become" eligible to receive a welfare plan benefit. To support these interpretations the Department of Labor cites not the definitional sections of the act but those sections which deal with the financial details of the plans to be reported and to the usage in these sections of the terms "participants" and "retired employees."

If the terms "participant" or "retired employees" were intended to be used in the exemption provision, it would have been a simple matter to have used them instead of the word "employees." How under such "unofficial, interim" interpretations the Department of Labor hopes to receive only 250,000 reports, on which their $1 million annual costs are based, is a mystery. And exactly how future court interpretations of the act will be affected by "unofficial interim"—and I might ask "interim to what"—memorandums remains to be seen.

Obviously, Mr. Speaker, there is much in the field of pension and welfare funds legislation which needs further study and clarification.

How Deeply Do You Believe in America?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. HALLECK

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 18, 1959

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, on March 10, 1959, Postmaster General Arthur E. Summerfield addressed the distinguished membership of the Sales Executives Club of New York.

Mr. Summerfield's courageous talk emphasizing the Nation's struggle against inflation, the need for tax policies that can bring greater opportunity to every American, and his demand for adequate legislation to control labor monopolies and its abuses by labor bosses deserves wide circulation and careful consideration by thoughtful Americans irrespective of party affiliations.

So, too, does his plea for more active participation in the affairs of government by businessmen, union members, farmers, the 42 million housewives who pay grocery bills every day, teachers, professional men, students, and retired people.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include Mr. Summerfield's remarks in the RECORD:

HOW DEEPLY DO YOU BELIEVE IN AMERICA?

It is good to be here today with so many of you who represent the sales leadership of American business.

I remember with deep pleasure my visit with you several years back. And I cherish greatly the honor you bestowed upon me at that time.

As you may know, I have spent the greater part of my life in businesses in which the sales activity was vital.

I need not tell you that selling in our great, competitive economy is challenging and rewarding—and more, it is the very dynamo of our whole enterprise system.

You also know, of course, that a dedicated salesman really never stops selling, regardless of where he may be. I suspect, therefore, it is no surprise to you that I am still selling.

I am selling a modern, efficient postal service.

I am selling the maintenance of peace and national safety in a troubled world.

And I am selling, with all my heart, the sound growth of our country under a philosophy of government that can provide the greatest opportunity for all our people.

Today, if I may, I should like to lay before you some thoughts on our national security, and our philosophy of government. They are, of course, entirely interrelated.

We must begin with the premise that we are today engaged in a great economic struggle with the Soviet Union. It is not a shooting war, and we pray to God that such a dread resolution will never come.

Neither is this conflict of our own choosing. The Soviets are pushing it for the express purpose of imposing Communist rule throughout the world.

But the struggle nevertheless is a hard, inescapable fact we must recognize and meet.

There is no shooting war only because the Soviets have not dared to launch such a holocaust. Whatever initial success they might have, they know that retribution from the free world would be swift, terrible and decisive.

They have resorted to bold threats of a shooting war, in the hope of dividing the free world alliance and leaving us to face encirclement alone.

But here they have been firmly rebuffed by the supreme statesmanship and courage of our leadership—our President and Secretary of State—and the steadfastness of our friends around the globe.

Nevertheless, the Soviets appear today to be as confident of ultimate victory as ever. Why? Because they are now concentrating on all-out economic war, and they believe they can defeat us in such a war without risking their own destruction.

They boast that they will overtake us in industrial production in 10 years. Their entire economy is aimed at surpassing us, not only internally but in total influence on a world scale. Their Premier has just told the party congress in Moscow: "The time will come when we shall have the decisive edge."

We dare not look cynically on their determination. They are gearing the whole massive Communist society to that objective. They are moving with grim and confident purpose. And the undeniable fact is, they are gaining.

We still, of course, are well in front. But they expect the very demonstration of their ability at closing the gap to win world opinion to their side.

Ironically, they are counting on us to help. While they are pushing the Soviet economy faster, they expect the American economy to falter on at least two rocks of huge and disastrous proportions:

1. runaway inflation; and

2. political unwillingness to hold to the basic principles that have made our country so powerful and so great.

I believe their hope will be in vain. I believe we shall continue to build the strongest, finest, freest way of life the world will know.

But, my friends, this I also believe:

To do so, America must maintain a sound economic philosophy, and sound policies firmly based on such philosophy.

This is why I am selling, with all the energy and devotion I possess, the sound growth of our country under a philosophy of government that can provide the greatest opportunity for all our people.

What is this philosophy?

I think it can be simply stated:

It is a government that discharges every legitimate obligation to its citizens, but does so within the framework of a responsible fiscal policy.

It is a government that recognizes our free enterprise system—our industry and agriculture—as the very wellspring of prosperity and opportunity for all our people. It is a government, therefore, that promotes the sound growth of this system and its service to the people.

It is a government determined to place the best interests of all its citizens above special interests of any selfish group.

Such a government is essential to deal with the problems of these times. It is vital in fighting inflation and in grappling with our tremendous problems of taxation.

For, make no mistake, we are at grips with deadly inflationary forces. We are under the gun of onerous taxation—taxation that can effectively prevent the accumulation of private capital and the incentive for productive expansion.

In our battle against inflation, two facts today stand out very clearly:

The first is, that if public spending soars far beyond the revenues of Government, inflation will infuse itself more deeply and dangerously throughout economy.

Unrestrained spending can only result in deficit financing, higher taxes and cheaper dollars. And in such event, who must bear these burdens? You. You and your family—and every other citizen of our country.

Inflation feeds on the income and the savings of every individual, every enterprise, in America.

It eats away the savings we cherish for our family's security. It robs us of the real value of the dollars we earn. A quick glance at the family food basket can make that point painfully clear.

In 1939, a dollar would fill the basket with potatoes, bread, coffee, cabbage, milk, and eggs. Today's dollar will buy only the cabbage, milk, and eggs.

Twenty years ago, you could buy a pound of round steak, a pound of bacon, a pound of pork chops, and a pound of sugar for what it costs you today to buy just the pound of steak alone.

And so it goes with everything we buy.

Every American, therefore, has compelling reason to be concerned over the gigantic spending schemes that already have been voted by one House or the other of the present Congress. Together, just to date, these schemes represent several billion dollars of needless, unjustifiable spending. And more of the same are in the offing.

All are the creations of political pressures of special groups.

But if they become law, it will be every American whose dollar is cheapened—every American whose paycheck must yield steeper taxes—and every American whose children must bear the future debt.

The second fact in the inflation battle is the vast monopoly power of a handful of union dictators. This is the very core of our inflationary struggle.

Eighty percent or more of the cost of what we buy is for labor. Obviously, industrial wage costs have a very direct bearing on everyone's cost of living.

Wage increases have been fundamental to the rising living standards of our people, and the vitality of our economy. They should continue to be. And they will be, so long as they are related to increased productive efficiency.

But when union dictators force wage costs far outrunning productivity gains, inflation is inevitable. With each round of wage and price increases, our dollar drops another notch in purchasing power. The wage earner who gets the increase soon finds that his new dollars, too, are siphoned off by a higher cost of living. And union members everywhere are hurt as badly as everyone else.

In the past 10 years, a 28 percent gain in industrial productivity has been overwhelmed by a 67 percent rise in wage rates. The difference between these figures is wage-push inflation. Inevitably, this has priced more and more American products out of export markets, and reduced our ability to meet foreign competition in our own domestic markets.

The Nation has been shocked by the colossal labor racketeering and corruption revealed in the hearings of the McClellan Committee. Our people—including the great body of union members—want these terrible abuses stopped, now.

But let us recognize that these abuses are but symptoms of a much greater problem.

Why are union racketeers contemptuous of public opinion? Because they operate within the framework of a tremendous concentration of power which aims to control the laws, and lawmakers of our land, and eventually the White House itself. Thousands of our businessmen and workers have been partially "brainwashed" into believing these influences cannot be successfully challenged, thereby weakening their will to resist, to stand up and fight for what is right.

This is a union boss monopoly power that equals any accumulation of vested interest to be found in history.

This monopoly draws upon huge financial resources—almost equal to the total resources of all the Nation's life insurance companies combined.

It is a power that permits a few entrenched bosses to spend millions of dollars of union dues money for political purposes, exactly as the leaders see fit, with no choice given the dues payers.

It is a power to impose at will an ever-rising cost of living upon our people.

It is a power that can systematically bludgeon American business until free competitive enterprise can no longer survive in America as a vital force.

This is a grave moral and economic problem to which our Congress should address itself with all earnestness. Many alarmed Members of the Congress are doing so. But, quite obviously, too many others presently are more concerned with the wrath of the union dictators than their duty to the American people.

Now, of course, whenever anyone questions abuses of union power, the affected bosses and their political cult rush to denounce him as antilabor.

But union members are no longer accepting that deceit. The overwhelming majority of workingmen and women and their leaders are devoted, self-respecting Americans. They know that anyone who is for a strong America, as I am, is for a strong union movement. They know that cleaning up union abuses is no more union busting than the legal cleaning up of pernicious business practices, years ago, was corporation busting.

They have had enough of union rackets, and corrupt unions, and corrupt and power-hungry union leaders. They have had enough of union elections rigged to deprive members of their rights. They do not want their own dues payments used to further political ideologies to which they may be firmly opposed. And they know that anyone who urges Government help to rid them of these abuses is prolabor in the deepest sense.

Fortunately for America, in these eventful times, there is wise leadership in our Government.

The fight to hold inflation in check, to keep our business economy growing, and to root out corrupt union elements, is being led by the President of the United States.

President Eisenhower prevented wild public spending from wrecking the economy when frantic pressure developed during the recent business slowdown. He insisted instead upon sound measures, with the result that our economy has moved soundly forward ever since. And, of most importance, our cost of living has been checked and has leveled off.

Our President is fighting to prepare the way for tax policies that can bring greater opportunity to every citizen through the sound growth of our economy

He is standing firmly for realistic legislation to assure America's union members honest and responsible union leadership.

Our Vice President, many Members of Congress, and many others in the Government, are equally vigorous in behalf of these issues.

Much, for example, will be accomplished by the President's new Cabinet Committee on Price Stability for Economic Growth. Good progress is being made under the able chairmanship of Vice President NIXON. I am proud to be a member of this Committee, and look forward to the work to be done.

We hear the question raised in Washing, from time to time, as to what constitutes bold leadership. That is a fair question. Let us take a look at it.

Which calls for the boldness of genuine personal courage and vision? To insist upon a balanced budget and a sound dollar—or to yield to the noisy pressures of special groups for more and bigger spending?

To seek diligently a fair tax code that will inspire our whole economy to grow—or to go along in order to placate everybody with a hand in the pork barrel?

To insist firmly upon labor laws the people desire and the Nation needs—or to try to fool the public with so-called labor legislation dictated by the union monopolists themselves?

These are the choices of leadership offered the American people.

Actually, commonsense policies are the policies the great majority of Americans want.

That fact is demonstrated by several recent polls of public opinion.

In one of the largest, these findings were made:

The large majority of citizens interviewed said the first requirement of responsible national leadership for 1959 is to help check inflation.

The three items they listed as most important for Congress to work on were: Holding down prices; prevention of inflation; and laws to clean up labor monopoly evils.

A higher percentage of union members listed these commonsense objectives than did even the general public.

In view of all these indications, then, why do the spenders, the taxers and the apologists for union abuses dominate the Congress?

The reason is just this: Far too few people take the trouble to let the Congress know what they think.

Congress is responsive to the will of the people. But how can the individual Congressman determine whether the public agrees with a particular proposal unless he hears from the public?

I think you will agree that this is an extremely critical problem. But let me ask you:

Have you let your Congressmen know where you stand?

Did you write to them when the big spending bills were up for debate?

The Members of Congress received plenty of letters, telegrams, telephone calls and personal visists. From whom? From the American people? Or from those groups who had a special interest?

The truth is that the Senate and House were bombarded by energized special interest groups. The arguments that poured in were one-sided. And the special interest groups won the first round.

Ladies and gentlemen, I am a Republican. But I am under no delusion here that I am speaking to the East Side Republican Club.

Some of you are Republicans; some of you are Democrats. Some are independents. But what I am urging is not a partisan proposition. I am not asking for partisan expression.

What I am asking, what I am saying, is simply this: Speak out. Let your voice be heard.

Not only to you as businessmen, but also to union members, farmers, the 42 million housewives who pay grocery bills every day; to teachers, professional men, students, retired people—to every citizen, I say:

How deep is your belief in this land of ours? Deep enough to speak up in its behalf?

Is it deep enough to give of your substance, your time and your genius to preserve it?

A hard and fateful struggle is being waged. Your voice and efforts are more than important, they are vital.

They are vital on specific current issues. They are vital on long-range issues. They are needed at campaign time, and between campaigns.

Sound political leadership must have the active support of those who want sound government.

Some State governments today face virtual financial collapse.

Why?

Because those believing in sound political leadership have stood aside as spendthrift politicians have joined forces with labor bosses in an orgy of reckless spending and more and more taxation.

And what permanent solutions are being suggested by those in control?

The only suggestions so far have been the wornout, old-fashioned soak-the-rich ideas; specifically, a call for a corporation's profit tax, and an income tax on so narrow a base that only a small percent of the citizens would have to pay the bills.

Nothing is being done to reduce expenditures. No studies are underway to see where the tax dollars of these States have gone and are going. Nothing is being done through long-range State tax reforms to make these States attractive once again to business and industry, and to help provide more jobs.

My friends, the citizens of these States are learning the hard way that more huge spending programs mean that the Government has to collect more in taxes to pay for them.

The more American business has to pay in taxes, the less it has left to invest in new products and new plants.

And certainly, the less business is able to invest in new production, the less it is able to create new jobs.

It is that simple.

Peaceful coexistence may have its virtues in some fields. But the welfare state and virile free enterprise cannot exist side by side within the same economy. And I don't believe for one minute that the union members of our country, any more than the rest of us, want to surrender their freedom to a welfare state.

Instead of increasing the tax burden, we need to carry out an essential revision in our Federal tax structure.

This task, we know, will be tremendously difficult. But it is part and parcel of the basic solution for stopping inflation and spurring our economic growth. It must be done.

We need to relieve the tax load being carried by the individual citizen and by our business system.

This great Nation has been built on the motivation of high levels of individual achievement. We have encouraged, with material reward, each citizen to perform to the best of his capacity.

Even the Soviets have taken note of this historic process. Russia, despite its Communist doctrine, now offers high incentives for outstanding individual performance in industry, science, and other areas of its society.

Consider, against this, the fact that we have been moving in the direction of destroying personal incentive.

We have steadily compressed the reward for doing something, thereby encouraging many to do little or nothing.

Take notice, for example, of what happened to the head of a family of four with an annual income of $5,000. Today he is paying almost 10 times as much in Federal income taxes alone as he did in 1939. And if he strives to increase his income, the penalty of taxation becomes increasingly severe.

Of equally great consequence is the effect of ponderous taxation on business initiative.

Our population is growing rapidly. In the years ahead, our people will need greater opportunities and millions of new jobs. Business is expected to create most of these jobs. Business expects to create jobs. Corporations today provide nearly three-quarters of all the nongovernment wages and salaries paid.

But new jobs can come into being only as billions of dollars are invested in new tools and capacity. Now, where is this money to come from? In the end, it must come from the earnings a company saves after paying all its taxes.

Today Federal taxes alone can take more than half of many a company's net income. Then follow State and local taxes. There are over 100,000 taxing authorities in our country. Their weight can seriously restrict the ability of business to meet its job-creating capital needs.

Much of our Federal tax code was hastily adopted during times of war.

A sensible, equitable, dynamic tax program is needed in its place. Such a program will keep Federal revenues up, not by taxing away incentive and means of growth, but by steadily increasing the tax base.

The present administration has made this clear. It has already embarked on a program of tax reform and reduction with the Revenue Act of 1954. The President's insistence on a balanced budget in 1959 is related directly to this goal. Putting our fiscal house in order, he has emphasized, is essential to a sound, progressive program of tax reform.

Obviously, this program cannot call for immediate and sharp reduction in all income tax rates. It calls for gradual reform and reduction. And it calls for equitable reduction for all taxpayers, large and small.

The ultimate tax pattern, in short, must be a completely integrated program that will meet the real needs of a dynamic economy.

And this kind of program will be achieved only if we avoid the pitfalls of grandiose spending for nonessentials, and other inflationary pressures which swell the costs of Government.

In summary, let me leave these thoughts with you:

We must maintain our initiative in military and world political strength.

We must be equally vigilant against the Soviet determination to defeat us politically with economic strength. This may well be the ultimate battleground the Kremlin has chosen.

To succeed, we must promote the sound maintain a philosophy of government that provides the greatest opportunity for all our people.

We must keep the cost of living in check, while our standards of living go up, with a stable dollar. This means a balanced budget, and control of pressure on prices resulting from the irresponsible demands of a few union dictators.

We must take steps to correct the union abuses that the great majority of workingmen themselves want corrected.

We must revise our tax system to permit our people to create the great economic expansion of which we are capable.

Here in this room today is a gathering of the finest sales abilities in America. Here are the executives who represent the sales growth of our whole economy—we must genius of many of our Nation's leading corporations.

Competition is your life. You are constantly devoting your best brainpower and energies to competing with others in your industry, possibly the fellow sitting at your same table today.

But may I suggest an even greater competition exists, in which there is more at stake for you, your company, its stockholders, and its employees?

It is the ever-pressing, huge and deadly competition you face with forces dedicated to government by presure groups and labor monopolists. It can defeat you, destroy you, as no industrial competitor could ever do.

There is nothing more important you can do than to devote some of your sales genius and best techniques to fighting this battle. Nothing is more essential to your company and its future.

Thousands of corporate mailings are made to stockholders every day. Why not employ these mailings to enlist their active support? Pressure-group government and labor monopoly power are definitely contrary to their interests.

I would dare to suggest that your companies, in these communications, tell your stockholders clearly how this struggle affects them, both as citizens and as owners of business. There are also many hard-hitting articles, speeches and other materials that could be included. Mailed regularly to the Nation's 10 million stockholders, they could be of ever-expanding influence throughout the country.

The same can be said of communications with employees. They, too, can see this great competition in progress, and they need to know from you exactly what is at stake and they should be told the truth.

What do you want for America? How deep is your belief in America? It is very deep, I am certain. But it can be effective only as you let it be known.

I urge you to take your place among those who will speak, and work, and fight for sound government and a stronger America in the years ahead.

My friends, the greatest era in history—the Golden Era of unlimited opportunity—lies ahead.

We can make it mankind's most fruitful period if we but solve the problems we face and move forward, as we can, united for the well-being of America.

We will do so if we but realize that the all-out economic war with the Communists calls for just as much unity of purpose, just as much devotion to country, just as much selfless effort, yes, just as much old-fashioned patriotism on the part of every American, as any military war ever did.

I am certain we can and will meet this challenge. We will do so best, I feel sure, by following the program of true liberalism I have outlined here today—a program based on free men organizing and conducting their lives in freedom and spreading freedom to everyone everywhere.

We have inherited the glory of this Nation, its strength and its freedom. Let us protect it—let us perpetuate it—and let us bear it proudly forward into the hands of our children.