ployment and another job as long as health and youth are enjoyed. I have every sympathy for the unemployed, particularly for those with families, but they have hope, while the future of many of our senior citizens seems hopeless under present laws. Oldsters cannot look forward to earned incomes, to youthfulness, or the bloom of health. Consequently, I consider that the series of bills I am introducing today covers a problem area of utmost importance to the present Congress. I plead with my associates for action and for help for millions of senior citizens on fixed incomes who have done their part to make this great land.

They now are in need of our due recognition of their problem.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 8, 1959

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

Our Father God, we thank thee for the inward voice which ever and again calls us away from the clamor and dusty strife of confusing days into the cool, quiet cloisters of the eternal, from whose revealing windows of faith our souls are strengthened by the far look.

In a baffled and bewildered day, save us from any panic of spirit.

May we draw our inner strength from deep wells.

O God, to whom the future belongs, use us as pioneers of a better world for ourselves and for all peoples.

Hasten the day when the black remnants of savagery, which now blight our social order, shall haunt the memory of a new generation as but an evil dream of a night that has passed.

In the midst of desperate and difficult days, deliver us from the evil of moral cowardice.

For those here set apart in perilous times to keep clean the springs of freedom, and to minister to the common welfare of the Nation, we pray for eyes to see, for minds to understand, and for hearts that claim kinship with all Thy children everywhere.

May we lift others by a faith that will not shrink, though pressed by every foe.

Pilgrims of the night, may we be heralds of the morning.

We ask it in the Name that is above every name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, April 7, 1959, was dispensed with.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the NASA authorization legislative subcommittee of the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

On request of Mr. DIRKSEN, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs was authorized to meet this afternoon during the session of the Senate.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

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

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

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to consider executive business.

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

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no reports of committees, the nominations on the calendar will be stated.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Carl W. Strom, of Iowa, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Bolivia.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Ellis O. Briggs, of Maine, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Greece.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be notified immediately of the confirmation of these nominations.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I am very much pleased, indeed, with the two nominations which have just been confirmed—namely, the nomination of Mr. Carl W. Strom, of Iowa, to be our Ambassador to Bolivia; and the nomination of Mr. Ellis O. Briggs, of Maine, to be our Ambassador to Greece. These are examples of two excellent appointments by the administration. I only hope it will maintain that standard in the case of all its appointments.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

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

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

ORDER FOR CALL OF THE CALENDAR ON FRIDAY

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that on Friday the calendar of bills and other measures be called, for the consideration of those to which there is no objection.

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

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM — ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT TO FRIDAY

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I announce that I have conferred with the distinguished minority leader [Mr. DIRKSEN]; and on Friday we expect to have a call of the calendar. I should like to have the legislative review committees on both sides of the aisle to be prepared for that call.

At the conclusion of the call of the calendar, we may bring up by motion other measures; and I shall make an announcement on that subject to the Senate as soon as I am able to obtain the consent of some of the committee chairmen.

We hope to be able to dispose of the unfinished business and the pending business today.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business today it stand in adjournment until Friday, at noon.

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

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

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. I do not know how much controversy there is in regard to the measures on the calendar. On the calendar is a bill relating to educational television. I wonder whether it is the purpose of the majority leader to have the Senate act on all the measures on the calendar, or to omit from the call those that are controversial and may take some time to dispose of.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. There are only three that previously have been passed over; and I do not think it will take more than a few minutes to dispose of them, even if any Senator wishes to debate them. Therefore, I ask that the call of the calendar begin with Calendar No. 52, Senate bill 12, to expedite the utilization of television transmission facilities in our public schools and colleges, and in adult training programs. Of course, objection will be made to the consideration of that measure during the call of the calendar, because on both sides of the aisle there are Senators who will object. However, we shall begin the call with Calendar

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

No. 52, and shall proceed through the entire calendar.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Very well.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

REPORT ON DISPOSITION OF CONTRIBUTIONS TO INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

A letter from the Acting Secretary of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the extent and disposition of U.S. contributions to international organizations, for the fiscal year 1958 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

REPORT OF ADVISORY COMMISSION ON INFORMATION

A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Advisory Commission on Information, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Commission, dated March 1959 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

REPORT OF DIRECTORS OF FEDERAL PRISON INDUSTRIES, INC.

A letter from the Secretary, Federal Prison Industries, Inc., Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Directors of that agency, for the fiscal year 1958 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

RESOLUTIONS OF MINNESOTA VALLEY COOPERATIVE LIGHT AND POWER ASSOCIATION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that three resolutions adopted this past month by the Minnesota Valley Cooperative Light & Power Association be printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred.

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

To the Committee on Public Works:

"RESOLUTION ON TVA SELF-FINANCING BILL

"Whereas the Tennessee Valley Authority is supplying power to our 5 million people in the area and to national defense installations; and

"Whereas the TVA power system is running short of capacity to meet the demands in the area; and

"Whereas the TVA project has demonstrated that TVA power system is self-supporting and self-liquidating, and that the resale of TVA power at low rates by consumer-owned distributors is economically sound as well as socially advantageous; and

"Whereas it is due concern of this Nation and our Government that TVA be provided with adequate financing plan to provide needed funds for expansion: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved at this meeting of the board of directors of Minnesota Valley Cooperative Light & Power Association, Montevideo, Minn., this 31st day of March 1959, upon motion by Henry Hanson, seconded by Donald Sundin, That we go on record to support the passage of TVA self-financing bill, S. 931 and H.R. 3460, which would give TVA authority to issue revenue bonds to finance power generating capacity; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be mailed to Senators and Representatives asking for their wholehearted support of the above bills.

"GEORGE TIMM,
"Secretary, Minnesota Valley Cooperative Light & Power Association, Montevideo, Minn."

To the Committee on Finance:

"RESOLUTION ON PROPOSAL TO TAX COOPERATIVES

"Whereas business enterprises are made up of several types of business organizations, including proprietorships, partnerships, corporations, and cooperatives all of which have contributed greatly to the tempo of economic activity within the Nation; and

"Whereas the tax position of cooperatives has been thoroughly investigated by the Congress of the United States over a long period of time and these investigations have revealed that under the present laws, the cooperatives have faithfully abided by the principles and regulations under which they have been organized; and

"Whereas cooperatives do pay taxes and in many communities of this Nation are the largest taxpayers; and

"Whereas the Secretary of the Treasury has recommended to Congress to require cooperative patronage savings to be paid in cash within 3 years and to draw not less than 4 percent interest, or otherwise to be classified as income to the cooperative and be thereby subjected to corporation income taxes; and

"Whereas this alteration of the present tax status would seriously hamper and restrict the services which the cooperatives are performing within the Nation; and

"Whereas a number of legislative bills have been proposed by the administration which would place prohibitive taxes on cooperatives: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the board of directors of the Minnesota Valley Cooperative Light & Power Association, Montevideo, Minn., this 31st day of March 1959, upon motion by Alfred Reishus, seconded by George Timm, That we ask Senators and Representatives in Congress to oppose any measures which would affect our present cooperative tax laws causing hardships to cooperatives, and that bills such as Mason, H.R. 198; Curtis, H.R. 3150; and Davis bill, H.R. 3848, be opposed from passing through Congress."

To the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"RESOLUTION ON REA INTEREST RATE INCREASE

"Whereas a resolution was adopted at the annual membership meeting of Minnesota Valley Cooperative Light & Power Association, Montevideo, Minn., held March 24, 1958, opposing any legislation which would increase the present 2 percent REA interest rate to rural electric cooperatives: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That upon motion made by Mr. Barkus and carried that the membership at this annual meeting held March 23, 1959, of the Minnesota Valley Cooperative Light & Power Association, reaffirm our 1958 resolution opposing to any interest rate increases on REA loan funds; and be it further

"Resolved, That being Congress entered into contract with the rural electric cooperatives in 1944, to lend money at a fixed 2 percent interest charge that these contracts or any future contracts must not be changed in order to allow all the cooperatives in the Nation to complete their area coverage and to heavy up systems to provide adequate service to existing consumers.

"GEORGE TIMM,
"Secretary, Minnesota Valley Cooperative Light & Power Association, Montevideo, Minn."

REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following reports of a committee were submitted:

By Mr. ANDERSON, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, without amendment:

S. 72. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Navajo Indian irrigation project and the initial stage of the San Juan-Chama project as participating projects of the Colorado River storage project, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 155).

By Mr. KUCHEL, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with amendments:

S. 44. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct the San Luis unit of the Central Valley project, California, to enter into an agreement with the State of California with respect to the construction and operation of such unit, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 154).

BILLS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. JAVITS:

S. 1609. A bill to provide assistance to small business concerns to facilitate adjustments made necessary by the foreign trade policy of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

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

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

S. 1610. A bill to authorize the issuance of special nonquota immigrant visas to certain alien orphans; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

By Mr. HARTKE:

S. 1611. A bill for the relief of Adeodato Francesco Piazza Nicolai; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMATHERS:

S. 1612. A bill to amend section 170 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to treat contributions to certain organizations of Reserve officers in the same manner as contributions to organizations of war veterans; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 1613. A bill for the relief of Matilda Kolich; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCARTHY:

S. 1614. A bill to reduce the import duty on cigars; to the Committee on Finance.

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

S. 1615. A bill to authorize the Chief of Engineers to enter into a contract with the Standing Rock Indian Tribe to provide for the clearing of certain portions of the Oahe Reservoir area; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. McCLELLAN:

S. 1616. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Army to convey the Army and Navy General Hospital, Hot Springs National Park, Ark., to the State of Arkansas, and for other purposes; ordered to lie on the table.

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

(Subsequently, on request of Mr. McCLELLAN, and by unanimous consent, the above bill was referred to the Committee on Government Operations.)

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

S. 1617. 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.

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

By Mr. HOLLAND:

S. 1618. A bill for the relief of certain aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware:

S. 1619. A bill to provide for the installation of a public address system in the Senate Chamber; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. BEALL:

S. 1620. A bill for the relief of Costas Forakis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

S. 1621. A bill to permit the flying of the flag of the United States for 24 hours of each day on the estate known as Terra Rubra, the birthplace of Francis Scott Key, in Carroll County, Md., and at the grave of Key in Mount Olivet Cemetery in Frederick, Md.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CASE of South Dakota:

S. 1622. A bill for the relief of Shigeki Tokunaga of Tokyo, Japan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ELLENDER (by request):

S. 1623. A bill to repeal section 8f of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. CASE of New Jersey:

S. 1624. A bill for the relief of Ivan Curko; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HENNINGS:

S. 1625. A bill for the relief of Moshe Nadir; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BENNETT:

S. 1626. A bill to retrocede to the State of Utah concurrent jurisdiction over certain lands within such State which are under the jurisdiction of the United States; to the Committee on Armed Services.

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

By Mr. MUNDT:

S. 1627. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Paula Deml; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HILL:

S. 1628. A bill to provide for the vesting of primary responsibility for the protection of the public health and safety from radiation hazards in the Public Health Service of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

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

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. 1629. A bill to amend section 9(b)(3) of the National Labor Relations Act so as to eliminate the provision thereof prohibiting the certification, as bargaining representative of persons employed as guards, of a labor organization which admits to membership, or is affiliated with an organization which admits to membership, employees other than guards; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

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

By Mr. HRUSKA (for himself, Mr. CURTIS, Mr. LAUSCHE, Mr. CAPEHART, Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota, Mr. LANGER, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Mr. BENNETT, and Mr. ALLOTT):

S. 1630. A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to require the disposal of certain surplus land for use in the production of crops through the operation of family-type farms, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

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

By Mr. JOHNSON of Texas (for himself, Mr. DIRKSEN, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. KUCHEL, Mr. HENNINGS, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. HILL, Mr. RANDOLPH, Mr. BYRD of West Virginia, Mr. DODD, Mrs. SMITH, Mr. SMATHERS, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. HARTKE, Mr. YOUNG of Ohio, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. YARBOROUGH, Mr. BEALL, Mr. GOLDWATER, Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. TALMADGE, Mr. CASE of New Jersey, Mr. MOSS, Mr. KERR, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. COTTON, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. McCARTHY, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey, Mr. ENGLE, Mr. FREAR, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. CHURCH, Mr. HART, Mr. CARROLL, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. NEUBERGER, Mr. JAVITS, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. ERVIN, Mr. O'MAHONEY, Mr. McGEE, Mr. KEATING, Mr. MUSKIE, Mr. GRUENING, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. AIKEN, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. SCHOEPPEL, Mr. CARLSON, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. WILEY, Mr. LANGER, Mr. CANNON, Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. GREEN, Mr. LAUSCHE, Mr. CAPEHART, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. McCLELLAN, Mr. PROXMIRE, and Mr. LONG):

S. 1631. A bill to provide for the establishment of a Commission on Unemployment Problems; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a seperate heading.)

ASSISTANCE TO SMALL BUSINESS ADVERSELY AFFECTED BY FOREIGN TRADE POLICIES

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I am today introducing a bill to provide assistance to small-business concerns and their employees adversely affected by U.S. foreign trade policies. The bill would enable businesses to obtain loans from the Small Business Administration, permit them to pool their resources, and make them eligible for rapid amortization of certain investments, in order to help them to meet foreign competition and to assist them in converting to new lines of enterprise. The bill would also assist unemployed workers from such businesses through retraining and reemployment aid and, where necessary by helping them to relocate to areas where job opportunities are available.

A liberal foreign trade policy with a minimum of protectionism and quotas is fundamental to the continued expansion of our domestic economy and is an important aspect of our foreign policy which seeks to foster the prosperity and friendship of the free world nations. It is equally fundamental that this overriding national policy will adversely affect the economic welfare of some businesses and employees and that we must assist them in meeting this economic impact without restricting our much larger foreign trade.

This bill will assist small businesses and their employees, who are often hit hardest by imports and whose problems have been used as justification to secure protection for the entire industry. I introduced a similar measure in the last Congress with Senators Ives and Potter.

The effect of imports and exports on our economy is clear: between 1950 and 1957 our gross national product increased 55 percent and our imports increased 45 percent, while our exports nearly doubled; the recession in 1958 brought about a 1-percent decrease in the gross national product and in imports, while exports decreased by 11 percent. It is estimated that about 4½ million persons derive their employment from foreign trade, while only 200,000 to 400,000 are employed in industries adversely affected by imports. Less than 120,000 of these were employed at peak periods in plants producing the 28 commodities for which the Tariff Commission recommended escape clause action between April 1948 and March 1959. Small businesses making smoking pipes, silk screen scarves, and umbrella frames in New York City, glassware throughout West Virginia, and velveteen in Massachusetts have been among those most severely affected.

The Senate has recognized the importance of this problem in the Depressed Areas Act of 1959 which contained provisions giving preference to those areas which contain industry adversely affected by foreign trade policy.

We cannot meet these problems by restricting our trade. What we should do is provide those affected with concrete assistance, which will enable them either to meet their competition or to make a smooth transition into other lines which can compete economically and successfully in the open market.

A section-by-section explanation of the terms of the bill is as follows:

Section 1: Where a finding is made by the Tariff Commission of a substantial injury to an industry under the so-called escape clause of the Trade Agreements Act and a recommendation has been made to the President which the President fails to approve, small business concerns within that industry become eligible for loans from the Small Business Administration. Such loans are based upon the disaster loan provisions of the present law—which are substantially easier to obtain than normal small business loans.

Section 2: The bill further contemplates that small businesses which have been adversely affected by the foreign trade policies of the United States may pool their productive capacities with the consent of the Federal Trade Commission and Attorney General without violating the antitrust laws. This will enable them in some cases to make their own operations more economical and less subject to foreign competition.

Section 3: The Secretary of Commerce, acting through the Office of Area Development, is charged with the general coordination of governmental assistance to these businesses which are so affected.

Section 4: The Secretary of Labor is authorized to provide assistance for retraining individuals whose last employment was in business eligible for assistance under this program and to cooperate with existing vocational training agencies. In addition, where he finds

that no job opportunities exist for such an individual in his own area, the Secretary may assist his relocation to another area where there are employment opportunities for him, including the payment of relocation costs of up to $150.

Section 5: Finally, the bill provides amendments to the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 providing for a rapid amortization—and therefore a tax abatement—as follows:

First. Where the line of business, and hence the capital investment of a company has been hurt by the U.S. trade policy described above, and where the facilities are not fully depreciated for tax purposes, the bill would permit a step-up in the depreciation rate of the existing equipment; the justification being that as trade policies have adversely affected the company, they have had a serious economic effect on the investment of the small business in its capital equipment. It is not illogical that this should be reflected in a tax reduction based upon the economic loss incurred.

Second. The bill also provides for rapid amortization of facilities of a small business acquired for the purpose of converting the business and developing new and different lines of production or improving old ones in order to cope with the adverse effect of the trade policies. This will, of course, provide an incentive for the small business to take account of the changed condition brought about by the trade policies of the United States and develop other fields of enterprise.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LONG in the chair). The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1609) to provide assistance to small-business concerns to facilitate adjustments made necessary by the foreign-trade policy of the United States, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. JAVITS, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

ISSUANCE OF SPECIAL NONQUOTA IMMIGRANT VISAS TO CERTAIN ALIEN ORPHANS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the junior Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING] I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill extending for an additional 2 years the law granting nonquota immigrant status to orphans under 14 years of age who have been or will be adopted by an American citizen upon admission to the United States. The present statutory authority under which these orphan children may be admitted—Public Law 85-316, approved September 11, 1957—expires on June 30, 1959.

Under the terms of this bill an orphan includes children under 14 where either both parents are dead, have disappeared, or have abandoned the home, or where one parent is dead, disappeared or has abandoned the home and the other parent is unable to provide proper care. It covers orphans who are adopted abroad, orphans who are abroad and assured of adoption in the United States, and orphans in the United States for whom adoption would regularize their immigration status.

More than 11,000 orphans have been admitted to the United States since the adoption of the first alien orphan statute 11 years ago as part of the Displaced Persons Act of 1948. The program has been extended three times since then, by the act of July 29, 1953, by the Refugee Relief Act of 1953 and by Public Law 316. It has been a great source of personal satisfaction to me as a member of the House of Representatives and later as a member of the Senate to have participated actively in the passage of these measures and to have joined in their sponsorship.

I have received many heartfelt requests from my constituency, from citizens wishing themselves to adopt individual orphans, urging continuation of the present law. In the debates and testimony on this legislation much has been said—and rightly so—regarding the unfortunate, parentless child for whom adoption is sought. I should for a moment like to add a thought for the childless couples and the many couples who have room in their hearts for another child who look to the Congress to extend the provisions of section 4 of Public Law 85-316, the alien orphan adoption section, beyond the June 30 expiration date. These are the Americans who think not in terms of immigration or foreign policy but rather in the personal terms of the Italian boy, the Greek girl, the Korean waif, whom they so earnestly desire to take into their homes as their own. The Congress can do naught but share in their blessings by the speedy enactment of this proposed legislation; I trust that the Judiciary Committee to which it will be referred will give it early consideration and prompt approval.

Mr. President, I point out that the situation to which I have referred applies very often to American service men and women and to Americans working abroad either for the Government or for private industry. I hope the measure will have the early attention of the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

The bill (S. 1610) to authorize the issuance of special nonquota immigrant visas to certain alien orphans, introduced by Mr. JAVITS (for himself and Mr. KEATING), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN REAL PROPERTY TO STATE OF ARKANSAS

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to direct the Secretary of the Army to convey the Army-Navy General Hospital, Hot Springs National Park, Ark., to the State of Arkansas.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill remain on the desk subject to being referred to committee on request.

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

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, the conveyance of this property is for the purpose of establishing a regional vocational rehabilitation center. The bill provides for the conveyance of approximately 25 acres upon which the hospital is situated, together with certain personal property deemed necessary for the project. The bill further contains the usual reversionary clause in the event the property is not utilized as a vocational rehabilitation center or other public health or education purposes. In addition, there is the usual reversionary clause in the event of war or other national emergency.

Mr. President, for a number of years the Department of the Army has insisted upon the closing of the Army-Navy Hospital in Hot Springs and declaring the property surplus. For the past 4 years, over their objection, the hospital has been operated under a directive from the Congress. The Army still persists, as it has all along, that the facility should be closed and declared surplus. During this period of time there has been much discussion as to the best use of the hospital for Federal purposes since it is recognized as the finest facility of its type in the continental United States. Although some 25 agencies of the Federal Government have inspected the facility to determine its suitability for their specific use, as yet none have considered it suited.

I have strenuously opposed the closing of the hospital, or the deactivation of it and putting it into mothballs, because I know that some use can be found for it, instead of abandoning it, when there is so much need in our land for medical services and for educational facilities.

Considerable interest has been manifested on a National, State, and local level, in a proposal to convert the hospital into a comprehensive rehabilitation center. In order to assure a detail knowledge and understanding of the existing facility, its suitability for a rehabilitation center, and to determine the existing needs for a national research and demonstration center, the Arkansas Vocational Rehabilitation Service made application to the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, for a grant to finance a study. The application was approved and the grant was made.

A study committee was appointed by the Arkansas Vocational Rehabilitation Service with the advice and counsel of the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation composed of 10 experts from various sections of the United States. After the study, the committee reported its findings and recommendations to the Arkansas Vocational Rehabilitation Service and the Federal Office of Vocational Rehabilitation December 5, 1958, that should the hospital be declared surplus, a national comprehensive rehabilitation center should be established at that facility. The report points out the need for such facilities in the field of vocational rehabilitation and recommends that it be operated by a State agency with funds provided both by the State

and Federal Government through Federal rehabilitation grants.

Mr. President, the recent session of the General Assembly of the State of Arkansas passed legislation that would permit the State of Arkansas to obtain title to the property, real, personal, or mixed, for the purpose of establishing and operating the rehabilitation facility. In addition, the State appropriated $200,000 annually of State funds for the maintenance and operation of the facility contingent upon the availability of the hospital and allocation of Federal funds from the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Mr. President, this is unquestionably a worthwhile project and in line with existing policies of the Federal Government to assist in the rehabilitation of our handicapped people.

Finally, Mr. President, I would like to point out that the investigating committee found that Arkansas has a vigorous and balanced program of rehabilitation and that the State has surpassed others in the provision of funds and rendering the services when considered on a population per capita income basis. The State agency, according to the report, has the philosophy and concept necessary to the successful administration of the comprehensive rehabilitation center.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McCARTHY in the chair). The bill will be received; and without objection, the bill will lie on the table, as requested by the Senator from Arkansas.

The bill (S. 1616) to direct the Secretary of the Army to convey the Army and Navy General Hospital, Hot Springs National Park, Ark., to the State of Arkansas, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. McCLELLAN, was received, read twice by its title, and ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, while I have asked that the bill be held temporarily at the desk until committee reference of it is requested, nevertheless, I deem it important that the processing of the proposed legislation proceed expeditiously.

The operation of the hospital will be discontinued at the end of this fiscal year. Immediately upon its being deactivated, preparation would have to be made to put it on a standby basis. Therefore, if the facility is to continue in the service of the people of the country and not be virtually abandoned by the Government, it is important in my judgment, that the bill be considered promptly and acted upon favorably, in order that the State may take possession of the property and immediately begin its conversion into a rehabilitation center. Otherwise, there will be an unnecessary lapse of time. There will also be an unnecessary waste of funds to put the hospital on a standby basis and then, again, to reactivate it should the bill be enacted.

I should like to confer with the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], before reference of the bill is made. As soon as it has been referred, I hope that early committee action will be taken on it, so that the bill can be placed on the Senate Calendar for disposition at this session. I hope it can be disposed of favorably before the end of the fiscal year.

Mr. McCLELLAN subsequently said: Mr. President, earlier today I introduced Senate bill 1616, which would convey the Army and Navy Hospital at Hot Springs, Ark., to the State of Arkansas for specific purposes, if and when the property becomes surplus to the needs of the Government, which we anticipate will occur at the end of this fiscal year.

At the time I introduced the bill I requested that it lie on the desk until I could consult with the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], chairman of the Armed Services Committee, with respect to the referral of the bill.

I have now consulted with him, and he has no objection to the bill being referred to the Senate Committee on Government Operations. Apparently, as of the present time, the Armed Services Committee might have jurisdiction of the bill. But once the hospital facilities are declared surplus, the jurisdiction will be reposed in the Committee on Government Operations.

For that reason, unless there is objection, I ask that the bill be referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

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

ADJUSTMENT OF LEGISLATIVE JURISDICTION OVER CERTAIN LAND USED FOR FEDERAL PURPOSES

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], I introduce, for appropriate reference, 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.

The bill is identical with S. 1538, reported by the Committee on Government Operations and passed by the Senate in the 85th Congress. After the bill had been referred to committee in the House of Representatives, due to a misinterpretation of certain aspects of the proposal, a motion was made to reconsider the passage of the measure. The motion was agreed to and the House was requested to return the bill to the Senate. The bill was returned to the Senate and placed upon the Senate Calendar under motions for reconsideration, where it remained until the close of the session.

The subject bill, in its original form, was prepared under the direction of the Interdepartmental Committee for the Study of Jurisdiction Over Federal Areas Within the States, appointed by the President. The staff of the Committee on Government Operations, assisted by the Legislative Counsel of the Senate and a special committee appointed by the Council of State Governments, perfected the bill in its present form, after many months of careful study. Following the completion of this work, the bill was approved unanimously by the Committee on Government Operations.

The bill and report made by the Committee to the Senate in the 85th Congress were submitted to the Governors and attorneys general of all of the States. In its present form, it incorporates a number of suggestions made by certain of these officials, and now has the approval of all officials and organizations concerned with the problems involved.

On March 14, 1959, the Attorney General transmitted to the President of the Senate a letter and an identical draft of the bill which were referred to the Committee on Government Operations. I am sending to the desk the Attorney General's letter which sets forth the general purpose of the legislation, and ask that it be incorporated in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

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

The bill (S. 1617) 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, introduced by Mr. McCLELLAN (for himself and Mr. BENNETT), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

The letter presented by Mr. McCLELLAN is as follows:

MARCH 13, 1959.

The VICE PRESIDENT,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. VICE PRESIDENT: Enclosed for your consideration and appropriate reference is a legislative proposal "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."

This measure is the end product of 16 months of intensive study by an Interdepartmental Committee for the Study of Jurisdiction over Federal areas within the States, prolonged study by the Council of State Governments' Committee on Legislative Jurisdiction over Federal lands, suggestions invited from Governors and attorneys general of the several States, comments received from numerous Federal agencies, recommendations from various other governmental and nongovernmental groups interested in the subject, and diligent work by the Senate Committee on Government Operations and its staff.

The general purpose of the legislation is to permit Federal agencies, in appropriate cases and with the consent of the States involved, to restore to the States certain legislative jurisdiction now vested in the United States over federally owned or operated lands and to assure that in the future the United States will receive only so much legislative jurisdiction as is essential to the proper performance of Federal functions. This would mean that persons residing on such properties would no longer, by virtue of the accident of the place of their abode, suffer disabilities with respect to voting, education, public health and safety, marriage and divorce, adoption, descent and distribution of property, and numerous other matters which are ordinarily provided for by State law.

Enclosed for your assistance is the comprehensive report, in two parts, submitted

to the Attorney General by the Interdepartmental Committee and transmitted to the President. The factual aspects of the problem to which the legislation is addressed and the original committee recommendations are contained in part I. Part II constitutes a textbook of the applicable law.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that there is no objection to the submission of this recommendation.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM P. ROGERS,
Attorney General.

RETROCESSION OF CONCURRENT JURISDICTION OVER CERTAIN LANDS IN STATE OF UTAH

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to retrocede to the State of Utah concurrent jurisdiction over certain lands within such State which are under the jurisdiction of the United States. I ask unanimous consent that a statement, prepared by me, explaining the purposes of the bill, be printed in the RECORD.

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

The bill (S. 1626) to retrocede to the State of Utah concurrent jurisdiction over certain lands within such State which are under the jurisdiction of the United States, introduced by Mr. BENNETT, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

The statement presented by Mr. BENNETT is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BENNETT

I have today introduced a bill which is most important to the State of Utah. It is a bill to retrocede to the State concurrent jurisdiction over certain lands within the State over which exclusive jurisdiction was previously ceded to the United States. The lands in question are all part of the huge military reservations in Utah which are utilized by the various armed services of the Federal Government.

Commencing with the outbreak of World War II, the U.S. Government began to acquire in Utah and in other States, huge tracts of land for the erection of buildings and the establishment of installations to support and maintain our Armed Forces and to carry out the important defense functions so vital to our Nation. The State of Utah responded to the request of the Federal Government and granted to the United States exclusive jurisdiction over many thousands of acres of land which were ceded and utilized by the Army, Navy, and Air Force. Utah today has four major military installations: Clearfield Naval Depot, Hill Air Force Base, Utah General Depot, and Tooele Ordnance Depot. We also have several other smaller installations which are of lesser significance.

With the end of the Korean conflict, there was an appreciable cutback in the missions of these military installations and consequently many of the buildings and some of the real estate became surplus to the needs of the Federal Government. A small part of this property has been sold by the United States and thus found its way back into private ownership and has been placed on the tax rolls. However, the large bulk of the property in question is still owned by the Federal Government. In recent years, the United States has commenced a practice of leasing warehouses and other buildings, which are excess to the needs of the Government, to private companies and contractors who may or may not be connected in some way with the defense effort.

This practice of the Government in leasing land, buildings, and other facilities for commercial purposes has created serious tax problems for the State of Utah. A number of companies have availed themselves of these excellent buildings at a fair rental rate from the Government, and then received an unexpected windfall because they have not had to pay State taxes on equipment and inventories located on these military reservations. In some instances, some of these companies have recognized a moral, although not a legal obligation, to pay taxes to the State of Utah, and have in the past willingly paid such taxes assessed by the State.

However, the Federal Government has now created a situation which has dried up even this source of voluntary tax revenue. Both the Treasury and the Defense Department have raised a question as to the legality of such companies paying these taxes, inasmuch as such payments are voluntary and not mandatory. The Defense Department has raised the question in regard to cost-plus contracts and has denied such voluntary tax payments as a necessary item of cost in arriving at the contractual amount to which a contractor might be entitled for services or goods produced for the Government. Likewise, the Treasury has looked askance at such voluntary tax payments, and has denied some of these companies permission to take such payments as a legal deduction on their Federal tax returns.

Consequently, it can readily be seen that Utah faces a real dilemma in that it does not have the necessary legal authority to assess and collect taxes against these companies using military reservations to do private business. And now, it is denied any hope of obtaining voluntary compliance with tax assessments against companies who lease facilities on Federal reservations where the United States has exclusive jurisdiction.

Moreover, companies which have been able to obtain leases of buildings on Federal reservations are given a distinct competitive advantage over other businesses which must pay State taxes.

Therefore, an urgent need exists to approve the legislation which I have today introduced to restore to Utah concurrent jurisdiction over the lands in question, so that the State might have the proper authority to levy and collect the taxes to which it is rightfully entitled.

The problem is especially acute in Utah, since the Federal Government owns almost 70 percent of the entire land area of the State, thus leaving very little private property to bear the brunt of taxes and pay the costs of operating the local, county, and State governments. I hope the Senate will take immediate action to approve this bill, or as an alternative, pass legislation similar to that contained in the adjustment of legislative jurisdiction bill which was before Congress during the last session, and which I understand will shortly be reintroduced by the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], and which I will certainly be happy to cosponsor.

I attach a resolution of the Legislature of the State of Utah, memorializing Congress to enact legislation similar to that which I have introduced today in the Senate. The resolution reads as follows:

"Resolution memorializing Congress and requesting that Congress consent to section 63-8-4, Utah Code Annotated, 1953

"Whereas in 1943 the Legislature of Utah ceded exclusive jurisdiction to the United States over all lands theretofore or thereafter acquired or leased by the United States for military or naval purposes and for forts, magazines, arsenals, dockyards, and other needful buildings of whatever kind authorized by act of Congress, reserving to the State the right to execute civil and criminal process only; and

"Whereas in 1951 the Legislature of Utah enacted section 63-8-4, Utah Code Annotated, 1953, as follows:

'The State of Utah retains concurrent jurisdiction, both civil and criminal, with the United States over all lands affected by this act'; and

"Whereas private persons and companies are now leasing warehouse space on military reservations in Utah for the purpose of storing personal property not connected with any defense effort of the United States; and

"Whereas the State of Utah is being deprived of property taxes upon such privately owned personal property for the reason that such military reservations were acquired by the United States prior to 1951, and are therefore beyond the legislative jurisdiction of the State of Utah; and

"Whereas the Legislature of the State of Utah does not desire to impose any taxes upon property owned by the United States, but only upon such privately owned personal property located on land owned by the United States: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the Legislature and the Governor of the State of Utah do hereby request that Congress consent to section 63-8-4, Utah Code Annotated, 1953, in order that the State of Utah may exercise concurrent jurisdiction with the United States over all lands in Utah acquired or leased by the United States prior to 1951; be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to Congress, to Senator BENNETT, to Senator MOSS, to Congressman DIXON, and to Congressman KING with the request that the Utah delegation in Congress take such action as may be necessary to secure congressional approval hereof."

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 9(b)(3) OF TAFT-HARTLEY ACT, RELATING TO AFFILIATION OF GUARDS' UNION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, section 9(b)(3) of the Taft-Hartley Act deprives any guards' union from affiliating with any other union which admits employees other than guards to membership.

The International Guards Union of America has called to my attention this serious discrimination in the present law. I firmly believe that guards ought to have the right to join in unified action on the same basis as other members of organized labor.

Therefore, I have prepared an amendment to repeal that part of the Taft-Hartley Act to which I have referred. I send the bill to the desk and ask that it be referred to the appropriate committee.

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

The bill (S. 1629) to amend section 9(b)(3) of the National Labor Relations Act so as to eliminate the provision thereof prohibiting the certification, as bargaining representative of persons employed as guards, of a labor organization which admits to membership, or is affiliated with an organization which admits to membership, employees other than guards, introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

COMMISSION ON UNEMPLOYMENT PROBLEMS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to create an 11-member Commission on Unemployment Problems. Six of the members are to be appointed by Congress: three by the Senate and three by the House of Representatives. The remaining five members are to be appointed by the President from among representatives of labor and industry. No more than three of the Presidential appointees can be from one group.

The Commission would be charged with making a full and complete investigation and study of unemployment conditions in the United States, giving particular consideration to areas of critical unemployment, for the purpose of determining what can be done to alleviate these conditions.

The Commission is to begin its work as soon as all appointments have been made, and is required to make its findings and recommendations to the President within 60 days after it has begun its work.

The Commission is authorized to make studies and to hold hearings at such times and places as its duties require. The members of the Commission or designated subcommittees will obtain firsthand information with respect to these problems in areas where unemployment conditions exist.

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

The bill (S. 1631) to provide for the establishment of a Commission on Unemployment Problems, introduced by Mr. JOHNSON of Texas (for himself and Senators DIRKSEN, MANSFIELD, KUCHEL, HENNINGS, SALTONSTALL, HILL, RANDOLPH, BYRD of West Virginia, DODD, SMITH, SMATHERS, HUMPHREY, HARTKE, YOUNG of Ohio, KENNEDY, YARBOROUGH, BEALL, GOLDWATER, FULBRIGHT, TALMADGE, CASE of New Jersey, MOSS, KERR, BRIDGES, COTTON, SYMINGTON, MCCARTHY, ANDERSON, WILLIAMS of New Jersey, ENGLE, FREAR, BIBLE, CHURCH, HART, CARROLL, BARTLETT, NEUBERGER, JAVITS, JACKSON, MAGNUSON, ERVIN, O'MAHONEY, MCGEE, KEATING, MUSKIE, GRUENING, JORDAN, AIKEN, CHAVEZ, SCHOEPPEL, CARLSON, BENNETT, HOLLAND, WILEY, LANGER, CANNON, JOHNSTON of South Carolina, MURRAY, GREEN, LAUSCHE, CAPEHART, KEFAUVER, PASTORE, SPARKMAN, MCCLELLAN, PROXMIRE, and LONG), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, this country is confronted with a situation which demands action.

If one American is willing and eager to work but unable to find a job, that is one too many. But when that number is multiplied by nearly 4½ million, it is 4½ million reasons for action.

I have introduced today on behalf of myself, the distinguished minority leader, and other Senators whose names I send to the desk, a bill. I ask unanimous consent that Members of the Senate who wish to add their names to it be permitted to do so until Friday noon.

The bill would create an 11-member Commission. Three members of this Commission would be appointed by the Senate; three by the House; and five by the President of the United States.

The Commission would be charged with the responsibility of going to the areas of critical unemployment in this country. They would be asked to hold hearings; to make inquiries; to feel and weigh the bitter despair which attends the lives of so many of our fellow Americans.

Then within 60 days they would be asked to report back with recommendations for action.

It is my hope that the bill will secure the action of both branches of Congress and the President, so that we can shed light into the dark corners of poverty in our land.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. RANDOLPH. The distinguished majority leader, in submitting the resolution for himself and other Members of the Senate, is focusing attention on a program which is not less than tragic in some of the States of the Union. The most recent figures indicate that 6½ percent of the working force of the country is unable to find employment. In West Virginia, the percentage of unemployment is more than twice the national figure. So, we in West Virginia are intensely interested in the creation of such a commission.

I feel especially privileged to be a cosponsor of this measure and to know that among other sponsoring Senators are the distinguished minority leader and others on his side of the aisle.

It is heartening to find among provisions of the resolution the requirement that within 60 days after the date on which all appointments to the Commission have been made it shall submit its findings and recommendations to the President for transmittal to the Congress.

The urgency of the unemployment problem in many depressed labor surplus areas of the country demands prompt committee consideration and early passage of such a purposeful resolution as the able majority leader has introduced.

I am sure that West Virginians generally will hope that a program of survey and recommendations will be forthcoming very speedily. We have real concern for the problems of our unemployed and the distress which bears down heavily upon all too many families in our State and in areas of our sister States where conditions have grown from the chronic into the acute in their labor surplus areas, too.

I congratulate the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] for his initiative in this matter.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I appreciate what the Senator from West Virginia has said. I have discussed the subject with the distinguished minority leader, and on a number of occasions I have discussed it also with the Senators from West Virginia. No one has been more aware of the serious situation which exists in West Virginia than the majority leader and the minority leader. I myself have listened with great interest to the Senators from West Virginia as they have spoken of the problems with which their great State is concerned. I hope that West Virginia will be one of the first areas to receive the attention of the Commission.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I am grateful to the distinguished majority leader for his kindness in yielding to me. As a cosponsor of the bill I am proud to rise in its behalf. I feel that the proposal to establish a temporary Commission to make a full and comprehensive study of America's unemployment and depressed areas problem may constitute a very significant step toward the alleviation of the problem.

I commend the distinguished majority leader for his authorship of the bill. I congratulate him for his deep interest in our country's grievous dilemma of joblessness.

I also wish to commend the U.S. Senate as a whole for the excellent work it has done so far this session in the passage of the Area Redevelopment Act, the Omnibus Housing Act, the Airport Extension Act, and other measures which will result in the creation of more jobs and thus combat the unemployment problem.

But, Mr. President, while these steps are important, I feel that much more must be done. Let us not forget that unemployment still is the single most crucial economic problem facing America today. Just 2 days ago, it was announced that unemployment had receded slightly in the month of March, and now stands at the level of 4,362,000. This is heartening news, even though most of the improvement probably is due to the yearly arrival of warm weather and the seasonal increase in construction and agriculture work.

But this slight improvement is not grounds for forgetting America's unemployment problem. Let us not be so cheered by the news that 387,000 fewer men are out of work that we forget about the staggering number—more than 4 million—who still are unable to find jobs.

When O. Henry wrote his book, "The Four Million," at the turn of the century, it was an entertaining volume of fiction. But there is nothing entertaining about the story of today's 4 million. The 4 million Americans who are walking the streets today, desperately looking for any sort of employment, constitute a distressing and disturbing picture. A large percentage of these unfortunate men and women are in the so-called depressed areas. Such depressed areas exist in my own State of West Virginia, as I have stated in the Senate at other times. West Virginia has more than 80,000 unemployed—or more than 13 percent of the State's entire work force.

What is needed is an intensive study which will summarize the problem and find new approaches to the matter of returning these persons to productive, worthwhile employment.

It is my belief that the bill which has just been introduced will help to achieve that purpose. I feel that it will be the vehicle by which appropriate, immediate, and direct action will be taken to aid the depressed areas of West Virginia and other States.

I again congratulate the majority leader, and I urge prompt consideration and early adoption of the bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I thank the distinguished Senator from West Virginia. No two Senators have contributed more to the preparation of the bill or to the submitting of it than have the Senators from West Virginia.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I commend the distinguished Senator from Texas for introducing this bill.

Since the advent of the industrial revolution, mass unemployment has been one of the continuing evils afflicting society. Governments have devised a number of stopgap remedies. We have tried doles, government work projects and a variety of forms of government spending. But all of these have been treatments of the effects of unemployment, not the causes. Therefore, I am pleased to cosponsor Senator JOHNSON's proposal for the establishment of a commission that would study the root causes of unemployment.

I am particularly pleased that his proposal calls for a report within 60 days.

In coming months Congress will act upon a number of proposals which bear directly on the unemployment problem. We need an authoritative guide as to the extent of unemployment, the causes of it, and the role each of the proposals before Congress can be expected to play in solving it.

We cannot accept unemployment for millions as a permanent factor of our economic system. We must make a coordinated and intelligent attack upon this problem.

I believe that the Commission proposed today by Senator JOHNSON provides an excellent starting point. If it properly carries out its task, probes the basic causes of unemployment, and makes comprehensive recommendations to remedy this evil, then we will have a proper basis for enacting a many-pronged program to wipe out unemployment in this country.

AMENDMENT OF TARIFF ACT OF 1930 RELATING TO FREE IMPORTATION OF TOURIST LITERATURE—AMENDMENTS

Mr. JAVITS submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (H.R. 2411) to amend paragraph 1629 of the Tariff Act of 1930 so as to provide for the free importation of tourist literature, which were referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed.

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL RESERVE ACT RELATING TO CERTAIN RESERVES — ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR AND PRINTING OF AMENDMENT

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, yesterday I submitted an amendment to Senate bill 1120, the bill relating to Reserve requirements for member banks of the Federal Reserve System, which would eliminate from the Federal Reserve Act and other banking laws the classification "central Reserve city" and reclassify New York and Chicago as Reserve cities.

The distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] advises me that he desires to be a cosponsor of the amendment. I ask unanimous consent that his name be added to the list of sponsors of the amendment, and that the names of other Senators may be added before the close of business today, if they so desire.

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

Mr. BUSH. I had intended to have the amendment lie at the desk through Friday for additional cosponsors. However, the Committee on Banking and Currency will meet tomorrow morning in executive session to consider Senate bill 1120. Accordingly, I now ask unanimous consent that the previous order of the Senate be rescinded and that the amendment be printed and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency at the close of business today.

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

PRINTING AS A SENATE DOCUMENT BIBLIOGRAPHY ENTITLED "WHAT POLICY IN LABOR-MANAGEMENT RELATIONS WILL BEST SERVE THE PEOPLE OF THE UNITED STATES?" (S. DOC. NO. 22)

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, the committee on discussion and debate materials and interstate cooperation of the National University Extension Association has announced that the national high school forensic problem for the academic year 1959–60 is "What policy in labor-management relations will best serve the people of the United States?" The problem comprehends three propositions for debate and three questions for discussion, as follows:

DISCUSSION QUESTIONS

1. How can the public interest best be protected in labor-management disputes?

2. What should be the responsibilities of labor and management in solving the current labor-management problems?

3. What should be the responsibility of Government in solving the current labor-management problems?

DEBATE PROPOSITIONS

1. *Resolved*, That section 14b of the National Labor Relations Act should be repealed.

2. *Resolved*, That the Federal Government should substantially increase its regulation of labor unions.

3. *Resolved*, That the Federal Government should require arbitration of labor disputes in all basic industries.

In response to numerous requests for material, the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] and I have had the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress and the staff of the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee compile a bibliography which the high school students of America may use in preparing for their debates next year.

If printed as a Senate document, this bibliography will provide material which Senators can send to people who write to them requesting debating material. It will also be useful to any person studying this question.

Last year, when the subject chosen for debate was education, a similar bibliography was printed as a Senate document and proved extremely useful, saving many of us the labor and time of continually duplicating material to comply with requests from our constituents.

I ask unanimous consent on behalf of the Senator from Arizona and myself, that this material, which will not exceed 50 printed pages, be printed as a Senate document.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Massachusetts? The Chair hears none, and 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. LONG:

Address delivered by Senator ELLENDER before the Red River Valley Association, Shreveport, La., on March 31, 1959.

By Mr. WILEY:

Address entitled "The Warmth of America in the Cold War," delivered by Senator RANDOLPH, of West Virginia, before United Service Organization's National Council, at the Sheraton Park Hotel, Washington, D.C., on April 8, 1959.

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

Address delivered by Senator TALMADGE before the annual meeting of the Tennessee Agricultural Council in Memphis, Tenn., on April 3, 1959.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON FREEDOM OF INFORMATION AND SECRECY IN GOVERNMENT BY SUBCOMMITTEE ON CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, I wish to announce, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights of the Committee on the Judiciary, that the subcommittee has scheduled a public hearing on the subjects of freedom of information and secrecy in government, on Friday, April 17, 1959, beginning at 10 a.m., in room 318—caucus room—of the Old Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

The witnesses to be heard by the subcommittee are outstanding leaders in the field of journalism, who are expected to present their views not only

on the general subjects of freedom of information and secrecy in government, but also on S. 186, the freedom of information bill which has been referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

This particular date was selected for convenience during the period the American Society of Newspaper Editors is meeting this year in Washington, D.C.

OPPRESSION OF TIBET BY COMMUNIST CHINA

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, a little while ago some 200 million Asians of the Buddhist faith recalled with prayers and veneration the 2,500th anniversary of Buddha's death. Buddhism, now moving into its third millenium, is not only the living religion of millions of people in Ceylon, Burma, Siam, Cambodia, Laos, Japan, Red China, and Nationalist China, but is also undergoing a vigorous renaissance.

Three years ago the Buddhist stronghold of Burma was the scene of large Buddhist conclaves. The great council meeting then held there was only the sixth of its kind during the past 2,500 years. As a mark of the resurgence and continuing vitality of this most ancient religious faith, a re-editing of Buddhist texts was completed after years of effort by scholarly priests from Burma, Thailand, Ceylon, Cambodia, Laos, and other Asian countries. Then, the task done, the texts were published in a definitive, authorized form.

Today, throughout vast reaches of Asia, there is a surge of anger as Tibet, a citadel of Buddhism, is brutally suppressed by its Red Chinese overlords bebecause it attempts to secure the autonomy that was promised it by Red China. There is, as well, a brutal repudiation by Communist China's Premier Chou En-lai of the principles of nonviolance and nonintervention in other countries' internal affairs that he made at the 1955 Bandung Conference of Asian nations.

Today, the Dalai Lama, the god-king of Tibet, has reached India, after a perilous flight from his own country, while his people—one of the most unoffending of all the world's peoples—continue their struggle for religious freedom, although they are few and are armed with primitive weapons, and are opposed by Communist China with its more than 600 million people whose forces are equipped with modern arms.

In this melancholy situation we note with interest the reactions of the free Asian press, and its expressed fears that communism threatens to extinguish the freedom of Asian peoples and to crush freedom of worship.

The Hindustan Times, in non-Buddhist India, said:

> A small country on our border has paid the ultimate penalty for its temerity to aspire to independence. Much else could die with Tibet if we do not, even now, heed the warning.

The powerful Times of India said:

> What trust can India place in Chinese Communist declarations after their open violation of repeated pledges they gave to the Tibetan people that they would respect their autonomy.

In Burma, the Rangoon Daily said Red China's action against the Dalai Lama was an "attempt to suppress Buddhism by the forces of communism."

The Nation, Burma's leading newspaper, said:

> The brutal machinegunning and bombing of the Tibetan people was a gross violation of the Bandung principles and should be condemned by all Asians who cherish freedom and independence.

It is a measure of free Asia's sense of shock at the outrages perpetrated on Tibet by Red China that comments such as these are made by the Burmese press, for small Burma has a long frontier with her giant neighbor who does not brook expressions of freedom and independence of thought by those upon whom her shadow falls.

There is little we can do to succor a Tibet in agony. But our deepest feelings are engaged, for although we are not of the Buddhist faith, it is nonetheless true that he who lays rough hands upon the followers of Buddha lays rough hands upon all who believe in freedom of worship, independence of spirit, and the dignity of man. Our Nation is founded upon these principles. It has never departed from them. It has never ceased to hope that they will become the guiding principles of all the peoples of the world. Hence our national sorrow that they are being stifled today in the devout and brave country of Tibet by Communist China.

TRIBUTE TO CHANCELLOR KONRAD ADENAUER

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, we in the United States and the other people of the free world recognize that during the years in which Dr. Konrad Adenauer has been Chancellor of West Germany the programs and policies which he has proposed and supported constitute an outstanding record in German, and world, history.

Within this period, the Federal Republic of Germany was revived from a shattered and impoverished nation to one of the most prosperous and forward-moving countries in Europe. Under his leadership, also, West Germany has risen to an honored and influential place in the councils of the Western World.

After yesterday's announcement by Chancellor Adenauer of his decision to be a candidate for the Presidency of West Germany, the world now is "taking stock" of what effect his action may have on international affairs.

As Chancellor, Dr. Adenauer has proven himself to be a strong, courageous statesman, dedicated to the cause of freedom. Furthermore, he has acted as a rock of Gibraltar, standing against the efforts of communism, overt and covert, to extend its influence to West Germany and the Western World.

As a long time friend of Konrad Adenauer, I have a particularly high respect for the outstanding ability with which he has served his country and the free world so admirably and honorably.

In reviewing Dr. Adenauer's splendid record, the world will reflect upon the constructive contributions which he has made toward close cooperation with the Western allies; improving French-German relations and cooperation; uncompromising policies for opposing efforts of communism to expand in Europe, and particularly to penetrate West Germany; willingness to share the burden of armament against Soviet power on the European Continent; and many other policies designed not only in the interests of West Germany, but also to strengthen the free world alliance.

In his candidacy for the presidency this summer, I, of course, wish him every possible success.

Although it is recognized that the presidency is a position of diminished authority and power, the people of West Germany and the free world can be gratified that—if he is elected as predicted—we shall continue to have the benefit of the wisdom, experience, and high qualities of statesmanship and leadership demonstrated by Dr. Adenauer over the years.

LABOR REFORM LEGISLATION

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, on previous occasions the press has reported my remarks on labor reform legislation, citing the fact that there is a demand on the part of the public and labor union members for effective legislation in this field. I should like at this time to elaborate on this subject.

During the Easter recess I had an opportunity to research correspondence in my files concerning labor-reform legislation. There is an unmistakable trend on the part of private individuals, labor union members, and businessmen, to support a bill which would curb abuses in the labor movement.

There is one striking feature of this research to which I should like to direct attention, Mr. President. Among the 422 pieces of correspondence which came from States other than my own State of Arizona, not one indicated approval of S. 505, the bill which was favorably reported from the committee, and the bill which I voted against. It is clear to me that the public feels as I do, that this is an ineffective proposal for labor reform legislation.

Again I should like to point out that in this sampling of correspondence not one individual voiced disapproval of S. 1137, the labor reform bill introduced by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN], who presided over the hearings which disclosed the abuses and racketeering of power-hungry labor bosses in the labor union field.

Equally important is the demand on the part of private individuals who expressly request that Congress enact legislation to curb the abuses of secondary boycotts and blackmail picketing. I feel it is important that we recognize the desires of these citizens. I request to have printed in the body of the RECORD

at this point a chart covering 422 letters in which there was stated a position on labor reform legislation.

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

Sampling of 422 out-of-State letters concerning labor reform legislation

	Pro 1555	Improve 1555	Anti 1555	Pro 748	Anti 748	Pro 1137	Anti 1137	Specifically requesting strong bill to curb abuses
Individuals	None	4	35	9	6	16	None	80
Business firms, organizations, and construction companies	None	3	83	6	25	12	None	41

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, again today, as I have done on several previous occasions, I wish to insert at this point in the body of the RECORD several newspaper editorials which are critical of the Kennedy-Ervin approach to labor legislation as proposed by S. 505 and S. 1555.

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

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, Feb. 19, 1959]

THE SECOND PACKAGE

Commenting on the Democratic proposal for a "two-package" approach to labor reforms, Secretary of Labor Mitchell says, "Whatever the packaging, it's the product that counts." Both the administration and Senator KENNEDY, of Massachusetts, have proposed legislation for union financial reports and internal reforms. They should be able to agree on at least one package.

Senator KENNEDY, however, has voiced objections to the administration's proposals which would go into the second package, yet these are as important as the first. The administration seeks Taft-Hartley Act changes to deal with blackmail picketing and some secondary boycotts. Mr. Mitchell says:

"The McClellan committee has disclosed a number of cases where racketeers have moved into unions, beat up dissenters, milked the union treasury and used picket lines to throw out of work people whose employers refused to have them organized from the top down."

The administration bill would deal with such racketeering without outlawing all boycotts or organizational picketing. The bill would prohibit picketing of an employer whose employees showed no interest in joining the union; it would prohibit boycotts of an employer not a party to a labor dispute. Such measures should protect employers and employees alike without hindering honest unionism.

It makes little difference whether these essential labor reforms are wrapped in one package or two, but the two-package approach should not be employed to bury the second package. Both types of labor reforms should be passed.

[From the Cincinnati (Ohio) Post, Mar. 14, 1959]

BILL OF PARTICULARS

Members of the Senate Labor Committee are working on legislation to curb the labor rackets exposed by the McClellan investigation. So far, the action does not point toward a very strong bill.

The reluctance of the Democrats on the committee, under pressure from the union lobby, to write a tight law is frightening, in view of the McClellan disclosures.

Just this week in a New York speech, Senator MCCLELLAN spelled out a bill of particulars in support of stronger measures he himself has proposed.

"The instability or lack of integrity prevalent today in labor-management relations in this country is appalling," he said.

In the investigation, "We have had to deal constantly with people of low character or no character at all." Of 1,200 witnesses so far summoned, more than 200 ducked behind the fifth amendment for fear of incriminating themselves. The evils which have been exposed, he said, "are outrageously cruel, corrupt and contemptible."

"No legitimate union, properly administered by honest and decent officials, would be penalized to any extent or degree whatsoever," the Senator said. "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."

How can any honest and decent union officials or Senators of like attributes, hesitate about on which side they stand?

[From the Roanoke (Va.) Times, Mar. 14, 1959]

THE PUBLIC INTEREST COMES FIRST

President Meany of the AFL–CIO has denounced the Eisenhower administration's labor reform bill as "stupid" and antilabor. In testimony before the House labor subcommittee, he contended the administration bill represents a deliberate attempt to obscure the issues.

Mr. Meany favors, with some reservations, the Kennedy-Ervin bill introduced in the Senate. This deals mainly with protection of union funds and other safeguards against racketeering. The administration measure has similar provisions but it would deal more severely with "blackmail" picketing. It proposes to ban picketing of a plant in the absence of evidence of sufficient interest in union membership among employees.

But there is a much more significant difference between the bills. This has to do with secondary boycotts. Despite the prohibition of the Taft-Hartley Act, it is possible for a union to force employers with whom it has no dispute, to stop doing business with a concern against whom it has called a strike. The administration bill seeks to close Taft-Hartley loopholes which permit the abuse of union power; the Kennedy-Ervin measure would make no change in the existing Taft-Hartley provision.

The power to shut down businesses having no quarrel with the union in order to compel another business to bow to union demands has been used frequently to paralyze a whole industry or a whole section of the country. Under the circumstances can such monopoly power in the hands of labor leaders be defended as in the public interest. The public welfare must take precedence over union interest. To claim that legislation aimed at preserving that principle is antiunion is simply befogging the issue.

[From the Terre Haute (Ind.) Tribune, Mar. 15, 1959]

WISHY-WASHY LABOR LAW

A new labor bill offered to Congress is practically the twin brother of the Kennedy-Ives bill of last session. This measure was pushed through the Senate on a hurry-up basis which allowed no time or opportunity for intensive hearings or consideration. It then was defeated in the House—for the simple reason that it just wasn't capable of doing the needed job.

There are good things in the currently proposed measure, just as there were in its predecessor. But the good is heavily outweighed by the negative aspects. To take one example, it would do nothing about two of the worst labor abuses perpetrated on business and the public—secondary boycotts, and "blackmail" picketing.

Newspapers throughout the country are now asking for a stronger bill. An interesting instance is provided by the Richmond Times-Dispatch. This leading southern paper editorially rebuked the House for voting down the Kennedy-Ives bill, on the grounds that any law was better than none. But now it takes a different view. It calls the proposed law wishy-washy, and says; "This year the need to halt the inflationary wage-price spiral is even more urgent. The threat of sympathy strikes and secondary boycotts carries the full weight not only of the striking union, but also the threat inherent in the 16 million membership of the full AFL–CIO syndicate. Therein lies the greatest danger of 'union monopoly.'

"The right to unionize, to bargain collectively, and to strike locally should not be impaired (so long as public welfare and national security are not endangered). But unless the threat of nationwide strikes in key industries is removed, the inflationary trend cannot be checked."

The country has the right to a labor law which will protect the legitimate interest of us all, including union members. The Congress has the responsibility to pass such a law.

[From the High Bridge (N.J.) Gazette, Mar. 5, 1959]

A CRY FOR HELP

Congress, we are told, is in a mood to enact labor legislation. As for what kind it may be, there is the distressingly likely prospect of getting the ineffectual, labor-dictated, 1959 version of the Kennedy-Ives bill—now known as the Kennedy-Ervin bill or S. 505. Debate on this innocuous measure begins any day now, and—in the absence of protests from home—there is good reason to expect passage.

A vote for the Kennedy bill is an easy out for the nervous lawmaker who, for a number of reasons, may prefer not to irritate the labor bosses, and whose constituents are uninformed or indifferent or both. He can then please the labor barons and pose at the same time as a champion of labor union reform. On the other hand, the conscientious Congressman or Senator who realizes what a phony this bill is must be a very brave man to vote against it when there is no hint of support or appreciation from the homefolks.

Whatever you may have heard, this is no reform bill. It does not strike down the vicious and indefensible secondary boycott, under which unions may attack at will any customer of any business against which they claim a grievance, real or fancied. It does not outlaw organizational or recognition picketing, whereby unions may victimize a business and abuse workers who have previously voted against unionizing. It does nothing to wipe out in free and democratic America the double standard of conduct under which the plain people are expected to be law-abiding and labor goons have come

to be considered as having extralegal rights in the departments of intimidation, skull-cracking and the destruction of property. It does not even protect union members against the very sort of exploitation revealed in the McClellan labor rackets hearings.

But, once this bill is passed, it will be seized upon by union gauleiters as a Federal "health certificate," as evidence that they have been purified and as a new weapon in more aggressive membership drives than we have yet seen. Correction and control of racketeering, hoodlumism and assorted mayhem will be farther off than ever. Historically, labor legislation is passed by Congress approximately every 10 years.

Useful as this bill could be to the union hierarchy—whose "fat cats" will bring every pressure to bear for its passage—it is a disservice to the rank and file union member and an insult to the public at large.

It is therefore the privilege of the people to resent the Kennedy bill. And it is their duty to demand of their servants in Congress that it be thrown out—bodily. They now have the choice of acting immediately—or repenting at long leisure.

[From the New York (N.Y.) World Telegram & Sun, Mar. 20, 1959]

LOOK WHO'S OPPOSED

While Congress timidly toys with labor legislation, New York has set an example of action.

The legislature has passed a bill designed to protect rank-and-file union members—and their dues—from the kind of larceny, misuse, and assorted hanky-panky exposed repeatedly in the hearings of the McClellan rackets committee.

It is axiomatic that Governor Rockefeller will sign the measure, since it was he who proposed it.

The bill outlaws mishandling of funds by union officers or agents. It bars them from engaging in conflict-of-interest transactions. It outlaws acceptance of payoffs from employers—the kind of thievery inherent in sweetheart contracts. It requires full financial reports to the State and the membership. It sets penalties of fines up to $1,000 and prison terms up to a year for willful violators of the prescribed fiduciary obligations. And it gives labor organizations and union members the right to bring court action for redress against officials who violate those obligations.

The bill also sets forth similar financial responsibilities for employers, employer associations, and labor relations consultants—and outlaws connivance and bribery on their part.

In short, it is basic protection—long overdue—for union members and their dues money. As one legislator put it in Albany, the only union officials who have anything to fear from the bill are hoodlums and racketeers.

And yet—

The State AFL-CIO opposed the measure. It argued that the States should let the Federal Government enact a law that would be uniform throughout the country.

But what happens when the merest hint of any such action by Congress arises? The AFL-CIO marshals its national strength to prevent any genuinely remedial legislation.

So, in effect, the AFL-CIO was saying to the legislature: "Let's coordinate all labor reform legislation at the national level, where we can knock it over the head."

This puts the supposedly responsible heads of American organized labor in the anomalous position of working against the interests of rank-and-file union members.

We think these AFL-CIO leaders, State and Federal, better take a look in the mirror, observe the egg on their faces, and wise up. On them it looks especially bad.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, at the time the Kennedy-Ervin bill was ordered reported I asked my staff to prepare an analysis of the bill, setting forth its shortcomings. The analysis, which is entitled, "The Gimmicks in the Labor Reform Bill Favorably Reported by the Senate Labor Committee," is now complete and I ask that it be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD. It is equally applicable to the reported version of S. 505, as well as the new bill, S. 1555.

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

THE "GIMMICKS" IN THE LABOR REFORM BILL FAVORABLY REPORTED BY THE SENATE LABOR COMMITTEE

Even if the committee bill effectively did everything it appears to do, it would still be largely inadequate to accomplish the job of eliminating or even substantially diminishing abuses, corruption, and racketeering in the labor-management field. Its serious omissions in this respect must, however, be left for full consideration in the forthcoming minority report. In this analysis the sole purpose will be to demonstrate that many of the provisions of the committee bill belie their own appearance, and in fact do not give employees and union members the rights, benefits, and protections which are claimed for them.

I. Fiduciary obligation of union officials (sec. 2(b)): The bill does no more than declare that it encourages the faithful observance of fiduciary responsibilities by union officials by requiring them to make certain financial reports. But by the use of the word "fiduciary" in what is in fact merely the bill's preamble, an impression is created that something is being done about the fiduciary obligations of union officials. The Democrats rejected a Republican amendment imposing fiduciary status on union officials and giving union members a right to sue in the Federal courts for breach thereof.

II. Who is a union officer? The sanctions of the committee bill are exclusively criminal and are directed mainly at union "officers" who fail to comply with its requirements—reporting of financial matters, and regulation of trusteeships, and of union elections. The U.S. Supreme Court has held that a union's "officers" are only those officials who are so designated by the union's constitution and that function is not the test. Thus, a union can rewrite its constitution so as to have only a single officer, its president for example. That means that those officials who perform the duties of vice president, secretary, treasurer, business agent, organizer, manager, member of an executive board or other union governing body are not officers and hence completely free from the bill's requirements or sanctions. The Democrats rejected a Republican amendment defining "union officers" to include all of these governing or policymaking officials.

III. Loans by unions to union officers, members, and employees (sec. 101(b)(4)): Unions must report all loans to union members and officials aggregating more than $250. This enables the union leadership to make loans of $250 or less to favored members or officials, to deny them to those union people who for one reason or another oppose the leadership, and to act in this discriminatory fashion without letting the membership know about it. A more effective device for permitting an incumbent union leadership to use union funds for perpetuating itself in office is difficult to imagine. Nevertheless, the Democrats rejected a Republican amendment to require reporting of all such loans, regardless of amount, which is just what the bill requires with respect to loans made by a union to any business enterprise.

IV. Conflict-of-interest reporting by union officials (sec. 102(a)): Section 102(a) requires every union officer and every union employee receiving an annual gross of more than $5,000 (except mere clerical employees) to report any conflict-of-interest transaction as set forth in the bill. Generally, these transactions are such as to put the union man on both sides of a labor-management situation at the same time, and they thus constitute a breach of his duty to his union. Because of the lack of definition of "officer" in the bill, all union policymaking and governing officials not designated as officers in the constitution, and who, if they are on the union payroll, receive less than $5,000 per year, are freed from the requirement of reporting these fundamentally unethical transactions. This provides a gaping loophole for those dishonest union officials whose main source of income is derived not from their union salaries but from their conflict-of-interest transactions. The Democrats rejected a Republican amendment to eliminate the $5,000 salary limitation which would have then required all nonclerical union employees to report these transactions. The Democrats, however, did knock out the $2,500 limitation on reporting of expenditures by employers for the purpose of influencing employees.

V. Conflict-of-interest benefits derived through a dummy or strawman setup: The Democrats rejected a Republican amendment designated to require reporting of benefits derived by a union official in a conflict-of-interest situation where the union official gets his unethical take from a third party intermediary.

VI. Exemption of small unions (sec. 101(d)): Having agreed in subcommittee to a Republican amendment eliminating the power of the Secretary to exempt small unions and employers from the financial reporting requirements, the Democrats, in full committee, put it back in again. Their argument was that such reporting would be burdensome to many small unions. However, the bill already contains a provision authorizing the Secretary to prescribe simplified reports where full reports would be burdensome. The result of retaining this exemption is to make it possible for some of the most corrupt unions, such as the Johnny Dio paper locals, having few, or even no members, to evade the financial reporting requirements of the bill.

VII. Information in required financial reports to be made available to union members (sec. 101(c)): This provision sounds as if union members would be given the information necessary for them to keep their union officials honest. Nothing could be more deceptive. Neither the union member, nor even the Secretary, can tell by looking at one of these required financial reports whether it is accurate, erroneous, or deliberately falsified. In order to determine that, it would be necessary to compare the report with the basic union books, records, and accounts from which the reports have been prepared. It is only then that discrepancies might become evident. The bill fails to provide that union members be given access to these basic documents. A Republican amendment to that effect was rejected. It was argued that the bill gives the Secretary access to these records and that is enough to assure that reports filed will not be falsified. This assertion is entirely unsound. The best source of information would be alert union members who had discovered falsifications after comparing the basic union records with the filed reports. Having no access to these basic records, union members are rendered largely useless as sources of information for such misconduct. The Secretary, under the bill, must rely either on the hit-and-miss method of spot checking a sampling of the filed reports, or on complaints unsupported by concrete evidence. Which of these is he to investigate? No one can say. This omission

renders the financial filing requirements of the bill almost entirely worthless despite its specious appearance of effectiveness.

VIII. Preservation of basic union records (sec. 105, 108(c)): The committee bill requires the making and preservation of the records upon which the filed financial reports are based and imposes severe penalties for their destruction or concealment. This adds to the impression that the bill's procedure for public disclosure of union financial affairs is being effectively safeguarded. But the very people who are most vitally concerned in the matter, the union members, are denied access to these carefully safeguarded records, a right enjoyed by corporate stockholders with respect to corporation records in almost every State in the Union.

IX. Embezzlement of union funds (sec. 109(a)): This makes embezzlement of union funds a Federal crime. Embezzlement of any kind is already a crime in every State and Territory of the United States, and there is no evidence that these local laws are not being properly enforced. This provision gives union members nothing they do not already have.

X. Suits by union members to recover embezzled union funds (sec. 109(b)): Union members seem to be given the right to sue in a Federal or State court any union officer who has been convicted of embezzling union funds, for the recovery of such funds for the benefit of the union. But this right accrues so long after the act of embezzlement occurred that even if the suit is successful there is small likelihood that the stolen funds will not have been dissipated. Thus, the officer must first be suspected, then investigated, then indicted, tried, and finally convicted. Even then the suit can't be brought by the union member until 6 months after the union's officers have rejected his demand that they bring such suit themselves. The period between the indictment and the suit by the union member could easily span several years. Furthermore, this apparent right of the union member to sue is so hedged about by restrictions and limitations that he is far better off suing in a State court under State law. In most States he could bring suit as soon as the money was misappropriated; he would not need to wait even for indictment of the embezzling official; he would not have to show criminal intent; and he could secure a judgment upon a preponderance of the evidence rather than wait for a criminal conviction requiring proof beyond a reasonable doubt. And finally the committee bill, as a further condition of bringing this suit, requires the union member to get leave of the court upon a sworn application and for good cause shown. These three additional conditions transform what appears to be a right to sue into a mere privilege dependent upon the court's discretion. Under State law, he could sue as of right without being subject to these conditions, conditions incidentally, which the law imposes very rarely, only in unusual types of cases, and never heretofore in this type of legal action. Thus, upon examination, this so-called right to sue for recovery of embezzled funds turns out to be a snare and a delusion which no lawyer would ever advise his client to utilize. It should be added that the Republicans secured acceptance of an amendment preserving the remedies of union members under State law in this type of proceeding. Without this amendment, union members would have been stripped of their existing rights and given literally nothing in return.

XI. Payments by employers to representatives of his employees (sec. 111): The committee bill makes it a crime for an employer to give anything of value "to any representative of his employees." The Supreme Court has ruled that the term "representative" is not limited to a representative for collective bargaining purposes. Thus it is possible for an employer to commit a crime if he gives a material reward to the president of his employees' bowling league for his success in running a bowling tournament. Such president is a "representative of his employees" within the meaning of the bill. A Republican amendment to eliminate this possibility was rejected.

XII. Payments by employers to union officials (sec. 111): This section also makes it a crime for an employer to give or lend anything of value to an officer or employee of a union with intent to influence his decisions, actions or duties as a "representative of employees" (again that dangerous phrase) or as a union "officer or employee." If this were merely intended to outlaw bribery of union officials, that is already illegal under all State laws. But the term "influence" includes acts which are not technically bribery—what seems to be aimed at is prohibiting the subversion of union officials in the performance of their union duties. But why should such subversion be criminal only if it is committed by an employer, even if the employer and the subverted official's union have absolutely no relations with each other? (The bill's language includes such a situation in its scope). If the subversion of union officials is reprehensible and merits outlawing, why shouldn't it be outlawed regardless of who does the subverting? As the bill now reads, a Jimmy Hoffa or Dave Beck can subvert the president of the Retail Clerks Union by paying him to give up an organizing campaign so that the Teamsters can take it over, and no crime is committed. But if an employer in the steel industry gives something of value to his acquaintance, the head of a textile workers union, to persuade him to influence his union to change its political line, that would be a crime under the bill. A Republican amendment to make it a crime for any person (not merely an employer) to subvert a union official was rejected by the Democrats.

XIII. Extortion to permit the unloading of freight-carrying motor vehicles (section 111): This section makes it a crime for a union or any of its representatives or employees to demand from a truck driver or his employer a fee or charge for the unloading of the truck's cargo. This is extortion and is already illegal under State law and in all probability under Federal law (the Hobbs Act) as well. Hence, the extortion rarely takes this obvious form. What usually happens is that the union or union official seeking to exact a fee for permitting the truck to be unloaded, requires the operator to join the union and pay a sizable initiation fee even if he lives and works in another locality and belongs to another union, even if it is merely another local of the extorting union. This gives the deal an appearance of legitimate labor activity but it is nothing but disguised extortion The Democrats rejected a Republican amendment designed to outlaw this kind of racket.

XIV. Extortion picketing (section 111): This makes it a crime to picket for the purpose of compelling the picketed employer to pay off an individual in order to get rid of the picket line. Again, this is naked extortion and is already a crime both under State and Federal law (the Hobbs Act). Hence, this provision, like the previous one, is mere window-dressing designed to create an impression that the committee bill does something effective about certain indefensible types of picketing which are just as frequent as this type of extortion picketing is rare. It does nothing of the kind. Recognition and organizational picketing where the employees clearly do not want to be represented by the picketing union and which frequently is carried on to force the employer to violate the law by recognizing such a union is left completely untouched. Moreover, even within its own narrow scope, the provision is specious. The picketing is illegal only if it is for the enrichment of an individual—if the ill-gotten gains go to the racketeering union itself, it is not illegal. And there is no illegality involved in threats to engage in such picketing nor in causing or attempting to cause others to so engage. The Democrats rejected Republican amendments to remedy these defects, and they remain to mislead the public into thinking that another labor abuse has been corrected.

XV. Reporting requirements in connection with trusteeships imposed on locals by international unions (section 201): This section requires international unions to file reports giving specified information about any trusteeships over a local. The documents, books, records, etc. which the union makes or keeps and upon which these reports are based must not be destroyed or concealed. But union members (including even those in the trusteed locals) are not given access to these basic records and hence can rarely know if the filed reports are accurate or falsified. There is, moreover, no requirement that such basic records must be made and kept by the union in the first instance. The only applicable provision in this connection is section 105 which merely requires unions to make and keep basic records in connection with financial transactions. Inasmuch as the trusteeship reporting requirements include nothing of a financial nature, the only requirement is that they not be destroyed or concealed if the union chooses to make or keep them, which it need not do.

XVI. Probable cause in connection with the Secretary's authority to bring suit to enforce the trusteeship and election provisions of the bill (secs. 204 and 302): At Republican insistence, an amendment was adopted giving the Secretary power similar to that of other regulatory agencies to investigate for violations of the bill's financial reporting requirements. This was done by striking out the restrictive phrase "probable cause" to believe violations had been committed and permitting the Secretary to investigate when he believes violations had been committed or are about to be committed. Retention of the original language, particularly the phrase "probable cause" would have completely nullified the Secretary's investigative effectiveness. Nevertheless, the restrictive phrase "probable cause" is still retained in two other significant parts of the bill. Section 204 gives the Secretary authority to sue in a Federal court to remedy violations of the bill's trusteeship provisions and section 302 to remedy violations of the provisions dealing with the election and removal of union officers. In each case, however, the same three conditions are imposed upon the Secretary's bringing suit. First, he must have a complaint from a union member; and second, he must have probable cause to believe (1) that a violation has occurred, and (2) that it has not been remedied. And just as the Secretary's power to investigate was limited by the phrase "probable cause," so is his power to sue on behalf of those complaining union members to whom the bill does not guarantee the access to the basic union records which would enable them to furnish the evidence necessary to meet the requirement of a showing of probable cause. Thus, this combination of lack of access to basic union records, coupled with the requirement to show probable cause, in effect, renders the remedies under the trusteeship and election provisions almost wholly illusory. Suffice it to say that no comparable Federal statute in the labor field conditions a suit upon probable cause, neither the Taft-Hartley, Fair Labor Standards, nor Walsh-Healey Acts. The Democrats rejected Republican amendments to strike out probable cause as was done in connection with the Secretary's investigative powers, but no reason for this difference in treatment has yet been forthcoming.

XVII. Rights of candidates for union office (sec. 301(b)): This section purports to guarantee rival candidates for union office the same facilities for reaching the membership as the incumbent officers. Senator Prouty's proposal to give them access to the union membership lists for 30 days was first accepted, then rejected by the Democrats in favor of a provision which does not give such access but purports to provide equal campaigning facilities for all candidates. The joker in this one is that the machinery all remains in the hands of the incumbent officers.

XVIII. Secret ballot in union elections (sec. 502(j)): This section defines "secret ballot," but does not exclude voting by proxy. The Democrats rejected a Republican amendment to assure that proxy voting was prohibited, thus leaving a loophole for election abuses.

XIX. Preservation of election and convention records (sec. 301): This section requires union officials to preserve for 1 year all ballots, election records, credentials of convention delegates, and all minutes and other convention records pertaining to the election of officers. But again there is no provision requiring that access be given to these records to union members or even rival candidates. Inasmuch as the Secretary can begin court action for violation of the election provisions only upon complaint of a union member, and upon a showing of probable cause, it is obvious that his remedial powers are sadly restricted. How can a complaining union member secure evidence amounting to probable cause of a violation if he is denied access to the basic election records and documents? Again we have an appearance of a remedy without the reality.

XX. Preemption of State laws by bill's election provisions (sec. 303): This section specifically preempts all State laws dealing with challenging a union election which has already been conducted, thus making the bill's provisions in this respect the sole remedy available to union members. The catch here is that many State laws provide more expeditious and effective remedies in this area than does the committee bill. The Democrats rejected a Republican amendment to preserve remedies available under State law.

XXI. Union organizations known as conferences, joint councils, State and district councils, and other associations of unions (sec. 501(h)(i): The McClellan Rackets Committee hearings revealed that some of the worst manifestations of corruption and racketeering in the labor movement were to be found in organizations which are associations of labor unions rather than of individual employees, such as conferences, joint boards, State and district labor councils, etc. The most notorious example, of course, are the regional conferences into which the Teamsters are divided, particularly the Western Conference of Teamsters formerly headed by Frank Brewster. Associations of this kind are not labor organizations under existing law nor would they be under the committee bill for they do not bargain collectively, do not represent employees for collective bargaining purposes, do not enter into collective bargaining agreements, and employees neither participate in their activities nor hold direct membership therein. Hence, these organizations, many of them extremely corrupt, as well as their officers and employees, are left completely untouched by the committee bill. Republican amendments to remedy this were rejected.

XXII. The no man's land problem (sec. 601): The no man's land is one of the most serious problems in labor-management relations. Senator KENNEDY himself has admitted that his own original proposal in his bill to compel the National Labor Relations Board to exercise all of its jurisdiction and take every case even if it was primarily local in character, is not an acceptable solution. Nevertheless the majority accepted Senator MORSE's amendment, now in the committee bill, which for all practical purposes, does exactly what the original Kennedy bill would have done but appears to be doing something different. It requires the Federal Board to assert all of its jurisdiction but permits it to cede jurisdiction (in cases which are primarily local) to the States to administer the Taft-Hartley Act but only through an administrative agency and not through the State courts. Under the provisions of the bill, these State agencies would be mere arms of the Federal Board subject to its control in every significant respect, and all judicial appeals would be through the Federal courts exclusively. To implement this provision would require every State in the Union to enact new legislation and 40 of them, which do not now have such an agency, to create one. Under normal circumstances it might well take decades before they all took the necessary legislative action. But the scheme so completely negates the sovereign character of the several States, that it is impossible to believe that any of them would voluntarily submit one of their independent governmental agencies, to the subordinate, even degrading status, to which the proposal would reduce them. But behind this completely unrealistic provision, hidden like a raisin in a cake, is the concrete fact that if the proposal is adopted, the Federal Board would be compelled to take every case affecting interstate commerce. The present time lag of the Board in case handling is about 2 years. This provision would extend it to 3, possibly 4 years. The small employer, his employees, and the unions which deal with them would be given a forum which they do not now have, but they still wouldn't get the quick and effective relief they so urgently need. The "no man's land" would be eliminated, but the "no man's land" problem would remain as unsolved as it is now.

XXIII. Communications between attorney and client: From time immemorial the communications made by a client to his lawyer, like those between patient and doctor, priest and penitent, etc., have been regarded as sacred, and the right to keep these communications confidential is protected by law in every State in the Union. Some of the provisions of the committee bill, particularly those that require reporting by labor relations consultants, experts or advisers raise a problem in this regard because many of these people are lawyers and the people for whom they act are their clients. The American Bar Association within the past few weeks vigorously urged that the labor bills specifically protect this traditional aspect of the attorney-client relationship. The Republicans offered an amendment to that effect which the Democrats rejected, their position seeming to be that it is already protected under existing law. As indicated, that is certainly true under State law—but it is questionable if there is any Federal law which provides similar protection.

XXIV. Allocation of jurisdiction as between the States and the Federal Government as contained in various provisions of the committee bill: The committee bill distributes its remedies as between the States and the Federal Government in accordance with no discernible standard or consistent principle. Some remedies are exclusively Federal, some are left to the States and denied to the Federal Government, some are given to the States but only if they apply Federal law, and some are allocated to both the States and Federal Government. In some instances, the majority insisted upon exclusive Federal jurisdiction asserting that absolute uniformity was essential; in others, it was insisted that diversity of treatment under varying State laws was preferable. The following are the eight major provisions in which an allocation of jurisdiction was made:

1. Fiduciary obligations: The bill creates no Federal fiduciary nor remedy. This is left entirely to the States, which in fact, have no statutory law on the subject and very little case law. Interestingly, New York State has just enacted a labor reform bill which imposes stringent fiduciary obligations on union officials and gives union members themselves the right to sue for breach thereof. But the New York State AFL–CIO, the largest State labor federation in the country, with over 2 million members, opposed the bill, its principal objection being that State governments should permit the Federal Government to enact a law that would have a uniform effect throughout the country. This is exactly the reverse of the position taken by the Democrats in committee on the subject of fiduciary obligations and remedies.

2. Suits to recover embezzled union funds: But, having taken this position on fiduciaries, the Democrats made an exception permitting union members to sue in either State or Federal courts under Federal law to recover embezzled union funds while preserving their right to bring a similar suit under State law in State courts. No reason for the distinction in treatment is discernible.

3. Embezzlement of union funds: This is made a Federal crime while preserving the right of the States to prosecute in State courts as a State crime.

4. Extortion picketing: This adds a new Federal crime although it is already a crime under State law (which is not preempted) and probably a Federal crime as well under the Hobbs antiracketeering statute. What the effect is on the Hobbs Act, nobody knows.

5. Extortion to permit unloading of trucks: Adds a new Federal crime although it is already a crime under State law (which is not preempted) and probably a Federal crime as well under the Hobbs Act, the effect upon which is again unknown.

6. Trusteeships:

(a) Creates a Federal court action by the Secretary of Labor for violation.

(b) Doesn't preempt State law remedies, but if union member chooses the Federal remedy (through the Secretary) he can't use the State remedy.

7. Election safeguards:

(a) Creates a Federal court action by the Secretary to challenge an election which has already been held and preempts any similar State remedy. The Secretary's remedy is exclusive and is the only one the union member may use—he loses his State remedy.

(b) But if there are abuses in connection with an election prior to its being held, the bill provides no Federal remedy at all. The union member's only relief can come only through whatever State law may exist on this subject.

8. The no man's land: Here, everything is turned over entirely and exclusively to the Federal Government with the sole unrealistic exception that the States may administer the Federal law only (Taft-Hartley) through administrative agencies and not the courts. These agencies would be virtually arms of the Federal Labor Board with little or no independent power or status, and in any event would be permitted to take only those cases which were primarily local in character, and where although technically there was an effect on interstate commerce, such effect was remote and insubstantial.

CALL OF THE ROLL

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

HATE BOMBINGS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, we received word over the news tickers the radio, and television this morning of an explosion which damaged the home of Mr. and Mrs. George Rayfield, of Collins Park, a suburb of Wilmington, Del. Mr. and Mrs. Rayfield are Negroes.

This represents one of those situations which indicate that a home has been bombed by way of intimidation, to keep people from living in a certain section of a town.

Mr. President, there are now pending before the Senate Committee on the Judiciary a number of measures to deal with such incidents, which are popularly called "hate bombings," such as that which occurred in Collins Park last night. I am sponsoring one bill. The administration has such a bill. The majority leader has such a bill.

I think this is a rather grim punctuation mark showing the urgency for getting action upon those bills. I direct the attention of the committee to this situation, and I hope very much that we shall have early action upon the so-called hate bombing bills, in an effort to make some measurable progress at an early date, and to enable the FBI to act on these situations which we have now observed occur not only in the South, but in a northern State—in this instance—in Delaware.

PRESIDENTIAL INABILITY

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, on December 31, 1958, the committee on Federal Constitution of the New York State Bar Association issued a report on Presidential inability. I am glad to be able to say that the report comes out wholeheartedly in favor of the solution contained in Senate Joint Resolution 161 of the 85th Congress, which was not acted upon by the Senate last year, and Senate Joint Resolution 40 of the present Congress, which I introduced along with Senators DIRKSEN and HENNINGS, and which is pending before the Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments. I ask unanimous consent to have published at this point in the RECORD this report by the committee and a letter from the chairman, Mr. Cornelius W. Wickersham, to Senator EASTLAND, bringing the committee's report to the attention of the Judiciary Committee.

I also call attention to an article on this same subject which was contained in the December 19, 1958, edition of the Yale Law Review. This is an article by the ex-Attorney General, Mr. Herbert Brownell, Jr., and it, too, comes out wholeheartedly in favor of this same solution to this vexing problem. Mr. President, this question of Presidential inability was discussed at a meeting of the Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments on March 9, 1959. There was a general disposition in favor of Senate Joint Resolution 40, with minor subcommittee amendments. The subcommittee favored prompt action on this measure, but it was decided to invite the present distinguished Attorney General, Mr. Rogers, to give further testimony, before taking final action on the measure. However, I hope that the subcommittee can make a recommendation to the full Judiciary Committee in the very near future.

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

CADWALADER, WICKERSHAM & TAFT,
New York, March 19, 1959.

Hon. JAMES O. EASTLAND,
Chairman, Senate Judiciary Committee, Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR EASTLAND: You will recall that former Attorney General Brownell, when he submitted his statement on Presidential inability to a subcommittee of the House Committee on the Judiciary on April 1, 1957, stated that the problem of continuation of orderly government if a President was unable to act was a practical problem of Government which should be met without delay.

The committee of the New York State Bar Association which has considered the question of Presidential inability for some time past made a unanimous report which was approvad in January of this year by the executive committee of the New York State Bar Association by unanimous vote, copy of which I enclose.

As chairman of the committee I am instructed to request that your committee give consideration to this vital question and it is our hope that you will agree with us that a constitutional amendment is necessary and that it should take the form that we have recommended as set forth at the top of page 3 of our report.

You will note also our conclusion that last year's Senate Joint Resolution 161, which died with final adjournment of the 85th Congress, seems to us to be preferable to the other methods that have been suggested in the event that your committee should not agree with our recommendations.

In the sincere hope that your committee will not allow this vital question to die again in committee, we urge you to bring the matter before your committee for consideration and action.

In this atomic age the present nebulous situation is not only dangerous, but unless corrected could easily lead to disaster.

With personal regards.

Faithfully yours,

CORNELIUS W. WICKERSHAM.

NEW YORK STATE BAR ASSOCIATION—REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON FEDERAL CONSTITUTION, DECEMBER 31, 1958

To the Members of the New York State Bar Association:

REPORT RECOMMENDING AMENDMENT ON PRESIDENTIAL INABILITY

The Federal Constitution now leaves open the determination of what constitutes inability of the President of the United States, and fails to provide the method of determining either the beginning or the end of the disability. This fact has been a matter of embarrassment to the Government in the past and could be a matter of national disaster in the future.

The problem arises under the fifth clause of section 1 of article II, which reads as follows:

"In case of the removal of the President from office, or of his death, resignation, or inability to discharge the powers and duties of the said office, the same shall devolve on the Vice President, and the Congress may by law provide for the case of removal, death, resignation or inability, both of the President and Vice President, declaring what officer shall then act as President, and such officer shall act accordingly, until the disability be removed, or a President shall be elected."

Thus Congress is authorized to provide for the case of removal, death, resignation or inability of both President and Vice President, declaring what officer shall then act as President, until the disability is removed, or a President elected. In consequence, Congress has enacted the so-called Succession Acts, designating who shall so act.

But the Constitution fails to give similar authority to Congress with respect to the matter here discussed. Only an amendment to the Constitution can cure this defect.

Several suggestions have been made proposing an act of Congress or an amendment, none of which appear to be adequate to meet the issue in a manner that would be understood by or acceptable to the American people—a consideration of highest importance. These include proposals that the President should make the determination, or the Vice President or the Cabinet or both; or that a commission either of selected officials or distinguished citizens should be appointed for the purpose. Another proposal is that the matter be referred to the courts. And there are other suggestions.

But these are matters that by proper constitutional practice should be decided by Congress—the representatives of the people of the country. Just as the Constitution now authorizes Congress to provide by law for succession where both President and Vice President are unable to act, so should similar authority be given to Congress to provide the method of determination of the vital question of inability to act.

Moreover, each of the various proposed methods of determination is untried and open to objections. To freeze any one method into the Constitution now would make correction in the light of future experience or change of circumstances extremely difficult, because it would require an additional constitutional amendment. This danger can be avoided by a constitutional amendment which gives Congress the power to select the method; then correction or improvement could be made at any time by Congress enacting a new law.

The question of what happens on the death of the President and whether the Vice President then succeeds to the office, or succeeds only to the powers and duties of the office, has been settled by historical tradition. As we all know, the Vice President is sworn in as President upon the death of the President.

Presumably, the same thing would happen in case of the resignation of the President or of his removal from office. Presumably also, in case of Presidential inability, the Vice President would only be authorized to act as President, succeeding to the powers and duties of the office only. But this conclusion has been questioned. The words "the same" have never been construed and this fact adds to the confusion which is apparent in the recent discussions on the subject in Washington and elsewhere. It is of the highest importance that the Constitution should be clear on this point, and that the text should be readily understandable not only to lawyers but to laymen as well.

As a result it is felt by this committee that a constitutional amendment is necessary, and that the amendment should provide in substance: (a) That the commencement and termination of any inability should be determined by such method as Congress shall by law provide; and (b) in case of the inability of the President, that the Vice President should succeed only to the powers and

duties of the office and not to the office itself.

At best it is extremely doubtful whether Congress has power to deal with the matter without a constitutional amendment and clearly any ambiguity of the present provisions cannot be cured by act of Congress alone.

This committee concludes that a constitutional amendment is necessary for any final or authoritative solution of the problem and recommends that the fifth clause of section 1 of article II of the Constitution should be amended to read as follows:

"In case of the removal of the President from office, or of his death or resignation, the said office shall devolve on the Vice President. In case of the inability of the President to discharge the powers and duties of the said office, the said powers and duties shall devolve on the Vice President, until the inability be removed. The Congress may by law provide for the case of removal, death, resignation, or inability, both of the President and Vice President, declaring what officer shall then be President, or in case of inability, act as President, and such officer shall be or act as President accordingly, until a President shall be elected or, in case of inability, until the inability shall be earlier removed. The commencement and termination of any inability shall be determined by such method as Congress shall by law provide."

If this amendment is adopted it would mean that in case of the death, resignation or removal from office of the President, the Vice President would be sworn in as President. In case of the President's inability, however, the Vice President would only act as President, having his powers and duties, until the inability was removed or a President elected. Congress would be called upon to enact legislation providing the method by which the commencement and termination of any inability should be determined.

In view of the amount of time that would necessarily pass before the adoption of the amendment there would be plenty of opportunity for the congressional committees to consider what method should be adopted by Congress for this determination.

In case of the inability of both the President and Vice President, the change contained in the amendment proposed above is designed to make it plain that the officer who shall then act as President under and pursuant to the Succession Act shall do so on a temporary basis until the inability is removed or a President elected.

It is believed that no amendment would be sufficient to meet the problem without (1) providing for the determination of the question of commencement and termination of inability of the President or the Vice President, and (2) without separating the provisions relating to inability from those relating to death, resignation or removal, thus removing any ambiguity involved in the present language.

The committee does not believe that the amendment should prescribe the methods for determination of the facts relating to inability. It is better constitutional practice to leave that matter to Congress, which under our proposed amendment Congress would be authorized to provide for by legislation. As already indicated, we believe the best solution to be a constitutional amendment such as that which we have recommended above. We have, however, examined other proposals, and of these we believe that Senate Joint Resolution 161, introduced in the Senate March 4, 1958, by Senator KEFAUVER, on behalf of himself and Senators DIRKSEN, HENNINGS, HRUSKA, JOHNSTON of South Carolina, LANGER, WATKINS, JENNER, and BUTLER, offers a solution which we would favor as second best to the proposal of our committee. Senate Joint Resolution 161, proposing a constitutional amendment, was reported favorably by a subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee, and its bipartisan sponsors constituted more than a majority of that committee. However, the full committee took no action. (Hearings had been held in 1957 by a subcommittee of the House Judiciary Committee, at which our committee's proposal was submitted, and in 1958 by the subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee, at which our committee's report was submitted substantially as above set forth and a member of our committee testified.)

In brief, Senate Joint Resolution 161 first provides that the Vice President shall become President for the unexpired portion of the current term in case of the removal from office, death, or resignation of the President (sec. 1). It then provides that if the President declares his inability in writing his powers and duties shall be discharged by the Vice President as Acting President (sec. 2). If the President does not so declare, the Vice President, if satisfied that inability exists, and upon written approval of a majority of the Cabinet, shall assume the discharge of the powers and duties, as Acting President (sec. 3). Then follow somewhat elaborate provisions for determination of the end of the disability by the President, and his resumption of powers and duties, subject to action by Congress if the Vice President, with similar Cabinet approval, declares his opinion that inability has not ended (sec. 4). A further section authorizes Congress to provide by law for the case of removal, death, resignation, or inability, both of the President and Vice President (sec. 5).

Also in March 1958 the House Judiciary Committee rejected Representative KEATING's proposed constitutional amendment (creating a disability commission similar to that contemplated by Representative CELLER's proposed statute, which had been reported favorably by a House Judiciary Subcommittee) and referred the whole matter back to the subcommittee. Subsequently Representative KEATING issued a statement endorsing Senate Joint Resolution 161, which he characterized as the administration proposal. Senate Joint Resolution 161 died with the final adjournment of the 85th Congress, and no proposal was reported out by either the House Judiciary Committee or the Senate Judiciary Committee.

Senate Joint Resolution 161 specifies the method and machinery for determining the commencement and termination of disability. This precludes leaving to Congress the details which might have to be changed in the future because the method selected proved to be unsatisfactory. Senate Joint Resolution 161 appears to us to be preferable, however, to other methods that have been suggested.

Now that extended hearings have been held by both Judiciary Committees, and much thought expressed by a wide variety of informed persons, and much education accomplished by public discussion, we urge the committees of the new Congress to come to a conclusion and submit to Congress a solution for this most urgent national problem.

Dated: December 31, 1958.

Respectfully submitted.

Cornelius W. Wickersham, *Chairman;* Theodore Pearson, *Secretary;* Eli H. Bronstein; John W. MacDonald; Leonard P. Moore; Joseph J. Perrini; Churchill Rodgers; Arthur H. Schwartz; Arthur H. Dean; Martin Taylor; Orison S. Marden; Welles V. Moot; George Roberts; Elihu Root, Jr.; Harrison Tweed.

MORE POLARIS SUBMARINES BEING ORDERED

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, for more than a year I have been prodding, pushing, and pleading for faster production of nuclear-powered Polaris missile submarines.

I am convinced possession of sufficient numbers of these weapons will achieve more for our national defense and security than any other single thing we can do.

Polaris submarines can give our defense the most punch for the least money. They do not require great escort fleets or elaborate foreign bases. They will operate as mobile and elusive launching platforms, capable of firing hydrogen-tipped ballistic missiles against enemy targets 1,500 miles away, even when they are submerged beneath the seas or the polar icecap.

Congress has already authorized the construction of nine of these submarines, but only six have been started.

As a first step in a drive to expand our fleet of Polaris submarines, I have urged the Secretary of Defense to order an immediate start on the construction of the three already authorized. Funds for them have already been appropriated by Congress, and the authority to build them has been lying idle at the Pentagon since last summer.

The Defense Department has now responded. Assistant Secretary of Defense McNeil advised me this morning that the Secretary of Defense has approved a Navy plan to proceed with the immediate construction of these three submarines. He indicated that bids are now being sought and that contract awards will be made by July 1 or shortly thereafter.

Secretary McNeil also indicated that the Navy has been authorized to proceed with the procurement of very long lead-time items for three additional Polaris submarines, authorization for which will be required in subsequent years.

This evidence of faster action on Polaris submarines is heartening as a first step in the expansion of our fleet of these submarines to the size required by our national safety and security. I hope the Department of Defense will follow through and order the construction of Polaris submarines as rapidly as they can be built. I shall continue to urge this course.

I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, a copy of my telegram to Secretary McElroy dated March 28, and a copy of the reply I received today from Assistant Secretary McNeil. I also ask unanimous consent to include an editorial from the Manchester, N.H., Union Leader of April 1, 1959, on this subject.

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

MARCH 28, 1959.

Hon. NEIL MCELROY,
Secretary of Defense,
Department of Defense,
Washington, D.C.:

Voyage of *Skate* provides solid new evidence of ability of nuclear-powered submarines to operate under and through polar ice, and a graphic illustration of how Polaris submarine can use icecap to mask its moves until it breaks through and fires its 1,500-mile missile against an enemy target.

Urge you to order immediate start on three Polaris submarines funded by Congress last year. Authority to build three is lying idle

now. I am convinced prompt action to build these submarines will do more for our national defense and security than any other move we could make. It gives the most punch for the least money, with no great escort fleet and no foreign bases.

NORRIS COTTON,
U.S. Senator.

OFFICE OF THE
SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, D.C., April 8, 1959.

DEAR SENATOR COTTON: This is in response to your telegram of March 28, 1959, urging the early construction of the three Polaris submarines for which appropriations have been made by Congress.

The Secretary of Defense has approved the plan of the Navy to proceed with construction of these submarines, bids are now being sought and contract awards will be made by July 1 or shortly thereafter.

In addition, the Navy has been authorized to proceed with the procurement of very long lead time items for three additional Polaris submarines, authorization for which will be required in subsequent years.

Sincerely,

W. J. MCNEIL,
Comptroller, Assistant Secretary of Defense.

[From the Manchester Union-Leader, Apr. 1, 1959]

WEAPONS FOR WAR AND PEACE

When Vice Adm. Hyman G. Rickover, father of the atomic submarine, pleads for a fleet of nuclear-powered killer submarines to meet the threat of missile attacks by Soviet underwater vessels, it is not because of pride in his own pet projects. Rickover is too practical a man for that.

On the contrary, it is because he shares the feeling of alarm so often expressed by this newspaper that Soviet submarines might hit Atlantic coast cities with a veritable torrent of atomic or hydrogen bombs carried by missiles, and thus irreparably damage this Nation's retaliatory potential.

As in everything he does, Admiral Rickover has once again insisted that the Nation face up to facts. "The Russians," he warns, "have about 450 or 475 submarines to our 110. We have built 25 since the end of World War II and they have built about 350." Complacent officials in the Defense Department have continually assured us that, as far as is known, the Russians do not have atomic submarines. But, as Rickover so pointedly observed, even conventional subs can carry and fire missiles and destroy our large industrial cities.

The atomic submarine, of course, is a dual-purpose weapon. This point was made clear when Senator NORRIS COTTON almost simultaneously with Admiral Rickover demanded a stepup in production of missile-firing Polaris submarines. COTTON's demand, which he has frequently voiced in the past, was prompted by the recent under-ice North Pole voyage of the atomic submarine *Skate*. Senator COTTON stressed the importance of using the polar icecap to hide fleets of submarines which can break through and fire their missiles against targets deep in Russia.

It is of course, true that while preparing for war we must also pray for peace. That is why the weapons demanded by Admiral Rickover and Senator COTTON are so vitally important. They are not only our surest guarantees of victory if war ever comes, but also effective deterrents to surprise attack by the Communists.

YESTERDAY'S CELEBRATION OF WORLD HEALTH DAY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, yesterday, April 7, represented an important landmark in human relations.

It marked the day of the coming into force 11 years ago of the constitution of the World Health Organization—the world's chosen instrument for spearheading health advances.

It was a particular source of interest that World Health Day, 1959, was dedicated to one particular health problem—that of the mental health of mankind. The day's theme was world "Mental Health and Mental Illness."

My colleagues are aware that mental illness in the United States and other countries is a scourge of incalculable magnitude. The figures show that 550,000 hospital beds in the United States—every other bed in our country—is occupied by a patient suffering from some mental disorder.

The number of Americans who are ill with less serious mental problems runs into the millions. When one thinks of the impact of mental ill health on children particularly, one realizes that here is a health problem of tremendous concern to ourselves and to all mankind.

In paying tribute, therefore, to the World Health Organization, we recall mental health specifically, as a key element in international and national well-being.

Upon sound, healthy minds depends the future of this, or any other country.

Let me note, too, in this connection, that in 1960 there will be observed World Mental Health Year. Under the able auspices of the World Federation for Mental Health, a WHO-affiliated organization, all of the countries will be invited to redouble their efforts in prevention and treatment of mental illness. I know that the United States will contribute effectively to the success of World Mental Health Year.

Here in the United States, the National Association of Mental Health is the principal private voluntary channel for stimulating mental health advance, just as the National Institute for Mental Health is our major public channel.

A great many other fine organizations are, of course, active on a private basis, such as the American Psychiatric Association, the National Committee Against Mental Illness, and others.

For World Mental Health Year, 1960, five specific areas have been singled out by the World Federation for intensified worldwide effort: First, worldwide study of childhood mental health; second, cross-cultural surveys of attitudes to mental disorder; third, mental health teaching in professional education; fourth, mental health and developing industrialization; and fifth, psychological problems of migration.

World Mental Health Year, 1960, will serve as an interesting forerunner of the International Public Health and Medical Research Year, which it is believed, will commence in June 1961. The latter year will, of course, embrace all of the diseases known to mankind.

It has been my pleasure to discuss plans for World Mental Health Year with two of the leaders who are playing a most active role in bringing it into being: Dr. Jack Rees, of London, director of the World Federation; and Dr. Frank Fremont-Smith, of New York, medical director of the Josiah Macy, Jr., Foundation. Both of these distinguished physicians are past presidents of the World Federation.

On May 12 in Geneva, the 12th World Health Assembly will open its sessions. The International Public Health and Medical Research Year will, of course, be on its agenda.

Shortly before that date, I shall issue my personal report to the Senate Committee on Government Operations on the subject of WHO, based on my consultations with it during my trip to Europe in November and based on my subsequent review of that great organization.

I invite now the attention of my colleagues to Committee Print No. 3 of the international health study being made by the Government Operations Subcommittee of which I am chairman. This print is entitled "The Status of World Health." It reports through 81 pages of charts and text on the present situation in world health.

I send to the desk and ask to have printed in the RECORD the text of a fine editorial, published in yesterday's New York Times in tribute to WHO and World Health Day.

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

WORLD HEALTH DAY

Today is being observed as the annual World Health Day of the World Health Organization. The purpose of this observation is to emphasize the world aspect of various health problems and seek the widest range in meeting them.

This year the theme will be "Mental Health and Mental Illness." It is appropriate because it foreshadows the World Mental Health Year, to be observed in 1960, under the auspices of the World Federation for Mental Health. Such a project deserves strong public support.

The realization of the extent of the mental health problem has appalled many persons. In some countries it is probably the largest single obstacle to individual and community health. But against that feeling of apprehension should be placed two great positive gains. First, the whole social attitude toward mental illness has changed for the better in many countries. The change makes it possible to discuss this question as a health problem. Second, there have been enormous advances in diagnosis and therapy. This suggests, at the least, the possibility of far greater gains than those already made.

This should be a day, therefore, of recognizing need and responsibility. It can also be a day of gratification and of hope.

USE OF BITUMINOUS COAL AS ROAD MATERIAL

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, a development in coal research which could benefit thousands of families dependent upon coal as a means of livelihood was announced this week by the Curtiss-Wright Corp. If proposed tests bear out initial claims, bituminous coal, and possibly anthracite, will be used as a base for new materials to be used in highway construction, roofing, shingles, floor tiles, and similar products.

The Philadelphia Inquirer of April 8 carries detailed information on this development. Because of its importance to the economy of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, as well as to that of other

coal-producing States, I ask unanimous consent that the text of these articles be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Philadelphia Inquirer, Apr. 8, 1959]

NEW ROAD MATERIAL MAY AID COAL AREAS

(By John M. Cummings)

HARRISBURG, April 7.—Impressed by what they saw and heard at a demonstration of a new blacktop road paving material, Pennsylvania legislators from the coal producing counties are hopeful chemistry has solved the unemployment problem in their sorely afflicted areas.

The new material, a binder with bituminous coal as its base, was described as having qualities that make it superior to asphalt in highway construction. Its developers, the Curtiss-Wright Corp., so far have not tested it against concrete, but confidence in its ability to meet this competition was freely expressed.

So far, the immediate hope is confined to the bituminous producing counties. But Roy T. Hurley, chairman and president of Curtiss-Wright, said research in anthracite has produced some satisfactory and promising results.

Just what the researchers expect to develop from hard coal is something of a mystery. The ingredients that go into the road binder, other than soft coal, also are a closely guarded secret.

So many and varied are the products of the chemists' laboratory, that no great surprise would be occasioned if the new creation should prove the basis of a revival in the bituminous fields, for a starter.

Republican and Democratic legislators who saw the demonstration last night readily agreed with Curtiss-Wright that a practical test should be given the material without undue delay. To this end there is to be bipartisan sponsorship of a bill earmarking a half million in highway funds for the construction of 12 half-mile sections on well-traveled roads to determine if in actual use it comes up to laboratory promise.

For years hardheaded businessmen have been seeking methods of using coal other than combustion. The collapse of the anthracite industry due to the encroachment of oil and gas, has created virtually blight conditions in some of the eastern counties. In the western and central counties, where bituminous underlies the surface in vast quantities, there is a widespread unemployment because of the decline in the use of this fuel in industry.

Curtiss-Wright chemists have found uses for the new material other than in road-building. Roofing, shingles, floor tiles, tar paper, pipes, conduits and automobile undercoating may be fashioned from the process.

The material was developed at the Curtiss-Wright research center located at Quehanna in Clearfield County.

We may be in for quite an industrial fight. Asphalt interests, centered in Pittsburgh, are not expected to receive the intruder with open arms. Secretary of Highways Martin, who witnessed last night's demonstration, was reserved in his comment. His was a wait-and-see attitude, natural enough in the circumstances.

If the material holds up under road tests, it could mean a new day in the coal fields. It is estimated 2,200 tons of coal would be used in a mile of two-lane highway. And when you think of all the roadbuilding going on these days, with more to come, you have the reason for the new gleam in the eyes of lawmakers from the soft coal counties at the conclusion of the demonstration.

[From the Philadelphia Inquirer, Apr. 8, 1959]

COAL PLAN OK BY LAWRENCE

HARRISBURG, April 7.—Gov. David L. Lawrence said today he was "very much impressed" by a new process to use coal for road building and other purposes. He said he would be "very happy" if the legislature would provide funds to support the process on an experimental basis.

Curtiss-Wright Corp., which developed the process, unveiled it at a dinner for legislators and State officials here Monday night. Roy T. Hurley, chairman and president of the corporation, said $500,000 would be needed to build a pilot plant and construct 12 half-mile stretches of roadway to test the material.

Governor Lawrence said he thought the new development might prove to be a tremendous spur to the use of coal and thereby improve the State's economy and create jobs.

Hurley estimated it would take up to 2,200 tons of coal to build a mile of two-lane roadway with the new material.

AMENDMENT OF REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 2 OF 1953

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that S. 144, the REA bill, be now considered and that notwithstanding the arrival of the hour of 2 o'clock, its consideration, if not disposed of, be continued at that time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCCARTHY in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered. The Chair lays the bill before the Senate.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 144) to amend Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1953.

MICHIGAN'S DEMOCRATIC DECADE

Mr. MCNAMARA. Mr. President, there are few instances in American political history which can match the dramatic rise of the Democratic Party in Michigan in only a single decade.

Under the banner of our Governor, G. Mennen Williams, dedicated party workers and millions of citizens interested in the welfare of their State have achieved victory after victory.

This rise was climaxed on Monday of this week when the results of Michigan's spring election gave the Democrats victories in 11 of 14 State offices which were at stake.

For the first time in Michigan history, the Democratic Party gained control of all four major State educational boards.

It gained one Republican seat each on the State board of education, the governing boards of the University of Michigan and Michigan State University, and it took five of the six seats on the newly created Wayne State University board of governors.

Despite these impressive Democratic results, the Republicans and some of their newspapers have frantically sought just one little ray of sunshine so that they could call Monday's election a GOP victory.

They found their excuse in the fact that the Republicans were able to hold on to three unsalaried offices which they already occupied. Thus was the basis for victory claims.

Joining this rose-colored glasses crew was none other than the Vice President of the United States.

In what probably will go down as the biggest political laugh of the year, he sent a telegram to Michigan Republicans congratulating them for their first statewide victory since 1955.

Mr. President, if the Republicans score another such victory, they are dead.

Simple statistics show that Republican officeholders in Michigan are becoming about as extinct as the dodo bird.

In 1948, for example, the Democrats held but 2 of the 35 statewide offices.

In 1959, after Monday's election, the Democrats now hold 32 of the 41 State posts.

From that comparison, one can see why the Republicans can become ecstatic over the fact that there were three unsalaried jobs they did not lose.

I ask unanimous consent that a chart comparing statewide elective offices in Michigan during the past decade be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

I also ask unanimous consent that an article describing the election appearing in today's New York Times and one giving the reply of Democratic Chairman Paul M. Butler to the Vice President's telegram also be printed in the RECORD.

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

Comparison of statewide elective posts in Michigan, by party, 1948–59

Office	1959		1948	
	Democrat	Republican	Democrat	Republican
Administrative board (Governor, Lieutenant Governor, department heads)	8	0	0	8
U.S. Senators	2	0	0	2
State supreme court	5	3	2	6
University of Michigan	5	3	0	8
Michigan State University	5	1	0	6
Wayne State University	5	1	(1)	(1)
Board of education	2	1	0	3
Total	32	9	2	33

[1] Not in existence as a State university.

[From the New York Times, Apr. 8, 1959]

DEMOCRATS GAIN IN MICHIGAN VOTE—WIN 11 OF 14 STATEWIDE POSTS—REPUBLICANS HEARTENED BY THEIR THREE VICTORIES

(By Damon Stetson)

DETROIT, April 7.—Michigan Democrats capped 10 years of steady election gains today by winning control of the State's four major educational boards.

Nearly complete returns from yesterday's biennial spring election also gave the Democrats a 2-year continuance of their 5-to-3 majority on the State supreme court, although candidates nominated by party conventions ran with a nonpartisan designation.

In strengthening their hold on key offices in Michigan, the Democrats elected 9 of 12 candidates for educational positions, plus the two incumbent supreme court justices nominated by their party.

Republicans, on the other hand, appeared heartened by narrow victories in three contests. Lawrence Lindemer, Republican State

chairman, called these triumphs a breakthrough that he interpreted as a "definite resurgence in the party."

Gov. G. Mennen Williams, a Democrat and chief architect of his party's recent rise in power, said the election results were a rebuke to Republicans who had played politics with the State's solvency and credit.

The Governor had urged voters to oppose Republicans because of the State senate's inaction in the fiscal crisis, which he has said could result in payless paydays for State employees next month unless action is taken.

The State senate has before it a bill providing for the mortgaging of the veterans' trust fund as a means of raising the cash needed to relieve the situation.

Dr. Lynn M. Bartlett, superintendent of public instruction and a Democrat, was reelected by a margin of about 40,000 votes over his Republican opponent, Hugh H. Holloway.

In several of the other races the margins were even smaller. But in the court contests Justice George Edwards had a plurality of more than 260,000 votes, and Justice John D. Voelker, author under a pseudonym of the novel "Anatomy of a Murder," won by nearly 200,000 votes.

The Democrats, in addition to retaining the superintendent of public instruction, gained a Republican seat on the State board of education and thereby achieved a two to one majority for the first time.

They also increased the Democratic majority from four to two to five to one on the State board of agriculture governing Michigan State University, gained a five to three advantage on the board of regents of the University of Michigan, which was formerly split four to four, and won five of six seats on the board of governors of Wayne State University.

Republicans and Democrats elected one new member each to the State house of representatives. The new representatives will fill vacancies and will keep the 110-member house evenly divided, with 55 members from each party.

BOTH SIDES CLAIM VICTORY

WASHINGTON, April 7.—Both Republican and Democratic leaders claimed victory today in Michigan's elections.

Vice President RICHARD M. NIXON sent a telegram to Lawrence B. Lindmer, a Republican leader in Michigan, congratulating the GOP for scoring their first statewide victories since 1955.

The Democratic national chairman, Paul M. Butler, referred to the Nixon telegram in a telegram to Governor Williams. Mr. Butler said it was "the first time I ever heard of a team being congratulated for losing a ball game 11 to 3."

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

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

THE BREAKDOWN IN OUR UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE SYSTEM

Mr. MCNAMARA. Mr. President, there are many reasons why we face a difficult task in preventing the kind of breakdown in our unemployment insurance system that has characterized the last several years. I have already pointed out the shortcomings in our own congressional attention to this vital question.

It is still true, however, that the largest single roadblock is the failure of the Eisenhower administration to face up to facts and to its own responsibility. Yesterday, two articles which appeared in Washington newspapers detailed the reasons why the administration has turned its back on the unemployed. The main reason is the pipeline which the large employers in the country have to the White House.

The influence they enjoy, through White House advisers, amounts to a national scandal. A man who was hired to fight the employers' legislative battles against decent and adequate unemployment insurance standards is now the President's chief adviser on unemployment insurance.

I ask unanimous consent that an excerpt from the article by Drew Pearson, in the Washington Post, and the article by John Herling, in the Washington Daily News, be printed in the RECORD at this point, so the country will know who will determine the fate of the Nation's unemployed.

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

[From the Washington Post]

THE WASHINGTON MERRY-GO-ROUND

(By Drew Pearson)

INSIDE LOBBYING

Behind President Eisenhower's firm refusal to liberalize the unemployment aid program has been the quiet lobbying of big business representative Stanley Rector, who operates very adroitly through the back door of the White House.

His inside contact man is none other than the President's chief counsel, Gerald Morgan, whose former law firm helped Rector fight Federal unemployment insurance. Now Morgan is carrying on the same fight from the vantage point of the President's elbow.

Rector works out of a three-room suite in the Washington Hotel, just around the block from the White House. Last year he spent over $100,000 lobbying against jobless benefits.

His board of directors includes executives from United States Steel, General Motors, Chrysler, Goodyear Tire & Rubber, Socony Mobil Oil, and Allis-Chalmers Manufacturing Co. Over 500 companies contribute from $200 to $2,500 apiece to Rector's operation.

In 1947, Rector hired Morgan's law firm, Morgan & Calhoun, as registered lobbyists. After Morgan entered the White House, he served as adviser to the President on unemployment compensation. As recently as last month, Morgan helped persuade Ike to reject liberal recommendations from Secretary of Labor Mitchell.

What Mitchell wanted to do was extend temporary benefits for jobless workers and overhaul unemployment insurance standards. In the showdown, the President sided with Morgan.

LOBBY LANGUAGE

Earlier, lobbyist Rector argued against these proposals in a letter, dated March 9, to his backers. He contended that any reforms should be left up to the States.

Three days later, President Eisenhower used the same, identical argument at a press conference.

Rector made one interesting concession: "In view of the fast developing showdown fight on Federal benefit standards, a 3- to 6-month extension might well, in the end, prove helpful."

Ike also agreed to this same concession.

"I haven't got such a rigid position about this that I wouldn't listen to something," he told the press. At the same time, he notified Republican congressional leaders that he would accept a 3- to 6-month extension.

It had all the earmarks of a triple play—Rector to Morgan to Eisenhower.

NOTE.—The President repeated his views to eight Governors who belong to the Governors' Executive Committee. The only missing member was New Jersey's Gov. Robert Meyner, who happened to be in the South Pacific on temporary naval duty and who also happens to favor strong Federal unemployment benefits. Meyner asked the White House to fly him to the conference, pointing out that the President as Commander in Chief could relieve him from his naval assignment. Ike flatly refused.

[From the Washington Daily News]

WHAT MITCHELL COULD SAY

(By John Herling)

Tomorrow James P. Mitchell, the troubled Secretary of Labor, stands up to the toughest test of his career. He faces 5,000 delegates to the unemployment conference of the AFL-CIO in the National Guard Armory. Its leadership knows that his private position on unemployment insurance differs sharply from the official position now saddled on him. What will be running through Mr. Mitchell's mind as he looks into the whites of 10,000 union eyes?

Mr. Mitchell's public personality has now been axed down the middle by President Eisenhower. Ike has repeatedly chosen to disregard his Labor Secretary's advice and adopt that of his bitter opponents, whom Mr. Mitchell himself calls reactionary.

"For 5 years now," Mr. Mitchell could tell the assembled delegates, "I have been among those urging the States to raise unemployment benefits and lengthen the payment period. The State legislatures paid not the slightest attention."

Mr. Mitchell might recall: "I told the President this latest recession was the payoff. We had every reason—as a Federal Government—to tell Congress that the law should now be amended by requiring the States to conform to higher standards of benefits, payment and duration.

"It seems to me the Federal responsibility is clear. The President is worried about balancing the budget. But I had important news for him. The higher unemployment insurance standards which we and he thought desirable could be put into effect without its costing the Federal Treasury a cent. There are $7 billion in State unemployment reserve funds which could be used for meeting these higher standards. I told Budget Director Maurice Stans about this. He was jubilant.

"What's more, Stans sees at once that instead of spending nearly $500 million more of Federal money on emergency unemployment compensation, we could save that by bringing permanent Federal standards into action."

This is the way Mr. Mitchell's thinking goes.

"Stans and I prepared a memorandum along these lines. We worked up support in the Cabinet: Health, Education, and Welfare Secretary Arthur Flemming is for this. The ball was rolling. We knew we had to work fast. But somebody in the White House was quicker.

"It was none other than Ike's special counsel, a nimble fellow named Gerald Morgan. Gerry, a chief architect of the Hartley or tougher part of the Taft-Hartley Act, is a close friend and law partner of Leonard Calhoun, hard shell who has fought every step

of the way against liberalizing social security. He, Morgan, and a man named Stanley Rector make up a trinity of reaction. Chief prong, Rector, heads up an outfit supported by most big business groups, masterminds their strategy against improvements in unemployment insurance, State or Federal."

Mr. Mitchell could then tell the audience: "To shorten a painful story, Gerry Morgan told Stans and me, supposedly the labor policy man in the administration, to lay off. He said the President was in his corner, not mine.

"Well, the next thing I knew was what I heard from Ike's news conference. A reporter asked the President what the administration's policy was on unemployment insurance. Ike replied, as Morgan predicted, that the policy remains the States' responsibility. No use arguing. It was clear to me that the voice was the voice of Ike, but the words were those of Morgan, Calhoun, and Rector."

All this keeps tumbling through Mr. Mitchell's mind. But tomorrow, when AFL–CIO President George Meany announces, "We will now hear from our friend, Jim Mitchell," the Labor Secretary will shake off his moment of truth, pick up his official speech, and begin to read it through his glasses darkly.

AMENDMENT OF REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 2 OF 1953

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 144) to amend Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1953.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS], on behalf of himself and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], as a substitute for the language proposed to be inserted by the committee.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, is the pending question on agreeing to the Curtis substitute?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is.

IMPORTANCE OF THE WORLD CONGRESS OF FLIGHT

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, at this time I wish to refer to the World Congress of Flight. I feel that it promises to be not only the first international exposition of its kind in America, but also the most comprehensive aero-space program ever presented in the United States.

Mr. President, the World Congress of Flight is to be held from April 12 through 19 in Las Vegas, Nev. I am certain my colleagues are aware that a World Congress of Flight is about to be held, since items about it have appeared in the press. As a member of the Senate Aeronautical and Space Sciences Committee, I have studied the details of the program of the World Congress of Flight. Some Senators may not have had an opportunity to examine this forthcoming program; hence, I should like to report that the plan is to present the latest information on aircraft, missiles, and space craft through 11 major conferences, 3 major aero demonstrations, and the largest static display of related equipment which has ever been assembled in one area.

Symposiums and conferences which have been planned for the World Congress of Flight will explore flight in terms of international security and human welfare. The social, economic, political, and moral problems which accompany the progress of flight will be analyzed. Flight in its broadest concept as an instrument for all mankind will be presented and scrutinized. The project, in short, Mr. President, is dedicated to the belief that greater world knowledge of aircraft, missiles, and space craft will help bring the world closer to permanent peace.

Representatives from more than 50 nations will participate in this magnificent venture, which is sponsored by the Air Force Association, in cooperation with a number of other well-known, nonprofit private organizations.

The World Congress of Flight will bring together ambassadors and air attachés of the NATO and SEATO nations, educators from more than 30 countries, State superintendents of schools from more than 40 States, flight safety specialists from some 20 countries, and executives from more than 1,000 American companies. Engineers and technicians will come to the World Congress of Flight from more than 50 countries. Executives and chief pilots will represent the world's airlines. Directors of aviation will come to the World Congress on Flight from 35 States. The roster of scientists who will be present includes several hundred distinguished names. Test pilots and private pilots from a host of nations will be present.

Time does not permit me to dwell in great detail on the specifics of the World Congress of Flight; but I should like to call attention to the Jet Age Conference, which will be attended by such outstanding persons in the field of aviation as Gen. Curtis E. LeMay, Vice Chief of Staff of the U.S. Air Force; Sir William P. Hildred, director-general, International Air Transportation Association; the Honorable E. R. Quesada, Administrator, Federal Aviation Agency; and the Honorable Walter Binaghi, president of the council, International Civil Aviation Organization.

Another of the conferences which will be held at the World Congress of Flight will be the Missile Management Conference. Here, industry in an accelerating technology will be examined by a galaxy of experts and technicians, including Peter J. Schenk, president of the Air Force Association; Dr. Edward Doll, vice president and associate director, Systems Engineering Division, Space Technology Laboratories; and David R. Hull, president, Electronic Industries Association, to name only a few.

As an American, Mr. President, I believe in the urgency of having men of the free world sharpen their appreciation and understanding of the space age, which is moving upon us with great speed. I feel that Mr. Edward P. Curtis, general chairman of the World Congress of Flight, should be congratulated for his part in arranging this outstanding program which promises to enhance appreciation and understanding of the space age by men of the free world. For my part, I look forward to being present at the World Congress of Flight. The scope of aerospace topics which will come under discussion at its sessions, the diversity of related equipment to be demonstrated and displayed, and the caliber of scientific, educational, and military representatives who will participate can only produce a number of the most constructive results. For one thing, these features of the program will highlight many of the opportunities and problems which are associated with the present and with the future course of aerospace progress. In addition, they will bring to bear on these subjects the tremendous fund of knowledge, skill, and experience of experts in the technological, the educational, and the military areas of airspace operations. Certainly many of the answers which will come from these deliberations will help chart the future course of our own national aerospace endeavors.

Looked at from another standpoint, I feel that the World Congress of Flight will also yield a valuable dividend by focusing free world attention on the benefits in terms of economic stimuli, closer relationships through travel, and mutual-defense enterprises which can be realized through cooperative international action. Where my own particular interest and responsibilities are concerned, the World Congress of Flight will provide assistance of tremendous value, since there are now under consideration literally dozens of legislative proposals on which the question of aerospace progress has an important bearing. As you know, Mr. President, these proposals cover such vitally important items as national security, civil aviation, and technical education.

Mr. President, I am aware that a number of my distinguished associates are striving to adjust their busy schedules so as to be able to attend and participate in the unique World Congress of Flight, where they will have the opportunity to meet the leaders of aviation, to confer on subjects of the greatest magnitude, and to see demonstrations of equipment which will play an increasingly important role in the future of the world. The knowledge to be gained by us from the World Congress of Flight can be invaluable as a basis for our subsequent evaluations and analyses of technical publications and committee reports. This, Mr. President, is truly a unique opportunity to follow the progress and work of a great free world enterprise.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG] for his impressive account of the forthcoming World Congress of Flight. It is a great honor for me to remind the Senate that the World Congress of Flight is being held in the State which I have the honor in part to represent—Nevada. We are extremely proud of the vast auditorium, the exhibition hall, the splendid facilities which will house the conferences, the meetings, and the exhibits at the World Congress of Flight scheduled to be held in Las Vegas, Nev., from April 12 to 19. The facilities at Las Vegas will seat more than 7,500 in the great circular auditorium. Space is provided for 22 additional meetings, each seating from 25 to 1,000, and there is in excess of 100,000

square feet of exhibit space. Adjacent to the vast auditorium and exhibit hall are some 2 million square feet of outdoor exhibit area, as well as a stadium before which aviation aircraft and helicopters can be demonstrated.

Ample facilities are available to house the participants and the visitors to the World Congress of Flight.

My distinguished colleague from Ohio has provided Senators with an overall picture of the World Congress of Flight. I should like to mention some specific facets of the program. For example, speakers from Western Europe, from Japan, and Bazil will make presentations on international research for the Air Force at a symposium being sponsored by the Air Research and Development Command of the U.S. Air Force during the World Congress of Flight. At this ARDC symposium, 1 of the 11 major conferences in the basic research necessary to military aeronautics and astronautics will be examined.

Another conference which is certain to attract worldwide attention is one scheduled on the space age. Here such men as Col. John P. Stapp, USAF, president, American Rocket Society; Gill Robb Wilson, chairman, Space Education Foundation; Dr. James W. McRae, vice president, American Telephone & Telegraph Co.; the Honorable Roy Johnson, Director, Advanced Research Projects Agency, Department of Defense; and Dr. Edward Teller, director, Radiation Laboratory, University of California, will contribute.

It seems fitting to recall the words of Mr. Edward P. Curtis, general chairman of the World Congress of Flight, when he said:

> No one in any country has attempted to combine in a single event and on such a large scale conferences and forums, outdoor displays and indoor exhibits with air and ground demonstrations, each dedicated to the advancement of aeronautics and astronautics, the twin sciences of flight. It is fitting that this huge effort should be undertaken first in America, the cradle of aviation.

As a Senator from Nevada, the State favored for housing the First World Congress of Flight, I am pleased to report that we Nevadans are proud of the role which we will play as hosts.

I reiterate my words of appreciation and congratulation to my colleagues and associates who will follow the work of this World Congress of Flight. My feeling, as a member of the Senate Armed Services Committee and of the Senate Aeronautical and Space Sciences Committee, is that this is a signal opportunity for men of the free world to further their appreciation and understanding of this important, fast moving, and competitive field.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I, too, should like to supplement and augment the remarks which have just been made by the distinguished junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG] and my colleague, the distinguished junior Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON].

As a member of the Senate Appropriations Committee and as the senior Senator from the great State of Nevada, I wish to thank my distinguished colleagues, the Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG] and my esteemed associate from Nevada [Mr. CANNON], for the vivid picture they have painted of the forthcoming World Congress of Flight. We in Nevada are honored and eager to serve as the host State and to participate in this unique enterprise, the World Congress of Flight, which is to be held at Las Vegas from April 12 through April 19. I have noted that Joseph B. Burns, president, National Business Aircraft Association; David R. Hull, president, Electronic Industries Association, Thomas G. Lamphier, Jr., president, National Aeronautics Association; and Jacqueline Cochran, president, Federation Aeronautique Internationale, are each playing a key role in the arrangements for the World Congress of Flight.

To refer again to the program which my colleagues have so ably discussed, I call the attention of Senators to additional presentations which are also parts of the Space Age Conference. Here Dr. Joseph M. Goldsen, of the Rand Corp., will discuss "Outer Space and the International Scene." Project Mercury which, of course, relates to man in space, figures significantly in this space age forum. My understanding is that the mission and operation will be discussed by Dr. Abe Silverstein, Director of Spaceflight Development, National Aeronautics and Space Administration; and Dr. W. Randolph Lovelace will discuss our first space man.

Dozens of individuals, organizations, and industries are joining hands to make this project a success. There will be the most complete display of aircraft, missiles, and space craft equipment ever assembled. Important emphasis will be placed on civil aviation and on the impact of modern flight on world trade and world understanding. The program which is planned for those who will have the privilege of participating is timed to mark the first full year of jet-powered commercial transportation on an international scale. The program is also timed to mark the availability of long-range missiles as major deterrents of war, as well as the completion of the first International Geophysical Year, with its impact on space exploration.

I also call specific attention to a symposium to be devoted to aerospace education, which will consider the ways whereby dedicated men and women in the field of education can expose the minds of the young people in the free world to this new dimension. Presentations will be made by such men as Boyd Graber, Department of Public Instruction, Iowa, James G. Harlow, dean, College of Education, University of Oklahoma, Leslie A. Bryan, director, Institute of Aviation, University of Illinois, and Ross Willmot, secretary-general, International Society of Aviation Writers.

Another symposium to which I should like to call specific attention is that on flight safety. Here such topics as economics and safety, and aircraft accident prevention in the jet age, will be carefully considered by Jerome Lederer, managing director, Flight Safety Foundation, the Honorable James R. Durfee, Chairman, Civil Aeronautics Board, James T. Pyle, Deputy Director, Federal Aviation Agency, and Maj. Gen. Joseph D. Caldara, Director of Flight Safety Research for the U.S. Air Force.

In addition to the discussions, the conferences, the examination of static displays and models, those present will have an opportunity to see a variety of important air demonstrations scheduled to be held at nearby Nellis Air Force Base.

We in Nevada are proud that this outstanding program is slated to be held in our State. Las Vegas was selected as an ideal site since the necessary facilities for air-ground displays and demonstrations, hotel accommodations for 7,500 individuals, and generous auditorium and conference hall facilities are all in the immediate area. We look forward with pleasure and pride to welcoming warmly those Members of the Senate who plan to be present, and the other Americans, as well as the international visitors, who will attend this unusual event.

THE LONG ARM OF THE FBI

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD, an article entitled "The Long Arm of the FBI," by the very able and remarkable columnist, Bob Considine, which appeared in the New York Journal American of April 2, 1959.

This article focuses attention on the numerous and varied activities undertaken by this great organization under the able and brilliant leadership of its Director, the Honorable J. Edgar Hoover, whose name is held in high esteem in every household throughout this great Nation. The confidence in this great agency which he has instilled in the American public has been a measure of strength to all of us. His zeal and patriotism in carrying out his duties as the Nation's top law-enforcement officer has won the gratitude, respect, and admiration of the public.

The article gives a bird's-eye view as to the vast number of activities placed under the able leadership of this great American, and I recommend its reading to every Member of the Congress.

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

THE LONG ARM OF THE FBI

(By Bob Considine)

WASHINGTON.—Stop 10 people on the street and ask them the mission of the Federal Bureau of Investigation and at least 8 may pinpoint the tracking down and capture of public enemies and kidnapers.

That is, indeed, part of the picture. But it's a comparatively small part. It is a mark of the enormous respect which successive Congresses and Executive Offices hold for the FBI that the Bureau is saddled with additional responsibilities each year.

Here are some of the bewilderingly varied activities now assigned to J. Edgar Hoover's compact 6,000-man force:

It is asked to prevent the accumulation in this country of arms for rebels seeking to overthrow the reigning governments of nations with which we have diplomatic relations. It must check on the interstate transportation of strikebreakers. It is expected to nab offenders of the Migratory Bird Act.

It protects the symbol of the American Red Cross from use by commercial houses (except Johnson & Johnson, which had it before the Red Cross did). It steps in if a blackmailer or extortionist drops a threatening note into your mailbox, threatening physical harm if you do not abide by the demands (but turns the matter over to the Post Office Department if the note is sent through the mails).

The FBI is the teeth of the Selective Service Act, investigates the claims of conscientious objectors. It hovers over patent and copyright abuses, is expected to be the scourge of white slavery and mail frauds, fights impersonation of Federal officers or military personnel, stalks crimes committed beyond the 3-mile limit, false claims by veterans.

If you go into bankruptcy the FBI sends around one of its crack accountants, for the Founding Fathers—trying to avoid slipshod debtors jails—put bankruptcy on the Federal level. If you are forced into slavery, it is the FBI who rides up to the rescue. Mess around with any Government property, commit a crime of passion on an Indian reservation, fail to report an act of treason, violate the 8-hour day law, neglect to report accurately if you're engaged in the interstate shipment of cigarettes, and the FBI is involved.

Tamper with a member of a Federal jury or panel, jump bail in a Federal case, rob any bank, phony up a Government travel voucher, violate probation or parole, wreck a train, steal an airplane and fly it across a State line, touch off a bomb near the mail car of a train, fail to register under the Voorhis Act if you represent a foreign government as a lobbyist, take a punch at or kill a Federal officer, desert from the Armed Forces, tell the judge you couldn't show up for the hearing because your wife was having a baby (and she didn't), and, well, there's an FBI man in your life.

If you want to get in trouble with the FBI, misuse a railroad pass, transport gambling devices, lottery tickets, obscene matter, or prison-made goods across the State line, travel across a State border with a switchblade in your pocket, ship an unsafe refrigerator from one State to another, hijack a load of anything that has moved interstate, mosey around any Atomic Energy Commission property.

In dizzying addition, the FBI is expected to check on the loyalty of all Americans who work at the United Nations, scrutinize suspicious looking claims for welfare and pension checks, keep an eye on those who would like to overthrow the U.S. Government by force, chase prostitutes away from military installations, clamp down on violators of civil rights, spot any man or woman falsely wearing a civil defense insignia.

There are a few dozen other duties. They all add up to an appallingly complicated and difficult task, performed with dedication, skill, a minimum of fanfare and, astonishingly, a profit. Last year, fines, savings, and recoveries in cases investigated by the FBI reached $132,706,098, which was $27,144,098 more than Congress appropriated to operate the Bureau.

DISCLOSURE OF INCOME OF CERTAIN OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, yesterday the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] introduced a bill which would require public disclosure of the names of senatorial employees and the salaries which they receive. It further provides that public officials earning salaries in excess of $10,000 shall be compelled to disclose their incomes and the sources of their incomes outside their governmental pay.

We know that within the last 2 months there has been considerable discussion in the newspapers, in the public forums, and in the homes about the fact that the U.S. Senate by a self-imposed rule has adopted the policy of refusing to reveal to the public the salaries paid to its employees.

I do not feel I exaggerate when I say that the public of our country feels it is entitled to know who are our employees and what are their salaries. More than that, we conduct public business, and under any philosophy we have no justification for keeping to ourselves information which is the proper and undeniable property of the citizens of the United States.

Someone might say to me, "Why do you not disclose the salaries of your employees?" In my opinion the disclosure of salaries by one Senator, without disclosure by all, would not reveal to the public a true picture.

The beginning of bad government is secrecy in management and operation, and that bad government's beginning becomes aggravated when the secrecy is perpetrated by the Congress of the United States.

Under the rule of the House of Representatives the identity and the salaries of employees are public property. It is my understanding that a similar rule once prevailed in the Senate, but that about a decade ago the rule was changed so that now we are not required by law to disclose the salaries received by the employees of the Senators.

I cannot help but put myself in the place of a citizen who is groaning about his tax-paying responsibility. I cannot help but think that the citizen who is groaning about his taxpaying responsibility frequently says, "If the Senate is extravagant with its own employees, and if the Senate refuses to disclose what it is paying them, what restraint can we expect of Senators when they deal with the general revenues and the moneys of the taxpayers as a whole?"

It is a pretty heavy burden to bear when citizens write to us, "Why do you not disclose what you are paying your employees?"

So far as my office is concerned, I have refused to divulge the information because of the self-imposed rule of the Senate and because of the fact that disclosure by one Senator will not reveal the true picture. I am firmly of the opinion that the Senate ought to pass whatever law is necessary making mandatory the disclosure of the salaries which they are paid.

Much has also been said about the hiring of relatives by Members of the Congress. The mere hiring of a relative is not wrong, but it is fairly obvious on the face of the situation that there have been revelations about the salaries paid measured against the abilities of the persons receiving the salaries which disclose a great disproportion.

The Senator from Oregon is not present today. I tried to reach him.

I repeat that the breakdown of Government, whether it be the executive branch, the judicial branch, or the Congress, starts with secrecy of operations. If I have too many employees on my payroll or if I am paying salaries to the employees which are grossly disproportionate to their worth and to the general average of salaries paid throughout the country, how can I turn down the requests of other citizens when they come to the Senate to say, "Give to me of the taxpayers' money"?

In my judgment, it is essential that we have a citizenry with faith in the U.S. Congress. If the citizenry does not have faith in us, woe to the country. There is grave doubt about the justification of asking for faith, trust, and confidence from the citizenry when we boldly and brazenly say to them, "It is none of your business what we are paying to our employees." That is wrong, regardless of the standpoint from which it is approached.

Therefore, I want the RECORD to show my subscription to the views expressed by the Senator from Oregon yesterday dealing with his proposal for the adoption of a rule of the Senate compelling a public disclosure of salaries paid.

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

Mr. LAUSCHE. I do not have the floor.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. I was going to ask the Senator from Ohio a question. As he knows, this subject has been a hotly debated one. I am deeply interested in it myself.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I cannot hear the Senator.

Mr. JAVITS. I will come nearer to the Senator.

The question of the disclosure of the details of salaries paid to Senate employees by individual Senators has been a hotly contested one. I have been rather actively engaged in it myself.

I feel entirely pleased about disclosing these details, as I did in the House of Representatives, where I served for 8 years. I did not seem to suffer under it then, nor did I feel my office suffered.

Does the Senator from Ohio feel that disclosure ought to be adopted as a general policy by the Senate? Is that essentially the Senator's point of view? Does the Senator believe no Senator ought to disclose the information unless all Senators do, or does the Senator feel it can be left, as it is today, strictly a matter of individual option, so that if I wish to do it or if the Senator wishes to do it we are perfectly free to act accordingly? There is no inhibition, but, on the other hand, there is no Senate resolution which requires the disclosure to be made by the Secretary, as there is in the other body.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Obviously the Senator from New York did not hear what I had to say on this matter. In my opinion there ought to be disclosure by all or by none.

Mr. JAVITS. I understand.

Mr. LAUSCHE. When only one or two Senators disclose the information it does not reveal to the public a true picture of what is happening. A full and

just conclusion can be reached only by making a comparison of the payments which are being made by the 98 Senators.

Mr. JAVITS. So the Senator does feel it ought to be the subject of a Senate resolution, requiring disclosure by all or by none?

Mr. LAUSCHE. Yes, I do. I will say to the Senator from New York that he puts his finger on a very vital aspect of this problem.

When the Senator was a Member of the House, and the identity of his employees and their salaries were revealed, he did not suffer thereby, did he?

Mr. JAVITS. I did not.

Mr. LAUSCHE. But we are suffering by reason of our seemingly clandestine efforts to conceal.

Mr. JAVITS. Let me say to the Senator that, speaking for myself, I should like to see the Senator's proposal operate in both directions. In other words, I agree that there is room for and need for action by the Senate. I also feel that if, in the interim, individual Senators chose to make their own disclosure, their colleagues should not take it amiss, provided that there has been adequate time for discussion and consideration. That is the basis on which I am trying to operate.

I do not believe that the public would expect any of us to feel that he must move immediately, in absence of the adoption of a general policy, if such a policy is agreeable. I do not wish to make the two alternatives mutually exclusive.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I do not know what the Senator's mail discloses, but I can say to him and to the people of Ohio that, from the standpoint of my mail, there is no subject so vital as this one in the minds of the people of my State.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, if the Senator from Illinois will allow me 30 seconds further, I shall appreciate it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. My own mail is not necessarily that strong upon this subject. I do not mean that individual letters are not strong. However, in my State the problems of the Berlin crisis, unemployment, and other problems overshadow this particular subject.

I feel that this is a subject so much within our own control, and representing to such a great extent, as the Senator from Ohio has well said, an earnest of our own good faith toward the country, that, whether my mail were large or small, I would feel very much as does the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. My conviction is not based solely on the quantity of my mail. What I have said is the consequence of a search of my own thinking and my own conscience. I think the Senator from New York must agree with me, that the more brutal the dictatorship the more secret the method of its operation.

Mr. JAVITS. The Senator from New York certainly agrees with the Senator from Ohio as to the end result. I feel that our colleagues in the Senate are collectively searching their own souls. The Senator from Ohio and I have found the answer in our souls. I think we should be understanding, and give our colleagues a reasonable opportunity to do the same thing.

I thank the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I do not wish to have the Senator from New York leave the Chamber. I should like to ask him to yield to me. Also, I hope our distinguished friend from Ohio will not leave the Chamber for a moment.

I have certain convictions on the subject, and I have ventilated them very freely, both publicly and privately. I recall addressing the Press Club a week or two ago, when the specific question arose as to how I felt about the disclosure which the questioners had in mind. I said that I was unequivocally opposed to it.

Let me say also to my distinguished friend from New York that I think it would be informative, from time to time, if Members of the Senate were to fortify themselves with a copy of the report of the Secretary of the Senate. It is issued regularly. It contains more than a thousand pages. Senators will find a vast amount of information in this report.

For example, the report contains the names of all those employed in the office of every Senator. In addition, it shows the amount of money which is disbursed by each senatorial office, for each quarter. If one were to divide by three, the total for each quarter, he could determine what every senatorial office disbursed every 30 days.

The only thing that is lacking is the specific amount which each employee receives monthly.

I have contended that quite often such a disclosure would develop a morale factor, because if an office manager feels that one employee is worth a little more than another, it is not desirable to have the others sitting around and talking about it, saying that they are worth more than they receive. But if the public interest is to be served, the entire amount of money which goes out of every Senator's office every quarter is shown in the report of the Secretary of the Senate. Those who receive the money are mentioned by name. I believe that is contrary to the impression which has been created from time to time, that the Senate, so to speak, has "taken the fifth amendment." Recently an editorial was published in the New York Herald Tribune under the caption "The Senate Takes the Fifth," which is very intriguing. I am sure the editorial makes most engaging reading.

The report of the Secretary of the Senate contains all the information necessary properly to serve the public interest. Anyone, including Senators, who wishes to learn what the disbursements are, can find them in the report of the Secretary of the Senate. But he can find more. He can find all the costs incurred and the disbursements made by investigating committees. The name of every one who is on the roll is contained in this report. Every miscellaneous item is listed. The other day someone told me that in one of these reports there was an item of $18 for a cord of wood which some Senator had sold to the Government. I do not know anything about it. I have not found the item. However, if I were to take 2 or 3 days off and go through all the items, I might find it.

Not even the most insignificant item escapes the keen, scrutinizing eye of the Secretary of the Senate, because he must balance his books. So if anyone wishes to determine what the disbursements are from the contingent fund, and the amount of money which comes out of the Treasury, he will find the information in this compendium, which is almost the size of a Sears Roebuck catalog. It makes good reading on a winter night.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Let me suggest to the Senator from Illinois that I understand that the names are listed. However, as the Senator from Illinois concedes, the fact is that the salaries paid individual employees are not listed. I submit to the Senator that it is not adequate for a Senator merely to be proper in the operation of his office. From the standpoint of the public mind, we should occupy a position in which we are beyond suspicion. We do not occupy such a position; and we fail to occupy it because of the refusal to let the public know what properly is its business.

Let me make one further point. The Senator from Illinois says that such disclosure might create discord in the morale of the personnel. I recognize that possibility. I am certain that there will be discord when the salaries paid in my office are compared with the salaries paid by other Senators. But such discord could be completely eliminated if each of us knew what the other was paying. We could establish some semblance of balance and uniformity in the payment of salaries, having relationship to the skill of the individual worker.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Let me say again to the distinguished Senator from Ohio that there is no restriction in the statute, and there is no inhibition in any Government regulation which would prevent any Senator from disclosing the names and the salaries of all persons in his employ. He is perfectly free to do so.

When it comes to measuring the volume of work in various senatorial offices, I do not know how that can be done. We have recognized the factor of volume by dividing the States into several categories—those below 3 million population, those with a population between 3 million and 5 million, those with a population between 5 million and 10 million, and those with a population of 10 million or more. We make additional clerk hire allowances available on that basis.

Secondly, Senators do not themselves disburse the money. If anyone has such an idea, I think I should disabuse his mind of it now. The employees go on the roll. They receive their checks automatically, and the Senator has nothing to do with the operation, except to place them on the roll. So I must say that, so far as I know, every activity in that field has been most circumspectly administered by the Senate.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I should like to add that I feel deeply certain, from the standpoint of the people of the country, our work could be done and enjoy far greater respect on their part if we did not try

to justify the fact that we are concealing from them the knowledge to which they are entitled, not by will, but by law.

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. CAPEHART. I should like to comment on how the situation should be handled. I believe that the Senate itself should classify the various positions in a Senator's office and designate the salary which each employee occupying a position in his office should receive. Under such a practice every Senator would be paying the same wage for comparable work.

If we did that first, we could make the list public. It should be made public. However, the situation which exists today in the offices of the 98 Senators is that each Senator sets the wages for his employees. On the average, I believe, there are 10 or 15 employees in a Senator's office. Nevertheless, no two Senators pay exactly the same wage for the same kind of work, and no two employees are receiving the same wage.

If we were to publish the wages paid our employees at this time, we would create a great deal of chaos. Therefore, if we wish to cure the situation—and I will vote for such a proposal—let the Senate first adopt a rule classifying the various positions and specifying the wage to be paid to the person who occupies each position in the office of a Senator. Let us first make certain that every Senator is paying exactly the same wage for the same kind of work.

Unless we do that we will only create a great deal of confusion if we publish the list of our employees and their salaries. Unless we do that we will be doing the public no good by merely publishing a list of the employees and their salaries. The public will be confused, and our employees will be confused. In my opinion we would be confusing everyone, and we would not be helping anyone. To clear up the confusion we must first adopt a rule in the Senate to cover the situation. We must first, by a rule of the Senate, specify the various wage scales to be paid in a Senator's office. Let us first make certain that every Senator pays the same wage for the same kind of work. If we do that, it will be proper for us to publish the list of employees and their wages. The information will then become public property. I see no reason why that should not be done.

Even if we proceed in the way I have suggested, I can see some trouble, and I can see some drawbacks to my suggestion, because Senators from some States have more work to do in their offices than Senators from other States. There are a great many problems connected with this subject. Many difficulties will be encountered even if we proceed as I have suggested. However, that is the only way we can proceed and be perfectly fair with the employees who work for the 98 Senators, fair with the public, and fair with the Senate itself. At the moment there is no classification of the various positions in a Senator's office. We would not be doing anyone any good to have the information about the present situation relayed to the families of the employees. They would see that one person, for example, was getting more than another for doing the same kind of work. We would be doing more harm than good. If we wish to cure the situation—and I will vote for such a suggestion—we must first classify the various positions in Senators' offices, and pay the same wages to all persons who hold similar positions. We must pay the wage which the particular classification covers. Every Senator would then be paying exactly the same for comparable work. If we could put such a procedure into effect we would be doing something worthwhile.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I do not believe the Senator from Indiana heard my statement——

Mr. CAPEHART. No; I did not.

Mr. LAUSCHE. He did not hear my statement when I said that if there were a disclosure, the very necessity of the situation would compel the adoption of uniform scales of pay for similar work. The suggestion the Senator from Indiana has made excels the one I have made. We should put our offices on a business-like basis, as he suggests, and his recommendation in that regard is sound. I also believe that whatever we do will be better than what we do now.

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. I question whether we would do anyone any good, including the taxpayers and ourselves, if we were to publish the various wages at this time inasmuch as the wage scales were arrived at by each Senator. What we ought to do first is adopt a rule classifying the various positions, and pay the same wages for the same kind of work. If we were to make such a classification first, that information would automatically become public property, just as is the case with respect to civil service employees. We know that X amount, for example, is paid in a specific job classification under civil service. Therefore, we should first classify the jobs. Then the people of the country will understand what we are doing, and what each employee is paid.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Along the same line we should take into consideration the fact that a civil service employee obtains a status in civil service employment. That is not the case with an employee of a Senator. If a Senator is defeated or dies, the employee probably must go home to his State or seek employment elsewhere. The same situation is true in the House. Therefore, in discussing this subject we will have to take all these matters into consideration.

Mr. CAPEHART. That, of course, is true. I have been in business, and I know that in business the various jobs are classified. If an employee leaves his job and a new employee is engaged, the man in business knows what the classification for that job is and what the wage for it is, and he, accordingly, engages a new employee at that rate to do the work called for by the classification which applies to that particular job. In business the wages of the various employees are not published, but the classification into which they fall are published. The same thing is done in union contracts.

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I have great respect for my friend the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE], and I admire his fearlessness and fairness always. I came to the Senate as a young man, to work as an attaché. I believe that my experience goes back, perhaps, longer than that of almost any other Member of the Senate.

The Senate is not a factory. It is not possible to put every employee into a rigid category and pay the same wage to all employees in that classification. It is just as impossible to separate into uniform classification the assistants who do research, who write letters, who go downtown on errands, or who work on constituent's problems, as it is to classify uniformly all the flowers of the field.

Ever since the beginning of the Senate men of private means and wealth have been Members of the Senate. They engage assistants, whom they pay out of their own pocket to prepare speeches for them, to do research for them, and perform other work. Senators have a right to do that. I wish I could do it, too.

However, how are we going to deal with the staff of a Senator who has no means of his own and all of whose assistants are paid by the Government? How can we uniformly catalog the employees of such a Senator and compare them with the employees of a wealthy Senator who—and very properly so—engages outside assistants and research experts and other experts and speech writers?

I do not criticize my friend from Ohio, but I believe it would be nonsense to attempt either to install a uniform pay schedule, or to make public the amounts paid individuals without such uniformity.

Our people back home have a right to know whether we engage relatives, whether some of the money paid in salaries comes back to our own families. They have a right to know that, and they do know it. It is a matter of public record. They have a right to know how much money is being used in our offices, and they do know it. It, too, is a matter of public record. They have a right to know who our employees are, where they are working, and what they are doing. Having access to their names, they can find out. Furthermore, so far as I am concerned, if being a Senator of the United States should deprive me of such privacy, I am perfectly willing to disclose my income and the small amount of stock I own.

If the time ever comes when it is necessary to make it a matter of public knowledge that the girl who works at one desk gets $100 a year or $500 a year more than a girl who works at another desk, and thus impair the efficiency of the office staff in doing the work of our constituents, I think we must be getting pretty

scared and starting to run in all directions. I doubt that the people of the country distrust their Senators to the extent that they expect that from us.

So far as I am concerned, there is nothing to preclude any Senator from making public anything he desires to disclose. But if we as a Senate are to say, first, that we must classify our employees—which we never can do; and, second, that we must disclose what we are paying the daughter of John Jones, who comes from one town in the State, and what we pay the daughter of Sam Smith, who comes from another town in the State—if we cannot trust ourselves more than that, I do not know how we can expect the public to trust us. The Senate will, indeed, have fallen pretty low in our own esteem, as well as the esteem of the country if we go to that extent.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, it is true that under the Reorganization Act and under other statutes, we are limited in the salaries we can pay to administrative assistants, secretaries, and stenographers, or clerks, as they are usually called. Let me show how impossible it is to set up a classification system. One woman in my office has been working with me for 25 years, although not that entire length of time in the Federal service. She started with me in my law office, worked with me during my two terms as Governor, and then came with me to Washington when I was elected Senator. Another woman started to work with me when I was Governor, in 1935 or 1936, almost 25 years ago.

If a system of classificaticn were to be established based upon the time when these employees entered my service, it can be seen what would happen. It would be almost impossible to do that and be fair to persons who fit into these categories.

Furthermore, on Capitol Hill, when the Republican Party takes control, many of the jobs which are held by the Democrats go to the Republicans. When the Democrats come into control, many of the jobs held by the Republicans go to the Democrats.

The woman of whom I just spoke, who has been in my offices for 25 years, is so experienced that when a letter comes to my office, she can tell immediately whether the writer of it is a crackpot, or whether he is a person who deserves a detailed reply. Likewise, she can tell whether to address the person as John, Tom, Dick, or Harry; because to call a person by his first name, as Senators, know, is very important if one wants to remain in the U.S. Senate. [Laughter.] All those things must be taken into consideration.

Limitations are placed on us at present. Beyond those limitations, we cannot pay higher salaries.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, perhaps I should conclude this discussion. It really was not on the agenda this afternoon. I did present to the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE] a copy of a bill introduced in the present session. I allude to it only because he prefaced his remarks with a reference to a bill introduced, or to be introduced, by the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] with respect to the disclosure of income by Members of the Senate and House.

It is certainly not telling any tales out of school to say that the present occupant of the Chair, the distinguished junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG], made some disclosure of his holdings so as to make certain that there would be no conflict of interest so far as his votes in a given committee of the Senate might be concerned.

I direct attention to the bill providing for disclosures because it provides that every Member of Congress, every civil officer or every military officer and each employee in the legislative or executive branch, whose salary is in excess of $12,500, and any candidate for the House or Senate, must file with the Comptroller General a report containing a full and complete statement which would include the following:

Each item of income, each item of reimbursement for any expenditure, each gift or aggregate of gifts from one source, other than gifts received from any relative or his spouse, which exceeds $100 in value; including any fee or other honorarium received by him for or in connection with the preparation or delivery of any speech or address, or attendance at any convention or other assembly of individuals.

In addition, he would be required to schedule the value of each asset held by him or by him and his spouse jointly; the amount of each liability owed by him or by him and his spouse jointly; all dealings in securities or commodities by him or by him and his spouse jointly, or by any person acting on his behalf or pursuant to his direction; and all purchases or sales of real property or any interest therein.

The report would be filed with the Comptroller General, and would be maintained as a public record, open to inspection by anyone.

That would mean that for the first time elective officers and all civil and military officers whose salaries from the Government were in excess of $12,500 a year would be placed in a special class. Their incomes would be disclosed as public records. They would be the only ones, among all the taxpayers under the jurisdiction of the Internal Revenue statutes, whose incomes would be disclosed in that fashion. They would be in a separate class in matters of that kind.

I never felt that being elected to office divested me of my rights as a citizen of the United States. I still think I have the same rights as has the humblest taxpayer and the humblest voter in the State I have the honor to represent, in part. Frankly, I do not propose to be divested of my rights as a citizen without a protest if matters or proposals of this kind shall be at any time seriously considered.

The electorate, of course, has the opportunity to ask questions when a candidate submits himself for their suffrage. They can ask him at any meeting he might attend: "Do you own any stock or bonds? Do you own any income property?"

The candidate can answer or not answer, as he chooses. But that, of course, is a part of the free elective system under which we operate.

I simply think we should be reasonably careful before we go so far as to make public officials second-class citizens and divest them of certain rights which are so carefully safeguarded under the statutes of the land.

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I conclude by saying that the discomfort and disappointment which Senators would suffer through a revelation of the salaries paid in their offices would be inconsequential and unimportant compared with the distrust which is created in the minds of the citizenry by our insisting that the salaries shall not be revealed. I understand that each Senator has a right to reveal the salaries he pays; but I believe it would be of interest to the country for us to adopt a rule which would make mandatory the publication of the salaries we pay.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, actually I secured recognition earlier today, in order to make a political speech; and I might just as well confess it at the outset, because I am going to give somebody the devil.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I thank the Senator from Illinois very much for giving me the time I have used, and I regret that I took so much of it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. It is a genuine pleasure, I assure my friend, the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. YOUNG of Ohio in the chair). The Senator from Illinois.

PAMPHLET ISSUED BY THE ADVISORY COUNCIL OF THE DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL COMMITTEE

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I wish to speak for a brief time about the Democratic National Committee's Advisory Council; and I expect to be a little pointed in my remarks.

Last week I was gratified to read in our national press two items which to a high degree reflect my own thoughts and judgments. They appeared in newspapers which are known and respected for their fairness and sense of responsibility and, generally, their journalistic excellence.

The first is an editorial, published in the Washington Star of Thursday, April 2, under the title "Burned Child." I shall read a portion of the editorial, and then I shall ask unanimous consent to have the entire editorial printed in the RECORD.

The editorial begins as follows:

The latest screed—

Mr. President, that is a good, earfilling word—

to emerge from the Democratic Advisory Council is a massive exercise in irresponsible nonsense.

Mr. President, that is a pretty good phrase. I was going to suggest to my distinguished friend, the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], that he should give good ear to it and should keep it in mind.

The editorial continues as follows:

Sponsored, as it is, by men and women of some stature, the truth-torturing nature of this foreign policy report is astonishing. Its ostensible purpose is to unload a partisan H-bomb on the Eisenhower administration. But even as a flagrantly political document it is self-defeating. For example, the report charges, with reference to the Formosa resolution, that President Eisenhower "heedlessly dropped a time bomb into the already explosive Far Eastern situation."

The editorial continues in that fashion. It contains one phrase which I believe reads with sheer elegance, namely—

To read the phrenetic language of the report is to understand why the responsible Democratic leaders in Congress have shunned the advisory council.

Mr. President, I submit the rest of the editorial; I have read enough of it to indicate the key to what I wish to say. At this time I ask unanimous consent that the entire editorial be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

BURNED CHILD

The latest screed to emerge from the Democratic Advisory Council is a massive exercise in irresponsible nonsense.

Sponsored, as it is, by men and women of some stature, the truth-torturing nature of this "foreign policy report" is astonishing. Its ostensible purpose is to unload a partisan H-bomb on the Eisenhower administration. But even as a flagrantly political document it is self-defeating. For example, the report charges, with reference to the Formosa resolution, that President Eisenhower "heedlessly dropped a time bomb into the already explosive Far Eastern situation." It does not mention the fact that an almost unanimous Congress voted for the Formosa resolution. Does the advisory council's indictment extend to the Democrats who approved the resolution? Also ignored is the fact that the expression of American purpose contained in this resolution, time bomb or not, has served for nearly 5 years to discourage a Chinese Communist attack on Formosa. If this is catastrophic error, as the advisory council would have the people believe, we could do with more of the same.

This incredible document concludes on a questioning note. "Must we sit in paralyzed horror for 2 more years," it asks, "watching our strength, our influence, our position in the world, and our alliance dissolve, as just a hundred years ago men watched the Union dissolve under the weak and palsied hand of Buchanan"? The best that can be said for this kind of gibberish is (we hope) that no one will take it seriously—except, perhaps, the members of the Democratic Advisory Council.

To read the phrenetic language of the report is to understand why the responsible Democratic leaders in Congress have shunned the advisory council. They are better acquainted with the facts of life, and they have a better understanding of the harm which this kind of ranting partisanship could do to the country in a time of danger. It is not so easy, however, to understand why Dean Acheson would serve as chairman of the committee which presumably drafted the report.

In his days as Secretary of State, Dean Acheson was subjected to much the same kind of outrageous abuse, and one might think that as a burned child he would dread the fire. But evidently he does not. In partisan politics, apparently, the familiar maxims do not apply.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, the next is an article which was written by Arthur Krock, a man of distinction and stature in the journalistic field. The article appeared in the New York Times of Friday, April 3, 1959. The title of the article is "NATO Is Told 'We Sit in Paralyzed Horror.'"

Mr. President, I shall let Mr. Krock speak for himself; so I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks.

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

NATO IS TOLD "WE SIT IN PARALYZED HORROR"

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, April 2.—The Foreign Ministers assembled here for the 10th anniversary of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization might have abandoned hope of the U.S. Government as an effective partner if they had accepted as unvarying fact the "greeting card" issued under the authority of the advisory council of the Democratic National Committee. Since the council includes former President Truman, Adlai E. Stevenson, and a few Democratic Governors and Senators, this bitter attack on the administration's foreign policy that it authorized, for publication in the week the Ministers were gathering, might have had that deplorable consequence in the very midst of the Berlin crisis.

But, according to one Ambassador from a NATO country, his Foreign Secretary understood that the pamphlet and its timing were "just internal American partisan politics." And probably this is true of any of the other Foreign Ministers who read a summary of the publication.

"Just internal American politics" is a sound evaluation of this most intemperate political critique. Its angry tone and harsh personalities would have earned the document that estimate whenever published. Yet not only was it authorized for release, and at this time, by the distinguished advisory council. It is the product, specifically, of the group which is the voice of the council on foreign policy matters, and the editor and principal author of this group's pamphlets is Dean G. Acheson, former Secretary of State.

During his term of office some critics assailed Acheson and his policies with language matching the abusive quality of several of the passages. So it may be argued that this history is sufficient justification for repayment in kind. At any rate, the parallel is provided by the pamphlet.

Here is a sample:

"Must we sit in paralyzed horror for 2 more years watching our strength, our influence, our position in the world and our alliances dissolve, just as a hundred years ago men watched the Union dissolve under the weak and palsied hand of Buchanan? Must we watch in silence the creation of an artifact, the new NIXON, out of a sullied creature who participated in every one of these decisions, who once defended them but who now tries to turn his face away while the surgeons of publicity lift it?"

Apparently we must, because the only means proposed to arrest the dissolution is Congress, which "can provide the means by which policies are carried out." But, as the pamphlet concedes, "the constitutional power to conduct our relations with foreign countries lies with the President." And he—whom the pamphlet accuses of "passive detachment as our alliances disintegrate and our power declines"—will be President until January 21, 1961.

Congress, on this same authority, can "point out lines of action * * * investigate inaction as well as wrong action," and the Senate can make constructive use of its special power to reject Presidential appointments. But the Democratic leaders of Congress have carefully kept aloof from the Democratic advisory council and its Acheson foreign policy committee. And both Senator JOHNSON, of Texas, and Speaker RAYBURN have made it plain they do not endorse the violent approach of the council and the committee to partisan issues.

This violence, the harsh personal references, and one remarkable instance of political amnesia are the flaws in what in many places is a brilliant and documented critique. The political amnesia is provided by an attack on the administration for "having no Far East policy at all" from a source whose negative Chinese policy of letting the dust settle was a failure, at colossal cost to the West, and whose proposal of a mixed Communist-Nationalist government was at least naive.

Furthermore, though this pamphlet assails the Taiwan resolution as a "time-bomb * * * heedlessly dropped into the already explosive Far Eastern situation," the Democrats supported it in an almost unanimous Congress. The pamphlet's implicit indictment of this support will hardly add to the already slight influence of the council and the committee at the Capitol. Hence, if the only hope—against the utter national and world disaster toward which the administration, says the committee, is carrying the United States—is the acceptance of its counsels by Congress, the dread inevitable is at hand.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, these items refer to a pamphlet which recently was published by the Advisory Council of the Democratic National Committee. The pamphlet is No. 3 in a series, and is entitled "How To Lose Friends and Influence: The Decline of American Diplomacy, 1953–59."

The Star editorial describes this publication as "a massive exercise in irresponsible nonsense," "truth-torturing," "a flagrantly political document." The Times article refers to the "violence," the "harsh personal references," the "political amnesia" of the pamphlet. And so on and so forth. As I have hinted, Mr. President, I agree with this evaluation.

Mr. President, the pamphlet represents a remarkably creative achievement in the literary area of political brainwashing.

Recently, one of my distinguished colleagues on the other side of the aisle, and one for whom I have abiding affection, said, in a speech in which he attacked the Eisenhower budget, that he classified "budgeteer" with "racketeer." Mr. President, I do not like to become engaged in a semantic contest; but sometimes I think that the word "pamphleteer" would perhaps rhyme better with the word "racketeer."

I have said that more glorified tripe might flow from some typewriter at the Democratic National Committee's Advisory Council, but I have some grave doubts about it. The prefabricated

phrases used in this tract are rather cunning. I made it Sunday reading. Actually, it was an engaging experience. The style is almost Rooseveltian. There is a journalistic flow and measured cadence about it; and I believe the blithe allegations would do credit to Baron Munchausen. It is almost as plausible as five-and-dime store costume jewelry.

I do not believe this publication is worthy of serious and sustained discussion, Mr. President, but I know it gets around among the people of the country. Mr. President, we have important and constructive work to do here; but ever so often one has to defend his administration against some of these attacks.

I suppose the actual authorship of this document will remain rather obscure. But we can easily note that it has had the approval of a rather interesting mixture of both professionals and amateurs in the foreign affairs field. Actually, Dean Acheson is a professional. I can hardly say that the Mayor of Pittsburgh is exactly a professional in the foreign affairs field. I do not know about the distinguished chief executive of the State of Michigan, who is affectionately known as "Soapy." He might be considered an expert in the fiscal field. I am advised, Mr. President, that the favorite beverage nowadays in some of the better emporiums in Michigan is a delightful little concoction known as "Michigan on the rocks." [Laughter.] He may be an expert in that field; I do not know. But I have grave doubt that "Soapy"—I know him by his nickname, and I use the term in the ultimate affectionate sense—is an expert in the foreign affairs field.

I see my distinguished friend the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART] rise to his feet, and I am glad to yield to him.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I rise only to observe that I think the status of Michigan's Governor as a fiscal expert will soon be acknowledged by the members of the Michigan Legislature, which is organized by the members of the party of the distinguished minority leader. I believe the Michigan Legislature will adopt the fiscal proposals the Governor made in January. If that happens, I assume the minority leader will acknowledge the Michigan Governor is a fiscal expert.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I do not know. I shall find out about that later on.

But, Mr. President, I know he "put the bite" on the leaders of the automotive field to get them to make advance payments of taxes to the State of Michigan in order to keep the State's fiscal head above water, and I think he has found himself in some difficulty in that field. I shall be delighted to examine—and I shall do so with a maximum of interest—any proposal he may suggest.

Mr. President, I have spoken about these "experts." Among them is James Patton, president of the National Farmers' Union. Mr. Patton may be an expert in the foreign-affairs field; I do not know. I have never arrogated to myself any claim of expert knowledge in that field. Mr. Patton may be an expert in it. At any rate, he is on the council.

Then there is our old friend Bill Benton, who used to serve in the Senate, and who at one time was Assistant Secretary of State. I love him almost like a brother. I used to council with Bill. We lived in the same hotel in Washington for a long time. He is a great fellow. He made a robust effort to return to this august body, but, for reasons which the people of Connecticut can best explain, he did not return. It may be that he was a little short on expert knowledge in this field.

But I refer to this matter in order to indicate that these gentlemen were the sponsors of this interesting document entitled "How To Lose Friends and Influence."

There are 26 members of the advisory council. I am at a loss to know exactly whom they advise, other than the Democratic National Committee itself. A copy of this pamphlet can be obtained for 10 cents. I thought perhaps they would break down and send every Member of the House and the Senate a free copy, but I think I shall have to send them a little note and ask for a copy for myself.

Mr. President, the timing of this publication is extremely unfortunate. I should think they would have been better advised. I freely admit that Dean Acheson, former Secretary of State, is a pretty "heady" individual. I respect his endowments and background in his field. But, somehow, at a time when we are in the process of trying to achieve unity between the United States and some of the other countries, having had all the NATO leaders here last week, when a statement of this kind is published, it certainly is not conducive to unity and to the best kind of feeling. I think, in a sense, it destroys some of the work which has been done to build up good feeling in this field.

Frankly, Mr. President, I do not support a moratorium on public discussion of foreign policy. Let it be recommended, evaluated, and discussed. However, we should bear in mind that rather complex issues are involved. I say now what I have said before: Members of the House or the Senate, and also of political committees, who undertake to advise the country, ought to exercise some careful restraint.

Two statements on the inside of the front page of this pamphlet, the first thing I noted about it, gave me a little pause. One statement was that the purpose of the series of pamphlets is "to bring about the widest discussion and understanding of public questions." The other little statement was that they "do not necessarily reflect the precise views of all members of the advisory council."

That is really very ducky, Mr. President, because as I read the statement, I thought it was like trying to build a nice house with nothing but an ax, or using a shotgun approach to the problem of developing some unity in this field and thawing the cold war, if it can be done.

The pamphlet stated everything was wrong. I could not find a thing in it that was complimentary to the administration, except possibly where the group said President Eisenhower really got his training in this field under prior administrations, which may be a bit of damning with faint praise.

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. Is that not the same advisory group of which the able majority leader of the Senate and the Speaker of the House refused to become members?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I do not know that they refused; perhaps they were not invited. But I am delighted they do not take too much advice from them. At least, it would appear they do not.

Mr. CAPEHART. Is it not a fact that many of the members of that group were advising and were helping to conduct the affairs of this country during the period when we got into so much trouble, and when we agreed to place Berlin in the middle of East Germany, surrounded by Russian territory? Is it not a fact that those gentlemen were making policy and were making the mistakes which have caused the Congress and the President of the United States so much trouble?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I do not know that all of them were so engaged. Some of them were, no doubt.

Mr. CAPEHART. Were they not the same group who were in prominent positions when we got into World War II and into the Korean war? Were they not in authority when we recognized Communist Russia in 1933? Were they not around here when the Yalta and Teheran Agreements were made? Were they not the same group who were advising the then President of the United States?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Certainly some of them were.

Mr. CAPEHART. Some of them were. There is no question about that.

Mr. DIRKSEN. But the point I made was that this is a rather unrestrained document and its publication was untimely. The pamphlet speaks about pernicious abstractions, and of the complete separation of words and deeds. It deplores the erosion of Western influence, and yet the very existence of this tract at this crucial moment seems ironically calculated to accelerate the erosion of Western influence. Its words are insistently of dark and suspicious gloom; clarity is smothered, hidden; understanding is destroyed. Certainly, it contains many items which are not documented. The use of insinuations is masterful, but the pamphlet can be terribly dangerous in view of the problems which confront the whole free world and this country at the present time.

The publication contains a bill of particulars. It is a little on the partisan particular side, I should say. It states that everything is wrong; everything starting away back in 1953 is criticized. Before that time, everything was apple pie and honey. Everything was lily white. Everything was pure, undefiled, and perfect—except one thing, the young boys who were being interred in the soil of Korea. Let us never forget that. This administration may have its faults, but no youngster has forfeited his life on a foreign battlefield since June 1953, when President Eisenhower went to

Korea and secured an armistice. From that day on no young American has had to let his lifeblood flow on some foreign hill or in some foreign valley or upon some sodden, soggy foreign battlefield. But that fact is not mentioned in the pamphlet. Its authors start with 1953. If they wanted to tell the whole story, they should have done so.

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. I refer to the chapter or paragraph wherein it is asserted that they and two former Presidents were responsible for President Eisenhower's success, and therefore they taught him what he knows, or what he ought to know, about foreign affairs.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is the assertion in this pamphlet.

Mr. CAPEHART. It is asserted that they taught him. It seems to me what they taught President Eisenhower was how not to do things as they had done them. I think he learned much from them. He learned not to follow their ideas and their kind of foreign policy. I think that is what he learned as a result of his experience. President Eisenhower has not put into practice the things he learned not to do when he was working as an American, as a general, and as a soldier, under the supervision of other administrations.

I congratulate President Eisenhower for learning what not to do, and how not to follow the advice and the recommendations of former administrations, and not to do the things they tried to teach him.

In President Eisenhower's memoirs I remember he stated he tried to sell those in power on the idea of permitting the general of the armies to go east so the Russians would never get into Germany or never go farther west than the Warsaw, Poland, line. He was told no, that they had made other arrangements at Yalta, or somewhere else, and that he should withdraw his armies and let the Russians come through.

I am sure President Eisenhower was taught what not to do. Since he has been President he has practiced what he learned. Perhaps the greatest lesson he learned when he was working for them was what not to do and how not to conduct foreign affairs.

Mr. DIRKSEN. In the pamphlet it is alleged that helping Pakistan has upset India. It is stated that the Marines in Lebanon landed without a doctrine. It is stated the Formosa resolution was a time bomb dropped into the already explosive Far Eastern situation. The concept of massive retaliation is obliquely criticized.

Congress adopted the Formosa resolution. It adopted the resolution affecting the Middle East situation.

I have only picked out a few particulars from this tract, Mr. President, but they are good examples, fair examples, and I should like to ask some questions and make some observations about them.

Are the authors of the Democratic Advisory Council in favor of stopping arms aid to Pakistan in order to appease India? I wonder. They never say. Do the Democrats who approved this pamphlet forget that the Eisenhower doctrine was overwhelmingly approved by Congress, as House Joint Resolution 117? The vote on the resolution was 72 to 19 in the Senate on March 5, 1959. A large number of Democrats supported it. And, although I point out that no administration could ever be so naive as to believe that a single policy or program could be expected to solve all the problems of that tragically troubled area, some peace and stability does exist: the Middle East is, at present, free from war. This is an accomplishment, and one which was assisted in no small part by the Eisenhower doctrine.

The marines in Lebanon, I submit, did have a doctrine. Contrary to this pamphlet, they most certainly acted in accordance with a clearly discernible mission. They were there to keep the peace. And they kept it. When they finished their work they left, and without having fired a shot. It was a truly unusual and successful action, Mr. President. It demonstrated both to the Communists and to the Nationalists of the Middle East that the United States meant business, and it constituted a major influence for the maintenance of stability and the repulsion of a subversive war threat at that particular time. Were the Democrats who approved this report against sending the marines to Lebanon? Again, they do not say.

Concerning the Formosa resolution, I am confused again. This was also approved by Congress almost unanimously. As the editorial in the Star states:

> Does the advisory council's indictment extend to the Democrats who approved the resolution?

Also, I must point out, there is no war in the Formosa Strait. The fact that stands out is that it was the policy of the administration—and of Congress—to prevent war in that area and it has been prevented.

In regard to massive retaliation—there has been much ranting and raving. It seems we lose sight of the fact that our present defense policy is predicated on the principle of deterrence, and that the ability to retaliate massively—or call it what we will—constitutes the main vital element of the active principle. How can Democrats one minute call for more defense expenditures for missiles, which will enable us to increase the massiveness of our massive retaliation—to "overkill," as at least one member of the Joint Chiefs has called it—and then, the next minute, cry out loudly against the very concept?

One more particular, Mr. President. One thing I could not find in the Democratic Advisory Council pamphlet was any account of Americans being killed under the Eisenhower administration. Nor was there any mention of the 32,000 dead and the 100,000 wounded in the $19 million police action in Korea under Truman and Acheson. There was no mention of young blood, of cemeteries, of anguished hearts. There was plenty about agonizing reappraisal, but nothing about the lacerated hearts of American mothers.

It is an incredible fact that this pamphlet has nothing affirmative in it—except the most obscure partisan hopes for the future. No suggestions, no alternatives, no advice, no proposals—nothing affirmative. The tract is against everything that has been done and is being done under this Republican administration. The pamphlet is simply a diatribe of negativity. Is this, I ask, a program for action, as it is advertised? Is that all that can be offered? Is this tract supposed to persuade the American people that they should vote for the kind of leadership demonstrated thereby?

Mr. President, I came to the conclusion of this pamphlet when the shadows were getting a little longer on a Sunday afternoon, and I thought, "This is it." I was almost tense and breathless. I was waiting for some concrete conclusion. But I did not find it.

The one conclusion this brochure offers, Mr. President, is that Congress can help. Congress, we are told, can "point out lines of action." Although "the constitutional power to conduct our relations with foreign countries lies with the President," Congress "can provide the means by which policies are carried out." I agree wholeheartedly. Just as Congress did do with the Formosa resolution and the Eisenhower doctrine—with overwhelming Democratic support. The Chief Executive does need the help, the wisdom, the ideas, the support of Congress. And that has been sought, offered, and received in the past and will continue. Congress will continue to give this assistance and without the help of the Democratic advisory council.

I think we all remember that this body was originally intended as a group with which the Democratic representation in Congress would have to confer before presenting legislative programs. This outside body would, presumably, guide congressional leaders in their own work. This idea, Mr. President, was immediately and correctly repudiated by the Democratic leadership in Congress, and I commend them for it. The Democratic congressional leadership have their own ideas about both the substance and method of their role within the two-party structure and the American system of the separation of powers. As the editorial in the Washington Star so aptly pointed out:

> To read the phrenetic language of the report is to understand why the responsible Democratic leaders in Congress have shunned the advisory council. They are better acquainted with the facts of life, and they have a better understanding of the harm which this kind of ranting partisanship could do to the country in a time of danger.

In closing, I wish to address myself to the American people, to the people of the free world, and to the Communist leaders. I speak for my colleagues across the aisle here, if I may, as well as for the Congress and America itself. This pamphlet does not represent any of us. We are a united people concerning the desire for and the need of standing firm in Berlin—and everywhere else where communism threatens. We are a people whose leaders, regardless of party or governmental branch, work together constructively, with strength, wisdom, and

unity, to advance policies dedicated to solving the problems which confront us—toward a peaceful, secure world.

I commend the Democratic leadership of Congress—with whom, to be sure, I do not always agree—for its nonpartisan, responsible, and constructive support advanced on the grave issue of Berlin. This is the type of thing which makes America great: statesmanship standing above party politics.

Frankly, Mr. President, I do not always agree with the very distinguished—and I use the adjectives advisedly—the very distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, but I would rather take his advice any time than the compound advice of the committee which sponsored this document at an untimely hour.

I want the record to be straight. In reply to this report, I wish to make strong and reassuring protestations about American strength and solidarity on these gravest issues, so that no one, either here or abroad, can reach any incorrect judgments about the real leadership of either party or either branch of our Government, and so that no disastrous miscalculation of war can possibly be courted.

REPORT BY SENATOR JAVITS TO THE PEOPLE OF NEW YORK, 86TH CONGRESS, SPRING 1959

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, this is the first report on the 1st session of the 86th Congress; it is intended to keep citizens of our State informed of the activities of the Senate and my part in them.

PROSPECTS FOR PEACE AND FOREIGN AFFAIRS

In the Berlin crisis the President has stated clearly that the United States intends to stand behind our commitments in Europe to our NATO allies. This position is indispensable to our security and freedom. Our willingness to negotiate up to the summit level certainly shows good faith in the effort to preserve the peace. The peace we preserve must be one of justice and dignity, for the free world has learned from bitter lessons the price of appeasement.

I undertook the opposition to a suggestion made by one of my colleagues that the German Federal Republic—West Germany—and the East German regime should negotiate the fate of Berlin. It was my view that such a negotiation really made West Germany negotiate with the U.S.S.R., the actual boss of East Germany, and this had grave dangers for the free world of being a signal to West Germany that it should seek a Soviet alliance.

We find ourselves today in a world position which requires a utilization, at the very least, of all our national capabilities and resources. To help meet this need I introduced a joint resolution to establish an Advisory Council on National Security consisting of all living ex-Presidents and 25 of the leading citizens of the Nation. The Council is to recommend to the President and Congress programs for the establishment and implementation of national policies to meet the responsibilities and dangers faced by the United States in the world struggle for free institutions.

Recent events in Iraq point up the importance of Israel as a strong, convinced democracy in a stragetic area of the free world; Israel's continued viability is important to the welfare and security of the free world and of our country in this critical area. I will continue my efforts for the maintenance of U.S. aid to Israel and to the whole area, and for the resettlement in the Arab lands of the Arab refugees.

The administration requested for the current fiscal year a supplemental appropriation—$700 million has already been appropriated—of $225 million for the Development Loan Fund which was created in the last Congress to give economic aid to underdeveloped free world countries. This amount was cut to $100 million by the House of Representatives and the appropriation is presently pending in the Senate. I will support the full amount as essential to U.S. policy and security. Sound applications are pending for many times this amount.

The administration also has asked for a $3.93 billion program of foreign military and economic aid for the next fiscal year. Last year Congress voted $3.23 billion which was $650 million less than the President had requested; no congressional action has yet been taken this year. Legislation has been passed increasing the U.S. subscriptions by $3.175 billion to the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development and by $1.375 billion to the International Monetary Fund.

I have long advocated economic and military aid for the security and for the development and strengthening of the economies of the nations of the free world and the raising of the standards of living of the peoples living in these nations. The President has called this aid as vital as our own defense preparations.

We should continue to try to achieve an effective cessation of the testing of nuclear weapons under international control through the United Nations, safeguarded by inspection. However, unilateral discontinuance of such tests without entry into an international control system by the U.S.S.R. would be a serious threat to the free world without commensurate benefit in peace.

The peaceful settlement of the extended dispute in Cyprus has restored peace to that strategic island, serving to strengthen the free world's position in the eastern Mediterranean.

BUDGET, THE ECONOMY, AND TAXES

The President has proposed a budget for the fiscal year 1960 of $77.1 billion. This budget will be in balance only if the Congress enacts requested increased revenues raising the gasoline tax 3 cents to 4½ cents per gallon to provide $700 million in revenues, increasing postal rates to bring in an additional $350 million, and other tax increases including $200 million annually in taxes on the income of life insurance companies. The Senate will shortly consider the various appropriation bills that make up the budget.

The Government's financial situation requires close scrutiny of the budget to eliminate wasteful and unnecessary items, such as pork-barrel spending and unrealistic farm price support programs. On the other hand, we need to be wise about our realization of defense and security needs and the requirements of a developing economy and society. As our national prosperity increases, so will revenues increase. We must look as far as possible to an expanding economy for needed Federal income rather than increasing general tax rates. Also, a review of items favored under the revenue laws such as the 27.5 percent oil depletion allowance must be undertaken.

I have been designated a member of the Joint Economic Committee.

Although nationally the economic recession is now largely behind us, there are a number of areas, such as those centered on Buffalo and Schenectady, where there remains substantial unemployment and economic stress. I joined in sponsoring the Depressed Areas Act of 1959, which was intended to assist areas with high continuing unemployment to attract new industry and to help the people in those areas to readjust to new employment opportunities. However, changes which were made in the bill drastically reduced its application to New York State communities, and the amendment which I offered to prevent its use for raiding industry from one area to another was not accepted by the Senate. As a result, the effect of this program on our State would have been limited to three small areas—excluding, for example, Utica-Rome—while the bill could support attraction of other industries away from New York and therefore I had to vote against it on final passage.

The President in his message to the Congress indicated that there may be opportunity for a reduction in the taxes imposed upon our people should there be a sufficient balance remaining after the budget requests have been enacted; he has also recommended the closing of certain specific tax loopholes and the remittance of specified tax privileges. Our problems are complicated by the urgent needs of national security and domestic security which must be met. I am most understanding of the tax burden on our citizens and will endeavor to bring nearer the time when tax reductions may be feasible. Relief is especially needed from those excise levies, such as the telephone tax, imposed as an emergency measure and which have remained on the books due to Government revenue needs.

I have reintroduced my bill to give to the physically handicapped the same $600 tax exemption now extended the blind.

NATIONAL DEFENSE

There can be no question that we must exert the maximum effort in order to maintain our defense capacity at the highest necessary level; to do less is to court disaster. It is the responsibility of the Congress, therefore, to weigh carefully all the evidence and to act in accordance with these facts to assure maximum defense effort, not only in terms of quantity and of money ex-

pended but in qualitative terms—sound in strategy and tactics. The President's opinion that we have adequate defense within the budget should be controlling unless the contrary can be affirmatively demonstrated. I am therefore awaiting with great interest the report of the Senate Preparedness Subcommittee now considering this matter. You may be sure that I shall do my utmost in this regard.

The Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, of which I am now a member, has partial legislative jurisdiction of civil defense. I continue active in my work here for an adequate civil defense system in our Nation, prepared to meet not only the emergencies of war but those of peace, as well, such as flood, and other natural disasters.

The draft has been extended for an additional 4 years beyond the expiration date of June 30, 1959. I supported this extension as necessary as under present conditions our basic security needs afford us no real alternative. It is hoped that the day will not be too distant when it will no longer be necessary for the United States to spend such a high proportion of its resources for defense or require its young men to spend such a fruitful part of their lives in the armed services.

AGRICULTURE

Our farm problem is not one of shortages and poverty but rather one of surplus and plenty; yet problems persist for the Government, the farmer and the consumer. Already we have some $5.4 billion worth of surplus crops in storage costing over $1 billion annually in storage and other costs. The bill for farm price supports for the next fiscal year is estimated at $4.5 billion, some 6 percent of our national budget. Yet farm income is far below what it should be especially for the family sized farm. Dairymen in New York feel the maladjustment very keenly, too.

The administration has taken the position that the price support and production control program have not worked and has recommended that Congress either abandon the parity price concept and relate mandatory farm price supports to average market prices, or, if it insists on keeping parity, allow the Secretary of Agriculture to set supports anywhere from zero to 90 percent of the parity price—parity is a theoretical price that is supposed to give farmers a fair return based on the relationship between prices and costs in 1910–14.

I have consistently opposed high, fixed price supports for agricultural commodities both as a burden upon the taxpayer and upon the consumer. It is vital that our agricultural policy move forward with the technological advances that have benefited the farmer and the country. Generally, I have favored flexible price supports keyed to supply and demand, Government help for research in industrial uses of farm products and farm operations, credit for farm mechanization, homes, schools, telephones, electrification and roads, better marketing and selling practices and disaster insurance to help the farmer.

The Department of Agriculture has announced that dairy price supports will be kept at present levels during the marketing year which began April 1, 1959.

COMMERCE AND INDUSTRY

I have been designated a member of the Subcommittee on Securities—of which I am the senior minority member—and the Subcommittee on Banking of the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency.

Commuter problems are very grave. The service is essential and a way must be found to continue it at reasonable cost to the consumer. Governor Rockefeller's initiative in a New York program has been widely welcomed and deserves full support. Much support has been evinced for my bill, S. 858, which would enable the railroads to take full advantage of any tax abatement granted them by cities, counties, and States in order to help them continue commuter services. Thus the tax relief would directly benefit the railroad and not be absorbed by increased Federal levies. Also, I have joined in legislation to hold up on further summary discontinuances of commuter services.

The Senate passed the Federal airport bill providing for $465 million to help States and communities develop airports in a 4-year period starting July 1. Under the program, Federal grants must be matched equally by the States. The bill originally called for expenditures of $565 million over 5 years. I voted in favor of the bill on final passage but supported the amendment to reduce the program to $250 million and to restrict expenditures to runways, hangars, and necessary supporting facilities, thus barring moneys for terminals. While the bill on final passage was not everything that I would have liked, I nevertheless believed—as did the administration, which had proposed a $200 million program—that in the light of increased air traffic and the requirements of the jet age some program of Federal assistance is needed. The House passed the bill in an amended form and it is now being adjusted between the two bodies.

I am seeking reconsideration by the Tennessee Valley Authority regarding the order placed with a British firm for a steam turbine, in the light of heavy unemployment in the Schenectady area. I am actively concerning myself here not only with this turbine generator question but also with other Federal activities which affect the unemployment situation in our State, such as the diminution of defense orders and the deactivation of military bases and other Government establishments.

A measure has been introduced to amend the Robinson-Patman Antidiscrimination Act to eliminate the defense of good faith in cutting a price for a particular customer allegedly to meet the quotation of a competitor. I will consider this proposal in the light of the necessity of maintaining practical rules of competition, not only for the benefit of the businessman but also for the protection of the ultimate consumer.

LABOR

As this report is written the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, of which I am a member, has reported out the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959—S. 1555. This is a new bill which has evolved as the result of weeks of work by the committee on the Kennedy-Ervin bill—S. 505—which was similar to the bill passed last year in the Senate by a vote of 88 to 1 but which failed of passage in the House. I have joined as a sponsor of this new bill.

S. 1555 represents a distinct improvement over the earlier bill. Every labor organization is required to file with the Secretary of Labor a copy of its constitution and bylaws and a report as to initiation fees, dues, and practices as well as file an annual report as to its finances and both labor and employers must file on dealings with each other's officials and agents and with labor consultants.

Suit by individual members of labor organizations to recover embezzled or diverted funds is authorized in certain cases. Bribery by an employer of representatives of a labor organization is prohibited. "Blackmail picketing" which is for the personal benefit or enrichment of an individual is also prohibited. The requirement of the filing of a non-Communist affidavit by union officials is extended to employers; provision is made to control excesses in trusteeships of union locals, for fair elections of the officers and executive boards of labor organizations by secret ballot, to make ineligible for union office certain persons convicted of crimes of violence except with the permission of the Secretary of Labor, and for the promulgation of codes of ethical practices by labor organizations. The bill includes an arrangement to deal with the so-called no man's land gap of jurisdiction between the National Labor Relations Board and State agencies. The bill also deals with union representation problems in the building construction industry, a long-needed reform.

This bill, which will be debated in the Senate very shortly, is an important step toward eliminating the abuses disclosed by the McClellan Committee. Passage of this measure does not preclude enactment of further legislation in this Congress dealing with labor-management relations and amendments to the Taft-Hartley Act.

The extent of unemployment and the inadequacy of many State unemployment compensation systems continue to present grave problems. The 3-month extension of the temporary Federal unemployment compensation program now law is inadequate to the purpose. It covers only those already entitled to draw the Federal supplement by virtue of exhaustion of State benefits on April 1, 1959, who are still within the one benefit year.

An estimated 405,000 jobless workers will keep getting payments until they have received benefits for a period equal to half the duration of their exhausted

regular State benefits. The program will involve additional costs of about $78 million, almost all in the current fiscal year ending June 30. No newly unemployed workers can be added to the rolls, nor can any now receiving aid collect money beyond July 1.

I joined in sponsoring an amendment which passed the Senate whereby newly unemployed workers could participate in the benefits of the bill during this 3-month extension period. This would have been some improvement; however, the House did not accept this amendment and it was omitted from the final bill. I anticipate the unemployment situation will result in long-range legislation during this Congress; the 3-month extension gives time for such action. I support Federal standards of unemployment compensation to be met by the States as minimums. These are necessary for the national economy to prevent unfair competition between the States for business.

I joined in sponsorship of S. 226 to provide improvements in the Railroad Retirement program.

I introduced the National Act Against Age Discrimination in Employment, which deals with unjust discrimination in employment because of age by firms engaged in interstate commerce; S. 739 to prevent age discrimination by Government contractors; and the District of Columbia Act Against Wage Discrimination in Employment, which is similar to the law enacted last year for New York State. I have also introduced a bill to designate the month of May as Senior Citizens Month.

SMALL BUSINESS AND CONSUMERS

As a member of the Senate Select Committee on Small Business and the Small Business Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, I am deeply concerned with small business problems.

I have joined in the sponsorship of S. 59 to provide a program of tax adjustment for persons engaged in small business; S. 1010 to permit the use of the new methods and rates of depreciation for used machinery and equipment; and the Individual's Tax Retirement Act of 1959, which would encourage the establishment of voluntary retirement plans by self-employed individuals analogous to the tax treatment accorded to labor-management pension plans.

The cost-of-living index, while relatively stable, still continues to rise. The danger of inflation, as of unemployment, persists. It is the consumer, especially those who must live on fixed or limited incomes, who bears the heaviest share of the burden of rising prices.

I have protested the restrictions on imports of oil and petroleum products (and on lead and zinc) and have called attention to the serious domestic problem that would be created for homeowners and apartment dwellers who would have to pay higher fuel bills.

HOUSING

The Senate passed major housing legislation, the Housing Act of 1959, early in the session, and it is now pending before the House of Representatives. This bill would liberalize FHA mortgage terms for homeowners, authorize $2.1 billion additional funds for urban renewal and slum clearance; extend the public housing provisions and improve other Federal activity in the housing field. The bill as passed in the Senate included my amendment to increase the amount payable to a family displaced from an urban renewal site from $100 to $200. Also included were my amendments to extend urban planning grants to counties and communities of up to 50,000 population and to make urban renewal sites available to New York State's low- and middle-income housing programs.

In order to meet the needs of middle-income families, I also sponsored a bill to create a Limited Profit Mortgage Corporation in the Federal Government modeled after New York State's successful middle-income housing program which is intended, at no cost to the Federal Government, to make available long-term, low-interest loans to private and nonprofit builders who will supply housing for middle-income families who cannot pay the rents of new, private housing, yet who are ineligible for low-rent public housing. The bill contemplates 150,000 such housing units in the first instance.

I also sponsored legislation to help avoid foreclosures of FHA mortgages in case of a temporary default, in order to assist families who are subject to a temporary economic setback to keep their homes.

CIVIL RIGHTS AND CIVIL LIBERTIES

The passage of effective civil rights legislation has in the past been repeatedly prevented by the threat of the filibuster in the Senate. On the first day of this Congress I renewed my fight to change the rules under which filibusters were possible. Although the Senate did adopt a slight change in the rules, I did not feel that this made a meaningful change; however, the real effectiveness of the change which reduced the number of Senators required to close off a filibuster, from two-thirds of the Senate membership—66—to two-thirds of those present, will be tested when civil rights legislation comes to the Senate floor.

I sponsored legislation to deal with the serious problem of hate bombings which have struck at churches, synagogues, schools, community centers and homes in a number of communities, especially in the Southern States where opposition to desegregation of the public schools is the greater. As part of the means for dealing with this problem, while at the same time carefully preserving our traditional freedoms of speech and press, I have introduced bills to bar from the mails literature which directly incites such criminal acts.

One of our most serious domestic problems continues to be the need for assuring all our citizens their constitutional rights, particularly in public school desegregation. I have introduced legislation to permit the Justice Department to take the initiative in local Federal courts in protecting the constitutional rights of individuals.

I also joined in sponsoring civil rights bills which would assist localities to meet the technical and financial problems of public school desegregation, to assure school facilities to children of military personnel when local schools are closed in an attempt to prevent desegregation, and to give statutory standing to the President's Commission on Equal Job Opportunities.

I continue to oppose enactment of legislation which would restrict the power of the Supreme Court to protect the rights of individuals or interfere with its jurisdiction to declare laws unconstitutional. While I do not believe that the Supreme Court or any other branch of Government should be immune from criticism, I consider the general attacks on the Court as posing a threat to the traditional balance of powers inherent in our form of government. I therefore reintroduced, with a bipartisan group of my colleagues, my constitutional amendment which would assure the appellate jurisdiction of the Supreme Court in constitutional cases; this proposal has received the support of bar associations throughout the country. While the Congress may and should pass laws to close up any loopholes in legislation it thinks have been opened up by Court decisions, these laws should in turn be subject to the Court's constitutional law jurisdiction.

I joined in sponsorship of the Federal Equal Pay Act to prohibit discrimination on account of sex in the payment of wages.

IMMIGRATION

Time is growing short in the necessity for enactment now of legislation to deal with modern immigration needs. Our law now does not reflect our national history and tradition of hospitality, asylum and equal opportunity or our national needs.

July begins the World Refugee Year. Both the Zellerbach Commission of the International Rescue Committee on the European Refugee Situation and the U.S. Committee for Refugees have made constructive recommendations on American policy in this regard, to which the Congress should give urgent attention. I am also preparing legislation looking for the admittance of a portion of these refugees and fourth-preference quota immigrants as well as the general rectification of the McCarran-Walter Immigration Act to eliminate discriminations and inequities.

EDUCATION, HEALTH, AND SOCIAL SECURITY

As a member of the Subcommittee on Education of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, I have found that despite efforts by the States and localities, an acute national shortage of classrooms and qualified teachers persists. Moved by this need for a major national defense emergency program of Federal assistance, I introduced in the Senate the Education Assistance Act of 1959 which provides for a 5-year program of Federal aid for expanded school construction and for increasing teachers' salaries with special provision for science and mathematics teaching. Provision is made that the Federal Government shall not exercise any direction or control over the personnel or pro-

gram of instruction in any local school system.

The need continues for the program of Federal aid to schools in federally impacted areas established in 1950 and I am supporting the necessary appropriation for this purpose.

I joined in sponsorship of legislation to authorize loans to colleges and universities for the construction, rehabilitation, alterations, conversion, and improvement of classroom buildings and other academic facilities. The substance of this measure was passed by the Senate and is presently pending in the House.

Four of my colleagues have joined me in introducing legislation to establish a Health Services Study Commmission which would determine the health service needs of all our citizens with particular reference to the coverage required by and actually extended to certain groups like the aged, unemployed, mentally ill, minorities, and others, including families in thinly populated areas, by the many voluntary prepaid health insurance plans now in operation.

To help combat the problem of drug addiction, I introduced proposed legislation to establish a Federal narcotics hospital in New York State.

Social security benefits were increased by 7 percent on the first day of this year in accordance with legislation enacted in the last Congress, which I had supported. The increase enacted was not altogether a satisfactory one in the light of the needs of our citizens; I shall work this year for a better law not only as it applies to the amount of benefits but also as regards the extent of coverage and benefits, and elimination of the inequitable earnings limitations.

To help provide needed day care for the millions of children of working mothers, I introduced the Day Care Assistance Act of 1959 to authorize a program of Federal aid for the day care of children outside the home.

I am working for early consideration of legislation dealing with juvenile delinquency and have also introduced the Juvenile Delinquency Control Act to strengthen and improve State and local programs to combat and control juvenile delinquency and youth crime, with a portion of the costs to be shared by the Federal Government with the States.

POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE

The budget request contains a $350 million increase in postal rates, including raising first-class mail rates from 4 to 5 cents. However the likelihood of enactment of this proposal this year depends on budget and defense expenditure considerations.

I have reintroduced my bill to grant employees of the postal field service time off for one State holiday each year.

VETERANS

I have joined in sponsoring the measure which would create in the Senate a Committee on Veterans' Affairs and am also cosponsoring the bill to provide a 1-year period during which certain veterans may be granted National Service Life Insurance.

Both the House and the Senate voted to increase the GI mortgage rate from 4¾ to 5¼ percent. Senate-House differences must be resolved before the legislation can go to the President to be signed into law. Although I have in the past opposed such interest rate increases, I supported this one as the only practical way money could be made available at this time for GI home mortgage loans since lending institutions have not been making loans at the lower rate.

MATTERS OF SPECIAL INTEREST TO NEW YORK STATE

Unemployment persists in several areas of our State. In an effort to ease the situation and in cooperation with my colleagues from both parties in the New York congressional delegation, I have been active to see that New York obtains its full, fair share of defense orders and have also protested the shift from New York to California and other States of Government contracts. To further help New York in this effort, I am joining in legislation to stimulate Armed Forces procurement on the basis of competitive bidding rather than by privately negotiated contracts.

In several instances in which defense contracts of New York firms have been terminated, I have taken effective action to minimize the effect of the termination of contracts in order to avoid as far as possible hardships to the employees of these firms as the result of layoffs and discharges. In a number of cases where there have been layoffs in Federal installations, such as the Scotia Naval Supply Depot, the Brooklyn Navy Yard, and the Stewart Air Force Base, among others, I have worked to minimize the extent of layoffs and substitute new activities at these installations for those which were terminated.

In order to relieve the heavy burden on our courts which has resulted in unfortunate delays in litigation, I introduced a bill providing for the appointment of seven additional judges for three Federal courts in the New York area.

I have sponsored legislation to provide for an additional payment of $165,000 to the village of Highland Falls toward the cost of the water infiltration plant constructed by such village; to authorize the conveyance to the city of New York of certain surplus lands comprising the Manhattan Beach Air Force Station at Sheepshead Bay; to recognize Samuel Wilson, of Troy, as the progenitor of America's national symbol, "Uncle Sam"; and to request the President to issue a proclamation designating 1959 for the observance of the 350th anniversary of the historic voyages of Hudson and Champlain.

I supported before the Civil Aeronautics Board the applications for MacArthur Airport, in Long Island, and Oneonta Airport, at Oneonta, to be certified as airports for use by scheduled commercial airlines.

MISCELLANEOUS

Alaska and Hawaii have now been voted admittance as our 49th and 50th States. I supported this legislation.

I have introduced legislation to modernize the tariff laws for works of art and other exhibition material. I am also sponsoring a bill to permit the importation of trademarked articles, like certain perfumes, now restricted, when the item *is* for personal use.

The question of publicity for payrolls of Members of Congress is one which has received much and deserved public attention of late. I favor full disclosure. I am the sponsor of several measures looking toward the maintenance of the highest possible standards of ethics in Government service. Needless to add, never have I had a relative on my official payroll.

To stimulate throughout the United States advancement of the performing arts, I introduced a bill to establish an Arts Foundation.

CONCLUSION

It becomes increasingly important that the people have a better understanding of what goes on in the Federal Government and what their elected legislators are doing. I am endeavoring to further this undertaking through this report and frequent reports to the State on radio and television; I ask from my constituents, on their part, letters and expressions of opinion; these are a valuable aid in my work here. In addition, the citizen's Federal problems are an important part of my duty. I sincerely hope that you will continue to express your views to me; also that you will feel free to visit my office in New York City—341 Ninth Avenue—or in Washington.

AMENDMENT OF REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 2 OF 1953

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 144) to amend Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1953.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, 25 years ago, as Governor-elect of South Carolina, I came to Washington to see the late President Roosevelt to seek funds to start a rural electrification program in South Carolina.

Early in 1935 the South Carolina General Assembly created the South Carolina rural electrification program which preceded action on the national level. Later that spring, by Executive order, President Roosevelt sent $100,000 to my State to help initiate this program. In 1936 Congress passed legislation creating the national rural electrification program. It was patterned after the program initiated in South Carolina. The South Carolina act was drafted in Washington at that time by the administration.

I know well the story, history, and good record of REA from top to bottom. When the REA was first created, the Congress established the office of Administrator of REA. Besides the paperwork and administrative functions, the REA Administrator was charged with the duty of approving or disapproving loans for rural electric programs. For over 23 years this function was performed by the REA Administrator.

Then, in May of 1957, the Secretary of Agriculture, within whose Department REA had functioned independently, decided to assume the loanmaking powers of the REA Administrator. There

is no justification for this assumption of power by the Secretary of Agriculture.

The REA program has been efficiently operated without the slighest blight on its record. Cooperatives in a great part of the country are ahead of schedule on their repayments, and the REA has not lost a thin dime of the Government's money. I point out that $1 billion has been repaid the Government by cooperatives on loans. It is a self-sufficient agency of the Government which has assisted the rural people of this Nation to come out of the Dark Ages and join the rest of the lighted world.

Before REA existed, more than 90 percent of rural America was still living at night by candlelight and lanterns. After years of futile pleading for extension of city lines to rural areas, the rural electric cooperatives were organized by the rural people themselves to do the job.

Today more than 90 percent of rural America is lighted with electricity. This commendable job was done under the administration of REA which, until 1957, was headed by the Administrator of REA, who made decisions on placing loans.

This bill, of which I am a cosponsor, would not change the REA program or its personnel in any way. It would only restore the REA to its original organization and operation which worked so successfully and above reproach for so many years.

The rural electric cooperatives in my State of South Carolina and the cooperatives all over America have endorsed this proposed legislation.

I certainly endorse this legislation for, if the Secretary of Agriculture plans to administer the rural electric program in the future as he has administered the farm programs in the past, the REA program will be wrecked in a short time.

I would much rather have a very weak law on the statute books and have a good Administrator than to have a strong law on the statute books and have a poor Administrator to administer it—one who was trying his best to kill it.

REA is a continuous program. As people buy more electrical equipment and modernize their farm operations, they will be needing more and more electrical energy. As this need grows, so grows the need for heavier distribution lines, and with such growth comes the need for new loans and new authorizations. The Administrator of REA, and not the Secretary of Agriculture, should be in the position of judging the soundness and need for such loans.

An unfriendly Secretary of Agriculture with no sympathy for the programs of REA, and not sworn to defend REA, could render havoc to our local REA programs. Farmers without adequate electricity do not buy electrical appliances and do not modernize their operations. A stagnant cooperative, like any other business, will degenerate. Incompetence in Washington can result in the bleak picture of a rural America being dotted with dying cooperatives.

The very existence of rural cooperatives and the REA program may depend on passage of this legislation or some similar legislation; I urge the Senate to support this bill, in order to defend the Rural Electrification Administration against the present Secretary of Agriculture. If we do not enact such legislation, I fear that rural electrification is in great danger.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the remarks made by the very able senior Senator from South Carolina with respect to the rural electrification program.

At least as much as any other program, the rural electrification program has contributed to a better way of life for farmers, and others, all over rural America.

The accomplishments of the REA in the past 24 years are well known.

In my own State, at the time the REA was created in 1935, but 6 percent of the farm families were receiving electric service.

Now, more than 95 percent of Missouri's farms are being served by this great institution.

The REA is an outstanding example of the type of achievement that can be had when individual farmers, in cooperation with both their neighbors and their Government, set out to do a job.

In recent years, there has been a growing feeling of apprehension on the part of the REA members of Missouri. When it became known that the Secretary of Agriculture was exercising final authority in passing on certain loans, our people became even more concerned.

As a member of the Government Operations Subcommittee in the last Congress, I was privileged to hear witnesses from all over the country request that the REA Administrator be given full authority for the loanmaking policy and functions of the REA.

Recently, at the national REA convention here in Washington, I also had the privilege of visiting with the leaders, as well as many members of the electric cooperatives in Missouri.

These people reiterated their support for the principles embodied in S. 144. They expressed their sincere view that the rural electrification program was created to provide electric service to farmers and farm areas.

The REA has been, and should continue to be, an organization of farmers, for farmers; therefore it should continue to be associated with those agencies of the Government primarily concerned with agricultural matters.

For a few years after the REA was created, it was an independent agency. In 1939, after 4 years of operation and study, the Congress decided to place the REA as part of the Department of Agriculture—in other words, as an independent agency of that Department.

As the chairman of the Agriculture Committee, the distinguished Senior Senator from Louisiana, said in the Senate Agriculture Committee on March 5 and 6:

> As far as I am concerned, I don't recall having heard very much criticism of the operations of the REA so long as it was under Agriculture as a more or less independent agency * * * It made its greatest progress while it was under Agriculture, where it received sympathetic review by the Department that was interested in the farmer.

Mr. President, the best interests of the REA will be served if we follow the philosophy of S. 144—to keep the REA within the Department of Agriculture; and give the Administrator of the REA full and complete authority with regard to the loanmaking and financial functions of the program.

Mr. CURTIS obtained the floor.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska yield so that I may suggest the absence of a quorum?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield for that purpose.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LAUSCHE in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I am pleased to offer an amendment in the nature of a substitute for the bill now under discussion. The distinguished senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] has joined me in offering the amendment. Our amendment, if enacted, would recreate the Rural Electrification Administration as an independent agency of government. It would recreate the agency in the status originally conceived and originally intended.

Mr. President, I should like to call the attention of the Senate to the text of S. 144. It consists of 15 lines on page 2, from line 7 to line 22.

I ask anyone to inform us who will run REA if the bill shall be enacted. I ask anyone who reads the amendment offered by myself and the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] whether he has any doubt in his mind as to who would run REA under the substitute. I shall refer to that point later.

I suppose that, if we were asked to select the greatest accomplishment in farming, in our generation, it would be very easy to point out the electrification of our farms. In 1935, 11 percent of our farms were receiving central station electric service. Today, 96 percent of our farms are getting such service.

One of the most interesting and praiseworthy aspects of our rural electric program, through its first 23 years of operation, is that it has enjoyed the strong support of Members of Congress from farming States. When REA was created, in 1935, it was set up to be a nonpartisan agency dedicated to the bringing of electricity to our farms. While there have been, at different times, political charges and counter charges surrounding some REA side issues, involving controversial power projects proposed for construction by the Department of the Interior, the program for authorization and appropriations of REA funds have had the votes of Republicans and Democrats alike, representing our farm States in Congress.

President Roosevelt created the REA by Executive order in 1935. A year later, Representative SAM RAYBURN, in the House, and Nebraska's Senator George W. Norris, in the Senate, sponsored legislation to prescribe its governing rules.

Permit me to cite a few facts. Since 1952, there has never been any year in which money for loan authorization was insufficient. In the 1957 fiscal year, a volume of applications exceeded the expected demand for new loans. The administration hurriedly requested $200 million for additional loans, and the authority to make the loans was speedily approved by the Congress.

Since 1952 the backlog of loan applications made to the REA headquarters has been wiped out and loans are being processed faster by Administrator Hamil than ever before in the history of REA. At this point let me relate that Davy Hamil, our REA Administrator, is doing the best job ever performed by any REA Chief. He is a farmer who worked with REA problems as a consumer and as an official of his co-op. In the legislature of his native State he labored effectively on legislation to promote REA. He is a diligent man, and is performing an excellent public service.

Because of the criticism of this administration's handling of the REA program, I have spent much time studying REA matters. About 2 years ago, the Secretary of Agriculture asked Administrator Hamil to submit, for review by him, all loan applications in excess of $500,000. This has resulted in much strife, noise, and name calling. The Secretary's request was based on two reorganization plans—one in 1939 and the other in 1953. The earlier plan, authored by President Roosevelt, removed REA from its independent status and placed it within the Department of Agriculture "under the general direction and supervision of the Secretary of Agriculture." The reorganization plan of 1953 further implemented the 1939 act and gave to the Secretary of Agriculture "all functions" of other departmental employees "not now vested in him." When the Secretary asked for review of all REA loans over $500,000, the concern in some places caused the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] to introduce a bill in the Senate, and Representative MELVIN PRICE to introduce a bill in the House, nullifying the 1953 reorganization plan. I am a member of the committee, along with the Senator from Minnesota, which studied his bill, and sat in the hearings on it.

The interesting feature of the hearings was not the heated politics, but the fact that officials of local REA's who came before the committee to support the Humphrey bill all stated, to a man, that review of loans had not slowed down, at any time, the making of loans. Davy Hamil testified that every loan approved by him has been made, and that review of the loans over $500,000 has not, in one single instance, reversed any loan he has approved.

During the past fall, I gave much thought to REA matters. I discussed REA with many Nebraskans who are interested in it. I reread hearings and debates on REA legislation. It occurred to me that the best interests of our fine and progressive rural electric program will be served by reestablishing its independent status. I discussed my plans with the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL]. He agreed with me and, on January 9, 1959, we introduced a bill to reestablish the Rural Electrification Administration as an independent agency of the Federal Government. Our bill, if enacted, will permit REA to operate as originally conceived in 1935, and as authorized by the Norris-Rayburn Act of 1936.

There is a logical background for the amendment. In 1944, Senator E. D. Smith, as chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, introduced a bill, S. 2034, to return the Rural Electrification Administration to independent status. This followed 5 months of hearings on REA problems, and the issuance of a subcommittee report recommending the proposed legislation which was signed by two Democrats and two Republicans.

Senator Lucas, on January 6, 1945, introduced a so-called postwar planning bill for REA—S. 89—which contained, among other provisions, the reestablishment of REA as an independent agency. It passed the Senate on May 14, 1945, without a record vote.

During the hearings on Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1953, Mr. Clyde Ellis stated in behalf of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association:

> Rural electric leaders have never become reconciled to the placing of REA in the Department of Agriculture and have continued to feel that the program would be better served by a completely independent agency.

Some fears have been expressed, and I believe with absolute sincerity, that disadvantages might accrue to the Rural Electrification Administration should it become an independent agency. These fears can be allayed by taking notice of REA's stature with Members of Congress of both parties. The widespread support for REA and its progress should certainly assure a wholesome continuation of its objectives. All members of Congress knowledgeable of the benefits of central station electric service to rural America will accord REA the support it deserves and merits. Those Members comprise a substantial majority in both Houses of Congress.

I have received many letters and resolutions from officials of REA districts supporting the amendment in the nature of a substitute which I have offered for myself and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL]. In addition, I am proud that the Nebraska Rural Electric Association, in a State convention on February 2, 1959, adopted a resolution supporting this proposal and a bill similar to it introduced in the House of Representatives by Representative LAWRENCE BROCK, of Nebraska.

Many arguments both pro and con were made at the time the Rural Electrification Administration was transferred to the Department of Agriculture in 1939. Regardless of the merits of those arguments, the great changes which have occurred in the electric industry since 1939 require a reappraisal of the justification for moving REA into the Department of Agriculture. Probably no other industry in the country has gone through greater changes than that of the generation, transmission, and distribution of electric energy. The borrowers from REA play an important part in this work. The rapid growth and peculiar problems of supplying electricity to people in rural areas require that REA be subject directly to Congress as an independent agency. While the supplying of electric energy to persons in rural areas has some factors common with other activities of the Department of Agriculture it is increasingly clear that the problems of the future with respect to REA work will not be the type of agricultural problems with which the Department is concerned.

It is my belief that the creation of REA as an independent agency will not violate the principles of the Hoover Commission report.

Having determined that the agency should be independent, it is necessary to assure that it will be completely free. Any attempt to give the Administrator partial control, and at the same time to retain some control in the Department of Agriculture, could only lead to utter confusion and the disadvantage of the program. Overlapping areas of judisdiction and control are the fertile fields of confusion and delay which lead to a breakdown of the service being rendered to the farmers by the REA program.

The discussions before the subcommittee of the Committee on Agriculture clearly show that there is confusion as to the intent and purpose of Senate bill 144. If it is intended to mean that the bare act of affixing or refusing to affix his signature to a loan is the sole responsibility of the Administrator, the bill is meaningless. If it means that all decisions as to policies, procedures, and personnel, which are the ingredients of the loan process, are to be made by the Administrator, then the enactment of the bill would result in removing the REA from the Department of Agriculture.

The substitute offered by me and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] removes all doubt as to the authority of the Administrator with respect to the loan programs authorized by the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended. Senate bill 144 creates confusion and doubt as to who has the final responsibility for carrying out the objectives of this act. Even the most charitable view of Senate bill 144 means that there will be two administrative heads of the REA. The extent of the authority of either of these heads is not made clear by the provisions of Senate bill 144. Having two bosses with their jurisdiction undecided could lead to only one end, namely, hopeless confusion and a serious adverse effect on the accomplishments of the REA program. The Congress should not at this time take any action which might defeat the objectives of the act.

For example, Senate bill 144 proposes to repeal the part of Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1953 which transferred

to the Secretary of Agriculture authority in addition to that given him by Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1939. That is proposed in an effort to give to the Administrator sole responsibility for the making of loans. At the same time, if Senate bill 144 is enacted, the Administrator will have, according to title I of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, with amendments—

all of the powers of which shall be exercised by an Administrator under the general direction and supervision of the Secretary of Agriculture.

There is no effort to clarify what "general direction and supervision" the Secretary of Agriculture will then have, should Senate bill 144 be enacted.

Mr. President, I now come to the very crucial point of the distinction between these two proposals. I believe that the authors of Senate bill 144 have acted in good faith and with good intentions. But I am convinced that the language they have used is such that it defeats the whole objective they seek; and I call attention to this particular point:

Section 3 of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended, provides:

The Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to make loans to the Administrator, upon the request and approval of the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. President, that provision is not changed by the Humphrey bill, Senate bill 144. This is obviously an important policy function still vested in the Secretary of Agriculture, which is not dealt with in Senate bill 144.

In other words, Mr. President, suppose there were to develop a situation in which the Secretary of Agriculture and the Administrator of the REA disagreed. Under the Humphrey proposal, the Administrator of the REA would have the sole authority to approve or to disapprove an application made by a local REA for a loan. But the authority to obtain the money from the Treasury, so the local REA could obtain its loan, would rest solely with the Secretary of Agriculture.

Could there be more confusion; could there be a greater blow to the fine REA program, than to have such dual authority? It is true that if such a proposal were enacted, nothing might happen under it for a time. But if there were a Secretary of Agriculture and an REA Administrator who were not working in harmony, then a proposal of this kind would result in such a situation that the REA Administrator would be the only one who could approve a loan which was sought by a local REA; but the only one who could obtain from the Treasury the funds with which to make the loan would be the Secretary of Agriculture. Such legislation would not be good; it would not result in sound governmental procedure; it would not be in accord with the Hoover Commission's report; it would not be fair to the American farmers. Instead, it would create legislative chaos.

I am thoroughly convinced that the authors of Senate bill 144 did not intend any such thing. But all the consideration and endorsement of Senate bill 144 by various organizations occurred prior to the writing of the present language of Senate bill 144 and prior to full discussion of the meaning of the language used.

Mr. President, it is my hope that the authors of Senate bill 144 will withdraw their bill and will reconsider it, or else will accept our substitute.

I suggest that all the Members of this body read Senate bill 144 and try to determine who will run the REA program. The bill says that the program shall be operated under the direction and supervision of the Secretary of Agriculture; but then the bill provides that only the Administrator can approve or disapprove an application for a loan, although the bill leaves in the Secretary of Agriculture the sole responsibility of obtaining from the Treasury the money with which to make the loans.

I suggest that all Senators read the bill, and determine who will administer the REA program; and I suggest that then they read the substitute, and then see whether they have any doubt about what will happen.

Our amendment in the nature of a substitute provides:

There is hereby created and established in the executive branch of the Government an independent agency to be known as the Rural Electrification Administration.

A little later our amendment provides:

The Administrator shall have direction, supervision, and control of the Rural Electrification Administration and all of its operations and functions as authorized in the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended.

Mr. President, the substitute may not prevail. It ought to; and I believe it may. But if this issue is carried back home to the local REA's, Senate bill 144 will be a bad one to take to them. All one has to do is read the 15 lines of the Humphrey bill to find that no one can say that there is central authority and responsibility provided for the REA program.

During hearings on the Curtis-Russell substitute before the subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Agriculture, headed by the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], it was stated that our substitute would "make possible the arbitrary discharge of experienced, capable and loyal employees of the Rural Electrification Administration."

The Curtis-Russell substitute has been drafted in accordance with standard provisions contained in all reorganization bills coming before the Congress. The authority to transfer personnel is always designated in this type of legislation. It is inconceivable, and almost ridiculous, to presume that Davy Hamil, as Administrator of the independent agency, would want to discharge capable and loyal employees of the REA. These apprehensions, however sincere, are not supportable. For example, our substitute bill duplicates the procedure taken under the act of August 6, 1953, which established the Farm Credit Administration as an independent agency. Does any colleague know of any instance wherein capable and loyal employees of the Farm Credit Administration were arbitrarily discharged as a result of that reorganization plan?

To allay any other fears, the Curtis-Russell substitute proposes that the substantive legislation relating to REA and its appropriations shall come before the Committees on Agriculture of both Houses, and before the same Appropriations Subcommittees now possessing jurisdiction.

The broad consideration and support which REA has received from a large majority of the Congress, representing both political parties, give me full assurance that our Rural Electrification Administration can best operate and grow and prosper as an independent agency. I sincerely believe that enactment of S. 144, as reported, can only serve to compound a confusion which we know exists, and make it worse, to the detriment of America's rural community.

Mr. President, the question has been raised, Do either of these proposals violate the principles of the Hoover Commission report? I say that S. 144 as reported by the committee violates the basic principles of the Hoover Commission recommendation. The objective of the Hoover Commission was to centralize authority, to establish a direct chain of command. The Humphrey bill defeats the principle of centralized authority and of a direct chain of command. For instance, if it shall become law, only the Administrator will be able to approve a loan, but only the Secretary will have final authority to secure funds from the Treasury to make the loan.

Could anything be more confusing? I hope the distinguished Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], who is so devoted to rural America, will withdraw his bill and consider the language again.

Mr. President, during yesterday's debate, as shown on page 5447 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the senior Senator from Minnesota cited certain examples to support his bill as reported from the committee. Among these examples he cited the Federal Maritime Board, the Bureau of Mines, and the General Counsel of the National Labor Relations Board. To my knowledge, neither the Bureau of Mines nor the General Counsel of the National Labor Relations Board has any loan programs under their respective jurisdictions.

However, in the case of the Federal Maritime Board, I should like to remind the distinguished senior Senator from Minnesota that Reorganization Act 21 of May 4, 1950, gave absolute control to the Chairman of the Federal Maritime Board over regulatory and personnel functions. The regulatory functions contained in the Shipping Acts of 1916 and 1933, and certain few ones contained in the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, were brought under the absolute control of the Chairman of the Maritime Board. On the contrary, there was reserved in that Reorganization Act to the Secretary of Commerce authority for general policy direction over the granting of subsidies for the construction and operation of merchant and passenger vessels under contract with the Federal Maritime Board. The Federal Maritime Board disburses very large amounts of

money for construction and operating subsidies and, as previously stated, the general policy over these subsidies has been reserved to the Secretary of Commerce by Reorganization Act 21 of May 4, 1950.

In closing, I wish to say there is no precedent and no pattern for S. 144. Its enactment would result in utter confusion. It would not do what its authors think it would. Some of the authors of the bill have expressed the opinion that S. 144 would create a situation such as exists in the case of the Farm Credit Administration. That is absolutely incorrect. The Farm Credit Administration is an independent agency, with all the power vested in one place.

Again I say, read the two proposals, and see if it can be determined who would run the REA if either one of the proposals were enacted.

There is no doubt what would happen under the Curtis-Russell proposal. The agency would be an independent agency. The Humphrey bill is condensed confusion in 15 lines. Admittedly, it vests with the REA Administrator the authority to make a loan to an REA in any of our States, but vests in the Secretary of Agriculture power over all further functions—legal, general policies, interest policies, and everything else—but, more than that, only the Secretary of Agriculture could get the money out of the Treasury to make the loans.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

CALL OF THE ROLL

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

Mr. HENNINGS. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. MCGEE], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], are absent on official business.

I further announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] is absent because of illness and that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] is absent because of illness in his family.

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER] is absent on official business for the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] is absent on official business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

AMENDMENT OF REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 2 OF 1953

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 144) to amend Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1953.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I am opposed to Senate bill 144, on which I filed minority views. I do not wish to speak for the majority leader or the minority leader, but it is my understanding that only three or four Senators may wish to speak for perhaps 3 or 4 minutes, and that after they have concluded their remarks the Senate will vote on the substitute offered by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS].

The substitute, of course, would make REA an independent agency. That would be much better than the situation which would result under Senate bill 144. I am a member of the Committee on Government Operations. The able Senator now presiding [Mr. LAUSCHE] and I listened to all the testimony a year ago.

Senate bill 144 is nothing more than what might be termed spite legislation. There is absolutely no more need for Senate bill 144 than there is for my having a third leg. Every person who testified before the committee, even those who were in favor of Senate bill 144, testified that the present administration of REA under Secretary Benson and Mr. Hamil had been 100-percent perfect; that they had never had an application for a loan rejected; that there never had been any delay in the granting of loans; that the operation of the agency, so far as they were concerned, had been excellent. The only reason the witnesses gave for wanting to change the procedure was that they were afraid of what might happen in the future. That is the only reason they gave in their testimony for wishing to change the present act.

I call attention to the committee report, at page 11. REA has been in existence for 24 years. In the 6 years in which it has been operated by Mr. Benson and Mr. Hamil half as many loans were made as were made during the two previous administrations. I am not criticizing the previous administration. During the past 6 years half as many loans were made as were made in the previous 18 years. There is nothing in the record anywhere which indicates that the Department of Agriculture has not been cooperating with REA. In fact, the record is just the opposite. For example, the record shows the total new loan funds appropriated amount to $1,545 million during the 6-year administration of Benson and Hamil; and $2,954 million during the previous 18 years under the former administrations.

The record shows, for gross loans made, under Benson and Hamil, $1,227 million; during the 18 years from 1935 to 1953, under previous administrations, $2,619 million.

For loans for generation and transmission facilities—and this is the item to which I wish to call particular attention, because it is the one about which some persons have expressed fear, apprehending that they will not get loans—under Benson and Hamil, for 6 years, $400 million; during the previous 18 years, the amount was $469 million. I could continue to recite additional facts. However, no showing has been made to indicate that we should deny the Secretary of Agriculture the right to veto loans.

I ask Senators to believe me when I say that the whole purpose of the proposed legislation contained in S. 144 is to embarrass Secretary Benson and the Department of Agriculture. There will be other Secretaries of Agriculture. Secretary Benson will not be in office forever.

The substitute offered by the able Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] calls for establishing REA as an independent agency. That would be a great deal better than to take authority away from the Secretary of Agriculture. Under S. 144 the REA remains in the Department of Agriculture, the moneys for it are appropriated to the Secretary of Agriculture, and he has the responsibility for them, but he has absolutely nothing to say about the loans.

If we adopt the substitute and make REA an independent agency, we will be where we were when the agency was first established. President Roosevelt, after it had operated 4 years as an independent agency, put it in the Department of Agriculture. It has been there ever since. The Department of Agriculture has done well with it. We should not be taking up the time of the Senate debating a proposal such as Senate bill 144. It is not needed. As I said a minute ago, it would be 100 percent spite legislation. Not one good reason has been advanced to support the enactment of such legislation.

Therefore, Mr. President, after a vote has been taken on the substitute proposed by the Senator from Nebraska, I shall make a motion to recommit the bill to the Committee on Government Operations for further study. I do not believe the Senate is ready to act upon this measure. I do not believe we can foresee what the consequences of the proposed action would be. If we are to do anything, we should make REA an independent agency. If we pass S. 144, no one will know who has the authority, whether it be the Director of REA or the Secretary of Agriculture. After the vote is taken on the substitute, I shall make a motion to recommit the bill.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, has the motion to recommit been made?

Mr. CAPEHART. No; I shall make it after the vote is had on the substitute.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I know that there are not many Members of the Senate who have supported the REA program longer and more earnestly than I have. I yield to no one in the support of the program at the present time. If I thought either of the proposals now before the Senate would improve the REA program, I would certainly support the one which I thought would advance its work the best.

I do not agree with some of the recommendations made by the administration relating to the work of the Rural Electrification Administration. I do not believe that this is the time to raise the interest rates. After all, if there is a subsidy involved in the low rate of interest at which money is loaned to REA cooperatives, that amount is small in comparison with the subsidies which were paid to corporate utilities through the rapid writeoff of a few years ago.

I do not agree that we should cut out loans for generating and transmission facilities for rural cooperatives. I do not agree with the Comptroller General's ruling, issued last fall, to the effect that the rural electrification program cannot serve any rural resident who lives within an area which is served by any other utility.

I do not believe that now is the time to force REA cooperatives to go to banks to borrow money at a high rate of interest, and at a time when the interest rate is going higher every day. The work of a large percentage of the rural cooperatives is not completed. It must be completed before we begin to think in terms of high interest rates or of eliminating Government loans altogether.

The REA program has done tremendous good. It has resulted in the development of sparsely settled areas, and in the introduction of small industries, the building of homes, and the improvement of farms in those areas. I cannot say too much for the good work which has been done. I will support the REA program to the best of my ability.

If I thought that either of the proposals now before the Senate would improve the work of the REA, I would be advocating them. However, we should not want to build up additional independent agencies in our Government. We went through that back in the 1930's, when a great many independent agencies were established. When the first Hoover Commission was created in 1947, there were 65 such independent agencies. That did not make for good government. The Hoover Commission recommended the elimination of a great many of them. The number has now been reduced from 65 to 40. I do not want to start in the other direction at this time, because to do so would not be conducive to good government.

In a report to the 81st Congress, relating to a study of the Department of Agriculture, the Hoover Commission said:

> We have urged in our first report that the foundation of good departmental administration is that the Secretary shall have authority from the Congress to organize and control his organization, and that separate authorities to his subordinates be eliminated.

That recommendation was approved by Congress.

The concluding report of the Hoover Commission to the same Congress stated:

> Once the practice of exempting certain agencies and excepting particular functions has begun, the chance of achieving substantial improvements in the efficiency of the Government will speedily diminish.

Although Congress accepted those recommendations of the Hoover reports, both the proposals now before the Senate would tend to start a movement the other way, a movement toward poorer and less efficient government than we now have.

Senate bill 144 takes from the Secretary of Agriculture only the right to approve loans. It leaves the control over all the rest of the REA in his hands. The Secretary of Agriculture, as I understand the REA law, is the only one who can get money to make the loans. Yet the proposal would take the disposition of the money out of his hands and place it in the hands of a subordinate official.

The bill appears to be aimed at Secretary Benson. I have disagreed with him frequently, even vigorously at times; but I do not like to have legislation directed at one person. I do not expect that he will be Secretary of Agriculture forever. I do not believe we should legislate now to eliminate a legitimate and proper function of the Secretary of Agriculture simply because some Senators do not happen to like the present occupant of that Office.

Furthermore, so far as I know, the present Secretary of Agriculture has not denied or vetoed any worthy loan which was proposed by the Rural Electrification Administrator. This proposal will not help. I have been tempted to vote for it as an antidote for the vigorous and vicious attacks which are being made upon the REA program; but I do not believe I would be doing anyone any good by voting in that way simply to get even with someone else.

I believe we had better leave the law and the program as they now are. I shall oppose any attempts on the part of the administration to make things more difficult for the REA program to carry on; but I shall support the administration—and I believe it is the administration's position—in not wanting to have these proposals adopted, because in this case the administration is right.

The only way we can and should vote is to vote for what we think is right, regardless of whether we like or dislike the supporters or the opponents of a certain measure.

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

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. KUCHEL. As always, the views of the distinguished Senator from Vermont are most persuasive. Am I to understand the Senator to indicate that if Senate bill 144 were passed, the control of the funds which might thereafter be used for loans would remain in the Secretary of Agriculture, so that there would be some hiatus?

Mr. AIKEN. The bill reads as follows:

> That the functions and activities of the Rural Electrification Administration and the Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration which were transferred to the Department of Agriculture and to the Secretary of Agriculture by Reorganization Plan No. II of 1939 and Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1953 are hereby transferred to the Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration, and shall be exercised and administered within the Department of Agriculture by such Administrator under the general direction and supervision of the Secretary of Agriculture; except that insofar as such functions relate to the approval or disapproval of loans authorized to be made under the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended, their exercise by the Administrator shall not be subject to the supervision or direction of, or to any other control by, the Secretary of Agriculture.

The Secretary of Agriculture is required under the law to get the money; but once he gets it, the bill would give a subordinate official the full and final authority over the lending of it. That would not be in accord with the thesis of good government which requires some kind of control from the top down through subordinate agencies.

Mr. KUCHEL. I thank the Senator from Vermont.

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

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. Under existing law, the Secretary of Agriculture can borrow from the Secretary of the Treasury such amount as he thinks necessary. Is that not correct?

Mr. AIKEN. That is as I understand.

Mr. CURTIS. He could reduce the amount, or he could enlarge it.

Mr. AIKEN. That is correct.

Mr. CURTIS. That makes the Humphrey proposal meaningless, because if at a future time—5 years or 10 years from now—there were a Secretary of Agriculture and an REA Administrator who were not getting along, who were following divergent policies, even though the REA Administrator had the power of final approval of the making of a loan to a local REA, the Secretary of Agriculture could withhold a request to the Secretary of the Treasury for the amount of the loan or a part of the amount.

Mr. AIKEN. The Secretary, in effect, would have full control over the making of the loan, simply by refusing to furnish the money with which the Administrator could make the loan. Therefore, I think this arrangement would be an idle gesture.

Although I have disagreed frequently with the policies of the Secretary of Agriculture, I do not feel we should take a gratuitous slap at him in this matter, because he has not so far denied, and I do not think he would in the future deny—I hope he would not, anyway—any legitimate request from REA cooperatives for funds. In fact, it has been pointed out that the loans which have been made in the 6 years from 1952 to 1958 have amounted to $1,227 million, while in the previous 18 years loans were made amounting to $2,619 million.

Mr. President, I know it is said that the Secretary is going to do some harm

to the REA. However, the fact remains that he has not yet done such a thing. The fact also remains that even if Senate bill 144 were enacted, if he were minded to do harm to the REA, he still would have authority to do so.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I was a member of the Government Operations Committee which took testimony on this bill. I attended practically every meeting of the committee. An examination of the testimony there taken will disclose that the record of the hearings does not contain a single piece of competent, tangible evidence to show that a single application for an REA loan was ever delayed or rejected under the present method of administering the loans.

There was discussion about a Hoosier application, in Indiana. But when inquiry was made into the application for the Hoosier loan, the testimony disclosed that that cooperative was promised that an aluminum company would build an $8 million plant in Indiana. Based upon that commitment, the application for a loan was made. The application was being considered and procesed when the cooperative in Indiana learned that the aluminum company was not going to build the plant there. When that fact was established, of course, the validity for the loan came to an end.

I have tried to determine the reasons for asking that the administration of this function of Government be taken from the Department of Agriculture and be placed in the centralized authority of the Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration. If the record is examined, it will show that three reasons were given:

First, dissatisfaction with the farm policy of Mr. Benson.

Second, dissatisfaction with the position the administration took on the Hells Canyon project.

Third, dissatisfaction with the proposal of the administration that the Government collect on its loans interest equal to that which it has to pay on whatever it borrows.

Those are the three reasons which were stated, in asking that the administration of this function be taken from the Department of Agriculture and be given to a separate agency.

Mr. President, I believe in centralized control. I think the Hoover Commission recommended it. And I believe common sense dictates that there cannot be two heads on one body and that it is not wise to attempt to have four hands hold the reins of one horse.

For that reason, in 1936 and in 1953 the administration of this agency was placed in one man.

In conclusion, let me say this effort is one to reorganize the Government to suit the whims and the desires of particular sponsors and groups at a particular time. My experience has been that whenever one tries to reorganize the Government to suit himself he gets into trouble.

If Mr. Benson is not acceptable now, there will be—probably 2 years from now—someone other than Mr. Benson in the administration. Will it be proper then, for those who believe that the one who now is under the control of Mr. Benson is not administering these matters in the way they want them administered, to come to the Congress and say to the Congress, "Reorganize the Government to suit our convenience"?

Mr. President, I have watched that game played in politics. I have seen political parties in Ohio change the rules of the game, thinking that the change would gain them privilege. But it never works out that way; there comes a reaction to such a proceeding; there comes a day for the payment of compensation.

In substance, this bill contemplates reorganizing the Government to suit the whims and caprices of some who are not satisfied with what is being done by a particular person in the administration.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I cannot let the recent statements go unchallenged, because the purpose of the bill is not to reorganize at the whim of someone. Instead, the purpose is to reorganize on the basis of what was the organization for 14 happy and successful years.

There is an expressed desire on the part of a large number of Members of the Senate for an independent agency for rural electrification. There is a greater expressed desire for no political control over the making of the loans, because the making of the loans is the very heart and substance of the REA program.

There are those of us who believe that the proliferation of independent agencies is not a desirable development in a great government such as ours. For years there has been an attempt to coordinate and consolidate agencies, rather than to have a proliferation or extension of them.

Therefore, Senate bill 144 is designed to do the following: To maintain within the Department of Agriculture an agency which not only is interested in kilowatts and loans, but also in the needs of the people of rural America. The bill concerns itself with the Rural Electrification Administration. Such a decision—as is well-known by the distinguished Presiding Officer [Mr. HARTKE], because he himself has given great attention to this matter—was made back in the 1930's, when the REA was getting its start. In 1939 it was incorporated in the Department of Agriculture, so it could become a fundamental part of the overall agricultural and social policy of the Nation. That worked well from 1939 to 1953.

I remind the Senate that in 1952 a reorganization plan was presented, by the then Truman administration, to give the same authority that the reorganization plan of 1953 gave. The Senate in its wisdom rejected the reorganization plan of 1952.

In 1953 the Senate, in what I believe to have been an unfortunate judgment, did not reject the reorganization plan of 1953.

I say most kindly and most respectfully that if anyone changed the rules, they were changed in 1953. It is not proposed that they be changed now. Our attempt is to reestablish at this time the rule that a Presidentially appointed administrator—namely, the REA Administrator, who serves for 10 years, on a nonpartisan basis, for a term longer than any 2 terms of a President, and surely longer than the term of a Secretary of Agriculture; and the Administrator is a Presidential appointee, whose nomination must be confirmed by the Senate—shall not have his authority diluted or negated by an appointee of the Secretary of Agriculture, an appointee not nominated by the President and not confirmed by the Senate.

The existing situation is that one Mr. Scott—and I refer to him by name, because currently he is the head of the Farm Credit Services of the Department of Agriculture, under the reorganization plan of 1953—presently has veto authority in the name of the Secretary of Agriculture. Testimony to that effect is to be found in the record of the hearings before the Senate Committee on Government Operations. Mr. Scott—and no nomination of Mr. Scott ever was confirmed by the Senate, and he is not a Presidential appointee, but, instead, he is a political appointee of the Secretary of Agriculture—can cast a negative vote upon a loan application that an REA Administrator approves.

The answer, of course, is that this has never happened. That is true. The Senator from Ohio was eminently correct when he stated there were no instances of interference on the part of the appointee of the Secretary. However, I think we should hear at least from the junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE], who has made some reference to that particular situation, and it was also referred to by the Secretary.

What we are attempting to do here is to leave the loanmaking authority unrestrained, unrestricted, in the hands of the Administrator appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate.

We are attempting to leave REA in the Department of Agriculture, so its orientation will be in agriculture, so the social policies which affect agriculture will likewise be somewhat concerned with the general policies relating to REA.

Our proposal is the middle ground. Senate bill 144 is not an extreme or radical proposal for the establishment of an independent agency. S. 144 is not a political fix of the Reorganization Act of 1953. S. 144 provides for a doctrine of independence in loanmaking policy.

I may say to my economy-minded friends that it provides for centralized purchasing, centralized personnel procedures, centralized travel procedures, which an independent agency would not follow. An independent agency would require separate purchasing, travel, auditing, and bookkeeping procedures. We preserve everything that needs to be preserved in the name of policy, and at the same time permit economizing in terms of administration.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. With respect to Mr. Scott, whose name was mentioned by the Senator from Minnesota, it should be

said that he is an appointee of the Secretary of Agriculture. The Secretary of Agriculture appointed Mr. Scott to coordinate the spending of money, not only in REA, but in all other functions of the Department of Agriculture. He is not a special appointee, particularly. What the Senator from Minnesota has said could also be said about any Assistant Secretary of Agriculture or any other employee of the Department, because they all report to the Secretary of Agriculture. Mr. Scott was simply an agent of the Secretary of Agriculture in checking into REA matters. He checked into many other matters. He has no particular authority. He cannot act upon his own responsibility without consulting the Secretary of Agriculture. He has no particular authority except that which is given to him by the Secretary of Agriculture.

Any department head or any Cabinet officer has the right, if he so wishes, to designate different employees within his organization to do certain work and to gather certain information for him. He can delegate authority, if he so desires. I think in this case the Secretary of Agriculture did that. What the Secretary of Agriculture was trying to do, as the testimony so well proved, was to make certain he saved some money and that there was coordination in spending of the money. What occurred took place at a time when there was an effort, which I am sure is still being made, to balance the budget and save money wherever it could be saved, without in any way interfering with the REA.

A moment ago I placed in the RECORD a statement that the administration of the Department under Mr. Benson has spent by far more money for REA each year than was ever spent by any previous administration, and that more loans were made. There is no testimony that REA has been interfered with in any way whatsoever.

As the able Senator from Minnesota so ably explained, the proposal would take away from the Secretary of Agriculture the right to veto loans.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. CAPEHART. Yet, as has been pointed out, money is appropriated directly to him. Only he can borrow money from the Treasury. He has to sign the notes. Yet when he gets the money, it is proposed that he have absolutely no authority over its disposition.

Nobody is trying to hurt the REA. But if any one should want to hurt the REA, all he would have to do would be to put the proposed reorganization into effect. In that event he could easily interfere with its functions, if the Director of the REA should refuse to cooperate. The Secretary of Agriculture could say, "I will not sign any notes for the Treasury, and I will not get any money from the Treasury for this purpose." Then the Director of the REA would be helpless. As I have said before, all that is being proposed here is a piece of spite legislation.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I say, most respectfully that this is not spite legislation. No one is accusing Mr. Benson, Mr. Scott, or Mr. Hamil of a single thing. As a matter of fact, the report of the committee is respectful in every way. I think it is wrong to try to insinuate that there is an attempt made to punish someone. The truth is that when Mr. Benson testified about Reorganization Plan No. 2 he said to the Senate Committee on Government Operations—and it was made a matter of record in the debate at the time of the consideration of Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1953—that if there were any major change in the administrative establishment or structure of Rural Electrification Administration he would personally tell the proper committees of Congress in advance. That was never done. That word has never come. It is a matter of uncontested fact. The truth is the Secretary not only did not tell us, but after the change was made we were unable to get him to testify before the committee until the Congress had already adjourned.

The senior Senator from Indiana was quite right in saying that all we seek to do is merely to leave the loan-making authority, a function which was designed in the original act to be an independent one, not subject to political control. After all, that is why there is a 10-year term for an REA Administrator. The term of the Administrator is not commensurate with or equal to that of the Secretary or the President. The program is supposed to be one operated without political bias or political interference. The record reveals that the Director of Agricultural Credit Services—whether his name is Smith, Jones, or Scott, whatever his name is—has, in the name of the Secretary, authority to either approve or disapprove an REA loan.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield to the junior Senator from Indiana.

Mr. HARTKE. I thank the Senator for his tireless efforts in behalf of the REA. With all due respect to my senior colleague from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] and also the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE] I think the facts concerning the REA in Indiana should be made known. The truth of the matter is that somebody tried to change the rules in the middle of the game. They were attempted to be changed for political reasons in the State of Indiana. That is exactly why this particular bill should be passed.

The truth of the matter is that the loan was on file and then the Public Service Commission, in an unprecedented effort to stop this loan on behalf of certain interests who wanted to cripple the REA, made an administrative change and lobbied against the people of their own State. They practically put a veto power of their own on this application. After there was a possibility that the courts might not uphold that decision, they came to the REA Administrator and the Secretary of Agriculture in Washington, D.C. The loan would have been approved and made if there had been a nonpolitical effort.

This did not involve a question of politics for the people who were seeking help. All they wanted to do was to go ahead with their program.

Years ago, before the REA program began to take shape, there was less than 12 percent electrification in Indiana. Today it is more than 99½ percent.

Four of the seven agencies which have repaid their loans, in the entire United States of America, are located in the State of Indiana. The first REA electric pole was set in the State of Indiana. The Boone County REA program paid its loan first. Every one of the REA programs in the State of Indiana has either paid its loan on time or ahead of time.

I do not see how in good conscience anybody could ever favor not returning to a program which was so successful for 14 years, with nonpolitical interference—no interference from Democrats or Republicans or from any subversive element. The purpose of the program is simply to give the people electricity.

I come from a town which had a problem as to electricity. I did not see electricity in my home until I was 10 years old. I remember the coal oil light. I remember the Aladdin lamp. I remember when electricity was put in my home. I for one appreciate what the REA has done for the rural folk.

For 14 years the program worked very well. Then the organization was changed, although the representation was made that there would not be a change in the administrative procedure or, if there were a change, the Secretary in good grace would inform Congress about it.

When I became a Member of the United States Senate, I went to the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] and said to him, "I am deeply moved; I want to join in the effort and in the attempt to take politics from the REA program and to place the program back in the hands of a nonpolitical administrator. I do not want to permit it to be placed in the political realm."

The situation was so bad during the last political campaign that the Governor, who was my opponent, reversed his position at the end of the campaign, when the public pressure became great and it was shown that he was attempting to put the REA into politics, although no one wanted that done.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield to the senior Senator from Indiana, because I am sure there must be some rejoinder he desires to make.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I have been a member of the committee for some time, and I have been a Member of the Senate for 15 years. What my able colleague said about the position certain persons in the State of Indiana took is correct, but I wish to say as a matter of record that there is no connection between the reorganization proposal we are considering at the moment and the so-called Indiana loan.

The Administrator and the Secretary of Agriculture considered the Indiana loan. The loan application was filed. There was no evidence that anyone did anything other than to follow the law

and to handle the loan the same as all other loans were handled. There is no connection at all between the proposed legislation and that particular loan.

We talk about taking this matter out of politics, but the President of the United States appoints the REA Administrator. The President also appoints the Secretary of Agriculture. Under those circumstances we cannot take this matter out of politics, because the President appoints those men. We could not take the matter out of politics by enacting this particular piece of proposed legislation. Would we get it out of politics by voting against the proposal? I do not believe so, because the matter is in politics, since the President appoints these men.

I think in all fairness we should say we would come as near to obtaining the Indiana loan if we should leave the law exactly as it is as we would by adopting a reorganization proposal, because there is no real connection between the two whatsoever.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The junior Senator from Indiana is absolutely correct in his description of some arguments which occurred in Indiana. The testimony discloses that. The testimony also discloses that the administration of REA had in no way interfered with the granting of the loan and was in no way a participant in what went on in Indiana. The Senator's description of what took place is accurate, as was stated by the senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART].

Mr. HARTKE and Mr. CARROLL addressed the Chair.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I shall yield first to the junior Senator from Indiana.

Mr. HARTKE. I should like to point out to my distinguished senior colleague from Indiana that we are very happy about the fact that the President has the power of appointment.

I think there is a fair distinction between the Secretary of Agriculture, who is appointed technically speaking, at least, at the pleasure of the President, and the REA Administrator, who is appointed for a term of 10 years. There is a considerable difference between the two. All I say is that I think a man who is appointed for 10 years can operate in a field in which he can be completely devoid of any political pressure of the moment.

I should like to point out that the Indiana loan is again being proposed by the REA people in the State of Indiana. It is now being processed. An endeavor is now being made to have the loan processed through the administration, and it is felt that political pressure is going to keep them from getting it. If there were no political pressure it is felt there would be no doubt the loan would be granted because, on the surface, it is a very difficult situation and there is an honest to goodness effort to help the people of the State of Indiana.

I wish to say that this is not partisan politics in the State of Indiana, because I have had Republican after Republican ask me to help in this matter. I refer to persons who have been interested in the affairs of the State, and who have helped to nominate and to elect Republican officials, yet they have come to me and asked me to help release the REA from the control which the present political system has upon it. They have asked me to help return the REA program to a strictly nonpartisan basis.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I now yield to the distinguished Senator from Colorado.

Mr. CARROLL. Before I ask the Senator a question, I wish to state that according to the statement on page 60 of the printed hearings, David Hamil, who is a Republican from Colorado, and an old friend of mine, who was appointed REA Administrator by the President, confirmed by the Senate, and took office on June 26, 1956.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator is correct.

Mr. CARROLL. I am trying to narrow this down a bit. It seems to me there is a very simple issue involved, if I am correct in my premise.

When the REA Administrator took office, what was the policy with reference to the making of loans? What was the Administrator's jurisdiction? What was his authority? What was his discretion?

Mr. HUMPHREY. There was complete discretion over the loans, because the reorganization plan ultimately went into effect in 1957. The authority was exercised by Mr. Scott.

Mr. CARROLL. The Senator from Minnesota in his remarks indicated there was a change in policy.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes.

Mr. CARROLL. What sort of a change in policy was there, and when did it take place?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I can give my recollection.

Mr. CARROLL. State it approximately. We do not have to pin ourselves down to exact dates. Was it subsequent to June of 1956?

Mr. HUMPHREY. It was June of 1957.

Mr. CARROLL. It was June of 1957?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I was trying to find the exact citation in the testimony. I am informed by the staff counsel it was June of 1957.

Mr. CARROLL. What was the change in policy with reference to the authority and the discretion of the REA Administrator?

Mr. HUMPHREY. It was that loans of $500,000 or more must have the final approval of the Secretary and that new borrowers must have the final approval of the Secretary.

Mr. CARROLL. Did the Congress prescribe that policy?

Mr. HUMPHREY. It did not.

Mr. CARROLL. Who prescribed it?

Mr. HUMPHREY. It was prescribed by the Secretary. It was the view of Members of this body that such a fundamental change in policy was a matter which should have been at least discussed with the appropriate committees of the Congress.

Mr. CARROLL. When was that policy disclosed to the committees of the Congress? When was it first brought to our attention?

Mr. HUMPHREY. It was never brought to our attention. It was finally discovered—it was never brought to the attention of Congress officially.

Mr. CARROLL. Let me say to the Senator from Minnesota that the Denver Post, which is a Republican, independent newspaper at the very time the discussions and the debate took place on the floor of the Senate, editorialized and published news articles against the policy established by the Secretary of Agriculture, attempting to curb the jurisdiction, the authority, and the discretion of the REA Administrator.

As I understand the proposal before us, the distinguished Senator from Minnesota is attempting to correct and change that policy back to its original state.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct; and to preserve unquestioned the authority of the Administrator. There was discussion, doubt, and debate as to whether or not the Secretary of Agriculture, under the Reorganization Act of 1939, had veto authority if he wished to exercise it. There was a ruling to that effect. Therefore we have made it crystal clear in Senate bill 144, the plan which is now before the Senate, that the loan-making authority shall be entirely in the hands of a presidential appointee whose nomination is confirmed by the Senate for a 10-year term; namely, the nonpartisan REA Administrator.

Mr. CARROLL. Let me summarize by asking this question: If the pending bill is passed, shall we be restoring the authority in the REA Administrator to the status which existed on June 26, 1956, when his nomination was confirmed by the Senate?

Mr. HUMPHREY. We will restore it as it existed in 1935 and 1936, when REA was established, when the Administrator had complete jurisdiction over all the loanmaking authority.

I say, most respectfully, to the Senator from Colorado that the loan-making authority was respected under the Reorganization act of 1939, so far as actual usage was concerned. However, in terms of the legal authority of the Secretary, if he wished to exercise it, there were honest differences as to whether the Secretary had the authority to veto if he wished to do so, or whether he was denied the veto right.

We have clarified the situation in our bill. We say, first, that the powers of general supervision, for housekeeping purposes, for accounting purposes, for budgetary purposes, and for personnel purposes, rest in the Secretary of Agriculture and the Department of Agriculture; but the power of loanmaking, which was in the original REA act, the power to grant or disapprove loans, rests solely and unqualifiedly in the Administrator.

Mr. CARROLL. Let me ask one final question. Are those who have most to do with the rural electrification program supporting the bill? What position do

the cooperatives and the farmers themselves take with reference to the proposed legislation?

Mr. HUMPHREY. They support it. The most recent conference of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, meeting at Washington, D.C., in the month of February 1959, supported the bill and the proposals before us at the present time.

Mr. CARROLL. I thank the Senator from Minnesota.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I am sure the Senator from Minnesota will agree with what I was saying in trying to explain to the Senator from Colorado the status of the law in 1953. The law enacted in 1953 provided as follows:

SECTION 1. Transfer of functions to the Secretary: (a) Subject to the exceptions specified in subsection (b) of this section, there are hereby transferred to the Secretary of Agriculture all functions not now vested in him of all other officers, and of all agencies and employees, of the Department of Agriculture.

That provision gave the Secretary complete supervision and control over the functions of his entire Department. However, as the Senator from Minnesota has said, there was some understanding that if there was to be a change in policy, some disclosure would be made to the committee.

Mr. CARROLL. And the Congress would be notified.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. But the law is clear, that the Secretary was vested with full authority and power at the time.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct; but the fact is that none of the authority under the law had been exercised. However, the residual power existed. We now propose to clarify the situation by making it clear that the original REA Act, which provided for an Administrator having authority over loanmaking functions shall be restored, and that the administration shall be independent and autonomous within the Department.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I commend the distinguished senior Senator from Minnesota for his leadership. He is the principal author and the leader in this movement to protect the REA; I have the honor of being a coauthor of S. 144 with the distinguished Senator from Minnesota.

As I pointed out in my statement before the committee, at the time the REA Act of 1936 was passed, only 2.3 percent of the farms in my State had electric power; but under the beneficent influence of that act, at the present time more than 95 percent of the farms in my State have electric power. We have more family-sized, family-type farms in my State than there are in any other State of the Union. There are more REA connections and users in my State than in any other State.

The people are vitally interested in this question. In the legislative history of the Nation few acts have proved to be as beneficial to as many people, with as little cost to the Government, as the REA Act. It is one of the most beneficial pieces of legislation the country has ever seen.

The program worked well until a change was slipped over in the reorganization bill, in a so-called efficiency reorganization. Ezra Taft Benson, as Secretary of Agriculture, began to get his thumb on the neck of REA, as he has placed it on the neck of practically every other family-type operation in the agricultural economy.

Thanks to those who first enacted the law, darkness has been eliminated from farm life, and a great deal of drudgery has been lifted from the farm.

The REA operates under the Lincolnian concept that it is the duty of the Government to help the people to do that which they cannot do for themselves, or cannot do as well.

The REA program is good government. The purpose of the program shows how good government can be employed to help the American people in their pursuit of happiness.

The pending measure is designed to protect the REA program from those who would, accidentally or intentionally, do violence to that program. The pending bill, if enacted into law, will make certain that the program cannot be curtailed or crippled by the Secretary of Agriculture exercising authority unwisely.

As I understand, it is proposed merely to reaffirm the statutory authority of the Administrator of the REA to grant REA loans. We shall now be restoring to the Administrator the authority which was used by the Secretary of Agriculture a year ago.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I wish to be most fair. We are proposing to reaffirm the statutory authority of the REA Administrator to grant loans. I believe that the colloquy has revealed that the residual authority of the Secretary under the Reorganization Act of 1939, to have general control over the REA, will remain. However, we are making it crystal clear that the authority over loan making shall be independent.

I have not attempted to abuse Mr. Benson, or to make a partisan issue out of this question. All I have attempted to do is to say that what we are proposing is sound administration.

We are attempting to do two things—first, to restore the loan-making function to the REA Administrator, without qualification; second, to maintain in the Department of Agriculture, for centralized administrative purposes, the Rural Electrification Administration.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I thank the Senator from Minnesota. It is true that the power was not illegally used. The residual power existed, but it had not been exercised by the Secretary. Is that correct?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator is correct.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. It was not illegally seized, but it had not been used.

Mr. HUMPHREY. It had not been exercised.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. If the pending bill is passed, the REA program will be administered by the people, as was originally intended, and as was done for years, until the current administration decided to hamstring the program by having the Secretary of Agriculture take over power from the Administrator.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator is correct.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I think the Senate has seldom had an opportunity to pass a measure which would be so constructive, with so little cost to the Government of the United States. This proposal would leave in the Administrator of the REA the power to pass on loans.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator is correct.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. And there would be no appellate power in the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator is correct.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. We often debate the question of how much money we shall spend in connection with certain measures. Often we are doubtful whether a proposed solution would be a wise solution. Is it not true that the wisdom of this measure has already been proved by the administration of the law from 1936 to 1953?

Mr. HUMPHREY. It is my considered judgment that that is absolutely a fact. From 1936 to 1953 we got along very well. I think there is no evidence that we are not getting along well now. However, I, for one, object to the appointee of a Secretary, whoever the Secretary may be, having superior authority over a Presidential appointee under a basic law such as the REA Act of 1936, when the nomination of the such appointee does not come before the Senate for confirmation.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I believe we are acting here to protect and perpetuate one of the great programs in American history.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator from Texas, whose cooperation I deeply appreciate. I now yield to my friend and colleague, the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I appreciate the action of the Senator from Minnesota in yielding to me. I also appreciate greatly the fact that he has handled this subject on the floor without casting aspersions either on the present Secretary of Agriculture or on any of his agents.

Mr. President, this is not a personal matter. It should be handled impersonally and objectively and with full knowledge of the fact that Congress shares some of the responsibility in this situation.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator is right.

Mr. HOLLAND. I have before me Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1953, which really brought on the trouble and disagreement which are responsible, I believe, for the present proposed legislation and for the amendment offered by the Senators from Nebraska and Georgia.

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE] has already read one section from that unfortunate reorganization plan. I may say, in passing, that I opposed it vigorously when it was before the Senate. Other Senators also opposed it. However, the Senate refused to cast the requisite vote to reject that reorganization plan. Let us not get away from the fact that the Senate has some responsibility in this matter. The first section reads as follows:

SECTION 1. Transfer of functions to the Secretary: (a) Subject to the exceptions specified in subsection (b) of this section, there are hereby transferred to the Secretary of Agriculture all functions not now vested in him of all other officers, and of all agencies and employees, of the Department of Agriculture.

I may say that subsection (b), which covers the exceptions, does not cover the REA.

Mr. President, I opposed the approval of the reorganization plan which contains that as its first provision. The Senate refused to disapprove that reorganization plan. The reorganization plan in effect gives to the Secretary of Agriculture—and I do not refer only to the present Secretary of Agriculture, but to all Secretaries of Agriculture so long as this reorganization plan is a part of the law of the land—the authority to exercise any power ever given to any of the agencies in the Department of Agriculture, and to any officer in the Department of Agriculture. There are a few which are excepted in a later subsection.

Then the reorganization plan contains section 4, which reads as follows:

Sec. 4. Delegation of functions: (a) The Secretary of Agriculture may from time to time make such provisions as he shall deem appropriate authorizing the performance by any other officer, or by any agency or employee, of the Department of Agriculture of any function of the Secretary, including any function transferred to the Secretary by the provisions of this reorganization plan.

Mr. President, if we had tried for 10 years we could not have written a provision which gave more fully to the Secretary of the Department the power to transfer any function to anyone he saw fit.

I am glad—and I think there are many others who believe as I do—that these provisions have not done violence to the REA. I judge, from the very temperate and moderate position of the Senator from Minnesota, which I fully approve, that he also believes that to be the fact.

Mr. President, although I believe something should be done about this unfortunate situation, I shall oppose the amendment offered by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] because, in my opinion, it would do great harm to the REA program.

The REA program necessarily has at heart the welfare of the agricultural segment of the Nation. When we seek to divorce that program from the Department of Agriculture, where it belongs, and where it has served the interests of the rural population, we attempt to take it out of its proper place and put it where it will be unbefriended and unsheltered by the sturdy wings of the mother hen, the Department of Agriculture, which is safeguarding all agricultural rights throughout the Nation, and whose function it is to do so.

I strongly oppose making the REA a completely independent agency. I voiced that opposition in the hearing recently attended by the Senator from Minnesota in the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and before the subcommittee of which I am the chairman. At that time I called the attention of the Senator from Nebraska to the fact that under his bill as then drafted he would take REA away from the Department of Agriculture and take it away from the subcommittee on appropriations which handles appropriations for the Department of Agriculture. I cited an illustration of what had happened recently in another field.

By offering an amendment to his bill, he in effect says that although he would make an independent agency of the REA, he would leave it in the legislative committee and in the appropriations subcommittee where it should be left.

In admitting that much, I believe he is admitting himself out of court, because he admits what to me is the potent fact that this very important agency—important more to agriculture than to any other segment of our economy—should certainly be left in the Department of Agriculture, where it may have the benefit of the advisory committee of the Secretary of Agriculture which represents the Nation's farmers, and of the whole set-up of the Department of Agriculture, which works for the benefit of the Nation's farmers, from morn to night, 365 days a year.

I commend the Senator from Minnesota for his moderate approach, and I regret that any Senator should consider the measure as being motivated in any way by personal resentment to our present Secretary of Agriculture or any of his agents.

I do not believe anyone can accuse me of being hostile to the present Secretary of Agriculture. I have supported him sometimes when a majority of his own party did not support him. I have not hesitated to support him when I thought he was right, and that has been most of the time. I believe that anyone who believes that the reorganization plan, from which I have read a part, can continue to be the law and leave the Department of Agriculture in a sound position, is wrong, or has not read the reorganization plan. It is the most vicious thing of its type we have ever adopted.

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

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Does not the Senator believe that we would be setting a dangerous precedent by moving REA out of the Department of Agriculture, because certainly there would then be attempts made to take other functions away from the Department of Agriculture? We might even expect an effort to take the administration of Public Law 480 away from the Department of Agriculture and repose its administration in an independent agency or put it in another department of the Government. The Senator knows what that would do to agricultural sales.

Mr. HOLLAND. That certainly would be possible. I am glad the Senator from Vermont has mentioned that point.

Mr. AIKEN. I may say that normally I would like to be able to vote for the proposal of the Senator from Minnesota, but when we come right down to it, all the proposal says is "We do not like Ezra Taft Benson."

Mr. HUMPHREY. I should like to say most respectfully—and the Senator from Vermont knows that I have on many occasions demonstrated my sharp difference of opinion with the Secretary of Agriculture—that I am not engaging in that kind of contest. The best argument which has been made for my proposal has been made by the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], who has refererd to what is not alone the mistake of the Secretary of Agriculture, but the mistake also of Congress when it permitted the reorganization plan to be adopted. Some of us had doubts about it then. Others had some doubts later, because this plan was tried in two administrations, first during the last year of the Democratic Truman administration, and then during the first year of the Republican administration.

That is the only partisan reference I am making here. I think the delegation of functions which is in the reorganization plan of 1953 lends itself, if left on the books, to further abuse. I do not make any accusations. Not a word can be found in what I have said in the report of the committee, for which I have some responsibility, or in my speech on the floor of the Senate which attempts to accuse the Secretary of Agriculture or anyone else of malfeasance of office or any kind of maladministration. All I am saying is that it is bad administrative structure. I think the time to correct it is now.

Mr. AIKEN. I accept the Senator's explanation of his devotion to the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator from Vermont for including me in the very limited membership of this club.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I hope the Senator from Vermont will feel that I have shown considerable fondness for the Secretary of Agriculture, both personally and by my votes and statements on the floor of the Senate. But whether the Senator from Vermont feels that way or not—and I believe he does—I think he knows that in this matter I am following a course which I established way back in the administration of President Truman.

At that time, substantially the same reorganization plan came before the Senate. I see in the Chamber the distinguished senior Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL]. He and I decided that the plan was bad. We fought against it, and enough of the Senate stood with us to knock the plan down.

Later it came up in the first bloom and blush of the new administration. Some of our friends, who had stood with us before, decided it was not so bad as they

thought it was earlier. I see some of those good friends here. But all of us make mistakes. We could not muster the vote the second time which we had the first time. If we had we would not now be struggling with this problem.

The point I am making is that I think it completely unrealistic, completely unfair, and completely unfriendly to the REA, and the millions of people who have been so blessed by it, to divorce it from the Department of Agriculture just at the time when the REA is becoming so strong that there will be more questions from now on as to whether it is competing with private power. It would be the unfriendliest thing that could be done to divorce it from the Department of Agriculture, its natural friend and shelterer, and to place it out in the cold, cruel world as an independent agency, where it would share the fate of some of the other independent agencies which have to fight to get anything at any time.

I am thinking of another public power agency—the TVA. Compare the friendly attitude of so many Senators toward REA with the questioning, if not suspicious, attitude which some of those Senators show toward TVA. I think Senators will concede that I have a valid point which deserves their thoughtful consideration.

I hope the amendment will be rejected.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate may proceed to vote in 15 minutes from now, and that 10 minutes be alloted to the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DIRKSEN), with 5 minutes to be controlled by the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. HUMPHREY).

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, it seems to me that a good many nongermane matters have been discussed in connection with the pending bill. The only thing involved is whether the Secretary of Agriculture, who holds the top post in one of the largest departments of the Government, shall have a little something to say about the activities and functions of a subordinate agency in his department.

After listening to the discussion, I think we should send Ezra Benson a letter saying: "Dear Ezra: We are going to leave the baby in your tender hands. You provide the room and board and all the other things which are necessary. But if the baby gets a little spunky, if it needs a little discipline or a little conduct, do not put your hands on the baby, because we are saying in the bill before us that you shall have no authority to supervise, direct, or control anything with respect to the approval or disapproval of the loans made by your subordinate baby."

Frankly, the Senate has an astonishing proposal before it. I think the Senate will rue the day it ever enacted the bill, assuming it may become law. First of all, if we look through the hearings, it is the beneficiaries of the credit and the money of the people who are asking less supervision rather than more. I think that is one of the most astounding things I have ever seen or heard advanced in the Senate.

The point is made on the other side of the aisle that the Secretary of Agriculture is a Presidential appointee, while the Administrator of REA holds a 10-year job. That very fact argues against the bill, because the Secretary cannot discipline the Administrator of REA. The Secretary cannot remove him. If the Administrator is weak, the trail will lead right to the White House. Then there will be confusion compounded.

The REA is growing. It has probably $3 billion in unpaid balances today.

It seems to me that we would be doing the REA a favor by providing for it a little more supervision, rather than less, and not concentrating the supervision in the hands of a single person. I cannot imagine that any business enterprise anywhere in the country would follow the line of reasoning which has been advanced on the Senate floor. Try to imagine General Motors Corp., with the Frigidaire Corp. as a component, and with the president or the chairman of the board of the Frigidaire Corp. saying, "We are within the General Motors fold, but only up to a limited degree. Beyond that do not interfere; we will run our own show." But that is exactly what Senators propose in this case. If that is good business sense, certainly I have never known such a thing to be proposed in business.

No one on this floor has ever contended that Mr. Hamil, the REA Administrator, does not have a good record. Even the chairman of the committee will admit that Mr. Hamil has a good record.

It must be admitted that the REA's record in the past 6 years is the best in the entire history of that agency.

I was a Member of the House of Representatives when the REA was created; and I would say to my distinguished friend, the junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE], that I was here when I made a Hoosier by the name of Claude Wickard, who was then the Secretary of Agriculture, investigate the REA; and I got the Deputy Administrator fired, before I got through. The record is here; that was in March 1941. It was "a rough go", and it took a rather long time. But Senators should not think that there have not been some difficulties there, as elsewhere. I have lived through this for a long period of time.

Everything in the field of good business tactics, everything in the field of proper governmental supervision and surveillance, argues that when there is such a $3 billion corporation, there should be some supervision, some direction, some authority in the hands of the Secretary of Agriculture, in whose department this agency is located. There could be a weak Administrator; but let us not forget that any Administrator of the REA will serve for 10 years. The Administrator might be weak in the whole loaning field; he might be weak in the administrative field. But under the present proposal the Secretary of Agriculture—whoever he may be, whether Henry Wallace, or Claude Wickard, or Ezra Benson, or anyone else—will never be able to remove him.

It seems to me that under those circumstances, if there were no recourse but to go to the top boss at 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue, we would have some trouble on our hands before we got through.

I am not going to play ducks and drakes in such a careless fashion with $3 billion of the people's money. If the REA is to continue to make progress, it requires careful supervision on the part of the Federal Government. And the proper supervisor should be the Secretary of Agriculture.

At the present time the technique is scarcely even to look at an REA loan application for less than $1 million. Only loan applications for larger amounts and the new telephone loan applications are looked at, for all practical purposes. I am advised from the Department of Agriculture that that has been the technique for quite some time.

So, when $3 billion of public credit is involved—money and credit which belong to the people of the United States, not only to those in the farming areas, but also to those in all the other areas of the country in which taxpayers live—I think the Senate has the responsibility to make sure that there is adequate supervision, because in proportion as we give attention to the REA, it will grow and will become an effective instrumentality for taking the country out of darkness.

Yet at this time, when we clamor, in respect to every other field, for more supervision, it is proposed by this means to destroy such supervision in this instance. I cannot imagine a greater step backward.

Mr. President, the sensible thing for the Senate to do tonight is to send the bill back to the committee, under a motion to recommit. I hope the Senator from Indiana, who is a member of the Committee on Government Operations, will soon return to the floor and will make such a motion. If he does not make it, I will, for I think that is where the bill should go. I will not vote to take a backward step and, by that vote, undertake to hurt future confidence in the REA, because that is what the action now proposed will add up to, before we get through.

Mr. President, I think that is the entire story, so far as I am concerned; and I am prepared to vote on the amendment in the nature of a substitute, and also for a motion to recommit.

The amendment in the nature of a substitute would again make this agency an independent one. I was a Member of the House of Representatives when the REA was created as an independent agency. Three years later it was placed under the Department of Agriculture. Then, in 1953, under a Reorganization Act, the Congress gave the Secretary of Agriculture the additional supervisory functions. Contrary to expressions made on the floor, I think that was a wise course; and evidently the Senate thought likewise, because that action only adds to adequate supervision of the handling of billions of dollars of the taxpayers' money—money which does not belong to the Federal Treasury or to the REA, but

belongs to all the people of the United States; and we are co-stewards, to make sure that the money is well and wisely administered.

Mr. President, that is my case.

Mr. BENNETT addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HART in the chair). The Senator from Illinois has 2 minutes remaining under his control.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield 2 minutes to me?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Utah.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, with respect to the pending bill, I have only one observation to make: After listening to the very wise counsel and approach of the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], I believe that if the Senator from Florida really wants to undo what was done in 1953, he should move that it be undone in its entirety, and should not limit the action to the REA. Instead, he should move to take away whatever authority the Secretary of Agriculture received by means of that program.

It seems to me that in this case we are dealing with two different things.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the distinguished Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS], the author of the pending amendment in the nature of a substitute, be allowed 2 minutes in which to discuss the substitute.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I agree to that request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Illinois? Without objection, it is so ordered; and the Senator from Nebraska is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I thank both the distinguished minority leader and the distinguished majority leader.

I wish to have the attention of Senators who will oppose the pending bill, on the question of its final passage, and who believe nothing should be done. I also wish to have the attention of Senators who believe that the Congress should legislate in this field. I ask all of them to read Senate bill 144, and then try to determine who will run the REA if that bill is enacted into law.

The bill contains only 15 lines. It provides, in substance, that the functions and activities of the REA shall be exercised and administered within the Department of Agriculture by such Administrator under the general direction and supervision of the Secretary of Agriculture. Then the bill takes away from the Secretary of Agriculture any authority over either the approval or disapproval of the loans. But there is the odd provision that only the Secretary of Agriculture can borrow money from the Secretary of the Treasury.

So, if the bill is enacted into law, it will mean that if at a later time the Secretary of Agriculture and the REA Administrator disagree with each other, the Secretary of Agriculture can still withhold the necessary funds. I do not believe the proponents intend that to be done; but that legislative confusion would then exist.

As to the amendment in the nature of a substitute, which I have submitted on behalf of myself and the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], it establishes an independent agency, and provides that the Administrator shall have direction, supervision, and control of the REA and all its operations and functions, as authorized in the REA Act of 1936, as amended; and it retains jurisdiction in the same committees which now have jurisdiction.

Mr. President, I appeal to Senators who are opposed to doing anything in this case: Let us perfect the bill, and not create confusion.

To Senators who believe some legislation in this field should be enacted—and let me say that I respect both groups—I say that certainly the Senate should not pass Senate bill 144 as it now stands, because it will not do what its authors intend it to do. No one who reads the amendment in the nature of a substitute can have any doubt as to who will run the REA if the amendment in the nature of a substitute becomes law.

The REA was an independent agency from 1935 to 1939.

I remind the Senate that on January 6, 1945, Senator Lucas introduced a bill, S. 89, that reestablished it as an independent agency, and the bill passed this body unanimously, without a record vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HART in the chair). The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 minute.

The purpose of the bill is simply to do two things: to take up that part of the history of the REA from 1935 to 1939 in which the independence of REA in respect to loan-making was established, and to keep the reorganization plan of 1939, for the purpose of administration, intact, thereby providing for the REA to be within the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, as I understand, all time on the amendment has been yielded back or consumed. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I ask unanimous consent that there be a quorum call, without the time being charged to either side. The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] has indicated that after the Senate acts on the amendment, he wishes to make a motion to recommit. When the Senate acts on that motion, I understand it will proceed to act on the committee amendment and the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Texas that there be a quorum call without the time being charged to either side? The Chair hears none, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the pending amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] for himself and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] as a substitute for the committee amendment. The yeas and nays having been ordered, the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. HENNINGS. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. MCGEE], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] is absent because of illness and that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] is absent because of illness in his family.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. MCGEE], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] would each vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER] is absent on official business for the Committee of Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] is absent on official business.

The result was announced—yeas 13, nays 74, as follows:

YEAS—13

Capehart	Hickenlooper	Talmadge
Case, S. Dak.	Hruska	Thurmond
Cotton	Lausche	Wiley
Curtis	Russell	
Goldwater	Schoeppel	

NAYS—74

Aiken	Fulbright	Morse
Allott	Gore	Morton
Anderson	Hart	Moss
Bartlett	Hartke	Mundt
Beall	Hayden	Muskie
Bennett	Hennings	Neuberger
Bible	Hill	O'Mahoney
Bridges	Holland	Pastore
Bush	Humphrey	Prouty
Byrd, W. Va.	Jackson	Proxmire
Cannon	Javits	Randolph
Carlson	Johnson, Tex.	Robertson
Carroll	Johnston, S.C.	Saltonstall
Case, N J.	Jordan	Scott
Church	Keating	Smathers
Clark	Kefauver	Smith
Dirksen	Kennedy	Sparkman
Dodd	Kerr	Stennis
Douglas	Kuchel	Symington
Dworshak	Langer	Williams, N.J.
Eastland	Long	Williams, Del.
Ellender	McCarthy	Yarborough
Engle	McClellan	Young, N. Dak.
Ervin	McNamara	Young, Ohio
Frear	Martin	

NOT VOTING—11

Butler	Green	McGee
Byrd, Va.	Gruening	Monroney
Chavez	Magnuson	Murray
Cooper	Mansfield	

So the Curtis-Russell amendment in the nature of a substitute, offered by Mr. CURTIS, for himself and Mr. RUSSELL, was rejected.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the Curtis-Russell amendment in the nature of a substitute was rejected be reconsidered.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, may we now proceed to the next motion?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. As the Chair understands, there is a previous order that the Senate now proceed immediately to consider a motion to recommit the bill.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I move that the bill be recommitted to the Committee on Government Operations, and I ask for a division on that motion.

On a division, the motion was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MUNDT. Has all time for debate expired?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time for debate has expired.

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

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. HENNINGS. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGEE], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] is absent because of illness, and that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] is absent because of illness in his family.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGEE], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] would each vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER] is absent on official business for the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] is absent on official business.

The result was announced—yeas 60, nays 27, as follows:

YEAS—60

Bartlett	Hartke	Mundt
Bible	Hayden	Muskie
Byrd, W. Va.	Hennings	Neuberger
Cannon	Hill	O'Mahoney
Carroll	Holland	Pastore
Case, S. Dak.	Humphrey	Proxmire
Church	Jackson	Randolph
Clark	Johnson, Tex.	Robertson
Curtis	Johnston, S.C.	Russell
Dodd	Jordan	Smathers
Douglas	Kefauver	Sparkman
Dworshak	Kennedy	Stennis
Eastland	Kerr	Symington
Ellender	Langer	Talmadge
Engle	Long	Thurmond
Ervin	McCarthy	Wiley
Frear	McClellan	Williams, N.J.
Fulbright	McNamara	Yarborough
Gore	Morse	Young, N. Dak.
Hart	Moss	Young, Ohio

NAYS—27

Aiken	Case, N. J.	Lausche
Allott	Cotton	Martin
Anderson	Dirksen	Morton
Beall	Goldwater	Prouty
Bennett	Hickenlooper	Saltonstall
Bridges	Hruska	Schoeppel
Bush	Javits	Scott
Capehart	Keating	Smith
Carlson	Kuchel	Williams, Del.

NOT VOTING—11

Butler	Green	McGee
Byrd, Va.	Gruening	Monroney
Chavez	Magnuson	Murray
Cooper	Mansfield	

So the bill (S. 144) was passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the functions and activities of the Rural Electrification Administration and the Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration which were transferred to the Department of Agriculture and to the Secretary of Agriculture by Reorganization Plan No. II of 1939 and Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1953 are hereby transferred to the Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration, and shall be exercised and administered within the Department of Agriculture by such Administrator under the general direction and supervision of the Secretary of Agriculture; except that insofar as such functions relate to the approval or disapproval of loans authorized to be made under the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended, their exercise by the Administrator shall not be subject to the supervision or direction of, or to any other control by, the Secretary of Agriculture.

The title was amended, so as to read: "A bill to modify Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1939 and Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1953."

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Oregon.

The motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, the Senate has passed a bill which, while it does not do any great harm, does not do any good for the REA, and is virtually meaningless so far as the operation of the REA program is concerned.

On January 14, 13 other Senators and I submitted a resolution, Senate Resolution 21, which is of very vital importance to the future of the REA. I ask unanimous consent to have the text of the resolution, together with a list of the sponsors, printed in the RECORD.

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

SENATE RESOLUTION 21

Mr. AIKEN (for himself, Mr. KUCHEL, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota, Mr. COOPER, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. HILL, Mr. HENNINGS, Mr. CURTIS, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. LANGER, and Mr. CLARK) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, at this point I express the hope that the leadership of the Senate will work as hard and earnestly for the adoption of this vital resolution as they have worked to pass the bill which the Senate has just passed, and which, in my opinion, means very little, if anything.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I should like to say to the distinguished Senator from Vermont, inasmuch as I am a cosponsor of the resolution to which he has referred, that I pledge to him the same kind of zeal, energy and, I hope, effective work as was indicated in the recent vote. I believe that both of these measures are important. The Senator from Vermont can be assured of my cooperation.

Mr. AIKEN. I may add that the resolution to which I have referred is completely bipartisan.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator is correct.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I am much pleased that the bill has been passed. I wish to congratulate and commend the Senator from Minnesota for his diligence and for his interest in the proposed legislation, as well as for the fine work he has done.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am deeply grateful to the Senator for his kind remarks and for his leadership in making it possible to pass the bill.

DEATH OF ROBERT AUFDERHEIDE, SUPERVISOR OF WILLAMETTE NATIONAL FOREST

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, it is with deep regret that I have learned, from an article published in the Eugene Register-Guard, of the passing of Robert Aufderheide, of Eugene, Oreg., the supervisor of the Willamette National Forest.

Bob Aufderheide was an outstanding conservationist, and the monument which he leaves behind is one which can be seen by all the people of the Nation as they visit our national forests.

I ask unanimous consent that the article published in the Register-Guard be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

WILLAMETTE FOREST SUPERVISOR, ROBERT AUFDERHEIDE, DIES

Robert Aufderheide, supervisor of the Willamette National Forest, and a U.S. Forest Service employee for nearly 25 years, died Saturday morning in a Eugene hospital. He had been ill with cancer.

Mr. Aufderheide was 50 years old. He had been seriously ill since September 1958.

Survivors include his widow, Muriel; a daughter, Roberta, 17, and two sisters. The family lives at 2240 Friendly Street, Eugene.

Funeral services will be announced by Simon-Lounsbury Mortuary.

OSC GRADUATE

A native of Minnesota, Mr. Aufderheide was graduated from the School of Forestry, at Oregon State College in 1935. He had been supervisor of the Willamette National Forest, one of the largest in the Nation, since 1954.

He began his professional career by working on various assignments, in 1934. He received his forester's appointment in 1935 and was assigned to the Rogue River National Forest.

In 1936 he was transferred to the Siuslaw National Forest. There he worked through the ranks from assistant ranger to the supervisor's staff in Corvallis.

In recognition for his knowledge in the field of research, Mr. Aufderheide was promoted, in 1946, to be forester in charge of the Western Oregon Work Center (now Willamette Research Center) of the Pacific Northwest Forest and Range Experiment Station at Corvallis.

Four years later, he was made supervisor of the Umpqua National Forest at Roseburg. This was his assignment until 1954, when he replaced retiring J. R. Bruckart as supervisor of the Willamette Forest at Eugene.

WILLAMETTE SUPERVISOR

Mr. Aufderheide was recently cited for outstanding work in connection with his administration of the Willamette forest. For his overall accomplishments, he was given a $300 cash award by the regional forester, J. Herbert Stone.

Stone said Saturday morning that "Mr. Aufderheide has set a splendid example of public service, particularly in the field of timber management and research—his loss will be keenly felt.

A soft-spoken man, Mr. Aufderheide during his professional career made many friends within the service and also in the timber industry.

GET WELL NOTE

At a recent meeting of forestry school alumni at Oregon State College, more than 300 signatures were placed on a "get well" note.

During his administration of the Willamette forest, an era of expansion and change took place, including an accelerated program of timber sales and considerable increased attention to recreational demands.

Much in demand as a public speaker, Mr. Aufderheide appeared at dozens of meetings in Lane County to explain various phases and purposes of forest service policy.

During a visit to Eugene last summer, Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson, who has responsibility for the forest service, sent a personal message to Mr. Aufderheide at the hospital.

THE LACK OF A FARM BILL

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a statement by me concerning the lack of a farm bill.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR LANGER

On several occasions this year, I have asked the leadership when are we going to have a farm bill? The majority leader graciously stated "that as soon as the Committee on Agriculture reports out a farm bill, I will see to it that it gets top priority."

During the recent campaign in North Dakota, the opposition to the Republican Party made great use of paid advertisements, showing the prices the farmer received for his products in 1952 as compared to that he was receiving in 1958 and further, what the farmer was paying for farm machinery in 1952 and what he had to pay in 1958. These advertisements were placed in every county newspaper and undoubtedly had a profound effect on the election results. As I have stated on the floor, I have been patiently waiting for a good farm bill to be reported out by the Committee on Agriculture. I have received thousands of requests, and I do not exaggerate that figure, asking me what Congress is going to do about a new farm bill and whether Congress will pass such a bill before seeding time.

In previous years, the division of votes between Republican and Democratic Senators was very narrow and the Democrats took great delight in placing the blame of the farm situation on the President and Secretary Benson, but now the Senate is predominantly Democratic, 2 to 1, and they must assume the full blame for the lack of the passage of a good farm bill.

I have written my constituents repeatedly that the Congress is controlled by the Democrats and if they present a good farm bill, I will vote for it and if President Eisenhower should veto it, I will vote to override his veto. The new farm bill is solidly and unequivocally on the back of the Senators from the Democratic side of the aisle. January, February, March, and now we are approaching the middle of April and still no farm bill and further, from what I have been able to observe, there doesn't even appear to be a new farm bill on the horizon.

Recently I appeared before a subcommittee of the Committee on Agriculture, urging that they take action immediately on a farm bill. Several farm bills supported by North Dakota constituents were being discussed. What I am saying here, I said before that Committee on Agriculture. I urged them to act immediately. I don't want to appear overbearing but at least once a week, I shall stand on the floor of the Senate and remind the Senators that although they were most stirring in their appeals to the farmer before November election, however, they appear to be very silent since November in the passage of a good farm bill.

I simply do not believe in hyprocrisy. If these farmers were being robbed and cheated and put out of business, as was so strongly stated by the Democratic opposition last fall, why haven't they done something to remedy the situation; why haven't they at least reported a bill out of the committee which they control 2 to 1? Certainly the farmers of the Midwest are entitled to better treatment than they have been getting. Because I know they should get a better deal, I wish to add my voice to those of the farming population who are asking for a square deal from the Congress. I reiterate, I, also, wish to assure the Democratic leadership that if they will report out a decent farm bill, I will not only vote for it, but if the President vetoes it, I will vote to override the veto.

USE OF MAILS FOR DISTRIBUTION OF OBSCENE MATERIAL

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, an Associated Press story reveals an announcement by Postmaster General Summerfield of the simultaneous raids on the New York City headquarters of three men, whom he described as among the east coast's largest dealers in obscenity. I am most happy to read of these raids which followed the opening of a sealed indictment returned by a Federal grand jury in New York, charging the men with using the mails to distribute obscene and pornographic films, slides, pictures, and circulars.

I am glad the Post Office Department as well as the U.S. attorney's offices and State and city law enforcement groups are constantly striving to wipe from the face of this country peddlers of filth who are contaminating the minds of our young.

As the ranking Republican on the Senate Juvenile Delinquency Subcommittee for a number of years, I am happy to note that our subcommittee conducted investigations and hearings into the distribution and sale of pornographic material, which amounted to a $500 million-a-year business. As a result of our hearings, we were able to wipe out five or six of the largest producers and distributors of pornographic material. Some went to jail; others were forced out of business by injunction.

I have received thousands of letters from parents and religious and civic organizations urging the subcommittee to do everything it can to stop the production and distribution of pornographic material.

I ask unanimous consent that the article which was published in the Washington Evening Star of March 7 be printed at this point in my remarks.

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

[From the Washington Star, Apr. 7, 1959]

POSTAL OBSCENITY RAIDS NET THREE BIGGEST DEALERS

Postmaster General Summerfield today announced simultaneous raids on the New York City headquarters of three men whom he described as among "the east coast's largest dealers in obscenity."

The raids, by postal inspectors and U.S. marshals, followed the opening of a sealed indictment returned by a Federal grand jury in New York charging the men with using the mails to distribute obscene and pornographic films, slides, pictures, and circulars.

DESCRIBED AS DEFIANT

Mr. Summerfield described those involved as "defiant and ruthless purveyors of mail order filth."

Those named in the indictment, Mr. Summerfield said, were:

Ben Himmel, 43, of Forest Hills, Long Island, operator of Pigalle Imports.

William Glanzman, 33, Atlantic Beach, N.Y., operator of Monart, Inc., and Bowery Enterprises.

Sidney Poss, 40, Brooklyn, operating Jefferson Creations, Milco Specialties, and Glamacolor Productions.

Mr. Summerfield said each of the men had a long record of using the mails to sell obscene material, and had, in the past, adopted fictitious names when the Department attempted to bar them from using the mails.

FLOOD OF COMPLAINTS

He said the Post Office Department has had a flood of complaints from clergymen, parent-teacher associations, high school principals, college presidents, newspaper editors, and alarmed parents.

"The purpose of today's coordinated raids, which is the largest single action of record," Mr. Summerfield said, "was to seize the operators and impound enough evidence to once and for all put these offenders out of business."

RADIATION HAZARD ACT OF 1959

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill which will vest in the U.S. Public Health Service the primary responsibility for developing, in consultation with State and local health authorities, a program to protect the public health and safety from the perils implicit in manmade sources of ionizing radiation.

Shortly before the Easter recess a report was made to the Surgeon General of the U.S. Public Health Service by the National Advisory Committee on Radiation. That committee made it clear that the absence of a comprehensive program through which the health hazards of all sources of ionizing radiation may be brought under supervision appears to be an important weakness in this Nation's efforts to control radiation. The bill which I am introducing, Mr. President, is based upon the report of this committee of outstanding scientists and has as its objective the carrying out of the committee's recommendation that primary responsibility for the Nation's protection over radiation hazards be established in a single agency of the Federal Government and that that agency should be the U.S. Public Health Service.

Here, briefly stated, is what the bill will do. It declares it to be the policy of this Government that primary responsibility for the protection of the public health from radiation hazards shall be vested in the Public Health Service and in State and local health authorities. It instructs the Surgeon General to develop, in consultation with Federal, State, and local agencies exercising responsibilities in connection with the control of radiation hazards, uniform standards of radiation protection. It authorizes the Surgeon General to conduct research, studies, investigations, and training programs with respect to the control of radiation hazards both directly and through grants-in-aid. It establishes a National Advisory Council on Radiation Hazard Control, to be appointed by the President and to consist of 15 members, including the Surgeon General of the U.S. Public Service, the Secretary of Defense, the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, and the Director of the National Science Foundation. And finally, it requires the Surgeon General to submit to the Congress not later than February 28, 1960, a comprehensive program for the control of radiation hazards emanating from all manmade sources. This program will be developed by the Surgeon General after consultation with Federal, State, and local agencies exercising responsibilities in connection with the control of radiation hazards.

The problem which this bill is meant to help resolve, Mr. President, is that of the peril to ourselves, our children, and to the future of the entire human race which has resulted from the creation and the rapid development of manmade sources of potentially destructive radiation.

It is a problem to which many of our colleagues have persuasively addressed themselves. Only a few days ago the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], chairman of the Foreign Relations Subcommittee on Disarmament, and other Senators joined in a most thought-provoking discussion of the radiation hazard which confronts us all. On several occasions the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] whose concern with the protection of the people's health is so well known to us all, has spoken on this problem. And the record shows that many Members of the House of Representatives have spoken to alert the Nation to the necessity of coming to grips with the risks and hazards of ionizing radiation.

It is because what they have said has been so well said that I will speak but briefly of the problem as I see it. Man in the last half century has let loose in the world forces which we do not as yet fully understand. We do not fully know either their potentialities or their hazards. The data on which to base conclusions is scanty. The conclusions so far arrived at are altogether tentative. The one single and apparently universally accepted conclusion is that we are dealing with forces capable of producing such ionizing radiation as may well decimate or obliterate human life.

The developments with which we are concerned began with the invention of the roentgen ray just before the turn of the century. That discovery, we all realize, has resulted in much that has meant life and better health for our people. It has, however, also resulted in problems which would, of themselves, be most serious even if they were the only radiological problems currently besetting us. But when in recent years man unleashed the power of the atom he concurrently began to bring into being still further and more alarming problems involving still greater exposure of human beings to ionizing radiation. The problem with which we are concerned is a problem of health. It is the health of our people that is being increasingly threatened by the cumulative forces of ionizing radiation to which mankind is becoming exposed.

Most people think of this problem solely in terms of the danger of radioactive fallout. The fact is that throughout all history mankind has been exposed to ionizing radiation from natural sources. A further and most important fact is that beginning in 1895 we added to these natural sources of ionizing radiation the first manmade sources of such radiation—the X-ray. Assuming that we can express the amount of radiation to which we are exposed from natural sources as having remained at a constant 100 units throughout the past, we must next note the fact that, whereas in 1925 our people on the average began to be exposed to an additional 15 such units from X-ray sources, this latter exposure increased to 40 units by 1935, to 75 units in 1945, and to 135 units in 1955. In short, in the brief span of 30 years we have so developed the use of X-ray in this country that today exposure to its resulting radiation far exceeds the amount to which we are subjected through natural sources. When we add to this the ionizing radiation to which mankind already has been and in the future may be exposed as a result of emanations from atomic sources, I think it becomes obvious that some effective control over all sources of ionizing radiation must be brought into being. I think it obvious, too, that such controls must be vested in that agency of Government which has but one responsibility—that of protecting the Nation's health. I would point out that such

responsibility does not exist today. Some governmental agencies have responsibilities for protecting the public's health from radiation hazards resulting from their own activities. No agency has the responsibility of devising ways and means of protecting our people from the totality of exposure to ionizing radiation.

What I have said explains the reasons why I am introducing this bill. Now let me speak for a moment on why the bill has taken the form in which it now appears. I recognize that the problem is both serious and urgent, but I am also aware that it is so complex and has such far-reaching implications that we must not permit ourselves to be stampeded into precipitous regulatory action. For this reason the bill does not create any new powers in the field of radiation hazard control but instead calls for a report in February of 1960 from the Surgeon General, in which he is directed, after consultation with Federal, State, and local agencies exercising responsibilities in connection with the control of radiation hazards, to submit to the Congress a comprehensive program for the adequate control and regulation of such hazards.

Senators will notice, I hope, that the bill does not affect the activities of the Atomic Energy Commission, the Department of Defense, or other Federal agencies concerned with the development or utilization of atomic power. Nor does the bill in any way affect the existing responsibilities of the Food and Drug Administration for protecting us against contaminated or dangerous foods, drugs, or X-ray equipment. It would, if enacted, immediately put Federal, State, and local public health services in a position to begin accumulating the knowledge and training the personnel which they will need to control radiation hazards already in existence and stemming from non-Federal activities. It will enable the Public Health Service to begin work on the formulation of standards needed to measure the totality of the radiation to which a community may be exposed with safety. But when it comes to the question of how best to vest primary responsibility for protecting our health against the hazards of all forms of manmade radiation, including those resulting from our need to protect the Nation against totalitarian threats and our desire to expand the peaceful uses of the atom, then the bill proposes that we proceed with the caution and the care necessitated by the seriousness of the problems involved. Here we propose that the Surgeon General, in cooperation with the Atomic Energy Commission, the Department of Defense, and every agency exercising responsibilities in connection with the control of radiation hazards, including State and local health agencies, develop and submit to the Congress such a plan as will, within the limits of our power, provide for the protection of our people from radiation hazards.

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

The bill (S. 1628) to provide for the vesting of primary responsibility for the protection of the public health and safety from radiation hazards in the Public Health Service of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. HILL, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

FAMILY-SIZED FARMS

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill relating to the sale of surplus lands at the Hastings, Nebr., Ammunition Depot.

While this bill is brought about by the situation near Hastings, it will deal with a problem which does and will soon exist in several of the 50 States.

There is a great deal of talk and writing about the family type or family size farm. But not much is done about it.

There is one area in which concrete progress can be made. It comes about by sale by the Federal Government of those of its landholdings which are declared surplus.

Mr. President, the Navy Department has announced that its large ammunition depot near Hastings, Nebr., will soon be disestablished as a result of a general reduction of its shore installations. As a result of the cutback, the tract of land occupied by the depot, which is approximately 53,000 acres in size, will be available for disposal.

Considerable oppostion has been expressed by the people in the Hastings region to the idea that a single landowner, or a very small number of them, might obtain possession of this surplus land. From a thorough study of the situation, I have become convinced that it would promote the well-being of our country generally, and American agriculture particularly, for the land to be disposed of in family-size units, which type farms remain the backbone of our rural economy.

The tract now occupied by the naval depot was assembled through the purchase or condemnation of numerous farm units. As the land is better suited for agricultural uses than to any other purpose, we should take every step to insure that the individual farm operator will not lose this extraordinary opportunity to establish a home and a means of livelihood for his family from this land.

The bill I am introducing is designed to insure the disposal of this and similar surplus tracts of land in family-type farm units. It provides that any tract exceeding 2,000 acres in area determined to be surplus which has been devoted to the production of crops and is immediately suitable for agricultural uses shall not be disposed of in parcels of more than 320 acres to each individual or family group.

This acre limitation would not apply to any such surplus land upon which buildings are located if they are still in usable condition for industrial, commercial, or residential purposes. The present law would remain effective in such instances. Every encouragement should be given to induce industry to locate upon and activate buildings and areas suitable to its purposes.

One of the most contentious and controversial legislative subjects is that of agriculture, with its almost limitless areas and varieties of activities and aspects.

Yet there is one feature of it upon which there is general agreement: the desirability of the family type and operated farm.

Its place and importance in the building of America was first realized and established in colonial times. The sources of strength which it creates were in the mind of Lincoln when he strongly advocated, and later signed into law, the far-reaching National Homestead Act of 1862, which authorized freehold farm tracts of 160 acres to citizens agreeing to make their homes on them for not less than 5 years.

My native State of Nebraska has participated in this tradition. The first homestead application under the act of 1862 was filed in Brownsville, Nebr., on January 1, 1863. A national monument marks the 160-acre tract near Beatrice, in Gage County, where Daniel Freeman lived and farmed after his filing.

HIGH PLACE OF FAMILY-TYPE FARM IN AMERICA

By tradition over decades and decades, the family type and operated farms come honestly and firmly to high place and estimate.

They spell the difference between the life of a tenant or laborer, on the one hand, and an independent operator, on the other hand. They determine so much the character of the neighborhood in which he will raise his family.

Not only is the farmowner in charge of his own destiny to the maximum one may be these days, but he has a chance to get ahead, and to rear a family in one of the most wholesome of circumstances.

Where smaller, owner-operated farms exist, there will be good, progressive schools, hospitals, churches, and various community enterprises that make for useful citizenship and enjoyable, healthful living.

Such things are possible because of the number of people which many small farms can support. The farmer's family in the first place. The grocer from whom they buy food; the clothing merchant; the farm implement dealer; the lumberyard; the dealer in autos and trucks, and the gas, oil, and repairs to run them; the neighbor from whom they buy their seed, feed, and fertilizer; the man who supplies wells and irrigation equipment; the doctor, dentist, lawyer, the builder, and so on and so on.

It is such as these that Senators Hans O. Jensen, 25th district, and Richard Marvel, 31st district, had in mind when they proposed in the Nebraska Unicameral Legislature a resolution, reading in part, "Whereas, the family-sized farm remains the backbone of American agriculture."

But such things do not come about, Mr. President, if the prairies are changed into farms so large that a man standing at one end of a furrow cannot see its other end because of sheer distance—a furrow so long and a field so

wide that only the largest, most specialized, and most expensive farm machinery can successfully cultivate it.

Too many forces which we cannot control are driving our farms into the automation which comes with large operations.

But when we encounter a situation arising where such trend can be stopped, we surely should take vigorous, courageous action.

ANNOUNCEMENT TO CLOSE HASTINGS NAVAL DEPOT

Mr. President, this surely was done by Nebraskans of Adams and Clay Counties when announcement was made last December by the Navy Department of plans to discontinue and dispose of the 53,000-acre Navy Ammunition Depot, located near Hastings, and in the two counties named.

This installation, which proved to be a defense bulwark in World War II and in the Korean war, was formed at heavy cost, not only in dollars, but in eliminating scores upon scores of family-operated farm units.

With announcement of impending sale of this land as surplus, came the dread fear to the many fine folk of that area, that large land investors—either individual or corporation—would come into the scene to buy the land in a single or large tracts, and thus hasten the many other factors which are working so relentlessly toward further defeat of the family-type farm tradition.

TWO PROBLEMS ARE PRESENT

Situations of this kind, which exist the Nation over, as I shall show presently, really bring two problems because while the land on which the depot is located is in large part suitable for farming, parts of it have been improved by the erection of buildings of various kinds. In each instance, the highest possible use should be made of both. The problems, then, are these:

First. To put to full and beneficial use that part of the improvements which lend themselves to industrial, commercial, or even residential purposes. The desirability of establishing payrolls in farming States and areas, is well known. Full advantage should be taken of such opportunities.

Second. The sale and operation of the agricultural land in question in family-type and size farms, "the backbone of rural, farming America."

FEARS ARE JUSTIFIED UNDER PRESENT LAWS

As to the second of these goals, research of statutes shows that the expressed fears of citizens of Adams and Clay Counties are justified. Family-type and operated farms are not favored by the laws under which surplus lands of this kind are sold. They do not provide any preference or priority to former owners.

In an effort to enable these former owners to bid for the property as effectively as possible under present laws, the General Services Administration which is in charge of the sale, tried to offer the property in separate tracts as much as practicable, and then offers them for sale at public auction.

The result of the public auction, however, is a dismal one for the normal individual farmer who seeks to bid. The competition of the large, well-capitalized investor—whether personal or corporation—is too strong and weighted against the man who seeks to acquire the land for the purpose of tilling it himself.

CORRECTIVE BILL IS PROPOSED

To overcome these difficulties and to be of as much help as possible to reach the desired goals, I have prepared and am sending to the desk, a bill which is designed to insure the disposal of this and similar surplus tracts of land in family-type farm units. The bill is proposed as an amendment to the Federal Property and Administrative Act of 1949, under which surplus property is disposed of.

It provides that any tract of surplus land exceeding 2,000 acres in area which has been devoted to the production of crops and is immediately suitable for agricultural uses, shall be disposed of in parcels of not more than 320 acres to any one individual or family group, as specified in the bill.

These limitations would not apply to any such surplus land upon which there are buildings or improvements if they are still in usable condition for industrial, commercial, or residential purposes. The present law would remain effective in such instances, since every encouragement should be given to induce proper persons or companies to locate upon and activate buildings and areas suitable to their uses.

The bill contains provision for preference to former owners. It is realized that the Surplus Property Act of 1944 did contain such a provision for former owners, and 5 years later the experience was so unfavorable that it was left out when the 1949 act was passed.

It is my plan, Mr. President, to make further inquiry into the reasons for the omission of the former owner preference from the 1949 act, when the hearings are held on this bill. If the reasons for such omission no longer exist and if some practical way can be worked out to reinstate it into law, I would strongly advocate that such preference be accorded. In this way, some equity will be done in favor of owners who were forced to part with the land for defense purposes which have now been served.

THE BILL IS GENERAL LEGISLATION

While the introduction of this bill is brought about because of a situation arising near Hastings, Nebr., it is designed to deal with a problem which has or shortly will exist in several of the 50 States.

The Navy Department recently announced that several such depots in various States, including the Hastings Depot, are no longer needed and will be disestablished as soon as it is feasible to do so. This may take several years to accomplish. In the meantime, the operations will be continued at reduced levels, and as soon as any portions of a given depot no longer serve any purpose, it is planned to declare it excess land, and prepare it, through proper departmental procedures, for disposition by the General Services Administration as surplus land.

The Navy's decision to close such depots is based upon radical and vast changes in weapons and methods of modern warfare and defense needs.

In addition to the several Navy depots to be disposed of, there will undoubtedly be other tracts of land which the Government will relinquish from time to time.

Insofar as such land was taken from family operated farm units and insofar as it can be returned to that use, it should be made possible to get that job done. The proposed bill will enable this to be done.

THE WILL AND DETERMINATION OF PEOPLE INVOLVED

What has happened in Nebraska when this situation was presented will no doubt happen in other areas when their time comes. It was heartening to see how these ideas which are so elementary, yet so fundamental, took quick, wide, and enthusiastic hold.

The Blue Hill, Nebr., Leader, of which Byron Vaughan is editor, put it this way:

> The thousands of acres of farmland comprising the Hastings Naval Ammunition Depot was purchased from farmers. * * * Today there is no longer need for the depot and the land will be returned to the farmers * * * that is, to those who are able to buy.
>
> * * * Since the depot is apparently situated over the best irrigation water supply in Nebraska, an ideal situation would result if the return to the farmers were handled with care.
>
> What a farming area it could be if the depot could be divided into small farms, well irrigated and highly tilled. To gain that end, it seems to us that farmers with limited financial means should be permitted to buy this land.

The Clay County News—Mr. King, editor—of January 29, carried an account of one of the mass meetings held in the community to discuss this subject. In part, this news story stated:

> As expressed at the meeting, sentiment is overwhelming for family-size farms; not more than a half section at the most—preferably quarter section farms. * * * Clay County, with more than 42,000 acres of its area seized by the Government, was dealt a hard blow by this seizure. Now Federal authorities, and the Navy Department in particular, have an opportunity to make amends. All that is asked is that the sales of NAD lands be restricted to individual buyers; no buyer be permitted to buy more than 320 acres—directly or indirectly.
>
> If possible, original owners from whom the land was seized be permitted to bid in former holdings; next, veterans be given preference.

POSITIVELY NO AUCTION SALE OF THE LANDS IN A SINGLE UNIT

The Nebraska Unicameral Legislature debated and adopted a resolution which was proposed by Senator Hans O. Jensen, 25th district, and Senator Richard Marvel, 31st district. The sense of the

resolution is pretty well stated in these words:

Whereas the family-sized farm remains the backbone of American agriculture. * * *

This legislature respectfully requests the General Services Administration offer the Hastings Naval Depot for sale in seperate tracts of such size as to be economically feasible family-sized farm units.

While I have received many, many letters from many fine folks on the subject, I should like to refer to the one written by S. W. Moger, who was for many years county attorney of Clay County. He is a good lawyer, and a sound citizen; I am proud to have had him for a personal friend for many years. He has been very active in the drive to make suitable progress on the matter of eventual sale of the depot lands.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the full text of his letter be printed at the conclusion of my remarks, together with the January 29, 1959, news article of the Clay County News, the full text of the resolution of the Nebraska Unicameral Legislature, and the text of the bill.

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

HOW THE LAND BECOMES SURPLUS

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, when the Navy will have no further use for the land, it will declare it to be excess land. Thereupon the Secretary of Defense will inquire as to whether any other agency of the Department of Defense has any use for it. If not, it will be certified to the General Services Administration, which will make inquiry if there is any other public use to which it can be put within the provisions of the 1949 act. If no such other use is found, then the land is ready for advertising and sale.

It will take the Navy several years to disestablish the depot, and be ready to move off of the place. The handling of ammunition is expensive. It should be done not only in an economical way, but also in a safe way.

But surely as time goes on, the Navy will be ready to release tracts of land of substantial size for which they do not have any use. An example of that is to be found in the sections at the eastern portion of the depot. Such areas should not be leased out again, when their present leases expire. They should be offered for sale, so as to get them back into private ownership, and preferably into individual owner's hands.

CONCLUSION

It is my earnest hope that the bill which I hereby introduce will be promptly and favorably considered, so that it will be operative by the time such sales will be made.

It should be repeated that this bill does not propose legislation for a special project. It will be of wide application. It will be wholesome and is much needed. I request that it be appropriately referred, and urge that it be considered favorably as speedily as possible.

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

The bill (S. 1630) to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to require the disposal of certain surplus land for use in the production of crops through the operation of family-type farms, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. HRUSKA (for himself, Mr. CURTIS, Mr. LAUSCHE, Mr. CAPEHART, Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota, Mr. LANGER, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Mr. BENNETT, and Mr. ALLOTT), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

The letter, resolution, article, and bill, which were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, are as follows:

CLAY CENTER, NEBR.

Hon. ROMAN HRUSKA,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Re Naval ammunition depot land, Hastings.

DEAR SENATOR HRUSKA: No doubt you wonder why I have not written you before because I imagine you have heard from a great many people in this locality concerning the sale of the Navy depot land.

I am a member of one of the committees regarding our proposals and we have put in quite a good deal of study as to what we think ought to be the fair and reasonable way of handling the sale of this kind and we have taken upon ourselves considerable time to talk with the different people who once owned the land, which was taken from them and with the general public.

After considerable discussion we feel that it is very important to our community that the several recommendations be requested to help our community.

I think you will recall what a tremendous hardship that was placed upon the farmers who lived in the area, who were required to move and leave everything behind and in some instances within a very few hours notice. In addition to that you will recall the values and appraisement that was made on this land in the land acquisition actions. Some of these parties had new modern buildings and I think that probably the top price of their farms was appraised at $75, some of them as low as $25 using the depressed values of land at that time. It was unpatriotic to demand the Government more than the appraised values. No one was able to purchase like land for the money that was paid them by the Government and it caused extreme hardship to many of them.

I know that you are familiar with the location of this land and when it was taken one-half of the trade area was taken away from the business men in the community.

Now we hope that this land will be turned back as you know they really have no use for much of this land particularly the three tiers of sections on the east side of the area. There are no roads, no buildings, no fences or improvements of any kind on this property. We are in hopes that the Government will not be too hard upon them to put this land back in family sized units where people can afford to buy and reimprove this land. We suggest that no one person be eligible to purchase more than 320 acres.

We feel that the persons who lost their land or their families be given the opportunity to purchase the land which they lost.

We feel that this land should not be sold at the competitive bid but that it be appraised in the same manner in which it was taken, that consideration be given in the appraisement of the fact that there are no roads, no fences, no improvements and not even a fence post that they could use.

We feel that if there is a second choice that veterans be given the opportunity to purchase or file on the same and if necessary a drawing be had among them, after which the land be sold to any individuals in family sized units.

Now we realize that this is a big assignment that we are passing on to you but I know your ability and know that if anyone can do it you and your colleagues can. I know what it means to this community.

I appreciate your announcements that you have made to the press with reference to our requests.

If you can spare the time I would certainly appreciate any suggestions or any information as to the progress that is being made. If there is anything that any of us should do to further this cause, such information would certainly be honored.

I trust that I will get to talk with you personally about this and any other matters or information that you might wish for me.

With personal regards, I am,

Yours very truly,

S. W. MOGER,
Attorney.

LEGISLATIVE RESOLUTION 15—LEGISLATURE OF NEBRASKA

Whereas the Hastings Naval Depot has been declared surplus by the United States Navy and its sale by the General Services Administration is expected; and

Whereas the tract of land of which such depot is composed was assembled through the purchase or condemnation of numerous farm units; and

Whereas such land is better suited to agricultural uses than to any other purpose; and

Whereas the family-sized farm remains the backbone of American agriculture: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the members of the Nebraska Legislature in 69th session assembled:

1. This legislature respectfully requests that the General Services Administration offer the Hastings Naval Depot for sale in separate tracts of such size as to be economically feasible family-size farm units.

2. That a copy of this resolution, suitably engrossed, be sent to the General Services Administration and to each Member from Nebraska in the United States Senate and House of Representatives.

DWIGHT W. BURNEY,
President of the Legislature.

I, Hugo F. Srb, hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of Legislative Resolution 15, which was passed by the Legislature of Nebraska in 69th regular session on the 6th day of February, 1959.

HUGO F. SRB,
Clerk of the Legislature.

[From the Clay County News, Sutton, Nebr., Jan. 29, 1959]

CLAY CITIZENS ASKING FAMILY SIZE FARMS AT NAVAL AMMUNITION DEPOT—MORE THAN 100 ATTEND CLAY CENTER MEETING—ORGANIZING FOR HASSLE WITH POWERS THAT BE IN WASHINGTON

If the Clay Center meeting Monday night, attended by citizens from nearly every town and township of Clay County, represents the wishes of Clay County citizens generally, anything less than a return of Naval Ammunition Depot grounds to their status quo prior to World War II, if not possible to return to original family ownership, will be a flouting of public will. Worse, it will be a callous disregard of what is fair and equitable for Clay County as a whole.

WIDE INTEREST SHOWN

Wide interest in Monday night's meeting was shown. County co-ops are interested; the CCA of Kansas City phoned and expressed

complete accord with the meeting's objectives; this is a matter of concern to farmers generally, as well as to citizens of the towns. Sutton's representation Monday night included Martin Lewis, Demas Griess, and Paul Bender.

As expressed at the meeting, sentiment is overwhelmingly for family size farms; not more than a half section at the most—preferably quarter-section farms.

Corporation landownership is feared should the lands in any considerable quantity be offered for sale. Clay County, with more than 42,000 acres of its area seized by the Government, was dealt a hard blow by this seizure. Now, Federal authorities and the Navy Department in particular, have an opportunity to make amends. All that is asked is that the sales of Naval Ammunition Depot lands be restricted to individual buyers; no buyer be permitted to buy more than 320 acres—directly or indirectly.

If possible, original owners from whom the land was seized be permitted to bid in former holdings; next veterans be given preference.

Positively no auction sale of the lands in a single unit.

The preference is appraisal valuations of the tracts offered be determined and then the preference rule.

At this time the land is worth not less than twice as much, if not more, than was paid by the Government.

Use of local appraisers, as originally assigned, is also suggested.

In this manner, the Government will profit; the land will again be occupied by families; Clay County will again have a population growth that will restore some prestige and privileges lost because of the loss occasioned by seizure of the land.

Which seems fair and reasonable.

Actually, little has yet been learned of Navy plans for the properties. Reportedly, an effort is being made to sell to a large arms corporation some of the land and buildings.

In another column on this page is found the Curtis report as released in Washington Saturday.

What the county organization hopes for is a flood of letters from Clay citizens to our two U.S. Senators, CURTIS and HRUSKA, and our Congressmen. Later, perhaps, a local delegation will be sent to Washington.

At this time, the brunt of the activity is centered in the committee which called the meeting: Attorneys John Sullican, S. W. Moger, and J. T. Massie; Dale Thomas, James Stych, and R. R. Byrkit.

Volunteer committeemen were also named at the Monday night meeting. They are Demas Griess and Dale Pope, Sutton; Gerald Stahl, Harvard; Vernon Grummert, Edgar; Howard Hanson, Fairfield; Fred Ellermeier, Glenvil; Melvin Salmon, Trumbull; Jack Hubbell, Deweese; Lyle Hinrichs, Inland; Herbert Johnson, Ong; Wayne Erickson, Saronville; and Jack Peshek, Fairfield.

The number of acres involved total 48,752.77, of which 42,747.53 are in Clay County.

Whether two section areas on the east are presently involved, with a three-section area with 29 sections, is speculation. But if the land is held to quarter sections, it would mean 80 to 116 additional farm families on our farm lands if sales are confined to quarter-section tracts.

The important thing at this time, as the countywide committee sees it, is for as many citizens to write as many letters as they can to Senators HRUSKA and CURTIS; to Congressmen WEAVER, BROCK, MCGINLEY, and CUNNINGHAM.

SENATOR CURTIS SUGGESTS PLAN FOR NAVAL AMMUNITION DEPOT LANDS—BUILDINGS TO INDUSTRY; SMALL TRACTS FOR NEW OWNERSHIP OPERATION

Washington dispatches to Nebraska newspapers from Senator CURTIS Monday told how the Senator was working toward a plan for using naval ammunition depot lands and buildings. He offers a four-point program that should be satisfactory to citizens of the area generally telling the Navy Department his plan is the result of personal reactions presented to him by citizens affected.

He urges the Navy Department to consider:

Any land or buildings which will not be used by the Navy be made available for farming and industry.

Farm land, when offered for sale or leasing should be in parcels suitable for individual family-sized operations.

Former owners to be given every possible consideration.

Study the problem of making payments in lieu of taxes from income producing property which may be leased by the Navy.

Senator CURTIS said he has been informed that only 200 acres of land is being offered for sale at present.

He also states definite plans have been announced for the closing of the vast installation, which was commissioned in 1943, covering some 85,000 acres of farm land in Adams and Clay Counties. Not all of the land is used by the Navy and a number of farming operations are now being carried on by leaseholders.

S. 1630

A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to require the disposal of certain surplus land for use in the production of crops through the operation of family-type farms, 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) section 203 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (40 U.S.C. 484) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(p) (1) Any tract of land exceeding two thousand acres in area which has been determined to be surplus property may be disposed of only in conformity with the requirements of this subsection if the major portion of such tract (A) has been devoted to the production of crops before its acquisition, or during its ownership or control, by any executive agency, and (B) is suitable for use in the production of crops.

"(2) Before disposal, any such tract shall be divided into separate parcels, no one of which may exceed three hundred and twenty acres in area, in such manner as to provide the maximum practicable number of parcels suitable for use in the production of crops through the operation of family-type farms.

"(3) Whenever any such tract includes land acquired by an executive agency after January 1, 1940, from one or more private owners who, before such acquisition, used that land chiefly for the production of crops in the operation of family-type farms, the boundaries of the separate parcels of land into which such tract is divided pursuant to paragraph (2) shall conform to the greatest practicable extent to the boundaries of the farms which existed at the time of their acquisition by such executive agency. In the disposal of any parcel of land the boundaries of which are so determined, appropriate notice of the proposed disposal thereof shall be given by publication made pursuant to regulations prescribed by the Administrator. The former owner of the major portion of any such parcel shall be entitled to purchase that parcel, at any time within 90 days after publication of such notice, upon the payment of the fair market value thereof for use in the production of crops, as determined by appraisal made in conformity with regulations prescribed by the Administrator. As used in this paragraph, the term 'former owner' means the person or persons from whom the major portion of any parcel of land, or any interest therein, was acquired by an executive agency; or if any such person is deceased, his spouse, if living; or if such spouse is also deceased, one or more of his natural or adopted children. If no former owner purchases any such parcel within the prescribed period of time, that parcel may be disposed of pursuant to paragraph (4).

"(4) Any parcel of land contained in any such tract which is not subject to, or disposed of pursuant to, the provisions of paragraph (3) may be disposed of by sale, after advertisement for bids, to any one individual, or to a husband and wife, or to a parent and one or more natural or adopted children.

"(5) No individual who has acquired by any means an interest in any parcel of land which has been disposed of pursuant to this subsection shall be eligible to acquire through any transfer made under this subsection any interest in any other such parcel contained in any tract of land if that other parcel is situated less than three miles from any such parcel in which that individual previously has acquired an interest.

"(6) Each instrument executed for the transfer of any parcel of land pursuant to this subsection shall contain such provisions as the Administrator shall determine to be effective to insure that for a period of not less than five years after the execution of that instrument that parcel will not be used for purposes other than the production of crops and uses incidental thereto."

(b) The amendment made by this Act shall take effect on the first day of the second month beginning after the date of enactment of this Act.

UNEMPLOYMENT

Mr. KENNEDY. Yesterday the Department of Commerce announced that 4,362,000 people were still out of work in March.

Perhaps the most serious domestic failure of this administration is its refusal to deal adequately with this high plateau of unemployment which blocks our economic recovery. For not only have its economic policies restricted our productive growth but, even more seriously, they have failed to recognize the human problems of economic lag—the problems facing men and women who are out of work for a sustained period of time.

It is for this reason that I again introduced this year, as in 1954 and 1958—and joined this year by the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY], the senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE], and 31 other cosponsors—proposed legislation which would increase the coverage and establish nationwide minimum standards for the payment of unemployment compensation benefits, both as to amount and duration. The average person out of a job today, if he receives any benefits at all under the present system of limited coverage, is required to support his family while looking for a new job on an average benefit check of $31 per week. Obviously, this cannot be done. According to a University of Michigan survey, about 44 percent of these unemployed workers have at least some savings on which they can draw during an emergency, but the savings will not last long. About 23 percent are forced to take help from rel-

atives; about 6.5 percent must fall back on help from public relief and welfare agencies.

Moreover, even this inadequate protection provided by the law lasts, in some States, for less than 90 days. Some attempt was made last year, and again this year, to enact an emergency program to meet the needs of the unemployed. Last year I offered, as a part of the bill for Federal minimum standards, a program of temporary benefits which would tide the jobless workers over until the permanent program could become effective. Unfortunately, both the temporary program and the permanent amendments to the unemployment compensation law which were in that bill were sidetracked in favor of an administration-backed bill, which simply permitted each State legislature, if it so wished, to use its own resources or credit to extend its own benefit period by up to 50 percent.

That bill did nothing for the great bulk of our unemployed workers. It did little to restore purchasing power. It was wholly inadequate even as an emergency bill.

On April 1 that bill was scheduled to expire, and a valiant effort was made to substitute a more meaningful measure. On March 9, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNamara] and 17 other Senators, of whom I was one, introduced a bill to provide an emergency unemployment extension program of much wider scope than the one which was adopted last year. Thirty-eight Senators voted for this program. Then, by an overwhelming vote of 52 to 32, the Senate adopted an amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. McCarthy] which would have made some slight improvement in the measure under consideration. But even this token acknowledgement of the existence of a serious unemployment insurance problem was rejected by the conference committee, and we now have a temporary bill under which no person who exhausts his benefits after April 1 can have them extended unless the State voluntarily, with no help from the Federal Government, is able to and does take some action.

If the temporary bill I introduced last year, or the McNamara bill, which I cosponsored this year, had been enacted, it would temporarily extend the coverage, raise the benefits, provide for a substantially extended duration of benefits, and be a reasonably adequate stopgap solution for the unemployment crisis we face today.

But we need more than stopgap solutions. The inequities and inadequacies of our unemployment compensation system preceded this emergency; and they will long outlive it, if Congress does not correct them now. If the system is not now adequate to the test of the current recession, it will not be adequate for any future recession. If it offers little help to unemployed workers and their creditors now, it will offer them no more help in better times.

I therefore urge that this session of the 86th Congress make it a primary order of business to enact a law which will give to every unemployed man and woman, who is seriously seeking work, a jobless insurance payment equal to at least one-half of his weekly wage—up to a maximum of two-thirds of the average wage in his State—and continue that payment up to a uniform maximum of 39 weeks.

This will restore our unemployment compensation system to the role it was intended to play in the life of our economy and in the life of our jobless workers. Instead of perpetuating the weaknesses and inequities of the present program, this will remove them. Instead of widening the gaps in employers' taxes in the various States, it will narrow them. Instead of delaying relief while legislators debate and lawyers argue, it will put money into the hands of the unemployed. In short, it offers a nationwide solgution, for all States, for a national problem.

The House of Representatives has begun hearings upon this bill. I urge that the Senate follow suit; and I hope that a measure may be sent to the President before another stopgap measure is necessary and before our unemployment rolls grow even larger.

But we cannot wait for the President to act, for he has already made it clear that he does not share our concern, and that he wants to leave this problem to the States. We cannot wait for the States to act, for the fear of an unequal tax burden has prevented them from meeting these standards since they were first urged by the President some 6 years ago. It is up to the Congress to take appropriate steps.

There will be objections to this legislation; there will be powerful forces against it. But to do less would be to fail in our basic responsibility to a group of fellow Americans whose plight bears comparison, in its desperation and need, to any the world over.

Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts has the floor.

ADJOURNMENT TO FRIDAY

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate at this time, under the previous order I move that the Senate adjourn until Friday, at noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 1 minute p.m.), the Senate adjourned, the adjournment being under the order previously entered, until Friday, April 10, 1959, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate April 8, 1959:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

To be Ambassadors Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the countries indicated:

Carl W. Strom, of Iowa, to Bolivia.

Ellis O. Briggs, of Maine, to Greece.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 8, 1959

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Charles W. Holland, Jr., pastor, Fountain Memorial Baptist Church, offered the following prayer:

Jesus said, John 14: 16: *I will pray the Father, and He shall give you another Comforter, that He may abide with you forever.*

Completely righteous and omnipotent Father God, as we pause to invoke Thy guidance upon this group, teach us to pray.

We thank Thee that Thou hast promised the presence and guidance of the Holy Spirit to Thy children.

Spirit of the living God, fall fresh on those who have made Thee Lord and Master of their lives. We thank Thee, God, that we can feel and depend on His presence in our midst.

Teach us as we study and work together to know His perfect will.

These requests and thanks we offer through Thy Holy Spirit. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS AND A JOINT RESOLUTION

A message from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, informing the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

On March 23, 1959:

H.R. 2260. An act to extend the induction provisions of the Universal Military Training and Service Act, and for other purposes.

On March 25, 1959:

H.J. Res. 198. Joint resolution to provide for the reappointment of Robert V. Fleming as citizen regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution; and

H.R. 1776. An act to amend the act of June 28, 1958, entitled "An act to provide for a National Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission, and for other purposes."

On March 31, 1959:

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

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

On April 3, 1959:

H.R. 5247: An act to increase the authorized maximum expenditure for the fiscal year 1959 under the special milk program.

PERMISSION TO SIT DURING GENERAL DEBATE

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Subcommittee No. 2 of the Committee on Banking and Currency may be permitted to sit during general debate today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

TRANSFER OF SPECIAL ORDERS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the special orders obtained by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES], the gentleman from Montana [Mr. METCALF], and the gentleman from California [Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER], for today, be transferred to Friday, April 10.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet on Friday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

COMMUNIST SUPPRESSION OF INDEPENDENCE MOVEMENTS

Mr. MONAGAN. 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 Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, the bloody suppression of the movement for independence in Tibet has once again dramatically and tragically demonstrated to the world the essential nature of the Communist movement.

Just as in Hungary and in Lithuania, a proud and freedom-loving people are being systematically trampled under by this tyrannical movement which can brook no opposition.

The leader of the Tibetan religion has been driven from his country and the holy religious places have been shelled and badly damaged.

Religion, tradition, human values mean nothing to the small dedicated clique which rules Red China. The values which we hold dear are to them outmoded shibboleths which stand in the way of their progress and must be brushed aside.

Tragic though this present Communist aggression may be, it has had one helpful effect in that it has brought home to the uncommitted nations of Asia the fate that communism holds for them if they succumb to the blandishments of its leaders.

Tibet has two lessons for us in free America.

The first is that the essence of communism does not change and is antagonistic to our way of life without respect for the individual, our reverence for religion, and our regard for free institutions.

The second and more crucial lesson for us is the warning implicit in the Chinese action that we must look to our own resources and strengthen them in every particular in order to succeed in our struggle against communism.

Militarily, politically, and socially, we must do everything in our power to insure our continued progress as a nation and thereby show to all nations the capacity of our system to surpass the efforts of the totalitarians.

REDUCTION IN GREAT BRITAIN'S ANNUAL BUDGET

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, I do not believe any news is more disturbing to our American taxpayers than to read in today's press that Great Britain's annual budget includes nearly $1 billion in tax cuts.

This kind of news from overseas is further aggravating to our wage earners in view of the disheartening reports from here in Washington that tax relief for the taxpayers in this country will not be possible for many years to come.

Mr. Speaker, the citizens of the United States who are already heavily burdened with Federal, State, and local taxes have a right to gripe. They have a right to begrudge the Britons their tax relief. They have a right to ask: How can the British reduce taxes while we cannot?

Mr. Speaker, the American taxpayers are entitled to know that as a result of our foreign aid program we have lessened the military and civilian expenditures in some of these countries with the result that their budgets show a surplus while ours reflects a continuing deficit.

Mr. Speaker, while we know and appreciate the fact that there are great merits to our foreign aid program, it should be operated on the basis of need and not to produce surpluses in foreign budgets so that our foreign friends can enjoy tax relief while our citizens continue to be soaked with more and more taxes.

THE UNEMPLOYED IN DISTRESSED AREAS OF OUR COUNTRY

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include an article entitled "I Had To Go on Welfare.")

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, today in the Nation's Capital we have thousands of unemployed from the distressed areas of our country and I am placing in the RECORD a breadwinner's own story, "I Had To Go on Welfare," as set forth recently in the Detroit Times and published without advance knowledge or participation of the Department of Public Welfare. It clearly sets forth the determination of an agency to do an effective job in guarding public funds and at the same time meeting the needs of the unfortunate citizen. The department of welfare in the city of Detroit is in the able hands of its general superintendent, Daniel J. Ryan, under the welfare commissioners.

Mr. Speaker, the article referred to above follows:

BREADWINNER'S OWN STORY: I HAD TO GO ON WELFARE

Seven hundred and four East Jefferson Avenue. The numbers, dimly seen above the entrance to the dark, forbidding building, proclaim that this is it—Welfare Department, Central Intake—the last hope.

Inhaling deeply, imagining this to be your last breath of fresh air, you shove the door open and walk in. Although you got out of bed early—5:30 a.m.—to avoid a long line, you find others have already arrived. From the single barred window marked "information" the line extends back to the entrance and then reverses itself, turns and continues across the far end of the room.

You place yourself at the end and get set for the endless wait. But it isn't too long. Before opening time, 8 a.m., the "information girl," a perfect characterization of someone's grandmother, gray-haired, bent, and seemingly senile, collects the application cards, numbers each, and sends the applicants to their seats, efficiently erasing the line in something less than 15 minutes.

Promptly 8 the loudspeakers begin summoning clients. Some are instructed to come to window 2, or window 4; others, not so directed, seem to know where to go—pushing through a swinging gate next to the windows, disappearing somewhere beyond.

TIME MATTERS NOT

You've barely had time to drink in the atmosphere: the high ceiling, the dirty walls, the subdued conversation, when your name is called—"Report to window 3." At the window you produce papers and birth certificates, you were told to bring, and swear that statements therein are true, having some difficulty shifting hat and overcoat and bundle of documents before raising your right hand. The clerk, pleasant and courteous, sends you back to your seat to await still another call.

In the coming weeks you are going to spend many hours here, becoming thoroughly familiar with the room and its occupants. One day you will wait from 7:30 in the morning till 3.30 in the afternoon before being interviewed by your "worker"—the interview taking up but 15 minutes time. But time matters not—you have plenty—what does matter, the thoughts you can't put out of your mind, remain to constantly gnaw and nag at your being.

You will study these people, people on welfare, unfortunate people—and you are one of them. You can't look down upon them as inferior beings as you once might have; they, like you, probably don't like being a welfare case, would be just as willing to work and make their own way if they possibly could.

NOT HAPPY, NOT SAD

One thing is apparent about each of them, and that is the acceptance of their situation. They appear neither happy nor sad. Nor desperate. You feel they are here because this is the only honest way left for them to put food on their tables; the last decent way to allow their families to exist.

You wonder what direction they would take if welfare help didn't exist. These people are rational, they are not hungry; their children do not cry for food. Hungry people in other ages have reacted differently, have tossed aside fear, and driven by hunger to irrational deeds, have revolted. Hungry people in this age, in less humane countries, have been forced to accept communism * * * further conjecture along this

line is temporarily interrupted by the loudspeaker.

Your name is called and you are met at the gate by your worker and escorted to his desk in a huge room at the rear of the building.

When you first applied for relief you were given an application blank—four pages—and a full sheet listing required documents and certificates. The application, when completed, thoroughly uncovers your employment and financial history for the past 10 years.

The required papers include birth certificates for each member of your family, marriage license and certificate, service discharge papers, financial statements as well as a form to be completed by your bank, a declaration of resources, proof of residence for each month during the past 2 years, utility and any other bills, a form to be completed by your last employer, social security cards for yourself and wife, and MESC identification and forms.

While your worker examines the documents, you have time to examine the room. Room 106 extends the full length of the building at the rear; possibly 100 by 75 feet. One end is framed, giving the impression that in former years it may have been an auditorium with the framed end a stage.

Approximately 75 desks occupy the area now and the workers manning these desks seem busily undisturbed by the classical FM music emitted by the hi-fi rig set up near the stage end of the room. Better times may have been had in this room, but not better music.

The papers examined with a minimum of questions, your worker informs you that it will be necessary to visit the employment and medical department on the second floor, and your wife is also given an appointment for possible employment—"bring her with you next week."

EMERGENCY FOOD ORDER

It is explained that, having three children, you are eligible for an emergency food order of $22 a week, but having declared $20 cash, the food order this week will be for $2. The home mortgage payments will not be paid by the welfare department at this time—"we can't take action until your home is foreclosed." The same is true of gas and electric bills—"if you get a shutoff notice, bring it in, we'll have 5 days to work on it."

The impression is that this is a temporary procedure, that after a more extensive investigation your case will be opened, and if all requirements are in order, you will be accepted and better arrangements can be expected.

Next stop, employment and medical section, second floor. There are more people here than seats; an overcrowded, poorly ventilated room. Some are leaning against the walls, others standing in the entrance hall.

As you wait, anxiety comes. You want employment, but what will be offered? A demeaning job, lacking dignity and offering substandard pay? You are willing to work, but working decently you also expect to be paid decently, to earn a respectable living for your family.

An unwelcome possibility filters into your thoughts—that you will be asked to accept a job in a car wash, or with a snow-clearing crew. It is unlikely that jobs available here will require a college education.

True, you don't have a degree, just 2 years college, the greater part received while in service, and impossible to verify. So you will take whatever is offered, being in no position to be choosy.

A seat is vacated near you and you find yourself near a disgruntled, talkative individual, shabbily dressed even for these surroundings, and unshaven. His remarks are directed at no one in particular.

He seems to be a chronic complainer and his complaint now is against the long wait—"before this depression you never spent more than an hour or two waiting; now it's more likely a full day."

It is difficult to decide whether he is bitter toward the welfare department or the newcomers to the welfare ranks. Probably both.

This man undoubtedly represents the small percentage of welfare recipients which has lately become the target of the ire of "Taxpayer" and "Citizen" and "Worker" writing their abusive and ofttimes inaccurate letters to the editor.

You are relieved when a clerk announces that it is lunch time, "no business transacted until 1 o'clock." You won't be forced to listen to the whining voice, and a breath of fresh air will be invigorating and most welcome.

Outside, a half snow, half rain fails to drive you back into the building. Lunch would cost about 75 cents and you are hungry—but 75 cents will buy about a gallon of milk, so food is put out of mind. A walk up Woodward Avenue and a check of civil service job openings in the City-County Building. Nothing available unless a bachelor or master degree is possessed. A stop at the University of Detroit Dental Clinic seeking a much-needed appointment for the 10- and 12-year-olds. Disappointment again—a wait of at least 6 months is necessary—aching teeth refuse to be ignored that long.

Shortly after 1, hungry, but somewhat refreshed, you are interviewed; the usual job application questions result in the information that nothing is available at present, but a part-time job may be secured for you sometime in the future.

A CARD FOR DOCTOR

You are given a card for presentation to the doctor and are called into his office almost immediately. A few questions and the brusque though efficient-appearing doctor signs your card and returns you to your worker.

You've barely had time to notice the old-fashioned furnishings in his office, and the framed certificate signed by Harry S. Truman, before departing.

Your worker is busy with another client, so it is nearly 3 o'clock before you are again called to his desk. A few more questions and a repetition of previous instructions before you are sent upstairs to await your check.

Upstairs, past the mezzanine, you find another room running the entire length of the building along the front.

In another era this room may have been a gameroom, or more likely, a grand ballroom. The south wall has a narrow balcony along its full length; the corners of the north wall each boast a huge archway over a staircase leading down to the main floor. The entire ceiling is a skylight.

The wire cage centered against the north wall is the immediate goal of every welfare recipient. Here, checks and bus tickets are dispensed. Many of the familiar green benches are unoccupied, for the waiting period is not so long.

It takes but 10 or 15 minutes before the punched business card sent up by your worker is translated to an emergency food check. The paymaster calls your name, hands over your check and two bus tickets, and you are finished for the day.

YOU TELL YOUR WIFE

After several delays you hesitantly inform your wife that it is necessary for her to be interviewed the following week. You know that it is distasteful to her, but there is no complaint.

The day before your appointment, she makes the necessary arrangements for a babysitter and decides which clothes she will wear.

In a humorous effort you chide her for selecting a skirt and sweater of some vintage and a coat somewhat older, "Why not your 'Sunday best'—or are you trying to impress them that we're really in desperate need?"

The straightforward answer, "They might have a job for me," stops further attempts at levity.

The bus ride downtown is completed in almost total silence, and you reluctantly seat your partner and place yourself in line.

Back beside her, after having your card numbered, you find her determinedly making the best of it, displaying more solicitude for a coughing baby than for herself.

THE FORMULA IS SIMPLE

You will be separated from your wife shortly after being called to your worker's desk. While she is sent through the employment channels, you will find yourself questioned at great length as your complete file is rechecked.

At this time you are told that it won't be necessary to come in the following week; you have received a pension check and consequently will not be eligible for a relief payment.

The formula is quite simple.

For example, a veteran receiving a 30-percent disability compensation check ($55) and having a weekly food allowance of $24, would spend $48 of his pension in a 2-week period for food, and would receive no payment from welfare. The following week the $7 balance from his Government compensation would be deducted from the usual $24 welfare check. He would receive an emergency food order for $17 and would add to that amount the cash balance of $7.

This brings to mind one other pertinent financial arrangement. The welfare recipient is not required to repay the department. The only return realized by the Welfare Department is whatever income tax return you have coming. You will be required to sign a statement acknowledging this liability.

It is shortly before 10 when you are reunited with your wife. She appears somewhat relieved although still a bit nervous. She is agreeably surprised to have been treated with consideration; she confides that she had expected it to be more of an ordeal.

Check and three bus tickets received; wives must be considered angels and able to fly home—the return trip is in a lighter and more talkative mood.

Being on welfare has its humorous side. A humorous secret not shared with the kids.

Any reference to welfare in the newspapers will be called to the attention of your partner without arousing the children's curiosity. When the TV script calls for one of the actors to relate, "ma and pa were on relief," sly glances will be exchanged.

Somehow there is a stigma attached. You tell yourself it is nothing to be ashamed of, it is not degradation you tell yourself, if there were another way you would willingly accept it. It is not your fault.

You find causes for it. Politics. The administration. Big business. Automation. Any reason. But not yourself. Outwardly. But it is a bravado which fails to completely convince. A defense mechanism, a sham.

Down deep you realize that you have failed somewhere. The failure is you. You know it and your wife knows it. You cannot hide it from her. So you attempt to cover it with a false humor and your wife, understanding, somehow finds humor, too.

But the kids don't have to know. So they are spared the humor, and the failure, and the stigma, attached to "being on welfare."

Cashing the first check poses a problem. Having no car, a $24 load of groceries can be quite a burden. Your pride dictates that you shop "away from your neighborhood," making the load even more difficult.

To save possible embarrassment, you call the grocer of your choice and inquire as to

the procedure followed in cashing welfare orders. You learn that you purchase whatever amount that you wish and a credit slip will be issued for the balance.

You decide to purchase $8 worth of groceries, a reasonable load to be carried the 10 or 12 blocks. You shop for the same items you ordinarily shopped for while employed, with few exceptions.

Now you buy powdered milk to mix half and half with regular milk. A roast or chicken for Sunday, but nothing fancy. More hamburger than usual. Versatile, it can make a meal of spaghetti, chili, or sandwiches. No extras—the imprinted food order plainly reads, "For essential food only."

Bananas, even sale priced at 10 cents a pound, seem a luxury when you are shopping for "essential" foods. But common sense overrides any feeling of guilt and they go into your cart.

Remembering the letter to the editor in last week's paper which should have been signed "Envious," you don't even think of purchasing cigarettes. The letter had stated you could easily spot the lucky welfare shopper. Best cuts of meat, etc., to be sold to friends and relatives, while the welfare family, presumably rolling in illgotten money, lives on surplus food handouts.

Your groceries are checked out and the check furtively handed over to the cashier. The manager or head cashier is called over to complete the transaction.

While your purchases are being packaged, a credit slip is made out for whatever balance you have coming. The delay and embarrassment you expected fail to materialize, and the worst part of the shopping trip is yet to come—the long walk home.

The department of welfare has lately been the subject of much public discussion, most of it controversial. An unprejudiced viewpoint would undoubtedly demonstrate that the department is doing a creditable job.

The majority of the people comprising the work force are doing the best they are capable of doing under adverse conditions. The entire program is hampered by a high turnover rate which is not conducive to perfection, in this or in any other business.

Since the first week of January, personal experience has brought contact with various welfare workers each week. While, without exception, each has been courteous and considerate, each has been businesslike and impersonal. No rudeness has been noted—nor condescension. They have a job to do, it's as simple as that.

Honest mistakes have been made and will continue to be made. In less than 2 months this particlular case was twice the victim of a clerical error.

On one occasion an overpayment was made. Upon discovery a readjustment was ordered and the proper deduction put through the following week.

Recently, it was necessary for a cartful of groceries to be replaced on the grocer's shelves because the food order lacked the signature of a welfare department official. This occurred on a late Friday afternoon, too late to have the check corrected before the weekend.

It is unusual to have bacon and eggs for Sunday dinner and ready-mixed cake in place of bread, but it is more desirable than hunger; the meal itself was not unpleasant, appetites being whetted by laughter at our comic plight.

Despite the shortcomings which have been noted, the Department of Welfare is admirably serving its purpose. In contrast to another aid agency, the Michigan Veterans Trust Fund, its humane attitude stands out.

In applying for aid from the trust fund, the veteran will spend a full day waiting; will be under the surveillance of an armed guard; will be unable to smoke. He will most likely be treated curtly, if not downright discourteously.

A typist here was pained and obviously put out because a veteran with a service-connected hearing defect had difficulty hearing his questions.

Another veteran, his arm in a cast, was virtually pushed out into the hall with the admonition, "Go down to the welfare, we can't help you."

I have spent 4 or 5 days at this agency and have there talked to scores of veterans. They, too, without exception, received the same advice to "go down to the welfare."

There are, of course, some who have been assisted, but the percentage must be extremely small. I can be numbered among the fortunate few, having been aided only after a protesting letter to Governor Williams resulted in an interview with a representative of the Lansing headquarters of the Trust Fund.

During this interview I had a run-in with a pompous individual of the local office who apparently resented the fact that I had requested the appeal.

It would be interesting to determine the outcome of the proposal to use the 50-million-dollar veterans' fund to help the State out of its present financial difficulty if the result were left to the decision of needy veterans who have requested aid.

Besides its primary purpose of giving immediate aid to the needy, the welfare department achieves a more important goal.

It is an immediate bulwark against crime and communism; it is a living example of the disadvantages of socialism.

Even the most adamant critic of welfare must admit that the man receiving assistance for his family is unlikely to turn to crime, to rob or steal to put food on his table. Neither is he a likely candidate for the blandishments of the Communist recruiter, whose propaganda is more deceiving if received while the stomach is empty and the heart discouraged.

The Socialist state will certainly lose luster in the eyes of the welfare recipient.

Being "on welfare" is not the utopian state. It is neither a life of luxury nor a "milk and honey affair." It is a bare living, and to the normal man, a temporary arrangement.

A small minority may see it in another light, may convince themselves that the bare existence offered by welfare is desirable when compared with the futility of their past. They may look back upon years of honest endeavor, may recall the bank account slowly and painfully accrued over a period of years, only to disappear in a few short months of adversity.

The cliche, "the poor workingman hasn't a chance," will ring true to a few. These few will remain as permanent welfare cases, satisfied with their lot. These few will be the "do-nothings," the cheaters and chiselers we are hearing so much about at the present time.

Thankfully, the majority will not be so easily satisfied. The honest, average person aided by welfare will be thankful for the "helping hand" and will endeavor to help himself when the opportunity presents itself.

These are the deserving, the majority, whom it is unfair to brand as "welfare bums."

BRITAIN SLASHES TAXES

Mr. GROSS. 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 Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I read in a morning newspaper the headline "Britain Slashes Taxes." In reading the story I got the definite impression that the British are slashing income and beer taxes by about $1 billion a year. That ought to make those who voted for the suspension of Britain's debt payments to the United States feel real good, especially in view of the fact that American taxpayers are digging deep in their pockets to find the money today to pay the interest on the money the U.S. Government borrowed to provide Britain with billions of dollars in so-called loans, loans that are uncollectible.

CONSENT CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Consent Calendar Day. The Clerk will call the first bill on the calendar.

ACQUIRE LAND ALONG MOUNT VERNON MEMORIAL HIGHWAY

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2228) to provide for the acquisition of additional land along the Mount Vernon Memorial Highway.

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

CENTENNIAL OF ESTABLISHMENT OF LAND-GRANT COLLEGES

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4012) to provide for the centennial celebration of the establishment of the land-grant colleges and State universities and the establishment of the Department of Agriculture, and for related purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to reserve consideration of this bill and ask a question about an amendment which I understand it about to be proposed by the committee. Could the committee indicate to the Members what this amendment will do, if approved?

Mr. ASHMORE. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield to me, this amendment will first put a limitation on the amount of money that might be expended. It cannot exceed $200,000. It will also provide that no funds from any department shall be used to carry out the provisions and the purposes of this Commission. In other words, the expenses of the Commission will be covered, such as travel and any other expenditures, through the funds within the $200,000. There will be no hidden funds and no way of getting money from a department, outside of the $200,000.

Mr. FORD. In other words, if an employee of the Department of Agriculture does some work on behalf of this project, the funds of the Centennial Commission will be charged rather than the appropriations for the Department of Agriculture?

Mr. ASHMORE. That is correct.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, there is no greater friend in this House of the land-grant colleges than myself. I have been a recipient of the services of one of them. One of the greatest of all is located in the district I represent. It is the Iowa State College of Agriculture. But certainly the economists who are the products of these colleges would never agree that the way to spend $200,000 is for a centennial celebration. If we want to spend $200,000, let us get some milk to some needy children, or spend it in some other constructive way. I cannot sit by and fail to object to the consideration of this bill to spend $200,000.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman object?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. I do object.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard.

WATER RESOURCES—SALT FORK AND PRAIRIE DOG TOWN FORK, TEX.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4405) to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to conduct studies and render a report on the feasibility of developing the water resources of the Salt Fork of the Red River in the State of Texas.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. MORRIS of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I call attention to the fact that on March 16 I requested that this bill be passed over without prejudice. On March 18 I wrote a letter to the Secretary of the Interior, and on March 23 I had his reply to that letter, through his assistant. In view of my letter and the reply, I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, that the copy of my letter and the copy of the Secretary's letter be incorporated in the RECORD at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

The matter referred to follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., March 18, 1959.

Hon. FRED A. SEATON,
Secretary of the Interior, Interior Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: The House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee has reported H.R. 4405 to the House Calendar. A copy of the bill and report are attached for reference.

I am writing to ask what effect this bill, if enacted by the Congress, might have on the development of any projects in Oklahoma, in the drainage areas of the Prairie Dog Town Fork or Salt Fork. I call special attention to the present activities of the Oklahoma City Development Office of the Bureau of Reclamation in regard to the Mangum project on Salt Fork.

I want to be a good neighbor to my colleagues from Texas, and if enactment of the bill, as reported, would have no adverse effect on any potential project in my district, I would wish to withdraw objection to the pending measure.

I think you should know that I have proposed an amendment which would make the survey applicable to the total drainage area of both streams in both Texas and Oklahoma.

Sincerely yours,

TOBY MORRIS,
Member of Congress.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D.C., March 23, 1959.

Hon. TOBY MORRIS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MORRIS: Your letter of March 18 asked what effect enactment of H.R. 4405 might have on the development of projects downstream, with special reference to the Mangum project.

We believe that, if H.R. 4405 is enacted into law, the immediate requirement will be a basin-type reconnaissance study, which will, among other things, bring together data on streamflow, water quality, and potential water uses. This study should not in any way be in conflict with or delay the scheduled investigations of the Mangum project. On the contrary, it should expedite the collection of data which will be needed for a report on the Mangum project, since we must establish the adequacy of the water supply, and the possibility of future upstream development as part of our finding of feasibility.

The bill authorizes and directs us only to make a study and report. Such activities could not adversely affect any proposed project. Accordingly, we have reported favorably to the enactment of this bill to the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Sincerely yours,

FRED G. AANDAHL,
Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. MORRIS of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to withdraw my reservation of objection to this bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized and directed to conduct the necessary studies and render a report to the Congress on the feasibility of developing the water resources of that portion of the drainage area of the Salt Fork of the Red River lying in the State of Texas and that portion of the drainage area of the Prairie Dog Town Fork of the Red River lying in the State of Texas for furnishing municipal and industrial water and for other purposes.

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

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to conduct studies and render a report on the feasibility of developing the water resources of the Salt Fork and the Prairie Dog Town Fork of the Red River in the State of Texas."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING FEDERAL CROP INSURANCE ACT

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 306) to amend the Federal Crop Insurance Act.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 508(a) of the Federal Crop Insurance Act (7 U.S.C. 1508(a)), as amended, is amended by amending the tenth sentence thereof to read as follows: "Insurance shall not be provided on any agricultural commodity in any county in which the Board determines that the income from such commodity constitutes an unimportant part of the total agricultural income of the county, except that insurance may be provided for producers on farms situated in a local producing area bordering on a county with a crop-insurance program."

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "tenth" and insert "eleventh".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. ABERNETHY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, the object of this bill is to provide more administrative flexibility in designating counties in which crop insurance shall be made available by the Crop Insurance Corporation.

Present provisions of the Crop Insurance Act provide that insurance with respect to any crop shall not be provided in any county unless written applications therefor are filed covering at least 200 farms or one-third of the farms normally producing the agricultural commodity.

While this arbitrary limitation was valuable during the earlier years of the crop-insurance program, it has now outlived its usefulness and has placed the program within rigid limitations which are proving most undesirable. The amendment made by this bill removes from the act the arbitrary limitation of 200 producers or one-third of the farms normally producing the commodity, and leaves to the discretion of the Crop Insurance Board the determination as to when there is sufficient demand for crop insurance in a county to warrant the program being established there.

There will be no additional cost as a result of this legislation; and its enactment might, in fact, result in some administrative savings since the corporation will not be placed in the position of conducting a preliminary insurance program only to find that its time and effort have been wasted because a few farmers less than the required 200 have signed up for the insurance.

This bill is identical to a bill—H.R. 13262—which was favorably reported by my committee in the 85th Congress and passed the House on August 23, 1958. Due to the lateness of the session, it was not acted upon in the Senate.

The legislation has the unqualified support of the Department of Agriculture and of the House Committee on Agriculture.

The bill is most desirable. Not only will it provide for economies in the administration of the program but it will at the same time have the effect of making crop insurance available to more farmers throughout the United States.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INCREASING PERIOD FOR COMMENCING HIGHWAY CONSTRUCTION

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4695) to amend section 108(a) of title 23 of the United States Code to increase the period in which actual construction shall commence on rights-of-way acquired in anticipation of such construction from 5 years to 7 years, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the second sentence of subsection (a) of section 108 of title 23 of the United States Code is amended by striking out "five years" and inserting in lieu thereof "seven years".

SEC. 2. Each agreement entered into before the date of enactment of this Act by the Secretary of Commerce and a State highway department under authority of section 110(a) of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956, or section 108(a) of title 23 of the United States Code shall be deemed to provide for actual construction of a road on such rights-of-way within a period of seven years following the fiscal year in which such request was made.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING THE ORGANIC ACT OF GUAM

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4603) to amend the Organic Act of Guam for the purpose of permitting the government of Guam, with the consent of the legislature thereof, to be sued.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the second sentence of section 3 of the Organic Act of Guam (64 Stat. 384, 48 U.S.C. 1421a) is amended to read as follows: "The government of Guam shall have the powers set forth in this Act, shall have power to sue by such name, and, with the consent of the legislature evidenced by enacted law, shall have the power to be sued."

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 3, strike out the words "shall have the power to" and insert in lieu thereof the word "may".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BOY SCOUTS WORLD JAMBOREE, PHILIPPINES, 1959

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 296) 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.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. PELLY. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to whether or not there are any private transportation companies who would be in a position to extend special rates comparable to those of the Military Air Transport Service for transporting these Boy Scouts?

Mr. KILDAY. I am not informed that there are such, but as the gentleman knows, this bill does require that the Government be reimbursed for the expense. I would not know what the rate charged by private companies might be.

Mr. PELLY. I think the gentleman from Texas will recognize that we are all very much interested in the Boy Scouts. We would certainly like to have the Military Air Transport Service at no expense to the Government transport these Scouts. However, I just wondered whether or not there are any private companies who would like to compete at the same cost.

Mr. KILDAY. There is no cost to the Government at all here. The Boy Scouts of America are undertaking this and giving bond that all of our property will be returned and that there will be no cost to the Government; but there is no reason why the Boy Scouts cannot make a contract with an individual carrier if there is one able to provide this transportation.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PELLY. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Is this limited to the Boy Scouts of America or may foreigners be transported?

Mr. KILDAY. This is for the Boy Scouts of America to participate in the international jamboree.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) the Secretary of Defense is hereby authorized, under such regulations as he may prescribe, to lend to the National Council, Boy Scouts of America, for the use and accommodation of the approximately five hundred Scouts, Scouters, and officials who are to attend the World Jamboree, Boy Scouts, to be held in the Philippines in July and August 1959, such tents, cots, blankets, commissary equipment, flags, refrigerators, and other equipment and services as may be necessary or useful to the extent that items are in stock and available and their issue will not jeopardize the national defense program.

(b) Such equipment is authorized to be delivered at such time prior to the holding of such jamboree, and to be returned at such time after the close of such jamboree, as may be agreed upon by the Secretary of Defense and the National Council, Boy Scouts of America. No expense shall be incurred by the United States Government for the delivery, return, rehabilitation, or replacement of such equipment.

(c) The Secretary of Defense, before delivering such property, shall take from the National Council, Boy Scouts of America, good and sufficient bond for the safe return of such property in good order and condition, and the whole without expense to the United States.

SEC. 2. (a) The Secretary of Defense is hereby authorized, under such regulations as he may prescribe, to provide, without expense to the United States Government, transportation from the United States or military commands overseas, and return, on vessels of the military sea transportation service or aircraft of the military air transportation service for (1) those Boy Scouts, Scouters and officials certified by the National Council, Boy Scouts of America, as representing the National Council, Boy Scouts of America, at the jamboree referred to in the first section of this Act, and (2) the equipment and property of such Boy Scouts, Scouters, and officials and the property loaned to the National Council, Boy Scouts of America, by the Secretary of Defense pursuant to this Act to the extent that such transportation will not interfere with the requirements of military operations.

(b) Before furnishing any transportation under this section, the Secretary of Defense shall take from the National Council, Boy Scouts of America, a good and sufficient bond for the reimbursement to the United States by the National Council, Boy Scouts of America, of the actual costs of transportation furnished under this section.

SEC. 3. Amounts paid to the United States to reimburse it for expenses incurred under the first section and for the actual costs of transportation furnished under section 2 shall be credited to the current applicable appropriations or funds to which such expenses and costs were charged and shall be available for the same purposes as such appropriations or funds.

SEC. 4. Under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of State, no fee shall be collected for the application for a passport by or the issuance of a passport to, any Boy Scout, Scouter, or official who is certified by the National Council, Boy Scouts of America, as representing the National Council, Boy Scouts of America, at the jamboree referred to in the first section of this Act.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 2, line 23, strike "or aircraft of the military air transportation service".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FIFTH NATIONAL JAMBOREE, BOY SCOUTS OF AMERICA

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 7) to authorize the Secretary of Defense to lend certain Army, Navy, and Air Force equipment and provide certain service to the Boy Scouts of America for use at the Fifth National Jamboree of the Boy Scouts of America, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of

America in Congress assembled, That (a) the Secretary of Defense is hereby authorized, under such regulations as he may prescribe, to lend to the Boy Scouts of America, a corporation created under the Act of June 15, 1916, for the use and accommodation of the approximately fifty thousand Scouts and officials who are to attend the Fifth National Jamboree of the Boy Scouts of America to be held as a part of the celebration of their fiftieth anniversary of service to the youth of the Nation during the period beginning in June 1960, and ending August 1960 at Colorado Springs, Colorado, such tents, cots, blankets, commissary equipment, flags, refrigerators, vehicles, and other equipment and services as may be necessary or useful to the extent that items are in stock and available and their issue will not jeopardize the national defense program.

(b) Such equipment is authorized to be delivered at such time prior to the holding of such jamboree, and to be returned at such time after the close of such jamboree, as may be agreed upon by the Secretary of Defense and the National Council, Boy Scouts of America. No expense shall be incurred by the United States Government for the delivery, return, rehabilitation, or replacement of such equipment.

(c) The Secretary of Defense, before delivering such property, shall take from the Boy Scouts of America a good and sufficient bond for the safe return of such property in good order and condition, and the whole without expense to the United States.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of Defense is hereby authorized, under such regulations as he may provide, to permit, without expense to the United States Government, the Boy Scouts of America to use such portions of the undeveloped lands of the United States Air Force Academy adjacent to such encampment as may be necessary, or useful, to the extent that their use will not interfere with the activities of such Academy, and will not jeopardize the national defense program.

SEC. 3. Be it further enacted that the various and several departments of the Federal Government are hereby authorized under such regulations as may be prescribed by their Secretaries to assist the Boy Scouts of America in the carrying out and the fulfillment of the plans for the celebration of their fiftieth anniversary and the Fifth National Jamboree.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 24, strike the last four words and on line 25 strike "lands" and insert "services and portions of the lands and buildings".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDMENT OF LONGSHOREMEN'S AND HARBOR WORKERS' COMPENSATION ACT

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 451) to amend the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act, with respect to the payment of compensation in cases where third persons are liable.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

TRAINING OF POSTMASTERS UNDER GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES TRAINING ACT

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4597) to provide for the training of postmasters under the Government Employees Training Act.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 4(a)(5) of the Government Employees Training Act (72 Stat. 329; 5 U.S.C. 2303(a)(5)) is amended by inserting "(other than a postmaster)" immediately following the word "Senate".

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADMINISTRATIVE AUTHORITIES FOR NATIONAL SECURITY AGENCY

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4599) to provide certain administrative authorities for the national agency, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 202 of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended (5 U.S.C. 1082), is amended by changing the period at the end thereof to a semicolon and adding the following new paragraph:

"(32) the National Security Agency."

SEC. 2. The Director of the National Security Agency is authorized to establish such positions and to appoint such officers and employees as may be necessary to carry out the functions of such Agency. The rates of basic compensation for such positions shall be fixed by the Director in relation to the rates of basic compensation contained in the General Schedule of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, for positions subject to such Act which have corresponding levels of duties and responsibilities. Except as provided in section 4 of this Act, no officer or employee of the National Security Agency shall be paid basic compensation at a rate in excess of the highest rate of basic compensation contained in such General Schedule. Not more than fifty such officers and employees shall be paid basic compensation at rates equal to rates of basic compensation contained in grades GS-16, GS-17, and GS-18 of such General Schedule.

SEC. 3. Section 1581(a) of title 10, United States Code, as modified by section 12(a) of the Federal Employees Salary Increase Act of 1958 (72 Stat. 213), is amended by striking out ", and not more than fifty civilian positions in the National Security Agency," and the words "and the National Security Agency, respectively,".

SEC. 4. The Director of the National Security Agency may establish not more than fifty civilian positions in such Agency involving research and development functions, which require the services of specially qualified scientific or professional personnel, and fix the rates of basic compensation for such positions at rates not in excess of the maximum rate of compensation authorized by section 1581(b) of title 10, United States Code, as amended by paragraph (34)(B) of the first section of the Act of September 2, 1958 (72 Stat. 1456; Public Law 85-861).

SEC. 5. Officers and employees of the National Security Agency who are citizens or nationals of the United States may be granted additional compensation, in accordance with regulations which shall be prescribed by the Secretary of Defense, not in excess of additional compensation authorized by section 207 of the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1949, as amended (5 U.S.C. 118h), for employees whose rates of basic compensation are fixed by statute.

SEC. 6. (a) Except as provided in subsection (b) of this section, nothing in this Act or any other law (including, but not limited to, the first section and section 2 of the Act of August 28, 1935 (5 U.S.C. 654)) shall be construed to require the disclosure of the organization or any function of the National Security Agency, of any information with respect to the activities thereof, or of the names, titles, salaries, or number of the persons employed by such Agency.

(b) The reporting requirements of section 1582 of title 10, United States Code, shall apply to positions, established in the National Security Agency in the manner provided by section 4 of this Act.

SEC. 7. The total number of positions authorized by section 505(b) of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended (5 U.S.C. 1105(b)), to be placed in grades 16, 17, and 18 of the General Schedule of such Act at any time shall be deemed to have been reduced by the number of positions in such grades allocated to the National Security Agency immediately prior to the effective date of this Act.

SEC. 8. The foregoing provisions of this Act shall take effect on the first day of the first pay period which begins later than the thirtieth day following the date of enactment of this Act.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, lines 8 to 11, inclusive, strike out "The Director of the National Security Agency is authorized to establish such positions and to appoint such officers and employees as may be necessary to carry out the functions of such Agency." and insert in lieu thereof "The Secretary of Defense (or his designee for the purpose) is authorized to establish such positions, and to appoint thereto such officers and employees, in the National Security Agency, as may be necessary to carry out the functions of such Agency.".

Page 2, line 1, strike out "by the Director" and insert in lieu thereof "by the Secretary of Defense (or his designee for the purpose)".

Page 2, lines 11 and 12, strike out "grades GS-16, GS-17, and GS-18" and insert in lieu thereof "grades 16, 17, and 18".

Page 2, lines 19 and 20, strike out "The Director of the National Security Agency may establish" and insert in lieu thereof "The Secretary of Defense (or his designee for the purpose) is authorized to establish in the National Security Agency".

Page 2, lines 20 and 21, strike out "in such agency".

Page 4, line 5, strike out "Act" and insert in lieu thereof "section".

The committee amendments were agreed to.

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

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to provide certain administrative authorities for the National Security Agency, and for other purposes."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDMENT OF BANKRUPTCY ACT—TRANSMISSION OF CERTAIN PAPERS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4345) to repeal clause (9) of subdivision a of section 39 of the Bankruptcy Act (11 U.S.C. 67a(9)), respecting the transmission of papers by the referee to the clerk of the court.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That clause (9) of subdivision a of section 39 of the Bankruptcy Act (11 U.S.C. 67a(9)), as amended, is hereby repealed and clause (10) of such subdivision is renumbered (9).

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SIMPLIFYING FILLING OF REFEREE VACANCIES

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4340) to amend sections 43 and 34 of the Bankruptcy Act (11 U.S.C 71, 62) to simplify the filling of referee vacancies.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That subdivision b of section 43 of the Bankruptcy Act (11 U.S.C. 71b) is hereby amended to read as follows:

"b. A vacancy in the office of referee may be filled on the existing basis upon the recommendations of the Director, the district judge or judges, and the circuit council that the office be so continued. If a change in the existing salary or arrangements is recommended by the Director, the district judge or judges, or the circuit council, a vacancy shall not be filled until the Conference has acted thereon."

SEC. 2. Subdivision a of section 34 of the Bankruptcy Act (11 U.S.C. 62a) is hereby amended to make the last sentence thereof read as follows: "Upon the expiration of his term, a referee in bankruptcy shall continue to perform the duties of his office until his successor is appointed and qualifies provided the filling of the vacancy has been authorized as provided in subdivision b of section 43 of this Act."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING BANKRUPTCY ACT—AUTOMATIC ADJUDICATION AND REFERENCE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4692) to amend sections 1, 18, 22, 331, and 631 of the Bankruptcy Act (11 U.S.C. 1, 41, 45, 731, 1031) to provide for automatic adjudication and reference in certain cases.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) paragraph (2) of section 1 of the Bankruptcy Act (11 U.S.C. 1) is amended to read as follows:

"(2) 'Adjudication' shall mean a determination, whether by decree or by operation of law, that a person is a bankrupt;".

(b) Paragraph (12) of such section is amended to read as follows:

"(12) 'Date of adjudication' shall mean the date of the filing of any petition which operates as an adjudication, or the date of entry of a decree of adjudication, or if such decree is appealed from, then the date when such decree is finally confirmed or the appeal is dismissed;".

SEC. 2. (a) Subdivision f of section 18 of the Bankruptcy Act (11 U.S.C. 41), as amended, is hereby repealed.

(b) Subdivision g of such section is hereby relettered subdivision f and amended to read as follows:

"f. The filing of a voluntary petition under chapters I to VII of this Act, other than a petition filed in behalf of a partnership by less than all of the partners, shall operate as an adjudication with the same force and effect as a decree of adjudication."

SEC. 3. Subdivision a of section 22 of the Bankruptcy Act (11 U.S.C. 45a) is hereby amended to read as follows:

"a. Unless the judge or judges direct otherwise, the clerk shall refer to a referee all cases filed under chapters I to VII, chapter XI, and chapter XIII of this Act."

SEC. 4. Section 331 of the Bankruptcy Act (11 U.S.C. 731) is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 331. The clerk shall, unless the judge or judges direct otherwise, refer the proceeding to a referee."

SEC. 5. Section 631 of the Bankruptcy Act (11 U.S.C. 1031) is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 631. The clerk shall, unless the judge or judges direct otherwise, refer the proceeding to a referee."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDMENT OF BANKRUPTCY ACT—REFEREES' SALARY AND EXPENSE FUNDS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4693) to amend the Bankruptcy Act so as to consolidate the referees' salary and expense funds.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) the title of section 40 of the Bankruptcy Act (11 U.S.C. 68) is amended to read as follows:

"§ 40. Compensation of Referees; Referees' Salary and Expense Fund; Retirement of Referees".

(b) Subdivision c.(1) of such section is amended to read as follows:

"c.(1) Except as otherwise provided in this Act, there shall be deposited with the clerk, at the time the petition is filed in each case, and at the time an ancillary proceeding is instituted, $32 for each estate for the referees' salary and expense fund, as herein below established: *Provided, however,* That in cases of voluntary bankruptcy such fee, as well as the filing fees of the clerk and trustee, may be paid in installments, if so authorized by general order of the Supreme Court of the United States."

(c) Subdivision c.(2) of such section is amended to read as follows:

"(2) Additional fees for the referees' salary and expense fund shall be charged, in accordance with the schedule fixed by the conference (a) against each estate wholly or partially liquidated in a bankruptcy proceeding, and be computed upon the net proceeds realized; (b) against each case in an arrangement confirmed under chapter XI of this Act, and be computed upon the amount to be paid to the unsecured creditors upon confirmation of the arrangement and thereafter, pursuant to the terms of the arrangement, and where under the arrangement any part of the consideration to be distributed is other than money, upon the amount of the fair value of such consideration; and (c) against each case in a wage earner plan confirmed under chapter XIII of this Act, and be computed upon the payments actually made by or for a debtor under the plan. Such schedule of fees may be revised by the Director, with the approval of the conference, not more than once during each calendar year, so that the total amount of fees, allowances, and charges collected and to be collected from all sources for the referees' salary and expense fund will, as near as may be equal the total amount of salaries paid and to be paid to referees in active service, and the total amount of their expenses: *Provided, however,* That such schedule of fees shall not be so revised for any year that the total collections estimated by the Director for such year shall exceed by more than 10 per centum the total collections in the preceding year. The Director, with the approval of the conference, may make, and from time to time amend, rules and regulations prescribing methods for determining net proceeds realized in asset cases, fair values of considerations, other than money, distributable in arrangement cases, and payments actually made by or for a debtor under the plan in wage earner cases; prescribing the procedure for collection by the clerk of fees and allowances for the referees' salary and expense fund; and providing for the effective administration of the provisions of this paragraph (2)."

(d) Subdivision c.(4) of such section is amended to read as follows:

"(4) A referee's salary and expense fund shall be established in the Treasury of the United States, and the amounts of the various fees and allowances collected by the clerks for the services of referees, and for their expenses, including the fees, allowances, and charges for their services and expenses as conciliation commissioners and as special masters under this Act, shall be covered into the Treasury of the United States for the account of such salary and expense fund. The salaries of the referees in active service and the expenses of the referees, including the salaries of their clerical assistants, shall be paid out of annual appropriations from such salary and expense fund by the United States. Any deficiencies of such salary and expense fund shall be paid out of any funds in the Treasury of the United States not otherwise appropriated, and appropriations to pay such deficiencies are hereby authorized: *Provided, however,* That there shall be covered into miscellaneous receipts of the Treasury of the United States in any subsequent year so much of the surplus, if any, arising in the salary and expense fund as may be necessary to reimburse the Treasury of the United States for payments made on account of such fund in any prior year."

(e) Subdivision c.(5) of such section is amended to read as follows:

"(5) As of the day preceding the date when the referees, as provided by paragraph (2) of subdivision b of section 37 of this Act, are to take office, an allocation shall be made by the judge or judges of the several courts of bankruptcy of all filing and other fees, commissions, and allowances, and of all expense funds, due the then existing referee for services rendered and expenses incurred in the cases pending before them, whether as referee, conciliation commissioner, or special

master under this Act. The balances of such filing and other fees, commissions, and allowances and the expense surpluses shall be covered into the Treasury of the United States by the referees and the clerks, to be deposited to the credit of the salary and expense fund. All cases pending before outgoing referees shall be referred, and no additional filing fees shall be required, but additional salary and expense charges may be assessed in such cases in such amounts as the judge or judges of the several courts of bankruptcy may deem equitable, taking into consideration the schedules of additional fees fixed by the Director and the payments previously made therein."

SEC. 2. (a) Clause (2) of section 51 of the Bankruptcy Act (11 U.S.C. 79) is amended to read as follows:

"(2) collect the fees of the clerk and trustee and the fees for the referees' salary and expense fund provided in paragraph (1) of subdivision c of section 40 of this Act in each case instituted before filing the petition, except where installment payments may be authorized pursuant to section 40 of this Act, and collect the various other fees, allowances, and charges for the services of referees and for their expenses, including their services and expenses as conciliation commissioners and as special masters under this Act;".

(b) Clause (5) of section 51 of such section is amended to read as follows:

"(5) transmit to the Treasury of the United States all fees, allowances, and charges collected for the referees' salary and expense fund, and transmit to the trustee, within ten days after a case had been closed the fee collected for him at the time of the filing of the petition."

SEC. 3. Clause (1) of subdivision a of section 64 of the Bankruptcy Act (11 U.S.C. 104) is amended to repeal the words "the fees for the referees' salary fund and for the referees' expense fund;" from the phrase following the first semicolon and to enact in their place the words "the fees for the referees' salary and expense fund;".

SEC. 4. That the second paragraph of section 72 of the Bankruptcy Act (11 U.S.C. 112) is amended to read as follows:

"No referee shall receive any compensation for his services under this Act other than his salary; and allowances made to a referee for compensation or expense while acting as a conciliation commissioner under section 75, or as a referee or special master under any chapter or section of this Act, shall be paid to the clerk, and by him transmitted to the Treasury of the United States for deposit in the referees' salary and expense fund."

SEC. 5. That paragraph (2) of section 624 of the Bankruptcy Act (11 U.S.C. 1024(2)) is amended to read as follows:

"(2) where a petition is filed under section 622 of this Act, by payment to the clerk of $15 to be distributed, $10 to the Treasury of the United States for deposit in the referees' salary and expense fund and $5 to the clerk, in lieu of the fees of $32 and $8 as prescribed in sections 40 and 52 of this Act: *Provided, however,* That such fees may be paid in installments, if so authorized by general order of the Supreme Court of the United States."

SEC. 6. That paragraph (2) of section 633 of the Bankruptcy Act (11 U.S.C. 1033 (2)) is amended to read as follows:

"(2) the debtor shall submit his plan, and deposit with the clerk, for payment into the referees' salary and expense fund a fee not to exceed $15, to be graduated and charged in the manner outlined in paragraph (2) of subdivision c of section 40 of this Act: *Provided, however,* That such fee may be paid in installments, if so authorized by General Order of the Supreme Court of the United States;".

SEC. 7. That paragraph (3) of section 659 of the Bankruptcy Act (11 U.S.C. 1059(3)) is amended to read as follows:

"(3) an additional fee for the referees' salary and expense fund, to be graduated and charged in the manner outlined in paragraph (2) of subdivision c of section 40 of this Act, and to be computed upon the amount of the payments actually made by or for a debtor under the plan; and commissions to the trustee of 5 per centum to be computed upon and payable out of the payments actually made by or for a debtor under the plan;"

SEC. 8. This amendatory Act shall take effect on the first day of the first fiscal year following the date of its approval.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5, strike out the word "Referrees' " and substitute in lieu thereof "Referees' ".

Page 1, line 6, strike out the word "Rund" and substitute in lieu thereof "Fund."

Page 2, line 5, strike out "general order" and substitute in lieu thereof "General Order".

Page 2, line 7, insert a period after "c" where it occurs after the word "Subdivision".

Page 2, line 25, insert a comma after the word "conference".

Page 3, line 20, insert a period after "c" where it occurs after the word "Subdivision".

Page 3, line 22, strike out "referee's" and insert in lieu thereof "referees' ".

Page 4, line 1, strike out the comma following the word "allowances".

Page 4, line 19, insert a period after "c" where it occurs after the word "Subdivision".

Page 5, line 2, strike out "referee" and insert in lieu thereof the word "referees".

Page 5, line 24, strike out the comma following the word "allowances".

Page 6, line 6, strike out the comma following the word "allowances".

Page 7, line 14, strike out "general order" and insert in lieu thereof "General Order".

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FLORIDA QUADRICENTENNIAL ANNIVERSARY

The Clerk called the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 103) to commemorate the quadricentennial anniversary of Florida and to recognize the quadricentennial commission of that State.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

Whereas the State of Florida proposes to celebrate the four hundredth anniversary of the permanent colonization of La Florida, the lands of which now, constitute an important part of the continental United States; and

Whereas said period of colonization commenced on August 14, 1559, with the establishment of a colony at Pensacola, Florida, by Don Tristan De Luna, pursuant to the direct orders of the Spanish King, but such colony was later abandoned; and

Whereas thereafter a French settlement was made in 1564 on the Saint Johns River near Jacksonville, Florida, at which point Fort Caroline was constructed and was occupied until it was conquered and resettled by a Spanish force under Menendez; and

Whereas the above period of colonization came to a close in September 1565 with the establishment at Saint Augustine, Florida, of the oldest permanent and continuous settlement in the continental United States; and

Whereas other events occurring at approximately the same time were events of national and international significance, and were matters of great historical importance in the colonizing of the United States which should be commemorated; and

Whereas a celebration of the character planned by the State of Florida will contribute greatly to the educational and cultural welfare of the people of the United States and will preserve the traditions of such period to posterity: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress of the United States join the people of Florida in commemorating the quadricentennial anniversary of the first permanent colonization by Europeans of any area now constituting a part of the continental United States, which will commence in the year of 1959 at Pensacola, Florida, and end in the year of 1965 at Saint Augustine, Florida, with celebrations being held in the intervening years at Jacksonville, Florida, and other cities of the State.

SEC. 2. That the Congress of the United States recognizes the establishment by the State of Florida of the Quadricentennial Anniversary Commission of Florida which has been charged with the responsibility and duty of planning the anniversary celebrations above described in coordination with any organizations now or hereafter designated by the State of Florida and any foreign nations participating in such celebrations.

SEC. 3. A copy of this resolution, suitably engrossed and duly authenticated, shall be transmitted to the Governor of the State of Florida and the Quadricentennial Commission of Florida.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDMENT OF TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 470) to amend title 10, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Defense and the Secretaries of the Military departments to settle certain claims for damage to, or loss of, property or personal injury or death, not cognizable under any other law.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That title 10, United State Code, is amended as follows:

(1) Chapter 163 is amended—

(A) by adding the following new section at the end thereof:

"§ 2736. Property loss; personal injury or death; incident to use or operation of property of the United States and not cognizable under other law.

"(a) Under such regulations as the Secretary of a military department may prescribe, he or his designee may settle, and pay in an amount not more than $1,000, a claim against the United States, not cognizable under any other provision of law, for—

"(1) damage to, or loss of, property; or

"(2) personal injury or death;

caused by a civilian officer or employee of the office of the Secretary of Defense, a civilian officer or employee of a military department, or a member of the Army, Navy, Air Force, or Marine Corps, as the case may be, incident to the use and operation of Government vehicles, or incident to the use of other property of the United States on a Government installation.

"(b) A claim may not be allowed under subsection (a) if the damage to, or loss of, property, or the personal injury or death, was caused wholly or partly by a negligent or wrongful act of the claimant, his agent, or his employee.

"(c) A claim for personal injury or death under this section may not be allowed for more than the cost of reasonable medical, hospital, and burial expenses actually incurred, and not otherwise furnished or paid by the United States.

"(d) No claim may be allowed under this section unless it is presented in writing within two years after it accrues.

"(e) A claim may not be paid under subsection (a) unless the amount tendered is accepted by the claimant in full satisfaction.

"(f) Any payment made under this section shall be reduced by any amount received by the claimant in the form of insurance payments or compensation based on the same damage, loss, personal injury, or death. A payment made under authority of this section is not subject to any claim for reimbursement by any insurance company or compensation insurance fund; and such a payment does not absolve any insurer, in whole or in part, of any obligation under any contract of insurance."; and

(B) by adding the following item at the end of the analysis:

"§ 2376. Property loss; personal injury or death; incident to use and operation of government property and not cognizable under other law."

(2) Chapter 653 is amended—

(A) by repealing section 7625; and

(B) by striking out the following item in the analysis:

"Claims against the United States; private property; loss or damage."

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

"That title 10, United States Code, is amended as follows:

"(1) Chapter 163 is amended—

"(A) by adding the following new section at the end thereof:

"'§ 2736. Property loss; personal injury or death: incident to use of property of the United States and not cognizable under other law

"'(a) Under such regulations as the Secretary of a military department with the approval of the Secretary of Defense may prescribe, he or his designee may settle and pay, in an amount not more than $1,000, a claim against the United States, not cognizable under any other provision of law, for—

"'(1) damage to, or loss of, property; or

"'(2) personal injury or death; caused by a civilian official or employee of that department or a member of the Army, Navy, Air Force, or Marine Corps, as the case may be, incident to the use of a vehicle of the United States at any place, or any other property of the United States on a Government installation.

"'(b) Under such regulations as the Secretary of Defense may prescribe, he or his designee has the same authority as the Secretary of a military department with respect to a claim, not cognizable under any other provision of law, for—

"'(1) damage to, or loss of, property; or

"'(2) personal injury or death; caused by a civilian official or employee of the Department of Defense not covered by subsection (a), incident to the use of a vehicle of the United States at any place, or any other property of the United States on a Government installation.

"'(c) Under such regulations as the Secretary of the Treasury may prescribe, he or his designee may settle and pay, in an amount not more than $1,000, a claim against the United States, not cognizable under any other provision of law, for—

"'(1) damage to, or loss of, property; or

"'(2) personal injury or death; caused by a member of, or a civilian official or employee of the United States Coast Guard, incident to the use of a vehicle of the United States at any place, or any other property of the United States on a Government installation.

"'(d) A claim may not be allowed under subsection (a), (b), or (c) if the damage to, or loss of, property, or the personal injury or death, was caused wholly or partly by a negligent or wrongful act of the claimant, his agent, or his employee.

"'(e) A claim for personal injury or death under this section may not be allowed for more than the cost of reasonable medical, hospital, and burial expenses actually incurred, and not otherwise furnished or paid by the United States.

"'(f) No claim may be allowed under this section unless it is presented in writing within two years after it accrues.

"'(g) A claim may not be paid under subsection (a), (b), or (c) unless the amount tendered is accepted by the claimant in full satisfaction.

"'(h) No claim or any part thereof, the amount of which is legally recoverable by the claimant under an indemnifying law or indemnity contract, may be paid under this section. No subrogated claim may be paid under this section.

"'(i) So far as practicable, regulations prescribed under this section shall be uniform for the military departments.'

"(B) by adding the following item at the end of the analysis:

"'2736. Property loss; personal injury or death incident to use of property of the United States and not cognizable under other law.'

"(2) Chapter 653 is amended—

"(A) by repealing section 7625; and

"(B) by striking out the following item in the analysis:

"'7625. Claims against the United States: private property; loss or damage.'"

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Defense, the Secretaries of the military departments, and the Secretary of the Treasury to settle certain claims for damage to, or loss of, property, or personal injury or death, not cognizable under any other law."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SPECIAL POSTAGE RATES FOR EDUCATIONAL, CULTURAL, AND LIBRARY MATERIALS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4595) to clarify and make uniform certain provisions of law relating to special postage rates for educational, cultural, and library materials, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) section 204(d) of the Postal Rate Revision and Federal Employees Salary Act of 1948, as amended (72 Stat. 140; 39 U.S.C. 292a(d)), is amended—

(1) by inserting "except that the rates now or hereafter prescribed for third- or fourth-class matter shall apply in every case where such rate is lower than the rate prescribed in this subsection," immediately following "for each additional pound or fraction thereof,";

(2) by striking out in clause (1) thereof "for students' notations" and inserting in lieu thereof "for notations"; and

(3) by striking out in clause (5) thereof "phonograph recordings" and inserting in lieu thereof "sound recordings".

(b) Section 204(e)(1) of such Act, as amended (72 Stat. 140, 141; 39 U.S.C. 292a-(e)(1)), is amended—

(1) by striking out in clause (i) thereof "for students' notations" and inserting in lieu thereof "for notations"; and

(2) by striking out in clause (iv) thereof "phonograph recordings" and inserting in lieu thereof "sound recordings".

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, strike out lines 7 to 14, inclusive, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(b) Section 204(e)(1) of such Act, as amended (72 Stat. 140, 141; 39 U.S.C. 292a (e)(1)), is amended by striking out '(i) books consisting wholly of reading matter or scholarly bibliography or reading matter with incidental blank spaces for students' notations and containing no advertising matter other than incidental announcements of books; (ii) printed music, whether in bound form or in sheet form; (iii) bound volumes of academic theses in typewritten or other duplicated form and bound volumes of periodicals; (iv) phonograph recordings; and (v) other library materials in printed, duplicated, or photographic form or in the form of unpublished manuscripts.' and inserting in lieu thereof the following: '(i) books consisting wholly of reading matter or scholarly bibliography or reading matter with incidental blank spaces for notations and containing no advertising matter other than incidental announcements of books; (ii) printed music, whether in bound form or in sheet form; (iii) bound volumes of academic theses in typewritten or other duplicated form; (iv) periodicals, whether bound or unbound; (v) sound recordings; and (vi) other library materials in printed, duplicated, or photographic form or in the form of unpublished manuscripts.'.

"(c) Section 204(e)(2) of such Act, as amended (72 Stat. 141; 39 U.S.C. 292a(e)(2)), is amended by striking out 'and catalogs of such materials' and inserting in lieu thereof 'catalogs of such materials, and guides or scripts prepared solely for use with such materials'."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DECLARING CERTAIN PROPERTY IN THE STATE OF NEW MEXICO TO BE HELD IN TRUST FOR THE PUEBLO OF SANTO DOMINGO

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2493) directing the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain property in the State

of New Mexico to the pueblo of Santo Domingo.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to convey by quitclaim deed, without consideration, to the pueblo of Santo Domingo, Pena Blanca, New Mexico, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the following described tract of land, together with all buildings and other improvements thereon, situated in the pueblo of Santo Domingo, New Mexico: Commencing at a point 342 feet from the southeast corner of the church in the Santo Domingo Pueblo, on a line running north 52 degrees 45 minutes west, thence running 443 feet south 63 degrees east, thence north 400 feet 47 degrees 49 minutes east, thence north 470 feet 52 degrees 45 minutes west, thence south 474 feet 42 degrees west to the point of beginning, containing 4.45 acres, more or less.

SEC. 2. The conveyance authorized by this Act shall be subject to the condition that the Public Health Service, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, be authorized to continue to utilize that portion of the aforementioned described tract of land, together with any building thereon, which it now occupies and uses for providing health services for so long as the Public Health Service continues to use such land and building for providing such services.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That all of the right, title, and interest of the United States in the land described below, together with the buildings, and improvements thereon, are hereby declared to be held in trust for the Pueblo of Santo Domingo, New Mexico, subject to the right of the United States to occupy and use for so long as they are needed for providing health services a parcel of approximately .10 acre of land and the buildings and improvements thereon that are now occupied and used by the Public Health Service, and the Public Health Service, upon termination of its use of such .10 acre parcel, may remove the temporary building occupied by it without obligation to restore the site to its former condition: Commencing at a point 342 feet from the southeast corner of the church in the Santo Domingo Pueblo, on a line running north 52 degrees 45 minutes west, thence running 443 feet south 63 degrees east, thence north 400 feet 47 degrees 49 minutes east, thence north 470 feet 52 degrees 45 minutes west, thence south 474 feet 42 degrees west to the point of beginning, containing 4.45 acres, more or less."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill declaring certain property in the State of New Mexico to be held in trust for the pueblo of Santo Domingo."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TO AUTHORIZE PARTICIPATION BY THE UNITED STATES IN PARLIAMENTARY CONFERENCES WITH CANADA

The Clerk called the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 254) to authorize participation by the United States in parliamentary conferences with Canada.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

PRIVATE CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is the day set for the call of the Private Calendar. The Clerk will call the first individual bill on the Private Calendar.

MRS. ELBA HAVERSTICK CASH

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1434) for the relief of Mrs. Elba Haverstick Cash.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

GEORG GAHN AND MARGARETE GAHN

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1546) for the relief of Georg Gahn and Margarete Gahn.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Alien Property Custodian be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay to Georg Gahn $6,537.07 and to Margarete Gahn $6,537.08. Such amounts represent the distributive share of Georg Gahn and Margarete Gahn under the will of their deceased sister, Lena Steeger, who died in Massachusetts on August 9, 1944: *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.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THOMAS A. HOWE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1601) for the relief of Thomas A. Howe.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

MR. AND MRS. MOSES GLIKOWSKY

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1766) for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Moses Glikowsky.

Mr. ASHMORE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be recommitted to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

The bill was ordered recommitted to the Committee on the Judiciary.

JOSEPH E. MILLER

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2954) for the relief of Joseph E. Miller.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, 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 is hereby authorized and directed to credit the account of Joseph E. Miller, Lockport, New York, in the sum of $630. Such sum represents an overpayment of an allotment in favor of his father, Joseph A. Miller, 128 Erie Street, Lockport, New York, for the period September 1944 through February 1946.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. CLARE M. ASH

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3240) for the relief of Mrs. Clare M. Ash.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for purposes of section 202(3) of the Social Security Act, Mrs. Clare M. Ash, of Racine, Wisconsin, shall be held and considered to be the widow (as defined in section 216(c) of such Act) of Frank S. Ash (social security account number [redacted]).

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PAUL NELSON

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3798) for the relief of Paul Nelson.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. AVERY and Mr. CONTE objected, and under the rule the bill was recommitted to the Committee on the Judiciary.

DR. GORDON D. HOOPLE ET AL.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3825) for the relief of Dr. Gordon D. Hoople, Dr. David W. Brewer, and the estate of the late Dr. Irl H. Blaisdell.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

JOSEPH B. KANE, JR.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1631) for the relief of Joseph B. Kane, Jr.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, 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 is hereby authorized and directed to reimburse Joseph B. Kane, Junior, of Detroit, Michigan, in the sum of $124.22. Such sum represents leave ration and accrued leave while serving in the United States Army during the years 1952 and 1953.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 3, strike out all of lines 3, 4, 5, 6, and 7, and insert: "That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $124.22 to Joseph B. Kane, Junior, of Detroit, Michigan, in full settlement of his claims against the United States for the amounts he repaid representing overpayments for leave ration and accrued leave in connection with his Army service during the years 1952 and 1953: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act 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."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOSE SANTIAGO SAVEDRA CALZA

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3817) for the relief of Jose Santiago Savedra Calza.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

JACOB NAGGAR

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4549) for the relief of Jacob Naggar.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, 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, Jacob Naggar 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.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

M. E. BOALES

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 5362) for the relief of M. E. Boales.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, 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 M. E. Boales, of Daytona Beach, Florida, the sum of $5,000. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims against the United States of M. E. Boales arising out of damage to his real property on and near the Halifax River in the State of Florida which was caused by dredging operations being carried out by the Secretary of the Army during the year 1952: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act 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.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PARK NATIONAL BANK

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 5733) for the relief of Park National Bank.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, 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 the Park National Bank, Knoxville, Tenn., the sum of $194. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of such bank against the United States arising out of the refusal of the Secretary of the Treasury to make payment in the original amount of $194 on a United States Treasury check drawn in favor of Joseph Orton Smith, private, United States Army, dated September 30, 1955, which, before being cashed by such bank was fraudulently raised to the amount of $494: *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.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 4, after the word "Act" strike out "in excess of 10 per centum thereof".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GERALD M. COOLEY

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1758) for the relief of Gerald M. Cooley.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, 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 Gerald M. Cooley, San Carlos, California, the sum of $679.93. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of Gerald M. Cooley against the United States for back wages due him from the Cooley-Cain Aircraft Corporation under the provisions of the Act of June 30, 1936, commonly referred to as the Walsh-Healey Act: *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.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 1, after the word "Act" strike out "in excess of 10 per centum thereof".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NORTH COUNTIES HYDROELECTRIC CO.

The Clerk called the resolution (H. Res. 189) for the relief of North Counties Hydroelectric Co.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

CERTAIN CLAIMANTS AGAINST THE UNITED STATES

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2594) for the relief of certain claimants against the United States who suffered personal injuries, property damage, or other loss as a result of the explosion of a munitions truck between Smithfield and Selma, N.C., on March 7, 1942.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, 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 the claimants hereinafter named, the sums hereinafter specified, representing the amounts reported by the United States Court of Claims to the Congress in response to H. Res. 319, Eighty-second Congress (congressional numbered 17876, decided January 15, 1958), plus, as a part of just compensation, interest at the rate of six per centum per annum from March 7, 1942, in full satisfaction of their respective claims against the United States for compensation for property losses or

damages sustained by them as the result of an explosion which occurred when a truck in which munitions were being transported for use by the United States Army collided with a privately owned passenger automobile at the intersection of United States Highways Numbered 301 and 70, between Selma, North Carolina and Smithfield, North Carolina, on March 7, 1942.

(1) Herman Benson, Selma, North Carolina, $150.30;

(2) Estate of Lloyd Guirkin (Gurkin), deceased, Selma, North Carolina, $17,500;

(3) Mr. and Mrs. J. P. Temple, Selma, North Carolina, $1,280.06;

(4) C. Talton, Selma, North Carolina, $200.32;

(5) Mrs. Mollie Creech, Selma, North Carolina, $342.80;

(6) Dora O'Neal, Selma, North Carolina, $11.37;

(7) Mrs. Frances Ebbs Hobbs and Mrs. E. G. Hobbs, Selma, North Carolina, $231.25;

(8) W. O. Fields, Selma, North Carolina, $20;

(9) C. P. Harper, Selma, North Carolina, $135.25;

(10) Mrs. Mary S. Blake, Selma, North Carolina, $159.33;

(11) Henry B. Hughes, Selma, North Carolina, $218.92;

(12) C. B. Fulghum, Selma, North Carolina, $66;

(13) Mary Boylan, Selma, North Carolina, $116.43;

(14) Mrs. Evelyn Morgan, Selma, North Carolina, $117.35;

(15) Trustees of Wake Forest College, Wake Forest, North Carolina, $140.02;

(16) T. R. Fulghum, Selma, North Carolina, $38.34;

(17) Jim Smith, Selma, North Carolina, $65.34;

(18) Mrs. Lena Proctor, Selma, North Carolina, $60.30;

(19) Selma Drug Company, Selma, North Carolina, $317.60;

(20) Paul W. McMillan, Selma, North Carolina, $35;

(21) Joseph A. Gurley, Selma, North Carolina, $22.91;

(22) Mrs. John A. Cox, and Harold Fulghum, Selma, North Carolina, $81.05;

(23) Edwin P. Raines, Selma, North Carolina, $50;

(24) Eliza C. Mials, Selma, North Carolina, $68.20;

(25) E. D. Parker, Selma, North Carolina, $89.86;

(26) ———.

(27) ———.

(28) J. T. Coates, Junior, Smithfield, North Carolina, $125.08;

(29) ———.

(30) W. L. Hunt, Rocky Mount, North Carolina, $296.46;

(31) G. N. Siler, Selma, North Carolina, $30.13;

(32) Saint Johns African Methodist Episcopal Church, Selma, North Carolina, $81.05;

(33) Mrs. Ida O. Styron, Pine Level, North Carolina, $18.98;

(34) Vernon Ricks, Selma, North Carolina, $61.20;

(35) Mrs. Lula Eason, Selma, North Carolina, $29;

(36) C. E. Denning, Selma, North Carolina, $45;

(37) Wachovia Bank and Trust Company, executor of estate of G. F. Brietz, Raleigh, North Carolina, $85.61;

(38) H. B. Pearce, Selma, North Carolina, $431.11;

(39) Town of Selma, Selma, North Carolina, $688.20;

(40) W. G. Ward, Greenville, North Carolina, $193.15;

(41) Floyd C. Price and Son, Selma, North Carolina, $177;

(42) W. A. Herring, Pine Level, North Carolina, $115;

(43) Saint Gabriels Protestant Episcopal Church, Selma, North Carolina, $24;

(44) H. E. Earp, Selma, North Carolina, $12.20;

(45) Willie Durden, Selma, North Carolina, $29.04;

(46) Closie J. Hinton, Smithfield, North Carolina, $15;

(47) J. C. Avery, agent for Ransom Richardson Estate, Selma, North Carolina, $60.67;

(48) Staff Sergeant Charles B. Register, Junior, Headquarters Battery One Hundred and Thirteenth Field Artillery Battalion, Fort Jackson, South Carolina, $8.50;

(49) J. H. Griffin, Selma, North Carolina, $34.42;

(50) Anne S. Noble, Selma, North Carolina, $24.90;

(51) Laura J. A. King, Selma, North Carolina, $71.96;

(52) Rosa B. Lassiter, Selma, North Carolina, $20.50;

(53) Anna Gilmore, 428 I Street Northwest, Washington, District of Columbia, $38.05;

(54) J. W. Blackman, guardian, Selma, North Carolina, $43.35;

(55) Hugh B. Anderson, Washington, North Carolina, $279.40;

(56) D. R. Lee, Dunn, North Carolina, $173.64;

(57) Mrs. Ellen F. Patrick, Selma, North Carolina, $50;

(58) Mrs. W. B. Driver, Selma, North Carolina, $28.10;

(59) ———.

(60) W. H. Stanley, administrator of estate of Mrs. R. L. Holloman, Smithfield, North Carolina, $1,274.50;

(61) Estate of C. M. Stallings, deceased, Smithfield, North Carolina, $1,000;

(62) Luther Capps, Pine Level, North Carolina, $1,255.12;

(63) Robert Lee Holloman, Junior, Smithfield, North Carolina, $331.04;

(64) Hazel Stewart, Smithfield, North Carolina, $246;

(65) Estelle Hill, Smithfield, North Carolina, $125;

(66) Estate of Ralph R. Talton, deceased, Smithfield, North Carolina, $25,446.35;

(67) T. C. Jordan, Smithfield, North Carolina, $101;

(68) J. A. Mitchiner, Edenton, North Carolina, $214.98;

(69) Roberta Bunn, Selma, North Carolina, $34.46;

(70) Mrs. Zelma Driver, Selma, North Carolina, $65.32;

(71) White Dairy Products, Raleigh, North Carolina, $150;

(72) T. M. Benoy, Selma, North Carolina, $39.63;

(73) Otis L. Duncan, Smithfield, North Carolina, $94.97;

(74) Elevia Ricks, Selma, North Carolina, $10.25;

(75) Albert M. Noble, Smithfield, North Carolina, $16.94;

(76) ———.

(77) Carolina Power and Light Company, Raleigh, North Carolina, $578.52;

(78) C. E. Kornegay, Selma, North Carolina, $220.10;

(79) Doctor W. B. Johnson, Selma, North Carolina, $62.69;

(80) Margaret Etheredge, Selma, North Carolina, $61.30;

(81) Fannie Richardson, Faison, North Carolina, $24.26;

(82) Mrs. Alma Lee Critcher, Selma, North Carolina, $13.71;

(83) African Methodist Episcopal Zion Church, Selma, North Carolina, $69.63;

(84) G. W. and Maggie J. Bryant, Princeton, North Carolina, $57.93;

(85) Clara Lockhart, Selma, North Carolina, $53.96;

(86) R. W. Etheredge, Spring Hill, North Carolina, $72.72;

(87) W. H. Field, Selma, North Carolina, $37.35;

(88) Louis Abdalla, Selma, North Carolina, $557.15;

(89) Susan Smith, Selma, North Carolina, $23.44;

(90) H. L. White, Selma, North Carolina, $161.10;

(91) Johnston County Superintendent of Public Instruction, for damage to Selma Public School for white race, Smithfield, North Carolina, $245.48;

(92) H. H. Olive, Route 2, Smithfield, North Carolina, $49.72;

(93) Johnston County Superintendent of Public Instruction, Smithfield, North Carolina, for damage to Selma Public School for Negro race, $552.57;

(94) Stanford Creech, Selma, North Carolina, $169.13;

(95) A. J. Powell, Selma, North Carolina, $40.75;

(96) Alvin A. Brown, Selma, North Carolina, $499.73;

(97) Person and Vick, Selma, North Carolina, $45.15;

(98) J. B. Person, Selma, North Carolina, $493.40;

(99) Mrs. Edith L. Raines, Selma, North Carolina, $102.65;

(100) A. H. Bone, Selma, North Carolina, $1,091.10;

(101) Sophia Hinton, Selma, North Carolina, $100.74;

(102) W. G. Best, Selma, North Carolina, $58.70;

(103) Mrs. J. W. Barham, Selma, North Carolina, $118.55;

(104) Selma Baptist Church, Selma, North Carolina, $600;

(105) P. H. Starling, Selma, North Carolina, $88.40;

(106) E. N. Booker, Selma, North Carolina, $102.18;

(107) Selma Clothing and Shoe Company, Selma, North Carolina, $69.17;

(108) W. B. Edwards, Selma, North Carolina, $146.81;

(109) Cullen Creech, Selma, North Carolina, $51.45;

(110) Leonard Creech, Selma, North Carolina, $81.38;

(111) Mrs. Piety E. Creech, Selma, North Carolina, $100.05;

(112) Southern Cotton Oil Company, Selma, North Carolina, $189.84;

(113) W. G. Ricks, Selma, North Carolina, $603.20;

(114) H. A. Whitler, Selma, North Carolina, $166.65;

(115) R. E. Suber, Selma, North Carolina, $109.16;

(116) Mrs. W. P. Sellers, Selma, North Carolina, $3,244.52;

(117) Miss Blanche Mitchener, Selma, North Carolina, $56.87;

(118) Mrs. H. H. Pilkinton, Selma, North Carolina, $103.68;

(119) Mrs. N. G. Blackman, Selma, North Carolina, $158;

(120) J. F. Brown, Selma, North Carolina, $277.77;

(121) W. H. Watson, Selma, North Carolina, $15;

(122) Estate of L. George, deceased, Selma, North Carolina, $91.94;

(123) Vick Brothers, Selma, North Carolina, $97.29;

(124) Frances Green, Selma, North Carolina, $53.73;

(125) C. C. Hathaway, Selma, North Carolina, $6.85;

(126) Mrs. Maggie A. Wall, Selma, North Carolina, $54.01;

(127) Mrs. Dora M. Mozingo, Selma, North Carolina, $42.50;

(128) W. G. Godwin, Selma, North Carolina, $224.37;

(129) First Baptist Church (colored), Selma, North Carolina, $1,197.65;

(130) J. T. Hughes, Selma, North Carolina, $164.75;

(131) Ideal Oil Company, Smithfield, North Carolina, $28.15;

(132) Andrew Worrells, Selma, North Carolina, $262.27;

(133) A. W. Mitchiner, Selma, North Carolina, $60;

(134) Wall Supply Company, Selma, North Carolina, $25;

(135) Mrs. R. L. Ray, Selma, North Carolina, $94.16;

(136) Floyd C. Price, Junior, Selma, North Carolina, $53;

(137) Dunn Furniture Company of Selma, Incorporated, Selma, North Carolina, $274.11;

(138) Jimmie Sanders, Selma, North Carolina, $186.55;

(139) G. C. Hinton, Selma, North Carolina, $86.59;

(140) Hattie Leach, Selma, North Carolina, $125.99;

(141) J. N. Wiggs, Selma, North Carolina, $223.67;

(142) M. N. Lewis, Selma, North Carolina, $151,94;

(143) Leoman Wellons, Selma, North Carolina, $9.27;

(144) C. S. Hicks, Selma, North Carolina, $94.95;

(145) Mrs. Edgar Rose, Selma, North Carolina, $275.06;

(146) Selma Masonic Lodge 320, Ancient Free and Accepted Masons, Selma, North Carolina, $196.03;

(147) Selma Methodist Church, Selma, North Carolina, $2,484.80;

(148) Henry Talton, Rocky Mount, North Carolina, $4,746.45;

(149) Johnston County Hospital, Smithfield, North Carolina, $19.78;

(150) J. G. McCormick, Goldsboro, North Carolina, $301.10;

(151) G. A. McLeMore, Smithfield, North Carolina, $13;

(152) Etta B. Morrison, Selma, North Carolina, $88.60;

(153) J. F. Coley, Selma, North Carolina, $20;

(154) Joseph Abdalla, Selma, North Carolina, $198.41;

(155) J. E. Peedin, Selma, North Carolina, $371;

(156) Mrs. J. F. Dail, Selma, North Carolina, $233;

(157) Albert Eason, Selma, North Carolina, $68.50;

(158) Carolina Service and Parts Company, Selma, North Carolina, $226.65; and

(159) ———.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the following-named estates of persons whose deaths resulted from the said explosion, the sums hereinafter specified, representing the amounts reported by the United States Court of Claims to the Congress in response to H. Res. 319, Eighty-second Congress (congressional numbered 17876, decided January 15, 1948), plus, as a part of just compensation, interest at the rate of six per centum per annum from March 7, 1942, in full satisfaction of their respective claims against the United States.

(1) Estate of Mrs. R. L. Holloman, deceased, Smithfied, North Carolina, $10,000;

(2) Estate of Claude H. Mitchell, deceased, Dunn, North Carolina, $10,000.

(3) Estate of Cecil Propst, deceased, Belwood, North Carolina, $10,000;

(4) Estate of Jesse (Jessie Mae) Holloway, Goldsboro, North Carolina, $10,000;

(5) Estate of Willie (Monroe) Howell, Goldsboro, North Carolina, $10,000; and

(6) Estate of George Stroupe, Gastonia, North Carolina, $10,000.

SEC. 3. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the claimants hereinafter named, the sums hereinafter specified, representing the amounts reported by the United States Court of Claims to the Congress in response to H. Res. 319, Eighty-second Congress (congressional numbered 17876, decided January 15, 1958), plus, as a part of just compensation, interest at the rate of six per centum per annum from March 7, 1942, in full satisfaction of their claims against the United States for compensation for personal injuries sustained as a result of the said explosion.

(1) Dalma Buffaloe, 420 School Street, Goldsboro, North Carolina, $165;

(2) W. L. Hunt, Rocky Mount, North Carolina, $5.50;

(3) Hugh B. Anderson, Smithfield, North Carolina, $126.65;

(4) H. B. Anderson, Smithfield, North Carolina, $500;

(5) John Hardy Maynor, Dunn, North Carolina, $66.80;

(6) John Hardy Maynor, Dunn, North Carolina, $400;

(7) Raymond O. Avery, Clinton, North Carolina, $7,500;

(8) F. H. Lee, Smithfield, North Carolina, $4,000;

(9) Mrs. A. H. Bone, Selma, North Carolina, $2,000;

(10) Mrs. Jimmy Sanders, Selma, North Carolina, $1,000;

(11) Mrs. Kathleen Guirkin, Selma, North Carolina, $1,500;

(12) Bruce Hopewell, Goldsboro, North Carolina, $1,500;

(13) Thelma Holloway, Ayden, North Carolina, $1,560; and

(14) ———.

SEC. 4. No part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 25 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with these claims, and the same shall be unlawful, any contracts 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.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, line 1, strike out "plus, as a part of just compensation, interest at the rate of six per centum per annum from March 7, 1942".

Page 2, line 12, strike out all numbers beginning with (1) through (159) on page 12, line 11.

Page 12, line 19, strike out "plus, as a part of just compensation, interest at the rate of six per centum per annum from March 7, 1942".

Page 12, line 11, insert "A. G. Boone Company, Charlotte, North Carolina, $726.50".

Page 13, line 18, strike out "plus, as a part of just compensation, interest at the rate of six per centum per annum from March 7, 1942".

Page 12, line 23, strike all numbers beginning with (1) throughout the remainder of the bill.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOHN F. CARMODY

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2100) for the relief of John F. Carmody.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

RELIEF OF CERTAIN ALIENS

The Clerk called the resolution (H.J. Res. 322) for the relief of certain aliens.

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be passed over without prejudice.

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, this bill pertains to some 15 or more individuals. I wonder if the gentleman would elucidate his objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). The gentleman cannot reserve the right to object on the Private Calendar.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This concludes the calling of the Private Calendar.

AIR FORCE NOW CONSIDERS AN AIRBORNE ALERT

Mr. STRATTON. 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. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, some weeks ago I called in this House for a so-called airborne alert of our Strategic Air Command, so as to be fully defended in the event of a Soviet missile attack against this country. I referred to testimony presented to the Committee on Armed Services by Gen. Nathan M. Twining in which he implied that no such alert was needed.

Today I desire to bring to the attention of Members of this House the fact that the outspoken Commander of SAC, General Power, has indeed indicated to one of the committees of this House that such an alert is necessary and desirable after all.

I sincerely hope that the administration will now see fit to support the request of General Power.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I insert herewith an article that appeared in the Washington Post this morning by Joseph Alsop, exploring some of the implications of General Power's testimony:

GENERAL POWER'S WARNING

(By Joseph Alsop)

"I think you are just risking the whole country. That is how important I feel it is."

This comment, on the inadequacy of the administration's program for maintaining our deterrent power, was not made by an ignoramus, or a crisismonger, or a partisan. It was made by the wise and moderate man who carries the lonely and terrible responsibility for the American deterrent, the U.S. Strategic Air Commander, Gen. Thomas B. Power.

Now that a much-censored version has been released, General Power's grim testimony before the Military Subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee has already attracted some attention. The attention has been ludicrously inadequate, however; and almost no attention at all has been paid to the statements by General Power which had the highest immediate significance. These concerned the need for an airborne alert of the Strategic Air Command.

To put this part of the Power testimony in a comprehensible context, it is necessary

to note that the "missile gap" has two phases. In the later phase, the United States will have some intercontinental missiles in hard or semihard pads, and some measure of warning against the Soviet missile attack. In this later phase, the business-as-usual defense budget will permit the Soviets to gain an enormous preponderance of nuclear striking power, by permitting the Soviets to outbuild this country in both long and medium range ballistic missiles. Concerning this later phase, General Power in effect said that it was insanely imprudent not to maintain a more reasonable balance of striking power, by building more of the Atlas ICBM's for instance.

In the present phase, however, the problem is quite different. This year and next year—for at least 18 months and maybe an even longer period—the United States will have no ICBM's in hard pads and no warning whatever against a Soviet missile strike. A small number of Atlas ICBM's will indeed become operational during this phase. But these first Atlas missiles will be "soft," which means cheap, easy targets.

The immediate question, therefore, is whether the Soviets can produce enough ICBM's to knock out America's deterrent power in this first phase of our maximum softness. As of today, for instance, the Soviets could win the world in one stroke, with just enough ICBM's to launch a surprise missile attack on about 50 targets in this hemisphere. The realistic requirement (which was seriously understated in an earlier report in this space) is approximately 350 Soviet ICBM's. This small number of these weapons, plus the admitted Soviet stock of medium range missiles to cover SAC's overseas air bases, would be enough to do the job.

They would be enough to do the job, because General Power's Strategic Air Command is only authorized at present to maintain a 15-minute ground alert. This kind of alert will be useful when the missile-seeing radars are at last in place, and ready to give SAC 15 minutes warning. But a ground alert is obviously worthless in the present phase, when there can be no warning whatever against a Soviet missile strike.

The only possible remedy, the only thing that can be done now is to run a continuous airborne alert. If a maximum percentage of SAC bombers are always in the air, ready to go, and beyond reach of a surprise missile strike, the entire American deterrent can never be knocked out. But since the problem of the air-borne alert began to be discussed, the great men of the Pentagon have been pouring out the customary flood of lies, inspiring statements that an air-borne alert was not feasible, that it could not be made to work, and so on and so on. General Power's testimony has now given the lie direct to the smooth, easy liars, as follows:

"Warning is the crux of the problem. We may not get any warning of a missile attack. Mr. Khrushchev knows that, and he might feel these are very favorable circumstances. What can you do? We in the Strategic Air Command have developed a system known as air-borne alert. * * * This is a difficult way to live. It never has been attempted in * * * military history. [But] we have tested it and we know we can do it.

"I do not want to see an air-borne alert [after] any responsible person in this country says: 'I will guarantee you warning'. However, I feel we must get on with this airborne alert to carry us over [the period of no warning]. For the minute [Khrushchev] thinks he can strike this country with impunity, we will get it in the next 60 seconds." You could have no clearer statement, from a more impressive source.

THE KINZUA DAM STORY

Mr. DULSKI. 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. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak against the proposed construction of the Kinzua Dam as a part of the Allegheny Reservoir project contained in the Public Works Appropriation Act for 1958 and I am particularly concerned with the plight of the Indians of the Seneca Nation.

The Seneca Nation was and still is the largest of the Six Nations or Iroquois Confederation. The lands to be flooded by the reservoir created by the erection of the Kinzua Dam are the property of the Seneca Nation and the Government of the United States has given its solemn promise never to claim this land or disturb the Seneca Indians in the free use and enjoyment of these lands. The permanent, seasonal, and occasional flooding created by the erection of a dam near Kinzua, as proposed, violates the spirit and intent of the treaty guarantees pledged by our Government in 1794 over the signature of our first President, George Washington.

I feel that the time has come for Congress to stop enacting legislation that is inconsistent with prior treaties, for the arbitrary abrogation of Indian treaties without any compelling national interest is immoral, and shows bad faith on our part toward the Indians. The Seneca Indians have lived up to their side of the treaty for the past 165 years and it is about time the United States followed their example.

Long ago, the Indian said, "White man, many times, he speaks with a forked tongue."

A study of the treaty of 1794 and the Kinzua Dam proposal reveals how farsighted the Indian adage was.

The rights of the Seneca Nation have not been considered, and good faith has not been exercised in the planning, the design, and the proposed construction of the Kinzua Dam. It is not necessary to flood these Indian lands—it is merely economically convenient, although morally indefensible.

The Seneca Indians have a vested property right that should not be swept aside by administrative selection based upon tenuous economic arguments. The promises made in the treaty must be kept, and their title to these lands should remain sacred instead of being destroyed by implication, innuendo, and unauthorized acts.

We recognize the Seneca Indians as a distinct people, vested with rights which constitute a State or separate community. They are now a defenseless people, wards of the Nation, and dependent wholly upon it for protection and good faith.

The Kinzua Dam proposal will, in effect, make refugees out of these Indians, for it is an out-and-out land grab—destroying homes, buildings, and forcing them to leave their homes and move elsewhere.

Hallowed cemeteries will be desecrated and relocated to prevent artificial, man-made flooding of Indian graves. It is important to the Seneca Nation not to have their ancestral graves under water.

Congress has never, to this date, removed any of the restrictions of the 1794 treaty which was a voluntary restriction by our Government, modifying the inherent sovereign right of eminent domain.

For the record, let me emphasize that I believe wholeheartedly in flood control, but with proper regard for the rights and privileges of the affected residents of the area involved.

There is a serious question as to whether the Kinzua Dam project is a flood-control project. The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD shows argument for the project on the basis of supplying water for the domestic and industrial life of the Allegheny Valley and Pittsburgh antipollution and waterflow regulation as a major reason for the proposed dam. These industries can well afford to pay the expense of chemically treating their own waste, rather than pass the bills along to the Federal Government and the Seneca Indians.

The Kinzua Dam, like other bureaucratic daydreams, has grown from a 40-foot dam to a 180-foot monstrosity, all on paper.

Sportsmen leagues have condemned the man-made lake to be formed by it because it will destroy the existing, excellent recreational facilities of the Allegheny Valley.

The CIO Greater Buffalo Industrial Union Council supports the Seneca Indians in their fight against this proposed dam.

The city of Salamanca, N.Y., casts a wary eye on the proposal because of the possibility of the southwestern section of Salamanca being occasionally flooded by the backwaters of the reservoir created by the proposed Kinzua Dam.

I do not concur that it is impractical to have this project in a location other than that selected to prevent menace to the national welfare by destructive floods causing loss of life and property and the obstruction of commerce. I call for a reevaluation of the existing plans for the Allegheny Reservoir project and serious consideration of an alternative proposal labeled the "Conewango Diversion" whereby the flood flows of the Allegheny River can be diverted to Lake Erie through the construction of a diversion canal. This proposal has decided advantages over the Kinzua Dam proposal, for the additional water diverted to Lake Erie would be welcome for power potentials at Niagara Falls, would provide greater flood protection to the Pennsylvania cities concerned, would destroy no Indian lands, would be cheaper to construct and save millions of tax dollars, would create new recreational areas rather than destroy existing ones. I call upon the Army engineers to take an openminded, impartial, engineering approach to this alternative proposal of a diversion canal and to call a halt to the expenditure of any public funds in the direction of the construction of a dam at Kinzua.

DECENTRALIZATION PROGRAM AT WRIGHT-PATTERSON AIR FORCE BASE

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the special order heretofore granted me for today be vacated and that I may have permission 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. SCHENCK. Mr. Speaker, most of the Members of the Congress will recall that a decentralization program was undertaken at Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio, several years ago. Many of us are also aware of the fact that the changes made were very expensive, both in funds and in time lost by relocation. Currently some of the relocated functions have been returned to Wright Field for greater efficiency.

Last week when I was in my district, I learned of a situation which is causing me a great deal of concern, and I feel that all Members of Congress will also be concerned. I have learned that the Air Force is contemplating moving the responsibility for research and development of rockets from Wright Air Development Center, Dayton, Ohio, to Edwards Air Force Base, Calif.

Let me say right now that I have no selfish motive in opposing such a move but do so in the overall interest of our national defense. While all of us are properly concerned with keeping jobs in our own districts, the problem here transcends local considerations. This is especially true at this very time when so much depends on the elimination of unnecessary time lags and on the procurement of defense needs in the most economical manner possible.

In the present instance it is my understanding this proposed move would not only affect the research and development of rockets but that it would also affect about 200 scientifically trained personnel. The conditions at Edwards Air Force Base, I am told, are not conducive to attracting technical personnel to its desert location. Consequently, a great number of these people will be lost to the critical rocket work until replacements can be trained.

Of prime consideration, however, is the fact that the Wright Air Development Center area is best for rocket research and development because of its location in the Wright-Patterson Air Force Base complex. Procurement and contracting headquarters are here. In research procurement at Wright-Patterson there is a constant need for personal contact between the laboratories and the procuring agency. Joint daily review of documents is necessary to cut down the already long lead time in developing this country's research. When all the liaison between procurement and Wright Air Development Center has to be done by telephone or writing, this doubles the procurement cycle and has a very harmful effect on the Air Force surveillance of the program. It is my understanding that it is absolutely essential from the standpoint of efficiency for project engineers managing various projects to have frequent personal contact with appropriate procurement personnel.

Also of importance is the fact that many contractors are located in the Wright Field area, and company technical personnel are able to meet with Air Force research and procurement people. Thus an ideal situation now exists with development, procurement, and manufacturing representatives all working in closest cooperation and with a minimum of lag time on projects. As it becomes necessary to require the technical personnel of the various manufacturers to travel long distances, this cannot help but necessarily add to procurement costs, thereby increasing the costs of these projects to our Government. If the propulsion engineering is moved to Edwards, then because of the advantages of having the project engineering team close to procurement, Air Materiel Command will find it necessary to move all of the rocket propulsion procurement from Dayton, Ohio, to ballistic missile center, California. Supposedly there is a strong move afoot in the Air Force to put all of the propulsion procurement at ballistic missile center. Some of the recent programs in this category have already been shifted from Wright Field to the west coast.

Similar moves have been accomplished by the Air Force before, and a good example was when they moved armaments from the armament laboratory at Wright Air Development Center to Eglin Air Force Base. The key people involved did not transfer to Eglin, and thus a break in the project engineering surveillance came about with the result, I am told, that some of the programs were without Air Force engineering for some time. The Air Force lost the key people and eventually lost the armaments area itself to the Army.

The weapon system project offices are supported by the rocket group in the propulsion laboratory; and if this propulsion group is transferred, it will leave the weapon system project office without engineering support. Rocket propulsion is one of the key problems with the Air Force, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, and Advanced Research Projects Agency. Removal of this Wright Air Development Center function at Wright Field will leave many other laboratories with only a partial picture of the complete Air Force research area.

Prominent military men are continually pointing out the need for a stepup in our programing and the need for a reduction of lead time. In this instance, however, both of these objectives will be adversely affected. I cannot stress too greatly the need for a complete investigation of this contemplated move, and I urge immediate action by the appropriate committee of the Congress.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SCHENCK] yield to me?

Mr. SCHENCK. I am happy to yield to my distinguished colleague from Ohio who so ably represents the adjoining Seventh District of Ohio, in which Wright-Patterson Air Force Base is also located in part.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend my distinguished friend and neighbor for the clear and splendid way in which he has presented this important matter. I also want to commend him for his constant vigilance and work not only in behalf of the district he represents so well here but also for his very effective efforts in behalf of the best interest of our entire Nation.

Mr. Speaker, these are indeed critical times, filled with worldwide tensions and problems; and we can ill-afford to take needless chances with our national security and safety. I want to associate myself, Mr. Speaker, with the timely remarks made by my associate and to urge that the most careful study and consideration be given to this matter by the U.S. Air Force Headquarters before they make a final decision. I also join with my friend, the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SCHENCK] in urging the appropriate committees of the Congress to take every step available to them to inquire into the merits of this proposed move.

Mr. SCHENCK. I thank the distinguished gentleman for his remarks and support.

A BILL TO ESTABLISH A U.S. ARTS FOUNDATION

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD, and to include a bill I introduced today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a bill to establish a U.S. Arts Foundation. This foundation, I hope, will stimulate the growth throughout the United States of the performing and composing arts. It is the intention of my bill, which is similar in scope and purpose to that of S. 1598, introduced yesterday by Senator JAVITS, of New York, and Senator CLARK, of Pennsylvania, to foster, encourage, and stimulate the production of plays, concerts, ballet, and other performing art forms throughout the United States. My bill calls for the encouragement and aid by the arts foundation to playwrights and composers.

Mr. Speaker, we are the greatest Nation in this world. We have raised our standard of living to a level unparalleled in the history of civilization. We have a technical and scientific colossus that has no equal. Our military might is very great. The freedom that we have and the sense of pride that we have in our Nation is not matched by any other people for their nation.

Yet, there is one vital element of our national character that is not strong. There is no question that the cultural life of America as it manifests itself in support of the arts can and must be improved.

The United States as a nation lags far behind almost every nation in Europe in aid that is given to composers, playwrights, and the performing arts.

For example, in Great Britain and Canada, respectively, there is a British and Canadian Arts Council. These councils do much to stimulate the performing arts in their respective countries. In Italy there are literally scores of government-aided opera houses and orchestras. Almost every city has a state opera, orchestra, and theater financed by grants from the federal, state, and local governments. In France, there is strong support by the French Government for the opera. There is also strong support in Austria, which spends a relatively high percentage of its budget on the performing arts.

Senator JAVITS has pointed out in an article first appearing in the New York Times on Sunday, and now appearing on page 5438 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, April 7, 1959, that "while the proposed bill for an arts foundation might be considered precedent shattering in the United States, it would be taken for granted nearly anywhere else in the world."

Let us hope that the United States will not continue to lag behind in an area which is of paramount importance to the greatness of our Nation.

In closing I would like to state our interest in this proposal out in the Middle West. As we all know, most of our performing and creative arts center in just a few big cities in this Nation. Obviously, this does not help the people who do not live in these three or four big cities. Through stimulation and encouragement by the arts foundation, community theater groups, orchestras, ballet, choral singing will become an important part of the lives of the small communities of this land. Art and the performing arts are not only for the big cities. They are for people wherever they might live.

Without objection, Mr. Speaker, I would like to introduce this bill into the body of the RECORD.

A bill to establish the United States Arts Foundation

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

ESTABLISHMENT OF FOUNDATION

SECTION 1. There is hereby established in the executive branch of the Government an independent agency to be known as the United States Arts Foundation (hereinafter referred to as the "Foundation").

DECLARATION OF POLICY

SEC. 2. The Congress finds that a large and progressively increasing proportion of the people of the United States are deprived of the opportunity to view and enjoy living theatrical performances, musical concerts, opera, dance, ballet, and choral recitals, and the performing arts generally; that the general welfare will be promoted by providing national recognition of the status of the theater and other performing arts as a cherished and valued part of the Nation's cultural resources since colonial days, and as a valued means for the building of morale among the civilian components engaged in defense production and among the Armed Forces, and for the promotion of education, national culture, recreation, skill in the arts, and beneficial utilization of leisure time; that it is desirable to establish a United States Arts Foundation to provide such recognition and also to consider how the presentation to and appreciation by the people of theatrical and other performing arts and productions may best be stimulated in civic and educational groups as well as professional companies throughout the Nation and regions thereof (including ships, airfields, posts, camps, and stations of the Armed Forces and mines, plants, and offices of the civilian component production forces) and to take steps appropriate to stimulate such increased and more widespread presentations.

TRUSTEES OF FOUNDATION

SEC. 3. (a) The Foundation shall be subject to the general supervision and policy direction of a board of trustees which shall consist of twelve members to be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The President shall endeavor to provide representation to the several performing arts, to both civic, educational, and professional groups concerned with and engaged in productions of the performing arts, to the trade unions and trade associations concerned with the performing arts, and to the attending public. The President is requested, in the making of nominations, to give due consideration to recommendations for nomination which may be submitted to him by the representative associations of the foregoing and of organizations and associations concerned with the encouragement and development of the performing arts.

(b) The term of office of each trustee of the Foundation shall be six years in duration, expiring on April 30, except that the terms of the trustees first taking office after the enactment of this Act shall expire, as designated by the President at the time of appointment, four at the end of two years, four at the end of four years, and four at the end of six years, subsequent to the April 30 following the enactment of this Act. A vacancy shall be filled only for the unexpired portion of the term. Any person who has been a trustee of the Foundation for twelve consecutive years shall be ineligible for appointment during the following two-year period.

(c) The President shall call the first meeting of the trustees of the Foundation, at which the first order of business shall be the election of a Chairman and a Vice Chairman.

PRINCIPAL POWERS AND DUTIES OF THE FOUNDATION

SEC. 4. (a) The Foundation is authorized and directed to—

(1) stimulate and encourage throughout the United States the study of and the advancement of the performing arts and public interest therein;

(2) stimulate and encourage within such reasonable limitations as it shall determine the presentation throughout the United States, and to the widest practicable audiences, of productions of the performing arts, of both new works and works drawn from the existing literature of those arts, which have substantial artistic or historic significance, giving preference to stimulating and encouraging the works of citizens and residents of the United States and of the Americas;

(3) foster and encourage professional and civic and nonprofit, private, public, educational, institutional, or governmental groups which are engaged in or directly concerned with the performing arts and productions;

(4) foster and encourage maintenance of registers, as may be deemed advisable, of theaters, personnel, or otherwise; and make such surveys and analyses as may be deemed advisable in the interest of the performing arts throughout the country;

(5) promote, encourage, and provide financial assistance through grant, fellowship, and scholarship for composers and students of composition, playwrights and students of playwrighting, for the purpose of encouraging new plays and musical compositions; and

(6) provide through direct grant or otherwise financial assistance and support from the funds appropriated to the Foundation or otherwise obtained pursuant to this Act or other Acts, to professional groups, and groups meeting professional standards, and educational groups, engaged in or concerned with the performing arts and productions, for the purpose of enabling such groups to provide productions of such type, or in such regions, as would be unavailable to the prospective audience without such assistance, or to provide instruction in the performing arts, but such groups shall be eligible for financial assistance only if no part of the net earnings of such groups inures to the benefit of any private stockholder or stockholders, or individual or individuals, and if such groups satisfy the standards of subsection (c) of section 170 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to authorize deductions from gross income of donations to such groups. The Foundation shall wherever practicable develop the principle of matching funds with interested agencies public or private.

(b) The Foundation shall not produce or present any production.

(c) The trustees of the Foundation shall meet four times each year, beginning on the first Monday in February, May, August, and November, and at such other times as the Chairman may determine. The Chairman shall also call a meeting whenever one-third of the trustees so request in writing. A majority of the trustees of the Foundation shall constitute a quorum. Each trustee shall be given notice, by registered mail mailed to his last-known address of record not less than fifteen days prior to any meeting, of the call of such meeting.

(d) The first Chairman and Vice Chairman of the Foundation shall be elected by the Foundation to serve until the first Monday in May next succeeding the date of election at which time a Chairman and Vice Chairman shall be elected for a term of two years. Thereafter such election shall take place at the annual meeting occurring at the end of each such term. The Vice Chairman shall perform the duties of the Chairman in his absence. In case a vacancy occurs in the chairmanship or vice chairmanship, the Foundation shall elect a trustee to fill such vacancy.

(e) The Foundation shall render an annual report to the President for submission on or before the 15th day of January to the Congress, summarizing the activities of the Foundation and making such recommendations as it may deem appropriate.

DIRECTOR OF FOUNDATION

SEC. 5. There shall be a Director of the Foundation (hereinafter referred to as the "Director"), who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. In the appointment of the Director of the Foundation, the President is requested to give due consideration to the recommendations for such an appointment which may be submitted to him by the Board of Trustees, and the Board of Trustees in making such recommendations shall give due consideration to the recommendations which may be submitted to them by the representative associations referred to in section 3(a) of this Act. The Director shall serve as an ex officio trustee of the Foundation. In addition, he shall be the chief executive officer of the Foundation. The Director shall receive compensation at the rate of $22,500 per annum and shall serve for a term of six years unless sooner removed by the President: *Provided,* That at any time a majority of the Board of Trustees may recommend such removal to the President.

ADMINISTRATION AND ENABLING AUTHORITY

SEC. 6. (a) The Foundation may appoint committees or councils or panels concerned

with particular regions of the country or with particular aspects of the performing arts, or both, and composed of persons who need not be trustees of the Foundation, or of organizations. The Foundation shall maintain an office in the District of Columbia, and in such other places through the country as it may deem appropriate.

(b) The Director shall have general authority to carry out and execute the programs of the Foundation on a full time, continuous basis, to recommend programs to the Foundation and to discharge such other functions as the Foundation may delegate to him, including functions vested in the Foundation by this Act. Except as specifically approved by the Foundation, the Director shall not hold any office in, or act in any capacity for, any group or institution with which the Foundation makes any contract, or to which it gives any award or assistance.

(c) The Foundation is specifically authorized to—

(1) prescribe such rules and adopt such bylaws as it deems necessary governing the manner of its operation and its organization and personnel;

(2) make expenditures, and enter into contracts or other arrangements, as may be necessary for administering the provisions of this Act, without regard to the provisions of section 3709 of the Revised Statutes (41 U.S.C. 5);

(3) make advance, progress, and other payments which relate to research in the performing arts without regard to the provisions of section 3648 of the Revised Statutes (31 U.S.C. 529);

(4) acquire by purchase, lease, loan, or gift, and to hold and/or dispose of by sale, lease, or loan, real and personal property, to receive and use funds or property donated by others, and such donations shall be classified as contributions deductible from gross income within the meaning of section 170 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954;

(5) publish or arrange for the publication of information relating to the performing arts and productions, or personnel engaged therein, without regard to the provisions of section 11 of the Act of March 1, 1919 (44 U.S.C. 11);

(6) accept and utilize the services of voluntary and uncompensated personnel;

(7) pay fees for and to enter into contracts with persons for the performance of services required by the Foundation; and

(8) pay to employees of the Foundation, and to all other persons rendering services to the Foundation, whether on an uncompensated basis or on a fee or contract basis, actual and necessary traveling and subsistence expenses (including, in lieu of subsistence, per diem allowances at a rate not in excess of $15) when engaged away from home, in business of the Foundation.

(d)(1) The Foundation is authorized to make loans to any professional group, or any group meeting professional standards, or any educational group meeting standards prescribed by the Foundation engaged in or connected with the performing arts and productions or in instruction therein. Such loans may provide for payment to the Foundation of a percentage of the net profits of the production or productions, or of interest, or both, as may be determined by the Foundation.

(2) A group shall not be eligible for assistance under subparagraph (1) unless (A) such group satisfies the standards of subsection (c) of section 170 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, so as to authorize deductions of donations to such group from the gross income of the donor, and (B) no part of the net earnings of such group inures to the benefit of any private stockholder or individual.

INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION

SEC. 7. (a) The Foundation is authorized, with the approval of the President and to the extent specified by such approval, and in consultation with the Department of State, to cooperate in, assist, and sponsor international activities relating to the performing arts, including the assistance to or sponsorship of performances in other countries.

(b) The Director, with the approval of the Foundation, and subject to consultation with the Secretary of State, may defray the expenses of trustees or employees of the Foundation, and members of councils or committees of the Foundation, in attending meetings, congresses, and performances in other countries relating to the performing arts, whenever he deems it necessary in the promotion of the objectives of this Act.

APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 8. (a) There is authorized to be appropriated to the Foundation for each fiscal year such sums as shall be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act. The moneys appropriated to the Foundation shall remain available for expenditure for two years following the expiration of the fiscal year for which appropriated.

(b) Moneys received by the Foundation pursuant to paragraph (4) or (5) of section 6(c), or pursuant to section 6(d), of this Act, shall not be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts, but shall be kept in a special account, maintained by the Treasury Department, or may be kept by the Foundation in commercial banking institutions, or invested in securities eligible for trust funds in the District of Columbia.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 9. (a) The Director shall, in accordance with such policies as the Foundation shall from time to time prescribe, appoint and fix the compensation of such personnel as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act. Such appointments shall be made and such compensation shall be fixed in accordance with the provisions of the civil-service laws and regulations and the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, except that the Director may, in accordance with such policies as the Foundation shall from time to time prescribe, employ such technical and professional personnel or personnel with experience in or relating to any of the performing arts, and fix their compensation, without regard to such laws, as he may deem necessary for the discharge of the responsibilities of the Foundation under this Act. The Deputy Director hereinafter provided for, and the members of the councils or committees, shall be appointed without regard to the civil-service laws or regulations. Except with the approval of the Foundation, neither the Director nor the Deputy Director shall engage in any other business, vocation, or employment than that of serving as such Director or Deputy Director, or hold any office in, or act in any capacity for, any organization, agency, or institution with which the Foundation makes any contract or other arrangement under this Act.

(b) The Director may appoint, with the approval of the Foundation, a Deputy Director, who shall perform such functions as the Director, with the approval of the Foundation, may prescribe and shall be acting Director during the absence or disability of the Director or in the event of a vacancy in the Office of the Director, and who shall receive compensation at a rate not to exceed $20,000 per annum.

(c) The trustees of the Foundation, and the members of the council and committees, shall receive compensation at the rate of $50 for each day engaged in the business of the Foundation pursuant to authorization of the Foundation, and shall be allowed actual and necessary traveling and subsistence expenses (including, in lieu of subsistence, per diem allowance at a rate not in excess of $15) when engaged, away from home, in the duties of their offices.

(d) Persons holding other offices in the executive branch of the Federal Government may serve as members of the committees or councils, but they shall not receive remuneration for their services as such members during any period for which they receive compensation for their services in such other offices.

(e) Service of an individual as a trustee or employee of the Foundation, of a committee or council, shall not be considered as service bringing him within the provisions of section 281 or section 283 of title 18 of the United States Code unless the act of such individual, which by such section is made unlawful when performed by an individual referred to in such section, is with respect to any particular matter which directly involved the Foundation or in which the Foundation is directly interested.

(f) Agencies of the United States Government are authorized to render assistance to the Foundation by the donation or loan of employee services and by the donation or loan of supplies, office or building space, or other property, either on a reimbursable or nonreimbursable basis.

(g) The Foundation shall provide a reasonable system for control and accountability of all funds of the Foundation, and shall consult with and consider the suggestions of the Comptroller General with regard thereto.

DEFINITION AND TITLE

SEC. 10. As used in this Act—

(a) The term "performing arts" means the arts related to performances of theatrical plays, dance, ballet, and choral performances, and performances of musical works (instrumental, voice, and/or operatic); and includes the arts of playwriting, acting, directing, staging, scenic and costume design, and composition and performance of music, opera, and dance and ballet.

(b) The term "productions" means plays (with or without music), ballets, dance and choral performances, readings, concerts, recitals, operas, and any other performances before members of the public involving the execution or rendition of any of the performing arts and meeting such standards as may be established by the Foundation.

(c) The term "group" includes any society, institution, organization, or association, whether or not incorporated.

SHORT TITLE

SEC. 11. This Act may be cited as the "United States Arts Foundation Act."

BATAAN DAY

Mr. McCORMACK. 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 Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, 17 years ago tomorrow the world saw the strength and vitality of American ideals and it is good to recall the historic event that showed it beyond the peradventure of a doubt. Filipino and American troops fought side by side to the bitter end in Bataan. That they faced odds that taxed their courage and

endurance seldom undergone by men in the history of all wars is an epic that will live forever. What gave them the fortitude and the valor to withstand what they so heroically endured was the unity that welded them together as no two nations of two different races were united before: a unity brought about by the ideals of democracy and freedom for which they fought.

Faced as the world is today by the threat of communism which is the antithesis of democracy and freedom as Americans and Filipinos have learned to value them, it is important to recall the epic that is Bataan, for it underscored what can be brought about by mutuality and understanding between two nations. When we first went to the Philippines we were misunderstod. It is possible that some of our actions then were subject to misinterpretation. The Filipinos who loved freedom fought us for 3 years. Gradually, however, we showed that we meant well by them, that the overwhelming sentiment among the American people was to help them to develop into a self-governing nation. All our subsequent acts proved this. At first we promised them independence as soon as they are able to maintain a stable government. Then we fixed a definite date for independence. When the date came, independence was proclaimed as pledged.

When war was declared by Japan, the Philippines was still a Commonwealth. It was an American Territory. It was the American flag that was attacked. But the Filipinos rallied to defend our flag with loyalty and devotion. The Philippine Army resisted the enemy in a manner that won the admiration of the world. The Filipino guerrillas organized and maintained a resistance movement that harassed the occupation troops for more than 3 years. With their guerrilla tactics they not only weakened the enemy but they helped save thousands of American lives. The memory of this loyalty and devotion to the United States we cannot forget and I recall them today with gratitude and admiration.

Bataan will always live in the heart of every American. It will always be a symbol not only of human courage but of an undying faith in those spiritual values that are inseparable from the democratic way of life. It ennobles us as a people to cherish the memory of the loyalty of our allies, the Filipinos. Theirs is a friendship tested and true and it is a friendship that we must never subordinate to any consideration dictated by expediency or self-interest. Only thus can we prove to the world that we know how to appreciate the loyalty of friends. As Gen. Carlos P. Romulo, Philippine Ambassador to the United States, said in a recent speech in New York City:

> Friendship is a thing of the spirit and loyalty to it cannot be bought with dollars or with rubles. Peoples who are used to have little of consumer and capital goods but who have depended only on their spirituality for their happiness in the past may more easily be attracted by that leadership now which can offer them a friendship that is steadfast and abiding, a friendship that will be loyal to them no matter what the shifts and changes may be in the world's balance of power.

In honoring the memory of the fallen brave of Bataan today let us reassure our Filipino friends with our deeds that American friendship for them is steadfast and abiding and that as a Nation we will always keep faith with them as it is our sincere and devout hope they will always keep faith with us.

AMERICAN DEMOCRACY PROGRAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, today it is my privilege and my pleasure to report to the House and to the American people on the amazing and most heartening progress of a program aimed at winning the hearts and the minds of people everywhere. I have selected April 8 as the date for this report because it was on April 8, 1954, just 5 years ago, that a constituent of mine, Thomas B. Stauffer, wrote me a letter that started a chain of activities that resulted in the program that now is known the world around as the classics of American democracy program.

Five years ago, when first I was alerted by this letter from a constituent at that time unknown to me, there were no copies available anywhere in the world on a grassroots level of the books in which our forefathers found their inspiration. Not even the Constitution of the United States and the Declaration of Independence had been translated into languages so that they could be read and understood by the peoples in awakening lands and as hungry for democratic inspiration as were our forefathers.

Five years ago, when I received this letter from a constituent then unknown to me, I could not believe what he told me that such outstanding classics of democracy as the "Federalist" had not been translated into other languages. But a check by my administrative assistant, Marie Crowe, herself a student of history and an author of textbooks on American history and on our Constitutional convention, revealed that the Federalist papers had been translated into only two or three European languages in limited editions, then long out of print.

That was 5 years ago. We then had been spending, and this expenditure I am not criticizing, large sums of money on our mutual security program. We had been building up the military strength and the economic stability of the nations that were joined with us in the cause of democracy.

But we had not been reaching into the minds and the hearts of people. Mr. Speaker, this should be self-evident that you do not have an ally who will stand with you steadfastly in the sunshine and in the storms unless he is bound to you in heart and in mind by an understanding that the cause in which he and you are enlisted is worth more to him and to you than life itself. Men can be armed to fight, and the arms may be the last word in modern armaments, but they will not stand up under assault and laugh scornfully as the odds against them grow unless there is something in their minds and in their hearts that bids them stand fast.

Five years ago we were losing the fight for the minds and the hearts of the peoples of the world. The classics of American democracy that had inspired our forefathers were not anywhere available on the grassroots level. There were a few copies, in expensive bindings and in English, on the shelves of embassies and of libraries that relatively few people visited and none except from the elite. Meanwhile, in every bookstall and in every language and at prices within the reach of everyone were the works of the architects of the ideology of communism.

Today the picture has been changed. It has all happened in the period of 5 years since the receipt 5 years ago today of a letter from a constituent of mine then unknown to me. Today the classics of democracy, and by that I mean those immortal works that gave inspiration to our own forefathers, have been translated into many languages, have been printed, sometimes on old delapidated presses by publishers in many countries, have by these publishers been distributed to booksellers and sold at prices within the reach of everyone. The response has been tremendous. Today in all the countries of the world these classics are being purchased from local booksellers, not as propaganda forced upon them but as something for which they feel the need as blueprints in democracy to guide them in their search for governmental structures that will assure to them government of, for, and by the people. As our forefathers sought to place the dignity of man beyond the perils of selfish government and the frailties of human nature, so are these peoples in lands now awakening looking for guidance and inspiration to the same sources.

Five years ago the Soviet was in complete command of the situation.

Mr. Speaker, today the picture has completely changed. Our country today is gaining in the fight for the hearts and the minds of peoples everywhere. Today the classics of democracy, that inspired our forefathers, in inexpensive translated editions are in the hands of readers all over the world. They are not being given away. They are not being forced upon the people. They are not under suspicion as American propaganda because in fact and in truth they are the products of local publishers and sold at popular prices in local bookstores. This grassroots program has worked so well that the Soviet has been forced to revise its own techniques. What we have done has shown up the Soviet giveaway program as pure propaganda.

Mr. Speaker, we hear so much of anti-American feeling in Latin America, in Africa, and throughout the world that it is most heartening to know that our

program aimed solely and unselfishly at reaching the hearts and the minds of people everywhere is meeting with this response.

The record must speak for itself. This is the first public announcement of what has been accomplished. I am sure it will be heartening to all Americans. We Americans do have faith in our democracy, and that faith has descended into every succeeding generation by the faith that was instilled in our forefathers by the books they read, books that were written by many persons in many different countries, but which together form a bible of democracy somewhat comparable to the Bible of religious faith. It will be heartening in every American home to know that this bible of democracy translated into many tongues and made available in inexpensive editions is being grasped as food to the hungry by peoples everywhere just as it gave understanding of democracy and inspiration to achieve democracy to our own forefathers.

Mr. Speaker, here is the report. It is prefaced by a letter to me under date of March 6, 1959, from the Honorable George V. Allen, the able Director of the U.S. Information Agency. It is a complete statement of the languages into which the classics of democracy have been translated, the size of the various editions, and the prices at which they have been offered for sale in native bookstores. Here is the report:

DIRECTOR ALLEN'S TRANSMITTAL LETTER

MARCH 6, 1959.

DEAR MR. O'HARA: I am enclosing two copies of the latest report on the classics of democracy which I understand you wished to have. I hope you will find the comparison between your hopes of a few years ago for bringing these important books to the attention of foreign readers and the accomplishments of American publishers and the U.S. Information Agency both satisfying and rewarding.

In addition to the publications noted in the report, American and foreign publishers have produced a number of classics titles for distribution abroad, in English and translated editions of 10,000 copies or more, in projects not associated with standard agency translations programs. Most of the titles so published are included on the attached list. Among those not listed are: "The Political Writings of John Adams"; "A Disquisition on Government" by John C. Calhoun; "David Hume's Political Essays"; "Selected Writings of Thomas Paine"; "Second Treatise on Government," by John Locke; and "Representative Government," by John Stuart Mill.

We are proud to play a part in this undertaking and are grateful to you for your continued support and interest.

Sincerely,

GEORGE V. ALLEN,
Director.

Report on classics of democracy

	Language	Edition size	Retail price
Dewey, John, "The Public and Its Problems."	German, in process		
Emerson, Ralph Waldo, "Emerson's Essays."	Arabic	5,000	$0.90
	Telugu	1,000	.40
	Tamil	2,000	.21
	Kannada	1,000	.26
	Malayalam	2,000	.32
"Basic Selections From Emerson," editor, E. Lindeman.	do	2,000	.32
	Greek	4,000	1.50
	Korean	3,000	1.00
	Bengali	5,000	.32
"Selections From the Works of Emerson," editor, Hans Hartmann.	German	5,000	2.33
"The Portable Emerson," editor, Mark Van Doren.	Hindi	10,000	.31
	Chinese	6,000	.43
	Gujerati	5,000	.32
	Marathi	5,000	.32
Hamilton, Madison, and Jay, "The Federalist Papers."	Italian	3,000	2.56
	French	2,000	9.60
	German	1,600	7.41
	Spanish	10,000	.87
	Portuguese, in process		
	Vietnamese, in process		
	Assamese,[1] in process		
	Bengali,[1] in process		
	Hindi,[1] in process		
	Urdu,[1] in process		
	Gujerati,[2] in process		
Hand, Learned, "The Spirit of Liberty."	Burmese	6,000	.42
	French	2,000	2.86
	German	6,500	6.19
	Greek	2,000	.67
	Singhalese	2,500	.21
	Telugu	1,000	.31
	Turkish	23,000	(3)
	Japanese, in process		
	Hindi, in process		
Jefferson, Thomas, "Thomas Jefferson," editor, Gilbert Chinard	Burmese	5,000	3.84
	French	1,500	1.71
"Jefferson: Champion of the Free Mind," Phillips Russell.	Malay	5,000	.34
	Japanese	17,000	.28
	Farsi	2,000	.32
	Gujerati	2,000	.31
"The Life and Selected Writings of Thomas Jefferson," Adrienne Koch and William Peden.	Bengali	3,000	.26
	Gujerati	5,000	.32
	Hindi	5,000	.32
	Marathi	5,000	.32
"Jefferson—A Great American's Life and Ideas," Saul Padover.	Chinese	4,000	.32
	French	3,000	.83
	Greek	1,800	3.42
"Thomas Jefferson on Democracy," Saul Padover.	Burmese	5,000	.31
	Chinese	4,000	.52
	German, in process		
"Thomas Jefferson and American Democracy," Max Beloff.	Italian	3,000	2.40
"Thomas Jefferson," Gene Lisitsky	English (India)	10,000	.32
	Arabic	5,000	.30
	Bengali	3,000	.34
	Chinese	3,000	.32
"Thomas Jefferson," Gene Lisitsky	Gujerati	3,000	.16
	Hindi	10,000	.32
	Indonesian	10,000	.06
	Japanese	3,000	.47
	Korean	2,000	.40
	Marathi	3,000	.16
	Oriya	3,000	.32
	Punjabi	3,000	.32
"Thomas Jefferson," Gene Lisitsky —Continued	Singhalese	2,500	$0.20
	Tamil	10,000	.05
	Telugu	10,000	.05
	Urdu	5,000	.32
	Portuguese, in process		
	Persian, in process		
	Thai, in process		
	Turkish, in process		
	Malayalam, in process		
	Kannada, in process		
	Indonesian, in process		
Lincoln, Abraham, "Lincoln Reader," edition, Paul M. Angle.	Thai	2,500	2.00
	Arabic, in process		
"Abraham Lincoln," Emil Ludwig	Bengali	1,100	.52
	Chinese	6,000	.23
	Gujarati	2,500	.42
	Hindi	5,000	.42
	Japanese	3,000	.56
	Kannada	2,000	.32
	Malayan	2,000	.26
	Marathi	2,500	.42
	Oriya	3,000	.32
	Persian	1,500	.32
	Singhalese	2,500	.20
	Telugu	2,000	.42
	Turkish	4,000	.35
	Tamil	2,000	.63
	English (India) in process.		
	Vietnamese, in process		
"Abraham Lincoln: The Prairie Years and the War Years," Carl Sandburg.	Hebrew	3,000	1.25
	German	5,000	8.49
	Spanish	3,000	5.39
	Arabic, in process		
"Abraham Lincoln," Benjamin P. Thomas.	Arabic	4,000	.29
	Chinese	3,000	1.15
	Greek	5,000	1.67
	Korean	6,000	2.00
	French	3,000	2.54
	Spanish	8,000	1.76
	Slovenian	2,500	1.66
	Japanese (vols. 1 and 2)	1,500	[4] 1.94
	German	5,000	3.81
	Serbo-Croatian	2,500	1.13
Mill, John S., essay "On Liberty," editor, Shields.	Arabic	4,000	.56
Thoreau, H. D., "Walden or Life in the Woods."	do	4,000	.75
	Chinese	8,000	.43
	Bengali	5,000	.32
	Portuguese	4,000	.68
	Telugu	5,000	.63
	Korean	5,000	1.20
	Greek	5,000	1.00
	Malayalam	1,000	.42
	Tamil	1,500	.42
De Tocqueville, Alexis, "Democracy in America."	Italian	10,000	.48
	Japanese	5,000	.33
	Spanish	3,000	5.20
	Burmese	10,000	.21
	Italian:		
	Vol. I	2,000	3.84
	Vol. II	2,000	
Wilson, Woodrow W., "The Wilson Reader" Frances Farmer.	French	2,000	2.35
	Chinese	5,750	.50
	Gujerati	2,000	.31
"The Story of Woodrow Wilson" David Loth.	Chinese	12,000	.25
	Tamil	1,500	.10
	Portuguese	6,000	.27

[1] Expected date of publication December 1959.
[2] Expected date of publication April 1959. No definite plans presently for Tamil, Telugu, Kannada, Malayalam editions; however the posts in India expect to place "The Federalist Papers" in 1 or more of these south Indian languages by the end of the year.
[3] Free distribution.
[4] A set.

GERMAN EDITION—THE FEDERALIST PAPERS

The German translation of The Federalist Papers was published in October in Vienna by the Manzsche Verlags- und Universitaetsbuchhandlung under the title "Der Federalist"

USIS Bonn received 400 copies. USIS Bern requested, and received, 25 copies for the mission's use. Sample copies were sent, as usual, to USIS posts in Sidney, Ankara, São Paulo, Buenos Aires, Asunción, Belgrade and Zagreb.

It has been deemed wiser and more effective to leave the promotion of this capital work to the Austrian publisher and to the editor, Prof. Felix Ermacora, both of whom are well known and respected in the German speaking countries. The latter, a renowned Austrian authority on international law and political science, who also wrote an excellent preface, has recently been appointed to a professorship at the University of Munich.

In addition to routine publicity in publisher's magazines in Austria, Switzerland, and Germany, advertisements in the trade journals, and distribution of leaflets, the Austrian publisher sent reviews and examination copies to the following professional journals:

Oesterreichische Juristenzeitung, Wein I., Justizpalast.

Zeitschrift fuer oeffentliches Recht, Wein I., Moelkerbaste 5.

Salzburger Nachrichten, Wein I., Rotenturmstrasse 25.

Juristische Blaetter, Wein I., Moelkerbastei 5.

Juristen-Zeitung, 14b Tuebingen, Wilhelmstrasse 18.

Frankfurter Allgemeine-Zeitung, Frankfurt/Main, Boersenstrasse 2.

Archiv des oeffentlichen Rechtes, 14b Tuebingen, Wilhelmstrasse 18.

Zeitschrift fuer die gesamte Staatswissenschaft, 14b Tuebingen, Wilhelmstrasse 18.

Zeitschrift fuer auslaendisches Recht und Voelkerrecht, Berlin W 35. Genthinerstrasse 13.

Archiv fuer Rechts- und Sozialphilosophie, Budenheim bei Mainz, Ernst-Ludwig-Strasse 1.

At the instigation of Professor Ermacora, the publisher has already presented copies of The Federalist Papers, in German, to Austrian Federal Chancellor Raab Education Minister Drimmel, and to most of the prominent professors of political science and constitutional law in Austria and Germany. The post has limited itself by agreement with the publisher, to an institutional presentation program in Austria aimed at schools of higher learning, university and government libraries, radio stations and daily newspapers as well as trade union periodicals.

At a recent conference of German, Swiss, and Austrian political scientists in Vienna, Professor Ermacora held a lecture on "The Federalist Papers" and distributed copies to interested participants.

ITALIAN EDITION—THE FEDERALIST PAPERS

Our latest communication (June 6, 1958) regarding the success of the Italian edition of "The Federalist Papers" states:

"'The Federalist' still continues to be of high interest to students and professors of political science and government, and also to European federalists. Last March, it was the basic text for a seminar on American federalism held at the University of Pavia.

"The publisher of 'The Federalist' is interested now in doing a series of related books on the American Constitution. This month, the first of these will appear: 'The Constitution and What It Means Today,' by Edward S. Corwin. Meanwhile, members of the original group of scholars who translated 'The Federalist' are at work on an anthology of documents relating to the origins of the Constitution, for which they have also received important assistance from the Ambassador (who originally encouraged translation of 'The Federalist').

"In short, it may be said that publication of 'The Federalist Papers' has been one of the most successful undertakings of our translation program."

SPANISH EDITION—THE FEDERALIST PAPERS

The publication of "The Federalist Papers" enjoyed immediate acceptance by the Argentine press. Its appearance at the time immediately preceding the meeting of the Argentine Constitutional Delegates contributed to its rapid sale. The agency's support contributed to the lowering of the retail price and thereby made the book a popular edition. Ninety-five percent of the 10,000-copy edition has been sold and a large second edition is under consideration by the publisher.

The following review of the Spanish edition of "The Federalist Papers" appeared in a leading Buenos Aires newspaper El Pueblo: "'The Federalist Papers' is the name under which political science has gathered the series of 83 newspaper articles which were the first commentary on the Constitution of the United States, edited by two Philadelphia Convention delegates—Hamilton and Madison— and by an intimate collaborator—Jay—of the great men whom, with filial respect, the Americans have named "Founding Fathers." Apart from the juridical interest—which for us has particular importance since 'The Federalist Papers' was basic reading for the original Argentine Constitutional Delegates—this work occupies an outstanding place in the history of political ideas, equivalent without a doubt to that of 'Spirit of the Laws' (Montesquieu) or to the 'Treatise of Civil Government' (Locke). As an absolute archetype, 'The Federalist Papers' is expressive of that which we might call the liberal thought of rights. The present edition does not consist of an integral reproduction of all the articles. It is, rather, a selection that constitutes the essentials of the work, systematized, on the other hand, in a clear manner which makes it more accessible to the nonspecialized reader. With the last Spanish language version out of print, it is worth while to call attention to the edition under review, which fills an appreciable void at a moment when the reform of the Argentine Constitution is under debate."

La Epocha: "These 'Federalist Papers' should be read by those who will go to the 'Reforming' Constitutional Convention in Santa Fe and by all those interested in constitutional problems—in sum ('The Federalist Papers') is an enlightening book especially since its spirit continues to be current in all the federal republican forms of government—such as ours."

Critica: "Thus it ('The Federalist Papers') constitutes a body of homogenous doctrine, a lucid exposition of motives, a living document from the past. This text acquires great actuality during these momentous and historic moments which we are now living in and the Constitutional Delegates would do well to read this book, as was done by the leaders of 1789."

El Laborista: "As much in our country as in many others of this hemisphere the wise pronouncements of 'Publius' are inscribed as in bronze in the spirit of these fundamental laws which preceded not only the progress and the security, but the liberty and justice of the New World. Its ('The Federalist Papers') reading is useful and obligatory for all those citizens interested in the future of Argentina."

SPANISH EDITION—"LINCOLN, THE PRAIRIE YEARS AND THE WAR YEARS," SANDBURG

This is a great book by a great poet about a great man. It is the fruit of 40 years of patient labor that the renowned American poet dedicated to the study of the personality of the exemplary President—Abraham Lincoln, the authentic champion of popular democracy, without a doubt merited this homage. The biography is as vast as his immense figure demands. But this book by Sandburg is like a hymn to his greatness, like the solemn consecration of his glory. (Review from Clarin, Jan. 19, 1958, Buenos Aires.)

BURMESE EDITION—"ABRAHAM LINCOLN," DAUGHERTY

Three editions of "Abraham Lincoln" by James Daugherty, totaling 20,000 copies, have been published in Burmese. The book was extremely popular with the Burmese reading public and may be considered as one of the alltime bestsellers in that country.

ITALIAN EDITION—"DEMOCRACY IN AMERICA," DE TOCQUEVILLE

Published in the fall of 1957 in a 12,000 copy Italian language edition, "Democracy in America," by De Tocqueville, had sold approximately 90 percent of its stock by January 1, 1959.

ENGLISH EDITION

Among the English paperback editions Lord Charnwood's "Abraham Lincoln" is one of the most popular items. It has sold approximately 45,000 copies.

HISTORY OF THE PROGRAM

Members of the House who were also present in the 84th and 85th Congresses will recall that on a number of previous occasions the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN] and I have urged that it would be desirable that the U.S. Information Agency should, among its many and divers activities, include a program tending to promote the publication in very inexpensive form, both in English and in translation, into the principal languages of the world, of the historic basic books of democratic political thought. They have developed in free debate in the common international spiritual heritage of Western civilization. I call these books the classics of democracy.

When the classics of democracy program was first proposed, three basic objections were raised. First, it was said that over the years these basic classics had undoubtedly already become available in all countries. However, researches confirmed by the Library of Congress showed that this was in fact not the case, either through the years or currently; for instance, in 1954, The Federalist Papers, the great fundamental exposition of the rationale of a Federal republic and of the United States Constitution, by James Madison, Alexander Hamilton and John Jay, was not in print in any language other than English.

Further, in the 167 years which had then passed, since the publication of The Federalist Papers no edition had been published in any of the languages of Asia and there had been complete editions in only three of the languages of the Western civilization. The case with the other international classics of democracy is generally similar to that of The Federalist Papers.

By contrast, as a result of the vigorous execution of the classics of democracy plan by the U.S. Information Agency, The Federalist Papers are now in the hands of readers in more languages than ever before—in all continents, and plans are maturing for the publication of this

work, which next to the Constitution itself is perhaps America's greatest intellectual achievement, in whole or in part in all of the principal languages of all parts of the world.

At last and for the first time, everyone everywhere will be able to read in his own tongue the fundamental thought of America, not on our current problems, but on the basic problems of a free government, of which the generation who wrote the Constitution intended America to be an example to all mankind.

A second objection to the Classics of Democracy plan was that the American people would not understand or support such an intellectual approach to the problem of getting the peoples of the free world to think and act democratically. In order to test the validity of this objection. Congressman FEIGHAN and I, working together on the project, through all the stages of planning, undertook a poll of leaders of American opinion in all parts of the country and in all branches of American life. This poll included officers of all national labor unions, and all directors of the National Association of Manufacturers; a broad panel of clergy of all faiths; veterans' and patriotic organizations, educators and professors of political science—in each of these fields the list of those polled was either inclusive or was selected for us by experts in the field.

About 3,000 questionnaires were mailed out. The response was very large and overwhelmingly favorable to the Classics for Democracy plan. This entire correspondence was introduced into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 18, 19, 20, and 21, 1956. The basic statement of the plan as formulated for this poll was made in a circular letter of December 12, 1955, which I include as part of this statement. The letter follows:

FULL TEXT OF QUESTIONNAIRE

DECEMBER 12, 1955.

In the next session of Congress a group of Members plan to push for enabling legislation directing the U.S. Information Agency to publish for nominal prices, in the principal languages of the world, a small library of basic statements of democratic political philosophy.

Before stating the proposal in final form, however, we wish to consult the experience and judgment of experts, and leaders and representatives of American opinion.

If you would give us your opinion of the plan as stated in enclosure, part 1, and of the list of books in enclosure, part 2, it would be a much appreciated help. This list is suggestive and illustrative only, and we will welcome any recommendations of yours—additions, omissions, substitutions—of books which you think better meet the purpose of the plan.

Our objective is a list of from 15 to 20 books which, in the majority judgment of this jury of American public opinion, are basic classics of American democracy. The list so selected will be presented for the action of Congress.

We hope you will give prompt and careful thought to this proposal, and we will give attentive consideration to your reply.

Cordially and sincerely,

BARRATT O'HARA,
Member of Congress.

ENCLOSURE, PART 1—PLAN FOR PUBLICATION OF DEMOCRATIC CLASSICS

It is proposed that the U.S. Information Agency shall translate and publish in the principal languages of the world a select list of the time-tested classical statements of democratic theory in their original forms. These books should be published in large quantities at nominal, subsidized cost, not more than a few cents a volume, and should be widely available in each country, not alone from U.S. agencies. Existing editions should also be widely sold abroad in quantity and at cheap prices.

These works should represent the broad historic and international character of the discussion and theory of democratic society and constitutional government, distinct from present domestic or international controversies. Advocacy of fundamental democratic ideas and methods is different from discussion of exclusive or short-run U.S. interests in current problems.

This program would be in addition to the present program and plans of the U.S. Information Agency, which do not include a similar operation.

The principle of this plan has been approved by the President's U.S. Advisory Commission on Information and by the Commissions Committee on Books Abroad.

America is known abroad mainly for autos and tractors, for riches and technology, but the specifically American political philosophy and the fundamental ideas of political and social democracy, are not widely known in most countries. Therefore, much in the practice of the United States and other constitutional democracies is misunderstood, and democratic methods are not effectively applied to the problems of the various countries, or to international problems.

The Communists owe part of their success to massive, heavily subsidized publication in many languages of the classics of Communist social, economic, and political theory—the works of Marx, Engels, Lenin, Stalin, and Mao—in addition to a large general and current publishing program.

All available reports indicate that American books of any kind are scarce and expensive in most countries, and democratic political philosophy almost unavailable.

In most of the few cases in which books like those on the attached list (enclosure, pt. 2) have been translated, it has often been in connection with the historic movements for constitutional democracy in the various countries.

There is abundant evidence from various international intellectual agencies that there is in many countries an effective demand for books of this type which is not being met, as this proposal would attempt to do.

This proposal has been advanced by a group of Chicagoans, including the Reverend Harold Fey, executive editor of the Christian Century; Dr. Richard McKeon, professor of philosophy at the University of Chicago and a former member of the U.S. National Commission for UNESCO; Dr. Jerome Kerwin, professor of political science and chairman of the Walgreen Foundation for the Study of American Institutions at the University of Chicago; John McGinness, president of Pennsylvania Railroad Lodge, No. 225, of the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen. The Chicago Daily News has taken an active and sympathetic interest in the plan and its editorial article of June 6, 1955, was reprinted in numerous papers. Preliminary discussions by Congressman FEIGHAN, of Ohio, and myself, on the floor of the House of Representatives evoked much interest and support.

ENCLOSURE, PART 2—SUGGESTED AUTHORS AND WORKS

Bryce: "The American Commonwealth," "Modern Democracies."

Burke: "Reflections on the Revolution in France."

Dewey: "The Public and Its Problems."

Emerson: "Moral and Political Essays" (which?).

Hamilton and Madison: "The Federalist Papers."

Hand: "The Spirit of Liberty."

Von Humboldt: "The Sphere and Duties of Government."

Jefferson: "Selected Writings" (which?).

Kant: "Perpetual Peace."

Lincoln: "Selected Papers" (which?).

Locke: "Letters on Toleration," "On Civil Government, Book II."

Mazzini: "The Duties of Man."

Mill: "On Liberty," "Representative Government."

Rousseau: "The Social Contract."

Thoreau: "Walden," "Civil Disobedience."

De Tocqueville: "Democracy in America."

Wilson: "The New Freedom."

PRESS GIVES ENTHUSIASTIC SUPPORT

As a result of this very broad and powerful expression of the judgment of representative leaders of American opinion, in support of this plan, in December of 1955 and January of 1956, to which I have referred, and of the deliberations of the President's National Advisory Commission on Information, the essentials of the Classics of Democracy publishing plan were included in the policy and plans of the Information Agency: Congressman FEIGHAN and I were informed of this in a letter dated January 27, 1956, from Theodore C. Streibert, then the director of the Agency.

There has continued to be a broad and vigorous recognition and support for the classics plan from the American public, and the Agency as well as the Chicago committee have asked me to thank those responsible for it. I refer in particular to an article in the New York Sunday Times of September 22, 1957, by Dan Adams Schmidt; an editorial in Labor, the national weekly newspaper of the standard railroad unions, dated October 5, 1957; an editorial of the Christian Century—Protestant—dated May 8, 1957; an editorial of Commonweal—Catholic—dated October 4, 1959; an editorial of America—Catholic—dated September–October 1957; an article in Family weekly newspaper magazine, dated April 21, 1957; an article and editorial in the Chicago Daily News, dated October 8, 1957 and October 14, 1957, respectively. The full text of these articles I shall give hereafter in my remarks.

CREDIT TO ALLEN AND STAFF

The third objection was that there would not be a receptive public in other countries for these books. The report by the U.S. Information Agency which is the occasion for this statement and which I am submitting to the House is an abundant and final refutation of this contention. The Information Agency, acting with increased enthusiasm for this plan under the experienced guidance of Mr. Allen, who has a distinguished record as one of America's best diplomats, has taken this project beyond the state of experiment. I venture to predict that as this program is carried forward its growing success will contribute to the intellectual prestige of the United States, to understanding and respect for America, and to the ability of the peoples of all the free countries to

attack their own problems with the same intellectual tools and the same success which are the pride and the strength of our own country.

The work of the Agency in carrying out this plan has gone forward as fast as circumstances would permit. I had hoped in this statement to mention by name the able and dedicated officers of the Information Agency who are carrying out this plan but I think that the spirit of this group is better expressed in the following quotation from the Agency's reply to my inquiry on this point than anything I could myself say:

Because of the extensive turnover of USIA personnel in the last couple of years, it is impossible to single out individuals for credit for the initiative and work involved in putting out (these translations). It was, in any event, the result of teamwork and cooperation on the part of the Embassy and USIA personnel, from the local employees all the way up to the Ambassador.

COMMENTS ON PROGRAM PROGRESS

Let me comment on the particular content of the Information Agency's status and progress report which is the occasion for these remarks to the House. The contents of the report can be summarized in the words of a European radio correspondent, writing from the Middle East to an American friend about the success of the program:

The books are selling better than I expected. They are used in courses in both Cairo and the Syrian University. Hurrah.

This brief comment makes two essential points about the results achieved under this program.

First, the public reception of them has been better than many U.S. or foreign experts had believed likely, and in some cases has astonished even the most convinced advocates of the program.

Second, these publications are not serving merely as material for the general reader, or as sources of information about the United States, but are affecting the very thought processes of the countries where they are now available, and are circulating under the sponsorship of the leaders of thought in each country. They are not functioning as U.S. propabanda but are entering into and enriching the culture of the whole world.

PROGRAM'S RECEPTION IN SYRIA

On July 16, 1958, the U.S. consulate at Damascus, even while U.S. troops were stationed in adjoining Lebanon in the last summer, sent us an account of the reception of the great English classic, "On Liberty," by John Stuart Mill. The Mill book is explicity a study of problems of personal and political liberty, and in particular of freedom of thought and debate, which Europeans of Mill's time felt had arisen in the United States; it is one of the most famous books of its kind, and this was the first edition in any Asiatic language or any of those of the great Moslem world.

I am quoting from a letter from Robert A. Lincoln, public affairs officer at that time at Damascus:

"On Liberty" was issued in Syria with some misgivings on the part of the publisher, who was uncertain whether an intellectual title of this nature would have much appeal. The translator, however, played a strong role in convincing him that both sales and reader interest would be high, and this proved to be correct. For example, although it is unusual for the Syrian press to review books, six Damascus newspapers carried reviews of "On Liberty." Excerpts are enclosed; I hope they will be useful to Congressman O'HARA in his report. Syrian University professors and students were among the principal buyers of the book. I know of several professors who purchased copies for presentation to selected members of their classes.

FOUR THOUSAND COPIES OF THE ARABIC TRANSLATION WERE PUBLISHED

The price of the book was 2½ Syrian pounds or about 56 cents. In terms of Syrian purchasing power, that will buy three packs of a good grade local cigarette or one locally manufactured undershirt. It is a moderate price for a locally printed book. The publisher, incidentally, felt that a lower price would cheapen the title in the eyes of prospective readers.

American paperback distributors have made quite an effort to place their product in the Syrian market. Limited knowledge of English, of course, prohibits the kind of sale which might occur in a country such as India. However, paperbacks are available in four well-known Damascus bookstores and in stores in larger cities in the Syrian region.

Quotations from Syrian press reviews of "On Liberty" follow:

"On Liberty" is an honest explanation of liberty in its widest sense * * * it has served millions of people struggling for their freedom. * * * (We) thank Papyrus House for presenting such a valuable book to the Arab library and the Arab peoples. (Al Manar, Damascus daily.)

Although the essay was written in the 19th century, it discusses the problems of the hour. * * * (We urge) educated young men to read carefully the contents of this valuable book (for) we need minds which will weigh and balance new ideas. Al Jamhur, Damascus daily.)

"On Liberty" is still new in subject and analysis. * * * I am convinced there can be no final solutions (to the problem of individual liberty versus authority) * * * (but) this book contains valuable ideas and discussions. It is worth lengthy study, especially because we are in the early stages of independence. (Al-Alam, Damascus daily.) (This review was only half favorable—but the fact that it called attention to the book is a net plus.)

This immortal book * * * emphasizes individual liberty as an element of well-being and an essential in building the life (which) everyone wishes. * * * We encourage every Arab intellectual to read such a fascinating work. (Al-Raquib, Damascus weekly.)

The book is not a political discussion, but a discussion of the rights of the individual. * * * We wish Papyrus House success in its service to culture and education. (Al-Insha, Damascus daily.)

A sound, calm discussion, strong in its meanings and ideas. (Sawt al-Arab, Damascus daily.)

This is the more striking in a country such as Syria, with a small population and comparatively low literacy.

SOME OF THE ACHIEVEMENTS

The report of USIA I have included in its entirety with this statement in order that my colleagues easily can grasp the wide range of achievements of the classics plan, but let me cite a few examples. There are many publications listed, the larger part of them first editions or replacements of editions long outdated. It has not been possible in every case to achieve the very low prices for which we had hoped, or prices as low as those of Communist books of comparable kind. But notice 18,000 copies of the works of Jefferson in the main languages of India for about 30 cents a copy; 75,000 copies of Lord Charnwood's "Great Life of Lincoln" sold in English in India for a dime; 25,000 of Locke's "Second Treatise on Government," the source of much of the thought and language of our own Declaration of Independence, also a dime each; 150,000 copies of Tom Paine in various Asiatic languages, also a dime. This is the kind of volume and price at which I think the program should aim generally. It may further interest the House to know that when in our poll of American opinion in 1955 we asked for suggestions of other additional titles, Tom Paine was a very popular write-in. Note again 25,000 copies of the great work of the Frenchman, Alexis de Tocqueville, "Democracy in America," in the Hindi language, for 16 cents each. Truly, this is an amazing achievement of USIA.

FEDERALIST IN GERMAN

There are two editions of special interest. They are translations of the "Federalist Papers," which have met with an unusual success. Incredible as it may seem, this great work had never been translated into German, although Germany has always been a federal state, and again became so under our military government. At the time of the democratic revolutions in 1848, there had been a fugitive publication of extracts, but this has long been a rare and obscure book. Now, for the first time, the entire work is available in German. As to the quality and importance of the edition, let me quote a distinguished bilingual scholar:

JANUARY 14, 1959.

I am much obliged to you for having given me an opportunity to look over the German edition of the "Federalist." The publication of that German version fills a demand of long standing. Lawyers as well as scholars of political science and people engaged in political activities have long been interested in Germany in the problems of federalism. The successive German constitutions since that of the North German Federation of 1866 have been considerably influenced by the American model. It appears, however, that the basic American work on the "Structure and the Problems of Federalism" has hardly been known in Germany. The book will be of interest also in the two other German-speaking countries, i.e., Austria and Switzerland, which are also organized on the federal pattern, and where the American model has also played a considerable role. The German translation seems to me to be very well done. It appears to be correct, at least as far as my survey would reveal, and it has even succeeded in conveying to the reader some of the flavor of the original English of the late 18th century. The introduction by Professor Ermacora neatly determines the historical place and role of the American classic, lucidly analyzes its main contents, and tells readers of the German-speaking countries why the book is of importance for them at the present time. The format of the book is attractive. I trust that it will find a wide circulation in Germany, Austria, and Switzerland.

Sincerely yours,

MAX RHEINSTEIN,
Professor of Comparative Law; Director, Comparative Law Research Center, University of Chicago.

The reception of the book in the whole German-speaking heart of Europe is amazing; an important businessman procured a large number of copies to be sent with his personal recommendations to his friends in the universities, the press, and public life; the Wall Street Journal of central Europe, so to speak, the Neue Zuricher Zeitung, devoted a third of its front page to a roundup of recent political philosophy of democratic tendencies, on the occasion of the publication of the book. Several professors in various universities have at once put this into their classrooms in Tuebingen, Heidelberg, Freiburg, with such comments as the following:

[Translation]

TUEBINGEN, *November 20, 1958.*

Mr. CHARLES D. CHAMBERLIN,
American Consulate General, Stuttgart.

DEAR MR. CHAMBERLIN: Thank you very much for your kind letter of November 12 and the transmittal of the "Foederalist". I can hardly tell you how pleased I am that the "Foederalist" has been published in the German language. It is one of the most sublime political works that I know of. For a couple of years I have repeatedly tried to induce German publishers to publish a translation, but to my regret without any success so far. The greater is my pleasure that finally such a translation is available. I thank you for your kindness in sending me a copy and I am with my earnest compliments.

Sincerely yours,
Prof. Dr. THEODOR ESCHENBURG.

FREIBURG, *November 30, 1958.*

Mr. CHARLES D. CHAMBERLIN,
Public Affairs Officer,
American Consulate General, Stuttgart.

DEAR MR. CHAMBERLIN: Please accept my warmest thanks for the kind transmittal of the "Foederalist" (Federalist papers). The essays combined herein, which I had not known yet, are not only very attractive as a historical document (but) they also possess a more than historical and lasting value, because men of special standards and judgment, who at the same time stood on the high spiritual level of enlightenment, had to solve problems of permanent importance practically in an effective and responsible way.

After all this I am glad to add your present to my library and I beg to transmit my best thanks to your Embassy and Prof. Max Rheinstein.

With best compliments.

Sincerely yours,
Prof. FRITZ VON HIPPEL.

Quoting from a letter dated December 19, 1958, from Michael Barjansky, chief, Information Center Branch, American Embassy at Vienna:

First, I am enclosing a copy of our recent report to the Agency; second, you will find a review dated December 10 from the Linzer Volksblatt, a Catholic (People's Party) daily newspaper with a circulation of 38,000; third, I am adding a general comment on the importance of "The Federalist" which appeared in the Neue Zuercher Zeitung, a very prominent Swiss newspaper mostly devoted to matters of commerce and finance. (You understand, of course, that while the translation was made in Austria, the distribution of "The Federalist" is being carried out systematically throughout the German speaking world, including Switzerland.)

We don't expect any important reviews before January, at which time, we are told, the Austrian radio and the important Catholic weekly Die Furche as well as the Trade Union Journal OeGB Bildungsfunktionaer will devote considerable space to "The Federalist."

You may be interested to know that the school of Journalism of Vienna University bought the German language "Federalist" to be used in conjunction with a lecture series on early American journalism. Finally, USIS Ankara has ordered five copies for presentation to the appropriate schools of the Turkish universities.

OTHER REPORTS FROM GERMANY

The president of the constitutional court and administrative court of appeals of the state of North Rhein-Westphalia says:

I hope the "Federalist" will do much good in Germany, and I shall do my best to publicize it.

The president of the Union for the Advancement of European Federation wrote, in requesting a review copy for the bulletin of the union:

That up to now, although they had often referred their readers to the "Federalist," they always had to refer them to the French of English edition.

There have been strongly favorable reviews in many papers; for instance, the principal newspaper of the Austrian trade unions, the Gewerkschaftliche Rundschau, for December 1958, recommended it to the attention of every union member in Austria.

I should mention that the USIA has also produced in German the Carl Sandburg "Life of Lincoln," which has had an equal success in circles of intellectual leadership, and perhaps even more of a popular one.

FEDERALIST IN ITALIAN

One story, however, remains to be told: that of the "Federalist" in Italy. It is of especial interest, although it does not directly result from the classics program, as Congressman FEIGHAN and I proposed it to Congress; it does exactly the same thing in principle, and has had a brilliant success, which further confirms the belief on which our advocacy of the program was based.

The first Italian edition of the "Federalist" was published in the fall of 1956, before this program had been adopted by the Information Agency. While USIA was instrumental in carrying out this specific publication, the initiative in this case did not come from Washington, but from the U.S. Ambassador in Rome, the Honorable James David Zellerbach, and it is my understanding that much of the cost of the edition came from his private purse. Now, surely, this is a function of an Ambassador beyond the call of duty, and beyond praise; I trust that this princely action is sufficiently rewarded by the great success of the book.

Ambassador Zellerbach formed a group of eminent Italians, some scholars, some men active in affairs, such as Signor Olivetti, of the business machine company. This group is proceeding, on the basis of the success of their "Federalist," to produce a series of similar works, such as Corwin's great commentary on the Constitution. The very high intellectual standard of this undertaking may be seen from the fact that Professor Ambrosini, who wrote the learned introduction, was appointed to the Italian Supreme Court at about the time the book came out; this is not the kind of publicity a press agent can rig. The sales and reviews of the book have been extraordinary. It was a bestseller for some months. The University of Rome held an international symposium on American constitutional theory on this occasion. Some of the reviews from leading Italian papers I have in my files and on request would be happy to loan them to my colleagues familiar with the Italian language.

In these remarks I have gone beyond the contents of Mr. Allen's report attached to his letter of March 6, and have supplemented it with researches by my staff and the Library of Congress. But the net effect of all this material should be to remove from all minds the belief that readers overseas do not welcome the classics of democracy.

GRASSROOTS BIRTH OF PROGRAM

The way in which the classics of democracy program came into being is worthy of note, not only a part of the record concerning it itself, but as an example of how the action of Congress and of Government agencies may be guided and stimulated by the intelligence and energy of private citizens.

On April 7, 1954, a constituent wrote me a letter inquiring what in the program of the USIA tended toward the goals which are now embodied in the classics program. His letter follows:

APRIL 7, 1954.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN O'HARA: Your newsletter accounting for your stewardship as our Representative in Congress is welcomed and read regularly and with satisfaction by our entire family. But to perform your duties, heavy as they are, so conscientiously and well, is only to ask for more duty, as you know. However, perhaps even amidst all their other burdens your staff can secure for me the answer to the following inquiry.

Among the problems of the U.S. information program overseas, is the choice of a mass audience, or of attempts to influence the opinion-forming elites of the various countries, and thus to reach the mass audiences more indirectly, but with a longer view. I had myself some experience with this problem in government service overseas.

Among the difficulties of the latter approach, was the fact that the intellectual bases of our democracy were both unknown and unavailable in most countries. I refer to such works as Hamilton and Madison's "Federalist"; Mill's "Liberty" and "Representative Government"; De Tocqueville's "Democracy in America"; Locke's "Civil Government" and "Letters on Toleration." Other works could be named, such as Corwin's "Constitution and What it Means Today." You will doubtless be shocked, as I was once, to learn that the Constitution itself was, as I personally ascertained, at one time not available in the American library in Rome, in English or Italian.

Is it not worth inquiring, which of our political classics, such as those named in particular, are available in the principal languages of the world? To what extent they are available through U.S. programs, either in the local tongues or in English? Where translations do not exist (as for instance I believe the "Federalist" is not in print unabridged in a modern German edition), what steps the U.S. Information Service is taking to make them widely and easily available?

I recall the very extensive circulation in Germany of Soviet communist classics, in very cheap but readable editions, at a time when none of the classics of democracy were

available at all. The same is reported in the press as being true in India.

In some cases there are old editions which could with great advantage be reprinted by our services. For instance there is a French edition of the "Federalist," now excessively rare, translated by Trudaine de la Sabliere, supposedly with the assistance of Jefferson himself, which was an important influence in France's own history (printed at Paris by Buisson, 1792). A "prestige" republication of this work could be quite an event in France.

Would it be possible to inquire of the responsible executive agencies what is the case on the points enumerated in the fourth paragraph above?

Yours truly,

THOMAS B. STAUFFER.

Mr. Stauffer, who resides at 5021 Dorchester Avenue in Chicago, is now a member of the faculty of Chicago City Junior College but was formerly an officer of the Army and of the Department of State, serving overseas in both capacities. The present status of the classics of democracy plan is attributed in large measure to the continued efforts and drive of Mr. Stauffer. He felt that the comments of the Information Agency on his inquiry did not deal adequately with the points he had raised, and organized a committee of persons with distinguished qualifications for judging activities in this field. This committee consisted of Dr. Richard P. McKeon, distinguished service professor of philosophy and classical languages at the University of Chicago, a former member of the U.S. delegation to UNESCO, and a president of the Internation Federation of Academies of Philosophy; the Reverend Dr. Harold E. Fey, then managing editor, now editor of the Christian Century; John W. McGinness, president of Pennsylvania Railroad Local 225 of the Brotherhood of Railway Trainmen; Prof. Jerome G. Kerwin, of the political science department, University of Chicago, chairman of the Charles R. Walgreen Foundation for the Study of American Institutions and a most eminent and active Roman Catholic layman; and Dr. Emery T. Filbey, vice president emeritus of the University of Chicago.

I am proud to be able to say that all of these men except Mr. McGinness are residents of the Second Congressional District of Illinois which it is my privilege to represent in this House, and I think it may be of interest to remark that Dr. McKeon was a former teacher of Mr. Stauffer, and that Mr. McGinness was a student of Mr. Stauffer's. It is this committee which formulated and documented the proposals which Congressman FEIGHAN joined with me in presenting to the Congress, and which are now part of the policy of the Information Agency, and on whose success I am now reporting.

VALUABLE RESEARCH BY VOLUNTEERS

This committee has had assistance from a number of persons and the committee has asked me to give public expression of its thanks and appreciation for this help. In particular, two young men, undergraduates at the time, did indispensable research on the problem with which the committee was concerned and had an important part both in formulating the outlines and in rendering precise the detail of the committee's proposals.

Leland G. Stauber, then an undergraduate of the University of Chicago and now a graduate student in political science and government at Harvard University, made the basic research as to whether the classics were in fact available in the languages of the world and had a great part in the conception and execution of the committee's correspondence in the first years of its work.

Walter T. Schoch, then an undergraduate at the University of Illinois, and now in the sales department of the Signode Steel Strapping Co., had a hand in all the deliberations of the committee up to the present; in particular in the fall of 1955 he discussed the outlines of the classics plan with a large number of students from other countries at the University of Illinois, many of whom were educators or professional leaders in their own countries. The result was a most useful report covering the thought of the members of this group on the reception of the classics to be expected in the various countries from which they came. I gave this report in January of 1956 to the President's National Advisory Commission on Information.

Warren A. Deutsch of Chicago, brought to the attention of the committee the publications of UNESCO to which I have referred elsewhere.

Lawrence and Jean O'Connor, of Chicago, have the peculiar distinction of having given the committee, in addition to sincere and enthusiastic encouragement, the only material assistance it has received. Mr. O'Connor, an eminent attorney, put the facilities of his office at the disposal of the committee, to reproduce their basic presentation of the classics plan for wide circulation.

VOICE OF THE PRESS RAISED

The committee having begun its work, the first public voice raised in behalf of the program was that of the Christian Century, in an editorial of June 2, 1954, which I introduced into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at that time.

Very shortly, however, the Chicago Daily News, joined its powerful voice to those who were urging that this whole matter be examined and the classics plan be undertaken, if formulated along sound lines. A. T. Burch, the associate editor, and Van Allen Bradley, the literary editor, have taken a continuing and very personal interest in the classics plan and have repeatedly put the resources of the News at the disposal of its advancement. It has been a source of great satisfaction to me personally to work closely with my friends on the Daily News staff in this matter and I want to add my own thanks to those which Mr. Stauffer and the committee have asked me to express for them.

How completely the Soviet was in command of the situation in this vital area, and how lamentably we were lagging, could not have been adequately brought to the attention of the Congress and of the American people except for the reports from the foreign correspondents of the Chicago Daily News stationed throughout the world. These reports were carried at great length in the Chicago Daily News and the many newspapers that it services.

For the first time they gave to the American public the full documented picture of American books, expensively bound, ornamenting shelves in libraries far from the great mass of the people and which relatively few ever visited. The spot reports of the foreign correspondents of the Chicago Daily News showed that nowhere at grassroots were inexpensive and translated editions of the literature of democracy available to counteract the flood of communistic literature. They constituted journalism in its highest and most constructively patriotic expression. In my judgment, the service rendered in this respect by the Chicago Daily News deserves recognition as one of the outstanding journalistic contributions in the field of international relationships in the troubled times in which we live. Now that our country is making the rapid strides forward shown in this report, too much credit cannot be given the Chicago Daily News for its pioneering contribution.

Nor can too much credit be accorded to the eminent members of the American Book Publishers Council, who at personal sacrifice render an outstanding service to their country, and to the American publishers as a whole. Without exception, in the effort to get widely distributed the classics of our democracy, they have put patriotism above profit and country before individual advantage. The program could not have succeeded without their full and unselfish cooperation.

INTERNATIONAL DEMOCRATIC PHILOSOPHY

Mr. Speaker, I have dealt at some length with the circumstances of the origin and development of the classics of democracy program to stress its grassroots nature. I doubt if ever there has been a Federal undertaking that has enjoyed so large a measure of spontaneous popular acclaim. The answer, I would say, is that it appeals to the common sense of our people. There will be some differences of opinion as to which books should be included, and which should be excluded, if we were to select, let us say, any 20 books constituting our bible of democracy. But on some there is a universal argument and thus far in the progress of the program there has been pretty largely an adherence to those works, such as the Federalist Papers, on which there is no disagreement.

The "Classics of Democracy" are in fact a sort of Bible for the politics of our civilization. Sharing a common inspiration, they come from various countries, various ages; all have stood the test of time, all have been sources to which men of democratic faith have turned for spiritual and intellectual armaments in previous critical battles of mankind against tyranny. The list of classics which has been included in this project, therefore, has been selected to typify this permanent and international character of democratic philosophy. Many countries are represented, and all of the authors listed are out of the way of present controversy and the tactics of present international quarrels.

The classics are intended to typify the moral message of the Western civilization, of which America is heir and part, which I like to think would be important to the world even if all the problems of communism and of Soviet imperialism had been solved or had never arisen. And yet I think too that in these books the most fundamental secular demonstrations of why the ideas and practices of communism are wrong are still to be found, and that as they become more widely available to all men, communism will be less likely to prevail.

In presenting this progress report to the House jointly for the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN] and myself it is with the acknowledgment that we were but humble workers in the vineyard whose contribution to a good work was small indeed compared to that of so many others, both in and out of the Congress, and certainly including the able, astute and dynamic gentleman from New York, the Honorable JOHN ROONEY, chairman of the subcommittee of the Appropriation Committee who annually does an outstanding job in pinpointing the virtues and as he views them the possible weaknesses or imprudent undertakings in the vast and vitally important worldwide range of the activities of the U.S. Information Agency. From the first, Congressman ROONEY has been a dedicated friend of the classics of democracy program.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I am very happy to yield to my very good friend from Wisconsin, and to tell him that during the Easter recess I read with interest and profit his splendid speech in Milwaukee on our foreign policy.

Mr. REUSS. May I commend the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA] on his magnificent contribution to our democracy in sponsoring this program to get the ideas and the ideals of democracy throughout the world. As the gentleman from Illinois knows, the most striking difference, I think, between our free world and the other side is not so much in military power—both sides have that—not so much in economic power—both sides have that—but from our side in the notion of human freedom and in the idea that man may work to perfect himself by the device of democracy.

To the extent that we can get these ideas ranging around the world, to the extent that we can make the Spirit of 1776 really live, we will have done, it seems to me, a wonderful thing for the furtherance of our foreign policy.

The gentleman certainly deserves all our heartfelt thanks for what he has done.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin so much for his contribution. I might add that much of what the gentleman is now saying he projected in his really remarkable speech recently in Milwaukee.

Mr. ALFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. ALFORD. I, too, wish to join the gentleman from Wisconsin in his commendation of the Classics of Democracy. In a small way I have been a student of American history. I certainly wish to commend the gentleman on his efforts. We are deeply engaged in psychological warfare throughout the world. I can conceive of no better way of educating the peoples of the world in the democracy that he represents than through the method he has presented today.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I am deeply indebted to the gentleman for his contribution.

I might observe that there are matters in our American democracy on which there are differences of opinion, but I found in reading the responses to our questionnaire that there was no division of opinion among the American people sectionally or by groups as to the inspirational value of our Classics of Democracy.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. WOLF. I, too, commend the gentleman from Illinois on his presentation. I had the experience in 1957 of making a trip to Russia and seeing what they had been able to do there in connection with textbooks on their theories and ideologies. I think they have done a better job sometimes than we have. I think it is a wonderful thing the gentleman has done, and I am glad to be here to hear his report.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I thank the gentleman. I know that my good friend from Iowa would be interested in knowing that one of the encouraging reports we are getting is that our program has been so successful that the Russians are changing their technique and are now copying our technique.

AS SEEN BY DANA ADAMS SCHMIDT

I am including in my remarks an article by the eminent journalist, Dana Adams Schmidt, in the New York Times of September 22, 1957, as follows:

CLASSICS OF UNITED STATES BIG HIT IN INDIA

(By Dana Adams Schmidt)

WASHINGTON, September 21.—Probably more people are reading the Classics of American Democracy in India today than in the United States.

This is the report of American publishers who, with the help of the U.S. Information Agency, have been conducting a successful campaign to sell the basic texts of democracy in cheap paperback editions in competition with the basic texts of communism.

Fortified by the success of their pilot project in India the publishers are branching out, into the vast area from the west coast of Africa to Japan, which appears to be a special target for Communist penetration.

And local publishers, again with help from the U.S. Information Agency, are beginning the task of translating the classics of democracy into scores of languages.

In June of last year, when the first of the Classics of Democracy appeared in English in Indian bookstores, the Soviet Union appeared already to have saturated the market with cheap and even give-away editions of Lenin, Stalin, Marx, Engels and the like.

Commercially it was a shot in the dark. No one knew how the Indian book market would react.

EIGHT BOOKS OUT FIRST

The experiment started with editions of 10,000 each of eight books, all selling for the equivalent of 10 or 15 cents each. They were:

Selected Writings on Nature and Liberty: Henry D. Thoreau by Oscar Cargill.

Benjamin Franklin: The Autobiography and Selections from his Other Writings by Herbert W. Schneider.

Hamilton, Madison, and Jay on the Constitution: Selections from the Federalist Papers by Ralph H. Gabriel.

John C. Calhoun: A Disquisition on Government by C. Gordon Post.

The Political Writings of John Adams: Representative Selections by George A. Peek, Jr.

From the Declaration of Independence to the Constitution; the Roots of American Constitutionalism by Carl J. Friedrich, Robert G. McCloskey.

The Political Writings of Thomas Jefferson: Representative Selections by Edward Dumbauld.

Thomas Paine: Common Sense and Other Political Writings by Nelson F. Adkins.

SOLD 4,000 IN 9 WEEKS

Nine weeks after they had been placed on the market the initial edition of Thoreau, Franklin's autobiography and the Roots of American Constitutionalism had sold 4,000 copies each. Adams, Hamilton and Jefferson were not far behind.

At the end of a year, sales ranged from 4,200 to 8,500. Meanwhile, the publishers had added Abraham Lincoln by Lord Charnwood and selections from Emerson by Lindeman.

These two were in editions of 25,000. In less than 6 months Lincoln was sold out and plans were afoot for another edition of 25,000. Emerson in the same period sold 10,000 copies.

Indian critics, meanwhile, set up a clamor for some of the basic texts of democracy that originated in England, and 3 months ago the publishers obliged with 10,000 copies each of three works:

Political Writings by David Hume; Second Treatise of Government by John Locke, and On Liberty by John Stuart Mill.

NO DUDS DISCOVERED

Forum books, a subsidiary of Liberal Arts Press, which brought out these editions, and the USIA, watched the circulation of these titles for duds. But they found none. Expansion to other lands seemed advisable.

Now 20,000 copies of each of the basic 13 books have been distributed to other countries of Asia and Africa in proportion to their estimated English reading audience. Thus Japan is getting 5,000 each, some African countries only 500.

First reports from Japan are enthusiastic. Twenty percent of the available books were sold in the first 6 weeks.

The next step in combatting the Soviet avalanche of cheap and basic political tomes will be to publish these and other classics of democracy in paperback translation. For the Soviet Union operates mainly in translations.

During the first 6 months of 1957, Soviet book publishing activities in translation expanded greatly. The largest percentage increases, according to U.S. Government analysts, were in languages of the Middle East and south Asia.

Thus in the first 6 months of this year the Soviet Union published three titles in 61,000 copies in Arabic; five titles in 69,100 copies in Bengali; five titles in 59,000 copies in Hindi; and six titles in 55,000 copies in Urdu. The total of books in these languages was 130 percent greater than the number published during all of 1956, and the trend is accelerating.

The total translation program for the year ended in June 1957 consisted of 709 titles

translated into 46 languages with 5,500,000 copies.

But the Soviet Union published 15,631,700 copies of 372 titles during the half year from January to June in 1957.

The success of the American project was a triumph especially for a group of Chicago citizens and two Democratic Representatives BARRATT O'HARA, of Chicago, and MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN, of Cleveland, who helped put their plea across in Washington.

EDITORIAL FROM LABOR

This is the lead editorial in the October 5, 1957, edition of Labor:

SPREADING THE CLASSICS OF U.S. DEMOCRACY

Congratulations to Congressman BARRATT O'HARA, Democrat, Illinois. He has scored a great victory for democracy and against communism, without firing a shot or spending a lot of public money. The best way to describe his victory is to begin with a news story in the New York Times. In part, it says:

"More people are reading the Classics of American Democracy in India today than in the United States. That is the report of the American publishers who, with help from the U.S. Information Agency, have been conducting a successful campaign to sell the basic texts of democracy in cheap paperback editions, in competition with the basic texts of communism. Fortified by their success in India, the publishers are branching out into the vast area from the west coast of Africa to Japan, which appears to be a special target for Communist penetration."

The Classics of American Democracy, which are being sold abroad by a private publisher, with the help of U.S. Government agencies, are listed as works of such men as Thomas Jefferson, James Madison, Benjamin Franklin, Alexander Hamilton, John C. Calhoun, Thomas Paine, and other great forefathers who helped write the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution, and books and pamphlets which inspired and defended the American Revolution.

As Labor reported several times, this plan to put cheap editions of these classics into the hands and minds of millions of people of other countries was originated and put through Congress by O'HARA, who himself is deeply imbued with American democracy of the most genuine kind. Hats off to O'HARA.

FROM CHRISTIAN CENTURY

This is the editorial that appeared in the Christian Century of May 8, 1957:

WHO WINS THE BATTLE FOR MEN'S MINDS?

While Congress was happily chopping $30 million plus from the funds allocated to the United States Information Agency, books by Communist authors dominated news stands, bookstores, and libraries throughout most of the world. Evidence that democracy may be losing the battle for men's minds is contained in a study of "the world's most translated authors for 1948–55," published in the February 1957 issue of the UNESCO Courier. First in the list stood what? Not the Bible. Not Shakespeare. Not Jefferson, Mill, Tocqueville, Burke, Madison, Locke or any other author of the classics of democracy. First stood the works of Lenin, of which 968 translations were published during that period. Then came the Bible, with 887. Third stood Stalin's writings, with 689. Tenth and eleventh on the list were Marx, with 415 translations, and Engels, with 409. The American writer highest on the list of over 100 whose books had been translated was Jack London, who stood fourteenth. Next Americans to follow were Pearl Buck, Mark Twain, E. S. Gardner, and James Fenimore Cooper. None of the 22 American authors on the list wrote on politics, economics or religion, whereas nearly all the Communist authors wrote on politics and economics, with a strong antireligious bias. How can we expect the world to understand the basis for democracy unless it receives help in obtaining access to such essential interpretations as "The American Commonwealth," "The Federalist Papers," and "Democracy in America"? Communist authors are translated and disseminated by agencies of the Russian Government, which expects to be repaid. It knows how richly it was compensated for flooding the bookstalls of China with Communist writings in the twenties and thirties. We should be expanding the facilities of the USIA instead of slashing them today. To attain that end, we again suggest that this agency undertake a serious program of translation and distribution at competitive prices with Communist publications of the classics of democracy. Why should not Wilson's "The New Freedom" and the state papers of Abraham Lincoln, for example, be made available in the principal languages of India? The Bible, whose translation and wide distribution does not depend upon government subsidies, will not remain high on the list of translations unless it receives in time the support of the literature of freedom.

On October 4, 1957, this editorial appeared in the Christian Century:

TEXTS OF DEMOCRACY

It would seem unlikely that the Classics of American Democracy are being read more widely in India than in the United States, but such, apparently, is the case. Working with the U.S. Information Agency, publishers introduced a series of cheap paperback editions of basic texts in English. Indians were able to buy works of people such as Thoreau, Franklin, Hamilton, Adams, Jefferson, and Paine, as well as selections from the "Federalist Papers" and constitutional documents. They not only bought these but asked for additional texts of English writers.

This project and its evident success should be heartening not only to the publishers, the USIA, and the group of Chicago citizens who initiated the project, but to all who are interested in furthering democratic principles. Democracy is too difficult to be either easy or safe. In the countries where it exists it is always under attack, and always being tested. There is a constant need, which recent years have only emphasized, to return to the fundamental and classic statements. From these statements the democracies continue to draw sustenance.

It is well that the citizens of other countries should be able to read the classic documents of democracy so that the democracies can be judged not only by the accomplishments and failures they display, and the distortions which hostile countries offer, but also by the ideals to which they aspire. We need not underrate the importance of supermarkets to suggest that we have other things to export.

These texts are now in competition in India with the many cheap texts of Marx, Lenin, Engels, and Stalin which the Soviet Union has already distributed. This is the kind of competition that will have long-range consequences. The initial project, already successful, well deserves to be expanded. Additional texts, translations into various languages, and distribution to other countries are all being considered and are extensions which should clearly be encouraged.

FROM THE FAMILY WEEKLY

Mr. Speaker, I am further extending my remarks to include the following article from the Family Weekly of April 21, 1957:

WE'RE EXPORTING AMERICAN IDEALS

(By Jack Ryan)

A Sicilian law student, a future leader of his community, decides to learn for himself about the conflicting ideologies of East and West, both fighting for his loyalty.

He goes to a nearby bookstall and finds that by skipping cigarets today he can afford to buy the Communist teachings of Marx, Engels, and Lenin in paperbound editions in his own language.

What books can he buy to learn about America? Mostly cheap novels about dope addiction, sadism, or unscrupulous business executives.

To read a copy of "The Federalist," a basic explanation of our Constitution, the Sicilian would have to travel hundreds of miles to Rome where he'd find three copies—in English. Lincoln's writings might be even harder to find. We've distributed only 25 copies throughout the world to show why we think our Government is best.

But this failure in providing the world with "the bibles of democracy" is being remedied. The political and social philosophies of Jefferson, Madison, and Franklin—to name a few—are being translated into 25 languages and will be made available in crucial areas of the globe at prices within the reach of the poorest student, teacher, or worker.

The books represent democracy in theory; how they came to be translated and distributed represents democracy in action.

In 1952 a Chicago teacher, Thomas B. Stauffer, returned home after Government service abroad during which he saw many situations like that confronting the Sicilian student. Something, he decided, should be done. In American fashion he wrote his Congressman, BARRATT O'HARA.

O'HARA was immediately interested in Stauffer's suggestion that our information centers not only tell the free world what is wrong with communism, but what is right with democracy. But he pointed out that Congress would need additional facts before it could consider subsidizing a library of American political classics for oversea book markets.

At O'HARA's suggestion, Stauffer's neighbors—such people as ministers, office and factory workers, and college students—pitched in to assemble those facts. They contacted 3,500 leaders in industry, religion, journalism, politics, and other fields for suggestions on exporting our most precious commodity, political ideals.

Without any prompting, many of the 3,500 wrote their own Congressmen about "bibles of democracy," and soon O'HARA was beset by legislators asking, "What is this book idea my constituents are deluging me about? How is it important?"

Thanks to his hard-working group at home, O'HARA had the answer.

We were losing the battle of books—and minds. In Moscow, the Russian Printing Bureau, working on a budget larger than that of our entire information service, was on a 24-hour schedule turning out Communist writings in 40 languages. Foreign students in our own universities told how their lands were flooded with Marx and Lenin while they heard only references to Madison and Hamilton.

"America," said O'HARA, "is known abroad for autos and tractors, for riches and technology, but the specifically American political philosophy and the fundamental ideas of political and social democracy are not widely known in foreign lands."

The big danger in this, historians pointed out, was that whenever a nation adopted democratic government, it did so on the basis of political ideals, not material wealth.

Still there was the question—would people read the "heavy" writings of America's political thinkers? This answer came independently from two U.S. industrialists who helped finance publication of "The Federalist" in Italian. Although relatively expensive, the publication skyrocketed to second place on Italy's best-seller list, was hailed

in speeches and editorials, and excited deep interest in similar American writings.

The U.S. Government, responding to citizen opinion, next tried a test in Asia by distributing a "year's supply" of "The Federalist." In 3 months, all were sold.

The last doubt about the worth of the program was dispelled, and Congress appropriated funds for 20 million books. They will be translated and sold in bookstores which now sell only Communist ideology.

The first of these translations already are in the hands of people who influence opinion in their countries. Should they ever feel the books are merely words, dreams, or ivory-tower theories, they have only to remember how the books came to them—through people like themselves who wrote a lawmaker and moved a government.

PETER LISAGOR'S REPORT

On October 8, 1957, Peter Lisagor, famous journalist and now head of the Washington bureau of the Chicago Daily News, made the following report in the News:

IN AFRICA AND THE MIDEAST U.S. BOOKS TO SOW IDEALS OF FREEDOM

(By Peter Lisagor)

WASHINGTON.—Representative BARRATT O'HARA, Democrat, Illinois, looks forward to the day when the classics of American democracy are published in the native languages of the Arab and African world.

This is no idle dream of the veteran Chicago Congressman. He was largely responsible for a successful pilot project in India, where cheap paperback editions of the basic writings on democracy have sold like tranquilizers on Madison Avenue.

And now O'HARA is preparing for a trip to the Middle East and Africa, as a member of a House foreign affairs subcommittee, to explore at firsthand the potential market for the writings of Thoreau, Benjamin Franklin and Thomas Jefferson.

The idea of cheap editions of American classics as a counter to the basic texts of communism distributed free by Moscow originated with a group of Chicago citizens and was pushed by the Chicago Daily News.

O'HARA, together with MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN, Democrat, Ohio, took hold of the project then and succeeded in getting the U.S. Information Agency enough funds to allow it to help underwrite the plan for American publishers.

The books sold for the equivalent of 10 to 15 cents, and the Indians probably are reading more of them than people in the United States, in O'HARA's judgment.

"The response to the translations has been thrilling," says O'HARA.

"People abroad don't want things they think are just American propaganda. But when they read what inspired our forefathers—and our democracy—I'm sure it will have the same appeal as it did for us."

O'HARA compares the classics on democracy with the Bible.

"The Bible was written by many hands and published in many languages. It emerges as the basis of the Christian philosophy. In the same way, these books give the basis of American democracy."

He believes the United States must intensify its efforts to persuade the people of the Middle East and Africa of the virtues of this democracy.

"Europe is like an overworked New England farm," he says. "The Orient is aborning. So is our hemisphere. Africa is undeveloped but it has the resources and the people, and it is the bridge to the East.

"That makes it of prime importance in the future."

O'HARA hopes ultimately to arrive at about 15 basic works, agreed upon by educators and legislators as well.

Besides the works of Thoreau, Franklin and Jefferson, the books now being sold include selections from the Federalist Papers, John C. Calhoun's disquisition on government, the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution and the works of Thomas Paine.

O'HARA's trip next month will take him to Lebanon, Israel, Egypt, Sudan, Ethiopia, Kenya, Uganda, Ghana, Liberia, French West Africa and north Africa.

In the Chicago Daily News of October 14, 1957, appeared the following editorial:

BOOKS VERSUS REDS

Peter Lisagor of our Washington bureau has reported on the success of the U.S. Information Agency in selling the classics of democracy to readers in India.

This is a program that is familiar to readers of this newspaper, for it was originated in Chicago. It is a joint effort of U.S. publishers and the USIA to sell the basic texts of democracy in inexpensive paperbound editions in competition with the basic texts of communism.

The Daily News led editorially in the effort in Congress to get the program underway.

The success has prompted the USIA to extend the program to other countries in Asia and Africa. Its next step is to translate books into native languages, as the Communists do.

These are encouraging results in the effort to match the Soviet cheap-book program in neutral areas. We are glad to have had a part in it. We believe it will yield dividends for years to come.

INFORMATIONAL MEDIA GUARANTEE

Mr. Speaker, I am further extending my remarks to include a letter from Curtis G. Benjamin, president of the American Book Publishers Council, in the New York Times of April 5, 1959. While the matter of which Mr. Benjamin writes does not have direct relation to the classics of democracy program, it certainly is indirectly related and the work American publishers are doing in this field is valuably supplemental to the classics program. While the appropriation was cut to $2½ million in the last Congress, it was due almost entirely to Congressman ROONEY that the item was not completely wiped out. I happen to know because at that critical period I had several conversations with the gentleman, having been alerted to the situation by Dr. Jerome Kerwin of the University of Chicago and a member of the Chicago committee to which I have previously referred as the originators of the classics of democracy program. Mr. Benjamin's letter follows:

TO SEND BOOKS ABROAD—APPROPRIATION SUFFICIENT TO MEET MASS DEMAND URGED

(The writer of the following letter is president of the American Book Publishers Council, Inc.:)

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

J. Donald Adams, in his "Speaking of Books" column in your book review section of March 15 drew attention to the need for more American books in Asia and Africa. He then appealed to the American Book Publishers Council to give the matter its earnest consideration.

The tremendous growth in the export of books from the United States to Indonesia, the Philippines, Formosa, Vietnam, Burma, Pakistan, and Turkey in the past few years has been made possible only by the informational media guaranty program of the U.S. Information Agency. Last August Congress cut a requested appropriation of $7 million for this program to $2½ million. This compelled a serious reduction in U.S. book exports to these countries.

U.S. publishers—unlike the Russians—cannot use local currencies accepted abroad in payment for books. The I.M.G. program, by guaranteeing conversion of other currencies into dollars, has facilitated U.S. book exports to countries which would have been deprived by their own exchange restrictions of the books they need.

FORM OF AID

While removing no obligation from the exporting publisher to sell his books or from the customer overseas to buy them, the I.M.G. program has insured, through a revolving fund, that publishers are paid in dollars. Here is one inexpensive form of economic aid which is neither a giveaway nor forced feeding, yet is being allowed to wither.

But even an unlimited I.M.G. program could not solve the problem of price, to which Mr. Adams also refers. The comparatively high cost of producing a book in the United States places it out of reach of a majority of Asian or African book buyers.

Here again the Russians have no problem, since their books are sold at nominal prices without relation to cost. In 1957 the Russians printed 30 million books exclusively for export, all in the languages of the non-Communist world, including many in English. The Russians are far ahead of us in supplying books to Asia and Africa and are likely to pull even further ahead unless Congress awakens to the fact, as Mr. Adams says, that the cold war is primarily and fundamentally a battle for men's minds.

MASS MARKET

The publishing industry is playing its part within its resources by vigorous cultivation of the market for books in Asia and Africa. Several publishers have begun to reprint important textbooks in English in Asia at one-half to one-third of the U.S. prices, thus bringing them to the mass student market in Asian countries.

The United States Information Agency and the International Cooperation Administration are also doing everything they can, with the limited funds they are allowed to spend on books, to break the barrier of price. But the sad fact is that there are many Asian and African countries today where students, professors, engineers, doctors, scholars, administrators—book users of every description—need American books.

Congress should see to it that the I.M.G. program receives an appropriation sufficient to insure that any country willing to sign an agreement to buy American books, at their full price, with its own currency, should be able to do so. Secondly, the United States Information Agency and the International Cooperation Administration should receive more funds to make books available to individuals and institutions in Asia, Africa and South America.

There is no other way to insure that the American book will play its full part as this country's most penetrating and effective ambassador at large.

CURTIS G. BENJAMIN.

NEW YORK, *March 31, 1959.*

AMENDING LONGSHOREMEN'S AND HARBOR WORKERS' COMPENSATION ACT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H.R. 451) to amend the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act, with respect to the payment of compensation in cases where third persons are liable; and before the Chair puts the unanimous consent request, I would like to state for the benefit of the House and for the RECORD that when this bill was reached

on the Consent Calendar today, the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD] asked that it be passed over without prejudice. I have talked with the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD] and he told me that he had asked that it be passed over because he had not had an opportunity to look into it as thoroughly as he would like to. Then another of our distinguished colleagues, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. PELLY] made the observation that there was no departmental report and nothing indicating the attitude of the Department in the committee report. Thereafter, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD] talked with me and said that if I found out or obtained any information as to the position of the Department, and if it was of a favorable nature or interposed no objection to the legislation, that I might ask unanimous consent to bring the bill up for consideration today. I called the committee and talked with the acting clerk of the Committee on Education and Labor, Mr. Derrickson. Mr. Derrickson said that there was a report on a similar bill which was made on March 12, 1958, by the Department of Labor, and that the Department did not object to the favorable reporting of the bill, and the Department suggested certain technical changes which were made in the bill which was reported out of the committee last year, which bill passed the House last year but did not pass in the other body, and that the bill, as reported out of the committee this year, is identically the same bill as was reported out of the committee last year. So, Mr. Speaker, on the basis of that information and the talk that I had with my friend, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD], I am asking unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill, the purpose of which is to allow an employee who comes under the jurisdiction of the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act who is injured, to receive compensation as provided by law while he is suing the person who injured him, or is claiming that the injury was caused through the negligence of others and brings action in court, a tort action. Under the present law, such an employee has to elect whether he will sue or take the compensation. If he elects to bring suit, he cannot get the regular compensation and this bill will enable him to receive his compensation while he is proceeding in the court. Of course, if he gets a larger verdict than the amount of his compensation, there has to be a reimbursement. It seems to me that it is a just proposition. Having cleared up the matter now in connection with the departmental report, I will be happy and I feel that we would all be happy if the bill passed the House today.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I just wanted to be clear on one thing. Will the gentleman repeat what he said about the departmental report?

Mr. McCORMACK. The information I received from Mr. Derrickson is that on March 12, 1958, the Department made a report. They do not object to the bill and they recommend certain technical changes, which were incorporated in the bill last year, and the bill was reported out of the committee, and which changes are incorporated in the bill at the present time.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. In other words, their objections have been taken care of.

Mr. McCORMACK. They did not object.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. They just wanted certain technical amendments?

Mr. McCORMACK. That is correct. The Department suggested certain technical amendments which were adopted so that the position of the Department is clearly expressed in the bill, as I have been informed.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 33 of the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act is amended to read as follows:

"COMPENSATION FOR INJURIES WHERE THIRD PERSON IS LIABLE

"SEC. 33. (a) If an employee entitled to compensation under this Act be injured or killed by the negligence or wrong of a third person not in the same employ, such employee or, in case of death, his eligible survivors or legal representative, if any, need not elect whether to take compensation and medical benefits under this Act or to pursue his remedy against such third person but may take such compensation and medical benefits and (within the time periods hereinafter set forth) pursue his remedy against such third person subject to the provisions of this Act. If such employee, or, in case of death, his eligible survivors or legal representative, if any, takes compensation under this Act and desires to bring action against such third person, such action should be commenced not later than six months after the entry of an order awarding compensation or not later than nine months after the enactment of such law or laws creating, establishing, or affording a new or additional remedy or remedies. In such case, the carrier liable for the payment of such compensation shall have a lien on the proceeds of any recovery from such third person, whether by judgment, settlement, or otherwise, after the deduction of the reasonable and necessary expenditures, including attorney's fees, incurred in effecting such recovery, to the extent of the total amount of compensation awarded under, or provided, or estimated, by this Act for such case and the expenses for medical treatment paid or to be paid by it, and to such extent such recovery shall be deemed for the benefit of such carrier. Notice of the commencement of such action shall be given thirty days thereafter to the Secretary of Labor, the employer, and the carrier upon a form prescribed by the Secretary.

"(b) If such employee or, in case of death, his eligible survivors or legal representative, if any, has been awarded compensation under this Act but has failed to commence action against such third person within the time limited therefor by subsection (a), such failure may operate as an assignment of the cause of action against such third person to the carrier liable for the payment of such compensation. The failure of such employee or his eligible survivors or legal representative to commence an action pursuant to the provisions of subsection (a) of this section, shall operate as an assignment of the cause of action: *Provided only, however,* That the carrier shall first, after award of compensation, have notified the employee, or in the event of his death, the employee's eligible survivors and legal representative if any has been appointed, in writing by personal service or by registered mail at least thirty days prior to the expiration of the longer time limited for the commencement of an action by subsection (a), that such failure to commence such action shall operate as an assignment of whatever cause of action may exist from the employee to the carrier. If the carrier shall fail to give such notice, the time limited for the commencement of an action by subsection (a) shall be extended until thirty days after the carrier shall have served the notice required by this section, and in the event the claimant fails to commence such action within thirty days after service of such notice, such failure shall operate as an assignment of such cause of action to such carrier. If such carrier as such an assignee, recovers from such third person, either by judgment, settlement, or otherwise, a sum in excess of the total amount of compensation awarded for the death or injury of such employee and the expenses for medical treatment paid by it, together with the reasonable and necessary expenditures incurred in effecting such recovery, it shall forthwith pay to such employee or his eligible survivors at the time of death two-thirds of such excess, and to the extent of two-thirds of any such excess such recovery shall be deemed for the benefit of such employee or his eligible survivors. When the compensation awarded requires periodical payments, the number of which cannot be determined at the time of such award, the Secretary shall, when the injury or death was caused by the negligence or wrong of another not in the same employ, estimate the probable total amount thereof upon the basis of the survivorship annuitants table of mortality, the remarriage tables of the Dutch Royal Insurance Institute, and such facts as he may deem pertinent, and such estimate shall be deemed the amount of the compensation awarded in such case, for the purpose of computing the amount of such excess recovery, subject to the modification thereof as hereinafter provided.

"(c) In the event of a modification of an award increasing the compensation previously awarded or in the event that the total amount of periodical payments made pursuant to an award under which the number of such payments could not be determined at the time of the award, shall exceed the total thereof as estimated by the Secretary, the principal of any of such excess recovery theretofore paid to such employee or his eligible survivors shall be credited against such increase or such excess. In the event of a modification of an award ending or diminishing the compensation previously awarded or in the event that the total amount of periodical payments made pursuant to an award under which the number of such payments could not be determined at the time of the award, shall be less than the total thereof as estimated by the Secretary, such carrier shall forthwith pay to the person entitled to compensation any additional amount of such excess recovery to which such person may be entitled by reason of such modification or such deficiency determined as hereinbefore provided.

"(d) If such employee proceeds against such third person the carrier shall contribute only the deficiency, if any, between the amount of the recovery against such third person actually collected, and the compensation provided or estimated by this Act for such case, except that in the case where the amount of settlement of a claim or action against a third party is less than the compensation provided or estimated by this Act,

prior approval of the employer or insurance carrier shall be required or else the carrier shall be relieved of all liability for such deficiency.

"(e) The right to compensation or benefits under this Act, shall be the exclusive remedy to an employee when he is injured or killed by the negligence or wrong of another in the same employ."

With the following committee amendments:

Page 3, line 18, after "registered" insert "or certified".

Page 6, line 10, strike out "killed" and insert the following: "to his eligible survivors or legal representatives if he is killed,".

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NATIONWIDE REFERENDUM—NATIONAL FLOWER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. WEIS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. WEIS. Mr. Speaker, in the spring of the year in this beautiful city of Washington, I wish to speak briefly not on the serious problems before this House and the country, but on a lighter but seemingly as controversial a subject.

Mr. Speaker, some weeks ago there was a serio-comic debate held in what I understand is sometimes erroneously called the upper House on the subject of our national flower. The virtues of a large number of flora were extolled—including some which at first blush would not seem to fall into the category under discussion at all.

Senator GORDON ALLOTT nominated the carnation as the "symbol of fertility, virility, stability, and courage," while his colleague from Iowa, Senator HICKENLOOPER, in defense of the corn tassel, characterized the carnation as the flower most used for funerals.

Senator THRUSTON MORTON, a true Kentucky gentleman, placed his own Kentucky blue grass in the running, and somehow during the debate, even John Barleycorn reared his ugly head.

My predecessor, Senator KEATING, once again took up the cudgels for the rose, which he had championed so many times when he was a Member of this august body.

As usual, this debate produced no action, but it did arouse sufficient interest so that Dave Garroway asked these distinguished Senators to continue their discussions on his television program at 7:10 in the morning. But unlike the flowers which unfold fresh and dewy with the rising of the sun, these gentlemen were unable to rise to the occasion. Therefore, perforce, Mr. Garroway turned to this lower but sturdier House.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. WEIS. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. I think I understood the gentlewoman to say in her opening statement that "the other body, erroneously called the upper House."

Mrs. WEIS. Sometimes erroneously.

Mr. McCORMACK. I thoroughly agree with the gentlewoman. That is a pet hobby of mine. It is a coordinate branch of Congress.

Mrs. WEIS. In view of the remarks by our Speaker recently, I was sure I was on safe ground.

Mr. McCORMACK. I want the gentlewoman to know that I not only admire what she said but I thoroughly agree. The more we emphasize it the more some of these columnists and editorial writers will be aware that they should read the Constitution again.

Mrs. WEIS. That is true.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentle lady yield?

Mrs. WEIS. I yield.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I have heard that expression originated because of the fact that they are continuously upping the appropriation bills.

Mrs. WEIS. That makes a certain amount of sense.

My colleague the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CURTIN] flung himself into the breach as a late starter in defense of the marigold, while I came to the support of the rose.

For this reason, and because my district in New York lovingly harbors the largest shippers of roses in the world, I am proposing that we end this debate once and for all by taking the issue to the country at large.

Admittedly, many public-opinion polls have been taken in the past, including a recent Gallup poll which showed the rose winning by a margin of 14 to 1. But Dr. Gallup has predicted landslides before—erroneously, to my regret.

It is obvious that periodic debate in the Congress is not going to settle this question. In fact, if the discussions continue, I dare say there will soon be as many flowers nominated as there are Members sitting in either House. Though my preference for the rose must be apparent by now, I am willing to abide by the will of the majority. Therefore, I suggest a nationwide referendum to determine the people's choice of a national flower, the results to be reported to the Senate which has scheduled another debate on this issue on May 5.

I would urge that every man, woman, or child in the United States who has an interest in this matter write a postcard to me, at my Washington office, listing the flower of his choice. I would urge also that my colleagues in the four States which have already selected the rose as their State flower—Iowa, Georgia, North Dakota, and my own State of New York—and those who represent areas such as California and Arizona, where roses are grown in great profusion, join with me in this effort. I would welcome, too, the cooperation of all those who are protagonists for the other floral nominees.

Though this maiden effort of mine may seem to have had facetious overtones, there are millions of flower lovers who are seriously interested in this question, and, after all, if America is to have a national flower, it should represent in every sense the wishes of the majority of the American people.

OUR DEBT MANAGEMENT POLICIES, II: HOW ABOUT PRACTICING WHAT WE PREACH?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. REUSS] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, on March 17 I urged that the Congress take a new look at our debt management policies. Particularly, I pointed out that our present debt management practices squarely collide with a number of principles that ought to be fundamental.

First among such principles, I pointed out, was that the debt to the maximum extent should be held by real savers, not by the commercial banks. This is so because a large bank-held national debt stockpiles an inflationary credit potential that may prove impervious to restrictive monetary policies if and when they become necessary.

No one can say that the administration has not, from almost the day it took office, preached the observance of this principle vigorously.

Former Secretary of the Treasury Humphrey said in April 1953:

> The concentration of short-term debt in the banks by the previous administration was one of the causes of inflation in the cost of living which has cost the American people billions of dollars. A gradual placing of more securities in the hands of nonbank investors is a necessary step for economic stability.

Former Under Secretary of the Treasury Burgess had this to say on May 12, 1953:

> When the Treasury meets a deficit by borrowing from the banks, it is inflationary—creates more money—tends to raise the cost of living.
>
> Bank borrowing may be cheap in terms of interest cost to the Treasury, but it is exceedingly expensive for the country as a whole, as all Americans who have been hurt by inflationary prices in the past decade should know.
>
> The reasons are simple but deserve spelling out.
>
> When the Treasury sells short-term securities to banks the money supply is increased by the amount of the borrowing. There is more money—but there is no increase in the things people can buy for their own use. Borrowing outside of banks, on the other hand, reaches genuine savings. Money which might have gone into other investment outlets goes instead into governments. The Treasury competes for available loan funds rather than creating new money.
>
> This avoids inflation—it keeps the price of food, clothing, and shelter from going up.
>
> These simple principles constitute the bases for the program of the Treasury Department for financing the public debt.

More recently, on February 5, 1959, Mr. Charles J. Gable, Jr., Assistant to the Secretary of the Treasury for Debt Management, told the Joint Economic Committee:

> The Treasury would have preferred that a larger part of its financing outside of the banks during the second half of the calen-

dar year [1958] had been through longer term savers—such as individuals and savings institutions. (Joint Economic Committee, hearings on 1959 Economic Report of the President, p. 409.)

Mr. Gable further assured the committee:

We will continue to secure our funds as largely as possible from true savers rather than from commercial banks in order to reduce the inflationary potential of our financing operations during a period of rising economic activity. (Ibid., p. 413.)

Here are the preachments, then, clear and forthright as anyone could ask: Place the national debt with the real savers, and avoid the commercial banks. What is the practice?

On March 19 the Treasury announced the offer of a $500 million, 10-year, 4-percent bond issue.

On March 26, by Treasury Department press release A-484, came the good news. Treasury press release A-484 reported that:

Reports received thus far from the Federal Reserve banks show that subscriptions for the bonds total about $1,477 million, of which about $238 million were received from subscribers in the savings-type investor groups, $918 million from commercial banks for their own account and $321 million from all others.

The press release went on to describe savings-type investors as follows:

Pension and retirement funds—public and private.

Endowment funds.

Insurance companies.

Mutual savings banks.

Fraternal benefit associations and labor unions' insurance funds.

Savings and loan associations.

Credit unions.

Other savings organizations—not including commercial banks.

States, political subdivisions or instrumentalities thereof, and public funds.

But then came the thunderbolt. Instead of rejoicing, and announcing that the savings-type investors were to receive the full $238 million subscribed, the Treasury announced that it was cutting down the allotment to savings-type investors by 35 percent of their subscription. In other words, although savings-type investors were ready, willing, and eager to take $238 million of the issue, they were only to be allotted some $155 million. The remainder of the issue was to be allotted to the commercial banks and to "all others."

When I saw this press release on the morning of Friday, March 27, I immediately asked the Treasury what possible excuse there was for diverting from the hands of real savers to the commercial banks more than one-third of the long-term Government bonds which the real savers wanted to buy and had legally obligated themselves to buy. The Treasury's answer was that it guessed that maybe some of the real savers who had legally obligated themselves to buy the bonds might not want to do so.

Here was the Treasury, which makes so much of the need for selling the debt as much as possible to real savers, and as little as possible to commercial banks, deliberately cutting down on the real savers in order to sell to the commercial banks.

I thereupon, later Friday morning, March 27, sent the following telegram to the President:

MARCH 27, 1959.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.:

According to my information, subscriptions from savings institutions, corporations, and individuals, exceeded the $500 million total offering of the new Treasury 10-year 4-percent bond issue. Commercial banks also submitted subscriptions in excess of the total amount offered. I am now informed that unless you stop them, the Treasury intends to sell $320 million to the commercial banks, leaving only $180 million to the real savers. As no one knows better than you, the financing of the national debt through the commercial banking system has highly undesirable and potentially inflationary consequences. I earnestly request that you immediately direct the Treasury to cease undermining the national credit and to allocate this issue to the real savers of the Nation.

HENRY S. REUSS,
Member of Congress.

The receipt of my March 27 telegram has been acknowledged, but it has had no effect. On March 31, 1959, the Treasury, by press release A-487, announced that the allotment had been made according to plan, with savings-type investors restricted to 65 percent of their subscription, even though they could have been allotted 100 percent of the amount of their subscription.

Let me make my position very clear. The commercial banks and the "all others"—very largely the bond houses specializing in U.S. obligations—serve a most useful purpose in the marketing of Government securities. We are not here concerned with the Treasury's selling to the commercial banks and to "all others" U.S. bonds that savings-type investors refuse to take. But a Treasury policy of actually preventing savings-type investors from buying the U.S. bonds which they are ready, willing, able and legally obligated to buy is indefensible. Diverting these bonds to the commercial banks then leads to further doses of tight money by the Federal Reserve in order to neutralize this inflationary tinder. So the recovery of the economy is further retarded.

Congress has the constitutional duty to safeguard the national credit. For that reason I have today introduced House Concurrent Resolution 111:

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 111

Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress with respect to allotments of subscriptions for Treasury bonds by savings-type investors

Whereas the expansion of the money supply which results from the acquisition of Government bonds by the commercial banking system is potentially inflationary; and

Whereas it is of vital importance that every legitimate means be used to facilitate the purchase of United States bonds with funds generated by true saving; and

Whereas the first section of the Second Liberty Bond Act confers upon the Secretary of the Treasury full authority to reject or reduce allotments upon applications from incorporated banks and trust companies for purchase of bonds issued under that Act, and to make allotment in full or larger amounts to others: Therefore be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of Congress that the Secretary of the Treasury, in making allotments to subscribers for bonds having maturities of 5 years or more after the offering date, shall allot in full the subscriptions of savings-type investors before any bonds of the offering are allotted to other types of investors.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that the Treasury in its upcoming bond issues will make an effort to practice what it preaches, and to place no obstacles in the way of real savers who want to buy long-term U.S. obligations.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REUSS. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I want to commend the gentleman for calling to public notice the tragic difference between pronounced policies and actual policies. Also I would like to ask the question of the gentleman from Wisconsin whether the Treasury could not have achieved his purposes by their own direct action without the need of this resolution, if it so chose?

Mr. REUSS. Absolutely. The Treasury proceeds in these bond sales under the Second Liberty Bond Act of 1918. That act which I have taken the trouble to read and to reread in the last day or so, clearly and specifically authorizes and permits the Treasury to cut down the commercial banks and certain other classes of subscribers to zero, if need be, in order to market the national debt to the largest extent possible to true savers. This is to enable people and savings institutions to buy bonds, giving up the power to buy something else, as opposed to the commercial banks, useful as their role may be, who by a stroke of the pen and by enlargement of their credit, purchase the national debt, thus creating an inflationary tender.

The Second Liberty Bond Act of 1918 expressly permits the Secretary of the Treasury to exclude nonsaving investors from these issues. Here, of course, it was not even necessary to do that. The Secretary of the Treasury could have given several hundred million dollars worth of these bonds to the commercial banks, instead of the larger amount that they did give to the banks, and to the so-called all others, and still have taken care of the real savers 100 cents on the dollar. Every other true saver could come to the Treasury and say, "Look, these are my savings. I would like to buy Uncle Sam's obligations."

It seems to me absolutely indefensible for the Treasury to do what it did do, to turn aside these citizens and savings institutions that wanted to buy the national debt by saying, "We are sorry, but we will have to place you on a quota."

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I commend the gentleman for his statement, and I hope the resolution is adopted. I regret its apparent necessity, and I trust that the Treasury will be sufficiently warned that they will use their discretionary power with more attention to their own pronounced policies. Because if they are to fail, it seems to me that we might be led into a situation where the

Congress would have to pass more restrictive legislation on the Treasury powers. I concur in the wisdom of the original decision to give the Secretary broad authority, but I regret that that authority was used in a manner inconsistent with public policy.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REUSS. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VANIK. I want to express my appreciation to the gentleman from Wisconsin for his splendid contribution this afternoon in pointing this out to the attention of the Congress. I think far too little attention has been paid by Congress to the great problems of debt management. I think the gentleman is perhaps too gentle with these indefensible Treasury policies. I wish his resolution would establish mandatory guideposts to the Treasury Department in issuing these securities. It seems to me that a charge could be properly leveled against the Treasury Department for mismanagement and mishandling of the public debt, because it has engaged in policies which have caused the cost of managing our debt to skyrocket during the past 6 or 7 years.

I certainly hope that the gentleman's resolution will be given very careful and prompt consideration by the Congress. I think it is time that Congress provided a very careful analysis of the complete debt structure of the country and consider ways and means to reduce this tremendous burden upon our people.

Mr. REUSS. I thank the gentleman from Ohio. I am glad he has pointed out the self-defeating nature of the action by the Treasury in loading up the commercial banks with the national debt by turning aside the real savers who want to buy it. In its Newsletter for April, which reached my desk yesterday, the First National City Bank of New York pointed out, for example, that the recent rise in the rediscount rate of the Federal Reserve of a few weeks ago, an increase which many of us in this body deplored, was necessitated very largely by the fact that commercial banks were holding such an increasingly large portion of the national debt. Well, do you not see what happens: To the extent that the Treasury loads up the commercial banks, the Fed comes around, raises the rediscount rate, with its attendant disastrous effects on small business, on the farmer, and the other weaker elements of the community? So we just chase our tail around, complicating rather than alleviating the problem of debt management.

Mr. VANIK. I have the feeling that the Federal Reserve discount rate is usually raised just before the Federal Government itself must apply for an extension of credit and sell large issues of its debentures on the public market. Does the gentleman concur with this reaction?

Mr. REUSS. To a limited degree, since the Treasury is in the market almost every month nowadays, marketing the national debt, and since the Federal Reserve is extremely quick on the trigger to raise the rediscount rate, you usually find that they raise it just before, during, and after these marketings.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REUSS. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. WOLF. I want to commend the gentleman for his splendid remarks. I would like to say that I hope the resolution will be given immediate consideration, and I hope it will pass in order to give us something to help this situation. One of the things that impressed me the most on my trip back to my district during the holidays was the demonstration and concern by many people in all walks of life that there is something wrong with our fiscal policy and it does need thorough consideration.

I was happy to be able to be back from Iowa in time to hear the gentleman's remarks. I hope he will continue the work he is doing in bringing this matter to the attention of the Congress.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REUSS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. The only thing wrong with our fiscal policy is that we are spending more money than we are taking in. If the gentleman would propose the taxes to take care of the increased expenditures and balance the budget, he would not have to make this presentation today.

Mr. REUSS. Yes; that is the answer of the administration to all constructive attempts on this side of the aisle to develop sound policies of debt management. I wish, however, that the gentleman, as the representative of the administration here this afternoon, would defend if he can the practice of the Treasury in deliberately turning down real savers, people who want to buy the national debt, and instead loading the national debt onto the commercial banks. That is the subject of my remarks. I would agree with the gentleman's observation in the abstract that balanced budgets are good things.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. REUSS. I yield.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. May I say that I worked 2 years for the Treasury Department, and I do not think there is any skulduggery in that shop. I think that they are doing an honest, sincere job. Their policies today are practically the same as they have been for 20 years. As far as real savers are concerned, there is an avenue for them through our savings bond program, which has been liberalized. Savings bonds can now be purchased in large amounts. They are available to the real savers whom the gentleman has mentioned. All they have to do is to take advantage of it.

Mr. REUSS. Nobody has mentioned the word "skulduggery" until the gentleman brought it up. I do not myself think that there is skulduggery on the part of the Treasury. I think, however, that there is inept debt management on the part of the administration and the Treasury, and it is our hope that by debating the matter here openly today and on other days we may make some contribution to the solution of the problem. The gentleman still has not answered my central point which is, Is it wise or is it foolish to turn down real, live savers who reach down into the mattress for their money and want to buy U.S. bonds, and instead to sell those bonds to the commercial banks? I cannot believe that it is, but I gather that the administration's position, as set forth this afternoon, is that this is wise.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I would say that the real savers can take that opportunity through the savings bond program.

Mr. REUSS. Does the gentleman suggest that the opportunities for real savers to participate in the national debt ought to be restricted to savings bonds?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I just do not accept the premise upon which the gentleman based his remarks, that is all.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REUSS. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I would not like the RECORD at this point to show, Mr. Speaker, that if we had a balanced budget there would be no problem of debt management. I think the RECORD should show that even if we had a perfectly balanced budget, down to the last dime, the Treasury would still have, according to my recollection, something like a $55 billion turnover in the debt in the coming year. Is that not approximately correct?

Mr. REUSS. I believe that is right.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. In other words there would still be the problem of where to place the debt which is coming due and payable during the next fiscal year, which must be replaced. You simply cannot maintain it as a volume of debt. The problem of debt management would be here whether we had a balanced budget, an underbalanced budget, or an overbalanced budget.

Mr. REUSS. I agree thoroughly with the gentleman. Indeed, if the budget were balanced, then the position of the Treasury in turning aside true savers and placing so large a portion of the debt with the commercial banks would be that much more indefensible.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. REUSS. I yield.

Mr. VANIK. I think the gentleman from Wisconsin is much too kind in permitting the word "skulduggery" to be taken out of the RECORD. I think it belongs in the RECORD, because Treasury skulduggery is the sort of thing that makes the gentleman's resolution a necessary thing. It is the Treasury action which favors the commercial banks by allocations of Treasury issues, that makes it necessary.

The very thing that makes the gentleman's resolution necessary are the Treasury efforts to look out for the interests of the commercial bankers of America rather than the taxpayers.

Mr. REUSS. I have tried not to use inflammatory language this afternoon. I certainly do not use the word "skulduggery." At the same time, I deeply regret that the only answer of the administration to my disquiet about the administration's debt management

policy is that real savers have the series E bonds available, and that that ought to be enough for them—let the other issues, or 80 percent of the national debt, be held by the commercial banks. To me this is economic madness, fiscal irresponsibility, and the most inflationary kind of talk I have ever heard.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REUSS. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PATMAN. I believe the gentleman's resolution is a good one; that is, the Treasury should sell all the bonds it can to people who actually have money to pay for the bonds; but, when they have sold all those bonds, then I believe we should use another method to obtain money rather than sell bonds to the commercial banks that create the money on the books of the banks to buy the bonds. The Treasury should not be allowed to sell securities to commercial banks when others are clamoring for the privilege of buying such securities and have the actual money to pay for them. I congratulate the distinguished gentleman [Mr. REUSS] for presenting his very constructive proposal. I hope it is adopted.

RECREATION AS A FACTOR IN FEDERAL WATER PROJECTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill to provide for additional consideration of recreation and fish and wildlife values in all Federal water-resources projects. The Federal Government should give more attention to the tremendous interest our people have in using the reservoirs and other facilities built by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation for outdoor recreation. The water projects of these two large agencies provide many recreational opportunities that our Nation can ill afford to overlook.

Many of my colleagues know from experience in their own districts how their constituents are attracted in ever-increasing numbers to these new lakes in order to enjoy fishing and hunting opportunities, to picnic, and participate in other outdoor activities with their families, and to use their boats. These public activities bring a substantial dividend to our Nation in the form of better health from wholesome outdoor recreation and through the release from tensions and worries that have become so much a part of modern living. Nor can we continue to overlook the huge business that is generated for goods and services to supply the needs of these recreationists.

The individuals and families that flock to these reservoirs spend millions of dollars each year at the service stations, restaurants, motels and hotels, and grocery and sporting-goods stores. Businesses and whole communities have been built up in some areas merely to supply the needs of these outdoor enthusiasts. The business that has been created as a result of this widespread recreational use has had a salutary effect on the economy in many parts of the country.

Despite all these obvious benefits, we still are building reservoirs, canals, and levees for flood control, irrigation, and power, without giving full consideration to the growing needs of our people to use those same facilities for fishing, hunting, and other forms of outdoor sports. Over and over again we hear the story of how these water facilities that have been built by the Federal Government are being overwhelmed by the rush of people even though the project features for public recreational use are only slightly developed at some reservoirs and largely nonexistent or grossly inadequate at most.

The growth and the magnitude of public recreation use of civil projects of the Army Engineers is shown in a news release from the Department of the Army, dated March 26, 1959, which states:

> Visitor attendance in 1958 reached a new all-time high of 94,793,000. This compares with 84,704,000 in 1957, and 71,340,000 in 1956. In 1950 it was only 16 million.

In my judgment it is high time that the Congress recognize this situation by providing specifically for public use of these facilities in the planning and construction as well as the operation of Federal water projects. The people who benefit from these projects from a recreational standpoint need not, in all equity, continue to be neglected in favor of the people who benefit directly from flood-control, irrigation, and power aspects of the projects.

The bill which I have introduced would permit the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation to cooperate more fully with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, National Park Service, and the fish and wildlife and recreational agencies of the respective States in building into project plans sound provisions for public recreational use of these projects. There is no valid reason why these projects should not be planned, built, and operated with recreation in mind, along with flood control, irrigation, and power. This will mean that recreation can be a purpose in project planning and not merely an incidental and perhaps accidental byproduct, as now is the case.

Experience demonstrates that the cost of making specific provisions for all types of recreation in these projects is very modest in relation to the cost of building dams, powerplants, and canals for traditional project purposes.

I am confident that my bill will have the enthusiastic support of all of those interested in the better management and wise use of natural resources. Its prompt enactment would do good service to the increasing millions of people who take to the highways every weekend earnestly searching for wholesome, healthful ways of employing their leisure time.

I sincerely hope and urge that the committee to whom the bill is referred will schedule early hearings so that we may have the bill before the House for consideration as soon as possible.

BATAAN DAY

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as the House will not be in session tomorrow I should like to join my colleague from Massachusetts, the distinguished floor leader [Mr. McCORMACK] in extending my thanks and appreciation and respect to all the fighting men who so courageously stood their ground on the Bataan Peninsula in the Philippines. Tomorrow is Bataan Day.

Seventeen years have passed since those heroic days on the Bataan Peninsula and the glorious stand made at Corregidor. Every American owes a debt of gratitude and respect to all of the men of our fighting forces involved in that great struggle. The battles of Bataan and Corregidor occurred in the early days of the war in the Pacific. These battles took place when the enemy had tremendus advantage over the American forces. Our men were few in numbers and poorly equipped. They possessed, however, one factor of strength superior to that of the enemy. This was their determination and their resolve to fight on to the very end. These men were Americans and they were determined to uphold the honor of their country and die as Americans. For the great fight they made, for their character, and for their resolve to place their country ahead of their own well-being and their own very lives, this Nation of American people owes them an eternal debt of gratitude and respect.

Many of us here in the Congress today were Members of Congress on this eventful day 17 years ago. Well can we remember the sickening pain we felt in our hearts when the news was unfolded to us of the heroic struggle these Americans made at Bataan and Corregidor. We remember how we chilled at the thought of their suffering in that famous Bataan death march. We know that their suffering steeled in us a resolve to never stop until we had defeated the enemy in the entire Pacific area. This resolve and determination created in us as a result of their suffering and their determination was indeed a powerful force not only in the determination behind the efforts of the Members of Congress but also in the steeling of the determination of the whole Nation.

Civilized people everywhere revolt at brutality. Regardless of the horrors and tragedy of war, even brutality exercised in the conduct of war causes a shocking and revolting feeling among civilized people. The death march on Bataan was brutal. It was unnecessary. It was inhuman. This inhuman act, so brutal and so unnecessary, reaped its harvest. It was the determination of an aroused America, not only to defeat the enemy but to seek out those responsible for this inhuman act and make them pay for it

in adequate punishment. This was done. This civilization had to do for the honor of civilization.

Back home in Massachusetts there is a sergeant of the U.S. Army from Boston who was one of those heroic men who fought on Bataan, who made the brutal death march, and who was able to survive all of the atrocities of the enemy. He is a very seriously injured man. I am proud to say that for his heroic deeds he possesses the Congressional Medal of Honor. I speak of Sgt. Charles McGilvery. Like a few of the others, Sergeant McGilvery never thought for one moment he would live to survive to this day 17 years afterward. To Sergeant McGilvery and all of his associates and comrades, living and dead, I extend my heartfelt thanks and respect.

Fighting with the American forces in this great battle of Bataan were many soldiers of the present Republic of the Philippines. With the Americans, and shoulder to shoulder, they, too, made their sacrifices and made their resolves and determinations. Now, 17 years later, some of these men, veterans of this great struggle, are denied certain benefits which are given to others who performed comparable service. In view of this fact, on March 12 of 1959, I introduced House Joint Resolution 307, for the purpose of creating a commission to conduct a thorough and comprehensive investigation of the veterans' program of the United States in the Republic of the Philippines with a view to correcting so many of these existing inequities. My resolution has the full support of the Government of the Republic of the Philippines. At this time, I think it is extremely appropriate for me to urge the Members of the Congress to enact this joint resolution. In the creation of this Commission, the Congress would be showing its good faith and its appreciation to those veterans of the Philippines who stood their ground on Bataan. I hope so much the Congress will enact House Joint Resolution 307.

Out of all great catastrophies, and from the oasis of all great events, it is my belief something good, something worthwhile and of benefit to mankind emerges. Surely from the great struggle on Bataan emerged a new way of life and new rules of conduct for many people in the Far East. Above all, however, the meaning of Bataan 17 years ago, at the present time, 17 years in the future, and for all time, is that freemen wherever they are assembled together, will never sacrifice their freedom, and that freedom existing in the hearts of mankind will live forever.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. STRATTON, on account of official business of the Board of Visitors of the U.S. Military Academy.

Mr. HALL, indefinitely, on account of illness.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to Mr. SIKES, for 15 minutes, today, and for 30 minutes on April 16.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. WAMPLER and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona (at the request of Mr. BROOMFIELD) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania (at the request of Mr. MILLER of New York) and to include a letter and statement.

Mr. POFF (at the request of Mr. MILLER of New York) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS and to include a newspaper article.

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. KASTENMEIER and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. GAVIN and to include extraneous material.

Mr. CELLAR.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Friday, April 10, 1959, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

828. A letter from the Acting Secretary of State, transmitting the seventh report on the extent and disposition of U.S. contributions to International Organizations for the fiscal year 1958, pursuant to section 2 of Public Law 806, 81st Congress (H. Doc. No. 111); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed.

829. A letter from the Secretary, Federal Prison Industries, Inc., U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting the annual report of the Directors of Federal Prison Industries, Inc., for the fiscal year 1958, pursuant to the act approved June 23, 1934 (18 U.S.C. 4127); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADAIR (by request):

H.R. 6150. A bill to free farmers from Government control; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BARING:

H.R. 6151. A bill to provide for the construction of sewer and water facilities for the Battle Mountain Indian Colony, Nev., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 6152. A bill to provide for transfer of title to irrigation distribution systems constructed under the Federal reclamation laws upon completion of repayment of the costs thereof; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 6153. A bill to stabilize the domestic market prices of lead and zinc; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BARRETT:

H.R. 6154. A bill to provide for the entry of certain relatives of U.S. citizens and lawfully resident aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BETTS:

H.R. 6155. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to exempt from taxation certain nonprofit corporations or associations organized after August 31, 1951; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BOGGS:

H.R. 6156. A bill to amend the National Defense Education Act of 1958 to provide for Federal grants to the States for the purpose of installing automatic sprinkler systems in elementary and secondary schools not adequately protected against the hazard of fire to safeguard the children of this Nation who will provide the leadership for its defense in the future; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin:

H.R. 6157. A bill authorizing the improvement of the Kewaunee Harbor, Wis., in the interest of navigation and other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. CARNAHAN:

H.R. 6158. A bill to extend certain privileges and immunities to judges of the International Court of Justice; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CELLER:

H.R. 6159. A bill to provide for the appointment of additional circuit and district judges, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FASCELL:

H.R. 6160. A bill to repeal the excise tax on amounts paid for communication services or facilities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FLYNN:

H.R. 6161. A bill to amend the Federal Credit Union Act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 6162. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase from $1,200 to $1,800 a year the amount of outside income permitted without deductions from benefits, and to provide that all types of income shall be taken into account in determining whether an individual's benefits are subject to such deductions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FOLEY:

H.R. 6163. A bill to provide for the creation of an Office of Administrator for Legal Assignments for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. FULTON:

H.R. 6164. A bill to amend section 6150 of title 10, United States Code, to provide for advancement on the retired list of officers of the Army or Air Force specially commended for performance of duty before January 1, 1947, in actual combat; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 6165. A bill to provide for the granting of a nonquota immigrant status to certain immigrants who are the brothers, sisters, sons, or daughters of citizens of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6166. A bill to revise the tariff laws to facilitate entry of works of art and other exhibition material, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 6167. A bill to provide for Government contribution toward personal health service benefits for civilian officers and employees in the U.S. service and their dependents, to authorize payroll deductions for participants, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 6168. A bill to amend subchapter III of chapter 15 of title 38, United States Code, to provide pension for widows and children of World War I veterans at the same rates as apply in the case of widows and children of Spanish-American War veterans; to increase the income limitations applicable thereto; and to eliminate annuities in the compensation of such income; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 6169. A bill to amend title X of the Social Security Act to enable the States to provide more adequate financial assistance to needy individuals who are blind and to encourage and stimulate needy blind individuals to become self-supporting; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 6170. A bill to clarify paragraph 4 of section 15 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942 (56 Stat. 368); to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 6171. A bill to establish a temporary Presidential commission to study and to report on problems related to blindness and the needs of blind persons, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mrs. GRANAHAN:

H.R. 6172. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to provide annuities for dependent parents of deceased unmarried employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 6173. A bill to amend sections 545 and 415 of title 38, United States Code, to provide for the exclusion of certain death benefits from income in determining the annual income of widows, children, and parents of veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado:

H.R. 6174. A bill to provide for the entry of certain relatives of U.S. citizens and lawfully resident aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LAIRD:

H.R. 6175. 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. LANE:

H.R. 6176. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, entitled "Crimes and Criminal Procedure" to provide that prior adjudication on the merits by any court of competence, State or Federal, shall bar prosecution for similar act committed against same person and State; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McFALL:

H.R. 6177. A bill to provide for the admission of 5,000 Assyrian immigrants; and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6178. A bill to authorize the modification of the existing project for the New Melones Dam and Reservoir, Stanislaus River, Calif., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. McGINLEY:

H.R. 6179. A bill to grant the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to certain lands to the city of Crawford, Nebr.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. McSWEEN:

H.R. 6180. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the deduction for medical and dental expenses in the case of the disabled; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 6181. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 by eliminating the "living with" requirement for purposes of monthly annuities to widows and widowers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MONAGAN:

H.R. 6182. A bill to authorize U.S. district court sessions at Bridgeport, Hartford, New Haven, and Waterbury, Conn.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6183. A bill to liberalize the tariff laws for works of art and other exhibition material, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CLEMENT W. MILLER:

H.R. 6184. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to establish a research program in order to determine means of improving the conservation of game fish in dam reservoirs; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 6185. A bill authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Interior to undertake continuing research on the biology, fluctuations, status and statistics of the migratory marine species of game fish of the United States and contiguous waters; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. MINSHALL:

H.R. 6186. A bill to provide for the acquisition of the Cleveland Cavalry Armory, Shaker Heights, Ohio, for the use of the Ohio Army National Guard; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MOORE:

H.R. 6187. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to clarify the meaning of the term "disability" and thereby to effectuate the purpose intended by the Congress in enacting the provisions of such act which relate to the payment of disability insurance benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 6188. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to reduce the coverage requirements upon which eligibility for disability insurance benefits thereunder is conditioned; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. NORBLAD:

H.R. 6189. A bill to exclude certain lands within the Bull Run Division of the Mount Hood National Forest from the provisions of the act of Congress dated April 28, 1904, as amended, thereby opening such lands for public recreational purposes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. NORRELL:

H.R. 6190. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Army to convey the Army and Navy General Hospital, Hot Springs National Park, Ark., to the State of Arkansas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. POFF:

H.R. 6191. A bill to amend the Mutual Security Act of 1954 to restrict the granting of economic aid to any foreign country which has reduced taxes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. RABAUT:

H.R. 6192. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of the Air Force to make grants to certain educational institutions for the construction of military and naval science buildings, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 6193. 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. REUSS:

H.R. 6194. A bill to amend the Historic Sites Act of August 21, 1935, to provide a method for preserving sites, areas, buildings, and objects of national, regional, or local historical significance which are threatened with destruction by federally financed programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. RIVERS of Alaska:

H.R. 6195. A bill to increase the price of domestically mined gold, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ROGERS of Texas:

H.R. 6196. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the size requirements which a corporation must meet in order to qualify to make the special election as to taxable status which is permitted small business corporations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SCHWENGEL:

H.R. 6197. A bill to authorize and direct the Administrator of General Services to publish on microfilm the original military and naval records of the Civil War, both Union and Confederate; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. SIKES:

H.R. 6198. A bill to make the evaluation of recreational benefits, and fish and wildlife conservation, resulting from any flood control, navigation, or reclamation project an integral part of project planning, and to provide for the construction of recreational and fish and wildlife facilities in connection with such projects, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 6199. A bill to amend title III of the act of March 3, 1933, with respect to the acquisition by the United States of articles, materials, and supplies for public use; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 6200. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a 10-year net operating loss carryover for certain regulated public utilities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 6201. A bill relating to the definition of the term "public utility" for purposes of computing the deductions for income tax purposes for dividends paid and received on certain preferred stock of public utilities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 6202. A bill to amend sections 1231, 272, and 631 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to iron ore royalties; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SMITH of California:

H.R. 6203. A bill to require the expenditure of 60 percent of the funds expended for military aircraft and missile repair and overhaul with private industry, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. STAGGERS:

H.R. 6204. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that full benefits (when based upon the attainment of retirement age) will be payable to both men and women at age 60; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TELLER:

H.R. 6205. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to reduce the rate applicable to the first $1,000 of taxable income for taxable year 1958 and to repeal or reduce certain excise taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 6206. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to increase the amount of the personal exemption for taxable year 1958 and to repeal or reduce certain excise taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 6207. 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.

By Mr. VAN ZANDT:

H.R. 6208. A bill to promote the welfare of the people by authorizing the appropriation of funds to assist the States and Territories in the further development of their programs of general university extension education; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. WOLF:

H.R. 6209. A bill to extend rural mail delivery service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 6210. A bill to establish the U.S. Arts Foundation; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. FLOOD:

H.J. Res. 333. Joint resolution designating the period beginning May 1 and ending May 7 of each year as Correct Posture Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JUDD:

H.J. Res. 334. Joint resolution authorizing the President to issue a proclamation designating January 22 of each year as Ukrainian Independence Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REUSS:

H. Con. Res. 111. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress with respect to allotments of subscriptions for Treasury bonds by savings-type investors; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DIGGS:

H. Res. 231. Resolution recognizing April 15 as Africa Freedom Day; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MILLS:

H. Res. 232. Resolution providing for printing additional copies of the hearings entitled "Mineral Treatment Processes for Percentage Depletion Purposes"; to the Committee on House Administration.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII,

The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to utilize the shipbuilding facilities of Wisconsin and other States in the Great Lakes area, which was referred to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANFUSO:

H.R. 6211. A bill for the relief of Franz Lieberman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLARK:

H.R. 6212. A bill for the relief of Mariano Vittorio Simeone; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COHELAN:

H.R. 6213. A bill for the relief of Jung Hoo Chew; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CURTIN:

H.R. 6214. A bill for the relief of Ashan Yung; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DADDARIO:

H.R. 6215. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Cornelia Fales; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FORD:

H.R. 6216. A bill for the relief of Ng Thiat Hor and Ng Thiat Keung; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GALLAGHER:

H.R. 6217. A bill for the relief of Frank Roszkowski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. GRANAHAN:

H.R. 6218. A bill for the relief of Francesco Fazio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAGEN:

H.R. 6219. A bill for the relief of Cornelis Jacobus Huvers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAGEN (by request):

H.R. 6220. A bill for the relief of Severino Passi Gateb; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. KELLY:

H.R. 6221. A bill for the relief of Henry McDermott; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KILDAY:

H.R. 6222. A bill for the relief of Leonidas G. Papageorgiou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KIRWAN:

H.R. 6223. A bill for the relief of Dr. Joon Sun Kim; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLEMENT W. MILLER:

H.R. 6224. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Yoshi Kawai; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLS:

H.R. 6225. A bill for the relief of White River Distributors, Inc., and certain other creditors of the Westmoreland Manganese Corp.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MINSHALL:

H.R. 6226. A bill for the relief of Catalina Properties, Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RIVERS of Alaska:

H.R. 6227. A bill for the relief of United Contractors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of Mississippi:

H.R. 6228. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Immacolata Bassani and her minor daughter, Rita Bassani; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

145. Mr. DADDARIO presented a petition and resolution of the Public Utilities Commission of the State of Connecticut, pertaining to excise taxes on telegraph service, which was referred to the Committee on Ways and Means.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Foreign Aid for Foreign Tax Cuts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD H. POFF

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 8, 1959

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, the American taxpayers, who have been told that they can expect no tax relief this year, have just received news that the British Government has granted their citizens a 6-percent tax cut. This will be the sixth tax reduction the British people have received in the last 8 years, whereas, in that period American taxpayers have received only one tax cut in 1954. Yet England has received from the United States more than $341 million under lend-lease arrangements and nearly $3.8 billion in foreign-aid grants. Every cent of this money, together with additional billions of dollars appropriated under the economic foreign-aid program, have been dollars which America had to borrow and which she still owes as a part of her $280 billion debt. America's national debt is not only greater than England's national debt, it is greater than the combined debts of all the nations of the world to which America extends foreign aid.

Included in the British tax cut was a reduction of 2 pence a glass in the duty on beer. Thus we find that the money of American taxpayers which apparently is insufficient to solve the unemployment problem of American workers is being used to subsidize more beer for British workers.

I have today introduced a bill which would prohibit the loan or donation of economic foreign aid appropriations or foreign aid counterpart funds to any foreign country that reduces taxes on its own citizens during the current fiscal year.

History of the Red River

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RUSSELL B. LONG

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 8, 1959

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, recently I had the good fortune to listen to my colleague the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] deliver a very fine address to a large audience representing the people who live behind the levees of Red River in the States of Louisiana, Arkansas, Oklahoma, and Texas.

This address does a fine job in tracing the history of the Red River and the efforts which have been made by the Federal Government, the governments of the States, local groups, and individuals to control flood waters and preserve them until they were needed to irrigate the lands or furnish water to the residents of neighboring communities.

I ask unanimous consent that the address delivered by the senior Senator from Louisiana before the Red River Valley Association, in Shreveport, La., on March 31, be printed in the RECORD.

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

ADDRESS DELIVERED BY SENATOR ALLEN J. ELLENDER BEFORE THE RED RIVER VALLEY ASSOCIATION, SHREVEPORT, LA., MARCH 31, 1959

I appreciate the invitation of your president, Cliff Fairbanks, and of my good friend, Roy Matthias, to be present here today since it offers me the opportunity of discussing with you some of the problems facing the Red River Valley and, indeed, the entire Nation, as a result of our very rapid increase in population.

It is always a source of pleasure to participate in your annual meetings, because you are dedicated to a cause in which I am deeply interested—the preservation of two of our most precious resources, soil and water.

Recently in reflecting on my 22 years in the Senate, where I have devoted a great deal of my time to the protection and development of the resources of our country, I had occasion to review some of the history of waterway improvements.

It was interesting to note that the first appropriation for the improvement of our waterways was made in 1824, and that by

1828 the War Department had requested an appropriation for the improvement of navigation on the Red River in the vicinity of Shreveport.

From the earliest days of exploration of our country the Red River was the main artery of entry into the Louisiana Territory. Many years ago a mass of vegetation and driftwood had become tightly packed for a distance of about 150 miles, in the bed of the Red River, forming the so-called great raft. This obstruction blocked the flow of the river, causing it to spread out and deposit its silt in the valley. Thus, the richest soil in America began the process of accumulation to form our fertile valley under this stagnant overflow. But because of the great raft, the valley, as today, was subject to severe flooding.

When it became imperative for the Federal Government to establish a garrison fort on the upper Red River in Texas, the War Department became interested in navigation on the Red River. Supplies for this garrison were sent down the Mississippi River, around the "raft," through the swamps and bayous, and then up the Red River.

On May 23, 1828, Congress appropriated $25,000 for the removal of the "great raft" from Loggy Bayou, 65 miles below Shreveport, to Hurricane Bluff, 27 miles above Shreveport. This was the first attempt on the part of the Government to improve the Red River, and harness it for the needs of man.

You are all familiar with the fact that Capt. Henry Miller Shreve, who helped to establish this modern city of Shreveport, found that the river presented a real flood problem. Before he could lay the foundations for Shreveport, he had to clear away miles of trees and debris in the river channel.

My interest in the beneficial development of the water resources of our Nation stems from my personal conviction that such developments were an important factor in achieving our present high standards of living, not only in this great valley of the Red River, but throughout the entire Nation.

All through history, water has dominated human life. The earliest civilizations appeared in the great river basins of Mesopotamia and Egypt. Settlements were limited to coast lines and river banks; trading centers arose at the confluence of navigable streams. Rainfall and drought set the stage for the drama of human existence.

Unless a well planned and aggressive program of water resource development is carried forward, our children and grandchildren will not have an opportunity to enjoy the many advantages that today we take for granted. We cannot afford to neglect our economic strength and our economic growth. If we ignore the development of our water resources, we jeopardize the expansion of our national economy. This we cannot afford if we are to maintain our position of strength, on which rests the future of the free world.

The benefits that result from completed projects are positive examples of increased national wealth created by such improvements. More startling proof exists in Europe and Asia, where the prosperity of the countries are directly proportional to the effort expended on projects to conserve soil and water. My recent travels through these areas have convinced me that unless we protect our greatest resource, water, unless we keep it inland and do not let it flow to the sea unused, some day many parts of our great country may become as barren as the Gobi Desert, or as the lands which I have seen on my travels in old Persia. Our history books tell us that about 500 years before Christ, the entire area of Persia was capable of sustaining the livelihood of 115 million people. Now it adequately can care for less than 14 million.

Consider the great valley of Mesopotamia between the Tigris and Euphrates Rivers. At one time that area could produce food and fiber for 15 million people. Today it can hardly supply the needs of 2 million people. Why? Because the rulers neglected a great natural resource—water. If it had been possible to retain the waters upstream on those great rivers, and not permit them to steal the rich topsoil and float much of it out to sea, the chances are that the great valley would still be very productive.

The fact is, that those rivers carried millions of tons of earth downstream and among other damage done, clogged the small tributaries and rivers of Mesopotamia. Today that land is not suited for extensive cultivation. It is sour. It is not productive farmland. Certainly we cannot afford to let that happen in our great country.

Two years ago I visited various portions of the Soviet Union for well over a month. This was my third trip to that country in as many years.

I had the opportunity of visiting cities never before seen by an American Government official—cities in the far reaches of Siberia, an area which had been pictured to me before my visit as wastelands of snow and ice—as a vast prison camp. But this was not what I found. To my great surprise, I saw a virgin land being awakened; a land that promises to make Siberia the granary of Russia. Industry was flourishing to a surprising degree. One of the principal tools the Russians are employing in this development is a well planned utilization of their waterways system, both for navigation and the development of hydroelectric power. I visited several hydroelectric power stations that were larger than our biggest, and one that was almost twice as large as any we have in this country. I observed foundations poured for the construction of turbines and generators which will have a rated capacity of 300,000 kilowatts each—almost three times larger than anything we have. And these projects were designed, constructed, and had all their component parts built within the Soviet Union. In fact, much of the work on the large turbines was being done at Novosibirsk, located in central Siberia, which was a small trading post in 1905, and now a city of almost 1 million.

As a result of my inspection of installations in Russia, I am convinced that in water transportation, and hydroelectric power developments, the Russians are inching ahead of us.

In any comparison of time, money and effort expended on resource development in Soviet Russia and the United States, there is, of course, absolutely nothing that we can do about the rate of such developments in Russia. They are proceeding with their own resources to meet the needs of their own economy. We must direct our attention to what we can do to satisfy our own needs.

But it makes my blood boil when the critics of an adequate program to develop our rivers cry "pork barrel." Without the improvements heretofore made, our great sea ports could not handle our vast world trade; our steel industry would starve for lack of the ore that comes through the Soo locks; and the Ohio Valley would not have earned the nickname of the Ruhr of America without providing for an adequate water supply and an excellent water transportation. Critics of this program, because they have no sound basis for attack, cry "log-rolling" and "political back-scratching." Well, Mr. Khrushchev does not need to roll any logs, or scratch any political backs. Russia is developing her natural resources for the simple reason that it is to her economic advantage. Russia will, if she can, do everything in her power to defeat us on the economic front.

Mr. Khrushchev has already announced that this is one of Russia's principal aims—to defeat us on the economic battlefields of the world.

Now, I want to make it crystal clear that I do not approve, condone, or sanction in any manner, the Soviet system, or endorse the means by which Mr. Khrushchev and his followers stay in power. That is not the point at all.

What I am saying, and what I have heretofore said, is that the Russians—well aware of the value of the development of their water resources—are moving ahead rapidly in this field. This is a statement of fact. We cannot hide from it no matter how much we might like to—no matter how much we dislike or abhor the principles of communism.

As a practical matter, if the Russians are intent upon waging economic warfare against our way of life, then it behooves us to assess the capabilities of our opponents. We must be realistic. No field commander ever defeated his enemy by consulting his own personal preferences instead of his intelligence reports.

No general achieves victory by ignoring his opponent's strength.

However, above and beyond the need to maintain economic growth in order to defeat the forces of communism on the present economic battlefront, development of our water resources is just plain good business and common sense.

If we studied our history lessons we would know that water resources development is in the best interests of our own country. History is replete with examples of how societies down through the ages have organized themselves to match resources with needs. Success in this effort has insured survival, as with Switzerland; failure has resulted in decline and ultimate decay, as with ancient Persia.

Water, controlled and navigable, and of good quality, is the most important factor in developing a sound and progressive community.

In any given river basin there are a limited number of good sites for storage of water, and limited areas where distribution channels or protective works are feasible. These sites should not be preempted, or devoted to purposes which will freeze the pattern of development, so that future needs cannot be met or will become so costly as to be impracticable.

Let us discuss for a moment the use and availability of water. As is the case with many nations of the world, our inhabitants settled this country along the river valleys. Two-thirds of our population at the present time resides within 50 miles of navigable water. But the increasing water shortage, which now, more than ever, is an important factor in the determination of proper plant location, requires that the many industries which must base their policies upon long-range future requirements, be located along waterways. In a recent study by the 10th Federal Reserve District, it was concluded that the geographical distribution of water supply may be of such a nature as to conflict with such economic goals as the diversification of industry.

There have been many comprehensive studies of resource developments made in recent years. One of the latest was the Presidential Advisory Committee on Water Resource Policy, dated December 22, 1955. In that report it was stated that the estimated use of water in the United States in 1950 was 185 billion gallons per day and that, based on an estimated population of 200 million by 1975, the requirement would be 350 billion gallons per day.

The November 28, 1958, issue of U.S. News & World Report contained a very penetrating article by Dr. Phillip M. Hauser on the so-called explosion of population in the United States, which sheds more light on one of the factors of increased water use.

Dr. Hauser is head of the department of sociology at the University of Chicago, and

has been Deputy Director of U.S. Census. He points out that the newest projections of the Census Bureau place the population of the United States in 1975 at between 216 and 244 million. That is an increase in the predictions of from 8 to 20 percent in the past 3 years.

Putting it another way, taking a mean of the projections, a population of 230 million by 1975 would mean a 30 percent increase in our population in the next 16 years. Think of the tremendous increase in demand on all elements of our resources, including water. In terms of water we will require about 400 billion gallons per day. In other words, during the quarter century period from 1950 to 1975 we will more than double our water requirements.

I know that you can get almost as many estimates of the consumption of water by the American people as there are authorities making surveys. Some of them tell us that in 1850, the average consumption of water per capita by the people of the United States was 50 gallons per day. They tell us that in 1950 it exceeded 1,000 gallons per capita per day.

The Public Health Service, and others charged with responsibility in that regard, tell us that in 1980 the per capita consumption requirements for water by the people of the United States will be about 2,000 gallons per citizen per day. Unless we stop to think, such figures sound incredible. When you consider that in the transformation of raw material to finished products, 1 bushel of wheat requires 7,500 gallons of water, 1 ton of finished steel takes 65,000 gallons of water, 1 yard of woolen cloth takes 500 gallons of water, a pound of rayon takes 150 gallons of water, and 1 gallon of gasoline requires 25 gallons of water, you begin to appreciate the fact that our domestic consumption is but a small fraction of our per capita consumption.

We are continually reclassifying from luxury to necessity items for our personal comfort which add to our water consumption. Take, for instance, the great increase in air conditioning. This alone adds a huge demand on our water supply systems.

That is the kind of changing economy, industrial and domestic in which we now move.

It has taken this Nation, that you and I regard as the strongest on earth, 350 years to reach a population of 170 million people. At the present rate of increase that population will double in less than 40 years. That means that our annual productive capacity will also have to double in the same period to maintain our present standard of living.

If that be the case, we are going to have to speed up water conservation, rather than slow it down if we are going to meet the requirements of this increasing demand from our economy. Plans must be made now to meet those expanding needs.

When the time required to develop a major project—3 years or more for planning, then 8 to 10 years for construction—is considered, it becomes evident that now is none too early to start projects which are actually needed and justified. They will become critically urgent long before they can be completed on an economical program.

The U.S. Geological Survey found in 1953 that there were 1,000 cities, from fairly good size up to big municipalities, that actually had to maintain a very restricted use of water. If something is not done now, then in 15 or 20 years it may be too late.

The average rainfall in the United States is about 4,300 billion gallons per day. Of that amount, about 3,000 billion gallons goes back into the atmosphere by transpiration and evaporation, leaving a total of about 1,300 billion gallons as runoff in rivers and streams, or for percolation into the ground. This, then, is the ultimate limit of our supply. Our consumption in 1956 was about 200 billion gallons; that means that we are consuming about 15 percent of the maximum available supply. By 1975 we will be consuming about 30 percent of the maximum available supply. These are average figures and do not take into account geographical distributions, distributions throughout the year, or the quality of the water for domestic or industrial uses.

There is a vast difference in the amount of rainfall in the various parts of the country. For instance, in the North Atlantic States the rivers carry about 191 billion gallons, but in the basins of the Red River of the North, in Minnesota and North Dakota, which is about the same area, the runoff is only about 4.5 billion gallons. It is apparent, therefore, that there is a very unequal geographical distribution. In some areas the seasonal distribution is even more unequal.

Perhaps a more important question than our absolute capacity to care for the water problems of our agricultural and urban areas, is the question of the relative cost at which we undertake needed developments. The cost of future water supply development can be held to a minimum by intelligent planning of urban settlements, and by multiple purpose water resource developments.

To help meet that problem, the Congress under the leadership of my good friend the great conservationist, ROBERT S. KERR, the senior Senator from Oklahoma, enacted the Water Supply Act of 1958. That act set the stage for a more farsighted and comprehensive consideration of water supply in river basin planning and development. One of the most important features of this act is that it enables the Corps of Engineers to include storage in reservoir projects to meet future needs for municipal and industrial water where there is no water user immediately at hand to pay the bill. The act, however, provides for equitable reimbursement when the need develops.

This act provides an essential and long-needed basis for planning, as in the past no authority existed to build for future water needs, even though it was obvious that they would develop.

Quantity is only one of the considerations in maintaining an adequate water supply; the quality of the water is of equal importance. The greatest water needs are for mineral-free or lightly mineralized water. The kind of water we need is not found everywhere.

What is the present administration doing to help meet this problem? It has not only failed to recommend funds to start surveys, plans, or new construction on projects that are needed now, but last year built into the budget a planned slowdown which would delay the benefits from the projects underway. This would also increase the overall cost of these projects.

As you all know, last year when the Congress added some new starts for planning and construction, there was a terrific blast from the White House.

On September 2, 1958, the President reluctantly signed the public works appropriation bill. At that time he issued the following statement:

"In the Public Works Appropriation Act, 1959, the Congress has included approximately $39 million in funds to initiate construction on 65 unbudgeted new starts that will ultimately cost almost $700 million. Adding nearly $700 million to the already heavy future commitments for Federal Water Resources projects is but another instance of irresponsibility in the expenditure of public funds. I am compelled to approve the act, however, because it appropriates essential funds for continuing work on river and harbor, flood control, and reclamation projects that were started in previous years."

When you consider that the appropriation for construction in the 1959 act was approximately $870 million, was it really an act of irresponsibility in the expenditure of public funds to start new projects which will ultimately cost nearly $700 million? I do not think so. That is adding less than 1 year's future commitment at the present rate of construction.

Unless it is the desire of the administration that the water resource program wither and die on the vine—and that may be the underlying reason—a fair number of new starts should be added each year.

Perhaps these shortsighted planners in the Bureau of the Budget believe that the Federal Government is spending too large a portion of its budget in developing the water resources of this Nation. Let us examine the facts.

Between 1950 and 1956 our national population increased 11.2 percent. Between 1950 and 1956 the national income increased 42 percent. During the same period the expenditures for rivers and harbors and flood control decreased 14.9 percent.

I believe those figures are very significant. As all of you know, construction costs have increased on an average of 5 percent a year. If that average is applied to the 1950 expenditures of $627 million, we should be spending about $908 million in 1959 on the civil functions of the Corps of Engineers in order to maintain the same level of operations as in 1950. In contrast, the appropriation was just under $814 million. This comparison disregards the increased need for these public works resulting from our expanding population.

I am not unmindful of the fact that it is requiring more capital outlay to carry on this Government than at any time in our history, but I believe that to curtail the development of our natural resources, may be the most expensive economy that we can make.

What is the situation in our own Red River Valley? The Red River, with a drainage area of about 91,000 square miles, flows through Oklahoma, Texas, Arkansas, and Louisiana. The Red River constantly expends a portion of its great energy in attacking the easily eroded materials through which it flows. The river is continually changing its alinement, and the losses from caving banks are very extensive. In Louisiana, alone, the 10 local levee boards have spent in excess of $35 million dollars for flood control and major drainage. In addition, millions upon millions of dollars worth of public improvements, such as highways and bridges, a large portion of which are part of the Federal Aid Highway System, have been damaged or rendered useless by floods and the meandering of the Red River.

Denison Dam was constructed by the Corps of Engineers to control the runoff from the upper 39,700 square miles of the Red River Basin, and thus reduce flood stages downstream.

For the past 2 years, when representatives of the Red River Valley Association appeared before the Public Works Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations to seek funds to continue this important work, floods were raging along the Red River. In fact, as I recall, we have had three floods in about 13 months in that area.

The fact that flood disasters still occur is not an indictment of the effectiveness of projects that are in operation. Quite the reverse is true. The effectiveness of the projects in operation emphasizes the fact that we are not progressing fast enough with our authorized projects for relief and control of these floods.

Year after year, waters that should be confined and utilized, flow over farmlands, destroying crops and cattle and driving many of the residents of the valley from their homes. Streets, sewers, water and gas lines, and other public facilities are destroyed. As terrible as are these losses, they can be repaired by the expenditure of millions of dollars for reconstruction. To me, a more serious loss is that resulting from bank

caving, where thousands of acres of rich soil are carried out to sea each year. That is a permanent loss.

The great flood of 1945 demonstrated that the runoff from the uncontrolled areas below Denison can produce floods equal to or greater than the maximum of record. The present plan for flood control on the Red River below Denison Dam was based on that fact. That plan was authorized by Congress in 1946. As subsequently modified by Congress, this plan provides for controlling floods by means of reservoirs, supplemented by local protection such as levees, channel improvements, and bank stabilization measures. It is primarily a reservoir plan, since reservoirs account for about 90 percent of the cost.

Considerable progress has been made on the authorized projects. Denison, Texarkana, Wallace Lake, Ferrels Bridge, and Bayou Bodeau Reservoirs have been built, and they have been very effective in reducing the heavy damage sustained as a result of floods in the past 2 years. But it was never contemplated that these completed reservoirs by themselves would solve the problem. As long as major tributaries—including the Little River—are completely uncontrolled, the Red River Valley is a sitting duck for a disastrous flood.

At long last the control of the Little River by a system of dams, authorized in the Flood Control Act of 1958, which incidentally was one of the plans that was the basis for the previous veto of the bill by the President, offers a ray of hope. Following passage of the authorization act last year, funds were provided for the initiation of the preconstruction planning on the Millwood and Broken Bow Reservoirs.

These were some of the new starts to which the President objected when he signed the Public Works Appropriation Act for the current fiscal year.

As I previously mentioned, we must not only look to the quantity of water, but also its quality. Salt pollutants in the Red River Basin add over 5,000 tons of salt and sulfates each day to the Red River arm of Lake Texoma. Preliminary studies of the U.S. Public Health Service in water quality conservation indicate that there is a possibility of improving the quality of Red River water. The objectives of the investigation are to find the source of pollutants, determine the type and volume, and devise practical means for controlling them.

Project studies now under way indicate promising means of reducing pollution of the Red River. The principal source of natural salt pollution is a rather thin, long rock formation, about 500 miles long and not over 10 miles wide. This formation cuts across many large river systems and pollutes otherwise good quality water.

The fact that major sources of pollution can be isolated suggests the possibility of remedial measures to prevent contamination.

The early completion of this study, and accomplishment of the remedial measures, is essential to the full utilization of the water resources of this great natural asset.

The problems which we have here in the Red River Basin are typical of the problems of water resource development throughout the Nation. Significant progress has been made toward solving these problems, here and elsewhere. Much remains to be done, but the importance of our water resources is becoming more and more widely recognized. With the continued efforts of men of leadership and vision, such as this association has demonstrated in the past, these problems will be solved here, and elsewhere.

It is impossible for me to accept the proposition that the American economy cannot afford the expenditure of funds for wealth-producing projects in this country, at a time when the administration recommends a 26-percent increase in a foreign aid program that in all conscience should be reduced below the 1959 level. I am afraid that the only hope for a nod from the administration for the construction of public works will be those States that border another nation. In such instances it may be possible for such a State to get a few crumbs. Just last month it was announced that the United States and Mexico would jointly build a $100 million dam on the Rio Grande. I wonder if such a project will be subject to the same tests and requirements that a similar project lying wholly within the United States would be required to pass in order to survive?

Could it be that the Bureau of the Budget and the administration actually do not believe that the conservation of water resources makes a major contribution to the economic stability and welfare of the people? No, for that is the basis for requests for large expenditures for economic aid, and for the Development Loan Fund under the mutual security program.

I have frequently been referred to as the Senate's most outspoken critic of the foreign aid program, and I suppose it is true. As I have said many times in the past, I did support foreign aid as originally conceived and I have no apologies to make. I was willing to help our friends get back on their feet. This has long since been accomplished, but we still continue to help them in one way or another. My objections to the present program are based on personal observations of actual operations, and I am convinced that we are not achieving the desired objectives.

In some cases we are sponsoring the wrong projects in the wrong places. For example, we are building flour mills in order to convince the people of Korea that bread is a suitable substitute for rice in their diet. It is hoped that by so doing, the consumption of rice in Korea can be reduced, thus making rice available for export, ignoring the fact that Korea is thus being placed in the position to compete for Far Eastern markets which our own rice industry would desire to obtain. It must be realized that Korea produces very little wheat. Thus, after constructing the flour mills we shall be obligated either to subsidize the importation of wheat into this country, or give it to the Republic of Korea. Consequently, it will be necessary for our aid to continue ad infinitum.

In other cases, the advantages from the projects we sponsor do not inure to the benefit of the peoples of the countries involved. In addition, almost universally, the peoples of the countries we are trying to assist are totally unaware of the millions we are expending in the development of their country. In some instances, because we gave something to one country and did not give a like amount to another, the nonrecipient country begins to pout. The moral of this should be clear to the President—you do not solve problems by giveaways.

One of my principal objections to economic aid projects approved under the mutual security program is the lack of adequate considerations in the overall planning, and the complete disregard of economic justification. A project in a foreign country receives little or no consideration as to its economic soundness, and construction is frequently started before the project is conceived in its entirety, thus increasing unnecessarily the eventual cost. Whereas in this country the project must be specifically authorized after detailed surveys under prescribed standards, and after critical review at the local, State, and National levels.

The project is again subject to critical review in the annual appropriations. Of course, these projects must show a favorable benefit-to-cost ratio, under prescribed conservative standards.

Last year when the House adopted an amendment requiring resource development projects in the foreign-aid program to show economic justification, the administration forces had that proviso removed from the bill, on the basis that it would cripple the program, as indeed it would.

In concluding his message of March 13, 1959, on foreign aid, the President stated:

"If we are wise we will consider it (foreign aid) not as a cost but as an investment—an investment in our present safety, in our future strength and growth, and in the growth of freedom throughout the world."

If the President is really sincere, he will also consider resource development projects as investments in America's future, rather than irresponsible expenditures. Believe me, so long as we consider appropriations for resource development as outright expenditure, instead of as an investment which will return sound dividends, just so long will we allow the chaos of flood and drought to deprive us of the full benefits of our resources.

I am certain that the American people are tired of being told the Federal Government cannot afford to improve our own rivers and harbors—that it needs much of our tax dollars to provide similar facilities in foreign countries. If it provides additional funds to start resource projects it will unbalance the budget.

Our efforts to obtain sufficient funds to keep our public-works program going is becoming more and more difficult. I believe the time has come for the Members of Congress, and the entire Nation as well, to stand up and demand that the administration take a new look at its public-works policy, or else prepare for the entrance of a new administration that will.

Welcome to Italian Foreign Minister Pella

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 8, 1959

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, it is noteworthy that an agreement has been concluded between the United States and Italy to permit the setting up of Jupiter intercontinental ballistic installations on Italian soil. This is a good omen, especially at this time, when we celebrate the 10th anniversary of the signing of the North Atlantic Treaty, of which Italy is an important component. This momentous event is also accompanied by the arrival on our shores of Giuseppe Pella, Italian Foreign Minister and famous diplomat, who comes here to participate in Washington ceremonies commemorating this anniversary.

The decision of Italy to set up these intercontinental ballistic stations within her territorial confines required tremendous courage. It is the result of the foresight of men such as Premier Antonio Segni and Giuseppe Pella. It was only natural for the Italian Communists and Moscow to criticize Italy for this action.

Foreign Minister Giuseppe Pella has been a consistent champion of the Western Alliance among European statesmen. It is interesting to note that despite changes in the heads of the Government in Italy, that country has consistently

lived up to her commitments in NATO and the Western alliance. That fact should be taken into consideration by the executives in our own Government in this forthcoming conference of Foreign Ministers prior to the so-called meeting at the summit. Italy should be a successful candidate for one of the positions at the Foreign Ministers' conference table.

I had the proud distinction of meeting Giuseppe Pella during one of my visits to Italy. Here we have a peasant's son who has risen to one of the highest official positions in the Italian Government. His life story is a most interesting saga. He was born in the foothills of the Alps—in Valdengo—in 1902 and as a mere stripling, helped his parents who were sharecroppers. He attracted the attention of the village priest with his brilliance of intellect and industry and the prelate induced the lad's parents to continue his education. He made the decision to work in a cotton mill, to help him pay his tuition. He kept his nose glued to his books and received a diploma as an accountant at the University of Turin, where he won high honors in finance and economics. When Giuseppe Pella was 30 years of age, he was more than self-sustaining and made considerable money as an adviser to large firms on their financial and other business matters. He entered politics at the end of World War II and became a member of the conservative wing of the Christian Democratic Party. He was elected a member of the Chamber of Deputies in 1946. His ability as a Deputy and a student of government attracted the attention of De Gasperi and he became Foreign Minister in his Cabinet.

He held that position until the fall of the De Gasperi Cabinet and thereafter, became Prime Minister of Italy, Minister of Foreign Affairs, and Minister of the Budget. He again became Foreign Minister in the present government on February 15 last. I am sure we are all glad to have him in our midst. We roll out the carpet for him and wish him and his dear ones well.

Expenditures of the Executive Office of the President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. RHODES

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 8, 1959

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, recently there has been much comment in the press concerning the expenditures of the Executive Office of the President. One columnist purportedly compared projected expenses for 1960 with the level of expenses for the year 1952, which was the last full year of the administration of President Harry S. Truman. At my request the Bureau of the Budget has furnished figures concerning actual expenses of the Executive Office in 1952 and estimated expenses for 1960.

A summary of these figures reveals that personnel costs for the White House actually increased more and at a greater rate during President Truman's administration than they have during President Eisenhower's administration, and this in spite of the fact that during President Eisenhower's administration Congress has twice increased the pay rates for Federal employees.

Employment figures for 1952 and estimates for 1960 are as follows:

White House and Executive Office of the President—Average employment, fiscal years 1952 and 1960

1952 White House and Executive Office total employment 1,256

	1952	1960[1]	Difference
Employment decreases:			
Executive Mansion and Grounds	74	70	−4
Bureau of the Budget	493	430	−63
Council of Economic Advisers	38	32	−6
Emergency Fund for the President	82	5	−77
Office of Defense Mobilization	[2] 295	[3] 225	−70
Total	------	------	−220
Additional employment:			
White House Office	252	274	+22
National Security Council	21	27	+6
Total	------	------	+28
New activities established:			
Special projects (some part by transfer from existing agencies)	------	101	+101
President's Advisory Committee on Government Organization	------	6	+6
President's Committee on Fund Raising Within the Federal Service	------	4	+4
Operations Coordinating Board	------	[4] 49	+49
Total	------	------	+160

1960 White House and Executive Office total employment (excluding personnel acquired as result of merger of FCDA and ODM) 1,224

Summary

1952 total employment	1,256
1960 total employment	2,730
Difference	1,474
Increase as result of acquisition of FCDA personnel	1,506
Actual comparative decrease	−32

[1] Estimated.
[2] Includes National Security Resources Board, later merged with ODM.
[3] ODM merged with FCDA, an established independent agency, to form Office of Civil Defense and Mobilization in the Executive Office.
[4] OCB staff is included in NSC budget.

Subject: White House and Executive Office of the President, comparison of employment for the fiscal years 1952 and 1960.

The attached table shows that employment in all units in the White House and Executive Office of the President, with the exception of employment added to the Executive Office as a result of the merger of mobilization and civil defense activities in 1958, actually decreased 2.5 percent from 1952, the last full year in office of the preceding administration, to 1960. The merger in the Executive Office of Office of Defense Mobilization and Federal Civil Defense Administration (an established independent agency) added 1,506 employees, and this tends to make comparisons in total employment misleading.

THE WHITE HOUSE OFFICE

Average employment of the White House Office increased from 252 in fiscal year 1952, to 272 in 1955. Since 1955, employment has remained close to 272, and no increases above the current 274 are anticipated through 1960.

SPECIAL PROJECTS

Certain of the policy development and policy coordinating activities consolidated under "Special projects" in 1956 had previously been carried on in the departments and by interdepartmental committees. Personnel were charged to the appropriation of the agency providing the funds rather than to the White House. This was also a practice of previous administrations.

A part of the increase indicated is attributable, however, to new undertakings which were dictated by the national interest. These include the studies in science and technology under Dr. Killian, and the airways modernization activities headed by General Quesada, which have since been transferred to the Federal Aviation Agency.

NATIONAL SECURITY COUNCIL

Employment of the NSC increased from 21 to 27 during the period 1952–58. Beginning in 1958, the Operations Coordinating Board has been financed from this appropriation. From its creation in 1953 until 1958 financing for OCB was provided by represented agencies and personnel were distributed according to source of funds. The OCB assists in coordinating implementation of national security policies. Total NSC employment for 1960 is estimated to be 76.

OFFICE OF CIVIL AND DEFENSE MOBILIZATION

The consolidation in 1958 of the Federal Civil Defense Administration, an independent office created in 1950, with the Office of Defense Mobilization, within the Executive Office of the President significantly changed overall Executive Office employment. Total OCDM employment in 1960 is estimated to be 1,731, of which 225 relate to the former ODM and 1,506 to the newly merged functions from FCDA.

OTHER ACTIVITIES

Employment of other activities in the Executive Office has remained stable, with the exception of the Bureau of the Budget which will employ 63 fewer people in 1960 than in 1952.

Waukesha, Wis., Daily Freeman: 100 Years of Progress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 8, 1959

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to congratulate an outstanding Wisconsin newspaper which celebrated its 100th anniversary on March 29. It seems to me only fitting that we pause long enough today to pay our respects to this militant, dedicated and persevering newspaper, the Waukesha (Wis.) Daily Freeman.

This newspaper, founded 100 years ago on March 29, 1859, is marking its centennial with a series of special editions which depict the growth of the city of

Waukesha, the County of Waukesha, and the Waukesha Daily Freeman.

The year 1959 is a particularly fitting time for the Waukesha Freeman to observe its centennial, because at no time since those first years of this newspaper has our country faced as serious a fight for universal recognition of individual civil rights as it does today.

For 100 years the Waukesha Daily Freeman has adhered to the principles of the abolition movement, and I might add that these principles are no less important today than they were 100 years ago. Through the years we have made considerable progress in the area of human rights, but recent newspaper headlines prove to us that we have not yet achieved in practice the theory of equal rights for all Americans, for all human beings.

The Waukesha Daily Freeman has made a major contribution to our democracy for its strict adherence for 100 years to its founding principles. The fact that this strength is still alive was well illustrated several years ago when the Daily Freeman, published in a community of some 28,000 residents, was nominated for a Pulitzer prize. Nomination for this coveted award throughout our land was based on the Waukesha Daily Freeman's ceaseless efforts to gain public access to local government records and meetings. In addition, this publication—though primarily local and State in news interest—has time and again stood in favor of this same free access to information at the Federal level. Its praiseworthy stand deserves the support of all persons interested in good government—at local, State, and National levels.

I wish to add only that it is my sincere hope and desire that the Waukesha Daily Freeman continue to be equally dedicated to the highest traditions of journalism in a free and democratic society for the next 100 years. This is a newspaper which has fought for a full century for the rights of all human beings, and I have every faith in the leadership of its publisher, Mrs. J. H. Youmans. I know it shall continue to adhere to its founding principle for the next 100 years.

My heartiest congratulations go to Mrs. Youmans and the Waukesha Daily Freeman, and I know that my 435 colleagues in Congress join me in this greeting.

Indiana Flood-Control Construction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED WAMPLER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 8, 1959

Mr. WAMPLER. Mr. Speaker, the Public Works Subcommittee of the House Committee on Appropriations has been working long and diligently on the public works money measure for the fiscal year 1960. With the bill in the final legislative stages, I would like to set forth for the information and consideration of all the detailed flood-control problems and needs of the Sixth District of Indiana, the district which I have the honor to represent.

On March 5, 1959, I appeared before the House Appropriations Special Subcommittee on Deficiencies, headed by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS], which was then conducting hearings relative to the second supplemental appropriations bill for fiscal 1959.

At that time, I had just returned from an inspection trip in and around my flood-stricken home area, Terre Haute, Ind. The degree of total waste, devastation, and privation was literally heartrending. The annual human, agricultural, and property damage loss and tragedy resulting from Wabash River floodings is incredible.

During the February 1959 flood, to which I have just referred, the small town of Clinton, Ind., with a population slightly in excess of 5,000, was fighting the floodwaters heroically, with some 8,000 sandbags purchased by the local citizenry for 14 cents apiece. As I told Mr. THOMAS' subcommittee, those sandbags were not purchased this year, they were bought several years ago during a previous flood, and when the danger was past they were emptied and stored so they could be used again, when the Wabash would inevitably threaten the area's people and their homes.

West Terre Haute has been flooded out for 3 consecutive years. Flood crestings are so frequent and so severe that Terre Haute no longer records flood levels at the 14-foot mark; the 20-foot mark now is the only recorded level.

In February of this year, floods along the Wabash caused 60 Indiana major highways to be actually impassable, thereby totally isolating many entire communities. Waterworks in the cities of Huntington, Wabash and Peru were so acutely threatened that if the floodwaters had risen 6 inches to 1 foot more, the local water would have become thoroughly contaminated, thus setting off a serious health hazard, conceivably to the epidemic stage.

I have obtained from the adjutant general of the State of Indiana a tally sheet of the expenses and losses incurred during the February 1959 flood. The totals I think are slightly less than astounding. It cost the people of the State of Indiana in expenses and losses—agricultural and property—a computed total of $1,663,211.77; of that total $567,105.46 was spent and lost in the immediate area in and around west Terre Haute.

To fight the floods, not only local volunteers were and are used, the Army and Air National Guard, the Adjutant General's Department, the State highway department, State penal farm labor, the Civil Defense Department, the American Red Cross, the Indiana State Police, the Vigo County Commission, the Terre Haute Street Department and the Army and Navy Reserves were employed. Two hundred and thirty-six State and Federal vehicles were used to fight back the floodwaters for a total of 17,833 hours.

And I am informed by the Indiana State adjutant general that the $1.6 million total is very conservative because it does not include extensive damage to private and personal property. In addition, President Eisenhower, within the last 2 months, has declared the general area a disaster region two times to the extent of emergency disaster Federal funds totaling $500,000.

Note, Mr. Speaker, that this rather staggering tally of expenses and losses is only for the February 1959 flood. The February 1959 flood has been preceded by 22 major Wabash River floodings; 9 within the past 12 years.

Flood damages in 1913 amounted to $11 million; the 1943 flood damage was $10,660,000, and the loss of 6 lives; the 1950 flood resulted in 4 deaths and damage of $1,662,000.

The 1957 and 1958 agricultural losses of acreage along the Wabash tributaries, including the White River, amounted to 487,200 acres, and total crop value losses amounted to $19,064,000.

Indiana highway losses due to floods in 1958 cost the counties and the State $602,770 in road repairs and $912,754 in bridge repairs. The 1957 State flood loss figures were $502,187 for roads and $113,417 to replace washed out or damaged bridges.

All these figures have been compiled by Indiana State officials and are a matter of published record.

And now, for the fifth time during the 4-months-old year of 1959 the Wabash River again is just about to spill over its banks bringing death and destruction. The Lafayette Journal and Courier newspaper for April 28, 1959, just 3 days ago, carried the headline "Wabash Flooding Again."

The accompanying story states, in part:

> The Weather Bureau said the Wabash should go about 3 feet over the 12-foot stage at the city of Wabash sometime Tuesday, then roll downstream and gain in depth.
>
> The river should hit 5 or 6 feet above the 14-foot flooding stage at Montezuma Friday and about 3 feet over banktop at Terre Haute Saturday.

Mr. Speaker, these appalling losses and expenses, not to mention the consequent Wabash Valley population and economic drainage, must be arrested and hopefully stopped. I am not asking for construction that has as one of its multiple purposes recreation. I want flood control project construction that will keep flood-driven, filth-laden waters from washing away homes, stores, factories, schools, and churches, and driving sincere, honest, hard-working people out of the area in which they were born and in which they would like to live and rear their families.

I have asked for, and the Army Corps of Engineers has informed me they have the engineering capabilities to utilize during the fiscal year 1960, the following funds for already authorized projects:

West Terre Haute local protection project: $30,000, to complete preconstruction planning.

Sugar Creek levee: $15,000, to initiate preconstruction planning and bring the planning to 50 percent of completion.

Wabash River Basin study, above the White River: $40,000. The President's budget for fiscal year 1960 asks only $25,000 for this study. General Person, Assistant Chief of the Army engineers, tells me the Corps has the capability to utilize $40,000 during fiscal 1960. The additional $15,000, Mr. Speaker, will allow the Army Corps of Engineers to continue working on Sugar Creek, Wild Cat Creek, and Big Pine Creek.

Clinton levee: $5,000, to enable the Army engineers to restudy the project.

Conover levee, which is a Terre Haute local protection project: $2,000, also to enable the Army engineers to restudy the project.

I understand that because the Adams Levee, Parke County, group's charter is expiring, a new document is needed. And since there is no Raccoon Levee, Parke County, organization, one will have to be established under State-authorized charter. In the case of the Greenfield Bayou levee, the group must reorganize because its current charter is not sufficiently inclusive. For these reasons, I am making no money requests for the Adams, Raccoon, and Greenfield Bayou levees.

I have, however, asked the Indiana Flood Control and Water Resources Commission and the local levee representatives to expedite their reorganizational activity.

The following charts compiled by the adjutant general of the State of Indiana constitute, I think, self-explanatory evidence of the desperate need for flood control construction in Indiana's Sixth District:

Indiana flood costs, by departments, February 1959

TERRE HAUTE AREA, IMMEDIATE AREA IN AND AROUND WEST TERRE HAUTE

	Army and Air National Guard	USPFO, Federal	Adjutant General Department	State highway department	Penal farm	Civil Defense Department	American Red Cross	Indiana State Police	Vigo County Commission	Terre Haute Street Department	Naval Reserve	Army Reserve	All Indiana, grand total
Man-days	1,479	170											1,649
Man-hours				720	920	3,340		1,042	1,137	40	561	440	8,200
Personal services cost	$11,830.66	$1,512.30		$1,080	$135.78			$4,000	$1,906.30	$292			$20,757.04
Transportation					23.10								23.10
Food	1,033.90		$34.60									$64	1,132.50
Motor oil									30.16			4	34.16
Gasoline	177.24								302.15		$257.60	80	816.99
Sandbags	12,438.00												12,438.00
Steel cable		85.00											85.00
Wire		264.00											264.00
Sand									205.80				205.80
Gravel					349.80				420.00				769.80
Shovels									139.32				139.32
Personal injury	30.75												30.75
Motor vehicles		20,160.00		8,640		$333							21,357.00
Heavy equipment										792	2,016.00	3,744	6,552.00
Bridge and road equipment				225,000									225,000.00
Agriculture damage						177,500							177,500.00
Small business damage						100,000							100,000.00
Families affected													
Homes damaged/destroyed													
Personal property loss													
Total	25,510.55	22,021.30	34.60	226,944	508.68	227,833		4,000	3,003.73	1,084	2,273.60	3,892	567,105.46

BALANCE OF THE WABASH RIVER VALLEY, BEGINNING AT CITY OF WABASH AND EXTENDING SOUTH TO VINCENNES[1]

Man-days	709												709
Man-hours				5,000		7,000		700					12,700
Personal service cost	$5,453.62			$7,500				$2,800					$15,753.62
Food	588.55												588.55
Motor oil													
Gasoline	212.84												212.84
Sandbags	2,622.30												2,622.30
Personal injury	29.00												29.00
Motor vehilces		$10,800.00		22,400									33,200.00
Heavy equipment				20,100									20,100.00
Bridge/road damage				225,000									225,000.00
Agricultural damage						$221,600							221,600.00
Small business damage						500,000							500,000.00
Families affected							2,220						2,220.00
Homes damaged/destroyed							539						539.00
Personal property loss							$77,000						77,000.00
Totals	8,906.31	10,800.00		275,000		721,600	$77,000	2,800					1,096,106.31

STATEWIDE GRAND TOTAL

Immediate area in and around West Terre Haute	$25,510.55	$22,021.30	$34.60	$226,944	$508.68	$277,833		$4,000	$3,003.73	$1,084	$2,273.60	$3,892	$567,105.46
All other areas in State	8,906.31	10,800.00		275,000		721,000	$77,000	2,800					1,096,106.31
Grand total	34,416.86	32,821.30	34.60	501,944	508.68	999,433	77,000	6,800	3,003.73	1,084	2,273.60	3,892	1,663,211.77

[1] See table below:

Vehicles used	Type	Number	Hours each	Total hours	Vehicles used	Type	Number	Hours each	Total hours
Army	Regular	78	72	5,616	Navy	Pumpers	4	40	160
Air	do	8	72	576	Do	Heavy duty	2	40	80
Highway	Heavy duty	30	67	2,010	Army Reserve	Regular	3	72	216
Do	Regular	55	141	7,760	Do	Heavy duty	10	72	720
Civil defense	do	37	3	111	State police	Regular			
Vigo County	Heavy duty	4	96	384					
Terre Haute	do	5	40	200	Total		236	715	17,833

Wabash River Basin projects, Indiana

Project	Estimated cost			Fiscal year 1960 engineering capability to utilize funds [1]		Remarks
	Federal	Non-Federal	Total	Planning	Construction	
Active authorized projects:						
West Terre Haute local protection project.	$473,000	$95,000	$568,000	$30,000	0	Funds would be utilized to complete preconstruction planning.
Sugar Creek levee	355,000	27,000	382,000	15,000	0	Funds would be utilized to initiate preconstruction planning work and bring that planning to 50 percent of completion.
Adams levee	262,000	13,200	275,200	0	0	Time limit on existing levee district charter is about to expire and the district will have to be reorganized.
Greenfield Bayou levee	1,890,000	270,000	2,160,000	0	0	The existing levee district will have to be reorganized as it now encompasses only the northern half of the project area.
Raccoon Creek levee	360,000	33,000	393,000	0	0	Levee district will have to be reformed. Original district charter has expired.
Projects deferred for restudy:						
Clinton levee	[2] 93,000	[1] 9,000	[2] 102,000	5,000	0	The fiscal year 1960 capability is for restudy work only.
Terre Haute local protection project (Conover levee).	[2] 199,000	([3])	0	2,000	0	Do.

[1] Fiscal year 1960 capability to utilize funds based on premise that no funds will be made available to these projects during the remainder of fiscal year 1959. The amounts shown have been determined strictly from an engineering standpoint, considering each project by itself without reference to our overall capability, or fiscal considerations. Since no funds were included in the President's budget for fiscal year 1960 for any of these projects, no funds can be utilized in view of overall budgetary considerations.

[2] Estimates last revised in 1954.

[3] Not available.

Address by Hon. Herman E. Talmadge Before Tennessee Agricultural Council

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 8, 1959

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, the thoughtful speech delivered by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE] before the annual meeting of the Tennessee Agricultural Council in Memphis, Tenn., on April 3, 1959. More than 1,000 leading farmers and businessmen were present to hear Senator TALMADGE. These farm leaders were impressed by his analysis of the farm problem and his recommendations for a solution. I am certain that Members of Congress and others who are giving consideration to the plight of the American farmer in trying to do something to better his lot will be interested in the analysis of Senator TALMADGE and will be impressed with the fact that he has a specific program to present, which is deserving of most careful consideration.

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

It is a happy occasion for me to have this opportunity to meet with my fellow farmers.

And I do like to regard myself as a farmer even though my principal agricultural pursuit at present is endeavoring to plow under Secretary of Agriculture Ezra T. Benson and his farm policies.

It is a planting which, I am sure you will agree, is long overdue.

And I am pleased to be able to report to you that the climate for doing some major cultivating in that field is improving every day both in Washington and throughout the Nation.

As incredible as it may seem to those unfamiliar with the facts, we in the United States have a Department of Agriculture which is the enemy of the farmer.

Had the Department of Labor for 1 day been as antagonistic to the interests of organized labor as the Department of Agriculture for 6 years has been to the interests of the farmer, Mr. Reuther and his associates in the AFL–CIO would have ridden the Secretary out of Washington on a rail before sundown.

For 6 years now it has been the policy of the Republican administration to ruin rather than to save the farmer.

For 6 years now it has been the program of Mr. Benson and the Department of Agriculture to discredit rather than to help the farmer.

With apologies to the late great Will Carleton, the farmer's present plight might well be summed up like this:

"Worm or beetle—drought or tempest—on a farmer's land may fall,
Each is loaded full o'ruin, but the Benson farm plan beats 'em all."

Or to paraphrase that well-known bit of anonymous farm doggerel:

"Some people tell us that there ain't no hell,
But they never farmed under Benson, so how can they tell?"

Of course, my friends, it is not necessary for me to tell you who earn your living from the soil that the present farm program has been a miserable failure and American agriculture is in the worst mess in this country's history.

It is a situation which is reflected in every compilation of agricultural statistics.

It is a situation which is reflected in the accelerated shift of population from farm to city.

It is a situation which is reflected in last year's election results.

It is a situation which is apparent to everyone except Secretary Benson and President Eisenhower.

These are the irrefutable facts:

Between 1952 and 1958, realized net farm income in this country declined from $14.4 to $13 billion despite substantially increased Government payments. And, when the degree of inflation which has occurred since 1952 is taken into account, it is obvious that realized net income would have to be increased considerably above the $14.4 billion sum merely to put farmers back where they were in terms of purchasing power 6 years ago.

Such an eventuality is hardly likely under the present program, however, inasmuch as the Agricultural Marketing Service itself predicts a reduction of from 5 to 10 percent in realized net income this year.

During the same 1952–58 period, farm production expenses increased from $22.6 to $24.5 billion and the spread between farm and retail prices widened by $75 for each thousand dollars spent for farm produce. The farmer's share of the market-basket dollar dropped from 47 to 39 cents and still is falling.

The Bureau of Labor Statistics index for last January showed prices received by farmers at that time were 10 percent below those realized in 1947–49 while prices paid by farmers were up 19 percent for the corresponding period.

In view of the situation evidenced by those figures it is not surprising that the Department of Commerce reports that between 1950 and 1957 2,349,000 persons migrated from the farms of the Nation to compete for increasingly scarce jobs in urban areas. According to latest reports, that trend is continuing.

Those are the facts which Mr. Benson blithely ignores in insisting that black is white and failure is success.

The essence of his recent testimony before the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry was that—and I am sure this will be news to you—farmers in the United States never had it so good.

As a matter of fact, he told the committee in effect that things are going so good for the farmer that unless Congress does something about it before May 15 the whole country is going to pot.

His prescription for doing something about it turned out to be a bigger dose of Benson brand sulfur and molasses.

The Secretary can claim the distinction of being the first man in history to use his own failures as arguments in favor of his policies.

He is making much of the fact that realized net farm income increased 21 percent during 1958.

What he is not mentioning is the fact that the 1958 total still is considerably below the rate which prevailed at the time he took office.

He is making much of the fact that per capita farm income last year topped the previous high set in 1951.

What he is not mentioning is the degree of inflation which has taken place since the Korean war and the fact that farm income is spread among fewer families now that his

policies have forced more than 2 million persons off the farm.

He is making much of the fact that the national farm surplus continues to increase.

What he is not mentioning is the fact that it was he who kept all surplus commodities off the world market during 1953 and 1954 and that it was not until Congress required by law that he do so that he began to move them into world trade channels.

He is making much of his contention that he could solve the problem of overproduction if Congress would give him authority to reduce prices.

What he is not mentioning is the fact that under authority given him since 1954 he already has reduced supports by an average of 20 percent and, at the same time, the wheat surplus increased by a third and the corn surplus doubled.

He is making much of his contention that he could restore the agricultural economy of the Nation if Congress would give him the laws he wants.

What he is not mentioning is the fact that of the 53 recommendations he has made to Congress, 48—or more than 90 percent—have received favorable legislative action and that those 5 which were turned down were of a relatively minor nature.

It will take more than Mr. Benson's usual pious sermonizing and glib platitudes to disclaim his responsibility for the sad situation which prevails in American agriculture today.

His contention that he should not be held accountable for the mess he has made solely because Congress has not given him everything for which he asked is about as plausible as his claim that he did American farmers a big favor by cutting parity prices by $200 million in January.

With Mr. Benson having his way, the farmers of America would be better off seeking their living at the dice tables of Las Vegas.

After all, even a crapshooter wins sometime, which is more than one can say for the chances of the American farmer under the Benson farm program.

The Benson program has depressed farm prices below the subsistence level.

The Benson program has forced farmers to abandon their farms.

The Benson program has stimulated artificially high prices for consumer goods.

The Benson program has generated unmanageable surpluses of farm commodities.

The Benson program has robbed the United States of its world markets.

The Benson program has resulted in a farm depression which, as we saw in last year's recession, is making itself felt in all other segments of our national economy.

Our experience has proved conclusively that reduced acreage, reduced prices, and rising costs lead only to reducing farm income to a disaster level. It has shown beyond contradiction that it is impossible to reduce production by reducing prices, to control production by reducing acreage, or to bring supply into line with demand through research, which has the effect of increasing supplies.

An openminded appraisal of all the facts affords no other conclusion but that we in the United States have reached the point where it is essential to the future welfare not only of the farmer, but also of the taxpaying consumer, that an entirely new approach be undertaken to solve the Nation's farm problems.

Both the farmers and the consumers of the United States have repudiated the ruinous policies of Secretary Benson at the polls, and they have given Congress a mandate to write a bold, new law which will give farmers the protection they have been denied for the past 6 years without placing an intolerable burden on the taxpayers of the country.

The farmer wants to be returned to a free-enterprise economy, with protection equivalent to that enjoyed by labor through the minimum wage and collective bargaining, and by industry through the tariff and Government subsidies and contracts.

The taxpayer wants a stabilized farm program which will give his pocketbook a break both in the marketplace and at tax time.

Our experience with Mr. Benson's ideas of farming stands as conclusive proof that those ends cannot be achieved through existing concepts.

To effect a realistic and permanent solution to our agricultural problems we are going to have to profit by our mistakes and take advantage of the lessons we have learned at so great cost.

We are going to have to discard completely the present patchwork of discredited farm laws, start all over again, and write an entirely new program which will get away from the compounded failures and the stereotyped concepts of the past.

My long and serious study of this matter has convinced me that such a program must have three fundamental objectives.

First, it must let the farmer farm.

Second, it must guarantee the farmer his proportionate share of the national purchasing power.

And, third, it must put American agricultural commodities back on the world markets at competitive prices.

Those objectives can never be achieved until the Federal Government is removed from the business of buying, storing, transporting, and selling agricultural commodities—which it is now doing at a yearly cost of $1.027 billion to the American taxpayers—and the responsibility for marketing farm produce is returned to the farmer and private enterprise where it belongs.

Those objectives can be achieved only by freeing the farmer to plant and sell his crops as he sees fit and by limiting the role of the Federal Government in agriculture to paying the farmer the difference between the prices he receives for commodities sold for consumption in this country and 100 percent of parity.

Those objectives are encompassed in the Talmadge farm plan which I first introduced during the 2d session of the 85th Congress and which I reintroduced with the cosponsorship of Senator OLIN D. JOHNSTON, of South Carolina, shortly after the beginning of the present 1st session of the 86th Congress.

The overwhelmingly favorable response which my bill has received from all sections of the country encourages me to believe that such an approach has widespread appeal not only among farmers but also among the general public.

While I would not say it can be enacted this year or next, I will make the prediction that when a new farm program is passed—and, if not before, one certainly will be after we install a Democrat in the White House in 1961—it will be along the lines of the measure I have proposed.

The Talmadge farm plan is exceedingly simple and can be understood by even the layman without the necessity of consulting a Philadelphia lawyer or a certified public accountant.

It has five major points, as follows:

First, it would eliminate all acreage controls and Government loans.

Second, it would assign each farmer growing basic commodities a domestic production quota to be expressed in terms of unit measurements—pounds, bushels, bales, etc.—which would be the same percentage of the national consumption of basic commodities that the farmer's average annual production for the preceding 5 years bears to the total national average production for the same period.

Third, it would guarantee and pay to each farmer a sales price support of the difference between the price he receives for his domestic production quota and 100 percent of parity.

Fourth, it would require each farmer to submit a bill of sale with this application for sales price support payments.

And, fifth, it would impose a maximum of $25,000 on the amount of sales price support which any individual farmer could receive in any 1 year.

As an example of how it would work, let's take the case of an average cotton farmer who now has a 5-acre allotment on which he grows 3½ bales of cotton a year. Under the Talmadge formula, his domestic quota would be about 2 1/10 bales which, when sold at current prices, would entitle him to a compensatory payment of $105 over and above the $315 he would receive in the market place. Those amounts would be in addition to his income from the sale of whatever additional cotton he might grow in excess of his quota to sell on the open market.

For cotton the Talmadge plan support price would be 40 cents a pound compared with the present market price of around 30 cents and the 81 percent of parity support price of 32.4 cents.

The actual amount of the compensatory payment to the individual farmer would depend upon the prevailing market price. If the market price went down the compensatory payment would go up and vice versa. The farmer thereby would have the firm assurance of a 100 percent of parity price on his domestic production quota regardless of the level of the market price.

The cost of my plan would depend upon the resulting free market price levels of the basic commodities, but in any event would be considerably less than that of the present program. It likely would vary between $1.5 and $2.5 billion and the agricultural experts of the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress estimate its potential saving to the taxpayer at between $2 and $3 billion a year.

While costing less, it would put perhaps as much as $1 billion a year more in the pockets of the farmers. As paradoxical as that might seem, it would be the case because the high costs of administering the present bureaucratic program would be considerably reduced. For instance, one of the costs which would be ended would be the billion dollars a year now being spent to handle surplus agricultural commodities.

Furthermore, whatever its ultimate cost might prove to be, the Talmadge farm plan would assure that every farm program dollar went into the pockets of the American farmers which decidedly is not the case at the present time.

With particular reference to cotton, under my bill American textile mills would get an even break with their foreign competitors who can now buy subsidized American cotton $35 to $40 a bale cheaper than it can be purchased in this country.

In other words, the underlying philosophy of the approach I have proposed is to subsidize Americans instead of foreigners.

While I will match my humanitarian impulses with those of anyone, I do not believe in—nor do I believe the American people believe in—global philanthropy at the expense of the American farmer and the agricultural economy of the United States.

Even more important than the financial considerations are the intangible advantages to be derived from a free enterprise farm program bolstered by compensatory payments.

Such an approach is extremely simple and would take the redtape out of the farm program.

Such an approach would eliminate the regimentation and dictation imposed by acreage controls.

Such an approach would let the farmer plant what he wants and sell it as he pleases.

Such an approach would take the Federal Government out of the business of buying,

storing, transporting and selling farm commodities and place the responsibility for marketing with the farmer and private enterprise where it belongs.

Such an approach would guarantee the farmer his proportionate share of the national purchasing power and restore agriculture to a free enterprise, competitive base.

Such an approach would end the accumulation of the national farm surplus which has glutted the Nation's markets and stagnated its economy.

Such an approach would make the national farm program an estimable budget item which would remain relatively stable over the years.

Such an approach would mean lower prices to both the consumer and industry and would put American agricultural products, both raw and processed, back on the world market at competitive prices.

Such an approach would give the farmer protection equivalent to labor's minimum wage and right to collective bargaining and industry's tariff and Government contracts and subsidies.

Such an approach would take the realistic view that the only justification for a farm program is to increase the income of farmers and would seek to do that by going in the front, instead of the back, door.

Such an approach would mark a new and fresh start which would release agriculture from the bonds of past mistakes and relieve the Nation's economy of the burdens of abortive farm laws.

There are those who contend that we should make agriculture entirely free and have no farm program at all. I do not share that viewpoint.

While I am enough of a Jeffersonian Democrat to believe that we would all be better off if our entire economy were freed and allowed to seek its own level, I am also, by the same token, enough of a realist to know that, with virtually every other segment of the Nation's economy protected by law, the farmer cannot be left as the only person without a legislative guarantee of his proportionate share of the national income.

If the farmer is to share in the general prosperity of the rest of the country—if he is to own an automobile, send his children to school, and give his family a reasonable standard of living—it is essential that a new farm program be devised which will give him that assurance.

The American standard of living is the highest in the world and to deny the American farmer legislative protection in the enjoyment of it would amount to putting him into direct competition with farmers in countries where living standards are minute fractions of our own and to make of him a virtual peon in a land of plenty.

While I would be the last to claim that my idea offers a complete solution to all the Nation's farm problems, I do sincerely believe that it affords a basis upon which agreement on a new national farm program can be reached. And I am now working toward that end with several of my like-minded colleagues in an effort to perfect my bill so as to give it the broadest possible base of support among all commodity groups.

I am hopeful that we can have an omnibus bill ready for consideration in the not too distant future.

Perhaps the most difficult of the problems with which we are wrestling is what to do about the $9-billion-plus surplus which Mr. Benson has accumulated.

My own idea is that a four-way disposal program should be undertaken.

The first step would be to have the National Security Council determine what portion of the surplus is needed as a national strategic reserve and make immediate recommendations to Congress for setting aside and preserving that amount of food and fiber for emergency use.

The second step would be to offer all local, State, national and international charitable, relief and welfare organizations and agencies donations of surplus commodities of whatever amounts they could utilize effectively in their humanitarian programs.

The third step would be to substitute surplus commodities for dollars in the conduct of the economic assistance phases of our foreign-aid programs, including long-term purchase agreements with underdeveloped countries like India.

And the fourth—and perhaps the most important—step would be to absorb the remainder of the surplus in the farm program itself.

The first three steps are self-explanatory and the fourth would be accomplished in this way:

Any farmer so electing could, by agreeing to put into conservation practices without payment the amount of land on which he would grow his domestic production quota, receive for sale on the open market at whatever price it would bring the equivalent of his quota from Government surplus stocks.

No compensatory payments would be paid on such sales as the farmer would have, in effect, received as payment in eliminating the cost of growing his share of the domestic market.

Under such an arrangement existing commodities would be substituted unit for unit for assigned quotas which would assure against disruption of normal trade channels. In addition, farmers electing the option would still be free to grow as much of any commodity as they desired for nonsupported sales on the world market.

Mr. Benson has seen fit in recent speeches to call the Talmadge farm plan "a long step toward a fully socialized agriculture," and to maintain that its proposal has joined the issue of "Goverment control versus freedom."

To the former assertion I would reply that Mr. Benson either is totally ignorant of the provisions of the Talmadge farm plan or he was looking in the mirror at his own program when he coined his description.

To the latter claim I would say that it is true that the issue has been joined but that the roles are the reverse of what he would have them be.

My recollection of elementary economics is that socialism is synonymous with nationalization or government ownership and control.

Now I ask you would American agriculture be more nationalized under my plan whereby the farmer could plant what he pleases and be held responsible for selling what he grows or under Mr. Benson's plan whereby the Government tells the farmer how much he can grow and then buys, stores, transports, and sells it for him?

My knowledge of the present farm program which stems from my own experience as a farmer operating under it is that its basis is drastic and ever-constricting acreage controls.

Now I ask you would the American farmer have more freedom under my plan whereby the farmer would be free to decide for himself what and how much he would grow or under Mr. Benson's plan whereby the Government puts strict limits on his planting and subjects him to stiff penalties for failing to comply with them?

I think the answer is obvious from the observation that under the Talmadge farm plan Stanley Yankus, Jr., the Michigan poultry farmer who has been put out of business by Mr. Benson's regulations, would not find it necessary to emigrate to Australia to find enough freedom to run his farm as he wants to run it.

Mr. Benson in his statements and letters to newspapers has sought to label my proposal a Brannan plan.

Such a label is not supported by the facts of the matter.

The only point of similarity between the Talmadge and the Brannan plans is the compensatory payment idea and, if it is the intent of Mr. Benson to equate that feature of my proposal with the Brannan plan, then by the same logic it also could be called the Eisenhower plan, the Seaton plan, and, yes, even the Benson plan.

That is true because officials by those names have advocated a similar application of the compensatory payment idea to producers of metals and growers of wool and sugar.

It is most unfortunate that there are some to whom playing politics is more important than seeking to serve the best interests of the farmers of America.

The most lamentable aspect of the present national agricultural dilemma is that it is the end product of partisan politics.

The welfare of our farmers and the protection and preservation of our national economy are above any personal considerations. They demand that we cease playing politics with the farm problem and act in unison to restore to the farmer his freedom and his rightful place in the Nation's economic picture.

As Columnist Joseph Alsop recently pointed out with great sagacity the present situation has "sorely endangered" America's great asset of an "independent farming population." He declared with great truth that "socially, biologically, historically, this is a name well worth national investment."

The sands of history are littered with the wrecks of civilizations and nations which perished as the result of dissipating and destroying their independent farming populations.

The vitality of any people stems from the soil and it is an inexorable law of nature that it withers and dies when its roots are transplanted to a wholly-urban culture.

There is something about the tilling of the soil which nurtures in the human breast an appreciation of the true purpose of man's existence which cannot be instilled through any other pursuit.

As Thomas Jefferson put it: "Those who labor in the earth are the chosen people of God * * * whose breasts He has made His peculiar deposit for substantial and genuine virtue."

The worst fate which could befall our country would be for urban Americans to lose sight of the fact that their present and their future are dependent upon the maintenance of a vital and progressive agriculture.

The day we allow ourselves to be deceived by demagogic appeals into believing that the American farmer is an economic liability will be the day which marks the beginning of the end of our great Nation.

Americans must look beyond their own selfish personal interests and recognize the great truth uttered by Daniel Webster when he declared:

"Let us never forget that the cultivation of the earth is the most important labor of man. When tillage begins, other arts follow. The farmers, therefore, are the founders of civilization."

That is why we must look to our farms as the only source of a posterity which cherishes its heritage of freedom and is dedicated to its preservation.

That is why we must do whatever is necessary to sustain our farms as the roots of our great American civilization.

That is why we must insist that Congress act immediately and decisively to write and enact a workable and productive farm program which will assure for all time to come that those roots will continue to nourish and replenish the life's blood of our Nation.

Toward that end I have dedicated my every effort.

Toward that end I beg your advice, help and support.

I thank you.

Launching of the "Sea Diver"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES A. BURKE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 8, 1959

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, April 5, 1959, there was launched at the Quincy Adams Yacht Yards at Quincy, Mass., one of the most remarkable vessels ever to take the water. She is called *Sea Diver* and is the first boat built from the keel up especially for use in underwater exploration of historical sites. Her owner is the famous inventor of the Link trainer, Edwin A. Link, president of the General Precision Equipment Corp. He gave the vessel his personal supervision and built into it special equipment, some of which he invented himself.

I had the great privilege of being present when *Sea Diver* slid down the ways. She is not a yacht but a work boat constructed for serious scientific purposes.

Made of heavy steel, with the care typical of New England craftsmen, she is 91 feet long, with a 20-foot beam, and will draw about 6 feet. There is ample accommodation for 14. Her cruising range, without refueling, will be more than 7,000 miles. She is powered by two diesel engines and there are two other diesel engines to operate the special equipment. She has radar, sonar, and loran for navigation. She has an underwater viewing compartment, a bay at the stern from which divers can descend, a device called an air lift which can suck sand from the bottom of a harbor so that the sand can be strained through a sieve to recover small objects and a crane capable of lifting 6 tons. In addition, she has a water jet which can be used for excavation under water or on land.

Mr. Link and his wife, Marion, already have made extensive and fruitful explorations off the Florida Keys and in the Caribbean. One of their achievements was the discovery of a 15th century anchor, possibly the anchor of Columbus' flag ship, the *Santa Maria*. Mrs. Link has told the story of their earlier explorations in a book recently published by Rinehart & Co., appropriately entitled "Sea Diver," the name of an earlier and smaller boat which they used in their adventures. She is donating her royalties toward the operating expenses of new expeditions.

The new *Sea Diver*, which I saw launched, soon will depart on a shakedown cruise to the Caribbean and will be used in the exploration of the sunken city of Port Royal in Jamaica under the auspices of the Smithsonian Institution and the National Geographic Society. Port Royal suddenly vanished under the water as the result of an earthquake in 1692. In 1956 the Links did some investigation there and now, with the new boat and equipment, will carry on a more thorough exploration.

It is possible that they will make a further contribution to history.

Upon leaving Port Royal, Mr. Link has told me, he intends to take *Sea Diver*, under her own power, to the coast of Israel, there to explore the sunken harbor of Caesarea, under the auspices of the America-Israel Society, an educational organization of which a number of my colleagues in the Congress of the United States are founders and sponsors and which has its headquarters in the Willard Hotel, here in Washington.

Caesarea was the favorite city of King Herod the Great and the port from which St. Paul sailed on his mission. The Links made a preliminary survey there in 1957, using light diving equipment. They were inspired to do so by the fact that fishermen had been bringing up in their trawls along the coast, jugs, known as amphorae, dating back more than 1,500 years before the Christian era. They found evidence that objects of great interest to archeologists lie buried in the sand beneath the harbor waters.

I am proud that a shipyard in my own State of Massachusetts was chosen for the construction of this unique vessel to be used in the cause of the advancement of knowledge. It seems to me, too, that *Sea Diver*, in exploring the historic past, hitherto hidden from us by the waters of the seas, will demonstrate, wherever she goes, the interest that we Americans take in peaceful pursuits and thus will make a contribution to good will and better understanding wherever she may drop anchor.

The Quincy Adams Yacht Yard is owned and operated by its president, Edward D. Whiting, 363 Adams Street, Milton, Mass. Mr. Whiting has over 35 years in boat building. He has been associated with the Lawley Ship Yards where he directed the boat building program for many years and has served as president of the George Lawley Ship Yard. Edward Whiting is owner and president of the Nevins Yacht Yard, City Island, N.Y., and is also owner of the Quincy Adams Marine Sales, Inc.

Born in South Boston, Mass., Edward Whiting has spent an entire life time amongst those who participate in yachting and boating in the South Boston and Dorchester coastal area.

We in Massachusetts are proud of Edward Whiting and his many accomplishments.

A great future can be predicted for the Quincy Adams Yacht Yard.

USO—The Warmth of America in the Cold War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 8, 1959

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, it was my privilege this morning to listen to one of the finest talks I have heard in Washington. It was by our friend and associate, the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH]. The occasion was a breakfast of the United Service Organization's National Council. There were present 75 Members of the Senate and House. There were in attendance 600 members of the USO advisory group, representing every State in the Union. They were here for a 2-day visit. As Senators know, the USO—United Service Organization—has in its membership representatives of all religious groups, business, and labor—in fact, it is a cross-section of America dedicated to selling service, in its broadest interpretation.

The meeting started with a talk by Harvey S. Firestone, Jr., USO chairman. It was following his remarks that the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] gave us a most illuminating and inspirational talk on the subject, "USO—the Warmth of America in the Cold War." The Senator's address gave a picture of the world today—the challenges which face us and the successes and failures of the Kremlin.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that this fine address be printed in the RECORD.

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

THE WARMTH OF AMERICA IN THE COLD WAR

(Address by Senator JENNINGS RANDOLPH, Democrat, of West Virginia, to the United Service Organizations National Council hometown breakfast, Sheraton Park Hotel, Washington, D.C., April 8, 1959)

Mr. Chairman, members of the board of governors, ladies and gentlemen of the national council, and guests, once again we meet to applaud and appraise the work of the USO in servicing the needs of the young men and women of our Armed Forces.

I have been asked to discuss the topic of "The Warmth of America in the Cold War," a subject that admits of wide latitude, to say the least. However broad the title assigned, it bespeaks a particular aspect of the work of the USO and of the national character of America which is of central concern to all of us; it indicates the role of compassion and understanding which lies at the heart of so much of our work, as well as that of the individual affiliated agencies. It challenges also the need for our extending these qualities throughout the range of our national affairs—a point to which I shall return in more detail later.

This month, ladies and gentlemen, we memorialize the 18th year of the USO—a year heavy with symbolic import. For this is the year when the young men who were born—as was the United Service Organizations—in 1941 first become subject to military conscription.

These young men, and we ourselves, face a radically different world from that of 1941. In that year American troops were stationed only on American soil and American Territorial possessions, guarding our national security by means which were determined largely by 19th-century conditions of warfare and by Admiral Mahan's concept of naval power.

Today our national security is intimately involved with that of every nation of the free world, a security cemented by alliances with other nations throughout the Western Hemisphere, in Western Europe, in the Middle East, and in southeastern Asia. American troops have followed these alliances as guarantors of our national commitment to the security of the free world, from the wastes of the Arctic to the sands of Arabia, from Korea to Koblenz.

To a limited extent only is this a world of our own making—and even less so is it one of our own choosing. But this is the world we have and must abide with for an indeterminate future.

Until the turn of the century the world was ruled largely by 13 empires. The First World War led to the collapse of the German, Austrian, Turkish, and Russian Empires. By 1955 most of the remainder had been dissolved—with the British, French, and Dutch Empires eroding under the resurgent tide of colonial nationalism.

Since the end of World War II, 21 new sovereign nations have come into being; so also has a new kind of imperialism—that of the aggressive and militant Soviet-Sino Axis, animated by the dynamism of a new religion of the state. This new imperialism controls the strategic heartland of the Eurasian land mass, and—with its satellite nations—numbers well over a third of the world's population.

This is one measure of the change, ladies and gentlemen, that has taken place within less than two decades. Another, and correlative measure, was the presence in Washington last week of the foreign ministers of the NATO nations—an indication that the free world is not without the strength and the means to oppose the Soviet imperialism.

But let us not be deluded by our own terms. We use the term "imperialism" to apply to the expansionist designs of the Soviet Union—just as we used the same word to apply to Germany and Japan of 20 years ago. The German and Japanese imperialisms, however, were based upon a racial mystique of pan-Germanism and pan-Asianism, respectively—each developed independently of the other, and each relying ultimately upon military conquests as the means of expanding its sphere of influence.

The new imperialism of the Soviet Union is neither so limited in its appeal to other peoples nor in its means of exploiting this appeal. Indeed, military conquest, in the traditional sense, is only one means—and not the most important, either—of the new Soviet imperialistic design.

The successes of the Communists in recent years have been on the propaganda front, in areas of economic and political infiltration, and in exploiting the tensions of colonial nationalism rather than on the military front. There we have successfully opposed them, in Europe and in the Middle East.

Not only has the Soviet Union failed to expand its strategic military position, but it has also felt compelled to retreat from many of the advanced positions it held at the end of World War II. This we have failed to recognize amid the Soviet successes in other fields, but let me note a few of the areas of Soviet withdrawal:

In Europe, they have withdrawn from the Danish island of Bornholm, from the Finnish naval base, and from the strategically valuable section of eastern Austria, while they have been forced also to accept the independence of Yugoslavia and a loosening of their hold on Poland. In Asia they have given up their naval bases in Darien, they have withdrawn from Sinkiang, they have ceded their domain over the Manchurian Railroad to China, and there is even evidence that their hold on Outer Mongolia may be weakening.

Thus, although we have seen some Soviet military withdrawals in Europe, and the ceding of Soviet authority in Asia to Chinese power, we have witnessed also the continued successes of the Soviet in other and equally important areas. Through piecemeal economic competition on a selective basis the Soviet Union has succeeded in gaining an economic and political foothold in many of the underdeveloped nations of Asia, Africa, and Latin America. In the Middle East it has exploited, with varying degrees of success, the tensions of Arab nationalism—falsely appearing there, and elsewhere, as the defender of the very values which have given us our strength—the ideas of freedom, of human dignity and of national sovereignty. Then, too, Russia's recent scientific and technological achievements have been presented to the less industrialized nations as evidence of the superiority of the Soviet economic system over that of a free society.

This, then, is the face of our adversary—a resourceful, aggressive and cunning opponent—equally capable of offering the disarmingly open hand of aid to Iraq or the mailed fist of conquest to Hungary and Tibet.

Against the expansion of this power we have developed our system of economic and military alliances in Western Europe and southeastern Asia, the cornerstone of which, in each instance, is the military power of the United States. This power can be effective only as it exists in force and in readiness, for we will never again be granted—as we were in World Wars I and II—the opportunity of 2 or 3 years in which to prepare behind the shield of our allies. The Armed Forces of the United States are now the main shield of the free world—not the French infantryman of World War I, or the British Navy and Royal Air Force of World War II.

Yet the men and women of our Armed Forces—stationed at the ramparts in England and Western Europe, in Africa and the Middle East, in Okinawa, Japan, and Korea—these young people are more than the sword and buckle of freedom. They are also emissaries of the American culture and American character to the lands in which they serve. And unlike the system of Soviet communism, the ideals of America cannot be extended under the sway of boot and bayonet.

The extent to which the people of other lands will rally to the American cause of freedom is determined in large part by the image created by American service men and women stationed in those lands. In many instances our uniformed youth must overcome local hostilities—created sometimes by Communist agents, and sometimes by nothing more than the natural envy of the poor for the rich. But whatever the source, its most effective antidote is the natural generosity and compassion of the young people in our Armed Forces. For it is they who provide the living image—and sometimes the only concrete one available in those lands—of the meaning of American ideals. Whether it be the American GI who shares his rations with the Korean war orphan, or the American Army doctors who help improve native health and sanitation facilities in Libya—wherever they serve, the members of our Armed Forces are ambassadors of the American ideal.

Today this ideal embodies the concept of a world society which preserves the values of national sovereignty and individual freedom—as opposed to the Soviet ideal of a world superstate, with nationalities as well as individuals in subservience to the state. It is the ideal of the commmunity of man, voluntarily held together by compassion, understanding and respect for individual differences—as opposed to the soulless collectivism of the Soviet, held in thrall by a secret police.

The young men and women of our Armed Forces thus share a large part of the responsibility for making this ideal meaningful to the people of other lands. And in this task—as you ladies and gentlemen know—the USO shoulders its responsibilities as well. For we have gone well beyond the coffee-and-doughnut concept of ministering to the needs of our Armed Forces.

The educational, cultural, and religious programs of the USO, in this country and in our stations abroad, help to illuminate for our service people the values of the culture they are defending. In this respect, the very name of our organization—United Service Organizations, Inc.—comprised of people from a variety of religious faiths and national origins—this very name symbolizes the voluntary and generous aspect of the character we identify as "American."

This national trait of service and voluntary giving is, according to the noted historian, Arthur M. Schlesinger, one of the 10 contributions of America to civilization. He finds it in America on a scale unparalleled in other countries—in our 4,000 philanthropic foundations, in our contributions to the Red Cross, in our United Fund, and in CARE. And, he states, "Thanks to this ingrained trait of the national character, the Government found it easy to mobilize our people behind the Marshall plan, a costly tax-supported program for repairing the war-stricken economies of Western Europe. Though these official undertakings were in part designed to halt the spread of communism, they arose from deeper springs of human compassion and have no parallel in history."

This is a large part, ladies and gentlemen, of what we mean by the warmth of America. But this is not all. We must extend this spirit of warmth and compassion into more than just the areas of national good will and generosity with our own material bounty—important as these are.

For the crisis our Nation faces today encompasses the entire domain of our feelings, our will, and our intelligence. It is a crisis in the human spirit—a crisis which challenges our capacity to know, and to feel the knowledge that we are come to one of the great watersheds of history. As with every such place in man's long travail out of barbarism, it is a moment of danger as well as opportunity—and a moment of choice. This time the choice may be between a planetary holocaust or working toward a new plateau of civilization. We have the technical means for either, but do we have the human means—the imagination, the compassion, and the will to make the right choice?

While history shows many instances of noble causes overwhelmed by the brute forces of evil—man has more frequently brought on his own defeat by failure to pursue the right than by the active forces of evil. We are no exception. We have received no divine dispensation from our own limitations and frailties; it is not written in the stars nor in the flights of birds that our national will is to prevail.

Yet, we may say with assurance that the image of the United States which we present abroad can be no stronger than that which we show to ourselves. Thus, we must answer for ourselves the question of whether the warmth of America is borne of our genuine commitment to the values of a free society, or whether it is in large part merely the expression of exuberance in our national wealth. The issue presented is whether—as individual men and women, and as a free society—we can once again generate as strong a faith in the values of a free society as in the material fruits of a free economy, and without confusing the identity of either.

Ours is the first civilization in history which has developed the means of eliminating poverty among all its members. For the first time in humanity's ageless struggle with nature we find at hand the means to release men from the iron chain of circumstance—from the pain and hunger which have been their daily lot.

The choice is ours to make, namely, either to use our national good fortune for the enlargement of the faith of man, to expand the ideal of brotherhood, and to extend our vision of the truth—or to continue with our present preoccupation with pleasure and profit, submit to a cult of mediocrity, and abide under the tyranny of our own selfish concerns and narrow nationalism.

Perhaps the latter seems a harsh and unfair description of our present national attitudes. This is a conclusion one may draw

when he hears the constant boast of our increasing gross national product—without ever the question of "For what?"—when we spend $10 billion a year on advertising to convince ourselves that we cannot do without the things we don't need, when we spent $10 billion a year on alcohol and $3 billion a year on cosmetics, the two together equal to our total expenditures—public and private—for education? What other conclusion may one draw, when, with a gross national product of approximately $450 billion, we hear calamitous talk of national bankruptcy over the issue of spending $3.5 billion on foreign aid—less than 1 percent of our total product? Is this the image of a strong society?

More than 100 years ago Ralph Waldo Emerson stated that "Things are in the saddle." He followed this comment with the observation that "A man's things soon come between him and himself." Now, this was no prejudice of Puritan asceticism, but an observation on human behavior—applicable to a society as well as to a man.

The evidence surrounds us if we will but open our eyes, for we have many unfinished tasks in our own society: to furnish the conditions of human dignity to the 5 million or so of our own families who live on the squalid edge of poverty—to eliminate the conditions of urban blight that contaminate so many of our cities—to restore education and the life of the mind to their proper role in a democratic society. These are only a few of the problems that press upon us.

We have the means to solve these problems. But not all our wealth of technology and instruments will avail us if we lack the imagination to perceive, the compassion to understand, and the will to act.

This is, in part, the meaning of a recent comment by Archibald MacLeish—one of the most intelligent and perceptive observers of our times. In referring to the defense of freedom in our society, MacLeish stated that, "The man who knows with his mind only, who will not commit himself beyond his wits, who will not feel the thing he knows, or know the thing he feels—that man has no freedom anywhere. He is tugged by the string of whatever is told him, maneuvered by slogans. Sooner or later his life will seem indifferent to him, something managed by others, and he will acquiesce in the management, think about it as little as possible, occupy himself with the only things near enough to seem real—his car, his front lawn, those shadows on the television screen—symbolic shadows."

This retreat into the privacy of selfish and petty concerns is our chief enemy of the human spirit in America today. For our greatness—as individuals and as a Nation—is achieved in the complementary relationship of private rights and public responsibilities. Our finest hours as a people have thus been those when we presented to the world at large the hope of realizing a new moral and spiritual vision of man.

This, I believe, is also what the warmth of American means today.

Analyses of Last Election

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 8, 1959

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, as was to be expected, there were a great many post mortems held after the election last year which did not come out very well for the Republican Party. Many people expressed their opinions as to the reasons for the apparent change in public sentiment and the failure of some tried and true Republicans to be reelected to the Congress. Indeed the national committee has conducted research work on this subject along with others and, of course, many reasons were propounded explaining the results and various suggestions given as to what the Republican Party should do to regain favor with the voters.

One of the most constructive analyses of the situation was contained in an article appearing in a recent edition of the Washington Newsletter, which is published by the National Federation of Republican Women. It was written by our colleague, Representative JESSICA McC. WEIS, of New York, and I am pleased to have permission to insert it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Mrs. WEIS is a lady of rare judgment, sound and practical vision, and experienced in the ways of politics, and I hope that the leaders of the Republican Party will take to heart the suggestions she submits in her article and incorporate them in a revised and forward-looking policy for the Republican Party. It is a great stimulus to all of us Republicans to have the benefit of JUDY WEIS' views.

(By Representative JESSICA McC. WEIS, New York)

From many a pessimist these days one hears dire predictions of dark days ahead for the party, and from the worst of these comes the sad lament that the two-party system itself may be in danger.

I personally reject this kind of thinking; for if there is one thing that I have learned from my years of political activity, it is that the pendulum of political opinion is in constant motion. I do not fear for the life of the party, now or at any time in the future. However, the health of the Republican Party would be improved by a massive dose of political vitamin B. The women of the Republican Party and the National Federation have a great opportunity to help administer that dose. This is the time for some real soul searching and factfinding in order to start that pendulum swinging once again in our direction.

The Republican Party, as a party, has managed only two congressional victories in the last 25 years, and has rather consistently given ground at every level. Even where we are still winning the margins are growing smaller, and unless we knuckle down and solve the political problem confronting us we are in very great danger of becoming a permanent minority party.

We can no longer delay in facing up to the grim fact of a weak internal party organization, particularly at the lowest, and most important, grassroots level. In 1958 we were simply outmanned, outworked, and outtalked, and in many cases, outfinanced. We cannot logically expect the opposition to be weaker in 1960. Therefore, it is imperative that we become a great deal stronger.

Since the 1930's, the regular party organizations of both major parties have been slowly disintegrating, but in the case of the Democratic Party, organized labor has been willing and able to take over the party apparatus, and today, the Political Action Committees and the COPE organizations of organized labor provide about 90 percent of the political workers and grassroots organizations for their party. We have yet to develop a comparable party structure, and this is the essential and overriding problem which confronts us. There must be a rebuilding of a strong, effective, dedicated party organization, starting from the ground up.

Having stated the problem, which is always relatively simple, it becomes imperative to look around for an adequate solution, and, in this connection, there are several things which must be done—the sooner the better.

1. We must decide precisely what issues we consider absolutely basic, and we then must enunciate them so clearly that every single citizen knows exactly what being a Republican means (and does not mean).

2. We must launch a fearless and constant attack on the inflationary big government philosophy that is motivating a great majority of the opposition. Here again, we must show in easy-to-understand language exactly how the New Deal-Fair Deal philosophy is slowly but surely stifling individual freedom and initiative, breeding a false sense of security, and corrupting those very economic and political principles which made this Nation great.

In other words—taking a page from the advertising industry—we must step up the selling campaign for our own product in two ways—by a clearer and better explanation of what we're selling ourselves, and by an equally clear explanation of what's basically wrong with our competitor's product. No matter how good the product—and ours is a good one—dynamic salesmen are necessary to do the job. Our salesmen must be appealing candidates, responsible, hard-working party leadership, and dedicated ward and precinct workers. This leads to a third important point.

3. We must make better use of our regular party workers, by providing them with solid, sensible, compelling reasons for putting forth more effort. We must instill in them a sense of purpose, a personal motivation for working as hard, and harder, than those who are being paid for, or coerced into, political activity.

4. Finally, not only must we have a greater effort from present party members, but we must actively recruit new membership, and leadership, for the party. At both ends of the age spectrum, we need new blood. Our party has a great deal to offer both the youth of America as well as our older, senior citizens.

In the final analysis, the only real answer lies in larger numbers of dedicated people with real convictions who are willing to roll up their sleeves and do the tough job of careful precinct-by-precinct organizing all over the country. And where is there a greater reservoir of such a dedicated, experienced and devoted group than in the National Federation of Republican Women? Hell hath no fury like a woman scorned, nor can any candidate withstand the onslaught of women when they are righteously aroused to the defense of those things in which they truly believe. The task will not be easy, but if we all pull together and work like mad, we will win; if not, we are in for another licking. The choice is clearly up to each of us.

Purchase of British Turbogenerating Equipment by TVA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD M. SIMPSON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 8, 1959

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to discuss the recent decision by the Tennessee Valley Author-

ity to purchase certain large turbogenerating equipment from a British firm rather than an American supplier. Specifically, I will comment on the justification cited by TVA for the action it has taken in this matter.

Mr. Speaker, in a release dated February 27, 1959, the Tennessee Valley Authority undertakes to explain its award of a contract for purchase of a turbogenerator to a British concern. Parsons & Co., the British bidder, underbid Westinghouse and General Electric by approximately 31 percent.

TVA says that it was disturbed by the rising price of turbogenerators, claiming that the prices charged by the domestic bidders had risen 50 percent since 1951 while average wholesale prices had increased only 5 percent. However, if we look at wages we find an increase in the electrical machinery industry weekly wage from $61.48 in September 1950 to $85.36 in September 1958. This is an increase of 39 percent. These figures come from the Bureau of Labor Statistics and are much more in point than general wholesale prices.

The building of a turbogenerator is a custom job and labor costs represent a large part of value added.

In such custom jobs our large mass production industries lose a great part of the advantage that comes from mass production. The process of building such a generator cannot be called mass production merely because the contractor is a mass producer of other items. The competitive disadvantage of much higher wages paid in this country reflects itself precisely where our productivity is not boosted by mechanization or automation. It stands to reason that in custom-made items we enjoy little if any differential in productivity over the British.

It would therefore be expected that the British could readily underbid us by a wide margin and would do so unless they allowed for an inordinate profit. Our wage rates are in the nature of 2½ times those of the British in the electrical machinery industry.

To repeat, in custom-built items we largely shed the productivity lead that we enjoy in many mass-produced items. Moreover, wages represent a high percentage of total costs of producing custom-made items.

TVA says that Westinghouse estimated 1,080,000 man-hours to build the turbogenerators; and concludes that the difference in wages between the British and American companies would be only $1.5 million. To arrive at this result it was necessary only to multiply the number of man-hours by the wage differential. This calculation, however, covers only a part of the story. The materials used by our manufacturers also contain American wages all the way back to the mines and the soil whereas the British materials contain the much lower British wages through all the stages of production back to the raw materials.

Therefore should the domestic companies enjoy no advantage in productivity over what appears to be a highly efficient and reliable British company, the advantage of the latter should be about 2½ to 1 costwise. If it is less than that, the British company is not as efficient as claimed by TVA; and our companies are penalized for their greater efficiency. To be sure, there is the duty of about 15 percent on the British product plus ocean transportation, marine insurance, and so forth; but none of these charges would span the 2½ to 1 ratio.

That Parsons should be able to underbid our domestic companies by only 31 percent is therefore a little surprising. That a handsome margin of profit could be hidden in such a bid seems easily possible. That possibility no doubt accounts for the company's ability to accept a penalty clause as noted by TVA whereas the American bidders would not do so even under their higher bid.

TVA's eagerness to send this contract overseas and its rationalization of its position by resort to transparent arithmetic is perhaps explained by its reference to our general foreign trade policy and our international relations.

That Executive domination of our foreign commerce, contrary as it is to the mandate of the Constitution, has now filtered through adminstrative capillaries to the various purchasing agencies is confirmed by the TVA award of the contract to a foreign company and its explanation of the fact. In the end, for example, TVA says that purchase of the power unit from Parsons strengthens the economic position of our ally, Great Britain. This, it should be noted, is an entirely different argument from the preceding ones and explains much better than TVA's ragged arithmetic the reason for the award to a British firm.

The part played by our Executive dominated foreign trade policy emerges very clearly. The State Department's diplomacy must be supported through thick and thin throughout the fabric of our Government. The totalitarian position thus given to our foreign trade policy must brush to one side all considerations of a domestic nature.

"For national security," continues TVA, "strong allies, a healthy world trade, essential industries strengthened by stimulation of competition, are likely to be at least as important as the location of specific powerplant repair facilities."

Westinghouse and General Electric had maintained that the national security would be jeopardized by creating dependence upon foreign sources for repair facilities. TVA was not impressed. It answered as just quoted.

Particular note should be taken of the fact that the view was expressed by TVA that the strengthening of essential industries by stimulation of competition, was desirable. Aside from the question whether TVA is by way of superseding the function of the Federal Trade Commission and the Department of Justice in seeking to assure the stimulaton of competition the question naturally arises whether competition is stimulated when a 40 percent wage level is pitted against one of 100 percent; or could it be argued that such competition is unfair, particularly if wages are not to be used as a source of competitive advantage. If it is the intent on the other hand to undermine the American wage system such competition could become a useful instrument.

Are we to assume that if the British company needs the great wage advantage that it has General Electric and Westinghouse are to be penalized because they are more efficient producers? They must indeed be more efficient if they can pay wages 2½ times as high as Parsons and yet bid only 50 percent higher on a Government contract.

TVA says it was willing to let the domestic bidders go 20 percent above the foreign bidder, as can be done under the controlling Executive order.

But why 20 percent? What possible relation is there between the production costs borne by Westinghouse and General Electric and those of a foreign competitor that operates under entirely different cost burdens? Let us suppose that the bidder had been not British, but Italian or Japanese. Would the differential that might then have been recognized still be one of 20 percent? Obviously, yes, since no discrimination can be drawn among different countries. Yet the 20-percent margin might have fitted even more loosely any other foreign bidder than it fit England.

The whole TVA position comes down simply to the desire, in keeping with our State Department's foreign economic policy, to give more public contracts to foreign countries. Otherwise why does TVA argue so elaborately the extraneous economic points that it presents and why does it bring in elements of foreign policy?

It says that—

> It can reasonably be assumed that these dollars (those garnered by Parsons & Co.) will be used to finance British purchases of other goods either in the United States or in third countries which will in turn use the dollars to make purchases in the United States.

Here we see TVA becoming the Department of Commerce; but it must be said that the TVA economics, like its notion of relative efficiency, will not bear the light of reality. In the past 5 or 6 years some seven or eight billions of dollars have flown overseas and, with the exception of 1957, have shown no signs of returning. In 1958 alone we lost $3.4 billion in our international monetary balance.

In fact, the economics in the TVA reply and the references to foreign policy read very much as if they had been written in the State Department.

As for the conclusion that the higher bids by the domestic concerns represent unreasonable prices and therefore presumably exorbitant profit, there is, of course, no proof. The only yardsticks used are the increase in wholesale prices, allegedly only 5 percent between 1951 and 1959, and the margin of overbid in relation to a foreign bidder. Neither yardstick is suited to the thing to be measured.

Was the American bid price unreasonable? That is all the law asks; although it must be admitted that the

regulations lay down an arbitrary measure; and, further, that TVA was bound by the regulations.

It was because of the unrealistic character of the regulations that the domestic companies made their plea on the basis of national security. On that ground TVA overruled them. The result is simply that the domestic industry loses the contract on grounds that penalize relatively higher productive efficiency. This result is achieved by using an irrelevant yardstick provided by regulations under the Buy American Act, but not by the law itself.

Through this loophole TVA is able to comply with the foreign economic policy of the State Department while at the same time going contrary to the domestic economic policies of the past 25 years, especially the part of it that has had the effect of raising wages in this country to the highest level in history.

By law wages have been taken out of domestic competition. Now the Government turns around and lowers the boom on is own creation. Foreign wages are free to compete and foreign industries paying low wages are free to take full advantage of the higher American level and win awards of public contracts by simple underbidding, a very easy thing for them to do.

Mr. Speaker, still another aspect of this problem has come to our attention and I wish to mention it at this point. My colleagues may recall receiving a letter recently from the United Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers of America. Among other things, the union attempted to prove that the contract in question was lost to American firms because their bids allegedly included an unreasonable percentage of profit, thereby enabling the Parsons firm to underbid their quotations by a substantial amount.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to include as a further extension of my remarks a letter which I have just received from Mr. C. H. Bartlett, vice president of the Westinghouse Electric Corp. The information supplied by Mr. Bartlett will serve to clarify the questions raised by the union. The letter follows:

WESTINGHOUSE ELECTRIC CORP.,
Pittsburgh, Pa., April 3, 1959.

Hon. RICHARD M. SIMPSON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SIMPSON: Since our dinner in Washington on February 26 at which time we discussed the problem of the import of heavy electric power apparatus, many members of the Pennsylvania delegation have shown an interest in this matter. Therefore, we feel an obligation to write you this letter in order to keep the record straight.

You have received, I believe, a letter from the general president of the United Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers of America, on the subject of the 500,000-kilowatt steam turbine generator ordered by TVA from C. A. Parsons & Co., Ltd., of England. In this letter, this UE official has done a great disservice to the union's membership and to the Nation with absurd charges of 265 percent profits in the electrical industry of the United States. The letter presents an argument based on false assumptions, incorrect figures, and distortions of fact. Its resulting conclusions are ludicrous.

For example, while the UE does not deny that U.S. electrical manufacturers pay wages at least 2½ times those paid in England, they somehow calculate that our labor costs on this $18 million job are only $91,000 more than Parsons labor costs.

They calculate further that the total cost of building this giant steam turbine generator would be only $5,300,000. The fact is that this amount wouldn't cover the cost of materials—to say nothing of wages and salaries, the costs of providing and operating our factories, and their great number of machine tools, transportation, research and development, and many additional expenses.

I am sure that Westinghouse stockholders would be delighted if our profits could be a little closer to the 265 percent that UE says we earn, instead of the 4 percent or slightly less that we actually have earned in the last several years.

The UE letter bases its charges of profiteering on what it says are company figures. It then quotes a statement by Mr. A. C. Monteith which appeared in the Westinghouse News to the effect that the TVA order in question would have meant 1,080,000 man-hours of work for Westinghouse employees at the Lester and East Pittsburgh, Pa., plants and 375,000 man-hours of work for employees in plants of supplier companies.

What the UE does not say is that these figures represent only the direct factory labor which would have been involved in production of the steam turbine generator—the labor of those factory employees who would have been working full time on this particular job and who are directly affected by the loss of this order. When we cited these man-hour figures to show the possible effect of this lost order on employment, we were intentionally conservative, limiting the figure to direct labor only.

The figure does not include the host of service personnel such as crane operators, materials handlers, production clerks, plant guards, supervisors, and others. Such indirect labor costs are at least double the direct labor costs. This means that the total labor cost of manufacturing this type of giant electrical equipment is approximately three times the actual direct labor cost. And that covers only the people in the manufacturing plants. In addition, there is the cost of the people in the research and development departments and laboratories whose efforts keep American electrical apparatus ahead of the world in reliability and efficiency. And there are sales costs and administrative costs. The UE letter ignores all these.

As a second step in its series of miscalculations, the UE takes this small portion of total labor cost and multiplies it by several industry-average wage figures—which also are incorrect when applied to the Westinghouse plants involved. The skilled employees who build these giant machines earn well above the average industry wage.

Then, to muddle even more the already completely inaccurate calculation, the UE applies a mythical productive efficiency advantage which, they imply, the heavy electrical manufacturers in this country have over similar plants abroad. This, they claim, is 244 percent. If such an advantage exists in the production of heavy electric power apparatus, we are not aware of it. And judging from the low bids of foreign electrical manufacturers, they haven't heard of their great disadvantage either.

It is indeed unfortunate that the officers of a national labor union who represent thousands of American workmen spread this type of economic nonsense which can only work against the best interests of their members in a segment of industry where reduced employment has been and still is a problem.

Such propaganda is serious also in that it encourages those who fail to see the dangers involved in our Government buying heavy electric power apparatus from foreign companies which could not provide the necessary repairs and maintenance in time of war.

The UE letter dismisses the security question as a hypocritical issue raised to justify our inability to meet the low bids of foreign suppliers. We are willing to leave to your judgment whether or not the continuous supply of electric power to key defense production areas of the country during a national emergency is a real or a hypocritical issue. In 1957, TVA supplied more than half the power used by the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission, for example.

Despite TVA reassurances on the ability of foreign suppliers to provide service, the fact remains that the Parsons company does not have a steam turbine generator manufacturing plant on this continent. Nor is there any plant in Canada capable of handling major repairs of large steam turbine generators. Parsons, in its bid, said it has just three technical men in all of North America to handle repairs and maintenance. By contrast, Westinghouse has more than 1,000 field service engineers, and, in addition to our major manufacturing plants, we have service and repair plants throughout the United States. Any major repair or replacement on such a steam turbine generator as the TVA Colbert Station unit would require Parsons to ship the unit overseas or ship parts from overseas—something which could be impossible in time of war or other national emergency.

This very real issue of national security should not be screened from view by the smoke of misinformation emanating from UE or any other source.

Sincerely yours,

C. H. BARTLETT,
Vice President.

National Forests

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEON H. GAVIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 8, 1959

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, my intense and continuing interest over the years in the well-being of our great national forests is well known to this distinguished body. We in the Congress are proud of the fact that when issues affecting our forests are at hand there emerges a singleness of purpose that assures the future safety, conservation, and wise use of these forests.

Mr. Speaker, the report on a "Program for the National Forests" which Secretary of Agriculture Benson sent to you on March 23, and which I inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on March 24, 1959, is a significant step forward toward more complete development and intensive management. Secretary Benson, Assistant Secretary Peterson, Chief McArdle of the Forest Service, and the others involved in the preparation of this report are to be congratulated.

On July 31, 1953, in a special message to the Congress about the Nation's natural resources, President Eisenhower stated that the Federal Government has a responsibility to see that the national forests are managed wisely. Secretary

Benson's report clearly states the measures and action needed to achieve the full development and use of the resources involved. It is now the responsibility of the Congress to study this "Program for the National Forests" and to take the necessary action to carry out both the short-term and long-range objectives.

I am interested in this program not only for its impact on the 181 million acres of national forest in 39 States and Puerto Rico, but also for the opportunities it presents to make the one-half million acres of the Allegheny National Forest in my State more productive and more useful to all our citizens.

The national forests are an operating public enterprise. The timber, wildlife, recreation, water and other resources are not locked up or withheld from orderly public use. The total cash receipts from the sale of timber and related resources now exceed a billion dollars. The second billion dollars in receipts should be reached within the next 10 years.

Each resource in the forests, however, must be developed, managed, and used in a coordinated manner if full renewability and adequate supplies are to be maintained for ourselves and the generations ahead.

We are not harvesting the full allowable cut of timber on all national forests. On the Allegheny we are now cutting about 22 percent of the cut the national forest will sustain. Research in new uses for hardwoods, better quality tree growth and better protection from insects and disease is needed. The accelerated forestry research program covered in this report will do much to improve the forests for expanded use.

The Armed Services Committee, of which I am a member, is constantly confronted with the staggering amounts of nonrenewable natural resources which are consumed to maintain a strong position in this nuclear age. We in the Congress must never overlook the need to build up and improve the renewable natural resources of the national forests as an added source of stability and strength. Research, therefore, is a must.

The flood of people from our cities to the national forests for recreation, hunting, camping and fishing and to enjoy the scenic beauty of the out-of-doors is now a major forest use.

The 1950 census showed some 47 million people living within 300 miles of the Allegheny National Forest. This is a day's drive by car. The next census will show more.

In 1958 over 800,000 people visited the forest for some type of outdoor recreation. An additional 930,000 people from Pennsylvania and surrounding States made day visits to the forest to enjoy beautiful scenery. If this present trend continues we anticipate an annual use over the next 10 years of about 1½ million people. This estimate is based on the forest as it now stands without any major developments to increase the recreation potential.

This "program for the national forests" tells us that the recreational use in all our national forests is expected to almost double within the next 10-year period. Where population figures are concerned, estimates are usually on the conservative side. Hence, we might have more than the 130 million people expected in the national forests by 1959.

The report tells us also the kind and number of improvements needed to meet this demand for more outdoor recreation by more millions of our citizens. The major improvements needed to provide better hunting and fishing by the increasing numbers of Americans going to the forests each year is revealing.

As America's population and economy expand, we in the Congress should make sure that the management, protection, and use of the resources of our national forests expand also. The direct benefits to our Nation will be rewarding.

Our small national forest in Pennsylvania now returns cash receipts of over one-fourth million dollars annually. Under this "Program for the National Forests" the cash receipts for all the national forests could be doubled in the next 10 to 15 years to over $210 million annually. The capital value of our forest property would be increased about a billion dollars. Payments to local counties for schools and roads will increase. Some 620,000 people would be employed in the harvesting and processing of national forest timber.

We cannot place a dollar value on the recreation, soil, and wildlife benefits that will accrue to millions of Americans in all walks of life. Better and more ample supplies of water for industrial and domestic uses, so vital in the West, will also be a benefit here in the East.

Mr. Speaker, we have made substantial progress in the development of our national forests over the past 50 years. Our past accomplishments are not sufficient to meet the resource demands of the future.

In this "Program for the National Forests," we now have a solid base for launching the most realistic and responsible national forest improvement program in our history.

SENATE

FRIDAY, APRIL 10, 1959

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

Our Father God, we thank Thee for the sacrament of loveliness which is unveiled when dawn gilds the sky, for chorus of bird song, for unfolding blossoms that make the awakened earth radiant and fragrant and beautiful—all on an April morning.

So set us free, we pray, from the icy grip of wintry natures, from habits of mind and action which smother something we might become. Deep in our hearts are the possibilities of goodness. There stirs within us a desire toward purity, selflessness, sacrifice, heroism, service, and a love that faileth never.

O Thou spirit of the living God, breathe upon the barren garden of our lives, so that we shall know that for us the winter is past, the rain is over and gone, flowers appear upon the earth, and the time for the singing of birds is come.

So in our private lives, known only to Thee, and in our labor as servants of the land we love, may the beauty of the Lord, our God be upon us. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, April 8, 1959, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

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

H.R. 7. An act 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;

H.R. 296. An act 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;

H.R. 306. An act to amend the Federal Crop Insurance Act;

H.R. 451. An act to amend the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act, with respect to the payment of compensation in cases where third persons are liable;

H.R. 470. An act to amend title 10, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Defense, the Secretaries of the military departments, and the Secretary of the Treasury to settle certain claims for damage to, or loss of, property, or personal injury or death, not cognizable under any other law;

H.R. 1546. An act for the relief of Georg Gahn and Margarete Gahn;

H.R. 1631. An act for the relief of Joseph B. Kane, Junior;

H.R. 1758. An act for the relief of Gerald M. Cooley;

H.R. 2493. An act declaring certain property in the State of New Mexico to be held in trust for the pueblo of Santo Domingo;

H.R. 2594. An act for the relief of certain claimants against the United States who suffered personal injuries, property damage, or other loss as a result of the explosion of a munitions truck between Smithfield and Selma, N.C., on March 7, 1942;

H.R. 2954. An act for the relief of Joseph E. Miller;

H.R. 3240. An act for the relief of Mrs. Clare M. Ash;

H.R. 4340. An act to amend sections 43 and 34 of the Bankruptcy Act (11 U.S.C. 71, 62) to simplify the filling of referee vacancies;

H.R. 4345. An act to repeal clause (9) of subdivision a of section 39 of the Bankruptcy Act (11 U.S.C. 67a(9)), respecting the transmission of papers by the referee to the clerk of the court;

H.R. 4405. An act to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to conduct studies and render a report on the feasibility of developing the water resources of the Salt