Congressional Record

United States of America

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 86th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

SENATE

MONDAY, APRIL 13, 1959

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

Our Father God, we thank Thee for the world in which Thou hast housed us as royal children, and for all that makes it beautiful and fair.

We are grateful to Thee for the life with which Thou hast endowed us, and for all that makes it a channel of uplift to others, and for all that brings its durable satisfactions to ourselves.

Grant, we beseech Thee, O Lord, even in the desecrated earth plowed by fear and hatred, that with high courage we may sow the seed of truth and love and freedom, believing in its ultimate fruition and fulfillment according to Thine eternal purposes.

In Thine own good time bring the harvest foreseen in radiant dreams of a redeemed earth, and while we toil in tribulation may we fight the good fight against the powers of darkness, in sweet contentment and with a quiet mind, knowing that though weeping may endure for a night, joy cometh in the morning.

We ask it in the name of Him who came to reveal the dignity and worth of our common human nature and its oneness with the Divine. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, April 10, 1959, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 3648) to regulate the handling of student funds in Indian schools operated by the Bureau of Indian Affairs, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H.R. 2493) declaring certain property in the State of New Mexico to be held in trust for the Pueblo of Santo Domingo, and it was signed by the Vice President.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Finance was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN] be excused from attendance at the Senate sessions on Tuesday and Wednesday of this week. The Senator will be visiting Redstone Arsenal on a study trip, to complete studies of Army installations having to do with matters associated with the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, leave is granted.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] and the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE] will be absent from the Senate today, in Annapolis, attending the meeting of the Board of Visitors to the Naval Academy.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

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

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

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Philip B. Taylor, of New Jersey, to be Assistant Secretary of the Air Force.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Cecil P. Milne, of Wisconsin, to be Assistant Secretary of the Navy.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Rear Adm. Ralph K. James, U.S. Navy, to be Chief of the Bureau of Ships in the Department of the Navy for a term of 4 years.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

COLLECTORS OF CUSTOMS

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Orley McGlothlin, of Colorado, to be collector of customs, with headquarters at Denver, Colo.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Harry D. Youse, of North Webster, Ind., to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 40, with headquarters at Indianapolis, Ind.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

U.S. AIR FORCE

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations for appointment as Reserve commissioned officers in the U.S. Air Force under the provisions of section 8351, title 10, United States Code, and section 8351 of Public Law 861, 85th Congress.

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations will be considered en bloc; and, without objection, they are confirmed.

NOMINATIONS IN THE ARMY, THE REGULAR AIR FORCE, THE NAVY, AND MARINE CORPS HERETOFORE PLACED ON THE VICE PRESIDENT'S DESK

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Army, the Regular Air Force, and the Navy and Marine Corps, which had been placed on the Vice President's desk.

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations will be considered en bloc; and, without objection, they are confirmed.

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

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

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

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.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I should like to inform the Senate that we anticipate having the Senate resume the consideration of House bill 2575, Calendar No. 140, authorizing an appropriation for the Pan American Games, which is the unfinished business, as soon as the morning hour is concluded.

Thereafter, if the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce is available, we may take up today certain proposed legislation reported from that committee. I shall confer later with the minority leader, after the schedule is more complete.

I am informed that the minority views on the labor bill are due tomorrow. I expect to speak to the chairman of the subcommittee handling that proposed legislation. There will be a Democratic policy committee meeting tomorrow. I anticipate that the labor bill will be discussed at the policy committee meeting, and plans will be made to schedule it for consideration by the Senate at an early date. I would not expect any votes to be taken on that bill this week.

I make this announcement so that Senators may know what our tentative plans are; and I shall discuss them in detail with the minority leader as soon as I can be more definite.

SELECTION OF SENATOR MORTON, OF KENTUCKY, TO BE CHAIRMAN OF THE REPUBLICAN NATIONAL COMMITTEE

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, last week the Republican National Committee assembled in Washington and selected a new national chairman in the person of our very distinguished and esteemed colleague, the Honorable THRUSTON MORTON, of Kentucky. Quite a number of comments have been made in regard to his appointment which I shall ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD.

I should like to amplify my own comments, Mr. President, by saying that it was my pleasure to serve in the House of Representatives with THRUSTON MORTON. I followed his career when he served as an Assistant Secretary of State, and I watched with interest his advent to this body and his legislative career here. He is in deed and in fact a very distinguished citizen, a solid legislator, and a most competent organizer; and I think the Republican National Committee has well and wisely chosen in making him the chairman of the national committee.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the comments which I send to the desk be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

STATEMENTS BY REPUBLICAN SENATORS ON THE ELECTION OF SENATOR THRUSTON B. MORTON AS REPUBLICAN NATIONAL CHAIRMAN

Senator JOHN SHERMAN COOPER, MORTON'S Kentucky colleague, has worked closely with the new chairman for many years—both in political campaigns and in the executive and legislative work of the Government. Senator COOPER said today:

"I am very happy about the selection of my colleague and friend, Senator THRUSTON B. MORTON, of Kentucky, as National Chairman of the Republican Party. He will bring to his work a distinguished record of experience as a businessman, veteran, Assistant Secretary of State, and as a Member of the House and Senate.

"Senator MORTON has great ability, and I am confident that his leadership will give purpose and vigor to the Republican Party."

In publicly urging the new chairman's selection, COOPER had been quick to point out that in Kentucky support for MORTON was enthusiastic and unanimous, saying: "He is vigorous and able, and will make a great chairman."

Senator LEVERETT SALTONSTALL, of Massachusetts, chairman of the Republican conference of Senators, stated: "This is a fine choice. Senator THRUSTON MORTON is particularly well-suited for the exacting and important tasks of the national chairman. His energy, judgment, and wide practical experience in the legislative and executive branches as well as in grassroots politics will enable him to serve well—with strength and imagination—both the Republican Party and the Nation."

Senator EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN, Senate minority leader, stated: "THRUSTON MORTON will make a good chairman."

Senator STYLES BRIDGES, chairman of the Republican policy committee, commented:

I extend my heartiest congratulations to the members of the Republican National Committee who today have chosen Senator THRUSTON B. MORTON to be their chairman. They have made an excellent choice.

"Having served in both Houses of Congress and in the executive branch, Senator MORTON is well-informed on all matters of concern to the American people. He is young, vigorous, able, personable, experienced—and a seasoned political warrior as well. I anticipate he will give the Republican Party the sound, hard-hitting leadership needed to rally all thoughtful Americans around the GOP banner.

"Senator MORTON comes from traditional Republican stock and is well-grounded in the principles which have made our party a party of freedom and responsibility.

"I wish Senator MORTON success in his new post and pledge my cooperation in the team effort to elect a Republican President and a Republican Congress in 1960."

Senator THOMAS H. KUCHEL, of California, minority whip, had the following to say concerning the election of Senator MORTON:

"The selection of THRUSTON MORTON is both good news and good sense.

"A vigorous suporter of the Eisenhower administration, in which he served with distinction before coming to the Senate, he has been in the vanguard of Eisenhower stalwarts in the Congress.

"Under his direction, a fair and square Republican Convention is assured.

"Senator MORTON can be expected to provide dynamic leadership and to carry forward with dedicated zeal the program undertaken by his predecessor, Meade Alcorn, to put our party in readiness for a no-punches-pulled campaign in 1960."

Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, of Wisconsin: "I am delighted that my distinguished colleague, Senator MORTON, has been selected to serve as chairman of the Republican Party. In this important post, I believe he will provide the kind of vigorous, astute, and constructive leadership that will be good for the Republican Party and for the country. Naturally, I am expecting 'great results'."

Senator MILTON R. YOUNG, of North Dakota: "In my opinion the selection of Senator THRUSTON MORTON as chairman of the Republican National Committee is a good choice. Senator MORTON will make one of the better national chairmen we have had in recent years. He has much to commend him."

Senator JOHN J. WILLIAMS, of Delaware: "THRUSTON MORTON is admirably qualified to take over the reins of the Republican National Committee, and I am delighted at his election."

Senator KARL E. MUNDT, of South Dakota: "My congratulations and best wishes to Senator MORTON in his selection as the national chairman of the Republican National Committee. I am confident that THRUSTON MORTON will bring to the committee a working relationship between the national committee and the legislative and administrative personnel of the Republican administration which will culminate in victory in 1960. He will inspire the Republican workers in the field with his projection of the Republican philosophy that the Federal Government should not invade the areas of local government and that government should live within its income and not overburden the citizenry with confiscatory taxes and the evils of runaway inflation."

Senator ANDREW F. SCHOEPPEL, of Kansas: 'The job of Republican national chairman is one which ideally requires a man of action, versatility, creative ideas, political wisdom, and wide experience relating both to the governing of the people and to the closest needs and desires of all the people.

"The members of the Republican National Committee are to be complimented for their selection of a man who so thoroughly fills these qualifications.

"Senator MORTON will command strong support for the cause of the Republican Party. Being a member of the Senate and a former Member of the House he will bring to the national committee experience and background which will be most helpful."

Senator FRANK CARLSON of Kansas:

"I am delighted that the Republican National Committee has selected THRUSTON B. MORTON as the national chairman. He will give young, vigorous leadership to the party.

"His experience, particularly in the executive and legislative branches of the Government, qualify him for this service at a time when we have pressing domestic and international problems."

Senator PRESCOTT BUSH, of Connecticut:

"The Republican National Committee has made an excellent choice. THRUSTON MORTON has had a wealth of political and governmental experience which has given him unusual qualifications to serve as national chairman.

"He will be in an excellent position to advise the White House of the views of Republican Members of Congress, and to inform the latter of the President's opinion on issues as they arise. I believe his election will result in increasing unity in the party."

Senator J. GLENN BEALL, of Maryland:

"I have been closely associated with THRUSTON MORTON both in the House of Representatives and in the Senate, and I believe I am in a position to judge him as a Republican and as a leader.

"As national chairman he will be forceful and capable in every respect. The national committee has chosen wisely."

Senator BARRY GOLDWATER, of Arizona: "I offer my wholehearted cooperation and that of the senatorial campaign committee to Senator MORTON. I hope that he will insist that the national committee be restored to

its rightful position in the party, and that he himself will be admitted to Cabinet meetings so that he can keep abreast of party policy."

Senator NORRIS COTTON, of New Hampshire: "It is rare that you find a man who combines dynamic leadership with restraint and good judgment. Senator THRUSTON MORTON is such a man and the ideal choice for chairman of the Republican National Committee."

Senator CARL T. CURTIS, of Nebraska: "I regard THRUSTON MORTON as a strong and able Senator and believe he has the capability of being a fine national chairman."

Senator CLIFFORD P. CASE, of New Jersey: "The selection of THRUSTON B. MORTON for national chairman is a first-class choice. He is able, energetic, and effective. I think the President and the national committee have made an excellent decision."

Senator THOMAS E. MARTIN, of Iowa: "Senator MORTON is an excellent choice to be our party's national chairman. He is capable, young, and vigorous, and he is in the fortunate position of combining those qualities with a wealth of experience in the field of practical politics. He will do a good job."

Senator KENNETH B. KEATING, of New York: "Senator MORTON will provide the Republican Party with the dynamic, forward-looking leadership that will carry the GOP to victory in 1960. His selection as Republican national chairman will be of tremendous benefit to the party. His invaluable experience in both the legislative and executive branches of the Government, his wide circle of friends in all walks of life, his political acumen and his ability to communicate the true magnitude of the Republican record in the Eisenhower era now become important assets for all Republicans and for the Republican cause."

Senator CASE, of South Dakota: "THRUSTON MORTON is an excellent man for the job. He understands the factors that make for shadings of opinion and has the ability to unite people for basic goals. He will be a worthy successor to Meade Alcorn and Leonard Hall."

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I do not wish to discuss Republican National Committee politics. However, since we have to have a Republican National Committee and a Democratic National Committee, and since those committees must have chairmen, I wish to say that I do not know how the Republican National Committee could possibly select a better equipped, better qualified, or more able or more highly respected citizen than the distinguished Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON]. I have known him as a Member of the House of Representatives, as an Assistant Secretary of State, and as a U.S. Senator. I may say that he has lived up to the obligations we associate with the title of each office he has held. I have the greatest respect for him; and I commend the Republican National Committee on its selection—even though I cannot commend the Senator from Kentucky on his selection of his party. [Laughter.]

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, in connection with the subject the minority leader and the majority leader have been discussing, let me say that I am glad to see there is so much harmony.

I agree with the harmonious conclusion they have reached because it refers to a man of character, a man of ability, a man who has had considerable experience in the service of his country and in its ranks. He has served in the executive branch and in both Houses of Congress. No one has ever said anything of a derogatory nature about him. In fact, in every position he has held, he has rendered the maximum of service.

So I am very happy that the National Republican Committee has exercised what I regard as superb judgment in selecting its new chairman.

GREETINGS OF CONGRESS TO FORMER PRESIDENT TRUMAN

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, it is a privilege and an honor to send to the desk a Senate concurrent resolution presenting the greetings and warm regards of the Congress to a distinguished former Member of this body, the Honorable Harry S. Truman; and I am glad that the leadership of the Senate—the minority leader, as well as the majority leader—have approved the resolution.

On May 8 of this year, Mr. Truman will celebrate his 75th birthday. By this resolution we, his old friends, along with his new friends in the Congress, may wish him a very happy birthday and many happy returns.

Few men can look back on a life of greater service to the people of his country and the world. Mr. Truman has served America in many roles—as a soldier of war, as a fighter for peace, as a county judge, as a Member of this body, as President of the United States.

And now he continues in the role of elder statesman and adviser.

His life is in the best American tradition. His patriotism and devotion to duty are an inspiration to all.

Perhaps the finest tribute which can be paid to this distinguished American is that, as his life progresses, he continues to grow in stature and in the esteem of his colleagues.

That is the mark of a truly great man.

Many of the present membership of the Senate served with Mr. Truman during his 10 years on Capitol Hill. As they will remember, he spent the first years learning his way; then he became one of the Senate's most influential Members, and performed a great service as chairman of the War Investigation Subcommittee.

This was his way in every position of responsibility. He spent the early years learning, and the later years performing.

We are indeed fortunate that since he left the White House he has been able to impart to the American people some of his great knowledge and experience.

Those of us who know Mr. Truman have always been impressed by his deep knowledge of, and respect for, the history of the United States.

He has always believed that if a man is to make history he must first understand history; and from that principle developed much of his great strength. Few of our Presidents have had greater knowledge and understanding of the role of Congress, the executive branch, and the judiciary in our political system.

Mr. Truman's years of service to his country bespeak his faith in the people, and his devotion to the ideals of democracy.

It is fitting that we here in the Senate, from which he drew so much, and to which he gave so much, should pay tribute to our distinguished former colleague on his 75th birthday, and by this resolution express our deep respect and gratitude for his service to his country.

Mr. President, on behalf of myself and my senior colleague [Mr. HENNINGS], I submit the concurrent resolution, and ask that it be read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The concurrent resolution will be read.

The legislative clerk read the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 20) as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress of the United State hereby extends to the Honorable Harry S. Truman its greetings, felicitations, and warm regards on the 75th anniversary of his birth, May 8, 1959.

SEC. 2. The Congress expresses its admiration and gratitude to President Truman for his many years of distinguished service to the United States and to the world. As a public servant and man of the people in the highest sense, he has gained the respect of all as the "Man of Independence."

SEC. 3. The Congress expresses particular appreciation for his dedication as Senator, Vice President, President, and author and elder statesman, in the battle against the enemies of freedom. His great efforts in the years following World War II helped unite the free world in its resistance to the common aggressor.

SEC. 4. The Congress expresses the hope that Divine Providence may permit Mr. Truman many more productive years of life and service to his country and to the world.

SEC. 5. A copy of this resolution shall be transmitted to that distinguished citizen of Missouri, the Honorable Harry S. Truman.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the concurrent resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the concurrent resolution.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I appreciate the thoughtful and kindly act of the distinguished junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON]. I am delighted to associate myself with what he has said about this able, good, and kind man.

President Truman served with distinction in many public offices, from the Congress to the White House. We all knew of him first as a Member of the U.S. Senate, where his fearlessness and vision distinguished his record here. Later he became Vice President, and he served in that post well.

When he assumed the office of President, on the death of President Roosevelt, he served with distinction and courage. I believe that history will record that this country has never had a more honest President, a more courageous and a more fearless President, or one who was more vitally concerned with the problems of all the people of the world.

I am delighted that the Senator from Missouri, with the cooperation of the minority leader, has made it possible for

the Senate to express itself, as it will shortly do, through the adoption of the concurrent resolution now under consideration.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I thank the Senator from Texas. I am very sure the subject Mr. Truman will be grateful to the majority leader for his kind and gracious remarks.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, in the rather mellow aura of an anniversary occasion, we have an opportunity to look back, look around, and look forward. Such occasions of course are marked by timely remarks tinged with mellowness and sympathy, which are indeed written in the resolution of my colleague from the great neighboring State of Missouri.

I think often of the visit with President Truman after I departed from public service in the House of Representatives. My bags were packed, and I was prepared to go home. I called up one of his assistants. I said, "I would like to see the President and say goodby to him and his family." The President was very busy. I said, "I will wait. If I have to, I will wait a week." So the following day I had an appointment with the President. We spent at least 30 minutes visiting. I recall with what vigor he said to me, "You should not have quit." I said I had an eye malady. I felt I should quit in the interest of my recovery. Mr. Truman said, "We need fellows like you." I said, "I could not leave Washington until I said goodby." In the hurly-burly of political activities, we usually "make tracks" when the session is over, and our bags are packed 2 days beforehand, in our eager desire to get home. It was a beautiful visit.

Later, when I was a candidate for the Senate, Mr. Truman came to visit me in a neighboring city. As an illustration of the kind of man he is, he wanted me to win. That is indicative of politics in this country. Underneath his front, he has a robust and sterling character.

I notice the language of the resolution is "the 'Man of Independence'." Being a stickler in etymology, I thought it should read, "the 'Man from Independence'." But I would not find fault with a preposition, because no one will say that our distinguished former President is not a man of independence in every sense of the word.

He has served the Nation well. I salute him for his service. I salute him also as a friend, for when he is one's friend, he is a friend in truth and in fact.

To mark this anniversary is one of the delightful and one of the worthwhile things we can do, because it adds to the reservoir of good will. So we salute him on his 75th birth anniversary.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I thank the distinguished minority leader for his kind and courteous remarks with respect to the No. 1 citizen of my State. I am sure Mr. Truman will appreciate also the comments the Senator from Illinois has been good enough to make on this occasion. Mr. Truman is a man of independence from Independence. Again my appreciation to the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, as an indication of one of the reasons why the junior Senator from Virginia wishes to support the resolution extending congratulations to a distinguished American, he would like to call attention to the fact that the desk occupied by the junior Senator from Virginia is the one formerly occupied by a Senator who later became President, Mr. Harry Truman.

It is a pleasure for me to sit at this desk. It is a source of great gratification to me that a distinguished former Member of the Senate and former President is an outstanding supporter of the distinguished Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON].

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I thank my able friend from Virginia for his kind remarks. I am sure there is no Senator Mr. Truman would prefer having use his old desk than the distinguished junior Senator from Virginia.

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

Mr. SYMINGTON. I am glad to yield to the able Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. It is with pleasure that I support the resolution offered by the distinguished junior Senator from Missouri. The former President, former U.S. Senator, former county judge—the great citizen of Missouri, of the United States, and of the world—Harry S. Truman, is entitled to honor, to love, and to respect. His patriotism has never been questioned. It cannot be questioned. His devotion to the public welfare is not subject to question. A man eminent in the life of our country and eminent in the hearts of his fellow countrymen is now honored by the adoption of this resolution, and I am happy to support it.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Tennessee for his superb remarks with respect to the life and public service of Mr. Truman. I am sure Mr. Truman also will be grateful for the comments of the distinguished Senator.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The concurrent resolution was unanimously agreed to.

Mr. HENNINGS subsequently said: Mr. President, I wish to take a few moments to speak briefly in honor of Missouri's most famous citizen on the approach of his 75th birthday anniversary. I have the honor to be a member of the national committee which has been designated to plan the celebration of the event.

All of us know that many things have been said and are still being said about Harry S. Truman by persons of varied political persuasion. It is only natural that he has been both praised and criticized, for he, himself, has never been sparing in his praise or criticism.

However, I believe that there is one thing about Mr. Truman upon which all can agree, one thing which both his friends and those who criticize him will grant him, and that is a personal courage second to no man. It is a personal courage which absolutely refuses to allow him to back away from a fight regardless of the forces alined against him.

All of us should remember this man's courage when he was a U.S. Senator. Let us all remember his courage as President of the United States. We recall that Harry Truman became President at a time when the Nation stood in need of courage. Let all of us remember that Harry Truman's courage was, throughout his years as President, repeatedly weighed and not found wanting.

When it comes to courage, and when it comes to assaying and weighing courage in the balance, I suggest that Harry Truman was and is the epitome of the highest ideals of courage which have characterized men throughout the formation and the life of the American Republic.

Only history and future generations can be the judge, but it is my belief that Harry Truman, acting almost alone, saved the free world in 1950. We recall that year as the year in which he told the Communist world that it could no longer pursue a course of world domination by act of armed aggression. On June 25, 1950, we went into Korea. Unhappily we are still not free from the threat of Russian militarism and all that communism represents. However, Harry Truman showed us the way. I am sure that future historians will rank him as one of this Nation's really great Presidents, and I am sure also that future historians will also rank his as one of this Nation's really great men.

Along with the other Senators who join me in sponsoring the resolution which was submitted this morning by the distinguished Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] and agreed to, I wish Harry Truman a happy 75th birthday anniversary and hope that he will have many, many more happy birthday anniversaries. I believe that the Nation also wishes Harry Truman many, many more birthday anniversaries, and I believe that that wish is entertained irrespective of party or political affiliation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The morning business is in order.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

REPORT OF GENERAL SALES MANAGER ON COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION SALES POLICIES, ACTIVITIES, AND DISPOSITIONS

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the General Sales Manager on Commodity Credit Corporation sales policies, activities, and dispositions, for February 1959 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REGULATION OF CREDIT LIFE INSURANCE AND CREDIT ACCIDENT AND HEALTH INSURANCE IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the regulation of credit life insurance and credit accident and health insurance in the District of Columbia (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

EXTENSION OF MOTORBOAT ACT OF 1940 TO CERTAIN POSSESSIONS OF THE UNITED STATES

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to extend the application of the Motorboat Act of 1940 to certain possessions of the United States (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REVISION OF SECTION 3054, TITLE 18, UNITED STATES CODE

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to revise section 3054, title 18, of the United States Code, concerning the enforcement of certain provisions of such code, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

TEMPORARY ADMISSION INTO THE UNITED STATES OF CERTAIN ALIENS

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

AMENDMENT OF TITLE 35, UNITED STATES CODE, RELATING TO PATENTS

A letter from the Under Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title 35 of the United States Code relating to patents (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 170 OF ATOMIC ENERGY ACT OF 1954

A letter from the Acting Chairman, Atomic Energy Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 170 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended (with an accompanying paper); to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Archivist of the United States on records proposed for disposal under the law (with accompanying papers); to the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The VICE PRESIDENT appointed Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina and Mr. CARLSON members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

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

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

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

"SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 13

"Joint resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to take steps to acquire, establish, and develop a Kettle Moraine National Park in Wisconsin to properly commemorate the Glacial Age

"Whereas one of the most important chapters in the geographical and geological history of our country, much more important than the features which most of our present national parks are dedicated to preserve or commemorate, is the Glacial Age—a period when glaciers repeatedly invaded the North Central and Northeastern parts of the United States and gorgeously carved and remodeled the entire surface of this area into a huge panorama of one of nature's rarest wonderworks; and

"Whereas because the Kettle Moraine State Park in Wisconsin is the only memorial established in recognition of these historical facts of national moment that indelibly molded the geographical character of this great expanse; because categorically the Kettle Moraine area is by far the most attractive and representative in which to establish a national park to commemorate the Glacial Age and its impact on this territory and the lives and habits of its people; because at present costs and rate of progress it will take the State of Wisconsin another 50 years to complete acquisition and development of the Kettle Moraine State Park as proposed in a 1936 State survey; because this land must be purchased and developed soon—before the inevitable population explosion, which is destined to follow the opening of the St. Lawrence Waterways, strikes Wisconsin and sends costs skyrocketing to prohibitive heights; because it is important that not only Wisconsin but this entire North Central and Northeastern area be provided with a Kettle Moraine National Park to give outdoor recreational opportunities for its rapidly increasing population; the State of Wisconsin seeks the aid of the Federal Government in developing a Kettle Moraine National Park and promises active cooperation toward bringing to reality in the Kettle Moraine area a national park concept to properly commemorate the Glacial Age; and

"Whereas the Republican Party in Wisconsin expressed the desire of thousands of people in Wisconsin and in its entire glacial area, when at its Platform Convention in 1958, it adopted the following resolution:

" 'We recognize the desirability of preserving the Kettle Moraine area of Wisconsin as a national park and pledge immediate cooperation with the Federal authorities in preserving the maximum area of this desirable region'; and

"Whereas the Democratic Party State platform adopted in 1958 said in part '* * * the Democratic Party favors:

" '4. Adoption of the basic plan of the proposed Moraine National Park for Wisconsin': Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the senate, the assembly concurring, That the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin memorializes the Congress of the United States to take necessary steps to acquire, establish and develop a Kettle Moraine National Park in Wisconsin to properly commemorate the Glacial Age, and pledges cooperation toward bringing to reality, in the Kettle Moraine area in Wisconsin, such national park concept; and, be it further

"Resolved, That properly attested copies of this resolution be sent to Dwight D. Eisenhower, President of the United States, to each House of the Congress of the United States and to each Wisconsin Member thereof.

"PHILLIP NASH,
"President of the Senate.
"LAWRENCE R. LARSEN,
"Chief Clerk of the Senate.
"GEORGE MOLENARO,
"Speaker of the Assembly.
"NORMAN C. ANDERSON,
"Chief Clerk of the Assembly."

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, protesting against restricting the further importation of residual oil, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

(See the above resolutions printed in full when presented by Mr. SALTONSTALL (for himself and Mr. KENNEDY) on April 10, 1959, p. 5585, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

A resolution adopted by an assembly of Federal employees in San Juan, P.R., protesting against the enactment of House bill 5926, to repeal the Federal Relations Act; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

JOINT RESOLUTIONS OF CONNECTICUT LEGISLATURE

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and my colleague, the junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], I present resolutions of the General Assembly of the State of Connecticut memorializing Congress to support a proposed amendment to the Federal Constitution relative to the imposition and collections of taxes on income by the States, and to amend Public Law 85–316. I ask unanimous consent that the resolutions may be printed in the RECORD and be appropriately referred.

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

To the Committee on Finance:

"HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 69

"Joint resolution memorializing Congress to support a proposed amendment to the Federal Constitution relative to the imposition and collections of taxes on income by the States

"Resolved by this assembly:

"Whereas citizens of Connecticut residing within this State, but employed in the State of New York and Massachusetts, are imposed upon by being forced to pay income taxes to those States; and

"Whereas citizens of Connecticut residing within this State, but employed outside of Connecticut are bearing a considerable share of the tax burden imposed upon all the residents of this State by the various Connecticut State tax laws, especially the sales tax; and

"Whereas the citizens of Connecticut residing within this State, but employed outside of Connecticut find the income taxes imposed upon them by New York and Massachusetts to be a most difficult burden in these times of inflationary costs, especially since these taxes are in addition to the various Connecticut State taxes already being borne by them; and

"Whereas U.S. Senators STYLES BRIDGES and NORRIS COTTON, of New Hampshire, have proposed an amendment to the Federal Constitution to bring to an end the imposition of income taxes by one State upon the residents of other States: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by this assembly, That the General Assembly of the State of Connecticut hereby memorializes the Congress of the United States to support a proposed amendment to the Federal Constitution by adopting Senate Joint Resolution 29 introduced by said STYLES BRIDGES and NORRIS COTTON, providing that the several States would have no power to impose and collect taxes on income from whatever source derived except in respect to residents of the State imposing the tax; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of state transmit copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, the Secretary of the Treasury, and the Senators and Representatives in Congress from this State and from New Hampshire and from New Jersey.

"Adopted in house of representatives March 9, 1959.

"Adopted in senate March 24, 1959."

To the Committee on the Judiciary:

"SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 26

"Joint resolution memorializing Congress to amend Public Law 85-316

"Resolved by this assembly:

"Whereas there are many Americans who have filed petitions with the immigration authorities of the United States for the entry of their sons, daughters, brothers, and sisters, which petitions are classified in the fourth preference quota of the Immigration and Nationality Act; and

"Whereas of the four preference quotas established by the Federal Immigration and Nationality Act, the first, second, and third quotas are allotted 100 percent of the total annual entry quota; and

"Whereas, as a result, those persons who fall within the fourth preference section must depend for entry into this country upon deficiencies in the first three quotas; and

"Whereas there is frustration and despair resulting from the law that gives hope to Americans by permitting them to file petitions, getting them approved, and then compelling them to wait for their kin who may never come; and

"Whereas thousands of discontented people abroad, whose hopes are first raised and then dashed, certainly cannot believe in the good will we try to engender through our foreign policy, and thus become easy prey to the propaganda of unfriendly nations; and

"Whereas Congress has recognized and alleviated a similar problem through Public Law 85-316, which includes a provision for reuniting spouses and minor children of aliens legally residing in this country whose petitions were approved prior to July 1, 1957: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the General Assembly of the State of Connecticut memorialize Congress to amend the provisions of Public Law 85-316 to include cases which fall within the fourth preference quota, in order to provide for entry of the many thousands, petitions for whom have piled up in a backlog in prior years; that, in order not to create another problem of separated families, those applicants who are married and have families be permitted to bring them; and that a suitable copy of this resolution be sent by the secretary of state to each Congressman and Senator from the State of Connecticut.

"Adopted in senate March 19, 1959.

"Adopted in house of representatives March 26, 1959."

JOINT RESOLUTIONS OF NEW MEXICO LEGISLATURE

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD, and appropriately referred, the following House joint memorials adopted by the 24th Legislature of the State of New Mexico:

House Joint Memorial 6, memorializing the U.S. Senators and Representatives in Congress from the State of New Mexico to take proper measures to amend the Federal Communications Commission's ruling prohibiting the use of television booster antennas.

House Joint Memorial 17, petitioning the Honorable Fred A. Seaton, Secretary of the Department of the Interior of the United States, to undertake all administrative and legal steps necessary to commence immediate construction of the Hammond project of the Colorado River project.

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

To the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

"HOUSE JOINT MEMORIAL 6

"Joint memorial memorializing the U.S. Senators and Representatives in Congress from the State of New Mexico to take proper measures to amend the Federal Communications Commission's ruling prohibiting the use of television booster antennas

"Whereas the rules and regulations of the Federal Communications Commission do not permit the operation of television booster antennas; and

"Whereas the use of television booster antennas serve the most practical and efficient means of receiving television in communities located in rugged mountainous country; and

"Whereas in the State of New Mexico there are many communities located in mountainous country, far removed from stations which transmit television signals; and

"Whereas the effect of the regulation of the Federal Communications Commission is to deprive many communities in New Mexico of the means of receiving television: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Legislature of the State of New Mexico, That the members of the congressional delegation from the State of New Mexico be respectfully petitioned and memorialized that they take all the proper measures necessary to have this regulation amended to permit the operation of television booster antennas; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this memorial be sent to the U.S. Senators and Representatives in Congress from the State of New Mexico.

"ED V. MEAD,
"President, Senate.
"HAL THORNBERRY,
"Chief Clerk, Senate.
"MACK EASLEY,
"Speaker, House of Representatives.
"ALBERT ROMERO,
"Chief Clerk, House of Representatives.

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

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

To the Committee on Appropriations:

"HOUSE JOINT MEMORIAL 17

"Joint memorial petitioning the Honorable Fred A. Seaton, Secretary of the Department of the Interior of the United States, to undertake all administrative and legal steps necessary to commence immediate construction of the Hammond project of the Colorado River project

"Whereas the proposed Hammond project is the only non-Indian project authorized for the State of New Mexico by the Colorado River storage project; and

"Whereas the Hammond project has been given a feasibility rating of 2.1 to 1 by the Bureau of Reclamation and is of vital necessity to the growth of the State of New Mexico and to the farming and livestock industry of the arid northwestern area of the State: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Legislature of the State of New Mexico, That the Honorable Fred A. Seaton, Secretary of the U.S. Department of the Interior, urge upon the Bureau of the Budget and the U.S. Congress the inclusion in the Bureau of Reclamation Colorado River budget of $500,000 for the fiscal year 1960, which sum and appropriation be dedicated to the start of the Hammond project; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this joint memorial be transmitted to the New Mexico delegation of the Congress of the United States: the Honorable DENNIS CHAVEZ, U.S. Senator; the Honorable CLINTON P. ANDERSON, U.S. Senator; the Honorable JOSEPH M. MONTOYA, Member of Congress; and the Honorable THOMAS G. MORRIS, Member of Congress; and be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this joint memorial be transmitted to the Honorable Fred A. Seaton, Secretary of the Department of the Interior.

"ED V. MEAD,
"President, Senate.
"HAL THORNBERRY,
"Chief Clerk, Senate.
"MACK EASLEY,
"Speaker, House of Representatives.
"ALBERT ROMERO,
"Chief Clerk, House of Representatives.

"Approved by me this 27th day of March 1959.

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

RESOLUTION OF HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF NEW MEXICO

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred, the following House Memorial passed by the New Mexico House of Representatives:

House Memorial 18, memorializing the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the New Mexico congressional delegation to initiate and support legislation to qualify New Mexico Boy's Ranch to become eligible for surplus property to be used in the furtherance of the educational and welfare programs of the New Mexico Boy's Ranch.

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

HOUSE MEMORIAL 18

Memorial memorializing the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the New Mexico congressional delegation to initiate and support legislation to qualify New Mexico Boy's Ranch to become eligible for surplus property to be used in the furtherance of the educational and welfare programs of the New Mexico Boy's Ranch

Whereas the New Mexico Boy's Ranch has been established to provide an opportunity for the youth of this State to become better citizens; and

Whereas the ranch has grown to accommodate approximately 40 boys, representing every county in New Mexico, and the ranch is now extending educational and occupational training opportunities to such youth: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Secretary of the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and the New Mexico congressional delegation be respectfully urged to initiate and support congressional legislation to make available Federal surplus property for use by the New Mexico Boy's Ranch in the furtherance of the charitable principles to which it is dedicated, and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this memorial be transmitted to the Secretary of the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and to Senators DENNIS CHAVEZ and CLINTON P. ANDERSON; and to Representatives JOSEPH M. MONTOYA and THOMAS G. MORRIS.

MACK EASLEY,
Speaker, House of Representatives.
ALBERT ROMERO,
Chief Clerk, House of Representatives.

LOW PRICE OF EGGS—LETTER

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, once more I desire to call attention to the fact that I have in my hand another letter dealing with the low price of eggs in North Dakota—18 cents a dozen. With a 50-cent dollar, it means the farmers are getting 9 cents a dozen for eggs. Time and time again I have called attention to this situation.

I ask unanimous consent that the letter be printed in the RECORD, and referred to the appropriate committee. The committee can take up the matter to the Department of Agriculture. I earnestly hope that something will be done in order that farmers of the Midwest may receive a fair price for eggs.

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

CAVALIER, N. DAK., *April 7, 1959.*

Senator WILLIAM LANGER,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. LANGER: I am sending you the markets from our Pembina County paper so you can see what us farmers up here are getting for our produce. Do you think a farmer can feed hens for eggs at 18 cents for grade A? And look at the price we get if we sell them, 7 cents. I wish you would show this to Ezra T. Benson and President Eisenhower also if they think the farmers are getting rich. We only have a 160-acre farm and how can we make a living? Don't we deserve better treatment?

We hope you are feeling good also your wife. Thanks for what you have done for us in the past.

Sincerely yours,

CHESTER CROSBY.

MARKETS—APRIL 1, 1959

Grain:	
60-lb. wheat, 13 protein	$1.78
Choice milling Durum	2.04
Heavy white oats	.45
No. 1 flax	2.56
No. 1 rye	.93
Poultry:	
Heavy hens	.07
Springers	.08
Old cocks	.06
Eggs:	
Eggs, grade A	.18
Eggs, M	.17
Eggs, B	.17
Eggs, C	.13
Current receipts	.17
Butterfat:	
No. 1 sour cream	.58
No. 2 sour cream	.42
Sweet cream	.60

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. BYRD of Virginia, from the Committee on Finance, without amendment:

H.R. 5508. An act to provide for the free importation of articles for exhibition at fairs, exhibitions, or expositions, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 162).

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

S. 29. A bill for the relief of Magda Kusen Canjuga (Rept. No. 163);

S. 33 A bill for the relief of Bertha Glickmann (Rept. No. 164);

S. 181. A bill for the relief of Mary (Marija) Grom (Rept. No. 165);

S. 334. A bill for the relief of Hilda M. Humpole Goldschmidt (Rept. No. 166);

S. 625. A bill for the relief of Sophie Stankus, also known as Sister St. Ignace (Rept. No. 167);

S. 626. A bill for the relief of Maria Wolfram (Rept. No.1 68);

S. 1034. A bill for the relief of Asae Nishimoto (Rept. No. 169);

H.R. 1453. An act for the relief of Mrs. Mathilde Ringol (Rept. No. 177);

H.R. 1462. An act for the relief of Logan Duff (Rept. No. 178);

H.R. 2237. An act to amend chapter 13—Wage Earners' Plans—of the Bankruptcy Act (Rept. No. 179); and

H.R. 4314. An act for the relief of Samuel Abraham, John A. Carroll, Forrest E. Robinson, Thomas J. Sawyers, Jack Silmon, and David N. Wilson (Rept. No. 180).

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment:

S. 182. A bill for the relief of Yong Chul Jurgens (Rept. No. 170);

S. 245. A bill for the relief of Umeko Parker (Rept. No. 171);

S. 524. A bill for the relief of Giovanni Malara (Rept. No. 172);

S. 843. A bill for the relief of Ursula Gewinner (Rept. No. 173);

S. 940. A bill for the relief of Hlias Anthony Lousedes (Rept. No. 174); and

S. 1239. A bill for the relief of Herbert Westermann (Rept. No. 175).

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments:

S. 848. A bill for the relief of Peter Trbojevic, and his wife, Milica Trbojevic (Rept. No. 176).

By Mr. CHAVEZ, from the Committee on Public Works, without amendment:

S. 114. A bill to provide for equal treatment of all State-owned hydroelectric power projects with respect to the taking over of such projects by the United States (Rept. No. 186);

S. 601. A bill to authorize and provide for the construction of the Bardwell Reservoir (Rept. No. 184); and

S.J. Res. 16. Joint resolution to designate the lake to be formed by the waters impounded by the Dickinson Dam in the State of North Dakota as "Edward Arthur Patterson Lake" (Rept. No. 183).

By Mr. CHAVEZ, from the Committee on Public Works, with amendments:

S. 219. A bill to provide for the construction of a fireproof annex building for use of the Government Printing Office, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 185); and

S. 441. A bill to extend the duration of the Federal air pollution control law, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 182).

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported an original concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 21) favoring the suspension of deportation in the cases of certain aliens, and submitted a report (No. 181) thereon; which concurrent resolution was placed on the calendar, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress favors the suspension of deportation in the case of each alien hereinafter named, in which case the Attorney General has suspended deportation for more than six months:

A-4727055, Blaek, Ewald.
A-6623087, Chen, Won.
A-7073910, Chen, Rose Marcial.
A-7841721, Doxas, Ioannis Georges.
A-7469427, Duran-Gomez, Lucio.
A-5653974, Goldberg, Jennie.
A-5923851, Gonie, Abdul.
A-8227824, Hintopoulos, Anastasios.
A-8227810, Hintopoulos, Elizabeth.
A-10237829, Howell, James.
A-9509847, Kim, Tan Cheng.
A-7910271, Laskaratos, Antonis.
A-3734088, Laush, John.
A-7606569, Lorsy, Pierre Auguste.
A-5680354, Mitsis, Vasilios George.
A-3191505, Miyagi, Shintaro.
A-9702526, Nam, Wong.
T-330304, Nunez, Estrella Quesda-Padron de.
A-10828947, Okano, Toshio.
A-9783404, Pioa, Ching Tsung.
A3313814, Poon, Gee King.
A-7123769, Prano, Francesco.
A-3026388, Sikinger, Maximilian.
A-5983271, Teh-Chee, Wong.
A-6218916, Tijerina, Elidia Gomez.
A-8082837, Yee, Chan Tim.
A-9634992, Choy, Wong.
A-5309224, Engelbert, Walter.
A-6888873, Huppert, George.
A-6798911, Huppert, Marta (nee Simon).
A-9563617, Karapanagiotis, Aristotelis Anastassios.
A-9197864, Sing, Lai.
A-10504603, De Belmares, Josefina Coronel.
A-4789022, Evans, Zena Ann.
A-4786269, Hamasaki, Hiroichi.
A-5364167, Hamasaki, Tsugino.
A-9684330, Kam, Lo.
A-9799123, Kwai, Yung Ah.
A-3351370, Lum, Chong.
A-7186533, Rubin, Riva.
A-4276892, Dos Santos, Alfredo Lopes.
A-7450107, Wong, Kam.
A-6657670, Cheliotis, Athanasios Elias.
A-7898703, Costa-Coloret, Candido.
A-10292017, Costa, Candida Jalda-Diaz De.
A-7137721, Galaviz, Juana.
A-7886181, Lam, Cheong King.
A-5056856, Trentin, Giuseppe.
A-2794618, Carlson, Peter.
A-6984286, Garcia-Mendez, Celia.
A-6984283, Garcia-Mendez, Maria.
A-6984285, Garcia-Mendez, Victor.
A-3974383, May, Chang Ah.
A-9625807, Mustasaar, Jaan.
A-8952421, Wing, Lew.
A-8952422, Chung, Lee Sun.
A-5830879, Arden, Robert H.
A-7264249, Kildea, Gay Yvonne.
A-8217364, Silaikis, Felix.
A-9635445, Wong, Chong.
A-10255991, Chow, Sow Tan.
A-9727518, Giraud, Boniface Victorius Leon.
A-7241518, Lynch, Timoth James.
A-9069727, Yin, Ho York.
A-7266325, Fong, Han Soon.
A-9571969, Lim, Chew Tak.
A-10255551, Toon, Tan Siang.
A-7469694, Wah, Tan Jow.
A-9537742, Tan, Yap Eng.
A-9561879, Paun, Tin Joke.
A-7978933, Nunez y Plasencia, Juan Jose.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. MANSFIELD:

S. 1656. A bill for the relief of Patrick J. McMenomey; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JACKSON:

S. 1657. A bill for the relief of Leonard T. Bilson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BEALL:

S. 1658. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Income and Franchise Tax Act of 1947 to provide more liberal deductions for medical expenses of individuals who have

attained the age of 65; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By. Mr. DODD:

S. 1659. A bill for the relief of Jesus Miguez Miguez and Camilo Sotelino Migues; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HART (for himself and Mr. McNAMARA):

S. 1660. A bill to authorize the Honorable Thomas F. McAllister, judge of the United States court of appeals, to accept and wear the decoration tendered him by the Government of France; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. KEATING:

S. 1661. A bill to include United States commissioners and certain officers and employees of the Department of Labor, the Department of Commerce, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Post Office Department, the General Services Administration, and Federal probation officers within the provisions of sections 111 and 1114 of title 18 of the United States Code relating to assaults and homicides; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

By Mr. FULBRIGHT:

S. 1662. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Arkansas Post National Park, in the State of Arkansas; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

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

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 1663. A bill directing the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain property in the State of North Dakota to the city of Bismarck, N. Dak.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 1664. A bill to provide for the construction of a dam and reservoir on the Little Missouri River in the State of North Dakota; and

S. 1665. A bill to provide for the construction of a dam and reservoir on the Green River in the State of North Dakota; to the Committee on Public Works.

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

S. 1666. A bill to amend the Small Business Act of 1953 to include within the definition of a small business concern certain agricultural enterprises; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina:

S. 1667. A bill for the relief of the widow of Col. Claud C. Smith; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHAVEZ:

S. 1668. A bill for the relief of Esther Hernando Perez de Castilla; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KUCHEL:

S. 1669. A bill for the relief of Evagelia Elliopulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRUENING:

S. 1670. A bill to provide for the granting of mineral rights in certain homestead lands in the State of Alaska; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

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

By Mr. MAGNUSON (by request):

S. 1671. A bill to provide a flexible rate of interest for Government financing under the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

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

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina:

S.J. Res. 90. Joint resolution to provide for the construction of an additional museum of atomic energy by the Atomic Energy Commission for the housing of exhibits and the dissemination of information concerning atomic energy and its peacetime uses; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

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

CONCURRENT RESOLUTIONS

Mr. SYMINGTON submitted a concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 20) extending greetings to Hon. Harry S. Truman on the 75th anniversary of his birth May 8, 1959, which was considered and agreed to.

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

Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported an original concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 21) favoring the suspension of deportation in the cases of certain aliens, which was placed on the calendar.

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

AMENDMENT OF TITLE 18, UNITED STATES CODE, RELATING TO ASSAULTS AND HOMICIDES IN REGARD TO CERTAIN FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to make it a Federal offense to kill, assault, resist, oppose, impede, intimidate, or interfere with any U.S. commissioner, or certain officers and employees of the Departments of Labor, Commerce, Health, Education, and Welfare, and of the Post Office and the General Services Administration, as well as Federal probation officers while in performance of his official duties. Except in the case of U.S. commissioners, the only employees covered would be those concerned with investigatory or enforcement functions.

This bill has been enthusiastically endorsed by the administration as to the executive departments concerned; and I may add that since U.S. commissioners sit as trial magistrates, it is patently clear that they should be afforded the same protection as other Federal judicial officers.

Under the present laws, such protection applies only to Federal judges, U.S. attorneys, officers and employees of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and a few other Federal workers.

Experience has shown that the knowledge that Federal laws apply to, and Federal enforcement agents investigate, attacks on certain Federal employees goes a long way toward deterring such actions. Even though the crimes are crimes under State laws, the deterring power of Federal protection is immeasurable.

We owe this protection to all Government employees who face the probability of assault or intimidation in carrying out their duties.

The bill I introduce would close a loophole in the present laws, by providing the shield of Federal laws for employees in these departments who constantly face danger.

Certainly those who risk life and limb for the good of the Nation deserve all the protection we can afford them. There should be no controversy about this measure, and I trust it will be given early and favorable consideration by Congress.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be made a part of the RECORD; and I also ask that the bill be allowed to remain on the table until Thursday, April 16, 1959, so that other Senators may have an opportunity to join in sponsoring it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DODD in the chair). The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD, and lie on the desk as requested by the Senator from New York.

The bill (S. 1661) to include U.S. commissioners and certain officers and employees of the Department of Labor, the Department of Commerce, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Post Office Department, the General Services Administration, and Federal probation officers within the provisions of sections 1111 and 1114 of title 18 of the United States Code relating to assaults and homicides, introduced by Mr. KEATING, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 1114 of title 18, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"§ 1114. Protection of officers and employees of the United States.

"Whoever kills any judge of the United States, any United States commissioner, any United States attorney, any assistant United States attorney, or any United States marshal or deputy marshal or person employed to assist such marshal or deputy marshal, any officer or employee of the Federal Bureau of Investigation of the Department of Justice, any post office inspector, any postmaster, officer, or employee in the field service of the Post Office Department, any officer or employee of the Secret Service or of the Bureau of Narcotics, any officer or enlisted man of the Coast Guard, any officer or employee of any United States penal or correctional institution, any probation officer of a United States district court, any officer, employee or agent of the Customs or of the Internal Revenue or any person assisting him in the execution of his duties, any immigration officer, any officer or employee of the Department of Agriculture or of the Department of the Interior designated by the Secretary of Agriculture or the Secretary of the Interior to enforce any Act of Congress for the protection, preservation, or restoration of game and other wild birds and animals, any officer or employee of the National Park Service, any officer or employee of, or assigned to duty in, the field service of the Bureau of Land Management, any employee of the Bureau of Animal Industry of the Department of Agriculture, any officer or employee of the Indian field service of the United States, any officer or employee of the Department of Labor authorized to perform duties in connection with investigatory or enforcement functions under provisions relating to labor in any law of the United States, any officer, guard, or special policeman who is desig-

nated either by the Secretary of Commerce or by any person authorized by him to make such designation, or who is designated by the Administrator of the General Services Administration or by any person authorized by him to make such designation, to guard and protect property of the United States under the administration and control of the Department of Commerce or the General Services Administration, or any officer or employee of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare in a position designated by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare as involving functions in connection with the enforcement (including any investigatory or inspection activities in connection with the enforcement) of the food and drug or public health laws administered by such Department, while engaged in the performance of his official duties, or on account of the performance of his official duties, shall be punished as provided under sections 1111 and 1112 of this title."

ARKANSAS POST NATIONAL PARK, ARK.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide for the establishment of the Arkansas Post National Park in the State of Arkansas.

The National Park Service has completed an extensive series of historical and archeological investigations in the Arkansas Post area. These investigations reaffirm the significance of Arkansas Post. I ask unanimous consent that a summary of the investigations be printed in the RECORD following my remarks.

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

(See exhibit I.)

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, the Interior Department's Advisory Board on National Parks and Historical Sites, after studying the results of the investigations, approved Arkansas Post for consideration as a national park. I am gratified that the Board has taken this favorable action, and I hope that the Senate will take action on the bill in the near future.

I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial on this subject from the Arkansas Gazette dated March 30.

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

The bill (S. 1662) to provide for the establishment of the Arkansas Post National Park in the State of Arkansas, introduced by Mr. FULBRIGHT, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

The editorial presented by Mr. FULBRIGHT is as follows:

[From the Arkansas Gazette, Mar. 30, 1959]

ARKANSAS POST

The Interior Department's Advisory Board on National Parks and Historic Sites has approved Arkansas Post for consideration as a national park with the encouraging observation that the area is "of exceptional value for commemorating the important historical events associated with exploration and settlement of the lower Mississippi Valley."

Arkansas Post is entitled to the description. As one of the earliest white settlements on the west bank of the Mississippi, it served as a staging point for the exploration of the frontier, and many of the historic adventurers of that day are thought or are known to have visited its vicinity.

Among these explorers were Hernando de Soto, who is believed to have stopped near there in 1541. Others included Father Jacques Marquette and Louis Joliet in 1673; the Sieur de la Salle, who in 1682 took formal possession of the entire Louisiana territory in the name of Louis XIV; and Henri di Tonty, who established the first settlement at the post a few years later.

Arkansas Post is historically important, not merely to a single section of the South, but to the whole Nation. It deserves the status of a national monument.

EXHIBIT I

ARKANSAS POST PROJECT, ARKANSAS

I. SUMMARY HISTORY OF THE AREA

The chief significance of Arkansas Post is that it was the first white settlement of a semipermanent character in the lower Mississippi Valley and the later Louisiana Purchase. It was established by Henri di Tonty, a lieutenant of the famed explorer, Robert Cavalier de la Salle, in 1686 as a fur trading post.

Tonty himself wrote in 1693 that his post on the Arkansas was merely "a house surrounded by stakes." A visitor to the place in 1687, a year after it was built, described it as a "house * * * built of pieces of cedar laid one upon another and rounded away at the corners; its roof is of bark." This first Arkansas Post served as a trading house for the Indians, strengthened the French alliance with the friendly Quapaw Indians, and was designed as an intermediate post between the Illinois and the French settlements at the mouth of the Mississippi. Lack of references to Tonty's Arkansas establishments by contemporary travelers leads us to believe that it was abandoned about 1700 and another post was not erected on the Arkansas until two decades later.

It was not until 1721 that the French, under the Scotch promoter, John Law, established another post on the Arkansas, presumably at another location some distance away. The exact location is not known. With the exception of only a few years thereafter, both the French and Spanish maintained a garrison on the Arkansas until Louisiana was transferred to the United States in 1804. Although moved several times to different locations, Arkansas Post had a continuous existence from the 1720's until recent times.

Arkansas Post was overshadowed in importance by such places as New Orleans, Natchitoches, and St. Louis. During its heyday under the French and Spanish, not more than a company of troops was there at any time, and the population under the two regimes never exceeded 200 people. However, it was considered by the colonial administrations of both France and Spain to be of such importance that from the early 1730's a garrison was always maintained on the Arkansas. The role of Arkansas Post under the French and Spanish may be summarized as follows:

(1) It was one of the leading centers for Indian trade on the Mississippi River and of the Arkansas which drained a large area to the west.

(2) The post served as an intermediate point and as a stopping place for convoys traveling between New Orleans and the Illinois country.

(3) The garrison served to strengthen the alliance between France and later Spain, and their strongest Indian ally in Louisiana, the Quapaw.

(4) The post served as a base for French expansion into New Mexico.

(5) The garrison served as an important frontier outpost against the hostile Osage and other unfriendly Indian tribes on the western border of Louisiana.

After a time following the transfer of Arkansas Post to the United States in 1804, the area continued to be an important center for Indian trade. It reached its greatest importance from 1819 to 1821 when it was the capital of Arkansas Territory. The site of this last Arkansas Post is preserved as Arkansas Post State Park. During the Civil War the Confederacy recognized its strategic location on the Arkansas River by fortifying it and placing 3,000 troops there. In 1863, 30,000 Federal troops under Gen. John C. McClelland captured the post and kept control of the area during the remainder of the war.

II. NATIONAL PARK SERVICE STUDIES OF THE ARKANSAS POST AREA

Arkansas Post has been the subject of intermittent study by the National Park Service since February 1935.

The Advisory Board of the National Park Service in 1940 voted that "as one of the earliest sites in the lower Mississippi Valley and as an area of transition between the regimes of the Indians, the Frenchman, the Spaniards, and the American, Arkansas Post should be classified as an eligible site within the scope of the Historic Sites Act." However, this conclusion was based on the assump that archeological excavations would yield data regarding the successive sites of Arkansas Post and that consequently, these aspects of the lower Mississippi Valley history might be successfully interpreted.

During the years 1956 through 1958 the National Park Service conducted and sponsored research aimed at locating the site of the original Arkansas Post of 1686. This research included a comprehensive documentary study and two separate archeological projects. The results of these studies, which were made possible by special congressional appropriations, are given below.

Historical research

The historical investigations were undertaken by Ray H. Mattison, National Park Service historian, in 1956 and 1957. Utilizing all available sources, he compiled a history of Arkansas Post, with particular emphasis on any information on location which could be found. He was able to establish that Arkansas Post had been moved a number of times. Concerning the available information, Mattison says:

"The available documentary data have been carefully searched for every clue as to the possible locations of Arkansas Post. Unfortunately the references found were generally fragmentary and extremely obscure. The map sections of a number of the leading libraries of the Nation were carefully combed for maps of the lower Arkansas * * * these proved to be very contradictory in many instances."

Archeological research

Two separate archeological projects investigated pertinent areas in an attempt to locate physical remains of Tonty's Arkansas Post of 1686. The first of these in the fall of 1956 and the spring of 1957 was under the direction of Dr. Preston Holder, then of Washington University, St. Louis. The second, in 1958, was under the direction of Dr. James A. Ford, of the American Museum of National History.

Holder concentrated his work at and adjacent to Arkansas Post State Park. He found the occupation area extended considerably beyond the bounds of the present park lands. He found no evidence which could be attributed to the post of 1686. He did find evidence of a French and Spanish population living on the site for a considerable time during the 18th century, probably beginning as early as 1750. He found a complex of trenches indicating several relatively large structures, although erosion had

claimed whole sections of the buildings. He concluded, "There is every likelihood that there are some remains of a fort built in this vicinity in the early 1750's by the French Commander de la Houssaye. There is an equal or greater likelihood that there are remains of the Spanish fort of San Carlos III of the early 1780's."

Ford's work was at the site of the Menard Mounds, about 15 miles away as the crow flies. He found no physical evidence of the 1686 post, but he did find a small amount of trade goods with some burials, and believes on the basis of this and physiographic evidence that the Menard site was the Quapaw village of Osotouay where Tonty's post was erected in 1686. He succeeded in defining the cultural complex of the Quapaw Indians at the time of European contact, but found no evidence of actual European structural remains.

The archeological projects, therefore, failed to locate the exact site of the French post of 1686, but did locate French and Spanish settlements of the last half of the 18th century at and near the Arkansas Post State Park.

FLEXIBLE RATE OF INTEREST FOR GOVERNMENT FINANCING UNDER MERCHANT MARINE ACT

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide a flexible rate of interest for Government financing under the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter from the Under Secretary of Commerce, requesting the proposed legislation.

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. 1671) to provide a flexible rate of interest for Government financing under the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The letter presented by Mr. MAGNUSON is as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE,
Washington, D.C., April 9, 1959.

Hon. RICHARD M. NIXON,
President of the Senate,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There are attached four copies of draft legislation "To provide a flexible rate of interest for Government financing under the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, and for other purposes," together with a statement of purpose and provisions of the proposed legislation.

The Department believes that this draft bill would provide an adequate basis for meeting all costs of the Federal Ship Mortgage Loan program including interest, administrative expenses and a reserve for possible loss.

We are advised by the Bureau of the Budget that there is no objection to the presentation of this draft legislation to the Congress for its consideration and that its enactment would be in accord with the program of the President.

Sincerely yours,

FREDERICK H. MUELLER,
Under Secretary of Commerce.

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE AND PROVISIONS OF DRAFT BILL TO PROVIDE A FLEXIBLE RATE OF INTEREST FOR GOVERNMENT FINANCING UNDER THE MERCHANT MARINE ACT, 1936, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

The purpose of the draft bill is to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to provide a flexible rate of interest, to be charged by the United States upon the unpaid balance of the purchase price of vessels it sells under that act, which will be sufficient to cover its cost of borrowing money, its administrative expenses connected with the credit transaction, and a reserve for probable losses.

Under existing law, the rate required to be charged upon such unpaid balances is 3½ percent per annum which is not at present sufficient to cover the foregoing costs.

The draft bill would add a new section 512 to the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, which would provide that when vessels are sold under that act, on credit, the interest that shall be charged on the unpaid balance of the purchase price shall be a composite rate consisting of two components.

The first component would be a rate equal to the current average market yield, during the month preceding the execution of the contract to sell the vessel, as determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, on outstanding marketable obligations of the United States of maturities comparable to the vessel mortgage maturity. This would cover the cost to the United States of borrowing money. During the month of November 1958, this rate, as determined by the Secretary of the Treasury in connection with other lending transactions of the United States, was 3¾ percent per annum.

The second component would be a rate, determined by the Secretary of Commerce to be sufficient to cover administrative expenses and probable losses, which shall be not less than one-half of 1 percent per annum and not more than 1 percent per annum, except that during the period during which the vessel to be sold is under construction the charge to cover administrative expenses and probable losses shall be not less than one-quarter of 1 percent and not more than one-half of 1 percent.

The foregoing minimum and maximum rates to cover administrative expenses connected with the credit transaction, and a reserve for probable losses, are the same as the minimum and maximum premium rates which are authorized under title XI of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, for mortgage insurance under that title. These rates provide sufficient flexibility, in the opinion of the Department of Commerce, so that, for the foreseeable future, the draft bill will authorize a rate which will cover administrative costs and a reserve for probable losses.

The composite interest rate which the draft bill would require be charged on the unpaid balance of the purchase price of vessels sold under the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, during December 1958 (if the draft bill had then been law), would be (except for the period during which the vessel is under construction) a minimum of 4¼ percent per annum and a maximum of 4¾ percent per annum. These minimum and maximum rates consist of (A) 3¾ percent per annum which during November 1958 (the month preceding the month during which the hypothetical contract of sale was entered into), was the current average yield of marketable obligations of the United States with maturities comparable to 20 years, plus (B) a minimum of one-half of 1 percent and a maximum of 1 percent to cover administrative expenses and a reserve for probable losses.

In addition to changing the interest rate on the unpaid balances of vessels sold under the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, the draft bill would change the minimum charter rate on vessels chartered under the Merchant Marine Act, 1936. Section 714 of that act now provides that the minimum charter rate on such vessels shall be 5 percent per annum of the foreign cost of the vessel plus 3½ percent of the depreciated foreign cost of the vessel computed annually upon the basis of a 20-year life of the vessel. This minimum charter rate is intended to recover a 5 percent per annum depreciation charge plus 3½ percent per annum interest. Since 3½ percent per annum does not cover the Government's cost, the draft bill would substitute for the 3½ percent rate the flexible rate which it provides upon the sale of a vessel.

The draft bill would amend all of the sales provisions of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to incorporate the interest provisions provided by the new section 512.

If vessels are built under title VII of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, by the United States because the purposes of that act could not be carried out under title V, the draft bill would require that if such vessels are sold on credit, the interest charged upon the unpaid balance of the purchase price be at the rate provided in the draft bill, rather than at the rate of 3½ percent which is required by existing law.

The flexible interest rate would also apply to the sale of vessels acquired under title XI of the 1936 act through an assignment to the Secretary of Commerce of a vessel mortgage which he has insured under which there has been a default giving rise to a right to foreclose.

The draft bill would also amend Public Law 85-521 which authorizes the construction of two superliners, one to be operated in the Atlantic and one in the Pacific, and the sale of the vessels at prices fixed in that act with the terms of payment provided in section 502(c) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936. These terms of payment under existing law include interest at the rate of 3½ percent per annum. The draft bill would change this interest rate to the flexible rate it provides for the sale of other vessels. This rate, if the contract to sell the vessels had been executed in December 1958, would be a minimum of 4¼ percent and a maximum of 4¾ percent.

CONSTRUCTION OF ADDITIONAL MUSEUM BY ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution which would provide for the construction of a museum at the Savannah River plant in South Carolina. This would be similar to the museum which was very successfully established at Oak Ridge, Tenn., some years ago. It would house nuclear exhibits for the general public to see. I feel this would be valuable in bringing to the attention of the American people the great potential of nuclear energy for peacetime use.

The U.S. Government is spending millions and millions of dollars in the development of nuclear energy, and it is certainly the intention of the United States to use this energy in a peaceful manner. Since the taxpayers are bearing the costs, I think it only proper that we keep them informed of the great progress which we are making.

I feel that the expenditures necessary for such an exhibition would be very small, indeed, compared to the great service it would render to the people. All Americans are naturally much inter-

ested in the uses of atomic energy, and I hope the Congress will see fit to pass this joint resolution.

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

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 90) to provide for the construction of an additional museum of atomic energy by the Atomic Energy Commission for the housing of exhibits and the dissemination of information concerning atomic energy and its peacetime uses, introduced by Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

LABOR-MANAGEMENT REPORTING AND DISCLOSURE ACT OF 1959—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

On request of Mr. KENNEDY, and by unanimous consent, the name of Mr. CARROLL was added as an additional cosponsor of the bill (S. 1555) to provide for the reporting and disclosure of certain financial transactions and administrative practices of labor organizations and employers, to prevent abuses in the administration of trusteeships by labor organizations, to provide standards with respect to the election of officers of labor organizations, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. KENNEDY (for himself and other Senators) on March 25, 1959.

PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO CONSTITUTION, RELATING TO EQUAL RIGHTS FOR MEN AND WOMEN—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF JOINT RESOLUTION

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the distinguished Senator from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN], be added as an additional cosponsor of the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 69) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to the equal rights for men and women, introduced by me on March 9, 1959.

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

PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO CONSTITUTION RELATING TO ELECTION OF PRESIDENT AND VICE PRESIDENT—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF JOINT RESOLUTION

Under authority of the order of the Senate of March 26, 1959, the names of Senators MURRAY, RANDOLPH, MCCLELLAN, FULBRIGHT, ERVIN, STENNIS, and HENNINGS were added as additional cosponsors of the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 86) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the election of President and Vice President, introduced by Mr. SPARKMAN (for himself and Mr. HILL) on March 26, 1959.

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

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

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

Address entitled "Moscow's Cold War Air Force," delivered by Senator BARTLETT at the American Legion Queens County meeting, New York City, on March 20, 1959.

REALISTIC PLANNING NEEDED TO BENEFIT FROM ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement I have prepared under the title "Realistic Planning Needed to Benefit from St. Lawrence Seaway."

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY

As we know, the St. Lawrence Seaway, scheduled to open this month, will bring new economic life not only to the Great Lakes and upper Midwestern region, but to the Nation.

According to current estimates, the first ships of the 1959 shipping season will begin probably the week of the 20th to come through the improved and deepened waterway.

The event will mark a milestone of progress in the tremendous construction and engineering feat, providing trade and commerce on the Great Lakes—America's fourth seacoast—with a deep sea route to the ports of the world. In effect, the completion of the Seaway will transform a dream into a reality.

Around the Great Lakes, communities in Wisconsin and other States are making tremendous efforts to improve port and harbor facilities to get maximum benefit from the Seaway.

We recognize, of course, that constructive, realistic planning is essential for the future. Among other things, the challenges include: Further expansion and development of port and harbor facilities; development of waterfront sites; dovetailing of rail and road transportation facilities for "local" and "through" traffic with water terminals; and other actions to take advantage of new opportunities.

A recent publication by the Great Lakes Commission on Great Lakes Port Organization and Administration, carried a thought-provoking article entitled "The Seaway: A New Dimension for the Great Lakes Region and Mid-Continent Area." The ideas contained in this article reflect upon the problems and challenges involved in full utilization of this artery into the heartland of America, as well as some of the policy decisions that remain at the national and international level. The article is as follows:

"THE SEAWAY: A NEW DIMENSION FOR THE GREAT LAKES REGION AND MID-CONTINENT AREA

"(By John L. Hazard, professor of business and transportation, Michigan State University)

"The role of the lake ports

"The Seaway comes to the midcontinent as the agent of change—far-reaching, long-term, deep-seated, and fundamental change. It has been over 7 years since Canada made a final commitment to proceed, alone if necessary, with the construction of the Seaway at the St. Lawrence. During this interval of seaway assurance and presumed midcontinent preparations, the Seaway has constituted at the same time an opportunity, a challenge, a threat, and an enigma to the different elements of the midcontinent. It has been the role of the lake ports, during this period of varying expectations, to penetrate the fog that shrouds the seaway, to analyze its implications and to set the midcontinent on the road to constructive and realistic preparations.

"This is, indeed, a large order of responsibility and a formidable task that has lent itself to varying interpretations. As an opportunity, the Seaway is probably the most significant industrial location and economic development influence in the history of the lake ports since the Erie Canal and the westward extension of the railroads. Beyond the industrial implications, the Seaway provides the ports with an opportunity to become the focal point from which the midcontinent might emerge to conduct much of its merchandise foreign trade in its own right. As a challenge, the Seaway has posed the fundamental problem of instantaneous transformation from primarily localized industrial ports to cosmopolitan port complexes responsible to approximately one-half of the North American population and industry.

"The Seaway has been conceived by many enterprises and cities, some of them now its foremost potential beneficiaries, as a threat, a change in the status quo, a specter of competition and poverty. Primarily, however, the Seaway has been an enigma to the lake port communities and as such has provoked a spectrum of very different community responses.

"I shall direct my remarks in this session to providing a setting for the more pointed talks to follow. In the limited time available I will attempt to cover, very quickly, the elements of the Seaway, the opportunities it holds latent, the issues and problems before the lake ports and some of the policy decisions that remain at the Federal and international level. In the process I shall try to obstain from either prejudging or evaluating the issues until they have been thoroughly discussed by the highly competent panel of experts who have been assembled for that purpose. In the final evaluation sessions I shall be willing to carry the argument that involved in the Seaway is the basic and larger question of the international emergence of an economically and politically unified midcontinent. Secondly, unless evidence to the contrary emerges from these sessions, I will pose the case that the U.S. midcontinent is almost totally unprepared for the advent of the Seaway—neither the larger opportunities that it holds nor to answer the magnitude of issues that it raises.

"Elements of the Seaway

"The Seaway is a waterway effecting a union between the North American midcontinent and most assuredly over a third of the world's population. Its agents are ocean and lake vessels. In the limited time available, we can probably get the best view of the spectrum of opportunity inherent in the Seaway by discussing these elements in rather barebone simplicity. The Seaway itself is a waterway with limitations. It is not a St. Lawrence Seaway but rather a Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Seaway. It will be a single-lock canal at the St. Lawrence within 5 months, must reach up through each of the connecting channels (estimated to be at various stages from late 1960 to early 1963) and must then probe deep into the recesses of each of the deserving lake ports (to be accorded a schedule of dredging priorities). Even then, the Seaway will not be a completed fact.

"The Seaway must set in motion changes that produce its traffic and, in poetic justice, must respond to the magnitude of those changes. It must, then, become a continuum—progressively setting off change and responding to its magnitude—or be consigned to functional obsolescence by virtue of rapidly changing vessel technology or innovations in competitive paralleling transportation. The Seaway strikes into a dynamic and competitive universe whose test of success and survival is change and growth.

"The Seaway is by no means an ideal waterway, though its limitations have been vastly exaggerated by those who either magnify the transitional adjustments necessary for its utilization or take an entirely static view of the ingenuity of the shipping world or the North American capacity for industrial innovation. The only fundamental limitations of the trade route are to be found in its seasonality, limitations of dimensions, and directional orientation. The Seaway seasonality is a function of its icing over for about 4 months out of the year, and even this would be difficult to hold as a constant in view of the high nonproductive overhead costs and the increasing availability of chemical, heat and energy, air bubbling, and mechanical techniques for dissolving and breaking ice.

"The dimensional limitations of the Seaway are well known; the locks, for instance, have 200 feet less length, 20 feet less width, and 10 feet less depth than those that are already proving to be obsolete at the Panama Canal. Even though locks are considered to be permanent fixtures, they do not fix the project with permanent limitations. At the time of project duplication—which in my own opinion will have to be much sooner than ever anticipated—the locks must be gaged to the future dimensional and technological requirements of shipping. The directional limitation of the Seaway is to be found in the fact that it constitutes a long, narrow funnel throwing high out into the North Atlantic, a point from which omnidirectional sailing, particularly to southern and eastern hemispheres, involves circuitous distances. This will not become a very serious problem unless the whole direction of our trade shifts dramatically.

"One cannot foresee such a trend even with the advent of Euromart and the European free-trade community. The dominant direction of our trade is with countries economically accessible by the Seaway; for instance, nations conducting over 74 percent of the U.S. foreign trade by volume have already been reached by the miniature, short-range vessels plying the old St. Lawrence Canal.

"The ocean vessel is the Seaway's agent of change. We have long heard that the Seaway will introduce ocean vessels of 9,000 deadweight tons into the Great Lakes and draw lakers of up to 25,000 deadweight tons out to the ocean. This has given little credit to the ingenuity and adaptability of the maritime industries. It now appears more probable that hybrids combining the seaworthiness of ocean vessels and some of the capacity features of lakers will be the prototypes designed specifically for Seaway carriage. These already have been constructed up to 15,500 tons and are under design up to 19,000 tons. Basically, the multiple bulk hybrids are not severely circumscribed by Seaway dimensions, for they can carry in a single hold the total freight accommodated in 13 to 15 average freight trains. These hybrids—many constructed, operated, and manned under foreign flags—experience line-haul costs of about 1 mill per ton-mile, which is approximately one-sixth or one-seventh the railroad ton-mile costs in the specialized bulk movements (60- to 85-ton gondola and hopper cars). It is within their capabilities to haul from Chicago to Liverpool at less cost than railroads experience between Chicago and New York City. These bulk vessels are reinforced by the more dexterous general cargo vessels of from 8,000 to 9,500 tons capacity. These experience line-haul costs as low as 2 mills per ton-mile, which is about 5.5 to 10 percent of truck line-haul costs and only 20 to 25 percent of railroad line-haul costs.

"Fundamentally, these vessels have cost capabilities of reaching from Chicago to Western Europe as economically as trucks reach from Chicago to Detroit. Further, we find the cycle of innovation in transportation, which started with ships and shifted from trains, to trucks, to air, is now returning to vessel technology in the form of atomic power, new hull structures, different ways of compartmentalizing vessels, containers, roll-on, roll-off, and other means of mechanized cargo handling. In the face of this revolution in ship technology, the introduction of ocean vessels on the Great Lakes perhaps opens a wider spectrum for interlake commercial opportunities than does the Seaway in overseas general cargo trades. One carrier cost study affords evidence that the sea-train-type carrier could compete with railroads on a cost basis—a basis that frequently has little to do with rates—even between such short distance points as Chicago and Milwaukee.

"Furthermore, a cost advantage to the vessel of over 1 cent per ton-mile would apply for each unit of distance beyond those points. Since the Great Lakes are water surrounded by land—rather than land surrounded by water as is the case of continents—the distances between many of the lake ports is shorter by water than it is by overland carriage. The lakes, then, with their large and economically interrelated cities afford an ideal waterway for the integration of carriers through the utilization of common containers and units of carriage.

"The Seaway strikes into the North American midcontinent. Here is a region grown from an elementary agrarian economy to the largest, heavy industry agglomeration in the world in basically the 65 years of Seaway controversy. Its industrial ascension has been at the cost of virtual extinction of most of the resources upon which its industry is founded. This is true of the Pennsylvania and Illinois petroleum, the immense softwood forestry resources which once blanketed the Upper Lakes States, the copper of Upper Peninsula Michigan, the galena deposits of lead and zinc on the Wisconsin-Illinois border and is now becoming abundantly evident in the seemingly inexhaustible supply of iron ore at the head of the lakes. The industrial midcontinent has rapidly pursued a course which makes it the center of the materials void in the United States. Yet, remarkably enough, we have found this region to be politically disunified during the 65 years of Seaway battle; apathetic during its construction; and, in many instances, unprepared for its advent and ex post facto on many of the international policy issues it raises.

"The Seaway unites this region with at least one-third of the world's population and a larger proportion of its economy. Though Seaway romantics have focused most attention on the remote overseas areas, it is probably nearby and undeveloped eastern Canada that holds the major potential for Seaway movement. The Seaway, in this perspective, imposes an additional 2,000 miles of coastline to the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence system. Eastern Canada is the repository of what may prove to be the world's largest iron ore deposits. The one large company (Iron Ore Co. of Canada) which was working a central deposit at Schefferville in 1954, has been virtually surrounded by 17 companies which have outlined an almost continuous 2,000-mile arc of iron ore stretching from Lake Mistassini up around the Ungava Trough.

"The Seaway has lent a new urgency to resource developments in Canada, and the discoveries have almost perfectly balanced the acute deficiencies of the midcontinent. Large deposits of base metals—copper, zinc, and some lead—have been discovered in New Brunswick and central Quebec, and a large deposit of manganese in New Brunswick. Thorium, rare earths, and titanium oxides are found in abundance along the north shore of the St. Lawrence. The pyrites of New Brunswick offer a large potential for sulphuric acid and a chemical industry in eastern Canada. Asbestos along the south shore of the St. Lawrence and in Newfoundland and Nova Scotia has responded rapidly to the prospect of the Seaway. Nova Scotia gypsum, the largest supply in the world, has seen a number of new entries with prospect of midcontinent support. Moreover, the Seaway opens the midcontinent to prospective materials support from virtually all countries abutting on the Atlantic, the Mediterranean, and the Caribbean. These are the primary repositories of our industrial resources.

"We have long acknowledged that the Seaway opens the midcontinent's primary surpluses—grain and coal—to a more direct and economical export option. Of prospectively greater importance, it accords the midcontinent with the opportunity to conduct its merchandise trade in its own right. With respect to the merchandise or general cargo trades, the Seaway holds much more complex and enigmatic potential and the midcontinent is much less ably prepared and postured for their development than it is for the bulk movements where single companies, few decisions and a limited number of persons are concerned. The general cargo movement is the one in which the ports carry the primary mandates and responsibility and the one to which most of the remarks will doubtlessly be addressed today.

"I should like to point out, however, that although the bulk commodities tend to be largely autonomous, private, and self-initiating and have so far, except for grain, been considered outside most of the ports' focus of attention, they may be of a far larger order of importance in reshaping the economic structure of the midcontinent than the commercial general cargoes. It might further be considered whether these should be outside the authority of the lake port agencies which must, in the final analysis, make recommendations to the civic authorities for the control of further waterfront blighting; call the attention of industry and developmental agencies to the new spectrum of materials options and interpret their meaning to new industrial locations; and pursue a plan of integrated port development that has coherence, makes sense, and must ultimately reach far beyond the bounds of their present plants.

"I have merely touched in skeletal form on the essential elements of the Seaway-instituted change—a change of such magnitude as to defy exacting measurement. Though I have spent a number of years analyzing in considerable detail the new patterns of commodity and resource movements by the Seaway, I have by no means emerged with the feeling that my studies have embraced a significant part of the project's potential. I think it should be made abundantly clear that I do not count myself among the Seaway optimists; in fact, I hold the Seaway as essentially neutral. It does nothing for anyone; it merely holds out latent opportunities whose realization depends upon decisions and responses.

"The time is far past for raising the question I have been asked many times in the Lake States, 'What will the Seaway do for Podunk, Ohio?' The answer is, of course, 'Nothing.' The only question of relevance is 'What is Podunk, Ohio, going to do about the Seaway?' One witnesses throughout the

midcontinent the misconception—the St. Nicholas myth of the St. Lawrence—which assumes that traffic has some magic capacity to suddenly volunteer itself from out of the hinterlands. One still finds numerous boards of trade, chambers of commerce, and metropolitan planning agencies 'waiting to see the traffic before acting.' They will doubtlessly be proved the prophets of the Seaway, for without acting there will be no traffic to be seen. The sooner the St. Nicholas myth of the St. Lawrence is abandoned, the sooner the vision of spontaneous bonanzas will give way to the reality of the larger tasks and issues the Seaway presents.

"Before addressing the port-related issues raised by the Seaway, we might examine the higher goals and purposes that the Seaway could serve—to see if they provide some guidance to the higher aspirations and larger responsibilities of the ports. Looking not to the legislative mandate but rather to the reality and potential of the Seaway, I would list and rank the higher goals of the Seaway in the following order:

"1. The primary purpose that the Seaway may serve is the fostering of better relations, closer cooperation, and the growing economic interdependence between Canada and the United States. This is the concept implicit in the spirit in which the Seaway was conceived and strengthened during the project's construction and will be reinforced by what will be primarily Canadian-United States trade through the Seaway. That we can no longer afford to take Canada for granted is all too clear from the coming of age of Canada, the rise of nationalism and the dangers of division in this crucial time in our history. We must recall that it was a small and aggressive Canada that dragged the United States into the Seaway late and embarrassed. Canada is not only our most reliable neighbor but our foremost trading partner and potentially our strongest political and military ally. The Seaway may well be the first step toward wider joint activities in the conservation and redevelopment of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence system. The system is not only the world's foremost fresh water supply but the greatest mutual asset shared by any two nations of the world, a system so divided that all actions relating to it must inevitably be joint, a resource suffering of serious pollution and despoilation.

"Further, the Seaway should lead toward parallelism in commercial laws with Canada and could be a first step leading toward regional economic union. Although we are living in a time that should make for an almost inevitable jointness, there is a disconcerting undercurrent of division between the United States and Canada. Certainly if we are to preserve this cherished relationship, the United States will have to show a much higher order of initiative than it has in its entry into the Seaway project. A study of the history of the Seaway battle makes it abundantly clear that our failure of entry on the Seaway was a regional, as opposed to a national or governmental, failure and, in this respect, the apathy, political disunity and open hostility of many in the midcontinent was probably as responsible as the vociferous opposition of the so-called longtime enemies of the Seaway. Certainly a large share of the task of enlightenment and of leading the midcontinent to an early and correct assessment of the larger issues of Canadian-American relations resides with the lake ports.

"2. The United States and Canada, in striving to foster their growing political and economic relationships, should also be mindful of the need to preserve the international dimensions of the Seaway—the right of transit and freedom of commerce by way of the Seaway to oversea countries. Certainly our oversea allies have pioneered and developed the lakes-overseas trade. Equally certain is the fact that the trade route is a vulnerable one. It is vulnerable to time losses stemming from duplicating governmental commercial laws—the many and disparate navigation, customs, immigration and other commercial rules that apply to the vessels and commerce passing over it. It is also vulnerable to the impositions of almost two dozen pilotage, maritime, shore, and transport unions which, in moving toward unity, can visit upon the commerce an almost unlimited number of grievances and restraints. It is further vulnerable to the defensive tactics of the inland carriers to whom the ocean vessels are, in different instances, both complementary and competitive. We might well consider then the role of the ports in bringing an international view to the problems of the Seaway, making it an integral part of our foreign policy and in considering its implications to our national and domestic transport maritime policy. Certainly, we are in a strategic position to throttle ocean vessels, of either foreign or domestic registry, in their attempts to develop commerce over this formerly closed navigation system.

"3. These matters will be an essential condition to what we might call the emergency of a midcontinent in fact. Not only does the Seaway afford the promise of access to new resource foundations to the industrial structure of the midcontinent and a new spectrum of market opportunities for its abundant primary and manufactured surpluses, but it also provides some reason to hope for the formation of an economically, politically and socially united region. The midcontinent heretofore has existed either as a figment of the imagination or as statistical fiction—the east north central district, the west north central district or the Great Lakes States. It is not a unified and coherent region like the Pacific coast, the Southwest, the South, New England, or even eastern Canada or central Canada. The Seaway will send out trade arteries that may constitute a unifying thread which could knit this section of the country into a coherent and articulate region. If it does, one might hope for an abandonment of the residual elements of isolationism and insularity that have remained, even after World War II, and the emergence of a region with a larger and more responsible voice in all international economic and political affairs. Needless to say, the ports must choose a leading role if such a transition is to obtain.

"4. The fourth purpose to be served by the Seaway may well be to establish the capacity of a navigation project for self-liquidation and this concept is probably well worth preserving. Self-liquidation is a part of the legislative mandate, will afford the grounds for more equitable transport competition and, in the final analysis, may become a condition for the extension and duplication of the project. This by no means supports the idea that we should expect the Seaway to rise full-blown and self-liquidating in its first few years nor that we should become so attached to its profit and loss aspects as to permit them to defeat the other higher international and regional policy objectives. I fully realize that supporting tolls is akin to a politician favoring sin or taxes, in some of the lake cities, so I will merely acknowledge that this is an issue on which the ports will have to take an informed and responsible position. If they do not, it is entirely conceivable that their failure to do so will not only be injurious to fostering amity between Canada and the United States but may be inimicable to a consistent U.S. voice in Seaway matters. Fortunately, harassment and irresponsibility over tolls may have passed beyond the fevered pitch reached about 2 years ago.

"These may seem to be lofty and utopian purposes to ports struggling with the daily myriad details and decisions—and, in many instances, fighting for political survival. Yet if the ports, as agents and interpreters of an emergent midcontinent, lose sight of the higher goals, we are certain to realize less than the full potential of the Seaway for positive change. The Seaway is no longer just a matter of new commodity flows and commerce but becomes a distinct means of positively redirecting our international policy during a period of intensification of economic warfare.

"Port-related issues

"We view the lake ports in a moment of fundamental, grassroot, and yet revolutionary, transformation. Theirs is the task of changing from industrial to cosmopolitan ports; from primary local to international ports; from independent, private, and bulk commodity industrial backyards to commercial entrepôts responsible to and conducting much of the foreign trade of the heartland of the world's richest continent. Time is of essence, for the lake ports must accomplish in 5 to 10 years what has evolved at seaboard ports over the past 150 years. Yet the lake port agencies have, with few exceptions, been underpaid, undermanned, and under attack. They have, by and large, done an excellent job under trying circumstances. Where failures have occurred they have been more often community, State, and national failures rather than port agency failures.

"If my assessment of accomplishments seems unduly harsh or the weight of issues I place on their shoulders unduly burdensome, it arises from a sense of urgency and not from unsympathetic miscomprehension of the magnitude of the task.

"The Seaway raises a number of fundamental port-related issues. I shall merely state some of the observations I have drawn from a number of contacts with the lake ports, state the related issues and leave the harder job of answering them to this stalwart panel of experts.

"1. One finds in the study of lake ports a number of traffic projections and forecasts for the ports. In many instances, these studies were predicted on the static and standard assumptions of city size, distances, natural endowment, and make-up of "captive" (a dubious term) hinterlands. Further, they proceeded to forecast tonnage as though it were the inevitable and inalienable right of the port community, without acknowledging the task involved in its gathering. We might question whether we do, in fact, have a proper conception of ports, any model for port growth, any idea of how they evolve. Further, whether static assumptions and unimaginative research might not have robbed cities of much of their audacity and blinded them to the formidable realities involved in the task of becoming ports. If ports have no inalienable rights of economics or geography, we might ask, 'What is the spectrum of opportunities open to communities, even relatively small ones, for self-determination in becoming ports?'

"2. In the absence of a larger showing of initiative elsewhere—at the National, State, or even importer, exporter and industrial level—the lake ports will have to play the key role in initiating general cargo movements, orienting the midcontinent to the conduct of trade in its own right and, in the larger context, fostering the international emergence of political unity in the midcontinent. The questions are multiple. Does their enabling legislation equip or disable them for such an undertaking and, if defective, in what ways should it be reconstructed? Are they adequately organized, financed and manned for the assumption of such responsibilities? Have they been given adequate community, State and regional aid and support in their undertaking? Why have some succeeded in spite of adversity and others failed in spite of wide-scale public support? Is it a problem

of leadership, organization and community motivation, or the carping attacks of local politicians and, uniquely enough, chambers of commerce?

"3. It appears clear that, as measured by their ocean counterparts or the Canadian lake ports, the pre-Seaway efforts of most U.S. lake ports have been limited and, more seriously, their long-term development plans are modest. Is the failure a local, State, or National failure? Since the United States is about the only Western nation which leaves port development entirely to local initiative, do we need a revision of national commercial policy to gain a wider voice participating in port development? Should the States, or even the regional hinterland, take a larger role in port development and participation in its financing?

"4. It appears clear that the scale of immediate port efforts or long-term plans has had little to do with the size of the metropolitan community, the immediacy with which the city will be contacted by 27-foot navigation, or even the potentialities of the community's supposedly captive hinterland. The questions again are hard to answer. To what guidelines should community port planning be tied? Certainly studies have had a limited effect on the magnitude or character of port responses. Detroit is perhaps the most studied and least responsive of the ports—and not because of any negative study findings. What new assumptions, approaches, insights, and methods should port studies be using? What informational voids, national and local, should be filled so that we cannot only study a community or region—say, as intelligently as Canada does—but also give it a realistic view of its stake in foreign trade? Further, who should be responsible for intelligent analysis, interpretation, and public information?

"5. The chief obstacles to port preparations appear to have risen variously: from policy mistakes of the distant past that have resulted in a vast blighting of the waterfront for navigation purposes; from lack of knowledge about the Seaway, ports, and economic potentials; from the exaggeration of the toll phantom; from the worst manifestations of local politics; and from the misunderstanding of the respective roles of the public voice and private enterprise in port development. These raise many questions and pose lessons too numerous to list here.

"6. The most ambitious and generally successful Seaway preparations have been undertaken in those cities that have preserved their waterfronts, exercised a voice in waterfront development and control, maintained a proper port image in the public mind, gained a sense of widespread private and public participation in the port activities and have been lucky or astute enough to man their port agencies with men of vision, immense energy, capacity for community leadership, and immunity to political assassination. There are no complete remedies for the historical mistakes of the lake ports nor is there any substitute for wisdom, vision, and leadership which still remain remarkably individual.

"A number of national policy issues respecting lake ports should be brought into sharp focus by the Seaway:

"1. Whether the national commerce policy, which is generous on navigable waterways but ill defined and vague with respect to ports—certainly of an equal importance—should be expanded to involve a voice and participation in port matters. It appears clearly evident that many of the lake port communities have permitted reckless blighting of their waterfronts and have assumed virtually no local initiative in responsibility for seaway preparations. The cost of such failure will not only be local but will involve loss to a good portion of the midcontinent.

"2. Whether great national or intergovernmental projects, such as the Seaway, hydroelectric, irrigation or other public projects, should be built, with the matter of utilization and discovery of their extent and limitations of usefulness left to chance. Public projects run the gamut from the TVA—in which farmers were taught crop rotation and use of the proper types of fertilizers, and mountain housewives were taught the nature and usefulness of electrical appliances—to the Seaway. The question is how far should the Seaway entities and other governmental agencies pursue traffic developmental, informational, and route protective activities?

"3. Whether the Federal Government should accord the lake ports recognition and treatment immediately or wait until they have demonstrated themselves, in fact, to be ocean ports. This might be asked in connection with the schedule and timing of priorities for lake port dredging, regulatory agency efforts, consideration given to placing the lake ports on inland carrier rate or service parity with the ocean ports and the according of gateway status to the lake ports by the Government agencies controlling the routing of much of the United States foreign aid, military shipments, agricultural exports and on other matters.

"4. Whether the Federal and Dominion Governments, the Seaway agencies, or an international Seaway Authority should assume the functions of fostering the trade routes' traffic development or of protecting the exposed route from arbitrary State, carrier, labor, or industrial infringements. Should trade development be left largely to local and private incentives but protection of the route from infringements by the eight or nine Government agencies, the eight States and two Provinces, the more than two dozen labor unions, and the numerous inland carrier and ocean conferences under whose auspices the commerce must move, be the task of an international authority or intergovernmental agency?

"The role of the ports

"In the absence of a clear expression of Government policy in these matters, it becomes particularly urgent that the role of the port agencies be expanded beyond the conventional ocean port tasks of informing the region, providing physical facilities for the dispatch of traffic and enlisting its flow through traffic developmental activities. The ports may have to assume the important function of voicing the whole region's interest in the Seaway. To do so, it is obvious that they will gain more strength through a collective front than through individual and dispersed efforts. We may someday see an effective association of all Great Lakes ports—Canadian and American—but, judging from the immediate, that day may be long in coming. There is today a Council of Lake Erie Ports, a Great Lakes Harbors Association, and informal monthly meetings of all major U.S. lake port officials, but so far there is no unified organization expressing articulately the interest of the midcontinent in the Seaway. The Great Lakes Commission, formed in 1955, may become the most effective agency. So far the commission has exercised an articulate voice, but it will lack authority on the larger issues until it has more direct and affirmative gubernatorial participation and more direct representation from midcontinent Canada.

"Whatever the form, effective collaboration of the lake ports will demand proper delineation of the areas in which their interests are competitive or common. One can, for instance, foresee them fighting jealously for traffic at borderline communities and collaborating effectively on the issues of port channel dredging, inland carrier rates and service rulings, priorities on lockages to be accorded foreign vessels, duplicating and binding commercial regulations, imminently dangerous shipping and trade restrictions, and a great range of other seaway questions that will soon come into clear focus. So far, the ports have been quicker to recognize and fight for their competitive interests, but the day may be not too distant when they will rise to recognize common interests.

"The promise that this program holds is in the early definition of common issues, challenges, and problems that the Seaway poses to a region. We are concerned with the international emergence of a midcontinent in which the lake ports bear an inordinate share of the responsibility for leadership."

INEQUITABLE CHANGES IN WILDLIFE PROGRAMS

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a statement by me on the inequitable changes in wildlife programs, in connection with the distribution of funds for wildlife projects under the Pittman-Robertson Act; and I also ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a letter I have written to the Secretary of the Interior, the Honorable Fred Seaton.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY

Recently the Department of Interior revised the formula for distributing funds for wildlife projects under the Pittman-Robertson Act.

By a new interpretation of the statutes, the Department decided to allocate funds to States on the basis of "numbers of license holders" rather than on the formula utilized since the enactment of the law in 1937 (that is, the record of "licenses issued"). This will create real problems.

The change will: (1) result in an inequitable distribution of funds; and (2) necessitate costly surveys—estimated at $15,000–$30,000 for Wisconsin and proportionately high costs for other States—to determine the number of license holders.

The proposed revision of the formula does not take into account the fact that there are separate costs of management and maintenance of game programs—for which single hunters may purchase licenses.

We recall that, under the Pittman-Robertson Act, the States match Federal funds on a 25 percent basis to carry on acquisition, maintenance, and restoration of wildlife projects. The funds are obtained by collection of an excise tax on firearms and ammunition. After deducting administrative costs and certain statutory aids to territories, the money is reapportioned to the States—according to a formula allocating 50 percent of the money according to land area, and (until now) 50 percent on the basis of licenses issued to hunters.

Recently, I introduced legislation, S. 1021, to redefine the statutes along the lines by which the Department has administered the program since its enactment in 1937. Fortunately, initial hearings have been held on the bill by the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. I sincerely hope that the committee will find it possible to complete action on this legislation in the near future.

In view of the facts that (1) the Department's action represented a far-reaching change in the program; and (2) legislation is being considered in the Senate, I have urged the Secretary of Interior to hold up action on the decision until Congress can take a new look at this program.

APRIL 13, 1959.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I am writing to express my opposition to action by the Department of Interior to change the formula for distributing Federal funds for wildlife projects under the Pittman-Robertson Act.

The Department's recent decision to allocate funds on the basis of numbers of "paid license holders" rather than on the record of "licenses issued" will result in: (1) an inequitable distribution of funds to States; (2) additional costs—estimated at $15 to $30,000 in Wisconsin—and proportionately high costs in other States—for surveys to determine the number of license holders.

The new interpretation of the provisions of the Pittman-Robertson Act would, as you know, actually represent a drastic change in administration of the law. Funds for the program, until now, have been distributed on the basis of the record of licenses. Now, without a change in the statute, the Department proposes to radically change the formula for distribution of money to the States.

As you may be aware, I have introduced legislation (S. 1021) to more clearly define the statutes—along the lines by which the Department has administered the program since 1937. Hearings have been initiated on this legislation.

Any administrative action to revise the fund-distribution formula, I believe, should be held in abeyance until Congress can consider this legislation and take a new look at the overall program.

Consequently, I again respectfully urge the Department to hold up action on the decision until Congress can act on this legislation.

Looking forward to hearing from you and with kindest personal regards, I am

Sincerely yours,

ALEXANDER WILEY.

CITY-FEDERAL COOPERATION

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, one of the highlights of last week's meeting of the American Society for Public Administration in Washington was an address delivered by the Honorable Raymond R. Tucker, mayor of St. Louis, Mo.

In his remarks, "A Mayor Looks At Washington," Mayor Tucker pointed up some of the steps which he believes the Federal Government should take to assure progressive and orderly development of our urban areas.

Raymond Tucker is one of the distinguished mayors of our country. During his administration St. Louis has moved ahead on a dynamic program of urban redevelopment. The Mill Creek Valley project alone will replace 465 acres of decay in the center of the city with a beautiful, well-planned series of housing projects and commercial buildings.

Mayor Tucker has an outstanding record and breadth of experience on urban problems. All those interested in the vital question of city-Federal relations will find his views of real value. In the years ahead, the Congress will be devoting considerable attention to this field.

For this reason, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the speech delivered by Mayor Tucker at the 20th annual conference of the American Society for Public Administration be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

A MAYOR LOOKS AT WASHINGTON

(By Mayor Raymond R. Tucker)

President Macy, distinguished guests, members and friends of the American Society for Public Administration, it is quite an honor to be here this afternoon. First, I have the opportunity to address your distinguished organization of teachers and practitioners of the art of administration.

Second, I have this opportunity on the occasion of the 20th anniversary of your society. May I add my appreciation to that of so many other administrators for the outstanding contributions made to the theory and practice of public administration through your efforts. Your journal, other publications, and services have maintained the highest professional reputation.

I certainly hope and expect that your success will be equally great over the coming decades.

As you know, the topic of my talk today is "A Mayor Looks at Washington." Some days ago, a friend of mine, hearing that I would address you on that subject, added, "and sees the green stuff."

His remark was, of course, intended to be facetious. Yet I wonder if he was not expressing a view that some people hold. Such a view would encompass the attitude that mayors and local government officials come to Washington cynically pursuing self-interest, looking for financial handouts for projects for which their local communities have neither the will nor the means.

In some circles it is quite fashionable to describe the Washington-oriented efforts of local governments as evasions of their responsibilities. The charge has been made that local governments are becoming weak and flabby as a result of dependence upon Federal financial largess.

It should come as no surprise to you that I emphatically reject these contentions.

Indeed, it is with a real sense of pride that I participate with so many of my fellow mayors in underscoring the need for continued Federal action in many policy fields which affect local governments.

I think that local officials would be derelict in their duties if they were not to fight for the adoption of such national policies.

I believe any reasonable person, studying the national municipal policy of the American Municipal Association, would recognize that some of the crucial domestic problems of our age are considered in that comprehensive series of recommendations.

Urban renewal and public housing, airports, water pollution, are typical of the topics included which require Federal action.

However, this broad-gaged approach to the policy questions of our urban areas is by no means to be considered limited to topics requiring Federal action.

It is here that I believe the role of our cities and their governments has been misunderstood. Cities have by no means been falling down on their job.

In reality, the little recorded and little understood story is the dramatic degree with which cities have accepted the massive challenges of the 20th century.

Local governments maintain a total monthly employee payroll of over $300 million more than the total monthly Federal payroll.

The borrowing and repaying of money by city government is second only to the Federal Government. Local government spends more tax dollars than the States, hires more employees than the States.

Since 1902, local government expenditures from their own revenue sources have increased from $828 million per anum to close to $18 billion per annum in 1956.

A more significant trend in the relative position of governmental expenditures is emphasized in last year's report of the House Committee on Governmental Operations on Federal-State-Local Relations. The report, speaking of the growth of government, declares:

"The components of the Federal budget not directly related to war and defense * * * increased from an estimated $9.2 billion to $14.5 billion during the years 1946–56, a period in which the general expenditures of State and local governments more than tripled."

Recently, in making for another purpose some comparisons in our St. Louis city budget, I noted that the budget of the health division had increased 10 times since 1914. There was no money allocated in 1914 for traffic control. Our hospital budget was less than 6 percent of its current level. You know by how much I could extend this list.

Such statistics about the tremendous growth of city government reflect, of course, basic substantive policies. This growth is the response of the cities to specific, vital problems.

I mentioned the tenfold increase in the St. Louis Health Division budget since 1914. This increase really means in substantive terms the current presence of specific sections of the Division dealing with meat control, food control, rat control, mosquito control, mental hygiene and industrial hygiene.

You will all recognize these services—and I'm only citing one kind of example—to be the result of demands upon Government brought about by our highly urbanized, industrialized society. This kind of example deals with service functions accepted in this century—functions which, of course, have become regularly accepted and taken for granted.

Our cities have accepted these functions. A safe and healthful city life in the industrial age made them inescapable.

Our cities accepted cultural and recreational functions, recognizing that concentrated populations needed more than the merest physical amenities. How often do we recognize the national contribution made at the local level of government by our great public libraries and art museums?

Before a mayor even begins to look at Washington, he is aware of a magnificent heritage of accomplishment by city government.

However, no society can remain static, resting upon past accomplishments. We are all aware of the fundamental changes of the era of "the exploding metropolis."

Sweeping population changes have changed the face of our urban areas. Similarly, technology is revising the structure and organization of our industry.

Following these changes, came the metropolitan "explosion." The impact of this explosion was primarily recognized after the Second World War, and we are still behind in our efforts to cope with it.

There are certain outstanding phases of this most recent metropolitan development: (1) The rapid dispersal of former city residents over large surburban areas; (2) the dense concentration of new residents from rural areas in older sections of the city; (3) the absence of adequate land in the old city for new type industrial facilities; (4) the obsolescence of existing central city industrial and commercial facilities.

From these phases develop particular city problems: (1) The erosion of the tax base; (2) increasing inadequacy of mass transit; (3) parallel exacerbation of the traffic and parking problems; (4) the almost amoeba-like spread of slums and blight; (5) deterioration of existing patterns of zoning and

land usage; (6) increased needs of public services in crowded lower income residential areas.

With all these new demands, our cities must nevertheless attempt to maintain existing traditional services and keep up their existing capital investment in structures and equipment.

The success of our cities in meeting these problems is an issue of paramount national concern. Close to 80 percent of our population now live in metropolitan areas, and the large central cities are finally responsible for the economic and social health of those areas.

The phases of the metropolitan "explosion" which I have described and their resultant city problems are the result of trends national in character. The effective meeting of these problems is, in so highly urbanized a society, crucial to national security and economic well-being. And if we are to develop in our national character the principles of the good life, of a better civilization, we had best see to it that our cities provide the necessary environment for such development.

Thus, our cities, having met the first wave of 20th century problems, are now coping with a new wave of problems national in character and importance.

It is to these newer problems that mayors are addressing themselves when they look at Washington and seek adoption of new public policies. It is indeed true that some of the Federal policies sought are costly, but I suspect that in terms of the long-range urban needs of the Nation we may have asked for too little.

I need not review too closely for this audience the kinds of programs cities advocate at the Federal level. Slum clearance, urban renewal, public housing, hospitals and health, highways, airports, water pollution, area redevelopment—these are the typical basic fields in which Federal funds are sought.

Remember, of course, that even here Federal funds are sought on a shared basis, with local initiative, participation, and money involved. But cities cannot, on an individual basis successfully attack problems which are the result of underlying broad national trends. It must further be emphasized that for the most part the functions for which joint Federal-city action is sought are above and beyond the traditional burdens of local government.

We have engaged in tremendous programs of Federal support to agriculture. Mayors must look to Washington for substantive support for the new problems of a Nation 80 percent urban in character.

I know, too, that you all understand that the cities are severely limited in their available tax sources by State constitutions and statutes. Federal, State, and local taxes compose more than 27 percent of the total national income. Almost 75 percent of this tax total is Federal in character.

Cities, frankly, have strained their fiscal resources to the breaking point. In St. Louis, we have turned to the earnings tax as a partial alleviation of the problem. Yet in face of the overwhelming Federal seclusion of tax sources, local fiscal flexibility is severely limited.

Since we have adopted major programs of Federal participation and since we shall see such programs continued and expanded, I expect to find new institutional arrangements evolving in intergovernmental relations.

Such new relationships are developing among the various levels of government. This follows logically since no dynamic society can express itself through inflexible structural arrangements.

Because of the developing intergovernmental involvements, the mayor of a large city will find much of his time devoted to coordinating relationships, or participating in efforts to coordinate relationships between different agencies of different governments.

Typical efforts come to mind. A new city expressway will terminate at the city line. Conferences are held by city officials, county officials, and officers of county municipalities to work out solutions to the impact of the new road.

As the great new Jefferson National Expansion Memorial in St. Louis comes nearer to realization, continual conferences—and I must say these relationships have been excellent—between the city and National Park Service are necessary to work out our mutual living arrangements.

Direct relationships exist between the city's land clearance authority and the Urban Renewal Administration in the Housing and Home Finance Agency. Sometimes we think in this area there is too much Federal oversight of operational details, and we feel that greater delegations of authority could be made to regional offices of such a Federal agency.

You can readily see the intergovernmental involvements in flood control and highways. Here the problems are continuing, and regularized relationships develop between the officials and technicians involved.

Sometimes a particular problem of governments working at cross purposes will drop out of a clear blue sky. Recently one large Federal governmental installation was scheduled for downtown St. Louis without any notification to the city planning commission, or any agency of city government. Only after stumbling upon these plans while seeking to develop the site for municipal purposes have we been able to begin the effort to come to a mutually satisfactory agreement about the proper land use of the area.

For the most part, respectable cooperative relationships develop for each specific program between the Federal, State, and local officials involved.

I think the more difficult program of cooperation lies in those areas where different programs have an effect on each other. Here the institutional developments for coordination have been slower in emerging. Yet progress is being made in exploring the interdependent implications of expressway building and urban renewal, for example, in our cities.

In creating specific policies for particular problems, there was a natural tendency to overlook the probable effects of one policy upon another. Consider the difficulties, for example, if one agency of government announces plans for an expressway running through an area in which another agency is successfully expanding a neighborhood rehabilitation project.

There remains then a vast need for coordination between programs as well as the more obvious need for coordination within one program of the activities of different levels of government.

Possibly more fundamental than the need for coordination is the gap in our understanding of the long-range impact of particular ad hoc policies. What, for example, are the desirable limits to the creation of urban expressways? What are the effects of expressways on the way of life in the central city and its outlying areas? What is the relationship between expressway building and the future of mass transit?

I feel that these underlying problems of coordination and of the need for fundamental and continuing urban research suggest the advisability of an administrative focal point within the Federal Government for urban matters.

I have long supported recommendations for the creation of a Cabinet-level Department of Urban Affairs. Such Cabinet recognition would fit the facts of our metropolitan society. It would provide the institutional basis for coordinating and assessing our public policies in the urban field.

More importantly, in the political sense, such a Cabinet department would bring dramatic recognition to the major domestic policy issues. It would create a responsible focal point at which the concern and understanding of any national administration for city problems could be evaluated.

A Cabinet Department of Urban Affairs would bring to the executive branch of the Federal Government a spokesmanship for our urban communities. Sometimes we city officials feel at a loss to to precisely where our friends are in the the executive branch.

Do not mistake me. I certainly do not mean that there are not many Federal administrators trained and understanding in the areas which concern cities. I have known and worked well with many of them.

What I am concerned about is the absense in the executive branch of any institutionalized location of a responsible overall view of urban affairs and Federal-urban relations.

Recognizing the tremendous problem of reorganization necessary in establishing a full Department of Urban Affairs, the American Municipal Association has recommended a Council of Urban Advisors. This Council could begin the basic research necessary to determine the nature of a new Department and the role it could best play.

These steps are long overdue. The role of our cities in the national economy must be fully recognized.

I have noticed, I must add, a generally sympathetic recognition of urban problems within the Congress. We all know that cities do not receive all that they request from the Congress, but we would hardly expect that. It is very clear, however, that within the Senate and the House, there are some dedicated and effective leaders of the urban point of view.

I have talked of institutional arrangements for bettering our city-Federal programs and relationships. I am sure that this audience, far better than most, knows that the really effective working of such relationships, no matter what the structural arrangements, depends on the individuals in administrative capacities.

The ability, understanding, and human character of these people is crucial to the development and execution of successful programs. I might add that these attributes are essential at all levels of the administrative structure.

I sometimes think that the contribution and significance of regional and local offices of Federal departments depends most on the variable of the kind of administrator in the office. One administrator in such a post may simply pass on his strictly interpreted version of central directives.

Another administrator in the same spot may have the wisdom—and the courage—to present his superiors with the local point of view. He may even—within his broad directives—attempt to show the merit of such a point of view.

I am sure you know the kind of administrator I prefer. Fortunately, such men exist in all levels of Government service.

My topic today "A Mayor Looks at Washington" relieves me of examining our deficiencies at the local level. We struggle under antiquated charters and in suburban areas almost hopeless jurisdictional hodgepodges. We face difficult fiscal problems and have difficulties attracting adequate personnel to city service. But today I could take a vacation from these things by looking at Washington.

I think that those of us who deal in the area of urban problems face the most inspiring and stimulating challenge of our times.

We know that we live in metropolitan aggregations of people. Our job is to attempt to assure that these aggregations are communities for civilized living.

I have the confidence that we can build a great urban future if we have the vision and perseverance to meet today's challenges.

Thank you.

TUESDAY EVENING INFORMAL ROUND TABLE DISCUSSIONS

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, in an age in which the Congress is confronted with many complex issues, there is an ever-increasing need for greater understanding of the intricate and perplexing problems which exist. Some time ago several of my colleagues and I were discussing the desirability of some informal roundtable discussions of a few of the most pressing issues of our time.

Partly as a result of this conversation, but mostly because of my own feeling of need for such background information, I invited Prof. Henry A. Kissinger of Harvard University to lead a discussion last Tuesday evening on the general subject of "Central European Security." I invited my Democratic colleagues to come, have dinner together, and join in a brief discussion. I found the observations of Dr. Kissinger and of my fellow Senators on international affairs enlightening and provocative. Several of my colleagues have voiced similar sentiments.

Because of the excellent response to the first discussion meeting, a second has been scheduled for tomorrow evening, and it is contemplated that the series will continue each Tuesday throughout April and May. Each week a guest who is especially equipped by learning and experience will be invited to present briefly his views on a timely topic and to conduct a discussion period.

Although invitations have been confined to Democratic Senators, the discussions are not intended to be of a partisan nature. Some of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have spoken to me about the meetings, and I have received a number of inquiries from members of congressional office and committee staffs, the press, and private citizens who would like to attend these meetings. However, because of the nature of the discussion program and the available facilities, the discussion group must necessarily be limited in number.

Dr. Raymond L. Garthoff, author of the book entitled "Soviet Strategy in the Nuclear Age," which I have found most interesting and informative, has kindly consented to lead the discussion tomorrow evening based upon the general subject area of his book. Dr. Garthoff is regarded as an expert on Soviet military organization and strategy.

Dr. Gardiner C. Means will be the invited guest April 21 for the third roundtable discussion meeting. His subject will be "Inflation, Employment and Growth."

Mr. President, I take this opportunity to invite my Democratic colleagues to the Old Supreme Court Chamber of the Capitol tomorrow evening at 6 p.m. and each succeeding Tuesday evening through May to participate in an informal discussion of some of the pressing problems which confront each of us as U.S. Senators. I am sure they will find these brief meetings worthwhile.

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

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. SYMINGTON. May I congratulate the distinguished Senator from Tennessee for having conceived and in effect being, the father of these meetings.

It was my privilege to be present at the first meeting. I say to my able friend, that since I have been a Member of the Senate I have never been more impressed than I was not only by the remarks made by Dr. Kissinger, but also by the planning for the meeting and the dispatch with which it was carried on. It could have only been the result of careful preparation and thought on the part of the Senator from Tennessee.

These meetings are as constructive as anything in which it has been my privilege to participate since becoming a Member of the Senate. Again I congratulate the very able Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I thank my distinguished friend, the junior Senator from Missouri, for his generous remarks.

The duties of Members of the Senate are so numerous and pressing that we find it difficult to become expert in the many fields with respect to which we have specific responsibilities. I find it very helpful to spend an evening with an authority, with an intellectual, who has had the time to specialize in a particular field.

It is not surprising that scholars such as Dr. Garthoff, Dr. Means, Dr. Kissinger, and others who will be invited can bring to us a wealth of knowledge and a fresh point of view which will prove provocative and helpful.

Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

INSPECTION AND CONTROL OF NUCLEAR WEAPONS TESTS

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, today Ambassador Wadsworth has suggested to the Soviets in Geneva that if they persist in their intransigence and in their unwillingness to accept a means of inspection and control adequate to assure compliance with a treaty to stop all nuclear weapons tests, they should agree now to stop tests in the atmosphere, from which radioactive fallout comes.

I hope the Soviets will accept this suggestion on the part of the United States and Great Britain as an act of good faith. It had been my hope that President Eisenhower would take the initiative in a more dramatic way and announce to the world that the United States would stop, for a period of, say, 3 years, all atmospheric nuclear weapons tests, and then invite the Soviets and the British to join in the consummation of a treaty which would make such stoppage permanent.

If the Soviets refuse to accept the suggestion which the Ambassador has made in the name of the United States, I hope the President will still consider stopping such tests unilaterally and unconditionally for a definite period and still seek to persuade other nuclear powers to join in such stoppage and to make it permanent.

I believe that the suggestion which our Government has now made, with the concurrence of the British, is constructive, wise, and humane. It is in the interest of humanity throughout the world. If accepted, it would bring to an end the contamination of the air, which all mankind must breathe, by nuclear tests in the atmosphere of the earth. This would be an important step. It would also be a major first step toward disarmament, which is a problem separate and apart from the antisocial act of contaminating the earth's atmosphere. It would also be an important first step in the establishment of a world organization for inspection and control. If this first step could be realized, it might well lead to a broader understanding and agreement in this important field.

I hope that the Soviets will accept the suggestion in the good faith in which it is offered, and that a treaty, at least in this limited field, can be consummated.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the negotiations at Geneva between representatives of the United States, the United Kingdom, and the Soviet Union on the discontinuance of nuclear weapons tests, are being resumed this month. The importance to mankind of these negotiations cannot be overemphasized. I have pointed out on other occasions the importance I attach to the continuance of these negotiations, so that there can never be any doubt in anyone's mind as to the sincerity of our purpose and the determination of the Government of the United States to bring about an effective agreement. I hope that our Government will at least embrace the proposals of an agreement with respect to atmospheric tests. This should be the irreducible minimum. I am hopeful that in the days to come, as these negotiations are resumed, the Government will propose in detailed form the discontinuance of nuclear tests in the atmosphere under international inspection, which will provide us, first, with an inspection apparatus which is internationalized and, secondly, reduce one of the real dangers to mankind, namely, nuclear fallout.

Mr. President, one of our fellow Senators, the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH], has made a proposal relating to the discontinuance of atmospheric nuclear tests. It is my considered judgment that his proposal merits the support of our Government and the support of Congress. I am happy to join with him in that proposal but I express the opinion that negotiations for a broader agreement should be continued at the same time.

So that my proposal may be clearly understood, I recommend that our Government proceed at once to try to obtain an agreement on discontinuance of nuclear bomb tests in the atmosphere, under international inspection; secondly, that we continue to pursue our efforts toward a broader agreement under international inspection.

I doubt very much that results will be obtained on the broader agreement until the summit conference. I am sure that the Soviets would like to build up as many issues for the summit conference as possible. Nevertheless, we should press relentlessly, effectively, and consistently for the elimination, on a joint basis, of atmospheric and nuclear bomb tests.

Of real concern is the danger of fallout resulting from nuclear tests. Never before in history has the human race been subject to such a danger against which there is so little defense. Radioactive fallout is the unseen enemy which threatens us all regardless of geography or national origin. Radioactive fallout is today a matter of most serious concern not only to our Government but to all other governments throughout the world.

In the April 16 issue of the Reporter magazine Senator FRANK CHURCH has written an excellent article on this very subject entitled "We Must Stop Poisoning the Air" in which he not only tells of the danger mankind faces, but also comes forth with a thoughtful proposal to end fallout from nuclear weapons.

I wish to take this occasion to commend Senator CHURCH not only for his fine article, but also for the hard and constructive work he has been doing as a member of the Subcommittee on Disarmament. Senator CHURCH has demonstrated those qualities of intelligence, thoughtfulness, and imagination which are so sorely needed in today's troubled world. It has been a genuine pleasure to work with him in this field of disarmament, as in other fields.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the article by Senator CHURCH to which I have referred be inserted at this point in the RECORD.

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

WE MUST STOP POISONING THE AIR

(By Senator FRANK CHURCH, of Idaho)

The negotiations in Geneva to end all further tests of nuclear weapons, launched with such high expectations last October, froze with the Alpine winter. Now, after an Easter recess, the negotiators of the United States, the United Kingdom, and the Soviet Union are resuming the talks. Soon the spring will turn Switzerland green again, but in Geneva there seems to be little promise for a thaw at the conference table.

We went to Geneva in good faith and with stout hope. We sought an agreement among the three nuclear powers by which the signatories should agree to suspend all further nuclear tests within the framework of a trustworthy international system of detection and control to safeguard against covert violations. At an earlier conference in Geneva last summer, the scientists of all three countries had agreed upon the structure of the technical detection system required. Thus a blueprint had been furnished in advance.

But from the beginning the Russian negotiators have stubbornly put forward impossible demands. They insist upon a veto over the operation of the proposed international control commission; they demand that the requisite control posts on Russian soil be operated by Russian nationals; they call for endless redtape that would frustrate timely action by the commission in dispatching mobile teams for on-site investigations of subterranean disturbances suspected of being nuclear in origin.

It is well to remember that the Russians were a suspicious people long before the Communists came to power. The Czars maintained their own Iron Curtain. Khrushchev may be exhibiting this age-old habit of suspicion when he charges that we really want military reconnaissance of his country in the guise of roving inspection teams probing into the remote corners of Russia to check on every earthquake. But whether deceitful or sincere, this Russian obstinacy has proved an effective barrier to the agreement sought at Geneva. Present methods of detection seem to require that one-site inspections be carried out if the ban is to cover all underground tests including those within the one- to twenty-kiloton range.

Although Russians are clearly to blame for the deadlock that now grips the Geneva negotiations, there are nevertheless those in high station at the Pentagon and in the AEC who are quietly applauding. The Soviets' mulishness, they feel, serves them right, while it serves us well. Given our country's increasing dependence upon nuclear weapons, both for deterrence and defense, they argue that more tests are needed to refine our atomic warheads and to chart new discoveries in antimissilery. From the outset, these men have not approved of our journey to Geneva. They hail the Russian stubbornness as providential, offering us an honorable exit to walk the road back.

Now it is true that the results of the latest tests, conducted underground and in outer space, tend to support the argument that an all-inclusive test ban might impede the progress of our weaponry. It follows, of course, that the military interests of the Soviet Union are affected in a like manner, and I have little doubt that the Soviet generals are saying so. Thus the pressures mount, on either side, to let the conference die.

GENERATIONS YET UNBORN

Yet men of good conscience everywhere are deeply troubled at the prospect of failure at Geneva. Our most fundamental instincts tell us that we must stop poisoning the air. It is life's element. If nuclear tests continue unabated, we shall seed the air with ever-mounting quantities of strontium 90, carbon 14, and cesium 137, to sift silently and relentlessly down upon us. This invisible rain, latest disclosures show, is falling faster and more lethally than we have heretofore been led to believe. Some samples of Minnesota wheat have carried radioactive levels approaching the "permissible maximum," while certain Dakota milk has shown contamination as high as 40 percent of the "tolerable limit." Actually, these so-called maximums are hardly safe. The best scientific estimates hold that if strontium 90 alone reaches the designated "permissible" limit in the human body, it could increase the incidence of leukemia by more than 20 percent. And the effect of this level of radioactivity on the incidence of other diseases would have to be added to this toll. Indeed, we cannot even calculate the extent of its grotesque effect upon generations yet unborn. It is therefore imperative that the Geneva conference not be forsaken while any hope remains for a meaningful agreement.

Is there a way to break the stalemate? Certainly we must try; and there is considerable feeling in the Senate that we have not been trying hard enough. Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY, chairman of the Disarmament Subcommittee of the Senate, has done much to alert the country to the significance of the Geneva negotiations as a key to the larger problem of disarmament itself. Senator ALBERT GORE has spoken up from the depth of his conviction that the United States bears a special responsibility, as the Nation that first unleashed the atom and let fall the only two atomic bombs ever detonated in war. He has proposed that the United States unilaterally declare a 3-year moratorium on nuclear tests in the earth's atmosphere, while reserving to ourselves the right to continue testing underground and in outer space. The eloquence of these two men, together with the smoldering indignation of Senator CLINTON ANDERSON, chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, has deeply affected the Senate.

For my own part, I have been moved to study closely the dilemma at Geneva, and I have concluded that there is still hope of salvaging something of value, for humanity's sake, at the conference table. In this 11th hour, I have proposed that the United States and the United Kingdom seek agreement with the Soviet Union to suspend all nuclear weapons tests in the earth's atmosphere, conditioned upon a workable international control system adequate to detect and report any violation. Such a proposal would exclude, for the present, any agreement involving suspension of nuclear tests occurring underground or in outer space, neither of which contributes to the pollution of the air.

IT COULD BE A BEGINNING

Such a ban on atmospheric tests would abruptly end the further poisoning of the air. This grave anxiety would be erased from among the apprehensions of our distraught world. Moreover, a first international apparatus would be established in the field of nuclear test controls. It would be a functioning harness within which to bind not only the present members of the nuclear club but also the oncoming nations that are fast developing atomic technologies of their own. In the accomplishment of this objective, the negotiating parties at Geneva share a common interest.

We must not lose sight of what such a breakthrough in creating an international control system might portend for our atomic age. It is the sine qua non for any meaningful progress toward future goals of prevention of surprise attack and of disarmament. Moreover, successful operations of such a control system might easily pave the way for its expansion to embrace a broader test ban, of the kind we have been seeking at Geneva, encompassing all types of nuclear tests in space and underground.

Is there any real chance the Soviets will accept a properly policed ban on atmospheric tests? We cannot know, of course, unless we put the proposal to them. But there is at least ground for hope.

The fact that atmospheric explosions can be monitored largely from fixed control stations, eliminating the need for on-site investigations, should allay any genuine fears the Russians may have about roving foreign reconnaissance within their country. On the other hand, if their fears are simulated, what better way could we find to expose them than by offering an international detection and control system that can safely end the slow pollution of the atmosphere without possibly doing them any internal mischief?

In addition, an atmospheric test ban could not jeopardize the military interests of either side. Outer space and the depths of the earth offer ample laboratories for further experimentation, should more be needed or wanted.

Of course it may be the Russians will rebuff this proposal, and all others that might be acceptable to the United Kingdom and the United States. If so, Russia will have forced us to take the grim road back from Geneva. But then, at least, we could walk that road without shame, knowing we had done our utmost to avoid it.

It will be an eternal burden upon our conscience if we do less.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I should add that the proposals I have

made today, which are in part the proposals of the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH] and the proposal on the continuation of negotiations on the broad program of inspection and agreement on the prohibition of nuclear tests, should be taken seriously by our Government and should be presented in the most comprehensive, frank, and sincere manner to the representatives of the United Kingdom and the Soviet Union on the resumption of negotiations at Geneva.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I wish to commend the distinguished senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], and also the distinguished junior Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH]. Together they make a great team. Their work in the field of disarmament is of the greatest interest to our country.

I hope the Senator from Minnesota will continue to speak on disarmament and nuclear testing, because they are subjects which must be kept constantly before us. Someone must keep pounding away in these areas. They are perhaps the most important subjects confronting the world today. I wish the Senator from Minnesota to know that I am grateful for his continued interest in this field.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator. I am very grateful to him for his kind remarks.

NATIONAL FUELS POLICY

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, I have at hand an invitation from the national coal policy conference to a dinner on the subject of a national fuels policy for this country. The dinner is to take place at the Statler Hotel here on the evening of April 27, and is to feature speakers from the utility industry, the railroad industry, and the coal industry—including John L. Lewis for the United Mine Workers.

I am told that all members of the Congress have been invited and I hope that my colleagues will attend, if possible. I realize the tremendous demands upon their time, including many invitations to dinner. I know that nothing would please most of us more than the opportunity to spend a quiet evening at home. Nevertheless, the bituminous coal industry, one of the country's major industries, is not in too good shape. Today, in almost every coal area there is unemployment. Production last year was close to 400 million tons, one of the worst years from that standpoint in coal's history.

The theme of the dinner, which is sponsored by the national coal policy conference, is "Why a National Fuels Policy?" The conference, as Senators may know, is a unique organization in itself, being composed of the leading coal producing concerns, the United Mine Workers of America, coal carrying railroads, coal equipment manufacturers, and electric utilities.

As I understand, the dinner on April 27 is the beginning of a campaign for a national fuels policy by the conference, representing the coal industry and related groups. The claim is being made that we have an oil policy, a gas policy, an atom policy, but not a policy which takes all fuels and their proper relationship to energy demands into account.

In addition to Mr. Lewis, speakers at the coal dinner will include: Philip Sporn, president of the American Electric Power Service Corp., of New York, and Howard E. Simpson, president of the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad. George H. Love, chairman of the board of the Consolidation Coal Co., of Pittsburgh, and chairman of the national coal policy conference, will preside.

At the dinner, some of the reasons for a national fuels policy will be stated, as well as some reasons for the situation of the coal industry. I know that the attendance of Senators at the dinner would be heartening to the coal industry. I feel also that the viewpoint of the spokesmen for the coal and related industries would be helpful to us all in considering and perhaps formulating an overall fuels policy.

PROTECTION OF MIGRATORY FISH RUNS IN RIVERS OF THE UNITED STATES—ARTICLE BY SENATOR NEUBERGER

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, on March 16, 1959, I introduced S. 1420, a bill to provide some restraints on issuance of waterpower project licenses by the Federal Power Commission in areas involving fish and wildlife values. Controls such as I have proposed are necessary to prevent construction of dams which would create insurmountable barriers to valuable runs of migratory fish. Unless authority exists outside the Federal Power Commission to rule on the advisability of dam construction in fish-spawning areas, I fear that a large portion of runs of anadromous salmon and steelhead in the Columbia River Basin will be doomed to extinction.

My views on S. 1420 and reasons for introducing it are detailed in an article which I have written for the April 1959, issue of Outdoor America, the official publication of the Izaak Walton League of America. Accompanying my article, the magazine also has published a brief statement by Mr. Joseph W. Penfold, the able and informed conservation director of the Izaak Walton League, explaining the intent and purpose of S. 1420. Mr. Penfold emphasizes that "existing law simply provides no reliable means for protecting fish and wildlife values in FPC licensing procedures—power is the Commission's specialty." I ask consent to include in the body of the RECORD with my remarks, my article from the April 1959, issue of Outdoor America, entitled "A New Fisheries-Power Partnership," and Mr. Penfold's statement entitled "What FPC-Wildlife Bill Could Accomplish."

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

[From Outdoor America, April 1959]

A NEW FISHERIES-POWER PARTNERSHIP

(By Hon. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER, of Oregon)

I

"The number of salmon in the river is incredible, to say the least." So wrote the explorers, Meriwether Lewis and William Clark, at the end of that first of all pilgrimages by Americans across this mighty continent. They were paddling down the Columbia River, where the salmon were so thick that the soldiers of the expedition could spear them with bayonets. "Never have so many fish been collected together in one place before," reported Lewis and Clark to their patron, President Thomas Jefferson.

That was slightly more than a century and a half ago. In the interval, white men have logged off forests, clogged rivers with sewage and offal, built dams and irrigation ditches. The Columbia is still one of the world's great fishery resources, but the abundance which amazed Lewis and Clark is gone. Tributary after tributary has been blockaded off as a spawning ground for migratory salmon.

Today, I am proposing a law which seeks to help protect such of our salmon runs as still survive. My proposal is simple. It would give the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service authority to pass upon fish-passage facilities before the Federal Power Commission could license a dam across any river or stream inhabited by anadromous fish. I am convinced that, unless some protective step such as this is taken, our remaining salmon and steelhead fisheries could be virtually wiped out—to become as one in extinction with the passenger pigeon and wild bison.

My bill would add this brief sentence to the Federal Power Act: "That no license affecting fish and wildlife resources shall be issued until the plans of the dam or other structures affecting such fish and wildlife resources have been approved by the Secretary of the Interior."

In 1958 this proposal was sharply attacked on the Senate floor as bad legislative practice because it presumably would give to the Fish and Wildlife Service veto power over the FPC.

Yet, for 38 years, the following sentence has been part and parcel of the Federal Power Act: "That no license affecting the navigable capacity of any navigable waters of the United States shall be issued until the plans of the dam or other structures affecting navigation have been approved by the Chief of Engineers and the Secretary of the Army."

In other words, my bill merely seeks to afford migratory fisheries exactly the same protection against indiscriminate FPC licensing that navigation has enjoyed for over a third of a century.

And, so far as any veto power is concerned, I think the best answer to that has been offered in a succinct paragraph written by J. W. Penfold, conservation director of the Izaak Walton League. Last August, Joe declared in a letter to me: "There has been objection to the enactment of this legislation on the grounds that it would give fish and wildlife considerations veto power over power considerations. Essentially this would be true, in the same sense that navigation considerations now have such veto power. We could point out that FPC now has life-and-death veto power over fish and wildlife."

Joe Penfold's statement is founded on demonstrable facts. The FPC had veto power over the survival of one of the Northwest's major steelhead migrations when it licensed Pelton Dam of the Portland General Electric Co. on the Deschutes River—despite protests by the Fish and Wildlife Service and the Oregon State Game and Fish Commissions. Identical veto power over the salmon migrations of the Cowlitz River was wielded by FPC when it disregarded the opposition of the Fish and Wildlife Service and Washington State conservation agencies, and licensed the Mayfield Dam of Tacoma's municipal light system.

And now a crisis impends for fisheries which makes mild, indeed, what has happened on the Deschutes and Cowlitz.

The Salmon River of Idaho, slashing with white-capped fangs through a mile-deep canyon, is appropriately named. In its

mountain headquarters spawn some 65 percent of the valuable spring Chinook salmon of the whole Columbia Basin. It is a wilderness river—fenced off from pollution, chemical wastes and filth by countless miles of timbered solitudes. Lewis and Clark would not be disappointed if they saw the Salmon again. But below the confluence of the Salmon and Snake Rivers is a prodigious waterpower site, Nez Perce. In the present stage of knowledge regarding fish passage over high dams, any bill in Congress proposing Federal construction of a towering 730-foot dam at Nez Perce would provoke a nationwide struggle of the proportions of that fought over Echo Park in the Dinosaur National Monument.

But what if the FPC licensed Nez Perce for construction either by private utilities or publicly owned systems? Unlike Congress, the FPC is rarely responsive to public opinion.

And is this possibility so farfetched? In 1956 the FPC held extended hearings on certain license requests in the Snake River region. At these hearings, this testimony was given by Sam Hutchinson, regional director of the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries of the Fish and Wildlife Service:

"Nez Perce Dam would present an obstacle to fish passage of the major part of the Snake River run of anadromous fish. These fish are of such value that their very existence should not be jeopardized by placing reliance upon undesigned and untried fish facilities."

Yet, Sam Hutchinson might have been trying to speak above the roar of Snake River Rapids for all that he was listened to by the FPC. Concluded the Commission, "There is nothing in this record which convinces us that the Nez Perce project could not be constructed under a license issued pursuant to the provisions of the Federal Power Act."

II

The FPC has shown by its whole performance that it is not interested in fish and game. It is interested in licensing the pouring of concrete, whether by private utilities or public bodies. Through the efforts of the Izaak Walton League and other conservation groups, the Coordination Act has been beneficially amended to assure greater safeguarding of wildlife at Federal river projects. But of what value is this assurance at Federal dams if dams sanctioned by the FPC can be built, willy-nilly, regardless of what happens to fisheries? It is like bolting the front door but taking even the hinges off the back door.

The claim has been voiced that the Secretary of the Interior might abuse his prerogative, if he were authorized by law to voice the objection of the Fish and Wildlife Service to FPC projects which imperiled fish. I refuse to believe this of men of the caliber of Oscar L. Chapman and Fred Seaton, who have occupied this position during recent years. Furthermore, is the Secretary of the Interior any less to be trusted than the Secretary of the Army, who has long been allowed to block FPC dams threatening navigation? Are salmon runs of so little national importance compared with tug-and-barge schedules? Navigation is essential. So are fisheries.

III

Protection of salmon and trout at FPC projects today is a "no man's land," with responsibility vested in nobody—not even the licensee building the dam. We have just witnessed a tragic example of this at the Brownlee and Oxbow projects of the Idaho Power Co., in the Hells Canyon reach of the Snake River, as reported in recent issues of Outdoor America.

Salmon-trapping facilities at Oxbow were erected on unsound foundations, which collapsed at the crucial moment for the fish run. No professional fishery biologist was in charge despite the important values at stake. The company received several warnings from conservation agencies that fish migrations of substantial size were en route upstream to the construction sites.

What happened? According to a factual report prepared by experts of the Fish and Wildlife Service, at least 4,000 adult Chinook salmon and steelhead trout perished because of the "failure of the trapping facilities at Oxbow Dam." In addition, some 50 percent of the 14,000 salmon which were collected at Brownlee Dam and transported around the project "did not survive to spawn." And the Fish and Wildlife Service has stated cryptically, "The success of the 3,700 steelhead trout which were passed remains to be determined."

I should like to repeat here the grim summary contained in the Fish and Wildlife Service report:

"Reasons for the fish loss are many, but predominant among them are—lack of experienced salmon men at the project, failure to anticipate the action of the fish when the flows were reduced, and the large number of fish migrating upstream to spawn at the time of the shutdown.

"The fishery agencies believe these losses could have been avoided, and that there is little justification for sacrificing this valuable living fish resource to a desire to expedite, without compelling reason, the hydroelectric power development of the project."

Despite this havoc and destruction of an irreplaceable fisheries supply, the Federal bureau charged with safeguarding this resource could only stand by and wring its hands in anguish. It had no jurisdiction over FPC licensees. It could remonstrate but it could not order, it could suggest but it could not command. And the result was the heavy loss of migrating species which the Fish and Wildlife Service has listed.

These salmon and steelhead had struggled all the way to Oxbow and Brownlee from the sea—650 distant miles away. They had surmounted the concrete fish ladders at the low-level Bonneville, The Dalles, McNary and Ice Harbor Dams—built at a cost of many millions of dollars by American taxpayers and power-users. These fish carried with them upstream a heavy cargo of eggs and milt, to propagate the next generation. But they could not survive the indifference to their fate which was manifested jointly by the FPC and the utility company building Brownlee and Oxbow.

IV

It is natural to blame the FPC and each power interest, public or private, which destroys multiple use values under an FPC license. Until a better framework of law can be provided, such adverse public opinion is a legitimate weapon. But far more important is the correction of the basic cause. That would be more helpful than criticism.

Had my proposed amendment to the Federal Power Commission Act been in effect, the fiasco in the Hells Canyon stretch of the Snake could have been avoided. To begin with, the Federal Power Commission never would have had the authority to license the Brownlee and Oxbow Dams until facilities and equipment for the safe passage of migratory fish had been provided to the satisfaction of the Fish and Wildlife Service. Under such circumstances, Idaho Power Co. would have been obligated to heed warnings issued by the fisheries experts of the Service.

Left to its own inclinations and existing law, FPC undoubtedly will license the Nez Perce Dam, despite its ruinous impact on the salmon runs of the Salmon River watershed. This could even have disastrous international complications. Canada has made a $250,000 study of the possibility of diverting 15 million acre-feet of water out of the upper Columbia and into the Fraser River system. This water then might be impounded with a series of large dams on the Fraser, which flows all the way to the Pacific Ocean in Canada. But we of the United States have been opposing such a scheme on the grounds that it could cause the destruction of the great Sockeye salmon runs of the Fraser, which have been built back into a $50 million annual industry with fish ladders constructed around landslide areas at Hell's Gate.

But if the FPC permits Americans to construct Nez Perce, in spite of its adverse impact on the Chinook runs of the Salmon River, how can we in good conscience urge our Canadian friends never to block off the Sockeye runs of the Fraser River? Would the Canadians place any trust in us if we advocate a course of conduct for them which we do not subscribe to ourselves?

V

Actually, one of the ideal locations for further production of waterpower in the Northwest is along the swift surges of the upper Columbia. Dr. Ira N. Gabrielson, president of the Wildlife Management Institute, has described this as a "fishless river" because it was barricaded from the sea two decades ago by the lofty parapet of Grand Coulee. Canada and our own country, jointly, could produce millions of low-cost kilowatts in this area without doing damage to anadromous salmon and trout. I watched the upper Columbia salmon runs being relocated, with tank trucks and hatcheries, to tributaries such as the Wenatchee. Entiat, and Methow Rivers—all of which join the main stem of the Columbia downstream from Grand Coulee.

This is one reason why I have been holding Interior subcommittee hearings, in an effort to break the stalemate between Canada and the United States. Then, projects might be constructed like Libby and Mica Creek, which would generate vast quantities of power without retarding any fish on their upstream journey to the spawning grounds.

I have served in the Senate since January of 1955. This experience has convinced me that Congress would be extremely reluctant to authorize for Federal construction any projects doing severe damage to migratory salmon and trout pilgrimages. Public opinion always receives a hearing in Congress. But the FPC is antiseptically screened off from pressure by the American public, which explains why it so often disregards the pleas and protests of conservationists. This makes imperative some collateral jurisdiction for the Fish and Wildlife Services over FPC licenses on rivers where significant aquatic life exists.

I do not seek to leave the impression that my bill is the entire answer to the problems facing our migratory fisheries—far from it. Extensive research must be carried on with respect to the untested skimmer device. Is it the answer to safe detour for tiny fingerlings downstream past the roaring spillways and grinding turbines of high dams? Al Day, able director of the Oregon State Fish Commission and former director of the Fish and Wildlife Service, has told me that infinitely more investigation must be undertaken with respect to our smaller coastal streams and the opportunity they might offer for the transplanting of salmon runs which now thrash all the way to remote alpine headwaters. Unfortunately the administration budget for fiscal 1960 is not especially encouraging so far as further fisheries research is concerned. As in so many other situations, human health and defense weapons, for example, basic research is a main hope for enabling us to fathom the riddle of migratory fish and how they can survive civilization's crushing impact.

When I was a boy a whole capillary system of rivers offered hospitality to spawning fish that were home from the ocean. Now, only a few isolated threads remain on the

map where salmon and steelhead can find the last, lingering creekbeds far back in the remote mountains. I want to help save these sanctuaries. When they are blocked off or desecrated, they will be difficult to replace. They must be preserved for the descendants of those salmon that the first westbound white men saw. That is the purpose of my bill. Such a cause presents a major challenge to an organization with the ideals and policies of the Izaak Walton League of America.

(NOTE.—Senator NEUBERGER is a member of the Portland chapter of the Izaak Walton League and has been an effective champion of conservation in the U.S. Senate. The Senator, a member of the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission, was recently presented the 1958 distinguished service award of the League's Oregon Division for his successful sponsorship of the bill to save the pine forests and waterfowl marshes of the Klamath Indian Reservation.)

[From Outdoor America, April 1959]

WHAT FPC-WILDLIFE BILL COULD ACCOMPLISH

(By J. W. Penfold)

Senator NEUBERGER illustrates the need for full consideration of fish and wildlife resources in Federal licensing of water-development projects through the dramatic example of the great salmon and steelhead resources of the Columbia Basin. His proposal to assure genuine partnership for fish and wildlife has immediate application throughout the United States where the Federal Power Commission must consider license applications. For example, proposed dams on the Connecticut River could have serious implications for migrating shad. A dam proposed above the existing Roanoke Rapids Dam (North Carolina and Virginia), by changing riverflow below, might create a serious problem for striped bass.

Hydropower projects inevitably affect fish, wildlife, and recreation values. The effects are not necessarily extensive nor detrimental. Frequently they can be beneficial, particularly if project features are designed and operations planned with such objectives in mind.

It is not likely that the review by the Secretary of the Interior of FPC licenses (as provided in the bill) would lead to many Interior objections. Careful scrutiny of all, however, would usually result in agreement with FPC on conditions of the FPC license issued, giving fish and wildlife reasonable consideration within the prime objectives of the project.

Existing law simply provides no reliable means for protecting fish and wildlife values in FPC licensing procedures—power is the Commission's specialty. The problem might be approached by requiring the FPC to add fish and wildlife to its prime responsibilities, but the more logical way is to place that responsibility—with reasonable authority—in the hands of the Interior Department, which is already charged by law with migratory-fish protection. Thus, the Neuberger proposal satisfies the multiple-use ideal of Izaak Walton League conservation policy by correcting the original error of allowing a single-use power dominance over other legitimate uses of our rivers.

THE BERLIN CRISIS AND THE PATH TO PEACE—ADDRESS BY SENATOR HUMPHREY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, over the weekend, at New Rochelle, N.Y., I was privileged to address the Westchester County Democratic Committee dinner on the subject "The Berlin Crisis and the Path to Peace." The speech was not rendered in a partisan vein. It was what I hope my colleagues will find it to be, upon their reading and reflection a constructive and formal analysis of the foreign policy difficulties which we face and of the challenge of the crisis at Berlin to our national security and to the North Atlantic Treaty Alliance. I ask unanimous consent that the address be printed in the body of the RECORD.

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

THE BERLIN CRISIS AND THE PATH TO PEACE

(Address by Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, of Minnesota, Westchester County Democratic Committee dinner, Glen Island Casino, New Rochelle, N.Y., Saturday, April 11, 1959)

We now look back on 10 years of cooperation within the NATO alliance, and we look forward to the rapidly advancing climax of the Berlin crisis.

These two—NATO and Berlin—are closely linked together.

The first Berlin crisis of 1948–49 brought the NATO community into being.

The present Berlin crisis tests whether that unique community of nations, conceived in common danger and dedicated to common security, can long endure.

FIRMNESS BEFORE THE SOVIET THREAT

We have learned from hard experience to be firm before the Soviet threat.

We learned much in Greece and Turkey in 1947. And what we learned we put into action when Congress endorsed President Truman's now famous doctrine.

"It must be the policy of the United States," said President Truman 12 years ago, "to support free peoples who are resisting attempted subjugation."

We learned the hard way in Czechoslovakia in 1948 when the Communists overthrew a free government. Then came the blockade of West Berlin. We were threatened. But by now we had learned well that those who do not stand firm will not remain free. We did not withdraw from the beleagured city. For 9 months free Berlin was sustained by an allied air bridge built of ingenuity and daring.

The lessons learned in Czechoslovakia and Berlin made their impact. Joining hands with the free nations of Europe, we created an unprecedented international community. NATO was established in 1949, just 10 years ago. Twelve nations—augmented by three more which joined later, pledged that an armed attack against one shall be considered an attack against them all.

The community of nations comprising NATO is the core of the Western World. If this community stands firm and united in the cause of freedom and justice, we shall prevail. If it collapses, we shall be in mortal danger.

The Soviets once more are threatening freedom in Berlin. They are probing to see whether that unique and indispensable community which is NATO can indeed endure.

Last November I stood in West Berlin with its able and courageous mayor, Willy Brandt. I vowed then, and I vow today, to support a policy of firmness, to uphold the right of France, Britain, and the United States to maintain garrisons in West Berlin until a legitimate peace treaty is signed.

This is the position and policy of our Government. It is also the position and policy of NATO. We will not surrender. We will not be pushed out.

But firmness before the Soviet threat, though indispensable, is not enough. Firmness alone will not preserve NATO, nor assure the survival of free Berlin.

Our firmness must be matched by our imagination and our willingness to negotiate.

Standing firm and a willingness to negotiate are not, as some suggest, contradictory policies. They are the two elements in any viable policy in the Berlin crisis. We can negotiate successfully only if we are prepared to stand firm. And we can command the political support necessary to a posture of firmness only if our negotiating position is clear, consistent, and realistic.

We may be grateful that this also is the position and the policy of our Government and of NATO. We will stand firm. And we will negotiate.

THE REQUIREMENTS OF NEGOTIATION

It is about negotiation that I want to talk with you for a few minutes tonight. I have frequently said that we must be willing to talk to the Rusians wherever and whenever there seems even the faintest hope of advancing the interests of peace and security.

Remember that we negotiated with the Russians on Austria for 10 years. Finally we got a treaty.

Remember that we negotiated with the Communists on Korea for 2 years. In the end we got a cease-fire.

For months we have been negotiating in Geneva on the cessation of nuclear tests. So far, there is no agreement. But we must go on negotiating.

This is what I had in mind when, on March 26, I introduced on the floor of the Senate a resolution which reads in part as follows:

"Resolved that the Senate support the efforts of the United States to continue to negotiate for an international agreement for the suspension of nuclear weapons tests and that it emphatically endorse the principle that an adequate inspection and control system must be a part of any such international agreement."

There is no alternative. We must negotiate on Berlin, on Germany, and on the general question of Eureopan security. We must go to the summit, and more than once if that is necessary.

I do not propose to talk tonight about the specific elements of our negotiating position in the forthcoming meetings of the Foreign Ministers of East and West. It would be both presumptuous and indelicate for a member of the legislative branch to speak of such affairs at the very moment that that position is being hammered out by the statesmen of the Western Powers.

But if I do not talk about the specifics, it is appropriate—in fact it is an obligation on all of us—to speak about the broad requirements of a viable negotiating position.

There has been much loose talk about Munich—about the dangers of being taken in by the Russians at the negotiating table.

I do not need to tell this audience that Berlin is not Munich.

To negotiate is not to appease. But we must understand very clearly what makes the difference between legitimate negotiation and inexcusable appeasement. Three requirements must be fulfilled if we are to come to the negotiating table prepared to seek reasonable adjustments without fear of succumbing to unreasonable demands. First, there must be unity of policy within the Western community. Second, we must be militarily prepared. Third, our people must understand the full gravity of the situation we confront. I want to ask you to think with me tonight about each of these requirements.

1. THE UNITY OF THE WESTERN COMMUNITY

First, the critical importance of unity. At Munich the democracies were not united. They were divided. The United States lived in the never-never land of isolationism. The low countries of Europe were neutrals. Britain and France were united, it is true—united in somnambulant apathy, anxious to believe the false promises of the dictators.

Happily, the situation is very different today. Yet there remains much to be done. We have achieved agreement on what we will not do.

We will not get out of Berlin, just because the Russians threaten us.

But negative agreement on what we will not do must now be transmuted into positive agreement on what we will do—what we will propose, what we will be prepared to give in return for what benefits.

This is our problem and our challenge.

The Western community is composed of free partners. The unity we seek must now be forged from the free give and take among partners in a common enterprise.

We must meet the demand for firmness on the part of nations most exposed to the Soviets—principally the Germans.

We must reconcile this demand for firmness with the opposing demand for flexibility on the part of other nations less exposed—principally the British.

We must understand the French desire for national prestige.

We must remain sensitive to German resistance to policies that appear to demand greater sacrifice of German interests than they do of the interests of the other partners.

We must never forget that all these points of view are legitimate.

The British, through their capable Prime Minister, Mr. Macmillan, demonstrate what we mean when we say that one can explore imaginatively and negotiate constructively while yet remaining firm.

The French, through their dedicated leader General DeGaulle, remind us that the unity we seek must be open enough to honor a genuine sense of national destiny.

The Germans, through the firm leadership of Chancellor Adenauer—who after so many years of invaluable service soon will leave the world of active politics—embody the vital quality of resoluteness.

Some people are distressed about the differences of view among the allies of the Western community. But the free discussion of our differences is a measure of our strength, and not our weakness.

The weak cannot expose their differences without exposing their weakness. So they conceal their differences—and remain weak. I am confident that in the process of reviewing and reconciling our differences we will emerge even stronger.

To achieve a united position among free and diverse people demands the utmost in good faith and consultative skill. But I am confident that we will achieve it.

It is quite possible that some of our present differences are the price we must pay for past negligence. We have tended to be fitful, not constant, in our consultations within the Western community. If we had worked a bit closer with our allies and strengthened the consultative process within NATO during the past 5 years, the task of achieving unity would be less difficult today.

Be that as it may, let us now accept the present crisis as an invaluable opportunity to foritify the unity of the Western community of nations. Without that unity, peace, and justice surely will not for long endure.

If unity is essential for NATO, it is also essential within the United States. It has never been more important than it is today for the administration to consult with the opposition party and to establish the closest possible working relationship with Congress. Our delegation to the coming Foreign Ministers Conference ought surely to include Senator WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, the respected chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate, and Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, ranking Republican member of that committee.

Finally, we should not ignore the importance of achieving unity and support beyond the confines of the NATO community. The United Nations may play a significant role at this point. Let's not hesitate, at the appropriate time, to place our case before this unique international body. The United Nations cannot solve our problems for us. It was never meant to be a substitute for the difficult foreign policy decisions all governments must make. But it does present many opportunities for the execution of a responsible foreign policy. And no objective is more important than that of mobilizing the support of the many nations that share our concern for security and justice.

2. MILITARY PREPAREDNESS

The first general requirement for a responsible negotiating position is, then, unity. The second requirement is military preparedness. At Munich, the democracies were unprepared. They had to buy time to rearm. They bought time—with the only currency acceptable to the dictators, appeasement.

Military preparedness is vital. As Carl Sandburg once observed, "the cockroach is always wrong when it argues with the chicken." The militarily weak always invite appeasement when they negotiate with the militarily strong.

Once again, our present situation is happily very different from that of the democratic leaders who confronted the Fascists at Munich 21 years ago. Yet there is little cause for complacency. We must put to work immediately the lessons of the Berlin crisis. For this crisis throws a bright light on our military position and shows us that there is much yet to be done.

Last weekend, before the 10th anniversary celebration of the NATO Council, President Eisenhower reviewed the military posture of the Western community. He fortified his optimism with Scripture. "When a strong man armed keepeth his palace," quoted the President, "his goods are in peace." But Mr. Eisenhower neglected to complete the quotation which continues, "But when a stronger than he shall come to him, and overcome him, he taketh from him all his armor wherein he trusted and divideth his spoils."

I would suggest that we indulge less in self-congratulation and more in self-examination—and if necessary in self-sacrifice.

Many thoughtful men have been engaged in this critical self-examination. Many of them have concluded that our Defense Establishment is rapidly becoming inadequate in terms of the threat we face. If we allow our armor to become weak we may well suffer the fate of the improvident man of the Scriptural story. It is time we faced resolutely some searching questions.

Are we militarily prepared in relative terms, relative, that is, to present and foreseeable Soviet capabilities? And are we militarily prepared in relevant terms, relevant, that is, to the various military contingencies we may have to face?

Is our strategic force adequate—relative to the Soviets? General Power, head of the Strategic Air Command, said the other day: "I think our deterrent posture is deteriorating." The fact is that unless action is taken now we are going to find ourselves facing the Soviets with an old weapons system, we with our manned bombers, and they with long range missiles.

Is our Military Establishment relevant to the kind of threats we may have to deal with? The fact is that unless action is taken now we will run the risk of shortchanging our forces in weapons appropriate to their job. Gen. Lauris Norstad, commander of the North Atlantic Treaty forces, has asked for a new weapons system for NATO. His request has been given vigorous support by the President's distinguished Committee, headed by Mr. William Draper, and commissioned to evaluate our military aid program.

The increase in military assistance is to be primarily for new weapons in the NATO area.

The military balance of terror between East and West is a horrible thing. But this horror is exceeded only by the prospect of an imbalance of terror, an imbalance favoring the Communists. For them the cockroach would indeed find himself arguing with the chicken. To negotiate from military weakness is to invite appeasement.

If the Western community of nations is to endure, we must do what is necessary to maintain military parity with the Soviets—and do it now.

3. PUBLIC UNDERSTANDING

The third general requirement for a responsible negotiating position is public understanding. The appeasement of Munich was partly the product of popular misunderstanding. Most people thought that Czechoslovakia was a small, remote country, hardly worth bothering about—certainly not worth fighting over.

In a democracy, responsible policy cannot long maintain itself in times of crisis when the public is misinformed—or even when it is uninformed.

Again our situation today is happily very different from that of Munich. A recent New York Times survey of American opinion reveals serious concern about Berlin. The American people surely are not basically opposed to a responsible policy in the Berlin crisis.

But the Times survey also flashed some danger signals. Thirty-nine percent of the people interviewed did not understand the basic strategic problem we confront in defending free Berlin—the fact that it is located over 100 miles inside of Communist Europe. Right here in the New York area the percentage of uninformed people ran as high as 75 percent. Just as serious, most people were certain that the crisis would pass—that the danger was not great.

I do not believe we are at the brink of war. I too am confident we can contain this crisis. But we shall successfully avoid war and discharge our responsibilities to the people of West Berlin only if we understand the full complexity and precariousness of our situation.

It is not enough that our diplomats understand the problem. Our capacity to cope with the danger we now confront will not depend alone on the wisdom of statesmen meeting in Washington, London, Rome, Paris, and Bonn. It will rest finally on the understanding of the people from whom the statesmen draw their power.

Why do I say this? It is because people who have not been given the facts may tend to expect too much, or may mistake legitimate negotiation for appeasement. People who do not know the facts—who do not know, for example, the complexity of the problems we face—may demand what is impossible. They may demand or expect a permanent European settlement with the Russians.

People who have not been fully informed—who do not know, how precarious our situation is—may shout "Munich" if our diplomats begin talking about limited agreements with the Soviets aimed at easing tensions.

It is my firm belief that the administration has not done a good enough job of informing the public in the interests of greater understanding. Now, what specifically are the ingredients of this understanding?

First, we must be openminded and imaginative. We must understand that negotiated agreements designed to reduce the hazards of war are not appeasement unless they alter the status quo to our disadvantage.

Second, we must be patient. We must understand that nothing will be solved overnight; that settlements will, in fact, take years; and that we face a long road of uncertainty and insecurity.

Third, we must be resolute and willing to sacrifice. We must be willing to spend money—hard-earned money—to do what is necessary to maintain the strength of the Western community of nations.

The requirements of the present crisis are high. I came here tonight to speak about Berlin and the prerequisites of effective negotiation. I cannot leave without reminding you that the imagination, patience, and resoluteness which, as a people, we must now demonstrate is necessary at every level in our contest with the Soviets, in aid, in trade, and in appeals to the minds and souls of men, and at every point in our contest with the Communist bloc, in Asia, in the Middle East, in Africa, at the U.N.

WE ARE CALLED TO GREATNESS

I think I understand well the Communist threat. I have talked to Khrushchev. I have seen at firsthand his vigor, his determination, his ruthlessness. I know the power of totalitarian might. We must never underestimate this massive threat.

More to be feared than Soviet hardness is our own softness.

More to be feared than ruthless Soviet purpose is our aimlessness.

More to be feared than the pernicious appeal of Communist slogans to the disinherited of this earth is our own inability to develop a clear sense of purpose and to give mankind a vision of a noble destiny.

I do not believe the pessimists who say that as a people we Americans cannot or will not meet the demands of the present trial of Western civilization.

I do not propose that we chastise the American people.

I propose that we challenge them.

The measure of our responsibility is such that we must act with greatness. No people have ever risen to greatness without being called to greatness.

The tragedy of these years is that the voice that should summon us is silent.

PORT FACILITIES OF DULUTH, MINN.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, as a result of the great St. Lawrence Seaway, Duluth is destined to become one of the busiest and most important ports in the world.

Duluth will, by May 1, be ready to accommodate ocean vessels, and with the opening of the Seaway this summer it will serve as a vital link in bringing American and foreign shipping lines into the very heartland of America.

The fine facilities of the port of Duluth were recently presented by the Governor of Minnesota, Orville L. Freeman, to shipping lines in New York City. The Governor's excellent presentation was reported in the Christian Science Monitor of March 24, 1959. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

DULUTH PORT BOOMED AS GATEWAY TO WEST

(By Harry C. Kenney)

NEW YORK.—Orville L. Freeman, Governor of Minnesota, came into New York recently to impress upon American and foreign shipping lines that the St. Lawrence Seaway will open a vast new highway to the great West through Duluth.

He said that in addition to its celebrated natural advantages, the Duluth port will offer facilities that are equal or superior to any others in the world. These will include a $10 million public terminal, plus a projected private terminal estimated at $80 million.

The Governor said that suddenly the seacoast is 1,500 miles closer. "That's how it seems to the manufacturers and processors in the hitherto landlocked region lying within the trade area of the seaport of Duluth."

SUPERPORT FACILITIES

On May 1, the Duluth port, serving a trade area of 540,000 square miles and more than 8 million persons, will be ready to accommodate ocean vessels (4 at one time) at a modern terminal equal or superior to other Great Lakes ports.

Governor Freeman, at the beginning of his remarks at a press conference at the Park Lane Hotel, emphasized that the Seaway is a new broad highway to world peace—from Duluth in the heartland of this continent to the major ports of the world.

There was little question but that the Governor and his 14-man delegation were here to convince as many shippers as possible that it might be less costly and more favorable to use their facilities than those of New York, New Orleans, Baltimore, Philadelphia, or even Chicago, and Milwaukee.

The people of Minnesota are putting great importance on the Seaway, and their Governor's presence here emphasizes the Duluth facilities.

FULL PROMOTION

The Governor's assistants were the first team of promoters. They were loaded with facts, figures, and statistics. They had charts and photographs. They were loaded with strategy on the potential volume of trade in the port's area and that "it stands in the very center of the food-producing area of the country."

The Governor stressed that opening of the Seaway will place Duluth at the head of the important waterway which will reach into the very heart of the North American Continent.

There were remarks at the press conference that Duluth would not eat into the port of New York activities; that the bulk of the area's foreign trade now moves by way of the gulf coast and very little is shipped by way of New York.

Robert T. Smith, director of the Duluth Port, said the port's future was not based upon diversion from other ports but rather in the hopes of an entirely new market developed from the enormous world trade potential in the Midwest.

COMPETITION SPURRED

There seems to be in the offing sharp competition among individual ports of the Great Lakes. Probably the king-sized prize will be the huge traffic potential of Minneapolis and St. Paul.

On this point, Prof. Ed Nightingale, of the University of Minnesota, said: "Nobody would think of moving Twin Cities foreign trade through Chicago or Milwaukee, if shippers could be assured of equal sailing at Duluth."

The Governor declared that he was impressed and pleased by expressions of sincere interest by the people in the maritime industry. He also was impressed by the pointed and specific questions asked dealing with pier availability, harbor drafts, labor supply, and rentals.

He said the Duluth authority has conducted surveys of general export-import cargo potential, not only for the 11-State area that the port will serve in the United States, but ranging as far as Canada and the west coast.

These surveys indicate a 350,000-ton annual average—92-plus percent export, 7-plus import. Minnesota alone has 352 shippers moving nearly 240,000 tons annually in foreign trade. It is expected that the export-import balance will improve with the advent of oceangoing ship traffic to Duluth.

Imports which should and will move through Duluth include coffee, cane sugar, glass and granite, automobiles, machinery, jute, burlap, and liquors.

MORIBUND WORLD COURT

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Moribund World Court," which appeared in the April 1 edition of the Washington Post and Times Herald.

The editorial points out the need for the Senate to take the lead in revitalizing the International Court of Justice by removing the reserve clause from its resolution of 1946 which accepted the Court's jurisdiction. I have recently introduced Senate Resolution 94 implementing this suggestion, so I should like to call this sound editorial statement to the attention of the Senate.

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

MORIBUND WORLD COURT

Many of the American judges struggling to keep up with their congested calendars must look wistfully at the leisurely pace of the International Court of Justice while the World Court justices surely wish they had more to do. The Court has been neglected by most nations since it was set up in 1945. So it is encouraging to know that both Secretary of State Dulles and Attorney General Rogers have urged countries to make more use of the international tribunal.

The United States should take the lead in reviving the International Court because the Senate is largely responsible for the failure of countries to make use of the Court in settling international disputes. When the Senate passed a resolution in 1946 accepting the authority of the Court, an amendment was attached giving the United States the right to decide whether a case involving this country came within the Court's jurisdiction. This bad American example has been followed by many other countries with the result that few international disputes have been referred to the Court.

President Eisenhower ought to urge the Senate to repeal this restriction on the Court's power. If the International Court is ever to realize its potential as a constructive force for peace it ought to have considerable power to decide whether a case comes within its jurisdiction. During its first decade the Court has exhibited no power-grabbing tendencies and there is no reason to believe that the distinguished jurists who have been appointed to the Court by the U.N. Security Council and General Assembly would usurp the authority of domestic courts.

LABOR UNION REFORM

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, from time to time as the articles have come to my office, I have placed in the RECORD the comments, editorially and in story form, concerning the efforts being made by the Senate to pass a so-called labor reform bill.

On this subject, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an article entitled "Is Congress Bypassing Effective Labor Laws?" published in the Small Business Bulletin, of the National Small Business Men's Association, for March 1959; and an article entitled "Our Labor Legislation Muddle: What Action Should Investors Take

Now?" published in the Investors League Bulletin of March 1959.

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

[From Small Business Bulletin, March 1959]

IS CONGRESS BYPASSING EFFECTIVE LABOR LAWS?

Outcome of momentous behind-the-scenes maneuvering now going on in Washington may spell doom to any labor legislation this year which would effectively help small business.

While public attention remains rooted on Senator JOHN KENNEDY'S—Democrat of Massachusetts—unusually hurried attempts to ram through Congress a mild anticorruption bill, insiders privately tell us hope is dim for laws to outlaw secondary boycotts and coercive picketing—two of the most potent weapons of corrupt or unethical union leaders—and the hoodlum element now infesting labor leadership.

This despite obvious public demand that union corruption be cleaned up through stronger labor legislation.

Essentially, KENNEDY'S bill would hit at union corruption and racketeering by compelling both unions and management to make public certain financial records and labor-management dealings—particularly relating to bargaining for union representation.

But several labor sweeteners also are included—proposed changes in the Taft-Hartley law which would be highly favorable to labor. Among other things, they would legalize existing—but outlawed—representation practices of the building trade unions, allow strikers replaced because of economic reasons to vote in representation elections.

Yet needed curbs on organizational picketing and secondary boycotts—which many, including the administration, know are just as important in stopping union corruption—are missing from the bill. And attempts to add them in committee have met overwhelming defeat.

Now, a trend toward compromise is developing, your staff finds, in certain congressional quarters. Both the labor sweeteners and picketing-boycott proposals would be deferred until later. Then a new attempt would be made to overhaul Taft-Hartley.

Through this move, a simple anticorruption reporting and disclosures bill should be passable. But the AFL–CIO says "No."

Give us the changes we demand in the Taft-Hartley law and give them to us now or we'll use our tremendous influence to kill the whole bill. This, in effect, is the ultimatum George Meany has hurled at Congress. Its connotation?

Complete disregard for public opinion. For this very union in 1958 pronounced these reforms good, and needed, to help unions put their house in order.

To put added teeth in this ultimatum and just before KENNEDY'S bill hits the Senate floor 3,500 building and construction trades delegates have been brought to Washington. At Bulletin press time, these men representing all States were up on Capitol Hill relating labor's story to their Congressmen and Senators.

FLOOR FIGHT COMING?

With little or no chance of amending the Kennedy bill in Senate committee, your legislative staff foresees a real floor fight in the offing and the first real chance to determine unions' extent of influence in the Senate after November's elections.

Here, attempts will be made to either: (1) Add provisions covering secondary boycotts and picketing; or (2) remove the labor sweeteners.

The probability? KENNEDY'S bill, from what we can learn, will be passed with some modifications and with the sweeteners removed. The fight for these changes will be led by Senators BARRY GOLDWATER, Republican, of Arizona, and JOHN MCCLELLAN, Democrat, of Arkansas, whose Senate select committee has exposed the startling corruption and misuse of office now prevalent in many unions.

But while attention has focused on Senate action, two additional important labor reform measures have quietly been dropped in the House hopper by House Labor Committee Chairman GRAHAM BARDEN, Democrat, of North Carolina. One is similar to MCCLELLAN'S Senate proposal.

Wisely separating union reporting and disclosure measures from major Taft-Hartley changes, BARDEN'S bills should be the basis for House action on labor reform.

A labor bill of rights—that's what BARDEN calls his reporting measure, saying, "it would restore to the workers the right to control the affairs of their unions * * * and wrest control of these unions from the gangsters, hoodlums, and racketeers."

In essence, here's what this bill would do: Prohibit use of union funds for political purposes, require secret union membership vote before any strike, regulate union disciplinary procedures against members, provide members with the legal right to sue their union, require democratic safeguards in union constitutions, impose fiduciary responsibility upon union officials.

His other bill would outlaw recognition and organizations picketing, give States jurisdiction over labor disputes not handled by government, eliminate existing secondary boycott loopholes in Taft-Hartley.

BARDEN'S proposals loom important since—regardless of Senate action—the House seems sure of writing its own labor bill. And instead of considering only testimony already heard by MCCLELLAN'S committee, the House unit, we're told, will hold its own hearings on labor management reform needs.

While the eventual result of congressional action may be a modified Kennedy bill it's no longer a cinch to be rammed thru before anyone can catch his breath.

And the chance for small business to realize effective labor reform legislation as needed protection from today's big unions, from what we can see, lies in the House.

PLAN HOUSE ACTION

That's where your association is concentrating its efforts making sure that the House committee hears first-hand testimony on the need for reform laws.

Many Congressmen already have told us they realize the plight of small-business men. But they emphasize an immediate, urgent need for examples from small firms of unions' power abuse.

If you want just labor laws, help your cause best by acting now. Write your Congressman a letter relating any personal experiences you or your friends may have encountered. Send a carbon to us.

Only an immediate real response from small business can win this fight.

[From the Investors League Bulletin, March 1959]

OUR LABOR LEGISLATION MUDDLE: WHAT ACTION SHOULD INVESTORS TAKE NOW?

We have repeatedly stated "Most people don't write their U.S. Senators and Representatives because they don't know just what to say and when to say it." Never has this remark been more appropriate than it is at this moment when important labor reform legislation is in the making. Our citizens who recognize the grave need of such legislation are confused and bewildered by the complexities of the various important labor measures which have been introduced in this session of Congress and on which public hearings before important congressional committees are now being held. All of them seem to taste good on the outside. But what really lies behind their sugar-coated surface?

The important work of the McClellan committee has brought into sharp focus the racketeering and arrogant dishonesty indulged in by certain bosses of some of our largest labor unions. This has aroused the public who demand a remedy to the intolerable conditions which now exist.

The political power of the labor czars was proven in the last congressional election and has instilled political fear in the minds of influential policymakers of both major political parties. They apparently feel that efforts to deal forthrightly with the evils that have been exposed may mark them for political extinction come 1960.

Investors well realize that the economic policies advanced by the AFL–CIO are definitely socialistic in character, are aimed at the destruction of saving and investment incentives through vicious taxation in behalf of promoting an all-powerful Government in Washington dedicated to wild-eyed Federal spending schemes to be paid for, if at all, in an inflated and debased currency. The crude, bare-faced philosophy of existence of many labor leaders may be capsuled in a few words: "Let's get ours today, and to hell with what happens tomorrow."

To fight this menance of the labor dictators the Investors League has consistently advocated legislation that would destroy this corrupt and ahorrently un-American and fascist dictatorship at its very roots rather than to temporize with ineffective and wishy-washy pretenses of mere regulation. We surely would never advocate regulated robbery, or regulated arson and violence.

Our basic legislative recommendations for ridding the Nation of the causes of labor union abuses have been to put unions under the antitrust laws, guarantee the right of every individual to join or not to join a union as a condition of employment, and ban unions from engaging in political activities with their members' dues. The several major labor bills pending before this Congress duck these issues with one exception. (The Barden and McClellan bills do contain provisions outlawing misuse of union funds in political activities.)

THREE MAJOR BILLS BEFORE CONGRESS

S. 505. The Kennedy-Ervin bill: This is by far the weakest and most ineffective pretence of remedial legislation as witnessed by its endorsement by the AFL–CIO. It has been roundly denounced before the Senate Subcommittee on Labor. Godfrey P. Schmidt, for instance, one of the three court-appointed monitors named to clean up the Teamsters Union, made the following comment on S. 505, "One of the most rampant abuses of power in the labor movement * * * is the practice of visiting reprisals upon union members and officers who dare to exercise free speech in opposition to the wishes or programs of powerful labor leaders. * * * Your bill (S. 505) would, I think, be unacceptable and inefficient precisely because it fails to take care of this most important abuse." Schmidt also stated his talks with workers convinced him that "no labor reform can be effectuated unless recognition and organizational picketing is banned. Your (Senator KENNEDY'S) prohibition of blackmail picketing is completely inadequate." Schmidt also said "Since the irresponsible power of labor leaders needs curbing, secondary boycotts, which is a source of this power, must be limited. I think provisions in this respect should be incorporated in your bill." Other serious defects in S. 505 include a provision to permit nonemployees to vote in NLRB elections and one to change the term "supervisor" as presently defined in Taft-Hartley in such manner that the door would be open to union domination of thousands of supervisors who are now considered a part of management.

No labor bill at all would be preferable to S. 505. It would simply strengthen the hand of the labor dictators by lulling the public into the false belief that constructive labor legislation had been enacted and pave the way for later demands for more dangerous amendments to Taft-Hartley such as elimination of the right-to-work provisions.

S. 748, the administration bill: This bill was introduced with the approval of Labor Secretary Mitchell by Senator GOLDWATER and 14 of his cosponsoring colleagues. This bill deals largely with requiring disclosure of certain financial transactions and administrative practices of unions and their officers and agents, election and removal of officers and other such matters. In these respects the provisions are more thoroughly defined than in the Kennedy-Ervin bill.

Unlike the Kennedy-Ervin bill, S. 748 contains provisions for materially strengthening laws against secondary boycotts and picketing. This administration bill contains no provisions against union political activities. While it is by far preferable to S. 505, it still leaves much to be desired. From a practical political standpoint, however, in view of the fact that it has the endorsement of the administration and the Secretary of Labor, and in view of the general attitudes of the Members of this Congress toward labor legislation, it is probably the best that can be hoped for at this time.

H.R. 4474, the Barden bill: This bill resembles the administration bill in many respects but contains some tougher provisions such as one to prohibit use of union dues for political activities, which the unions will fight tooth and nail. Senator MCCLELLAN has introduced S. 1134 which more or less parallels the provisions of H.R. 4474 except that as of the date of this Bulletin he had not yet introduced a bill dealing with amendments of the NLRA and LMRA. Desirable as these bills are, it is quite doubtful that they could gain the endorsement of the Secretary of Labor, to say nothing of the labor-liberal majority Members of the present Congress.

WHAT SHOULD INVESTORS DO?

This is no time merely to do nothing. This would only help get the wrong labor bill enacted. We would normally, as a matter of principle, urge support of the Barden and McClellan bills. From a practical political standpoint, however, it might be more effective if we were to write Senator MCCLELLAN and urge him to help defeat the Kennedy-Ervin bill and support the administration bill, leaving for a later date consideration of legislation banning the use of union dues for political purposes and other needed amendments to Taft-Hartley. Your president has written Senator MCCLELLAN such a letter which is reproduced on the back page.

WILLIAM JACKMAN,
President, Investors League, Inc.

THE NEED FOR SALK VACCINE SHOTS

Mr. HART. Mr. President, yesterday was the 4th anniversary of the dramatic announcement made at the University of Michigan that at last the Nation had in its possession a highly effective method with which to fight paralytic poliomyelitis. Yet 4 years later less than half of our population has received one shot. That leaves about 77 million men, women, and children who have not taken advantage of this most essential means of self-help.

The New York Times on yesterday, April 12, published an article which I can only hope those who have not taken advantage of the Salk vaccine will read.

As the parent of a child who was stricken with paralytic polio the summer before the Salk vaccine came on the market, I only wish I could find the word formula which would induce all parents, and the rest of the population, as well, to insure themselves against attack by taking advantage of this wonderful vaccine.

We approach the summer vacation time with happy contemplation. Nonetheless, we realize there are some things which are dangerous and cannot be avoided—the other fellow's driving on the highways and the unpredictable weather on the water. But polio is a disease which is traditionally associated with summer weather and about which we can now do something. We owe it to our families and ourselves to do what we should.

In Michigan, it has been found that the group which is the hardest to reach are the preschool children, the group at home. Only 43 percent of such children, too young to do anything about this themselves, have been given the opportunity to receive one shot.

I know we are all reading about the wonderful one-mixture vaccine which it is hoped will immunize against many diseases. But let us not wait for that to come on the market in great quantities, because the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has informed State agencies that a mass supply may not be on the market for some time. That agency also has stressed that it is better to have everyone receive the three shots of the Salk vaccine before worrying about those who have not had the fourth shot. The department urges, finally, that the three shots be received in the period before the end of June, even though this means receiving the shots closer together than is normally recommended.

Again, I wish I could find the formula in words which would induce everyone in the Nation to insure himself against the hideous aftermath of an infection which now can be avoided, thanks to Dr. Salk, whom Congress honored so deservedly a year or so ago.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article entitled "Need for Salk Shots," written by Howard A. Rusk, M.D., published in the New York Times of April 12, 1959, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

[From the New York Times, Apr. 12, 1959]

NEED FOR SALK SHOTS—STUDY OF HOW MOST IN U.S. LACK THEM AND A PLEA FOR IMMEDIATE VACCINATION

(By Howard A. Rusk, M.D.)

Four years ago today the world rejoiced at the dramatic announcement made at the University of Michigan that at last a safe and effective vaccine against paralytic poliomyelitis was available. The vaccine, of course, was that developed by Dr. Jonas E. Salk of the University of Pittsburgh.

But now, 4 years later, less than half (77 million) of the Nation's population has had even one dose of Salk vaccine. Almost 98 million men, women, and children have not taken advantage of one of the most important medical developments of our time.

During the first half of the century there was a steady increase in the incidence of polio in the United States, with a peak of almost 58,000 cases in 1952. With the introduction of Salk vaccine, the incidence dropped sharply. In 1957, there were but 5,500 cases and less than half of these (2,500) were paralytic.

SHOWED INCREASE IN 1958

But in 1958 the number started to rise again. Provisional figures indicate that polio struck 6,000 persons, including 3,100 paralytic cases. More than half of these paralytic cases occurred in children under 5 years old. Needless epidemics killed and crippled victims in Michigan, New Jersey, Montana, Texas, Virginia, West Virginia and Hawaii.

In the Detroit epidemic, 95 percent of the paralytic cases occurred among persons who were unvaccinated or incompletely vaccinated and 61 percent of these cases were among infants and children under 5.

Why did polio increase in 1958? The answer is simple. In 1958 only half as much vaccine was distributed for domestic use as in 1957.

What will happen this year? Preliminary figures indicate that 1959 will be worse than 1958 unless those who have not had the full three doses of Salk vaccine start their immunization program immediately.

The U.S. Public Health Service reports that during the first 12 weeks of this year there were 187 reported cases of paralytic polio, compared with 103 during the same period of 1958.

Since the vaccine program has been administered through the schools in many areas, the percentage of school-age children who have been vaccinated is higher than in any other group.

Two age groups highly susceptible to polio and in which only a low percentage have been vaccinated are preschool children and young adults between 20 and 30 years old.

The U.S. Public Health Service has recently approved a 4-in-1 vaccine to protect preschool children against polio, diphtheria pertussis, and tetanus. This new multiple antigen vaccine will reduce the immunization course for the four diseases from six to four injections.

Older persons however, should not overlook the importance of vaccination. Two years ago this month, James Wood, of Charlotte, Mich., a 36-year-old father of 7 children, was struck by paralytic polio and had to be placed in a respirator. Mr. Wood had taken care to see that his 7 children ranging from 2 to 13 years old had received the full 3 doses of vaccine. But, he himself had been "too busy to bother."

Dr. Herman E. Hilleboe, State Commissioner of Health and Dr. Leo Gibson, president of the Medical Society of the State of New York, urged all physicians in the State to emphasize the importance of polio vaccination. They suggested that physicians should ask all persons under 40 coming to their offices for any reason if they had been vaccinated.

In the opinion of this writer, all persons under 60 should take the full set of Salk vaccine shots. Last year he saw 3 persons who had been struck with paralytic polio past the age of 60.

In their bulletin, Dr. Hilleboe and Dr. Gibson also recommended a fourth dose of Salk vaccine. Dr. Salk in January reported that a fourth dose of a selected lot of commercial vaccine resulted in the appearance of antibodies in the blood of a group of children who had failed to develop detectable circulating antibodies against one or more types of polio virus after three doses of vaccine.

Most important, however, is to get all persons vaccinated.

Intensive research is under way toward the development of new and more potent

vaccines. Field tests of an attenuated live-virus vaccine are being made. It is to be hoped these efforts will be successful. But the presently available Salk vaccine, when 3 doses are taken, is at least 80 percent effective.

Last week the professional advisory committees of the National Foundation met to lay plans for the new March of Dimes attack on the other 62 known viruses and on juvenile arthritis and congenital malformations.

All of these authorities agreed that despite the importance of these new programs, the highest priority must be given to inducing all who have not had the full three doses of Salk vaccine to begin their series of innoculations at once. The time for action is now.

SENATOR MANSFIELD OF MONTANA

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from a very fine newspaper, the Washington Evening Star, for whose editorials I think all Members of Congress have high regard. The editorial to which I refer relates to the distinguished majority whip, MIKE MANSFIELD. The editorial appeared in the Washington Star of yesterday. I think all of us agree there is no finer and abler servant in public life today than MIKE MANSFIELD. I should like to have all my colleagues and all those who read the RECORD see the fine comments expressed by the Evening Star concerning MIKE MANSFIELD.

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

THINKING MAN'S APPEAL

It is a good thing to have a man like MIKE MANSFIELD around at a time when too many people are enthralled or intimidated by catchwords and cliches. It is good because this Montana Senator thinks for himself and says what he thinks.

There is a cult in our country which is preaching the doctrine that it is futile to negotiate with Mr. Khrushchev because the Russians have never lived up to an agreement. And by implication this cult charges that anyone who disagrees is either an appeaser or a halfwit.

Senator MANSFIELD has not hesitated to disagree—his most recent effort being a speech last week to the Alumni Association of New York University Law School. What he says makes sense to us.

The Montana Democrat appealed for an affirmative approach by the West to the forthcoming session of Foreign Ministers and the prospective summit meeting. There should be less concern, he said, with saving face and more with saving civilization. Senator MANSFIELD was not born yesterday, and he definitely is not a peace-at-any-price advocate. He insists that any agreement must be based on a quid pro quo, on concessions to match concessions. And, of course, he realizes that there will be no peace, and no settlement, unless the Russians want a peaceful settlement.

He argues, however, that there have been great changes in the world in 15 years—great changes especially in Europe and in Germany. These changes bear down upon the Russians no less than upon the West, and they call for rethinking in order to be sure that our tactics have not become frozen in obsolete concepts. In short, Senator MANSFIELD is saying essentially what Mr. Macmillan has been saying, as we understand it. And this is that policies devised years ago, in another setting, cannot serve in the new situation which is evolving.

In short, we must raise our sights and try again. Let's ignore the namecallers and the defeatists. It is at least possible that the Russians, for reasons of their own, want a settlement which the West can accept. If this is the case, the opportunity should not be muffed because of shackled thinking. For the alternative is war—a nuclear war which will dump mankind into a black and bottomless pit. This, in essence, is Senator MANSFIELD's message. We hope he will continue to speak his piece.

PRESENTATION OF MEDAL TO ADMIRAL RICKOVER

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, announcement was made a day or two ago that a medal would be presented to Admiral Rickover on Wednesday, April 15, the ceremony of presentation to be held in the auditorium of the New Senate Office Building.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the announcement by the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, together with the text of the joint resolution authorizing the medal be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

ANNOUNCEMENT OF RICKOVER MEDAL PRESENTATION

A special gold medal, authorized by the Congress last year, will be presented to Vice Adm. Hyman G. Rickover at a public ceremony on Wednesday, April 15, Senator CLINTON P. ANDERSON, chairman, and Representative CARL T. DURHAM, vice chairman, of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, announced today.

The ceremony, to be part of a public session of the Joint Committee, will be held in the auditorium of the New Senate Office Building and is scheduled to start at 2:30 p.m. Senator ANDERSON, as chairman, will make the presentation on behalf of Congress as provided by the law.

Congress authorized the medal last year in a joint resolution introduced by Senator ANDERSON, Congressman DURHAM, and a number of their colleagues. The resolution was approved unanimously in both Houses of Congress and was signed into law by President Eisenhower on August 28, 1958.

Congress stated in the resolution that the medal was to be awarded in recognition of Admiral Rickover's work in directing the development and construction of the world's first nuclear-powered ships and the first large-scale nuclear power reactor devoted exclusively to the production of electricity. Admiral Rickover is known as the "Father" of the nuclear submarine fleet including the *Nautilus*, the *Skate*, and the *Skipjack*.

Invited to participate in the ceremony are Vice President RICHARD M. NIXON, House Speaker SAM RAYBURN, Senate Majority Leader LYNDON JOHNSON, Senate Minority Leader EVERETT M. DIRKSEN, House Majority Leader JOHN MCCORMACK, House Minority Leader CHARLES HALLECK, Chairmen CLARENCE CANNON and CARL HAYDEN of the House and Senate Appropriations Committees, and Chairmen CARL VINSON and RICHARD B. RUSSELL of the House and Senate Armed Services Committees.

At the presentation ceremony next week, Admiral Rickover will give his annual report on the status of the naval reactor program and the Shippingport, Pa., civilian power reactor project, the Nation's first nuclear power station to go into operation. Committee members and other Members of Congress participating in the ceremony will be given an opportunity to comment on the accomplishments of the program.

The award of the medal by Chairman ANDERSON will follow. Senator ANDERSON also will present Admiral Rickover with a special copy of the joint resolution of the Congress, and a resolution signed by all members of the Joint Committee expressing their appreciation to him for his contribution to America's technological progress.

All Members of Congress and a number of officials of the executive branch of government have been invited to attend the ceremony. These officials include Secretary of Defense Neil McElroy, Under Secretary of Defense Donald Quarles, AEC Chairman John McCone and members of the Atomic Energy Commission, Navy Secretary Thomas S. Gates, Jr., Presidential Assistant James C. Hagerty, and Capt. E. P. Aurand, USN, President Eisenhower's naval aide.

The public is cordially invited to attend the ceremony, Senator ANDERSON and Congressman DURHAM stated.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 201

Joint resolution to authorize the chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy to confer a medal on Rear Adm. Hyman George Rickover, United States Navy

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That in recognition of the achievements of Rear Admiral Hyman George Rickover, United States Navy, in successfully directing the development and construction of the world's first nuclear-powered ships and the first large-scale nuclear power reactor devoted exclusively to production of electricity, the Chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, on behalf of the Congress, is authorized to present to Admiral Hyman George Rickover, United States Navy, an appropriate gold medal for such purpose, the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to cause to be struck a gold medal with suitable emblems, devices, and inscriptions to be determined by the Secretary and Chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $2,500 for this purpose.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury shall cause duplicates in bronze of such medal to be coined and sold, under such regulations as he may prescribe, at a price sufficient to cover the cost thereof (including labor), and the appropriations used for carrying out the provisions of this section shall be reimbursed out of the proceeds of such sale.

PERFORMANCE RECORDS OF SUBMARINE "SKIPJACK"

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, several members of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy have enjoyed a memorable trip on the submarine *Skipjack*. On the trip, the submarine went to a greater depth than any other submarine has ever descended before and moved at a greater speed than any other submarine has previously traveled. I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a press release issued by the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy upon the return of the congressional party to the mainland.

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

Two new performance records of the USS submarine *Skipjack* were announced today by Senator CLINTON P. ANDERSON, chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, upon his return from an overnight trip on the submarine with six other committee members and Vice Adm. H. G. Rickover, USN.

Senator ANDERSON stated: "While underway and submerged, the Joint Committee held an official committee meeting, during

which time the *Skipjack* was going faster and deeper than any known submarine in history. For security reasons, I can only say that we were deeper than 400 feet and moving faster than 20 knots. In 1955 some of us also traveled on the *Nautilus* and we were impressed today by the many technical advances and substantial increases in performance that have been achieved in *Skipjack*, including speed, maneuverability, and endurance."

In addition to Chairman ANDERSON, the following committee members were abroad: Senators JOHN O. PASTORE, Rhode Island; HENRY M. JACKSON, Washington; GEORGE D. AIKEN, Vermont; Congressman CHET HOLIFIELD, California; JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, Pennsylvania; and JACK WESTLAND, Washington.

During the record breaking trip, the committee members and staff were given a thorough tour of the new submarine, and participated in high speed maneuvers.

At the underwater hearing held in *Skipjack's* wardroom, Admiral Rickover gave a presentation on the accomplishments of the *Skipjack* and new developments in the naval reactors program. In response to questions, the Admiral explained the safety features of the reactor design and operation of the *Skipjack*.

The committee members stated that the Electric Boat Co. and other participating industrial companies deserved congratulations for a job well done.

Senator ANDERSON, on behalf of the congressional committee, thanked Cmdr. William W. Behrens, Jr., USN, the commanding officer of the *Skipjack*, for the hospitality extended by him, his officers and crew, and for the expert way they put *Skipjack* through its paces.

In closing, Senator ANDERSON said: "We are impressed with the tremendous advancements that have been made in the 4 short years that have transpired since the first atomic submarine went to sea.

"The country and all our citizens can be proud of Admiral Rickover and his fine team for achieving for the United States technological leadership in the field of nuclear ship propulsion. The committee, on behalf of the Congress, will recognize these accomplishments at its forthcoming public ceremony, Wednesday, April 15, 1959, when we will present to Admiral Rickover the special congressional medal authorized by Congress last year."

The committee and Admiral Rickover were accompanied by Capt. E. P. Wilkinson, USN, Commander Submarine Division 102; Carleton Shugg, vice president, General Dynamics Corp., Electric Boat Division; and James T. Ramey, executive director of the Joint Committee staff.

HYDROPOWER AND THE BUREAU OF RECLAMATION—ADDRESS BY COMMISSIONER W. A. DEXHEIMER

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, the basic problem of far-western America is a sufficient supply of water in order to make it possible to cope with the fast increasing population and the rapidly burgeoning economy of the States located there. I doubt that any Federal policy adopted during the last half century has been more beneficent to the development of western America than the Federal policy of reclamation.

During most of the era of the Eisenhower administration the Commissioner of Reclamation has been Mr. W. A. Dexheimer, who retired only a few days ago. On the 1st of this month, Commissioner Dexheimer spoke on "Hydropower and the Bureau of Reclamation," at the American Power Conference, at the Sherman Hotel, in Chicago, Ill. He indicated how the Department of the Interior has, during the last half century, followed the guidelines laid down by the Congress of the United States in constructing reclamation projects in the West, many of them multipurpose in character.

The hydroelectric energy generated as an incident to multipurpose Federal construction has been necessary on most occasions to demonstrate the economic feasibility of the Federal undertakings. Costs of commercial power and of water for municipal and industrial purposes under Federal law are repaid with interest. Costs allocated to the supplying of water for irrigation purposes are repaid without interest.

Mr. President, as I have stated, the Federal reclamation policy, established under the administration of Theodore Roosevelt, and continued by the legislation enacted by the Congress down to date, has been of great benefit to the country, and most particularly to the semiarid Western States.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD the complete text of Commissioner Dexheimer's excellent and timely speech.

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

HYDROPOWER AND THE BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

(Paper presented by Commissioner of Reclamation W. A. Dexheimer, at the American Power Conference, Sherman Hotel, Chicago, Ill., April 1, 1959)

I am pleased to discuss the hydroelectric program of the Bureau of Reclamation with you today, particularly because it gives me an opportunity to put power generation in its proper perspective as it relates to our statutory responsibilities.

Our primary job is the conservation and utilization of water for consumptive purposes, principally irrigation, in the semiarid West, generally defined as the 17 Western States. Secretary of the Interior Seaton, who sends his greetings to this conference, recognizes the importance of water conservation in our future and has supported our efforts to further this work.

In the semiarid West, water is and has always been the key to survival. Storage facilities are necessary to conserve the erratic spring runoff of melting snow water for use later in the hot, summer season when the western river flows drop sharply or, in some instances dry up completely.

In recent decades, seasonal regulation has been expanded to become cyclical storage because of wide variations in annual flows. We have borrowed from Joseph's dream of Biblical days to store water in days and years of plenty to carry through periods of drought and want.

Hydroelectric-power generation has been a natural byproduct of storage dams and reservoirs necessary for this water conservation. I am sure no one would dispute the wisdom of also harnessing and using this tremendous source of energy. It would be a criminal waste of one of our most valued resources to do otherwise.

The Department of the Interior is responsible for the marketing of all energy generated by federally constructed plants except the Tennessee Valley Authority.

In these two Federal Government functions—installation of power facilities and marketing—competition exists, and hence they are subjects of debate and conflict. However, it is important to remember that the Secretary of the Interior, as well as we in the agencies under his direction, are carrying out responsibilities placed upon us by the Congress. We are governed by a broad framework of laws and policies laid down by the Congress in all phases of water resource work, including development and marketing of hydropower. These include the preference of municipalities and REA in purchase of power.

It is against this background that I have prepared this discussion on Bureau of Reclamation hydro operations and their relation to our total program.

Federal reclamation was first authorized in the Reclamation Act signed into law by President Theodore Roosevelt in 1902. One of the first irrigation projects to be undertaken was the Salt River project in Arizona, and it was on this project that the first Federal reclamation hydropower was generated. A small plant, of 15,400 kilowatts, was built as an initial part of Roosevelt Dam to supply energy for the manufacture of cement.

From this beginning, hydropower facilities have grown concurrently with other phases of our water conservation until we are currently operating 40 plants scattered through the Western States and Alaska. The installed nameplate capacity is 5,110,175 kilowatts. This represents roughly 18 percent of the installed hydro capacity in the United States and 4 percent of the world capacity.

Bureau of Reclamation power generation is entirely hydroelectric, with no steam generation whatever. It should be noted also that we specifically do not attempt or profess to supply the entire power needs of any area. We are primarily a water resource development agency and not a utility for power supply.

Within the statutory authority under which we operate, we seek the closest cooperation with the utilities in the area—be they municipal, cooperative, or investor owned—in order that the power supply we have available can be utilized to the greatest degree possible.

Bear in mind, however, that hydropower generation is low man on the totem pole so far as priority of use of water is concerned on reclamation projects. We are bound by 57 years of consistent policy and multiple Federal and State laws which establish priorities for the use of water in the semiarid West.

Generally, these statutes provide that domestic requirements have first call on the available supply of water. Beneficial consumptive uses, such as municipal and industrial consumption and irrigation, rank high followed by pollution abatement, salinity control, flood control, and navigation. Usually all are ahead of requirements for hydropower generation.

Water conservation for consumptive use has been and is today the most important problem facing the Western United States. As you are probably well aware, it is also a subject that is gaining in importance elsewhere in the United States as our population grows and our water needs soar.

It is this intense competition for water that has brought to the fore the multiple-use concept of development. In many instances, water may be made to serve more than one master and a reclamation project can provide multiple benefits, including the generation of hydropower.

In most such instances, overriding primary benefits are much more important than power generation. Also, in many cases, a single-purpose power facility, such as a utility would be licensed to construct, would not be feasible. Thus, by combining these multiple water uses, the Federal project is providing benefits which could not be realized from any single-purpose endeavor.

Hydroelectric power has another very important function in the development of the

water resources of the West, particularly irrigation. This is the part it plays in the financing of the overall project.

The Reclamation program is unique among federally financed activities in that the invested capital is repaid into the Treasury. Ninety-three percent of the money the Bureau of Reclamation spends is repaid to the United States by the project beneficiaries.

Costs of commercial power and of water for municipal and industrial purposes are repaid with interest. Costs allocated to the supplying of water for irrigation purposes are repaid without interest.

This interest-free concept goes back to the reclamation fund which was established by Congress at the time the Reclamation Act of 1902 was passed. Accretions to the fund come not from the taxpayer's pocket but from the sale of public lands, royalties from land leasing for some minerals, and from revenue from reclamation projects. This fund comprises approximately 44 percent of our annual appropriation at the present time. Most of this fund is from the public lands of the Western States, and Congress obviously did not feel that the West should be charged interest for using its own money.

Many Western States today have more than 50 percent of their land area under Federal control. The reclamation investment is in the nature of a replacement for the depletion of western resources which provide revenue for the reclamation fund.

However, in this day of high competition for water and of high-cost construction to bring it to the user, most irrigators cannot carry the entire burden of repayment of irrigation costs. In many instances power revenues are used to pick up the balance of these costs, as well as repaying all power costs with interest.

Thus power becomes not only an important byproduct of multipurpose reclamation project construction; it also becomes a paying partner and makes possible many projects which would not otherwise be feasible.

As people who are interested primarily in power production you will ask: "Is this fair? Without carrying these added costs, could not power from Federal projects be marketed at a lower rate?"

Quite possibly, but consider two balancing factors. First, investor-owned utilities contribute to the upbuilding and general economic welfare of the areas they serve by substantial tax payments. Federal hydroplants built as a part of reclamation projects are tax free, but they contribute to repayment of and thereby make possible the total project, thus vastly improving the total economy of the area and of the Nation.

Secondly, as I have pointed out, in many instances a single-purpose hydropower plant may not be economically justified where a multipurpose project is entirely feasible. Certainly, in many instances, a substantial repayment by power to the cost of the total project is fair and reasonable—the local power consumer benefits both from water conservation and power.

Thus it is clearly demonstrable that hydropower is an integral and very essential part of multipurpose water resource development. Without it, the water users would be faced with an impossible repayment burden and the orderly process of development would be slowed to the danger point. By the same reasoning, without water conservation and use as primary functions of multipurpose reclamation development, projects would be cut back to single-purpose hydropower dams or not built at all.

In the West most of the feasible single-purpose hydropower sites have been used—large storage is essential to further feasible hydropower. Development of this vast segment of our Nation depends on water supply, for water is truly the lifeblood of the West. Its availability determines the ceiling of progress and expansion.

Many of you here today are from outside of the 17 Western States—the semiarid belt served by the Bureau of Reclamation. You can reasonably ask: "Is this so bad, to halt development and expansion at Government expense of a segment of the United States which may be increasingly in competition with me?"

I have already pointed out one answer—Federal reclamation is on a reimbursable basis. Only those expenditures which, as a matter of national policy, are not repayable are written off from our capital costs. They are 7 percent of the total and largely for flood control. The more important answer is the contribution the expanding western economy can make to the national welfare.

In the early days of American pioneering when the settlers pushed first past the Appalachians, then across the Mississippi and Missouri, fought their way across the high Rockies and on to the Pacific coast, the American economy was fed and prospered because of the wealth-creating productivity of new homes, new farms, new communities, new industries, as the frontier was pushed ever westward.

We have long since reached the Pacific and only this year have welcomed two new States into our Nation from the Pacific. There still remains a vast storehouse of natural resources in the semiarid reaches of the West not touched nor exploited in 100 years of the rush to the Pacific.

Water has been and is the key to the unlocking of this storehouse. There must be an assured supply of water for people in the cities and for industrial use. There must be water to keep the crops growing during the long, dry summers when rainfall is a rarity in most parts of the West.

There must be energy, too, to turn the wheels of industry and to supply the mounting per capita needs as well as the increases resulting from an increased population. Per capita uses of both water and power are shooting skyward. With the West experiencing the highest rate of population growth of any area of the Nation, a double problem is posed in keeping supply ahead of demand.

The Federal Government has an orderly program underway to assist the States and their local entities in development of the water resources. To the extent possible, hydropower development is incorporated in these plans. But, as I have stated, the Federal Government is not a utility, and we look to the utilities to accept the responsibility of keeping an adequate supply of kilowatts on the line.

Continued development of this vast semiarid segment of the United States is a natural sequel and, in a sense, a continuance of the pioneering that has been a stimulus to national trade and economy for almost two centuries. And it can continue to be a stimulus to the national welfare and prosperity.

As recently as 1955, the Second Hoover Commission had this to say about the Federal reclamation program:

"The justification for Federal interest in irrigation is not solely to provide land for farmers or to increase food supply. These new farm areas inevitably create villages and towns whose populations thrive from furnishing supplies to the farmer, marketing his crops and from the industries which grow around these areas.

"The economy of seven important cities of the West had its base in irrigation—Denver, Salt Lake City, Phoenix, Spokane, Boise, El Paso, Fresno, and Yakima. Indeed, these new centers of productivity send waves of economic improvement to the far borders, like a pebble thrown into a pond. Through irrigation, man has been able to build a stable civilization in an area that might otherwise have been open only to intermittent exploitation."

The Library of Congress, in a report on reclamation published only last January, takes further note of the importance of developing this interior area. I quote:

"Another newer value (of reclamation), apparently not truly envisioned a half century ago, appears highly important today. The settlement and development of our western area has provided us a key to power—not only uranium and other significant raw materials, but even more important—integrated and firmly held space.

"We are not an 'east of the mountains' country; we span the continent and have our feet firmly implanted on the shores of two great oceans. We are not a loose linking of marginal settlements—we have no dead never-never continental interior as does Australia."

I have just returned from a visit to Australia and a visit to the Snowy Mountains water conservation and hydroelectric project. That project represents Australia's great national effort to better utilize its very limited water resources. It is a long-range effort stretching over several decades and will, I am sure, bring that nation to a new high level of economic stability and opportunity for growth just as will our own continuing efforts in this country. Australia, with a land area nearly equal to that of the United States, has just reached 10 million in population. Their greatest problems are conservation of water and providing power for economic growth.

It is not generally realized but for every family on a reclamation farm, two families gain a living in the local area in produce handling, merchandising, shipping, other service functions, and in the professions.

But bear in mind that the wealth productivity of a reclamation project is not restricted to the immediate local area. Crops produced on reclamation projects last year had a gross value of a billion dollars. A large part of this money went into the purchase of tractors, other farm machinery and hard goods and shoes, clothes and staple groceries that came from the four corners of the Nation. It is on such trade and purchasing power that the Nation's industrial payrolls are built and fed.

What of the future? It is anticipated that there will be an additional 60 million people in the United States by 1975, bringing our national population up to more than 225 million. Of this increase, 11 Western States will have the largest total numerical gain and also by far the greatest percentage of growth of any major sectional area.

Couple this fact with anticipated increased water needs skyrocketing from 185 billion gallons a day in 1950 to 450 billion gallons by 1975 and you will understand the concern of all agencies dealing with water supply to meet this challenge of the future.

The Bureau of Reclamation has currently underway construction on dams which will provide about 38,170,000 acre-feet of storage space and projects which, upon completion, will provide water for 1,971,300 acres of land. Several projects have hydroelectric facilities as a part of multipurpose dam construction and we expect to add 2,367,950 kilowatts of capacity to Bureau constructed facilities by the time presently authorized projects are completed.

Many of these projects, such as the Colorado River storage project and its participating units, and the Missouri River Basin project, are long-range undertakings and will require several decades to complete.

In addition, we have on the planning boards many more projects. These will be submitted to Congress for possible authorization as the planning reports are completed and the need for them develops as it surely will in the face of a rising population and increased per capita water needs.

These projects of the future have several things in common. They will be costly in

comparison to projects built in low-cost construction times of previous decades. Most of them will clearly need some repayment assistance beyond the ability of the irrigation water users. Many of them will require tremendous quantities of low-cost energy for irrigation pumping. Much of this energy will come from hydroelectric plants built as a part of basinwide development plans.

The important thing to remember is that power is of major importance in the future development of our water resources. We anticipate incorporating power facilities in any multipurpose project where they are economically feasible.

It may be well to consider for a moment the future of hydropower in competition with other forms of generation. There have been some rather ill-considered statements in recent years that hydropower is pricing itself out of the market in competition with modern, efficient high-pressure steamplants and the promise of nuclear development.

In the January issue of Power Engineering, Calvin B. Davis, president of the Harza Engineering Co., makes this observation:

"For the future I see a continuing development of hydropower for the United States and for most foreign countries. A few countries will approach full development and the remaining less economically attractive hydrosites will feel increased competition from thermo and nuclear sources.

"However, the complementary relationship between nuclear capacity and hydroelectric pumped storage capacity appears to bode well for the hydro industry for many years to come in the United States."

A few years ago, we asked the Atomic Energy Commission whether continued hydroelectric power development would be feasible and, if so, for how long in the light of potential nuclear power development. The answer was that any hydroelectric development which can be justified and is feasible today will be feasible throughout its useful life.

It seems to me that this conclusion has been reached generally in the industry because hydropower development today is increasing. The Federal Power Commission has before it a great number of applications for licensing of power projects at sites that, a few years ago, would have been far beyond the need or possibility of development by private investment capital.

The Federal Power Commission is faced with a critical decision on a number of these applications as to whether the best interests of total development are served by a single-purpose project or one in which multiple benefits may be incorporated. The Department of the Interior also has a responsibility in this regard because the Secretary is expected to comment to the Federal Power Commission on utility license applications and their relationship to maximum basinwide utilization of the water resources.

Essentially, I would like to sum up my remarks in this way:

1. The Bureau of Reclamation's primary responsibility is conservation and development of the water resources of the West by construction of projects which are largely self-liquidating.

2. Hydropower is a byproduct of multipurpose reclamation development, albeit a very important one from the standpoint of economic feasibility and for maximum utilization of the available water.

3. Congress has the ultimate determination as to the authorization of specific reclamation projects and how potential hydropower facilities shall be incorporated.

4. Long existing laws and congressional policies determine how energy from Federal facilities is marketed.

5. The need for conservation and maximum utilization of water and for added generation of energy from all sources becomes more critical every day.

6. The Federal Government has a vital and continuing interest and responsibility in water conservation as do the public utilities in meeting the Nation's power needs.

7. There is far more to de done in both fields than can be undertaken by any one agency or organization. It will require united and cooperative efforts to keep ahead of water and power needs.

Finally, this Nation's investment in conservation and use of our water supplies has proven its worth. Today's continuing effort in this field constitutes one of the most important programs currently underway for our economic growth and prosperity. It must be maintained at an orderly pace.

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

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT TO WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate adjourns today it stand in adjournment until Wednesday next.

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

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the policy committee will meet tomorrow, and if the labor bill is ready to be taken up, and the reports and hearings are available, and the policy committee schedules it, I think we should start discussing it Wednesday. For that reason, the Senate, when it adjourns, will do so until Wednesday. I do not expect to have any votes on the amendments this week. There will be discussion of the bill. The leadership is prepared to have a Saturday session if Senators wish to discuss the bill.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield to the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. DIRKSEN. With reference to having any votes this week, I am sure Senators will wish to know how to make plans. I wonder if the majority leader can assure us there will be no votes this week.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. So far as the majority leader is concerned, he will do everything he can to protect Senators from having to vote this week. We do expect the policy committee to schedule bills, such as the cotton-acreage bill. If the policy committee does schedule bills, we expect to bring them up before the week is over. But we do want general discussion on the labor bill if the policy committee schedules it. We will have sessions as long as there are Senators who wish to discuss it, including Saturday. We cannot make them discuss it, but we can provide an opportunity for them to discuss it. The Senate will be held in session so long as any Member asks for an opportunity to speak on the labor bill, but so far as the leadership is concerned, there will be no votes on the bill this week.

ORDER DISPENSING WITH CALL OF CALENDAR

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the call of the calendar under the rule be dispensed with.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

REPORT ON OPERATIONS UNDER INTERNATIONAL CULTURAL EXCHANGE AND TRADE FAIR PARTICIPATION ACT OF 1956--MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DODD in the chair) laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with the provisions of Section 9 of Public Law 860 of the 84th Congress, I transmit herewith for the information of the Congress the Fifth Semiannual Report of Operations under the International Cultural Exchange and Trade Fair Participation Act of 1956.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, April 13, 1959.

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATION FOR III PAN AMERICAN GAMES

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 140, H.R. 2575.

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

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 2575) to authorize the appropriation of $500,000 to be spent for the purpose of the III Pan American Games to be held in Chicago, Ill.

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

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. DOUGLAS obtained the floor.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield so that I may suggest the absence of a quorum?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield, provided I do not lose the floor.

Mr. MANSFIELD. With that understanding, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, when H.R. 2575 was called up on the Consent Calendar last Friday, I made a brief statement about its nature; but since an objection had been filed by a Member of the Senate, the subject, of course, was not pursued further.

I am very grateful to the leadership of the majority for calling this measure up today. I should like to take this opportunity to make a somewhat expanded, but I hope not too lengthy, statement on the measure.

The Pan American Games are scheduled to be held in Chicago from August 27, to September 7. It is hoped to attract some 2,000 athletes from all countries of the Americas, but primarily from Latin America south of the border and in the Caribbean area.

The House some time ago passed, by an overwhelming vote, the authorization for an appropriation of $500,000 for these games; and the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, with only one dissenting vote, ordered a companion measure reported on the 25th of March. This is the measure now before the Senate.

A great deal of planning and work has gone into the preparations for these international games, and substantial sums have been authorized and spent locally. Private subscriptions of some $500,000 are now being made. The city of Chicago has itself committed itself to appropriations and expenditures amounting to approximately $2 million. Both the citizens, therefore, and the government of Chicago, are cooperating fully in expending large sums of money for the conduct of these games.

The prospects are therefore bright that we may be able to promote friendship between the countries of this hemisphere, provided this appropriation is made. The games will be participated in by some 2,000 contestants, who will represent Canada, the United States, South and Central America, and the islands of the Caribbean. Similar games were held in Buenos Aires in 1951, and in Mexico City in 1955. At the conclusion of the 1955 games in Mexico City, the holding of the 1959 games was awarded to the city of Cleveland. Two years afterward, the city of Cleveland withdrew as the host city, and it became necessary for the Pan American Games Association to seek another locale.

When we in Chicago witnessed the disappointment over the withdrawal of the host city from participation in the games, the Chicago City Council directed that an invitation be extended to the Pan American games officials to award the holding of the games to Chicago, to be held August 27 to September 7, 1959.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. First, let me say I am heartily in favor of the bill. I am glad it is before the Senate. I concur in what the distinguished Senator from Illinois has said about the merits of the bill. I shall support it, if I am present in the Chamber when the vote is taken.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thank the majority leader for the assurance of his support, and I wish to say he is an extremely good man to have on one's side.

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

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. During the course of his comments on the bill, which I support fully, by the way, the Senator from Illinois mentioned that the bill was ordered reported to the Senate by the Foreign Relations Committee with one dissenting vote. I think, for the RECORD, it should be made very plain that, in comparison with the arrangements previously made when the games were scheduled to be held in another city, the financial arrangements with Chicago are superior, and will not cost the Government anywhere near the amount previously anticipated if the games were to be held in the other city. Is that correct?

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct. I thank the Senator for emphasizing that fact. Congress appropriated $5 million to the city of Cleveland. The major portion of the funds was to be used for the construction of a stadium in the city of Cleveland, in which the games would be held. We are asking for an appropriation of only $500,000. None of this money is to go for the construction of any facilities. They will all be furnished by the city of Chicago. The funds are instead to be used solely for reimbursement for the expense of flying the contestants to Chicago, and for the partial maintenance of the athletes from outside the United States while they are in Chicago.

The participating countries will make an expenditure of $3 a day per individual for maintenance, but the actual cost will be between $8 and $10 a day. The residue of the $500,000 not needed for transportation is to go for the difference between this $3 and the actual cost. Any money not spent will be returned to the Treasury. The Comptroller General will be able to inspect all expenditures, to audit the accounts in full; and, if there are any questionable expenditures, they will be thrown out.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The statement just made is one of the points I wanted to bring to the Senate's attention, because it is quite possible that, even though $500,000 is being requested of the Congress, the refunds which will be made in the final summing up will result in the actual expenditures of a lesser amount.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I hope that will be true.

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

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I think in all fairness it ought to be said that, had such an arrangement as was proposed by the city of Chicago been proposed by the city of Cleveland and been presented to the Congress for consideration, the result might well have been quite different. I think the RECORD should show this is quite different from the original proposal as it affected Cleveland, and that the individual interested in this matter at that time acted in good faith and with good reason.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thank the Senator from Montana. I agree with the statement which he has just made.

It should be worthwhile to point out a supplementary safeguard which we have inserted in the pending bill; namely, that the Comptroller General is not only to make an audit of the expenditures, but that the expenditures themselves are to be subject to such control as he deems to be proper. So if the Comptroller General requires that the money be spent on vouchers only, it will be done in that manner. In other words, the items of expenditure for air transportation and for maintenance will be strictly under the control of the Comptroller General and not under the control of the local committees. This also is very different from the Cleveland proposal.

It is also worthy of note that in recent days the plans for transportation have been changed. It was originally contemplated that the military forces would be reimbursed for transportation furnished, and I so stated to the Senate Friday. The plans have now been changed, and it is now planned that the transportation will be provided by civilian planes, so that the rather humorous objection which the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] made last Friday is now removed, and the Senator from Illinois cannot be accused of any inconsistency in opposing junkets conducted by the Air Force for which no reimbursement is made, and flights authorized by Congress for which full reimbursement is made. Now we will take the military completely out of the picture and the civilian airlines will be used on a commercial basis.

I think the example which Chicago has set can be copied and should be followed by the defense forces in respect to other matters.

Mr. LAUSCHE rose.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am glad to yield to my dear friend, the senior Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Am I correct in my understanding that the original bill made a general grant of $500,000 to be used in whatever manner the developers of the program saw fit, and that the bill was subsequently changed so as to earmark the fund for two specific purposes; one being transportation, and the second being the maintenance of the athletes, in part, while they are in Chicago?

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator from Ohio is correct. The bill specifically provides that the funds are for lodging, food, and transportation.

This is the result of both the financial punctiliousness of the city of Chicago and the very effective needling of the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I thank the Senator very much. Secondly, the original bill contained no provision about the auditing of the accounts.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator is correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. And that has been changed.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is true.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I have one final question.

Mr. DOUGLAS. We began with the Cleveland bill.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Yes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. But as we discovered more and more errors in the Cleveland bill we changed our bill accordingly.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Does the Senator from Illinois think he is going to persuade me to vote for the bill by these concessions and by the bit of approbation he has given to the conduct of the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I hope that I may, but I know the Senator from Ohio is very unpredictable and I am not certain I shall be successful in persuading him. I will quote some lines from Oliver Goldsmith, about hope:

The wretch condemn'd with life to part,
Still, still on hope relies,
And every pang that rends the heart,
Bids expectation rise.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The Senator from Ohio hopes always to be definitely predictable when the issues before the Senate are decided on the basis of merit, but when the issues are not decided on the basis of merit but on the necessities of politics, and the Senator from Ohio becomes convinced that is the fact; in that event one can rest assured the Senator from Ohio will pass upon the issue in the manner which he thinks is proper.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I think that is correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I have one final question. Is it possible that the city of Chicago will come back to the Congress for more money?

Mr. DOUGLAS. The answer is "no." We will not ask for 1 additional cent. And if we do not need the money authorized—we want to be thrifty in its expenditure—we will return it, and the bill so provides.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The $500,000 will be the limit to be asked?

Mr. DOUGLAS. It is the absolute ceiling.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I thank the Senator very much. I commend the Senator from Illinois for the ardor he has exhibited in supporting the bill.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I hope the Senator from Ohio will exhibit a true sense of proportion in this matter and will vote for the bill.

I say to my good friend that whereas Cleveland wanted the U.S. Government to build a stadium for them, which they would then inherit, the city of Chicago is not only furnishing Soldier Field, but it is building additional facilities at its own expense and at the expense of the Park District, which will run very much over a million dollars.

I should like to indicate some of the facilities which will be furnished. There is to be a swimming pool suitable for swimming, diving, and water polo, to cost $1 million, and to be covered by appropriations from the Park District. There is to be a new running track in Soldier Field, which will cost more than $100,000. There is to be a new cycling track at a cost of $40,000. There will be provided an adequate rowing course in the Cal-Sag Canal, requiring an expenditure of $20,000. Equipment, horses, and facilities will be furnished for the equestrian events and for the modern pentathlon at a cost of $35,000. A rifle and pistol range will be built at a cost of $100,000. A further expenditure will be made for special equipment, fencing, and gymnastics, $12,000.

Never has a city done so much for the Pan American games as the city of Chicago is going to do for these games. If Cleveland had only had the public spirit to do likewise and had not tried to take the Government for a buggy ride, Cleveland undoubtedly would have received the appropriation.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I am obliged to state that Cleveland went through an experience which frequently happens in instances of this type. When the program was submitted it was presented as one which would require no expenditures. Later it developed that $200,000 would be required. That $200,000 ultimately lifted itself, with the prospect of the State having to put up $2 million, the Federal Government having to put up $5 million, and the city of Cleveland having to put up $3 million, with private enterprises having to put up other amounts.

It was for that reason that I opposed the project; and it is for that reason that I asked the Senator from Illinois whether he contemplates coming back and asking for more money if the $500,000 is not adequate.

Mr. DOUGLAS. May my tongue cleave to the roof of my mouth, and may my right arm be withered if I do any such thing as that. I am sure that my colleague from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] will take a similar vow of abstinence.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I thank the Senator.

Mr. DOUGLAS. As I have said, I am somewhat dubious as to whether the Olympic games breed international friendship, because frequently the competition between the big powers is so intense at those games that they stir up animosity rather than friendship. However, the Pan American games are of a different kind. They are between small powers and the United States and Canada. There is no basic ill will between any of the nations. They compete on the basis of merit and with fairplay and the best men winning. They should therefore breed friendship.

I think it is important that we realize that the interchange of persons and the building of friendship takes place not merely on the intellectual level, but also in the field of sports, and in the field of art.

The distinguished Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] has inaugurated a great program of Fulbright scholarships and exchange of persons. This program is very valuable. But we want to build friendship on other levels as well. If sports are properly conducted, and not excessively competitive, they, too, can develop friendship.

I also point out that by private subscription we are also providing a festival of the arts and the music of the Americas. We wish to bring orchestras, writers, painters, and sculptors from Latin America, so that on the artistic side of life we may become better acquainted with one another's achievements and create a deeper understanding and friendship.

This is important, because the intellectuals of the Latin American countries are frequently inclined to deprecate American achievement in the arts and culture. This program will help to offset and overcome that unfortunate tendency.

Furthermore, we should remember that while these games are in progress in Chicago, a world youth congress will be in progress in Vienna, under Communist auspices. That World Youth Congress will have a great deal of support from the Communist countries. They are reaching out to attract visitors from other portions of the world including Latin America.

I believe that the Pan American games, and the Festival of the Americas, which will accompany it, can be used to help offset the drive of the Communists for intellectual relationships with Latin America. The Communists are already beginning to make a great drive in Latin America. It is very important that we should offset it. I think we are slowly coming to realize that friendships are built not so much by arms, not even solely by economic aid, but also in the world of sports, the world of artistic achievement, and the world of thought and philosophy.

So it is with a clear conscience that we submit this proposal, which we have tried to make economical, and yet sound.

The President of the United States has indicated his belief in the importance of the games by accepting the chairmanship of the Honorary Sponsoring Committee.

Because time is of the essence, if this appropriation is not authorized, it cannot be made; and if it is not made, then for the lack of $500,000 the Pan American games may fall through. This would be a great reflection upon this country, if, after the games had been awarded and scheduled, we were to say, "We do not have enough money to go through with it."

Mr. President, that completes all I have to say, unless the Senator from Ohio has further questions, which I shall be glad to try to answer.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I subscribe to the general statement made by the Senator from Illinois, that for the good of our country it is absolutely essential that there be carried on exchanges in cultural, athletic, business, and other fields. I am thoroughly in concurrence with him in that expression.

However, I have voiced my objection to this proposal, principally on the basis of the mode which has been established by various communities, of promoting the establishment of an international event in a particular area, and then coming to the Federal Government, after the deed has been agreed upon, asking for financial help.

I have in mind three instances in which that has been done. The first is the Cleveland instance, in which the representation was made to the city that

the project would be self-sustaining. Before the program was ready to be submitted, it ran to a cost of between $11 million and $12 million of the taxpayers' money.

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

Mr. LAUSCHE. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Let me say that we in Chicago pitch our programs on a more modest scale than that on which the good people of Cleveland operate. They are more expansive, and we are more restrained.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The basic wrong, however, existed also in the case of Chicago. It proceeded to drive the pegs for the establishment of the games, and then came to the Federal Government for financial aid.

The second instance I have in mind is that of the Squaw Valley International Olympics. In 1954, Reno, Nev., conceived the idea that it would be a great thing to have the winter olympics held in Squaw Valley. It emphasized the point that Reno wanted the International Olympics. They were to be held in the mountains of California, but Reno is about 40 miles away, and undoubtedly it felt that benefit would come to Reno in the event the Olympics were held there.

Two men by the name of Cushing and Poulsen had bought some land in Squaw Valley. They got together a group of men in 1948 and bought 574 acres of land in an area which was not at all developed. They put up a total of $400,000.

In 1954, when Cushing saw that Reno wanted the Olympics, he decided that he would interest himself, and he went to a legislator in California and said that it would cost about $2 million to provide the facilities for the winter Olympics. The State of California was persuaded to put up $1 million. I assume that the other $1 million was to be gathered in various ways, through private contributions, and possibly from the city of Reno. But $1 million was available, and the promoters then went to the international committee and persuaded the international committee to decide upon Squaw Valley as the place to hold the winter Olympics. I now quote what Cushing said to the committee. He did not expect to get it, but, he said: "We would plead poverty, poor mouth it all over the place. We would not try to compete with the rich European resorts, which would stage the games with Roman grandeur. Ours would be a healthy, unadorned game in a clean, simple atmosphere, free from commercial pressure and public interference."

That is the plea with which he went to the Committee on International Olympics. He said, "Come to the mountains of California, into Squaw Valley. We do not have the grandeur of the Romans, but here will be simple surroundings, with fresh air and simple facilities to accommodate you. We have no money to provide grandeur and richness of facilities."

The International Committee accepted that argument and decided to go to Squaw Valley.

Then they began to look around. They found that $1 million was not enough, and they went to the Legislature of California, and got the legislature to give them $4 million. Four million dollars was not enough. They then came to Congress and got $4 million from us. It is not now known whether the $8 million will be adequate to properly finance the project.

Cushing and the other promoters have $10 million in facilities which are being built in the Squaw Valley project. All types of facilities have been constructed. It now appears that the promoters are going to be in the midst of $14 million worth of public improvements from which they will enjoy the bonanza that will come in the future.

Squaw Valley went forward with the program. They did not come to Congress or the State Department to learn whether they would receive the money. They cast the die and then, when they were in distress, came to Congress for the financial aid which was needed. I might say that the Legislature of California finally threw up its hands and said, "We have given $4 million. We cannot give any more." The result was that last summer, I believe, Congress voted a $4 million appropriation for the promotion of these games.

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

Mr. LAUSCHE. I yield.

Mr. KUCHEL. Am I to understand that the Senator objects to the action of Congress in appropriating funds by which it will be possible for the winter Olympic games to be held at Squaw Valley?

Mr. LAUSCHE. The Senator from California has not heard what I have said.

Mr. KUCHEL. That is one of my difficulties.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I said at the very beginning that in my opinion these international cultural, athletic, and scientific events inure to the benefit of our country. What I have in mind is that whenever the United States puts up the money to build arenas and stadiums, swimming facilities, ski lifts, dormitories, and sewer systems, and all the other facilities which are necessary, the opportunity to hold such games should be afforded available to every State that has facilities which could be used for that purpose. I have in mind the States of Washington, Oregon, California, Idaho, Maine, Vermont, Colorado, all States which have mountains and such facilities.

Mr. KUCHEL. Does the able Senator know under what circumstances an area of the State which I have the honor in part to represent was chosen for these Olympic games?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I have on my desk an article which appeared in the Saturday Evening Post of February 1958, and one which appeared in Time magazine of February 9, 1959. They show that the initial invitation came from Reno, Nev. Then a Mr. Cushing and a Mr. Poulsen saw the newspaper item in the San Francisco Chronicle, stating that Reno was inviting the Olympic games. Poulsen and Cushing, who own nearly 600 acres of land and a lodge in the area, felt that that would be grand for them. They undertook to develop the proposal that the games be held at Squaw Valley. The point I am trying to make is that if the United States is to put up money, every State which has facilities ought to be given an opportunity to bid on the project.

Mr. KUCHEL. If the news stories to which my friend refers are correct, I must say that in some ways they constitute a tribute to the forehandedness of some of my constituents in California. However I should like to ask my friend from Ohio, Who makes the decision to hold the Olympic games wherever they are going to be held?

Mr. LAUSCHE. The Committee on the International Olympics.

Mr. KUCHEL. Is the Senator from Ohio objecting to the manner in which that committee discharged its responsibilities in making its choice?

Mr. LAUSCHE. The Senator from Ohio is not objecting on that basis. The Time magazine report tells the story of the argument made to the committee and the quotation which I have given to the Senator from California.

Mr. KUCHEL. Does the Senator object to the moneys appropriated by Congress to underwrite the winter Olympics?

Mr. LAUSCHE. No, I do not object to that, but I object to the method which is adopted. Interested persons go to the taxpayers and say it will cost nothing. The cost then rises to $13 million. In the California project it was said it would not cost more than $2 million. That finally rose to a figure of $4 million for California and $4 million for the Federal Government. I am vigorously opposed to such techniques, which I see exhibited day after day.

Mr. KUCHEL. Let me ask my able friend this question: When he talks about the technique which was used and to which he is opposed, am I to understand he means that in the urging by the people of my State that the winter Olympics be held in their State anything wrong or unethical was done?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I have nothing but the greatest respect for the people of California. They were not in unanimous agreement on the subject. They believed that it would cost only $2 million when they started out.

Mr. KUCHEL. Who are "they"? The people who wanted it?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I believe the California Legislature felt it would cost only $2 million. When they were asked for $4 million, I believe they honestly felt that amount would be enough.

Mr. KUCHEL. I apologize for coming into the Chamber late. I had a meeting to attend. I am always distressed to hear any of my colleagues take potshots at the State which I have the honor in part to represent.

Mr. LAUSCHE. It is not a reflection on California. My discussion relates to the technique which is involved in these projects.

Mr. KUCHEL. How would the Senator explain that technique?

Mr. LAUSCHE. The technique is that the promoters—and this was not the

State of California—submit a proposal which, they say, will involve no cost. Then by the time they get through it runs into millions of dollars.

Mr. KUCHEL. Does the Senator from Ohio suggest that any bad faith was attached to any of the estimates of cost in this instance?

Mr. LAUSCHE. The initial figures were made without an honest calculation. So far as the California proposition is concerned, in the case of transportation inexcusable mistakes were made until experts were called in to figure really what the cost would be. I am now talking of the promoters of the proposal, not the ones who ultimately undertook to finish it.

Mr. KUCHEL. When the International Olympics Committee decided to hold the Winter Olympics in Squaw Valley, Calif., would the Senator say they were misled in arriving at that decision?

Mr. LAUSCHE. No; they were glad to come to the United States; there is no question about that. I am glad the Olympics are to be held in California. What I desire is that in the approach to these matters there be some advance, careful calculation made, with a view to getting reliable figures of what the ultimate cost will be.

Mr. KUCHEL. I respect the able Senator from Ohio and the constructive purpose he seeks to serve in demonstrating that what is needed, on all levels of government spending is to consider most carefully the basis upon which appropriations are asked for. However, I think he and I, together with other Members of the Senate, unanimously agree that it is good for amicable relations between the people of the United States and the people of the rest of the world that the next Olympic contests will be held in this country. The fact that they will be held in one State rather than in another is simply an irrelevant fact.

It is on the same basis that I supported appropriate legislation for Squaw Valley, when it was before Congress that I look with favor on the bill now before the Senate.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I ask to have printed at this point in the RECORD the text of articles relating to this subject published in the Saturday Evening Post of February 22, 1958, and Time magazine of February 9, 1959.

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

[From the Saturday Evening Post, Feb. 22, 1958]

THE GREAT WINTER OLYMPICS FIGHT

(By Melvin Durslag)

The committee arranging the solemn closing ceremony of the 1956 winter Olympic games at Cortina d'Ampezza, Italy, was beset suddenly with panic. Olympic tradition calls for the mayor of the host city for the next games to sit among the dignitaries on the rostrum. But no such official was on hand from Squaw Valley, Calif., the site of the 1960 winter Olympics.

An excited Italian raced into the stands and tugged at the arm of John J. Garland, American member of the International Olympic Committee. "Come quickly," the Italian cried. Garland hurried to the rostrum and was pushed into the vacant chair. The ceremony proceeded and the 1956 winter games concluded, with no explanation being offered of why a stand-in was needed for the mayor of Squaw Valley.

Actually, it happens that Squaw Valley doesn't have a mayor. For that matter, it has no policemen, no post office, no gasoline station. It doesn't have much of anything except some strikingly scenic mountains, oceans of snow, and gobs of troubles.

Through a dazzling display of salesmanship by one of Squaw Valley's 30 registered voters the 1960 winter Olympics had been given to an area which doesn't appear on most maps. Indeed, except for a sprinkling of ardent ski enthusiasts who have discovered the pristine charm of Squaw Valley and tested its wondrous alpine slopes, there were few people even in California who had heard of it, let alone seen it.

Squaw Valley stretches only 3 miles long by a half mile wide. It is located in an obscure spot on the eastern side of the Sierras, adjacent to Lake Tahoe and 45 miles southwest of Reno, Nev. Squaw Valley is a place of quiet, simple beauty, but since the moment 3 years ago when it was picked by the International Olympic Committee as the scene of the 1960 winter games, it has been a whirlpool of strife and controversy.

The balloting had hardly concluded before a spokesman for Innsbruck, Austria, which finished second in the voting, hurled a charge of political connivance. A delegate from Saint-Moritz, Switzerland, which was also in the running, described the Squaw Valley bid as a cunning land-and-hotel scheme. Even Avery Brundage, of Chicago, the president of the International Olympic Committee, warned Squaw Valley that the wherewithal for staging the Olympics had better be forthcoming immediately, or he would recommend that its right to hold the games be forfeited.

Skiing and sledding groups joined the detractors. And to add to the complications, the principal landowner in the valley, some of whose property is needed for the games, refused to sell. A hot court battle is pending.

The bringing of the winter Olympics—and all attendant troubles—to Squaw Valley was accomplished by a nimble-witted promoter named Alexander Cushing, who has been called "a Mike Todd in snowshoes." On December 23, 1954, Cushing, then 41, sat reading the morning paper in his mountain home in Squaw Valley. A dispatch from the East put his memory machinery into motion. The U.S. Olympic Committee, he read, was hearing bids in New York City from various winter sports centers which were eager to become the American nominee as host for the 1960 winter Olympics. The more Cushing thought about it, the more he was convinced that the games belonged in Squaw Valley.

His enthusiasm wasn't dampened by the fact that Squaw Valley's facilities consisted of (a) 1 ski lift, (b) 2 rope tows and (c) 1 small lodge. Nor did he worry that the nearest place for groceries, aspirin, and mail was 7 miles away, at the village of Tahoe City. These were drawbacks, he felt, that could be easily surmounted.

More important in his view were the natural attributes of Squaw Valley, which he considered the finest in the world for winter sports. The flawless wind-free skiing and the clean, fresh air of the valley had enchanted Cushing at first sight, back in 1947. A socially prominent New Yorker, a Harvard graduate—by way of Groton—and a prominent attorney, he chucked his career in law and brought his wife and three children to Squaw Valley in order to enter, of all things, the ski-resort business.

He obtained 574 acres of land from Wayne Poulsen, a Pan American World Airways pilot, and Martin Arrouge, ski-instructor husband of former Actress Norma Shearer. Then Cushing built a lodge and ski lift with $400,000 he raised among his eastern friends. Laurance Rockefeller and John (Jock) McLean were among those who became major stockholders in 1948 in the newly formed Squaw Valley Development Co.

Now, in December of 1954, the problem at hand for Cushing, president of the development company, was how to realize his brainstorm of landing the 1960 winter Olympics. "I didn't know the first thing about procedure on this sort of matter," he says, "so I phoned the U.S. Olympic Committee in New York. The man I talked to finally told me to prepare a presentation, not exceeding 45 minutes, which the committee would hear at 8 a.m. on January 10. You can see I had to work fast."

Cushing began by getting the backing of Gov. Goodwin Knight and the U.S. Senators from California, THOMAS KUCHEL and William Knowland. "None of them thought I had a chance," says Cushing, "but they naturally couldn't go on record saying they were against the winter Olympics coming to California. All gave me an endorsement."

FIRST MILLION STATE

The next step was to get a promise of financial backing from the California Legislature. For this project, he enlisted the help of State Senator Harold T. Johnson, of Placer County, in which Squaw Valley is located. Cushing extolled the endless benefits that Placer County would reap from a winter Olympics. He assured the senator that the cost would be nominal. Johnson introduced a bill in the State legislature that would appropriate $1 million for the winter games—if Cushing should be able to bring them to California.

Thus armed, the one-man delegation from Squaw Valley was off for New York to make his pitch against such widely publicized contenders as Sun Valley, Idaho; Lake Placid, N.Y.; and Aspen, Colo. Other candidates included Reno, Nev., and Anchorage, Alaska.

Cushing is a tall, distinguished-looking man who appears completely at home in the sports jacket and slacks in which he is usually attired. He is a cool, imposing speaker. His words flow evenly, and they hit with the clear ring of fine crystal. In his presentation before the U.S. Olympics Committee, he talked eloquently of Squaw Valley's beauty and its magnificent slopes, which offer skiing with all exposures to the sun. Squaw Valley's unique layout, he continued, was such that spectators, all of whom would be quartered in surrounding areas, could commute for each day's events and empty out at night, leaving the valley free of constant congestion. Finally, he assured the committee that all resources needed for staging the games had been pledged by the State of California, whose hospitality had no peer.

Much to the shock of winter-sports authorities around the Nation, not to mention Cushing's rivals, Squaw Valley was chosen as the U.S. candidate. Snorted a delegate from Lake Placid, "If you ask me, the whole place"—Squaw Valley—"is a figment of Cushing's imagination."

The selection came as a surprise even to Cushing. "Up to then, I was going mostly on palaver," he says today. "I had won the first round, but the big problem was still ahead—how to sell Squaw Valley to the foreigners."

The final choice was to be made by the International Olympics Committee at a meeting in Paris in June. The Winter Olympics are traditionally a European proposition. Of the seven winter games staged in the past, six have been awarded to Europe and one to Lake Placid. Since 1936 European athletes have dominated the Winter Olympics. The honors at Cortina were divided largely among Russians, Austrians, Swiss, and Scandinavians. The United States won in only two divisions, the men's and women's figure skating.

Cushing felt that, although he could do nothing to improve the skill of our winter-sports athletes, he at least could arrange for

them to lose on their own soil. He went back to Placer County. Victory, he assured officials there, was now within sight. They came up with $12,000. From the Southern California Committee for the Olympic Games he got $2,000 more, even though southern Californians aren't ordinarily in the habit of encouraging promotions in the northern part of the State. The remainder of a $50,000 war chest was donated by the Squaw Valley Development Co., whose stockholders were convinced by Cushing that opportunity at last was knocking to put Squaw Valley on the map.

Money matters now out of the way, Cushing departed for Europe to make his reconnaissance of the opposition. Other cities bidding for the 1960 winter games were Austria's Innsbruck, Switzerland's Saint-Moritz, and Garmisch-Partenkirchen in West Germany. Since previous Olympics had been awarded to Saint-Moritz and Garmisch, the overwhelming favorite this time was Innsbruck.

In Europe, Cushing met a veteran foreign correspondent for the Chicago Daily News, George Weller. The picture that Cushing painted of Squaw Valley was so intriguing and his arguments for bringing the games there so convincing that Weller was moved to volunteer his services—if his editor in Chicago was agreeable.

Returning to America, Cushing went directly to the offices of the Chicago Daily News. In no time at all, he persuaded executive editor Basil Walters to keep Weller on the Daily News payroll while letting him work gratis for Squaw Valley. Cushing and Weller began to plan their strategy. To offset the strong support that would go to Innsbruck from Austria's neighbors and from anti-American strongholds behind the Iron Curtain, they figured they needed votes from nations that generally don't concern themselves with the Winter Olympics. Cushing and Weller decided they could best secure votes by personal contact with Olympic committeemen. They divided up the world. Weller would go to South America and the Caribbean, heading from there to the Scandinavian countries. Cushing would salvage what he could in Western Europe.

Their strongest talking point, they figured, was Squaw Valley's physical layout, which for the first time would make it possible for all the Winter Olympics events to be seen in the same place. At Cortina in 1956, for instance, the skating was held in a village 18 miles away, and the ski jump in another village 3 miles distant. In Squaw Valley, every event either would finish or be staged in its entirety in the one area.

OLYMPICS VILLAGE

A second selling point was the idea of having a Winter Olympics village for the athletes. This was another first. Participants in the summer games are always quartered in the privacy of their own village, but the winter competitors usually live in public hotels, where, as Cushing puts it, "other guests drink beer and raise hell until all hours."

A third argument for Squaw Valley was the need for holding the Winter Olympics in a new locale—namely, among the Pacific family of nations. Satisfied that their case was sound, Weller departed for South America and Cushing left for Europe, enlisting the help en route of a Harvard classmate named Marshall Hazeltine, a polished expert in the field of public relations.

"Hazeltine is what you'd call a top-level man," says Cushing proudly. "He attended Eton, has worked on diplomatic missions abroad for our State Department and has excellent contacts all over Europe. He also speaks French, Italian, and German fluently."

By the time the Squaw Valley triumvirate reached Paris for the meeting of the International Olympic Committee, they had a dossier on each of the 62 delegates attending. They had also obtained an endorsement from President Eisenhower, who had signed a joint resolution, passed by Congress, inviting the world to Squaw Valley.

Each group bidding for the Olympics was granted 30 minutes in which to state its case before the committee. In preparing the all-important speech, Cushing, Weller, and Hazeltine realized that Squaw Valley's chief weakness was the scarcity of facilities there. Considering the $1 million budget, there was no prospect of startling improvements. However, they conceived a way of converting this liability into a sales asset.

"It came to us like a vibration from heaven," says Cushing. "Psychologically, this was our knockout punch. We would plead poverty—poor-mouth it all over the place. When had Americans ever admitted abroad that they had nothing? We wouldn't try to compete with the rich European resorts, which would stage the games with Roman grandeur. Ours would be a healthy, unadorned games in a clean, simple atmosphere, free from commercial pressure and public interference."

And so the Squaw Valley bid officially was dedicated to "Restoring the Olympic ideal to the winter games." Cushing and Weller decided that the speech might have added impact if delivered by Hazeltine in French, the language of the revered founder of the modern Olympics, the late Pierre de Coubertin.

Hazeltine, a man of quiet charm, spoke impressively to the delegation for 22 minutes. In the remaining 8 minutes Cushing delivered a crisp summary in which he emphasized that the cost of sending athletes to Squaw Valley would not be high. He guaranteed that transportation on a charter arrangement and 3 weeks of room and board with decent accommodations would not exceed $500 for any athlete.

On the first ballot cast by the committee, Squaw Valley, aided by strong South American support, polled a surprising 30 votes, as opposed to 24 for Innsbruck, 6 for Saint Moritz, and 2 for Garmisch. Squaw Valley and Innsbruck moved to the finals. To most observers, it seemed a foregone conclusion that the Europeans who had backed Saint Moritz and Garmisch would now swing their votes to Innsbruck. On the second ballot, however, Squaw Valley won by a count of 32 votes to 30, the closest finish in I.O.C. history.

Innsbruck took the defeat hard. Not impressed by the Squaw Valley platform of friendly but humble games, the Innsbruck newspaper editorialized tartly. "The rich Americans may have won, but the Olympic ideal has been defeated."

In California there were jubilant headlines. Champagne toasts were drunk to Cushing, the supersalesman. Then the roof fell in. The State quickly discovered that it had a sputtering bobcat by the tail.

COST PER ATHLETE

To begin with, Cushing's guarantee to the IOC of a $500 maximum cost per athlete for travel and living expenses turned out to be a slight miscalculation. State experts figured the bill at $725 per athlete. This meant a total cost to California of $270,000, because, as an official of the California Olympic Commission explains, "Rather than renege on a guarantee, we will make up the difference."

BUDGET UP TO $4 MILLION

Secondly, the $1 million originally allocated for the games proved a noticeably short figure. Cushing's revised estimate came to $2,400,000. When State architects and engineers got busy and started totaling up such sums as $2 million for an ice arena, $440,000 for a sewer system and $300,000 for flood control, the cost quickly expanded to $4 million.

When it was found that the ice arena would cost a million more than originally expected, and the next total estimate came to $5 million, the California Legislature rebelled. Some members suggested it would be sinful to take the Winter Olympics away from such a garden spot as Innsbruck. Many taxpayers agreed.

There was, however, the matter of California pride, not to mention the endorsements of the President, Congress and Governor Knight. The feeling soon grew in the California Olympic Commission and the Olympic Organizing Committee, both appointed by Governor Knight, that if anything was worth sponsoring in California, it was worth sponsoring in a manner befitting the State's reputation. They eventually won out in a hard fight over the economy-minded faction.

UP TO $8 MILLION

Right now the cost of the games has risen to $8 million, and with heavy expenditures still in sight. Squaw Valley has asked Congress for a $3,800,000 appropriation. (Note: not due for action until April.)

H. D. Thoreau, executive secretary of the commission, explains, "To justify all the spending for the Winter Olympics, it has been decided to make a State park in Squaw Valley of all the land on which the State is doling out money for improvements. To do this, the original $5 million investment must be protected by expenditure of an additional $3 million to convert the area into a permanent installation."

The idea of a State park for winter and summer recreation is acceptable to most taxpayers in California, but not to the biggest landowner in Squaw Valley, Wayne Poulsen, who has opposed the plan from the outset. Of the 1,200 acres that Poulsen holds in the area—valley and hillside—the State wants to buy 63½ and lease 129 for 2 years. This land is an indispensable part of the proposed 480-acre winter Olympics tract.

For 2 years, Poulsen refused to sell. When he finally agreed last fall, he demanded a price so high that the State balked. At the time, the State had wanted to buy 73½ acres for which it offered $103,000. Unblinkingly, Poulsen made a counter offer of $440,000, whereupon the State invoked the law of eminent domain and carried the case to Placer County court. Since the State has amended its complaint, asking for only 63½ acres, plus other land for lease, the court must now determine an equitable price. The court is due to take up the case sometime this month or next.

Of the California Olympic Commission's many headaches, Poulsen currently rates as No. 1. A quiet, sturdy man of 41 with a penchant for the outdoors, Poulsen flies the polar route for Pan American from San Francisco to London. As a ski fan and hunter, he first came to Squaw Valley in 1938, shortly after his graduation from the University of Nevada. He began to buy acreage on credit, acquiring tiny parcels at a time. After World War II, he and his wife, Sandy, and their five children moved permanently to the valley, occupying a tent until they could build a home.

To the best of Poulsen's knowledge, he and his family were the first full-time residents there since the gold prospectors cleared out in the 1840's. Remains of the mining villages of Claraville and Knoxville can still be seen at the east end of the valley, through which the old Emigrant Trail passed, leading across the Sierras. It was only a few miles away that members of the Donner party perished in 1846.

The Poulsens have dreamed for years of developing Squaw Valley into a charming alpine-type community—a sort of small-scale Saint-Moritz. Poulsen cringes at the thought of a State park. Envisioning campers, hamburger stands, souvenir hawkers, and the like on land where he had planned

his dream village, he has fought the State doggedly.

POULSEN NAMES $3 MILLION KILLING

California officials, however, are resolute in their feeling that one man's real estate ambitions shouldn't take precedence over the public welfare. P. K. Macker, assistant to the president of the organizing committee, adds: "Despite himself, Poulsen will become rich off the Olympics. They will considerably increase the value of his land"—the bulk of which is not directly involved. "He should make a $3 million killing."

Poulsen's opposition isn't all that the State has had to cope with lately. It has a major rhubarb on its hands, with the International Federation of Bobsledders and Tobagganers, which is protesting the elimination of bobsledding from the Squaw Valley program. Olympic rules specify that no single event need be staged unless entries have been received from at least 12 nations. Since fewer than that number answered in a poll that they would compete in the bobsledding, Squaw Valley seized the opportunity to drop the event, thereby saving the $750,000 cost of building a bobsled run.

Says Alan Bartholemy, technical director of the Squaw Valley games, "The federation has demanded we build the bob run, under threat of exposing us to the world as American cheapskates." The Amateur Athletic Union of this country has joined in asking that bobsledding be offered.

The Russians, too, have been unhappy. They have roared their indignation over fingerprinting requirements made of all foreigners entering this country. The California Olympic Commission has asked Congress to waive the McCarran-Walter Immigration Act for all Olympic athletes.

Further concessions are needed for Russian satellite countries not recognized by our State Department. Caught in a crossfire between the International Olympic Committee, which does not acknowledge political differences, and Senator JOHN BUTLER, of Maryland, who has demanded that the satellites be barred, Squaw Valley has appealed to John Foster Dulles to admit all nations which wish to compete in the games. Barring any world upheaval, Dulles has promised to comply.

Meanwhile, trying to balance a budget that is shaking precariously, Squaw Valley is still moving ahead with preparations for an elaborate Olympics. "We have spent $200,000 for expert advice alone," says Bartholemy. "We will probably have the finest and most novel winter games of all time."

At this stage, four ski courses have been completed in Squaw Valley, and foundations laid for new buildings. Land has been graded for the ice arena and a hillside cleared for the ski jumps. Work has been finished, too, on a $155,000 ski chair. As a flood-control measure, engineers have also begun the rerouting of Squaw Creek, which runs through the heart of the valley's meadowland, where much of the proceedings will take place.

When snow melts this spring, the bulk of the construction, delayed a year by Poulsen's land fight, will start at an accelerated pace. This is the first winter Olympics ever planned from the ground up. In the past, Olympic construction has been mostly superimposed by the host cities upon existing facilities. But almost everything at Squaw Valley will be new, including a sprawling Olympic village, which will quarter some 1,200 athletes, trainers, and coaches from 35 nations.

The village will overlook a scenic 10-acre artificial lake, for which ground will soon be removed. About 500 yards away will be built the ice arena, center of Olympic activities. From there, a walk of no more than 200 yards will bring one to any event. It won't be necessary to go even that far to see what's taking place because, from a comfortable seat in the heated arena, spectators will be able to watch the show flashed on a giant screen by closed-circuit television. Camera towers to be built along the Alpine and Nordic ski courses will bring viewers a picture of the races in progress.

For not-so-hardy members of the press, who don't relish an invigorating trudge in the snow, there also will be closed-circuit television in the lavish press center, adjacent to the ice arena. This structure, complete with restaurant, cocktail lounge, snackbars, and locker rooms, will accommodate 600 working writers.

Other new facilities will include a speed-skating rink, 3 hockey rinks, 3 ski jumps, a ski chair, several restaurants, cafeterias, warming huts, and a network of spectator centers, all equipped with closed-circuit TV.

Squaw Valley has made arrangements with the Navy to conduct snow-compaction tests this year to determine whether automobiles could be parked in the meadowland. If this doesn't prove feasible, a unique traffic plan has been worked out whereby private cars will be barred from the valley entirely. The expected 30,000 people per day will be shuttled instead by 250 busses, leaving every few minutes from the nearby communities of Tahoe City and Truckee. Bus service will be free to those purchasing tickets to the Olympic events.

Alexander Cushing's original theme of restoring the Olympic ideal in a natural setting devoid of embellishments has long since been forgotten. With deep-felt pride, Governor Knight recently told the International Olympic Committee, "In the State of California, there are many monuments to the creative and engineering genius of our citizens * * * We are confident that this same technical skill will lead to construction of winter-sports facilities in Squaw Valley which will greatly exceed the expectations of our visitors who will come to this great event from all parts of the world."

Cushing isn't in the least crushed that most of his poverty-inspired ideas have been discarded in favor of more grandiose plans. "I truthfully don't see the need for such extravagance," he says. "But, as far as I'm concerned, my feelings won't be hurt if they spend $20 million—just as long as all the stories on the games are datelined, 'Squaw Valley.' "

[From Time magazine, Feb. 9, 1959]

BONANZA IN THE WILDERNESS

On the twisting trails that lace the flanks of Vermont's Mount Mansfield, traffic was so heavy that skiers had trouble keeping out of one another's way. On Michigan's Boyne Mountain, colorfully garbed schuss-boomers cheerfully endured long waits to ride lifts up the glistening white mountainside. Restaurants on Colorado's Aspen Mountain were overrun with crowds. Thousands left their sitzmarks on the deep powder slopes of California's Sierras and Washington's Cascade Range. Whenever there was snow, busloads of weekend skiers left New York and Chicago at first light, and in Nevada deserts sweaty cowboys watched mountain-bound cars go by, skis lashed to the roofs.

FROM FANATICS TO FAMILIES

In less than 25 years, skiing has been transformed from an eccentric practice pursued by a handful of fanatic, chilblained young men to the U.S.'s fastest-growing outdoor winter sport. Today, anybody skis—corporation president and office boy, college student and secretary, parents and children. It is no longer a pastime for the well-heeled who could afford to go to Europe to learn. The skiing establishment at Aspen, Colo., is a typical example of what the sport has added to the face of the United States. A broken-down mining settlement as late as 1946, Aspen now boasts some 50 ski lodges, offers a wide range of overnight accommodations, from Ed's Beds ($2.75 and down) to the luxurious new Villa Lamarr ($8 and up), financed by Hedy Lamarr's estranged husband, Howard Lee, and promptly dubbed Hedy's Beddies.

Keys to the U.S.'s ski boom were the rope tow and its more advanced counterpart, the chair lift. The first rope tow, a jury rig powered by a truck engine, was installed at Woodstock, Vt., in 1934, the first chair lift at Sun Valley, Idaho, in 1937. Until then a skier had to be young and determined enough to rise at dawn, spend most of the day trudging up the side of a mountain for the sake of one or two swift descents. The tow made skiing a downhill run all the way.

This winter an estimated 3 million skiers will be out on slopes from Maine's Sugarloaf Mountain to Oregon's Mount Hood. There is skiing in Taos, N. Mex., and on North Carolina's Mount Mitchell, and ski clubs have appeared in Amarillo, Tex., and Louisville, Ky.

SNOW FEVER

Resort owners are convinced that the boom is still young, and are pushing ahead with expansion plans, undismayed by the uncertainties inherent in snow itself—not enough of it in the East, where slopes must be closely tended to preserve what falls, often too much of it in the West, where gun crews must shoot down avalanches to ensure safety and jumbo storms can seal off an area for days. Vermont's Mountain Snow opened the first outdoor swimming pool at an eastern ski resort. California's plush new $1,750,000 inn at Mammoth Mountain was doing a land-office business. Michigan's Boyne Mountain resort was plowing back $250,000 a year into improvements. All in all, there were no fewer than 90 new overhead lifts operating in U.S. areas this winter, and more were on the way.

For the past year, the most feverish of all ski area preparations have been centered in and around a narrow, steep-sided valley high in the California Sierras, 200 miles northeast of San Francisco, 40 miles southwest of Reno, and 6 miles from Lake Tahoe. Despite the snow and cold last week, work crews poured into Squaw Valley to put the finishing touches on four handsome, pastel-shaded dormitories, transform a shell of bright orange girders into a skating rink, built lift towers. Navy snow-compaction teams experimented with tamping down a large meadow to serve as a parking lot. A year from now, some 1,000 athletes and 35,000 spectators from all over the world will jam Squaw Valley daily during the 1960 winter Olympic games; to make sure that all will go right, the State of California and the U.S. Government are pouring millions into a place that only a decade or so ago was wilderness.

TACT AND TACTICS

Squaw Valley's position as a ski resort and Olympics site is the work of a tall (6-foot 5-inch), slat-lean man of eastern socialite background (New York, Newport) and upbringing (Groton, Harvard) named Alexander Cochrane Cushing. With no experience at developing or running such a place, Alec Cushing proceeded purposefully through trial and error at Squaw Valley, made some horrendous mistakes in judgment and tact en route. But he pulled a master coup in wangling the Olympics for his own backyard, a tactic that will leave him, after the Olympics are over, in the center of a $14 million establishment which will put Squaw Valley squarely in the top rank of U.S. ski areas.

Such figures no longer startle ski men, for skiing has become big business. This year skiers will spend an estimated $120 million on accommodations, transportation, lift tickets and equipment. They will pay $5 million for skis, a like amount for pants

and parkas, $4 million for boots. East and West, ski shops reported business at new highs, up as much as 40 percent from last season.

FLOATING AND DEFYING

Ski equipment comes in a wide price range—most of it expensive. Most beginners find themselves impelled to spend at least $150 if they are to feel properly equipped. As for clothes, an old pair of jodhpurs and an old sweater will no longer do. Even the raw novice feels a compulsive need for skintight Bogner stretch pants ($50), quilted parka ($30) and Alpine sweater ($30).

But the dedicated scorn details of money. Sometimes they seem to consider skiing less a sport than a mystical experience. They get rhapsodic when they try to explain the feeling that makes a few hours on a slope worth the long tortuous trip to get there and the possibility of a broken bone. "When I ski," explains one buff, "I feel like a fellow in a dream, floating through the air, defying gravity, conscious only of the hissing of the skis through the snow. The only thing that vaguely resembles the sensation is flying. Unlike any other sport, the skier is completely on his own. Once he begins his descent, no one can help him."

THE CULT

By common consent, skiing is the greatest device for social mixing since the decline of the office party. Among its rituals are the hot buttered rum around the fireplace in the evening, the songs, the exchange of stories on the day's moment of triumph or disaster. "Where else can two young people get to know each other better than at a ski resort hundreds of miles from home?" asks one resort owner. "A girl can look real cute in a ski outfit, especially in those stretch pants," a ski tour director points out.

Skiers develop a language of their own, happily swap such German terms as geländesprung (a jump), schussboomer (one who dashes headlong straight down a slope) and sitzmark (the imprint left in the snow by a fallen skier's hindquarters), refer familiarly to moguls (bumps in the slopes) and snowplows (a novice's slow stop maneuver). Even skiing's hazards provide a bond of sorts. Ski magazine estimates that in an average year one in every ten skiers will injure himself more or less seriously. Every ski lodge boasts its quota of walking wounded. Most innkeepers consider them poor advertising. Grumbles one healthy skier: "They wear their plaster casts like badges of honor. As a comeon, they usually ask you to autograph the cast."

Stalking through his Squaw Valley lodge last week, Alec Cushing signed no plaster casts. He is not the type. He sees no reason for making small talk with people he does not know, feels little of the easy camaraderie that skiers cherish. Most skiers concede a grudging admiration for his salesmanship, immediately follow with the charge that he sold Squaw Valley to the Olympic nations, not on the basis of what was there, but on what he hoped the State would provide. In fact, Cushing at the time owned only one chair lift and just 6 acres of level land on the valley floor. But by the imperatives of terrain, every one of the ski runs ends at his front door step. In effect, he owned home plate, and the authorities could not do without him even if they wanted to.

"I'M TERRIBLE"

Western skiers dislike Cushing because he is Eastern, because he barged into Squaw Valley, ultimately (and legally) took the ski operations there away from a California native who planned the area and owned most of the valley land, and because he has the annoying habit of walking precipitously away from a guest, leaving a conversation dangling in midsentence. Says the wife of a neighboring resort owner: "I'd like to like Cushing, but he's so rude. We've been introduced 26 times, and he never remembers me." Admits Cushing: "I'm terrible with the public. I don't like that professional oily quality, but I guess I'm wrong. People at resorts like to say the owner talked to them. Here they say, 'That sonofabitch Cushing didn't speak to me for the 13th consecutive day.'"

To his friends, and to strangers when he wants something from them, Cushing can display a formidable charm, and a determination that is awesome. But Alec Cushing had a certain rudeness about him from the beginning. "He was a beautiful baby," recalls his older sister, Mrs. Lily Cushing Boyd. "He was also the most determined boy you ever saw. Whenever people came up and went 'itchykoo' at him, Alexander would lie back and bark like a sea lion." He was born to wealth. His grandfather, Robert M. Cushing, was an old Boston tea merchant. His father was a talented painter, died when Alec was 4. Young Cushing grew up in New York and Newport luxury. A gangling, tree-tall adolescent with a huge head topped by unruly red hair, Alec inevitably got the nickname "Pin," learned to play tennis well enough to reach the quarter-finals of the Newport Invitational when he was 16. He prepared for the match (against Wilmer Allison) by drinking till dawn, then amazed himself by taking a 4 to 1 lead in the second set. At this point his hangover caught up with him. Says Cushing: "I had a total blackout. When I tried to throw the ball up for service, I almost went flat on my face. At least that's my story. My friends say Allison looked at his watch, noticed that it was nearly lunchtime, and quickly ran off five straight games."

At Groton, the gangling Cushing was a good-hit, no-field first baseman. ("I couldn't bend over far enough to get to ground balls"), did the crudest kind of skiing (classmates recall he was forever stepping out of his bindings, losing skis on the slightest of hills). At Harvard he played squash, flopped at crew ("I learned a wrist trick—a way of making a big puddle without actually pulling hard. The coach caught me one afternoon, stopped the boat and took me off").

As a matter of course, he made the Porcellian Club. Summers he traveled abroad, became expert at living like a first-class passenger on a third-class ticket. On one voyage, he ingratiated himself with Boxing Manager Joe (I should have stood in bed) Jacobs before the ship left the dock, spent most of the trip playing poker on A-deck with Jacobs, Max Schmeling, and Morton Downey. In his sophomore year Alec decided summer trips were too short, set out to get his degree in 3 years, didn't quite make it (he lacked one-half unit), but managed a 9-month tour of the Far East (on which he visited with Fred Astaire) while his classmates labored back in Cambridge.

Graduating in 1936, Cushing cast around for something to do, decided to go to Harvard Law School. "I had no particular love for the law," he admits, "but the alternative was going to work."

MATTER OF CONTACTS

Before he left Harvard Law, Cushing married blonde, blue-eyed Justine Cutting, socialite daughter of Dr. Fulton Cutting, of New York, professor of physics at New Jersey's Stevens Institute. His closest friend (and fellow Porcellian), Alexander McFadden, had married Justine's older sister. All through his life Alex Cushing has known important people, and casually made the most of his contacts. Desultorily looking for a job, Cushing ran into his old Groton classmate, Stewart Alsop, through him got an interview with Justice Department Trust-buster Thurman Arnold, who promptly hired him.

With the outbreak of war, Cushing was commissioned in the Navy ("I figured I'd get drafted anyway"). Assigned as a troubleshooter for Naval Air Transport Service, he traveled to all war theaters, worked as he never had before.

On one occasion he flew to Brazil, found a Naval transport station sorely in need of dockage equipment. Ironically, the very equipment needed was stored only four miles away but assigned to the Rubber Development Corporation. Federal law forbade transfer to the Navy, so Cushing decided the law needed changing. He flew back to Washington, went to Secretary of the Navy James Forrestal, got his backing, helped prepare the legislation, all in one stretch of 60 hours without sleep. The bill passed, but the strain proved too much. He collapsed, wound up in Bethesda Naval Hospital.

THE NUT WARD

"When I came to," he recalls, "I was in the nut ward. My face was totally paralyzed. My eyes were frozen open. The nurses had to tape them shut at night so I could get to sleep." From his bout with hard work, Lieut. Commander Cushing was left with a partial paralysis of the left side of his face that still pulls down the corner of his mouth, gives him a quizzical look. He was philosophical ("There was not a damn thing I could do about it, so what was the use of worrying?") At war's end he went back to the law (in Wall Street), stuck it out for two years, quit in boredom ("The war taught me life could be exciting".)

TRAGEDY

Cushing first saw Squaw Valley in 1946, hiked into it (there was no road then) with a likable skier and Pan American World Airways pilot named Wayne Poulsen, who had bought up much of the valley's land. Over the bridge table that night, Alex cautiously asked his wife: "How would you like to live in these mountains?" Justine did not look up from her cards. "Are you out of your mind, Cushing?" she inquired icily. But 2 years later the Cushings and the McFaddens headed west once more to check on Squaw as a possible ski resort. They never got there. Skiing down a dangerous slope at Aspen with two experienced skiers one morning, the two brothers-in-law were trapped when a huge avalanche cut loose above them. Cushing was buried to his neck. Alexander McFadden died under tons of snow. The death of his closest friend was a profound shock to Cushing, still reduces him to sobs whenever he tells the story.

Despite the tragedy, Cushing was obsessed with opening a ski area, went into partnership with Airman Poulsen to develop Squaw in June 1948. Poulsen supplied the land—640 acres—and Cushing the money—$400,000. Alec and Justine invested $145,000 of their own, got $50,000 from Laurance Rockefeller, the rest from other friends.

Poulsen and Cushing had differences almost from the start. Cushing allowed Poulsen to reserve 42 acres of land for homesites, found belatedly that Squaw Valley Development Corp. was left with only 6 acres of level ground. Cushing wanted to operate restaurant, bar, and lodging facilities at Squaw. Poulsen wanted to lease them out. Cushing went ahead anyway, bought a set of old Air Force barracks, had them trucked into the valley, put the corporation in the hotel business.

TROUBLE

In Squaw's first 5 years of operation, avalanches ripped out lift towers three times.

The lodge was cut off four times by bridge washouts, flooded out twice, later (in 1956) burned to the ground. Poulsen and Cushing had increasingly sharp differences. The showdown came in October 1949, when, in

Poulsen's absence on an international flight for Pan Am, his wife, Sandy, fired off letters to Squaw stockholders accusing Cushing of mismanagement. A stockholders' meeting was called, and the result was inevitable, since Cushing owned 52 percent of the stock, his friends another 46 percent. After an audit showed nothing legally wrong, Cushing replaced Poulsen as president of Squaw Valley Development. Today, a bitter Poulsen still controls choice homesites in the valley (and stands to become a millionaire with the land boom caused by Cushing's getting the Olympics), but Cushing and the corporation have exclusive ski rights, since they possess the only lift permit allotted to the area by the U.S. Forest Service.

The opening of Squaw Valley Lodge on Thanksgiving Day, 1949, was a memorable fiasco. Cushing had to hire strikebreakers when his union workmen struck the week of the opening, hooked up plumbing himself. Justine hurriedly summoned the domestic couple from their New York home, pressed a friend into service as a chambermaid. One woman guest arrived early, found Cushing still at work on the plumbing. Snarled Alec: "Madam, come back in 3 hours, and we'll be ready. Meanwhile, don't bother me." That night everything went wrong. There was no dinner until 10. Only one toilet was working, and the waiting line for it snaked out into the lobby. One of Cushing's daughters tripped, broke her leg. A guest ran over one of his dogs. The whole thing was, to use Cushing's word, ghastly.

TO GET SPACE

One day in 1954, a two-paragraph item in the San Francisco Chronicle caught Alec Cushing's eye. Reno had bid for the Olympic games. Cushing had only one chair lift at Squaw then, but he decided to apply, too. "I had no more interest in getting the games than the man in the moon," he admits. "It was just a way of getting some newspaper space." The space he got in west coast papers brought a flood of encouraging letters, made up Cushing's mind: "When I got letters from all those people saying what a nice thing I was doing, it made me feel bad."

There were only 6 weeks in which to ready Squaw Valley's bid for consideration as the U.S. nominee to stage the games. Cushing moved quickly, enlisted the support of California State Senator Harold ("Biz") Johnson and Governor Goodie Knight, got the legislators to revive an old bill that had promised Los Angeles money to back its successful 1932 summer Olympics bid, pass a new version to guarantee $1 million for Squaw. Old friend and Squaw stockholder (5 percent) Laurance Rockefeller gave his support. With evidence of financial backing, a hastily prepared brochure and a charming dissertation on Squaw ("I'm a very strong speaker when I'm convinced"), Cushing sold the U.S. committee. His next target was the delegates to the Paris meeting of the International Olympic Committee, who would decide the site of the games.

THE TRIUMVIRATE

For the selling job, Cushing called on two fellow Harvardmen for help: George Weller, globetrotting reporter for the Chicago Daily News, and Marshall Haseltine, urbane expatriate who lived in Europe. Weller got a leave of absence to work with Cushing. He drove into Squaw Valley over the rutted dirt road from State Highway 89, took one horrified look and decided on the spot that the pitch had to be a return to Olympic ideals of togetherness and simplicity, in contrast to Europe's ornate resorts.

Applicants' brochures were customarily printed in English, French, and German. Weller noted that "only two countries spoke German, and they both wanted the Olympics in their own area," ordered Spanish substituted for German to please Latin American delegates. Weller embarked on a 4-month tour of South America to emphasize the advantages of an Olympics in the Western Hemisphere. His next trip was to Scandinavia, where he plugged the idea of a simple Olympics to thrifty Swedes and Norwegians. Cushing and Haseltine took on other European International Olympic Committee representatives.

THE SOFT SELL

By the time the crucial meeting convened in Paris, Cushing and Company had made personal contact with 42 of the 62 delegates. The three Americans hung out unobtrusively in cocktail bars frequented by delegates, never pushed themselves, but were always available. Cushing had ordered a huge (7-foot by 12-foot) relief model of Squaw Valley at a cost of $2,800, had it shipped to Paris for $3,000. The monster proved so big it would not fit through the door of the International Olympic Committee exhibit room, but after lodging was found for it down the street delegates went out of their way to go see it, thereby giving the Americans a chance to practice the soft sell away from competing exhibits.

Despite all the groundwork, the outlook was not bright for Squaw when the meeting opened. Huffed a German delegate to Cushing: "Don't think you are going to parlay one ski lift into an Olympic Game." Even a U.S. delegate sneered: "Who's going to vote for you? I'm not." Austria's Innsbruck was Squaw's chief competitor, and seemed a sure winner when one of the delegates charged that Squaw was totally unprepared to stage an Olympics, furthermore should be disqualified because it was not a town (it still is not). Summoned to the meeting room for an explanation, Cushing turned on the charm. There should be no fears about readying an Olympic plant at Squaw, he argued. After all, there were 4 years in which to build it, said he, and had not the governments of both California and the U.S. endorsed Squaw's bid? As for the town technicality, "We're all sportsmen here, not politicians." Squaw Valley won the bid, 32–30 over Innsbruck, on the second ballot.

CONFLICT OF INTERESTS

Triumphantly Cushing returned to the United States, ran head-long into a stern warning from the International Olympic Committee's crusty chairman, Avery Brundage: Cushing, you are going to set back the Olympic movement 25 years. For a time, it appeared that Brundage had something. Cushing could count on the piddling $1 million voted by the State, but even in his most poor-mouth moment, he never envisioned that the games could be staged for less than $2 million.

Somehow he managed to inveigle a group of prominent Californians to serve as a watchdog commission over the steadily expanding State expenditures at Squaw. He became president of the Olympic Organizing Committee that had been set up to stage the games. The conflict of interests was obvious at once to everyone but Cushing. He stubbornly insisted that Cushing the Olympics promoter and Cushing the resort owner could lead separate lives, finally stepped down in December 1955 as cries mounted for his scalp.

THE PRICE GOES UP

The new committee chairman, tough-talking Prentis Cobb Hale, head of a West Coast department-store chain, promptly told Cushing to go back to Squaw and keep his nose out of Olympic business. "He treated me like a criminal," complains Cushing. "He gave orders that none of his employees were to talk to me when they came up here." Saddled with making good on Cushing's extravagant promises to the Olympic nations, purposeful Prentis Hale brooked no nonsense, made few friends, but ultimately got results.

An architect's survey determined that there would have to be sewage and flood-control facilities, access roads, an ice-skating stadium and practice rinks, a ski jump area, at least three new lifts. On top of that, dormitories would have to be built. Total estimated cost: at least $8 million. Hale got $4 million from the legislature, had to go back for $2,990,000 more. When the State finally balked, he got $4 million from the Federal Government.

The Olympic program for Squaw Valley is rolling along on schedule. The 3,300-foot lift for slalom runs is finished; another up Squaw Peak is under construction. The dormitories are virtually complete, the jump is ready, administration buildings are up, the skating arena is well along. At the State's insistence, Cushing has built a spectacular new 5,000-foot lift up the side of Squaw Peak's neighbor, KT–22.

HOME FROM HOT DOGS

Cushing's own property stands at the focus of the Olympic activity area. He has survived criticism and natural catastrophe with great aplomb. The burned-out lodge has been replaced, is now an adequate blue-pastel structure featuring a radiant-heated outdoor dining terrace and candlelit cocktail lounge in which jazz pianist Ralph Sutton displays his talents. Critics still complain that Cushing begrudges many comforts, that his sleeping quarters are still far from first class, overpriced ($18 a day) and resound to every footfall. Cushing admits that his accommodations could be better, will decide after the Olympics just how to improve them.

The Cushings live just 100 yards from the lodge, in what once was a hot dog stand in the resort's early days. It has been converted and expanded into a comfortable, split-level home, featuring bright crimson walls and ceilings in the main living area. Here Alec and Justine can relax with their three daughters—Justine, 18 (at Radcliffe College); Lily, 15 (at swank Foxcroft in Virginia); and Alexandra, 10, who attends school in nearby Truckee.

Though he will have no direct stake in the Olympics (the State will run his lodge and lifts during the games), Alec Cushing is in sight of the big payoff. He has contracts for a 10-year lease on the new lifts the State is building. A new superhighway to the valley entrance from Reno and San Francisco will make it easier than ever to get there. Later this month, as a testament to the revitalized valley, the North American skiing championships will be held there for the first time.

Cushing stands at his front doorstep, gazes fondly at his lodge, at the Olympic work progressing all around him, listens contentedly to the soft whirring of the lifts. His blue eyes roam up and down the white, pine-pocked slopes. He smiles faintly, "We should do pretty well here from now on," he says, "unless we hack things up—and we probably will."

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, the principal purpose of having these articles printed in the RECORD is to show how an inconsequential project, from the standpoint of money, grew into a multimillion-dollar expenditure. I shall not ask for a yea-and-nay vote on the bill, I may say to the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], but I want the RECORD to show that on the basis of the method chosen for developing the program, I shall not vote for the bill.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I appreciate the statement, characteristically honest in nature, of the Senator from Ohio. While

it is true that the consent of the State Department was not obtained by Chicago prior to the initiation of the invitations, the approval of that Department has since been obtained, and the President of the United States has agreed to act as honorary chairman. We are observing all the safeguards which the Senator from Ohio desires, and which were not followed in the case of the Ohio project.

I have no further comment to make. I hope the Senate may proceed to vote on this measure.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I am advised that tomorrow will be the 69th anniversary of the Organization of American States. This organization, which has endured for 69 years, has been instrumental in developing in this hemisphere a great family of 21 nations.

A responsibility rests on every one of these nations to bring into orbit such cultural relations and exchanges of confidence and of good will which will solidify this organization and our relationships with our great and good neighbors to the south.

I think the bill before the Senate, if and when it is passed, as I trust it will be without difficulty very shortly, will bring together a great host of athletes who will come to this country and that their visit will result in an accretion to the reservoir of good will which is so necessary to the cohesive force of an organization of this kind.

Two thousand young athletes would, indeed, be a great missionary force from the republics to the south. I think of this event in terms of the fact that the world and the future belong to youth.

The Apostle Paul once wrote a magnificent sentence in a letter to his young friend whom he had sent forth as a missionary: "Let no man despise thy youth."

Never was I so much impressed with what youth can do in the field of developing good relationships as I was in 1940, when I sat in a bleacher seat on the Avenida Juarez, in Mexico City, and saw a parade which lasted for 14 hours, in which young athletes from all over Mexico participated. It was one of the most impressive sights I ever witnessed.

I could readily understand the great missionary surge which went not only through that great metropolitan center, but also through the people of the country as they sent their players of games of all kinds—football, baseball, track, soccer, and the other games—to compete, in the hope, of course, that their capacities and capabilities would dominate, and that they would come home with the prizes. It was one of those great events which I think helped Mexico over and above anything else to develop a certain stability, a stability which is manifested today.

So I say that the future and the destiny of the world belong to youth. In proportion as we cultivate it, energize it, and encourage it, so we shall serve a great and useful purpose in a world which is still too troubled with too many fevers.

Mr. President, what would be better than to have a great outlet for youthful energies? Competitive games are the natural outlet for the energies of youth. I remember the days when I was on a track team in high school. I once won a bronze medal—it was the lowest award given—in the mile race. I hung that medal on the wall in my home, behind glass, so it would not tarnish; and year after year I used to see it there. I prized it highly. I never was much of an athlete; but when I won third place in the mile run in that county contest, I took the greatest pride in that award; in fact, I think I prized it more than membership in the Senate. Of course things are relative, depending on how old one is.

So I think of the great resurgence of spirit of the part of the athletes who will come to the United States. I also think of the envious young Americans, all over our country, who will be saving their money, in the hope of going to Soldiers Field and seeing what the young men of other countries can do in athletic competition, in the various events—whether in the footraces, the shotput, the pole vault, or whatever other events may be scheduled. So these games will bring a great lift to the young people of our own country, as well. Of course, the the games will also add immeasurably to the great reservoir of good will.

Furthermore, I hope that many of the athletes who come to our country will win. Winning will be of great importance to them and to their countries; and the names of the winners will be emblazoned in the headlines of the newspapers in Rio de Janeiro, Buenos Aires, and the other great cities to the South of us. Mr. President, what a homecoming the winners will receive.

I can think of nothing better for young people and the development of their energies than to participate in these games.

Mr. President, Chicago is the natural place to hold the games. Chicago is a center of transportation, and is a great sports center. Chicago is the home of two great professional football teams, the Bears and the Cardinals. Chicago is also the home of two great professional baseball teams—the Cubs and the White Sox. They have been playing a long, long time. I remember that when I was a youngster in knee pants I used to watch baseball scores coming from Chicago. The fine athletes who attend Northwestern University are there. All in all, Chicago is a great, natural sports center.

Of course, Soldiers Field is located in Chicago. That field is large enough to accommodate the very great convocation of people will will be interested in the games. Soldiers Field will be festooned, decorated, and lighted. The celebration will be one of the great celebrations to be held, and, in my judgment, it will never be forgotten.

The $500,000 the bill authorizes to be appropriated will be nothing more than Federal participation. My colleague, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], has already pointed out the cost of the facilities which will be a charge upon the local authorities of Chicago. But there will be other charges which are not so apparent. For instance, consider the large number of extra policemen who will have to be used for traffic-control purposes, because the city will be filled with visitors when the games are held. There will also be a ceremonial dinner. Someone has to pay for all these things—either the city or the county or the State of Illinois. There are many hidden charges, which we are glad to undertake. In short, the $500,000 will be only a modest appropriation to help defray the cost of lodging, food, and transportation. I do not believe it is too much.

When we went before the Foreign Relations Committee one of our very dear and distinguished colleagues said, "Well, here come those two economists. They have been trying to balance the budget, and now they want $500,000."

Incidentally, Mr. President, before I forget it, let me say that the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] has charged me with stating—in case he could not be present at this time—that he would be against the bill. So, in all good grace, I must say to the Senate that he is against it. I hope he is the only one who is against it—although certainly it is his privilege to be against it. So, Mr. President, if he is unable to be present today, the RECORD will very dutifully and circumspectly note for my esteemed colleague, the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], and for his beloved constituents, that he does not want the $500,000 appropriation to be authorized.

Mr. President, this request is only for Federal participation. I believe that if my colleagues ever have a chance to see a summation of all the expenditures which will be made by the citizens of the city, and by the city itself, and by the county and by the State, they will find that the total will be very great, indeed, and that in proportion to the total the amount we now request will be very small.

So I hope very much the bill will be passed.

Certainly I shall not ask for a record vote; I do not think one is necessary. I trust that in the interest of conserving time a record vote will not be taken.

Let me state that I have cleared this matter with the Bureau of the Budget. I like to be very circumspect in my conduct in the field of economy; so I talked to the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, to ascertain whether this item was cleared; and it was.

I also talked to the State Department, to see whether this proposal has their approval; and it does.

So I think we find ourselves on good ground with respect to the normal budget procedures of government, in making our request in connection with this matter.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BARTLETT in the chair). Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. LONG. Can the Senator from Illinois advise us for how many young men or young men and young women the appropriation envisages their board will be paid?

Mr. DIRKSEN. The number has been figured out, and probably it is only an estimate. I believe it will run into the thousands. So something must be done. I believe they are allowed $3 a day; but we know what prices are today. So something must be done to ease their lot.

I am reminded of the days when I was on a high school football team, and when we journeyed with the team, and had to count our nickels and our pennies. Of course we always used a bus for transportation, and we always took care of our own meals. In those early days that seemed to be a burden, even in the case of a youngster in high school, to whom a penny or a nickel was almost as big as the moon coming up over Rockaway Beach. There was no inflation in those days and for a nickel one could buy in a butcher shop a bone for soup for a fairly large family.

Mr. LONG. I hope the reception the young people from Latin America will receive in our country will be as favorable as the reception accorded our young people when they visited the countries to the south. I have noticed that often the hosts have paid perhaps more than they could afford, in order to make a good impression. So I hope that when the visiting athletes return to their own countries, they will not take with them the conclusion that we did far less for them than they had a right to expect.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Precisely so. I am sure our young people were well received in Buenos Aires, and certainly we should do a good job in this case. Youngsters are at the impressionable age, and we want them to be favorably impressed.

Incidently, Mr. President, not the least important in connection with such an affair are the decorations. It will cost a considerable amount to decorate a place the size of Soldiers Field. For instance, I noticed that when the President of Ireland was in Washington, soon after the parade, almost all the Irish flags disappeared; people took them. So the District of Columbia was that much out of pocket. In short, the decorations for these games will not be the least of the items of cost.

So I trust that this measure will be passed expeditiously, and that we shall take prompt steps in connection with the necessary appropriations, so that these games will be made one of the greatest successes ever held in this hemisphere.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment.

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

The bill was ordered to 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?

The bill (H.R. 2575) was passed.

Mr. DOUGLAS subsequently said: Mr. President, if it is in order, I should like to move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which H.R. 2575 was passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is informed that that may be done by unanimous consent.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I ask unanimous consent that I may make a motion to reconsider the vote by which H.R. 2575 was passed.

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

Mr. DOUGLAS. I now move that the vote by which the bill was passed be reconsidered.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

TELEVISION TRANSMISSION FACILITIES IN PUBLIC SCHOOLS AND COLLEGES

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 52, Senate bill 12.

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

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 12) to expedite the utilization of television transmission facilities in our public schools and colleges, and in adult training programs.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to the consideration of the bill (S. 12) to expediate the utilization of television transmission facilities in our public schools and colleges, and in adult training programs, which had been reported from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce with an amendment, at the top of page 4, to insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. 7. No application for any grant under this Act may be accepted by the Commissioner of Education after the day which is five years after the date of enactment of this Act.

So as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That there is hereby authorized to be appropriated such amounts as may be necessary to assist the States and certain organizations therein to establish or improve television broadcasting for educational purposes, in accordance with the provisions of this Act, by providing for the establishment and improvement of television broadcasting facilities.

SEC. 2. Any agency or officer, or organization in a State, described in clause (b) (2) of this section, which is establishing or improving television broadcasting facilities, may receive a grant as authorized in this Act to cover the cost of such establishment or improvement by—

(a) making application therefor in such form as is prescribed by the United States Commissioner of Education; and

(b) providing assurance satisfactory to the Commissioner of Education—

(1) that the necessary funds to operate and maintain such facilities will be available;

(2) that the operation of such facilities will be under the control of (a) the agency or officer primarily responsible for the State supervision of public elementary and secondary schools, (b) a nonprofit foundation, corporation, or association organized primarily to engage in or encourage educational television broadcasting, (c) a duly constituted State educational television commission, or (d) a State controlled college or university; and

(3) that such facilities will be used only for educational purposes.

SEC. 3. Upon determining that an agency or officer or an organization has satisfied the requirements of section 2 of this Act, the Commissioner of Education is authorized to make a grant to such agency, officer, or organization in such amount as is determined by the Commissioner to be reasonable and necessary to cover the cost of such establishment or improvement of facilities. An agency or officer or an organization may receive one or more grants under the provisions of this Act, but the total amount of such grants for television broadcasting facilities in any State shall not exceed $1,000,000. Such grants shall be made out of funds appropriated for the purposes of this Act, and may be made in such installments as the Commissioner deems appropriate.

SEC. 4. As used in this Act the term "establishing or improving television broadcasting facilities" means the acquisition and installation of transmission apparatus necessary for television (including closed-circuit television) broadcasting, and does not include the construction or repair of structures to house such apparatus, and the term "State" means the several States, the District of Columbia, and the Territory of Hawaii.

SEC. 5. The Federal Communications Commission is authorized to provide such assistance in carrying out the provisions of this Act as may be requested by the Commissioner of Education.

SEC. 6. Nothing in this Act shall be deemed (a) to give the Commissioner of Education any control over television broadcasting, or (b) to amend any provision of, or requirement under, the Federal Communications Act.

SEC. 7. No application for any grant under this Act may be accepted by the Commissioner of Education after the day which is five years after the date of enactment of this Act.

MINERAL RIGHTS IN CERTAIN HOMESTEAD LANDS IN ALASKA

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, during recent weeks Americans have followed with great interest the trek of a group, calling themselves the Fifty-niners, to settle in the new State of Alaska. These venturesome people represent the first spontaneous, unsponsored American homesteading group—and I emphasize the word "group"—in over half a century. They are, of course, only the most recent of many families who have gone individually to Alaska to help make it become the fastest growing and fastest developing area under the American flag.

Nearly 2 years ago national attention was focused on the particular area to which the Fifty-niners have now gone. The attention was caused by the Richfield oil strike on July 23, 1957, when in the very first well drilled on the Kenai Peninsula a substantial flow of petroleum was developed. Since that time, only 20 months ago, this area of great agricultural promise has become simultaneously Alaska's No. 1 oil-producing area.

Before 1957 the lands in this area were not classified as prospectively valuable for oil and gas. Homesteaders who had completed all the requirements under the homesteading laws were granted full

patents; that it, title to both surface and subsurface rights. The U.S. Geological Survey, prior to the 1957 oil strike, carried these lands in their records as nonmineral in character.

The homesteaders who had valid and subsisting entries on July 23, 1957—the date of the oil strike—had come to the Kenai to develop their homesteads in the expectation that they would gain title to subsurface as well as surface rights.

Many of these homesteaders had spent as much as five, ten, and fifteen thousands dollars in developing their 160-acre tracts of land. Even more important, they had spent long hours of hard work, hard in a degree which would be understood only by those settling raw land, and had made many personal sacrifices in an effort to carve farms and homes out of a wilderness.

According to the Department of the Interior, approximately one-third of these homesteaders whose entries were pending at the time of the oil discovery have now "proved up" on their lands and have submitted final proof to secure patents. Several of these have been waiting for more than 20 months. Now they have been told by the Secretary of the Interior that they must sign waivers to the oil and gas rights within a certain number of days or get off the land, forfeiting all their rights there as required by the 1922 Alaska homesteading statute.

I recently asked the Secretary of the Interior to extend the deadline for the signing of waivers. This request was granted so that the Alaska delegation in Congress might investigate the possibility of proposing legislation to remedy this unusual situation. With my colleagues in Senate and House, I have spent several months looking into the matter, and I have had several meetings with officials of the Interior Department in seeking a solution. These officials have agreed with me that the Alaska case is a special one, special primarily because of the long administrative delays which have ensued in the issuing of patents to the homesteaders. One such official has characterized this special situation as "a hearts and flowers case," a situation which properly evokes great sympathy and calls for justice.

The 1922 Alaska Homesteading Act is essentially the same as the original homestead act signed by Abraham Lincoln to promote prairie settlement in 1862. As Benjamin Hibbard wrote in 1924 in his "History of the Public Land Policies," immediately apparent is the act's "utter inadaptability to the parts of the country for which it was not designed."

The 1922 act, in many respects, is unsuited to the land conditions of Alaska. Its various requirements are admittedly somewhat arbitrary—representing more or less an obstacle course or endurance test ritual, a cross between trial by ordeal and schoolboy hazing. Be that as it may—and I hope that our homesteading laws soon will be revised with a view to their modernization and liberalization—something should be done to solve this present knotty problem, as the Acting Governor has described the situation on the Kenai Peninsula.

The homesteaders who entered these nonmineral lands prior to 1957 had no way of knowing that the Geological Survey would change the classification of these lands, an action which under existing law would prevent their securing subsurface rights to what they have long since come to look upon as their land.

These homesteaders entered the land in good faith. They entered the land to develop it for farms and homes, and I believe the Congress will want to see that justice is done in their behalf.

I have prepared a bill which would provide the granting of subsurface as well as surface rights to the Kenai homesteaders who had begun to prove up on their tracts prior to the date in 1957 when oil was first discovered in Alaska. The bill applies only to these Kenai homesteaders, numbering about 200 in all, and the few others in a similar position elsewhere in Alaska as a result of the general reclassification in 1957 of all sedimentary lands in the Territory—now a State—as prospectively valuable for oil and gas.

This bill does not apply to homesteaders who made entries after that date in 1957, for indeed, they were put on notice by the oil strike that their titles would be granted subject to the oil and gas reservations required by the 1922 law.

The few homesteaders who have already waived their subsurface rights would be restored those rights by quitclaim from the Federal Government.

Those who have submitted acceptable final proof, but have not yet waived, would be given full patents—that is, patents without reservations.

The remaining homesteaders who were on the land prior to July 27, 1957, and who have yet to submit final proof, would be excused from the necessity of waiving their oil and gas rights.

I introduce a bill on this subject and I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed at this point in the RECORD, together with a few letters, representative of scores of such letters I have received from homesteaders in Alaska in regard to the problem encompassed by the bill.

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

The bill (S. 1670) to provide for the granting of mineral rights in certain homestead lands in the State of Alaska, introduced by Mr. GRUENING, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the United States hereby quitclaims as of the date of this Act or as of the date of issuance of patent, whichever is later, to the patentee or to his lawful heirs if title to the lands prior to the date of this Act had by devise or succession passed out of the patentee, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to oil and gas deposits in lands in the State of Alaska patented to homestead entrymen pursuant to homestead entries which were valid and subsisting on July 23, 1957.

SEC. 2. Nothing in this Act shall affect the validity of any lease issued under the Mineral Leasing Act of February 25, 1920 (41 Stat. 437; 30 U.S.C. 181 and following), as amended, or any rights arising thereunder, or any of its terms and conditions except that quitclaim under that terms of this Act of any oil and gas deposit covered by such a lease shall vest in the grantee all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to such lease, including the right to all rentals, royalties, and other payments accruing after the date of quitclaim and including any authority that may have been retained by the United States to modify its terms and conditions.

The letters presented by Mr. GRUENING are as follows:

Senator ERNEST GRUENING,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: I am hesitant about writing you at this time, knowing full well how busy you are with the opening of Congress. However, as the Interior Department—namely our friend, Mr. Seaton—is pressuring us homesteaders with a 90-day time limit to surrender our rights to the oil trusts or get out of Alaska, it is urgent that any action which can remedy the situation be taken at once. I am but one of 200 to 500 homestead cases in the Anchorage Land Office in a similar category.

I first came to Alaska in 1936 and have resided here ever since except for time served in the Armed Forces overseas. In the spring of 1955, I received my first opportunity to homestead in the Matanuska Valley, which I did. Using my veterans rights I submitted my final proof papers 7 months later in the spring of 1956—before the Kenai oil strike. With full faith in the justice of our homestead laws I had at this time invested $7,000 in improvements and cultivated 20 acres of land on my entry. According to land office circulars a veteran is supposed to receive his patent immediately following submission of such a showing. The original geological report showed my entry as not prospectively valuable for oil or gas and there was no reason to believe that I would not receive full rights as all previous homesteaders in Alaska had done.

In July 1956 the land office suspended issuance of all homestead patents. (This was evidently a deliberate stall for time until the Interior Department could find some legal means of taking away our oil rights. No mention was ever made in the Anchorage Land Office of the 1922 law which Mr. Seaton's men finally came up with when we originally settled on our land.) And as I still had faith in due process of law I was content to wait for my patent to be processed through the red tape of the land office, meanwhile trying to develop a farm out of a wilderness entry.

Senator, today, 3 years after submitting final proof on my entry and with approximately $15,000 improvements and 80 acres of cleared land, I received a letter from the Anchorage Land Office stating that I must sign a waiver to my oil and gas rights within 90 days or be kicked off the land that I have spent my life's savings and 4 years of hard work developing. If I sign the waiver, the oil companies will be able to drill wells, build roads, pipelines, pumps, etc., in my fields or elsewhere on my property with no recompense for property damage.

I can only hope that you can visualize my feelings and the feelings of other homesteaders whose patents were held up deliberately by Mr. Seaton's Department until they could sell us down the river. I do not believe that any Alaskan is against development of the oil industry but with 365 million acres of land in this great State, I, for one, do not believe that they are justified in grabbing the 2,000 or so acres involved in these homestead patents.

We can only ask as pioneers who entered upon the land in good faith for help. If possible, get some legislation passed in this

session of Congress giving full rights to any settlers who entered upon land in Alaska at least before the Kenai oil strike.

We farmers know full well the terrific workload placed upon the shoulders of our representatives in Washington, D.C. However, you men, Senator, stand alone, our last hope against the great oil trusts in the opposite party. Any action which you could possibly take will be appreciated back home. I am enclosing a copy of the land office ultimatum.

Sincerely,

DONALD CHURCH,
Homestead Entry,
Anchorage 029582.

Hon. ERNEST GRUENING,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: A few days ago I received a notice from the Bureau of Land Management stating I have to sign a mineral waiver before I can get patent to my homestead, No. 031504, original S½ NE¼, NW¼ SE¼, section 28, and No. 032296, additional SW¼ NW¼ section 27, Township 5 North, Range 10 West, Seward Meridian.

I filed on these lands November 1955. I received my notice of allowance December 1955. At this time it was classified as agriculture lands. We completed our required residence in 1956. We cleared and cultivated over 20 acres, built a nice house. The Bureau of Land Management had made a field check and given a favorable report, and I filed final proof in September 1957. At this time the latest Geological Survey report classified this land as agricultural. The land office here still gave us to understand that we would get our mineral rights. On February 1958 I received my notice for publication (copy enclosed), in which the manager of the land office states that if no protest is filed during the period of publication or 30 days thereafter, final certificate would be issued. We have been waiting for this certificate for over 1 year. In July 1958 the land office requested a Geological Survey report, 10 months after we filed final proof. Now we receive this notice that if we don't sign a waiver on mineral rights or petition for reclassification (which must be supported by geological or other data) within 90 days our homestead will revert back to the Government.

We have acted in good faith and have met all the requirements up to this point. We have invested over $5,000, plus time and labor of myself and family, valued at over $10,000. If I sign a waiver of mineral rights, an oil company can lease these rights from the Government for about $40 and at any time they can come on any part of my homestead as they choose, without my permission, and not be liable for any surface damages whatsoever. It's like buying a house and paying for it, then the seller telling you he has kept a set of keys and is reserving part of the house in case his mother-in-law or some of his friends want to move in with you.

The homesteaders have petitioned the Government through the Alaska Governor's office to be able to lease the mineral rights on their own homesteads so that they will have jurisdiction of their own land. In this way the Government won't be out any lease money.

I would like to further develop my homestead so I can make a living on it, and this I cannot do, as I can't get financial assistance until I can get title to the land. This has been held up for more than a year now. I am intending to file an appeal. A good many homesteaders who filed prior to the oil discovery are in this same predicament.

Your assistance and advice in this matter will be greatly appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

LOREN M. HEATH.

SPENARD, ALASKA.

COHOE, ALASKA.

DEAR MR. GRUENING: The oil rights of the Kenai homesteaders have been challenged on the basis of the amount of revenue the State will lose if legislation is passed allowing the homesteader to retain his oil rights. This sum is represented to be in the millions of dollars.

Let us examine the contributions of the homesteaders that are affected by the department of Geological Survey's ruling. What is the value of their homesteads to the State:

There are over 100 homesteaders on the Kenai Peninsula who filed on homesteads before the Swanson Creek oil well was drilled. However, as an example, let us determine the contribution of only 100 homesteaders. The cost of proving up on a homestead in the Kenai area has consistently averaged $15,000 per 160 acres. On this basis, 100 homestead families have pumped $1½ million into the economy of the State on proving up alone.

The Department of Agriculture from studies made in Alaska has advised us that the average expenditure to bring a farm in Alaska into production is $50,000. A farmer, in order to pay off his capital investment, must gross one-third of his investment to pay off the principal and realize a living wage each year. On this basis, the contribution 100 homesteads will make to the economy of Alaska figures out at $1,660,000 per year on a $5 million investment.

The round robin effect of this much money pumped into the economy of an area is hard to evaluate in the amount collectible in tax dollars. If we were to follow the path of a stay-in-Alaska dollar that remains in circulation, its tax potential becomes astronomical.

Let us say that the farmer buys a pound of seed from the feed store; the storekeeper, in turn, uses the dollar to purchase gasoline; the station-owner uses the dollar to buy medicine from the druggist and so on through a hundred transactions over the period of a year. Each transaction adds to the gross sales of the merchant on the taxable wage dollar of the worker. Each transaction is a possible avenue of tax revenue. It is not inconceivable that this dollar will return 100 percent of its value in tax revenue to the State over the period of the year.

Let us take a brief look at oil as an avenue of revenue on homestead lands. The department of Geological Survey in the geological report of this area shows tertiary deposits starting at Homer and extending northward; another tertiary deposit originates in the Swanson Creek area and goes southward. In this report, they state that the occurrence of oil is not probable in these formations.

Standard Oil, in their advertisement in the Juneau Independent, states that the average number of oil wells drilled in a proven field is 1 to 320 acres.

The Kenai oilfield, on the basis of the known formations, is broken up by the upheaval of the land to the extent that most of the oil is probably concentrated in pockets. The average depth of wells driven so far in this area, is more than 12,000 feet. Wells this deep, by the law of economics, require more land than the 320 acres. In this type of formation, and at the depth the oil formation lies, the wells drilled on the Kenai will, in all probability, be concentrated over known pockets of oil and be spaced at wide intervals.

The wells driven on the homesteader land affected by the department of Geological Surveys classification, will be very small. It is to the oil companies advantage to drill first upon Government land. We very much doubt that any wells will be drilled upon private land for years to come.

If we balance farm revenue against an uncertain income to the State from the relatively few oil wells that may be drilled on homestead lands we must realize that oil revenue is a one-shot affair. The State receives a small percentage from each gallon delivered on an uncertain flow of oil that has an unforeseeable life expectancy. Oil does not flow indefinitely; the farmer will be with us forever.

We homesteaders are not opportunists. We came here before oil was discovered. We have developed our homesteads because we have faith in the future of Alaska. We have had no Government help. We hardly need point out to you the huge expenditures used to stabilize the economy of the farmer in the other 48 States. Our Congress, in its wisdom, understands that the economy of our Nation lies within its productive farmlands. We, the citizens of the United States, learned a hard lesson by the great depression of the late twenties and the early thirties when the economy of the farmer fell far behind the productive capacity of industry. Our national economy did not recover until millions of dollars had been pumped into agriculture. Most of this aid to agriculture has not as yet become available to the Alaskan farmer. Any outside income a homesteader might derive from an oil industry in his area is that much less help he would require from the Federal Government.

When we balance all these factors and many more yet not apparent against an uncertain oil revenue, we have a bird in the hand that balances very favorably with the bird in the bush the State may never catch.

ALASKA ENTRYMAN'S RIGHTS ASSOCIATION.

Hon. ERNEST GRUENING,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: Please don't let anyone tell you that the State will lose large amounts of revenue if your bill goes through. The number of homsteaders who actually would obtain rights under a July 1957 deadline is small, not much over 150 by my reckoning. Loss to the State of royalty money is therefore infinitesimal since the land involved amounts to only about one-twentieth of 1 percent of the State's 103 million possible acres or one one-hundredth of 1 percent of total Alaska acres.

Any royalties received by these people would be plowed right back in development and provide additional tax base anyhow. I firmly believe that these homesteaders will put more back into Alaska than the dozen or so leaseholders who would receive the oil rights if the homesteaders do not.

In justice, the homesteaders who filed before the discovery deserve their rights.

Sincerely,

FRANCIS E. MULLEN.

SOLDOTNA, ALASKA.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: We do not consider ourselves a select group; we are a group of so-called little men who believe in our land and country and are fighting for what is rightfully ours.

The homestead laws definitely need adjusting as they are not stable enough for present times. * * *

The truth of the matter is that no waivers were sent out until after July 23, 1957, when Richfield struck oil. We believe that everyone that had an entry before this date is entitled to their rights.

We are sure that you will give this bill you are planning to introduce special and full consideration.

We on the Kenai are hopeful that this matter will be cleared up so that we can obtain our patents and plan our future and our children's on our land that we have worked so hard for and continue to help build Alaska to the great place it is intended to be.

Sincerely,

CHARLES G. MARTIN.

KASILOF, ALASKA.

FEBRUARY 2, 1959.

Hon. ERNEST GRUENING,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: My husband and I are homesteading and have been since 1956. We really appreciate your recent stand on oil and gas rights for the homesteader. Since we are about to apply for a patent we are very interested in this matter. As far as we know not only are we not granted oil and gas rights, but an oil company may come onto our land and drill any place they please without compensation to us. We have put a great deal of time, effort, and money into our homestead and don't wish to throw it to the winds; however, signing our name to a slip of paper that says an oil company more or less can do what they please with our land is too much for us to bear. We sincerely hope that you will be able to rectify this matter. I believe most any homesteader will agree that this would be very desirable.

We are proud of your work in Washington, both past and present.

Respectfully yours,

MRS. GLENN VLATER.

ANCHOR POINT, ALASKA.

Hon. ERNEST GRUENING,
U.S. Senator, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I was advised by my good friend, Heinie Snider, to write to you concerning my homesite problem.

We applied for this homesite under the act of May 26, 1934. It was officially filed April 17, 1953. We still do not have a title. When we applied for, advertised and paid for this homesite, there was no question about us not getting a clear title.

We never have understood the delay at the land office in sending us the title. As a result of the delay, we are asked to sign a release to gas and oil on the homesite before we can get a title.

Having lived on this site since 1918 and applying in good faith for ownership, it is disturbing to have recent developments that were not mentioned at the time we applied, cause us to sign the release or lose the site.

Homesite No. 012377, lots 16, 17 and 23. sec. 25, T. 21 S., R. 17 E., C.R.M.

Sincerely yours,

MRS. BEN WATSON.

CAPE YAKATAGA, ALASKA.

KENAI, ALASKA, *March 25, 1959.*

Mr. PHIL HOLDSWORTH,
Commissioner of Mines,
Juneau, Alaska.

DEAR SIR: * * * One block of ground in this area is held by an individual who now lives outside in another State. The State will receive 50 cents an acre on the ground he is able to tie up with all rights, making this ground barren and valueless.

If the homesteaders on that same ground get their oil rights, they will spend every nickel here, plus they will improve their property, giving this area and all of Alaska a more stable economy.

I have clear title with oil rights on my homestead, so this may or may not concern me. But I leased my ground to Standard Oil. My lease money went to a local lumberyard, for material to improve my new home. I want to see more and better homes in my own neighborhood. If these homesteaders around me do not get their oil rights, incidentally, those same homesteaders have been here since 1953 and 1954, then they cannot make improvements, they can do nothing, because under existing lease rules, the oil companies can drill in their backyard, front yard, or even living room. Can you say that this is progress? * * *

If these homesteaders, who have waited so long for patents get their oil rights, this will be monetary gain for them individually, and for the State in the increased value of improved ground and living conditions.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES ARNESS.

KENAI, ALASKA, *March 14, 1959.*

Hon. ERNEST GRUENING,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: * * * In view of your action favoring oil rights for Kenai entrymen, we the undersigned, wish to add our support to your efforts:

Kenneth and Margaret McGahan, Bernard McCarthy, Arthur C. Lee, Ethel D. Randall, James Bergsand, Claire Gagnin, William Destry, Mrs. James Linderman, Frank Hudson, the Powells, Leonard D. Holt, L. E. Brown, John J. Yurman, Paul E. Puckett, Stanley and Caroline Huhndorf, Norman McGahan, Harry L. Riding, Elise J. Riding, Bernard W. Toliff, Bertha Porter, Joseph M. Wolding, Robert J. Latzka, A. E. Olson, E. A. Dossow, Donald Kelly, Alfred Wik, William Steib, Leonard Dennis, Georgine Sleib, Daniel Johnson, Goldie Johnson, Dean F. Rounds, Mary I. Rounds, Charles Gagnan, Andrew Huthenen, Lois McGahan, Leo T. Albert, Thomas V. Suthard, Charles W. Stiles, Luther R. Rogers, James Arness, O. L. Nicholas, M. J. Hergatt, Raymond D. Gee, E. C. Winz, Audrey R. Anderson, Galen E. Gray, Robert A. Smith, Walter F. Myrick, E. E. Mueller, J. J. Weaver, Donald L. MacNevin, Dennis D. Green, A. C. Naisber, Henry R. Trusty, Jean Rogers, Odgen J. Gelle, Audrey S. Gelle, Kathleen Tum Suden, Faith Archer, John B. Smith, Tony Bordinelli, W. L. Hansen, Anne L. Hansen, David G. Bell, E. McGahan, Hubert M. Johnson, W. E. Gibbs, L. J. Whittington, Herman R. Hermansen, Eugene D. Smith, Alexander P. Shadura, B. E. Mulvaney, Alexander M. Ross, Herrick A. Poore, George R. Pollard, Blaine E. Saunders.

Hon. Senator GRUENING,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: What can you do to help the homesteaders who are certainly in need of your help and support, plus the support of everyone who is interested in seeing the right thing done?

We are all supposedly endowed with the rights of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness in this new State of ours—the same as any other U.S. citizen.

Well, we are not living—we are existing. Can you live under the conditions that many of us homesteaders must put up with, when we feel we can't go ahead and make things more comfortable, because tomorrow we might have our homes ordered from under us? Those who already have these orders (people who have proved up but refused to sign a waiver and have never received the title that they have earned) are given 90 days to remove their improvements. Could you move 20 cleared acres, a cement foundation, a well, a cesspool, the fertilizer, and conditioners that it takes to prepare the ground for planting, not to mention the hardship and living conditions which we and our families went through because we were building a future?

A great many of us have earned our titles a year, 2 years, and even 3 or 4 years ago, and put in our final proof which was approved, but we have not been permitted to advertise. The land office tells us they are too busy to sign the papers, but if we sign a waiver they will take care of it immediately. Does our signing a paper make them less busy?

If we don't own the oil rights, why do we have to sign them away; and, if we do have the right to them, is it right and lawful to procure our signatures under duress with the threat of taking away our homes plus everything we have worked toward and setting our children out in the streets? Is this the American way?

To proceed to No. 2—liberty. Is this liberty?

Then comes the pursuit of happiness. True, it only gives us the right to pursue happiness. But we were doing this to the best of our ability by trying to build a comfortable home, when someone from the land office decides they will take it upon themselves to push us back down just to show they can—for they have the backing of our Government. Is this government of the people, by the people, for the people?

Supposedly the waivers turn the oil rights over to the Federal Government—but do they? There are applications for lease on all these lands, and when we sign a waiver the oil rights go to the speculators. True, they pay the Federal Government 25 cents an acre; but, if this is the issue, why can't we have the first opportunity to pay this 25 cents an acre on our own ground?

Sincerely,

BERTHA PORTER.

KENAI, ALASKA.

KENAI, ALASKA, *March 31, 1959.*

Senator ERNEST GRUENING,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: We, the homesteaders of the Kenai Peninsula, Alaska, would like to solicit your help in the solution of a problem we find we have, in conjunction with our homestead filings. Listed below are some of the factors involved.

When we filed and settled on the lands in question, we had one main concern, farming. We were given land allowances with all our rights, or releases from the Geological Survey office, and now have filled our part of the bargain with our Government. Now we cannot get our patents, because we will not sign oil waivers. We contend that all dates taken, concerning oil rights, would be the date we were given our land allowances, providing we completed our requirements. This is necessary as some, who had land-clearing problems, didn't file their final papers, for patent, until after oil was discovered, even though they had been in residence since 1953. It seems logical that the date of allowance be used, as that is the time in which the Government released the lands concerned, for the action to be taken and henceforth completed by the homesteaders. If the homestead claimant completes his part, the patent then becomes the last stage of his action, and mainly the legal document for his land.

An item of intense interest and discussion is the date in which the Geological Survey office claimed this land to be valuable for oil; which is the basis of all the actions taken against us, by the Bureau of Land Management. As of this date, the Geological Survey has done no field work in connection with oil discovery in this vicinity. The conclusion of, prospectively valuable, came after the discovery of oil on Swanson Creek, by an oil company, not by the Geological Survey, who had already issued reports that the area had no oil. If the Geological office is going to classify this area as feasible for oil prospecting, would it not be more fair and proper to give those with prior land allowances the first chance for oil rights? As it is, in many cases, the oil leases are given to second parties, who in turn will lease them to the various oil prospectors, who can then enter upon our lands and do as they please. Would it not be more in the American way of doing, if the people who have had the lands in question, who have fought through the past few years to build homes and improve their lands, who are all an exciting part of this new State of Alaska, were to be given their full rights?

Much concern has been raised by the possibility of the Federal and State Governments losing too much money on leasing and royalties. Several factors exist in this respect. First, there are only a few homesteads involved, and this makes up a very minute portion of the actual lease lands. The amount of money paid to the Federal and State Governments, for leases, will be far less than the amount that will be paid through income tax and property tax by those few homesteaders involved in the issue. Does it not seem logical that in the years to come, our State will lose millions in property tax alone?

It must be understandable that our lands, without oil rights, will in no way be as valuable and consequently as taxable, as the lands with the oil rights. Is there any assurance that the oil companies will lease these lands for any number of years? Nevertheless, it is a fact that we the people will pay property tax for generations to come. Will not this offset the amount the State may expect to lose? Then comes the moneys paid for the leases, to resident landowners with oil rights. Undoubtedly a large portion of their revenue will be spent here in Alaska. This will give a greater spending power to those who are a part of our State and consequently be of a great help in making our statehood a success. Those of us who are attempting to carry out a farming policy, can be expected to invest further in bettering our homes and lands. Let us be every mindful that this will also greatly add to our national defense and help strengthen our country as a whole. As we improve our lands, we improve our State, also have more taxable property, thus adding to our State treasury. It must be remembered, too, that an individual can borrow money on the valuation of his property. Lands without oil rights will be of much less value, thus restricting the loan valuation, and impairing the progress of the landowner.

We are all hopeful that there has been a misinterpretation of the law of 1922. That this law, if necessary, be amended to give the oil rights to those who had land allowances, before the date used by the Geological Survey office, as the date of oil discovery. This amendment would need only apply to Alaska or the Kenai Peninsula.

We, the homesteaders on the Kenai Peninsula, Alaska, feel certain that our Government of the people, by the people, and for the people will not let us down. That our Congress and our President will come forth, in this issue, giving us the rights which we have earned—our patents, including all our rights.

Sincerely,

ALEXANDER MCFARLAND ROSS.

Senator ERNEST GRUENING,
Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, Washington, D.C.

DEAR ERNEST: * * * In the circulation of the enclosed letters, 99.5 percent of the people voiced their indignation and expressed their desire that your legislation to benefit the homesteader should be passed.

Since we are working against time, the area of Kenai-Soldotna-Cohoe, and Kasilof were only covered. It is my belief that had we the time to cover the whole Kenai Peninsula of Alaska that the voters would overwhelmingly express the same attitude.

Copies of this enclosed letter from the people are going to Senator Bartlett, Acting Gov. Hugh G. Wade, Representative Ralph J. Rivers, and to Representative Allan Pettersen in Juneau.

Sincerely yours,

ALEXANDER P. SHADURA.

KENAI, ALASKA.

KENAI, ALASKA, *March 24, 1959.*

Many responsible officials including Interior Department officials have admitted the need for a change in the law (act of March 8, 1922) in order to give fair and just consideration to the settlers of the land. The land area involved in this controversy is very small compared to the Federal-owned lands. Should the mineral ownership dispute be adjudicated in favor of the homestead entryman resultant loss of revenue to the State from the royalties on these homesteaded lands would be inconsequential. However, if the mineral rights are given the State or Federal Government, a tremendous betrayal and loss will be perpetuated upon the homesteader, who worked diligently and expended great sums of money in performing his requirements to earn equitable title to the entered lands. There are many homesteaders involved in this situation because of BLM bottlenecks not attributable to the homesteader but which delayed BLM actions in processing final proof submittal which should have resulted in issuance of patents without oil and gas reservations.

When Senator ANDERSON, of New Mexico, attempted to introduce an amendment to H.R. 8054, bill passed by the 85th Congress, which amendment proposed to raise the rentals on Federal oil and gas leases in Alaska from 25 to 50 cents per acre and to make that rental increase retroactive and apply to all pending Federal oil and gas leases, a tremendous protest was made by the oil institutions, and Federal oil and gas lease applicants who rightfully argued that they applied for leases on hundreds of thousands of acres of Federal land and planned development on those lands because of a Government-sponsored incentive that such lease could be acquired for a first 3-year rental of 25 cents per acre. The Insular Affairs Committee with the approval of the Secretary of the Interior recommended that the increase should not be made retroactive because to do so would be a betrayal to the terms and conditions under which the U.S. Federal Government offered to lease its lands to U.S. citizens and companies. We agree that that decision was wise and morally just and saved oil companies many thousands of dollars which would have been required of them to pay had the rental increase been made retroactive. Therefore the oil company wasn't victimized in the processing stage of an agreement with the Government.

Now the homesteader who has made entry upon his lands, builds homes, clears land, and performs his required duties to earn patent to his land has a very similar situation in that he performed his required duties with the governmental suggestions that he will gain ownership of the land and whatever mineral value is contained under his land excepting for coal and radioctive minerals. Using the above-mentioned rental increase proposal as an example: Why then, is it not just as unfair to change the land classification on an entryman performing his required duties, and through an outdated law deprive him of the rights and entitlement to his land under the conditions which the Government offered at the time he entered into his effort to earn patent.

As your constituents, we plead that you voice an immediate and vigorous protest to Mr. Holdsworth's recommendations and to encourage legislation to give the mineral rights to those homesteaders who had made entry and were expending money and energy in settling their lands before oil was found to exist on the Kenai Peninsula. If given the mineral rights, those homesteaders will lease their land to the oil companies and a more orderly and harmonious development of the oil and gas resources of the peninsula would result. Such development would benefit the homesteader, the State, and the oil companies alike. If the mineral ownership is reserved to the State resulting in the homesteader suffering surface damages from exploration without the benefit of the fruits from such exploration, a critical situation of confusion and trouble most certainly could jeopardize the success of oil and gas development on the Kenai Peninsula and all parties concerned would fail to benefit.

Voters on the Kenai Peninsula: Alexander P. Shadura; Jack Lewis; George W. Johnson; Robert A. Eaton; Louis Nosen; Florence Lancashire; Ruby S. Cagle; Beatrice I. Suthord; Paul P. Shadura; Ward Showalhik; Richard L. Wilson; Howard Wilson; Abe Wilson; Chestor H. Cone; Albert C. Lee; William H. Wells; M. L. Grange; Helen C. Jones; Arthur Fass; Leda E. Shadura; W. L. Seely; Raymond J. Foldager; Waldo E. Coyle; Orville B. Thomas; Nickitha Mishakoff; Arlon Ball; Paul Wilson; George Sherman; C. F. Cline; George M. Frazier; Melba Frazier; Leah Estes; Rev. Carl S. Glick; F. Howard Hudson; Morris L. Porter; Marguerite Bidwell; James B. Marshall; Norman McGahan; Leonard D. Holt; George A. Navarre; Arthur P. Outlaw; Stanley F. Thompson; Autry L. Holt; Allen S. McGrady; Dennis Thompson; Rosemary Navarre; Dale Tutwell; Philip Wilson; E. Showalth; B. E. Mulvaney; J. S. Miller; Ken McGahan; Bertha Porter; Grace Cole; Margaret McGahan; James Bergsrud; C. W. Rice; Helen Haworth; Leo T. Oberts; Wayne D. Sterling; Sharon Sterling; Billy McCann; V. L. Chamberlain; Rayle Parker; Beula M. Grange; Ralph James Pate; Jaeger Haagnsen; Margaret T. Mullen; Howard J. Brinkley; Leslie B. Naff; Chell O. Bear; Verona T. Wilson; Lewis H. Johnson; Vera Franklin; Donald E. Wilson; Leo F. Reeves; Mrs. Leo Reeves; Ted V. Grange; L. H. Lancashire; Carl H. Swanson; Catherine Swanson; C. J. Hansen; Bert Hansen; William Ness; James E. Hollingsworth; J. W. Showalter; Mrs. David G. Bell; Bernard D. McCarthy; Ethel D. Randall; August Ness; Joe Consiel; Walter A. Lahandt, Jr.; Irving Molander; J. W. Thompson; Dean L. Rounds; Duke Dering; Don F. Cole; Frost Jones; H. C. Jones; E. McGahan; Wayne F. Morgen; James Goff; Rita Goff; Elizabeth Norman; O. Wanda McGahan; Daniel Johnson; Goldie Johnson; Joseph M. Wolding; Percy Johnson; Vera Johnson; Josephine Davidson, B. S. V.; Jimmie L. Davidson; H. A. Poore; Virginia Poore; Kathryn Nichols; Daphne McLane; Stanley S. McLane; Leota E. Patterson; Fayrene McIntosh; Bill Patterson; Clarence Cases; Carl Hancock; Kenney Javelt; Jerome Agre; Grant Rember; D. M. Imges; Richard J. Hlebechule; Wilbur Schroeder; R. H. Gaines; Mrs. R. H. Gaines; Floyd D. Boatman; Thomas Walsh; Walter Whitley; William S. Olsen; Thelma Olsen; Peggy Filkel; Wayne Filkel; Josie Seward; James M. Seward; Ray F. Murphy; Luther R. Rogers; Jean Rogers; Henry R. Trusty; Ella M. Trusty; Henry H. Knockutedt; James V. Arness; Fred E. Burgess; Jessie C. Ainsworth; Mary Ness; Mrs. A. F. Johansen; Waino Hakkinen; Francis E. Mullen; Wm. E. Thompson; Lavey W. Hodgson; Marjorie Madden; Dan W. Madden; Ethel M. Browning; Homer R. Browning; George Bonin; Dolores Bonin; Joan Lahndt; Fred R. Huebsch; Mrs. Fred R. Huebsch; Isaac P. Shadura; C. L. Heckel; Ray Mainwaring; Irene Mainwaring; Issabella Harris; E. William Harris; George Jackinsky; Jeanne Jacocinisocy; Laura Savage; D. C. Walker; V. J. Savage; Norman O. Williams; Winona G. Williams; Alice Scarantino; Joseph Scarantino; C. W. Smith; Raffield Smith; Frank P. Clar; Chas. G. Martin; Judy Martin; Florence Burton; Raymond E.

Burton; Chet Rull; L. R. Masek; F. R. Blake; A. F. Fauerbach; Archie Ramsell; Ann Ramsell; N. W. Webb; Trudy S. Webb; Harry Gerberg; Dolly Gerberg; Chas. O. Lewis; Elfreda Lewis; Carl E. Johnson; Karin Johnson; Dorothy E. Hermansen; Dorothy J. Tri; Wilbur A. Tri; Herman R. Hermansen; Martin E. Hermansen; Martin E. Hermansen; Martin Hermansen, Sr.; Mrs. M. Hermansen, Sr.; Jess H. Nicholas, Jr.; Cynthia A. Miller; Carolyn L. Nicholas; Ira L. Miller; Charles B. Mead, Jr.; Myra S. Mead; Mrs. Michael Shepard; Harvey Fields; Helen Tri; Velma Shelley; Ernest E. Neuman; Rex C. Poe.

GARNISHMENT LAW OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, just before the Easter recess, Senator JOHNSTON of South Carolina introduced and I cosponsored a bill to repeal the garnishment law for the District of Columbia. I made a lengthy speech on the subject, which may be found on page 5221 of the March 25 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Mr. President, I firmly believe that the garnishment law of the District of Columbia is nothing more than a haven for the easy-credit stores which hoodwink customers into paying much more for the products on the basis that they can get easy credit. As a result, the customers are subjected to all types of hardships through garnishment proceedings.

I have in my hand an article from the Washington Star of April 10, 1959, which urges repeal of the garnishment law. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this article be placed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

GARNISHMENT LAW REPEAL URGED

The Congress Heights Citizens Association last night strongly opposed District garnishment laws.

It recommended that all laws holding employers responsible for collection of employees' debts should be annulled.

Charles W. Harris, president of Boilermaker Local 655, cited cases of four and five garnishments against one man. Current laws, he said allow a worker to jeopardize his job and to become unable to support properly his family.

The group protested the rezoning of a triangle of land at Nichols Avenue, Upson and First Streets S.E. for a filling station. A representative was chosen to oppose the petition at the zoning board meeting, 9:30 a.m. Wednesday.

Mark Hotrick, president, conducted the meeting in Congress Heights School, Nichols and Alabama Avenues S.E.

FARM LEGISLATION

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a GTA Daily Radio Roundup, dated April 7, 1959. It deals with the farm situation in North Dakota and the Middle West. The situation is rapidly deteriorating because of the inaction of the majority, which means two-thirds of the Senate now democratically controlled. Since the election—November, December, January, February, March, and now April—not even a subcommittee of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry has reported a farm bill.

The planting season is over in the Midwest. Yet thousands of people who voted for candidates who were supporting a good farm bill have not had the satisfaction of knowing even what is proposed. My colleague from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] and I have announced time and again that we would support any good farm bill reported by the committee, and that we would vote to override a presidential veto in the event the President vetoed such a bill.

I want to say again that we relied upon the majority on the other side of the aisle. They have completely ignored the wishes of the voters in the Middle West.

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

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

A man who aspired to be President of the United States and didn't make it—but who continues to be a respected U.S. Senator—says this country needs a Federal Department of Consumers, just like we've got Departments of Labor and Commerce and Interior and Agriculture. He says he gets hundreds of letters that read: "I am in the red. Please help the forgotten consumer." One letterwriter says he bought a few groceries—and the bill came to $17.83.

This Senator, whom you will recognize as ESTES KEFAUVER, says that in popular parlance around Washington grocery stores' cash register tapes are known as consumer stationery. Consumers there think food prices are too high.

Well, most people will agree that a Federal Department of Consumers might be a good idea. Consumers as a group are not adequately represented. Such a department might be in a position to explain to consumers better than it is being done now that food prices are only remotely related to farm prices. It could point out that consumers really owe a vote of thanks to farmers for doing more than anybody else to hold down the cost of living.

A few spokesmen are telling that story now. It's in the most recent issue of the Farmers Union Herald, which is in the mails now on its way to 250,000 upper Midwest rural mailboxes. Washington columnist, Porter Hedge, says that farmers are giving consumers a sensational bargain in foods, including meats. But a lot of city people don't know about it. It is being screened, Porter Hedge writes, "by a curtain of larger and wider price margins." As a result, bargain basement farm prices don't show up over the supermarket checkout counters.

"But that's been going on for years," he says. It's nothing new. But right now these bargain basement farm prices are in the spotlight again because eggs at the farm in the Midwest have dropped to as low as 19 and 20 cents a dozen, and that's 10 to 15 cents lower than a year ago.

Porter Hedge also tells about the bargains that farmers are turning out in poultry and pork and beef. It's all explained in the April 6 Farmers Union Herald. If you don't get the Herald just drop us a postcard here at GTA in St. Paul and we'll see that you get a copy.

The Washington farm writer sums up the situation by revealing that the farm value of the food—a typical consuming family buys in a year—went down $55 between 1952 and 1958. But the retail price went up $86. Add up those two figures and you'll see that marketing charges have increased $141, with both farmers and consumers paying the bill.

Well, is there an answer? Perhaps the department of consumers suggested by Senator KEFAUVER would be able to explain the situation better to consumers. But would it be able to lower the high cost of marketing and thus give consumers lower prices?

As far as farmers are concerned, their contribution is already very large. Raising farm prices to fair levels, which is all that farmers ask in return for their contribution of abundance, would have very little effect on food prices. But for the long pull, remember that your bushels of grain and dollars of business work for you when you put them to work GTA the co-op way.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DODD in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

TELEVISION TRANSMISSION FACILITIES IN PUBLIC SCHOOLS AND COLLEGES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 12) to expedite the utilization of television transmission facilities in our public schools and colleges, and in adult training programs.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, Senate bill 12 deals solely with educational television. A similar bill, with the exception of one amendment, passed the Senate unanimously last year. The House held hearings on the bill near the end of the session; but the bill was caught in the legislative jam, although, so far as I know, with the exception of some minor amendments on the House side, which, after conferences with the chairman of the committee, Mr. HARRIS, we would have accepted, it would have passed the House. There was very little objection to it.

In order that that may not happen again in connection with this important measure, I proceeded to introduce the bill as one of the first bills of the session, as is indicated by its number, 12, in the hope that we could expedite passage of the bill and send it over to the House, in order that this very important program might proceed.

Last year the bill was sponsored, both actually and impliedly, by practically every member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, including former Senator Bricker, of Ohio. This year the sponsorship is under the direction of myself and the distinguished ranking minority member, the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL].

S. 12 is a modest and somewhat simple proposal with a tremendous and far-reaching impact on the general public. This legislation is intended to expedite and accelerate the use of television in our schools, colleges, and training programs in each of the several States, the District of Columbia, and what will be the new State of Hawaii. The bill proposes to make grants not in excess of $1 million to each State agreeing to

provide the land, buildings, and the costs of operating and maintaining the television facilities placed into operation. In other words, there must be a great deal of local participation before any applicant will be considered for a Federal grant. The grants authorized by the bill are simple and direct. The money is to be used exclusively for the purchase of actual equipment, and facilities required in educational television projects. The Federal Government intervention ends at that point. It is shut off at that point. There is no intention whatsoever to determine the kind of programs, the type of circuits, or anything pertaining to the program of education by the new medium.

Seven years have passed since the Federal Communications Commission wisely reserved 242 TV channels or approximately 12 percent of all television channels in the United States for noncommercial educational use. In that period 37 educational stations located from Massachusetts to California and from Minnesota to Texas have been constructed and 22 are in various phases of construction. In the case of many of them great difficulties are being experienced in obtaining financing. Thus a total of only 59 stations have been constructed or begun, out of the 242 channels set aside.

Despite the strides which educators have been making in establishing educational stations in the United States, only a small part of the total potential has been achieved. Vast numbers of problems and obstacles have beset educators and laymen throughout the United States in their efforts to activate the unused channels reserved for education. The failure of the educators to use these channels is not the result of lack of interest, desire, planning, or zeal on their part. The largest problem which faces them and others desirous of using television for educational purposes is the lack of adequate funds to pay for the basic installation of television facilities.

But something else happened. In the spectrum there are available so many very high frequency channels. Beyond that, in the ultra high field, which requires a different kind of set, there are many channels. But these channels are at a premium. There was quite a fight 7 years ago to have them set aside for educational purposes. No one knows better than does the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD] how much trouble it is possible to have with very high frequency channels and ultra high frequency channels, and the scarcity of channels. So when a channel is idle for 7 years it is only natural that those who want to go into commercial television work and to serve the public in commercial television, which has done a good job throughout the United States in most places, should attempt to pry loose the unused channels. The argument is always used, "For 7 long years this channel has been idle." That feature enters into the problem. One of the real purposes of the bill is to deal with that aspect.

Experience has demonstrated that once a television station has been built State legislatures, local educational systems, and local communities at large, have raised funds to produce the programs over these stations. In other words, when channels are not being used, the argument is to the effect that, "This is a new fangled idea." There has been quite an educational campaign to convince the people, and to obtain public support for the program, to the end that legislatures will provide appropriations and State universities will participate, in the effort to convince the public, which supports these institutions, that this is meant to be a supplement to education, and not a substitute therefor. So there has been a great deal of difficulty; but we have found that in every case in which such stations have been started, the value of the program becomes so apparent, once they get off the ground, as it were, that none of the communities, State universities, or States themselves want to see educational television die out. We feel—and there is ample testimony in the RECORD to support that feeling—that unless the Federal Government takes the initiative by contributing to construction costs, thereby forcing a breakthrough in this field, I am afraid a great educational potential will be lost.

We have heard many times about the existing and growing problems of education. We know that there is a serious shortage of teachers and buildings and that each of these shortages grow with each passing day. The use of television facilities in our schools and colleges and adult training programs will strike directly at these existing shortages. We all know television is a powerful means of communications. Its message can be transmitted live or by use of training films. Current research and experimentation, as well as local and regional planning, reveal unlimited potentialities for the future in educational television.

This bill is intended to launch our country generally upon the path of bringing into our educational system the tremendous advantage and opportunity afforded by the television medium. Its costs in actual dollars is modest. Its rewards are virtually unlimited when compared to the problems existing in the educational field today. Once these facilities are constructed, I am sure the States can carry the load.

It is to be recalled that in the last Congress, as I have said before, I introduced S. 2119, which was generally the same as the pending bill. However, whereas the bill, passed last year contained no time limitation, the pending bill does limit the time to 5 years.

I do not intend to make a further lengthy statement on the bill, because the hearings last year and this year adequately cover the need for the proposed legislation. However, I merely wish to quote the statement of a leading educational leader, Dean Gordon Sabine, of Michigan State University, who said:

> The educational needs of the United States have so far outstripped the educational capabilities of the Nation that we must have educational television to help us win the fight to educate a whole people. Without it, we surely are defeated.

The committee reported the pending bill unanimously and added one short amendment which would terminate the effect of the legislation after 5 years, because we feel that this is an important subject which Congress should have an opportunity to evaluate from time to time. I cannot too strongly emphasize the importance of the proposed legislation.

Since last year many things have happened in this field. I recommend to all Members of the Senate a reading of the full report of the committee, because of the many exciting new things which have happened in this new area. We know that we are short of teachers of science in our high schools. Under an educational TV system some of the great scientists of the United States and of the world will devote their time and energy to make a training film from which every youngster will get the benefit of a lecture given by those whom we regard as among our great men in this new field.

In the field of music that is likewise true. The same thing can be said of the field of art and the field of finance.

I note that the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL] is on the floor. He has taken a deep interest in this subject. I made it a point to inquire last week while I was in my home State about educational TV at our university. It comes to only one town. Only one program was televised, and that was a class in Russian. It was advertised, but it was necessary for a participant to go to the university and get an enrollment slip, with the hope that he would come back and take an examination, to find out how he was getting along. The university had so many requests that it could not accommodate the number of people who came to the registrar's office to register for the class in Russian.

Three weeks ago in New York City, on an educational TV program, I believe one conducted either by the college of the city of New York or Columbia University, it was stated that the program would consist of a series of training films on shorthand and typewriting. I believe that some 6,000 applicants showed up to get their enrollment slips. We are certainly faced with a great potential.

Hagerstown, Md., was selected as an experimental place for an educational TV program to supplement courses in the elementary schools. Everyone contributed to it, even the commercial networks. They published a TV guide for the benefit of the children, so they would know what was coming up next. All this supplemented the regular elementary courses. At the end of the year it was found that the students had advanced almost a whole grade in their studies.

At the University of Alabama and at Ohio State University it is possible now to take first year credits. That is particularly true at the University of Alabama. First year credits can be earned on a TV educational program, which has been instituted all over the State. In that way a farm boy or anyone else can go to the University of Alabama on first-year credits received on the TV program.

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL] and I asked how TV students

compared with the regular college students when they entered the sophomore class. We were told that both groups stood on about the same level. The TV students stood with the college students, so far as scholastic achievement was concerned.

Of course, I do not believe a TV educational program will be a substitute for solid education. However, it will supplement our regular educational programs in the schools and colleges. It is well worth while.

I know the question will be asked why we should give $1 million to each State. Obviously the State of Nevada would not need as much as the State of Washington or the State of New York. The State of Kansas would not have programs similar to those in the State of California.

The figure was chosen so as to get the program started. The construction program must be approved by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the Office of Education, and also by the FCC on the engineering aspects.

Obviously the programs which will be produced will be small in the smaller States and greater in the larger States. The purpose of the bill is merely to get the program off the ground. I hope we can make a start on this long-delayed and long-overdue program in this great new educational field.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I have listened with interest to the statement made by the distinguished Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], whom I have been glad to join in the introduction of the pending bill. As was pointed out by the Senator from Washington, the bill is almost identical in form to the bill which was passed during the last session of Congress.

At that time the distinguished Senator from Ohio, Senator Bricker, and the distinguished Senator from Washington had much to do with presenting the bill to the members of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, in the hearings, and supporting the bill on the floor.

Now we are discussing it after it has been reported by the committee.

I am glad to be associated in sponsoring this measure because of the many things which the Senator from Washington has brought out and the interest which has been manifested all over the country. Many of the points the Senator has mentioned with reference to the State of Washington and some of the other States are true also in my State of Kansas.

We are now well started in the fourth month of the 86th Congress, and already the cleavage has become sharp between those whose greatest fear is uncontrolled inflation and those who see the greatest hazard in an economy that does not expand at a fixed and regular rate each year.

I prefer to be classed with those who see danger in deficit spending and inflation. Nevertheless, there will be times when some spending will seem to me to be the prudent course and the best way of conserving values that are important to our way of life and our survival as a nation. The bill now before us (S. 12), the so-called educational TV bill, would authorize the kind of spending I approve—even at a time when money is relatively short.

During my service on the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, I have had the opportunity to follow the hearings on the allocation and use of educational television channels. This is a matter to which the Senator from Washington referred a moment ago. It has been most gratifying to note, year after year, the tremendous strides taken by those communities whose educational TV stations have actually gone on the air.

At the same time, it has been disappointing to observe that two-thirds of the people in the United States still have no access to educational television. At present, only a score of our great universities use television to meet their educational responsibilities. Of the many thousands of school systems in the United States, only about 150 have educational television even in their near future. For the rest, educational TV is probably many years away.

The failure to make more abundant use of educational television stems from no lack of confidence in its worth either on the part of educators or of others who have had the opportunity and occasion to evaluate it. The trouble is that not enough people know what educational television can do, and their voices are too small when budgets are put together. The inevitable consequence is postponement added to postponement. Meanwhile, children march through school, never to return to grades in which instruction has been thin and poor because of the lack of access to educational television.

To me, the great tragedy in lost educational opportunity lies in the impossibility of retrievement. The hours and years doled out to each of us can be spent but once. If by inaction or inadequate plan, we give too thin a fare to those for whose learning we hold responsibility, we fail in a way that we cannot make up, for what is lost is learning time.

Educational television is not primarily a way of making learning palatable. Neither is it primarily a way of lowering the cost per student. It is simply the best way open to us to improve the quality of education and make it universal. Television broadens the reach of the best teachers—even to remote rural schools and areas. It adds to the effectiveness of all teachers. It enriches curricula and introduces subject matter not otherwise available outside of great metropolitan centers.

As I see it, the bill before us is a kind of domestic point 4 program. It is a way of getting educational television operating, at least on a pilot plant basis, in all of the States at the earliest possible moment. The bill would not force-feed educational television to school systems which do not want it. It would not put the Federal Government into the business of prescribing course content, methods of teaching, qualifications of teachers, or structure of school systems. If enacted, it would simply give a helping hand, at a time when it is most needed, to schools, colleges, and other educational entities which are ready and willing to spend even more of their own money to get educational television going or expanded to meet their needs.

The substance of S. 12 was approved by the Senate in the second session of the 85th Congress. The bill at that time was S. 2119, which, as indicated by the distinguished Senator from Washington, was reported unanimously by the Commerce Committee despite adverse comment from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

I mention that comment in particular because a similar comment has been received from the same Department on the current bill, S. 12. As a matter of fact, the comment on the bill before us gives every evidence of having been quilted from pieces of the previous one. The substance of the comment, in both instances, is that the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has no information to indicate that S. 12 is necessary to assure continuing development of educational television or that there is inability, without Federal help, to finance transmitting equipment.

I cannot quarrel with the HEW comment other than to say that it misses the point, as I understand the matter. I agree that educational television can grow and expand without Federal help. I even think it likely that most communities can, if put to the task, finance the purchase of transmitting equipment. Ultimately they will, but in the meantime, how many children will we have neglected? How many potential scientists will we have lost through failure to make televised courses in chemistry and physics available to students in thinly populated areas? They are entitled to those privileges.

Turning now to the budgetary approach, how much will S. 12 cost? If all the grants authorized are taken up within the 5 years stipulated in the bill, the total cost will be $51 million. I hope that all of the grants will be taken up, but there are obstacles that could result in the lapse of some of the authorized funds. A lot of thinking, planning, and local decisions must take place before an applicant can even be ready to file for a grant. Such decisions embrace commitments to provide sites, buildings, personnel, and operating and maintenance funds for educational TV.

As provided in the bill, an applicant may fall into any of the following categories: First, the applicant may be, in his State, the officer or agency primarily responsible for the State supervision of public elementary and secondary schools. In this class would fall State superintendents of public instruction, State boards of education, and the like. The second class is a relatively new type entity, a nonprofit foundation, corporation, or association organized primarily to engage in or encourage educational television broadcasting. Fitting this definition is such a group as the Greater Washington Educational Television Association, Inc.

The third class is a duly constituted State educational television commission. An example of such a body is the Alabama Educational Television Commis-

sion, whose general manager, by the way, testified during the hearings on S. 12.

The fourth and final class of applicant is a State controlled college or university.

The rate of spending under S. 12 would be determined not only by the time required by the various types of applicants to arrive at local plans and decisions but also by certain requirements that the Commission of Education is empowered to impose. Before he may make a grant, the Commissioner must determine that it is reasonable and necessary to cover the cost of acquiring and installing transmission apparatus and that it falls within the overall allocation of $1 million for the State from which the application comes. The Commissioner may make any grant in installments, if he deems it appropriate.

Aside from the delays which may be occasioned by the need for local decisions and by the processing in the Office of the Commissioner of Education, there will be additional delays in many instances because of the need to obtain a construction permit from the Federal Communications Commission for a reserved educational TV channel. It is most difficult, therefore, to predict the impact of this legislation upon the budget of a particular fiscal year other than to say that it is most unlikely that any great part of the authorized funds would be expended within the first year or two of operation under the grant authority.

No doubt those States which have already done most in the field of educational TV would be first to come forward with plans and applications for extension and improvement of the work already under way. I see no harm, however, in early grants to those areas which already have some educational television, because everything learned in this field immediately becomes part of a body of common knowledge readily available to others who want to follow the pioneers. Furthermore, work done in the pioneering areas trains people who can then fan out to assist in development of educational TV in new areas. That such diffusion of trained people has already taken place was indicated in the biographies of expert witnesses who testified during the hearings on S. 12. More of such diffusion will occur, and it will come faster, when funds authorized by S. 12 become available to the several States, the District of Columbia, and Hawaii.

In essence, Mr. President, the judgment each of us is called upon to make in connection with the pending bill is whether the expenditures it would authorize are ones it would be wise to postpone or to forego altogether. In my view, they have been postponed overlong already. If we are to make educational opportunity truly universal, if we are to give to our youth in their learning years and their creative years the breadth of education which it is within our power to give, we should, in my humble opinion, vote our approval of S. 12. When that has been done, we shall have taken a great step forward in the field of education.

Mr. President, my colleague on the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the distinguished junior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON], who is much interested in the bill and who did much work in this field, is unavoidably detained from attendance in the Senate this afternoon. I ask unanimous consent that a statement which he would have made as a part of this discussion had he himself been present today be printed at this point in the RECORD, and also that the exhibits which he would have submitted also be printed following his statement.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR COTTON

Television has the ability to provide more education for more people in less time than any instrument ever devised. But much of this potential is going to waste today, despite our urgent needs in education.

In the 10 years since television became an every day reality, it has proved to have two great powers beyond any other means of communication.

First, unlike any other means of communication, it has immediacy. Now a man can sit in his own living room and see the curve of the earth. He can see his own destiny being shaped, at the moment, on stage. All the stored-up treasures of the ages—science, music, literature, art, culture, can be brought before his eyes.

Television is the one instrument through which sleeping interest in science, chemistry, and the arts can best be aroused. It reaches homes where books are seldom read. It reaches homes where beauty is absent. The maze of tubes and wires behind the screen have the capacity to lift the intellectual level of a whole nation to new heights.

This is the potential at our disposal, if we are willing to make use of it.

Second, it has an exposure power, an attractive force greater than ever before known. The average American sits before that little square screen more than 3 hours a day, over 22 hours a week. He spends more time before it than on anything else except sleep and his work. Forty-two million families have spent more on TV sets than on anything else they own except their homes and cars.

This tremendous investment in time and money does bring them a good deal of education, but only occasionally or incidentally. Americans are studying such things as atomic physics, religion, and Russian on commercial TV, but usually at some time like 6:30 in the morning. The economics of commercial TV effectively prevent even the most education-minded station executive from providing broader fare at better hours. To stay in business, he must present the big-paying, big-drawing horse operas and the variety shows during the prime viewing hours. Despite its own real efforts, commercial TV simply cannot bring educational telecasting to its full bloom.

The contrast between the lusty, billion-dollar commercial TV industry and the puny educational TV establishment emphasizes the need for swift, effective, and even drastic measures to get ETV off the ground.

Twelve percent of the Nation's television channels have been reserved for noncommercial, educational use for the past 7 years. Only 36 of these 257 channels are now on the air. Twenty-four more stations have gotten construction permits from the FCC but are not yet broadcasting, and six applications are pending.

Furthermore, 191 of these reserved channels are going begging. They have no takers. Two-thirds of the people of the Nation have no chance to see an educational TV station. Only 20 of our great universities have a TV station to help them carry out their regular and adult education responsibilities.

Not only is the potential of ETV going to waste, it is in danger of being lost entirely because of the steady and increasing pressure to free these channels for commercial use. This is especially true of the 45 which are in the VHF band covering the keenly-sought channels from 2 through 13. The Federal Communications Commission has steadfastly refused to throw open these channels for commercial TV, but they can't hold off indefinitely, allowing scarce channels to remain dark and vacant.

This bill offers a means of lighting up these 191 channels and putting them to the best possible use. By making up to $1 million available to each State for the equipment and facilities needed for their ETV stations, it will be a galvanizing shock that can make the promise of ETV a down-to-earth reality.

It is one low-cost, high-yield, single-shot Federal spending program I can go for with enthusiasm.

Frankly, I haven't always felt this way about ETV. While I believed the channels should be used for the enlightenment of our people, young and old, and to relieve the monotony of the endless westerns on commercial TV, I had the mistaken idea that ETV was the frosting of education. I had the impression it provided the appetizer but not the main course—teaching current events, improving cultural backgrounds, and whetting the appetite of students and adults for the arts and sciences.

Hearings before our committee last year and again this year have left no doubts. The record is filled with specific examples of the benefits of educational TV. In Memphis 700 adults have learned to read and write; in Schenectady 4,000 are learning a foreign language at 6:30 in the morning; in Chicago 29,000 have enrolled and paid fees for a junior college course; in rural sections of Oklahoma science and mathematics are being brought to children in small schools who have never been taught them before; 1,200 classes in the Washington area receive a daily science lesson. The list is a long one.

One of the most striking things is that the achievements of ETV stations have been accomplished with an investment of $60 million, and almost half of this sum, $27 million, has come from a single private charitable foundation, the Ford Foundation. There is no question that ETV can do for our schools what the power loom did for the weaver. It offers new opportunities for better teaching at a saving in teachers and buildings.

In my own State, the New Hampshire Educational Broadcasting Council, composed of representatives of 19 schools and colleges, the State Department of Education of the Catholic Diocese, and the Association of School Superintendents, has been striving to put an ETV station on the air. In 1958, a citizens committee was successful in raising sufficient funds to match a grant from the Ford Foundation's Fund for Adult Education, and securing a construction permit for a station at Durham, N.H. WENH plans to be on the air within a few months, presenting its educational programs over channel 11. New Hampshire's other educational TV channel, 27 at Hanover, is still unused and unsought.

New Hampshire's share of the funds provided by S. 12 will be available for such things as improving the facilities of WENH, increasing its power and range, and installing other devices to bring its benefits to a wider number of viewers, as well as for lighting the darkness of channel 27. The full value of ETV will be a long time coming to New Hampshire, and most of the rest of the Nation, unless we seize the opportunity before us.

The time has come to put ETV on a firm basis. Passage of this bill will be a powerful and overdue move in the right direction.

EXHIBIT 1

UNIVERSITY OF NEW HAMPSHIRE,
Durham, N.H., March 30, 1959.

Hon. NORRIS COTTON,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR COTTON: The University of New Hampshire educational television station, WENH-TV, sent out its test pattern from its tower site last week and will initiate its first program services June 1, with 3 or 4 hours of adult educational programing. The enclosure explains our plans for this project, carried on in cooperation with the other college and educational agencies of the State.

As you know, there is now pending Senate bill 12 (the Magnuson bill), which will provide up to $1 million to each State for educational television transmitting facilities. This could mean, of course, expanding our planned coverage, going to full power, and providing a genuinely statewide educational television service. In these ways, New Hampshire would benefit, even though we are about to get WENH-TV on the air from other minimal sources of support. For these reasons, we and all concerned with the station's future are much interested in the passage of the Magnuson bill again.

We are grateful for your assistance last year, and feel confident of its continuation. We invite you to tour our studio and transmitter facilities when you are in Durham.

Sincerely yours,

ELDON L. JOHNSON,
President.

EXHIBIT 2

JANUARY 28, 1959.

Citizens of New Hampshire will be served in their homes and schools by late spring through the facilities of WENH-TV, the State educational television station, located at the University of New Hampshire, Durham. Station manager Keith J. Nighbert is already making plans for early conferences with the New Hampshire Broadcasting Council, the Citizens Advisory Committee, and superintendents, teachers, and principals of the State. A statewide program survey will be conducted to determine what the people of this State would like to see in terms of program services on WENH-TV.

The educational television transmitter building, located on Saddleback Mountain, Deerfield, is now completed, with the tower antenna to be erected within the next 2 weeks. Studio and office located in the Memorial Union Building at the university are now being constructed and will be completed in about 3 months.

WENH-TV Chief Engineer Charles F. Halle has completed the hiring of his engineering staff. Program and production staff will be selected within the next few months.

Tentative plans for the station's program schedule indicate that about 2 hours of programs in the morning will be provided for in-school television lessons for the New Hampshire schools. Demonstrations of the in-school television service for teachers will be scheduled by the station in the late spring. This will be an opportunity to give teacher training and will allow schools to obtain, install, and adjust equipment for channel 11.

The engineering staff will welcome questions about the type of television equipment for schools and will be glad to supply the necessary information.

Adult programing will be telecast 3 or 4 hours each evening, Monday through Friday, when the station takes the air. A concerted effort will be made, Nighbert said, to attract and procure outstanding New Hampshire talent for the live programs to be produced by the station.

Services to the schools can be a major service with either supplementary experiences offered through the station or direct teaching of subject matter.

New Hampshire children may soon have the opportunity of having the State's outstanding art or music or science teacher coming into their classrooms daily. The school curriculum can be both broadened and strengthened through this new educational service. In-service training through our State colleges can provide valuable assistance to teachers in their homes or classrooms by providing them with college courses for credit or with demonstration lessons in the elementary and secondary curriculum.

Mr. Nighbert stressed the point that teachers and school administrators will make the decisions as to content of the in-school program services.

The staff of WENH-TV will strive to provide quality program services of significance to the people of New Hampshire. Our aim will be to make this station the "best station" in the Nation, Mr. Nighbert said.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD three articles, as follows: One entitled "There Is No Substitute for the Truth on the Air," written by John Crosby; one entitled "A 'Revolution' Is on the Way," also written by John Crosby; and one entitled "Global TV Is Coming," written by James L. Kilgallen.

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

WITNESS ETV—THERE IS NO SUBSTITUTE FOR THE TRUTH ON THE AIR

(By John Crosby)

ANN ARBOR, MICH.—"Gandhi demonstrated the power of the spirit over material things," declared the narrator in a film on the University of Michigan television's "Genius" series. "You could put his possesions into a shopping bag but he lived and died for the truth and therein lay his genius."

You might say that educational television has the same material weakness and spiritual strength Gandhi had. But educational television people don't always know where their strength and weakness lie. The most powerful educational TV shows I have seen here have been fairly simple declarations of truth—and all you need for that is a human being who knows what he's talking about and a camera.

For instance, one film on the university's "Understanding Our World" series is on the unpalatable subject of the behavior of our prisoners of war in Korea. The record is bad—very bad—but no attempt is made to pretty it up. After all, the university doesn't have sponsors or ad agencies or Nielsen ratings to worry about or to placate. It can present the truth unvarnished. Frequently, the lack of varnish is enforced by the absence of money to buy varnish or production and this, too, is an asset—even though it's hard to convince a producer that it is.

Every so often the bare bones of truth begin to pall on the producers and directors of educational TV. Then trouble looms. They begin to pretty up the truth with production, with music, with singing, and lighting and acting—and pretty soon it doesn't resemble truth or entertainment or anything else. The most horrible example of this I know was the Bell Telephone Hour prettying up cosmic rays with cute dialogue and cartoons and sound effects to the point where anyone seeing it could never understand cosmic rays at all.

Michigan television has not done anything that bad but now and then production does rear its head. One of the "Genius" series was on Magellan—"My Name—Magellan," cried the hero just like in "Dragnet"—which resembled an Abe Burrows parody on all documentaries.

Sometimes this ingenuity was striking. The Gandhi program opened with a shot of Gandhi's few possessions—his spectacles and sandals and books. Over his picture was a simple moving account of Gandhi's assassination. In the long run, words are educational TV's greatest assets—and they are inexpensive though precious.

While the rest of television is drowning in triviality, educational TV has another great asset which those in charge of it sometimes forget—and that is the sheer importance of its subject matter. Here they have done massive 10-part studies of Russia and China. When the viewer has finished with these, he is left with a very real sense of achievement, far more lasting and rewarding than any amount of entertainment.

There's no limit to what persevering young men can do with little but their own ingenuity. Besides television, Michigan has an educational radio station, WUOM, which is now preparing a series on journalism. Here again the power of words is striking.

I listened to one of these on foreign correspondence and heard Eric Sevareid complain: "There isn't much point in having very able men scattered all over the world if the networks only use a minute or so a day on news programs. It's not enough to get the facts; space is needed to present them on the air and now the men don't have the opportunity."

It was quite a hard-bitten honest roundup of expression from some of the most capable newsmen in the business.

A "REVOLUTION" IS ON THE WAY

(By John Crosby)

NEW YORK.—On my lecture tour I am impressed and just a little abashed to discover that the first question on everyone's lips is a sort of half-belligerent, half-prayerful: "How about educational television?" I'm tempted to reply: "Yeah, how about that"—and let it go at that. Because, I'm afraid I come from a very backward city in that regard. In some 34 cities, none of them in New York, educational television stations are now busily disgorging education on the daytime and nighttime air, hitherto considered sacred to the sale of deodorants. However, while we don't have a station, we do have the Metropolitan Educational Television Association trying to catch up, mostly with daytime programs on channel 11. The other day I had a talk with Richard Heffner, director of programing at META, on just what they're up to at META these days.

"We have quite diverse programing now. For instance we have a French course each day, a course on the Far East is given on Wednesdays by Dr. John Stoessinger of Hunter College, playwrights in the contemporary theater given by Norris Houghton, and a Russian course by Miss Katherine Alexieff of St. John's."

Not long ago META invited some of its Russian students to its headquarters at the Carnegie Endowment International Center and conducted its TV class from there. This was partly to find out how many people were taking its Russian course, partly to dramatize an appeal for funds. The results were gratifying. Students of Russian of all ages, including some Boy Scouts from New Jersey, overflowed the room, happily phrasing Miss Alexieff's sentences and answering questions in Russian on camera. Russian is not an easy language to teach but it can be taught on TV and is being taught in about 32 cities. If Russian can be taught, anything can be taught on television.

While ETV (educational television) is supposed to have a small audience, Heffner says with great earnestness that ETV alone can really reach all of the people: "Everyone

wants to learn, to know, to grow—in some area or other, ETV doesn't have to capture the largest possible audience—all at the same time—as the commercial stations do. But cumulatively it can get your interest with one kind of program, mine with another. ETV can truly foster alternative programing. This makes it possible to reach all of the people—and it doesn't have to worry about getting them all at once."

The educational and cultural challenges that confront this country are manyfold and Heffner thinks the greatest weapon—and one of the most neglected—is educational TV.

A glance at channel 11 during the day will show META's strong points and weaknesses. I have watched warm, relaxed, vital teachers imparting science so skillfully that it was a pleasure to watch. I have seen math courses in singsong English by bored teachers who almost put me to sleep. We have all had teachers like that in school. There's no excuse for having them on television.

But even with its small budget and sometimes shaky foundation, META has always caused a run on course books in local stores, brought forth innumerable letters to me, and tremendous interest from all levels and all ages. Right now, it's preparing courses for distribution on languages and linguistics, astronomy, poets, and poetry. This is just the beginning of what the Rockefeller report calls "a long overdue revolution in teaching techniques."

GLOBAL TV IS COMING

(By James L. Kilgallen)

NEW YORK.—Worldwide television—how soon? Perhaps within 10 years, according to Edmond H. Leavey, president of International Telephone and Telegraph Corp., a former major general in the U.S. Army, and one of the Nation's foremost experts in communications.

"By one electronics development or another, worldwide television can be a reality within a generation—perhaps within 10 years," he told me in an interview. "The major problems have been solved, so this method of global communications could come as quickly as capital is made available and the relay stations are built."

A second question was: What will this mean to the world?

"Obviously, worldwide TV would bring a better understanding among all free nations of the world," said Leavey.

"Conceivably it could mean the development of a universal language and, eventually, it should lead to an unprecedented era of peace which I am sure all men, in their hearts, desire."

Already, the electronics industry has made international television possible, marking a big stride toward worldwide television. This was accomplished through "over-the-horizon" transmission, a technique pioneered by I.T. & T.

The first commercial television of "O/H," as it is termed, came on September 13, 1957, when a program originating in the United States was seen in Cuba for the first time through this technique.

Explaining how this technique works, Leavey said:

"Envision the world surrounded by a gaseous blanket, 5 to 10 miles above the surface of the earth. This is the troposphere. Television signals, shot from a powerful transmitter, strike the gaseous layer. Some of the signals move out into space.

"Some signals are scattered forward and drop to the earth, where they are captured by highly sensitive receivers, given new strength, and transmitted on to a television station which broadcasts the program to its viewers."

In other words, O/H signals can be bounced from one land mass to another.

With O/H transmission now working smoothly between Florida and Cuba—over a 187-mile link from Florida City, Fla., to Guanabo, Cuba, just south of Havana—its future possibilities excite the imagination. Electronics experts believe it is only a question of time when this service will be worldwide.

Every Friday night boxing matches in the United States, under the sponsorship of the National Broadcasting Co., are seen in Cuba at the same time they are viewed in the United States. Other programs have also been carried.

The 1958 World Series games were transmitted from New York and Milwaukee to Cuba by O/H. On-the-spot coverage of the recent overthrow of Batista in Cuba was fed from Havana to U.S. TV screens by this technique.

The next step in the direction of worldwide TV, according to scientists, might be the establishment of a series of transmitters and receivers which would take the shortest route across the top of the world via land masses, with O/H transmitters shooting signals from one country to another.

In Europe at present there is a TV network called Eurovision. It's a system whereby one European country transmits to another by TV—not on a regular basis but only on big events such as the coronation of the Pope.

Eventually, Eurovision could serve as a terminal for transatlantic communication from America in the establishment of worldwide television.

Now that international television is in operation between the United States and Cuba, the next step could be to set up an all-Spanish language network which would embrace Cuba, Mexico, Haiti, the Dominican Republic, and Puerto Rico.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DOUGLAS in the chair). The committee amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. At the end of the bill, it is proposed to insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. 7. No application for any grant under this Act may be accepted by the Commissioner of Education after the day which is five years after the date of enactment of this Act.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HART in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I find it necessary to oppose the bill which is presently before the Senate. In a general way, it provides for a million dollars in grants to the respective States for establishing and improving educational TV.

While, of course, "improve" is a word that has a wide latitude and is subject to a great deal of interpretation, I presume improvement will go on year after year unto infinity. So, in the launching of a program of this kind, I can see it is the beginning, and certainly not the end. I presume that at some time in the future much more money will be involved in this program than is authorized by the pending bill.

Once again I find it necessary to invite attention to the fact that this bill is not consonant with the budget of the President of the United States for the fiscal year 1960. It may well be said, since we have 49 States, there will be involved only $49 million, and what is $49 million in an era and an age when we so carelessly throw billions of dollars around?

I have just finished making a TV film for the viewers and listeners back home, and also some radio tapes. I do that every week for some 50 or 60 stations in Illinois. I spent a part of the weekend developing a little information on the so-called missile program, because nothing bewilders me more than the intriguing subject of missiles. I learned that in the fiscal year 1959 we have earmarked, as I recall, some $7 billion for missiles, and in fiscal 1960 there will be an equivalent amount.

I entered Congress 25 years ago, when the whole Government was operated for about half that sum. So it is understandable when people say, "Well, it is only $50 million." But, frankly, $50 million is not hay to the taxpayers anywhere in the country.

What is the present situation with respect to channels? There are 257 television channels set aside for educational television. Of that number 50 are very high frequency channels, which are the more desirable channels. There are 171 ultra high frequency channels. Those are mainly available for educational TV purposes.

In principle, the program is good. But the question is, Is there a need for the Federal Government being requested to put up money for this program, and for its development and improvement? We ought to look at the progress of educational TV in the past 6 years. 32 States have taken action for its development. It cannot be said they have been laggard or are guilty of laches. Seven States have appropriated funds for statewide TV educational programs. 37 stations have come on the air in the past 6 years. That is a rather creditable record, I think. 12 stations are in the process of building or preparations are being made to build them. There are 41 locations in the planning stage.

Under such circumstances, with those channels available for educational purposes, it can scarcely be said progress has not been made or that the States have not been aware of or alerted to their responsibility.

In addition thereto, we are getting some closed circuit TV. It has been reported that has been increasing at a rather fast rate.

If this program were absolutely necessary, quite aside from whether it is desirable or not, surely the Secretary of the department of Government which is concerned with education and in which the Office of Education is located would be coming before the appropriate committee and making rather vigorous and robust advocacy of the program and urging Congress to adopt it. That is not the case, if I read correctly the letter addressed to the Chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, date February 2 of this year, a

letter over the signature of Arthur S. Flemming, the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Mr. Flemming is no novice in this field or in the governmental field. He came before us once as Chairman of the Civil Service Commission. He has held other responsible positions in Government. He is Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare today. He gained distinction for himself in the educational field as president of an outstanding college in Ohio. I refer to Dr. Arthur S. Flemming.

In his letter to the committee he states, among other things:

> The Radio-Television Services Section of the Office of Education has played an active role in both the promotion and evaluation of educational television.

Further along in the letter he states:

> The National Defense Education Act of 1958, authorizes the Commissioner of Education, through grants or contracts, to conduct, assist, and foster research and experimentation in the use of television, radio, motion pictures, and related media for educational purposes.

I submit that statement only to point out that he is identified with this field; and that the Office of Education and the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare are alert to their responsibilties and to the needs in this field.

So, on the basis of that qualification, here is a recital in the Secretary's letter which I think is quite persuasive:

> We have no information indicating that a Federal program, such as this bill would provide, is necessary to assure continuing development of educational television, or that there is an inability to finance the acquisition and installation of transmitting equipment.

There is the Cabinet officer who, in the structure of Government responsible for the Nation's activities in the education field—and that includes educational television—stating very simply, in language all can understand, that the States are able to finance the program; that they are able to procure the necessary equipment, and that there is no information indicating that this proposed Federal program is necessary.

So it seems to me a statement of that kind merits the attention of the legislative branch, charged, as it is, with the responsibility for the public purse, and undertaking, if it can, to cojoin with the President in attaining a balanced budget, or a reasonably balanced budget.

The Secretary made another statement in that letter which merits attention:

> It is our view that for the present, at least, Federal assistance in the development of educational television is most effectively rendered through the assignment of transmitting channels for educational use, the general encouragement of ultrahigh frequency transmission, and study and research in the utilization for educational purposes.

Then he says, among other things, that a weakness in the bill lies in the fact that it does not "provide any guide for establishing a reasonable and equitable method for allocating the total funds available among the States."

The Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare says that the necessity has not been established, and that there are no effective guidelines for allocating this money among the States. So it occurs to me it would be unwise, notwithstanding the action taken by the Senate last year, to enact the bill into law at this time. If my understanding is correct, the House rejected the bill. The bill is before the Senate for a second time.

I wish to summarize the arguments of the chief administrative officer in Government under whose direction the bill would be administered. He says, first, there is no information that a Federal program such as this bill provides is necessary; second, there is no information that there is an inability on the part of the States to finance such a program; third, that there is no guide for allocating the funds; and, fourth, he recommends that the bill not be enacted into law.

When we talk about development and improvement and acquisition of facilities for educational TV, Mr. President, let us look down the road a little further. We will soon have to start talking about maintenance of those facilities, also. TV facilities are sensitive, and involve highly expensive appliances. States may acquire facilities under terms of this bill and then say, "We need additional money for maintenance," or, "we need expansion of these facilities." So a measure of this kind may become an entering wedge rather than the final conclusion of a venture in this field.

I submitted this matter to the Bureau of the Budget, and I learned it was not consonant with the budget estimates or the budget program of the President of the United States.

Since the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare is opposed to passage of the bill, and since the Bureau of the Budget is opposed, considering the spending mood which is presently upon us I think we have a responsibility to conserve even $50 million, although in a budget of seventy thousand million dollars it seems to be only a little bit of money. So, Mr. President, recognizing, as I do, the possibilities of television as an instrumentality in the educational field, I still feel it necessary to lift my voice in opposition to the bill, because it is not necessary at this time. The States can take the load, and we should not put this burden upon the 1960 budget.

When the 1960 budget was submitted to us the figures were so closely calibrated that we could see only roughly a $70 million surplus. This bill, if passed, would almost demolish the small surplus which was contemplated by those who, in connection with the activities and the functions of Government, gave so much time and attention to assembling figures which would keep the budget in balance and generate good will and confidence on the part of the people not only at home but abroad.

I am therefore not willing to authorize the additional $50 million, because it will be too easy to say, on another occasion when a bill which is founded on desirable principles and is designed to provide a desirable function is under consideration, "It involves only $50 million." It takes only 10 bills each involving $50 million to make a half billion dollars. Pretty soon we would have a real impact upon our fiscal structure, the delicate fabric upon which this country rests.

The testimony and the letter of the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare speak for themselves. I am quite content, since the Secretary is expert in the field and is charged with the responsibility for the educational activities of the country, to stand upon his recommendation when he says that this bill should not be enacted into law.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point the letter of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare; and, following that, the testimony and statement of Mr. William G. Harley, president of the National Association of Educational Broadcasters, which represents 142 colleges and universities.

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

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION, AND WELFARE,
February 2, 1959.

Hon. WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
Chairman, Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This letter is in response to your request of January 12, 1959, for a report on S. 12, a bill to expedite the ultilization of television transmission facilities in our public schools and colleges, and in adult training programs.

S. 12 would authorize the appropriation of such amounts as may be necessary to assist the States and certain organizations therein to establish or improve television broadcasting for educational purposes. It would authorize the Commissioner of Education, upon the application of an eligible State agency, officer, or organization, to make a grant—such grants not to exceed an aggregate of $1 million in any State for the establishment or improvement of television broadcasting facilities to be used only for educational purposes. The "establishment or improvement of television broadcasting facilities" is defined as "the acquisition and installation of transmission apparatus necessary for television (including closed-circuit television) broadcasting." Eligible agencies would be limited to (a) the agency primarily responsible for the State supervision of public elementary and secondary schools; (b) a nonprofit foundation, corporation, or association organized primarily to engage in or encourage educational television broadcasting; (c) a duly constituted State educational television commission; and (d) a State controlled college or university. The applicant would be required to provide satisfactory assurance to the Commissioner of Education that the necessary funds to operate and maintain such facilities would be available.

In its sixth report and order, dated April 14, 1952, the Federal Communications Commission set aside 242 channels (now 257) for the exclusive use of noncommercial educational television (representing approximately 12 percent of all channels available for television use in the United States). Each State and Territory, as well as the District of Columbia, was assigned the maximum number of channels then available to provide an opportunity for a minimum service deemed

necessary for the use of the noncommercial educational use of a portion of the publicly owned television channels of our country.

Under the provisions of the sixth report and order and further, under the rules for operation adopted by the Commission, 32 States have called statewide conferences, set up State advisory commissions, and otherwise have taken action toward the development of educational television on a statewide basis. One group of States, the Southern Conference of 16 States, has investigated the possibilities of an interchange of program output within their area, in order to reduce costs of operation and avoid duplication of effort in subject-matter fields of educational interest.

Seven States have appropriated funds directly to support statewide educational television operations—Alabama, Florida, Georgia, New York, North Carolina, Oklahoma, and Oregon. Many other States contribute indirectly to educational television stations and closed circuit operations through appropriations to their State universities or in partial support of individual school systems. Among such university stations are those located at Michigan State University, the University of Wisconsin, the University of Nebraska, the University of Washington, the University of Illinois, Oregon State College, and Ohio State University. The University of Minnesota, the University of Utah, the University of Georgia, and the University of Arizona are all now building or operating stations. Expenditures for educational television via closed circuit within campus are made for those programs carried on by at least 50 more institutions.

During the 6-year period of the development of educational television, 37 noncommercial educational stations have come on the air and some 12 are in process of building or preparatory to building. Another group of approximately 41 locations are in the planning stage.

Research to date indicates that television is a practical means of transmitting a wide variety of knowledge and skills and possesses the potential of serving educational needs existing both within and beyond the classroom. Educational television, however, is still largely in the state of experiment and planning, as indicated by this report.

Closed-circuit construction for educational television, from present reports, is increasing at a fast rate in all parts of the country. There is evidence of a steady growth of interest in every phase of educational television from preschool to university extension, and further evidence at hand shows that it will continue to elicit and deserve public support and approval.

The Radio-Television Services Section of the Office of Education has played an active role in both the promotion and evaluation of educational television. It will continue to be of such assistance. Title VII of Public Law 85-864, the National Defense Education Act of 1958, authorizes the Commissioner of Education, through grants or contracts, to conduct, assist, and foster research and experimentation in the use of television, radio, motion pictures, and related media for educational purposes. It also authorizes him to make studies and surveys to determine the need for increased utilization of these media by State or local educational agencies and institutions of higher learning and to make available to them the results of research in this field. The program thus authorized is being rapidly and vigorously developed by the Office of Education.

We have no information indicating that a Federal program, such as this bill would provide, is necessary to assure continuing development of educational television, or that there is an inability to finance the acquisition and installation of transmitting equipment. Some States have as yet taken no steps to initiate the necessary planning for utilizing television in their educational programs and some States have moved more slowly than others in carrying their planning to the point of actual operation of facilities. It is our view that for the present, at least, Federal assistance in the development of educational television is most effectively rendered through the assignment of transmitting channels for educational use, the general encouragement of ultrahigh frequency transmission, and study and research in the utilization for educational purposes.

Finally, it should be noted that the bill, while limiting to $1 million the amount of grants for television facilities in any one State, does not establish, or provide any guide for establishing a reasonable and equitable method for allocating the total funds available among the States.

For the reasons discussed above, and in the light of the healthy and continued growth of educational television, though the purpose of the bill is most laudable in intent, we recommend that S. 12 not be enacted.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that it perceives no objection to the submission of this report to your committee.

Sincerely yours,

ARTHUR S. FLEMMING,
Secretary.

STATEMENT OF WILLIAM G. HARLEY, PRESIDENT, NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF EDUCATIONAL BROADCASTERS, MADISON, WIS.

Mr. HARLEY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I am William Harley. I am here on behalf of the National Association of Educational Broadcasters. This is a 34-year-old association made up of 142 universities, colleges, public schools, and nonprofit community corporations which operate or hold construction permits for 148 nonprofit educational radio and 35 nonprofit educational television stations.

The preamble to our constitution states that we associate ourselves to promote the dissemination of knowledge, education and information to the end that the educational, cultural, and technical benefits of broadcasting may be extended to all.

Our appearance here this morning is entirely consistent with that stated purpose.

Though I have a prepared statement to offer for the record, in the interest of conserving time I will confine my remarks to a summary of points relating to this central idea; namely, the need for extending the educational benefits of broadcasting to all, and the relation of this proposed legislation in helping to realize that objective.

In testimony presented yesterday and before this committee last April there has been ample documentation of the crisis in education, and convincing evidence presented as to the use of television as a tested tool for helping to meet both the qualitative as well as the quantitative problems confronting education. It has the potential for providing more information to more people in less time than any instrument yet devised.

This tool for education stands ready, awaiting the support which can project it into the full usefulness of which it is capable.

There are now 36 educational television stations in the United States. Most of these are not adequately financed; few have sufficient power or enough physical facilities. Where they do exist, their usefulness and economy are each year being demonstrated.

We believe the record of educational television's contribution to education at all of the levels is an impressing one wherever it exists, either on a broadcast or closed-circuit basis, but it exists in all too few spots to provide the national assistance our educational efforts require now.

As I stand here, two-thirds of the population of the United States has no access to educational television. All but some 20 of the great universities of the United States have no television station to help them meet their regular and adult educational responsibilities. All but some 150 of the many thousands of school systems of the Nation are probably years away from access to this electronic miracle unless Federal assistance is provided.

Unless such support is available we believe that for many years there will be some 50 to 60 television stations in the Nation, while more than 150 other frequencies allocated for education lie fallow.

With only two or three exceptions, State, regional, and national networks will remain unrealized greens unless and until Federal funds are made available to construct stations to fill in the gaps, the hundreds of miles which separate these pioneer islands of television from each other.

We regard these funds proposed in this legislation as pump-priming funds, and, to mix a metaphor, are a tremendous shot in the arm for television, and a one shot in the arm. There should be no need to come back for a booster. With the added impetus and encouragement these Federal funds could provide we believe the States and individual communities can then push forward with the job to its fulfillment.

There is a need for this pump priming. It is absolutely essential that very few of the present 36 stations would now be on the air or at least as far along in their development if it were not for the pump priming provided for the first 20 or 21 stations by the fund for adult education.

The $100,000 to $150,000 made available for these emerging stations made all the difference between whether these stations just incubated or finally hatched.

Last year, in testimony before this committee, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare indicated that they had no evidence to indicate a need for Federal assistance to educational television in this country. I certainly trust that in the nearly a year which has elapsed since that time, the Department has taken the trouble to find out the facts about this situation, because there are plenty of situations in this country to provide ample evidence that State and local agencies are not in a position to get an educational television station established.

So, gentlemen, there is a need, and whether or not such aid is forthcoming can mean the difference between leadership for the United States and second-rate status for our Nation in education. Absence of such help can mean delay of a generation, and that may be too long.

Therefore, on the basis of solid evidence presented in testimony before this committee on April 24 and 25 of 1958 and January 27, 1959, regarding both the educational needs of our Nation and of the needs of our educational system for more modern instruments of instruction, and of the potential of television as an instrument available to help solve our national educational needs now, I would most earnestly urge passage of this legislation.

Thank you.

Senator MONRONEY. Thank you very much, Mr. Harley.

Would you say that the distribution of the funds provided in this bill, $1 million per State, is an equitable distribution, from your standpoint?

Mr. HARLEY. I think it is a very practical and reasonable approach to the situation. I think that other solutions might be provided but I think that this is the most workable one.

Some stations have different population densities, but in other cases the places, where there are not as many people and in other places there is more need.

Senator MONRONEY. The more populous States have a greater audience so they get a

major benefit out of it even though the expenditure might be the same.

It is not like so many classrooms that are necessary to house students. This does reach out into the other areas.

Mr. HARLEY. That is correct.

Senator MONRONEY. Would you say also that while it will act as the seedcorn in some States that do not now have any educational television, it will also be a very great shot in the arm to those who desire to further expand the service area of their programs that are now local in character by establishing statewide networks?

Mr. HARLEY. I agree absolutely. Not only do we need to expand existing facilities, but it is absolutely true that this might provide the impetus for establishing stations where none now exist.

It is frequently the case that in a State where tax funds would be made available to support educational television, the feeling is that unless the service can be provided for every citizen of the State, these funds should not be provided to establish service to a local area. And they don't have funds for a whole television network in the State immediately available, so nothing is done at all.

I think that funds of this order, if made available, might trigger the establishment of State networks in many areas.

Senator MONRONEY. Do you also think that in this program that the Federal Communications Commission owes a duty, since many areas of the United States such as New York, New Jersey, Virginia, District of Columbia, and many others I could mention, where you have large blocks of population and an extremely high adult population, that would like to receive nonclassroom educational television, that the FCC owes a duty to this vast group of people to try, through whatever engineering facilities they might require, to see if additional V stations could be squeezed into some of these areas?

Mr. HARLEY. I certainly hope and feel that it is an obligation of the FCC to do something about making benefits of television more generally available to every citizen of the country.

This is the greatest opportunity this Nation has ever had to make equality of educational opportunity available to everyone. It would be a crying shame if we didn't take advantage of this opportunity to realize this objective.

Senator MONRONEY. In other words, the equipment for a V or U station is almost the same, isn't it? I mean, as to cost. You don't pay a great deal more for the machinery to broadcast over a U than you do over a V?

Mr. HARLEY. The equipment is substantially the same. From the standpoint of the number of individuals reached by VHF compared to UHF, VHF is much more satisfactory.

Senator MONRONEY. You would have a hundred times greater yield on the same investment?

Mr. HARLEY. Absolutely.

Senator MONRONEY. So if as a part of this move we could move the Federal Communications Commission to resurvey areas which now do not have V channels for V dropins, we could reach millions where only thousands are reached by putting in U stations.

Mr. HARLEY. We would certainly be pleased with such an outcome.

Senator MONRONEY. Are the U transmitters easily and cheaply convertible to V if the channel is maintained?

Mr. HARLEY. I don't have the technical knowledge to answer that.

Senator MONRONEY. The cost of converting from U to V transmission should be studied. So while they are studying for the V locations in the areas which do not have educational V's today, specifically the Middle Atlantic States, including New York and New England, it may be possible to go on the air, perhaps with a U and if conversion is found to be inexpensive, the U transmitter can be converted to V as soon as one is available. Thus the public will have the advantage of having available an educational channel.

Mr. HARLEY. I think so.

Senator MONRONEY. Senator CASE?

Senator CASE. I have no questions at this time.

Senator MONRONEY. We appreciate very much your help and information given this committee, Mr. Harley, and wish you Godspeed in the work you are doing for educational broadcasting.

Mr. HARLEY. Thank you, sir. It has been a great privilege.

STATEMENT OF WILLIAM G. HARLEY ON S. 12

I am William G. Harley. I speak on behalf of the National Association of Educational Broadcasters, of which I am president. This is the 34-year-old association which is made up of the 142 universities, colleges, public schools, and nonprofit community corporations which operate or hold construction permits for 148 nonprofit educational radio and 35 nonprofit educational television stations. These stations are operated in the direct service of American education, as their primary function. In that respect I speak on behalf of American education rather than on behalf of broadcasting as such.

The NAEB, as I shall hereafter refer to our association, is the senior organization in the field of educational television and radio. In this capacity we have at various times in our history also seen specialized needs that we could not ourselves meet. NAEB leadership was instrumental in the creation of the Joint Council on Educational Television, which was set up to help safeguard the frequencies allocated to educational television and to expedite, as much as possible, their activation. The NAEB also recommended the creation of the Educational Television and Radio Center, which is the network for educational television. We are represented on the boards of the joint council and the center, and work closely and cooperatively with both. We have also had the privilege of being represented in testimony before other congressional committees in the past.

I would like, first of all, to thank the committee for the opportunity to appear here today on behalf of a service on the full development of which American education counts heavily to meet many of the needs and challenges of the years immediately ahead.

I would also like to thank you for the understanding and sympathy which our representatives were accorded, some 9 months ago, in appearances before this same committee.

At that time Mr. Richard B. Hull presented in some detail the history of educational broadcasting in the United States, and of the NAEB. We believe this is an honorable story of dedicated educators who all along have seen the possibilities of the electronic broadcast mediums as tools of education, and have sought to secure their benefits for American education. It is also a story of impoverishment amidst plenty, of the decimation of educational radio stations in the 1920's and 1930's because of the lack of funds, and the lack of other kinds of understanding and support of the sort which this bill, if approved, could begin to develop for television.

I should like to say a few words on behalf of educational radio, before I proceed to the principal portion of my statement. For we of the NAEB see television and radio both as educational resources, and much of what I shall say about television could also be said of educational radio. Moreover, school broadcasting by radio gives us some understanding and perspectives on what to expect from television, when it is adequately established.

Back in Wisconsin, which is my home State, we have pioneered in the use of radio to supplement instruction. We operate the only State radio network in the Nation; 10 transmitters programed from studios on the university campus.

For 28 years the Wisconsin Radio School of the Air has enriched classroom instruction in grade schools of the State. Approximately 284,000 individual Wisconsin children listen to these programs, with total enrollments in the various courses, on the basis of 2½ programs per child each week, of 710,000. In many counties 100 percent of the schools are now equipped with receivers, as a tribute to the usefulness of this broadcast service. This may give you some indication of what can be expected of educational television, which by adding the visual dimension, brings even more meaningful concepts into the experience of students and adults alike.

Our Nation was rudely awakened a little over a year ago by a flying object which Russia called a sputnik but which, so far as implications for America were concerned, was a flying alarm clock. Let us hope that Russia does not have to launch the equivalent of a sputnik in the use of television for educational purposes in order to bring the breakthrough which American education so desperately needs if it is again to seize a position of world leadership in education not only in science, mathematics, and the modern foreign languages but also in those humanities, social sciences, and cultural areas for which the world and especially the underdeveloped nations look to us for leadership. The testimony presented before this committee last April 24 and 25 made one fact clear: That television, with its potential capacity to impart more information to more people in less time than any medium yet devised, is an effective means of realizing the dream of our Founding Fathers for universal education. And this effectiveness has been demonstrated at all levels of education, from the primary grades through adult education, and in virtually all subjects in which it has been responsibly tried.

As a nation, we are committed to equal educational opportunity for all. Yet today in hundreds of rural areas there are no teachers qualified to teach physics, modern languages, art, music, and many other urgently needed disciplines. Many paraplegics and many who are aged or infirm, or even simply ashamed to go back to school, perhaps with their children or grandchildren, are left unserved. The millions of illiterates we have, and refugees who need to learn our language and our traditions, are unrealized resources of our Nation. The need is here. A tool is here, a powerful tool, to help solve these problems.

The crisis confronting education in this country regarding the appalling lack of facilities and teachers to cope with ever-mounting enrollments has been too well documented to need repeating here. Let me cite but one such statistic: At the present rate of training teachers it appears that there will be a shortage, at least of well-trained teachers, of some quarter of a million by 1965. By increasing the productivity of good teachers, and making adjustments possible in teacher loads and functions, educational television can greatly assist with this problem as well.

However, I would like to make clear that the NAEB does not promote television or radio, which we also deem important in education, as a replacement for teachers or for space or other facilities. We need better education—not cheaper education. We don't offer television merely as a temporary expedient regardless of how useful and efficient it is, for helping to solve the logistics problems of too many students, too little space, or too few teachers. We offer television principally to improve the quality and amount of good instruction which our Nation needs in so many subject areas.

Television can extend the influence of good teachers. But more importantly it can contribute to the effectiveness of the teaching of all teachers and the learning of all students. As a teacher training instrument as well as for informing the citizens of America of what their schools are doing, by opening a window on the classroom through which all who will can see, television offers an additional and promising new dimension for education.

Educational television also stands for a type of general public service which commercial television so far has not been able to offer in anything like adequate quantity or quality. Educational television makes the best minds of America's great educational institutions available to the whole community. It expands the public service potential of State and Federal agencies, helping to bring the Government and its elected officials closer to the people, and the people closer to their Government. We believe the hundreds of hours of this sort of programing on the educational stations of the Nation in this regard, as reported on in the hearings last April, are eloquent testimony to the social, educational, and general public service responsibility of educational television as it is emerging in these United States. It is attracting to positions of management some of the finest educators and community leaders and adult educators of our Nation—men who see here a facility with great promise for arousing our people to intellectual and community activity—arousing the honest curiosity and eagerness to learn which has too often been forgotten in recent years, in our belief that people want only whipped cream and meringue. We find that people, common everyday people, hungry for solid "nutritional" fare of an intellectual nature, respond and are grateful, and tell their friends about this new kind of television. Thus, the value systems implicit in commercial television in the United States find a counterbalance in the thoughtful and thought-provoking programing which characterize educational television's growing adult services.

The effectiveness of television as an instrument of education has been proved over and over again. Its economy, in comparison with outdated approaches, is increasingly recognized. It stands ready as a tool, or genii, awaiting the support which can project it into the full usefulness of which it is capable.

There are now 36 educational television stations in the United States. Most of these are not adequately financed. But where they exist, their usefulness and economy and courage are each year building more stable support for them.

We believe then that the record of educational television's contributions to education at all levels is an impressive one wherever it exists, either on a broadcast or closed circuit basis. But it exists in all too few spots to provide the national assistance our educational effort requires now.

As I stand here, two-thirds of the population of the United States has no access to educational television. All but some 20 of the great universities of the United States have no television station to help them meet their regular and adult education responsibilities. All but some 150 out of the many thousands of school systems of the Nation are years away from access to this electronic miracle unless Federal assistance is provided. Unless Federal support is provided, we believe that, for many years, there will be no more than some 40 to 50 educational television stations in the Nation, while over 200 other frequencies, allocated for education, lie fallow. With three or four exceptions, potential State, regional, and national networks will only remain unrealized dreams unless and until Federal funds are made available to construct stations to fill the gaps—the hundreds of miles which separate these pioneer islands of educational television—these lighthouse stations—from each other. Whether or not such aid is forthcoming can mean the difference between leadership for the United States and second rate status for our Nation in education. Absence of such help can mean delay of a generation; and that may be too long. I need not remind you, gentlemen, I know, how precarious is the position of the channels allocated for educational television. Commercial broadcasters, various industries, the armed services, and a multitude of other perfectly deserving organizations remind the Federal Communications Commission periodically of the unused resource contained in these channels for which funds have not been available to erect stations. They are under pressure. This pressure is daily increasing as the competition for more room in the spectrum intensifies.

We believe this bill, if approved, would give great impetus to station activation, and virtually at once, would announce this Nation's resolve not only to preserve but to use them for America's most critical need—for education. In many States, the use of State or public funds to develop educational television stations has been delayed or prevented, by the belief that, if State funds are to be used to support educational television, the service must be available to the entire State—not merely to those fortunate few who are within the service area of the university, or school system, or proposed organization seeking to launch it. Funds of the order proposed by this bill, though not sufficient to solve this problem fully, would break this deadlock, by making State systems, capable of serving, in most cases, the majority of the population and the schools of the State, a more realizable objective.

Once such vistas are opened, with pump-priming funds made available to make a start possible, we believe that live regional networks will not be long in forming—and a live national educational network can begin to be developed. Then, at last, this Nation will have a real alternative service to the entertainment-centered and commercial-based services which are the only ones we now have in most of the country. To summarize: Events of the first half of the 20th century, marked by two world wars, discovery of "the bomb," and culminating in space conquest, have shocked traditional education into an awareness that its problems do not and cannot end with halls of ivy and yesterday's print-based curriculums. The classroom has become the community, the Nation, the world. Schools, colleges, and universities, in an effort to preserve tomorrow's world, and make it better for our children, are trying to use every facility available to extend their area of service and their potential for usefulness.

The little band of individuals in my association who, years ago, had dreams about the great usefulness of these electronic instruments of education, and fought for frequencies for education first in standard AM radio (unsuccessfully), and later in FM radio and television (the latter two successfully) offer you this tool. Not as a replacement of teachers—or of space—or of higher salaries for teachers—but in support of, and as assistance to, all the other tools and resources we can muster. And with it we offer a growing body of dedicated members of our association also, who have learned and are daily learning to use this tool in new ways—for the good of American education.

If I may quote Dean Gordon Sabine, of Michigan State University: "The educational needs of the United States have so far outstripped the educational capabilities of the Nation that we must have educational television to help us win the fight to educate a whole people. Without it, we surely are defeated."

We of the NAEB feel that approval of the bill will also be a step toward something which for many years has been close to our hearts: The development of a sound national communications policy to the end that all the broadcast media, no matter in whose hands they rest, are employed for the greatest good of the Nation and the world.

Therefore, on the basis of the solid evidence presented in testimony before this committee on April 24 and 25 of 1958, regarding both the educational needs of our Nation and of our educational system for more modern instruments of instruction; and of the potential of television as an instrument available to help solve our national educational needs now, I would most earnestly urge passage of this legislation.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the part of the report containing the allocations now made to each State in the Union, appendix III, beginning on page 63 of the report.

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

APPENDIX III

Educational television channel reservations, January 1959

[86 VHF, 171 UHF; total 257]

Educational areas:	*Channel No.*
Alabama (7):	
Andalusia [1]	2
Auburn	56
Birmingham [1]	10
Mobile	42
Montgomery	26
Munford [1]	7
University	74
Arizona (2):	
Phoenix	8
Tucson	6
Arkansas (3):	
Fayetteville	13
Fort Smith	16
Little Rock	2
California (8):	
Fresno	18
Los Angeles	28
Sacramento	6
San Bernardino	24
San Diego	15
San Francisco-Oakland [1]	9
San Jose	54
Stockton	42
Colorado (4):	
Boulder	12
Colorado Springs	17
Denver [1]	6
Pueblo	8
Connecticut (3):	
Bridgeport	71
Hartford	24
Norwich	63
Delaware (1): Wilmington	59
District of Columbia (1): Washington	26
Florida (9):	
Gainsville [1]	5
Jacksonville [1]	7
Miami [1]	2
Orlando	24
Panama City	30
Pensacola	21
Tallahassee	11
Tampa-St. Petersburg [1]	3
West Palm Beach	15
Georgia (5):	
Athens	8
Atlanta [1]	30
Columbus	34
Macon	41
Savannah	9

[1] Educational stations on the air.

Educational television channel reservations, January 1959—Continued

Educational areas:	Channel No.
Idaho (2):	
Boise	4
Moscow	15
Illinois (7):	
Carbondale	8
Champaign-Urbana [1]	12
Chicago [1]	11
DeKalb	67
Moline. (See Davenport, Iowa.)	
Peoria	37
Rockford	45
Rock Island. (See Davenport, Iowa.)	
Springfield	66
Indiana (9):	
Bloomington	30
Evansville	9
Fort Wayne	27
Gary	66
Indianapolis	20
Lafayette	47
Muncie	71
South Bend-Elkhart	52
Terre Haute	57
Iowa (6):	
Cedar Rapids	26
Davenport-Rock Island, and Moline, Ill	30
Des Moines	11
Iowa City	12
Sioux City	30
Waterloo	22
Kansas (4):	
Lawrence	11
Manhattan	8
Topeka	48
Wichita	22
Kentucky (1): Louisville [1]	15
Louisiana (4):	
Baton Rouge	34
Lake Charles	14
New Orleans [1]	8
Monroe [1]	13
Maine (3):	
Bangor	16
Orono	12
Portland	47
Maryland (1): Baltimore	24
Massachusetts (3):	
Amherst	82
Boston [1]	2
North Adams	80
Michigan (12):	
Alpena	11
Ann Arbor	26
Bay City	73
Detroit [1]	56
Escanaba	49
Flint	22
Grand Rapids	17
Houghton	25
Kalamazoo	74
Marquette	35
Sault Ste. Marie	34
Traverse City	26
Minnesota (2):	
Duluth-Superior, Wis	8
Minneapolis-St. Paul [1]	2
Mississippi (5):	
Biloxi	44
Jackson	19
Meridian	36
State College	2
University	20
Missouri (4):	
Kansas City	19
St. Joseph	36
St. Louis [1]	9
Springfield	26
Montana (6):	
Billings	11
Bozeman	9
Butte	7
Great Falls	23
Miles City	6
Missoula	11

[1] Educational stations on the air.

Educational television channel reservations, January 1959—Continued

Educational areas:	Channel No.
Nebraska (2):	
Lincoln [1]	12
Omaha	16
Nevada (2):	
Las Vegas	10
Reno	21
New Hampshire (2):	
Durham	11
Hanover	27
New Jersey (6):	
Andover	69
Camden	80
Freehold	74
Hammonton	70
Montclair	77
New Brunswick	19
New Mexico (6):	
Albuquerque [1]	5
Gallup	8
Raton	52
Roswell	3
Santa Fe	9
Silver City	10
New York (10):	
Albany-Schenectady-Troy	17
Binghamton	46
Buffalo-Niagara Falls	23
Ithaca	14
Malone	66
New York	25
Poughkeepsie	83
Rochester	21
Syracuse	43
Utica-Rome	25
North Carolina (8):	
Asheville	56
Chapel Hill [1]	4
Charlotte	42
Durham	40
Greensboro	51
Raleigh	22
Wilmington	35
Winston-Salem	32
North Dakota (6):	
Bismarck	24
Dickinson	17
Fargo	34
Grand Forks	2
Minot	6
Williston	34
Ohio (8):	
Akron	55
Cincinnati [1]	48
Cleveland	25
Columbus [1]	34
Dayton	16
Oxford	14
Steubenville. (*See* Wheeling, W. Va.)	
Toledo	30
Bowling Green	70
Oklahoma (7):	
Enid	27
Lawton	28
Muskogee	45
Norman	37
Oklahoma City [1]	13
Stillwater	69
Tulsa [1]	11
Oregon (3):	
Corvallis [1]	7
Portland	10
Salem	18
Pennsylvania (5):	
Erie	41
Philadelphia [1]	13
Pittsburgh [1]	35
Pittsburgh	16
State College	48
Rhode Island (1): Providence	36
South Carolina (4):	
Charleston	7
Clemson	68
Columbia	19
Greenville	29
South Dakota (4):	
Brookings	8
Pierre	22

[1] Educational stations on the air.

Educational television channel reservations, January 1959—Continued

Educational areas:	Channel No.
South Dakota—Continued	
Sioux Falls	44
Vermillion	2
Tennessee (8):	
Chattanooga	55
Cookeville	69
Crossville	77
Knoxville	20
Lexington	11
Memphis [1]	10
Nashville	2
Sneedville	2
Texas (18):	
Amarillo	2
Austin	70
Beaumont-Port Arthur	37
College Station	48
Corpus Christi	16
Dallas	13
Denton	2
El Paso	7
Fort Worth	26
Galveston	47
Houston [1]	8
Laredo	15
Lubbock	20
San Angelo	23
San Antonio	9
Texarkana	18
Waco	28
Wichita Falls	16
Utah (4):	
Logan	46
Ogden	18
Provo	28
Salt Lake City [1]	7
Vermont (1): Burlington	16
Virginia (5):	
Blacksburg	60
Charlottesville	45
Norfolk-Portsmouth-Newport News	21
Richmond	23
Roanoke	33
Washington (10):	
Ellensburg	65
Kennewick-Richland-Pasco	41
Omak-Okanogan	35
Pullman	10
Seattle [1]	9
Spokane	7
Tacoma	56
Walla Walla	50
Wenatchee	45
Yakima	47
West Virginia (4):	
Charleston	43
Huntington	53
Morgantown	24
Wheeling-Steubenville, Ohio	57
Wisconsin (11):	
Adams	58
Chilton	31
Eau Claire	19
La Crosse	32
Madison [1]	21
Marinette	38
Milwaukee [1]	10
Park Falls	18
Richland Center	66
Shell Lake	30
Superior. (See Duluth, Minn.)	
Wausau	46
Wyoming (1): Laramie	8
Alaska:	
Anchorage	7
Fairbanks	9
Juneau	3
Ketchikan	9
U.S. TERRITORIES AND POSSESSIONS	
Hawaiian Islands (4):	
Lihue, Kauai	8
Honolulu, Oahu	7
Wailuku, Maui	10
Hilo, Hawaii	4
Puerto Rico (1): San Juan [1]	6

[1] Educational stations on the air.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, not only as a member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, which reported this bill favorably, but also as a member of the Education Subcommittee and as chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Subcommittee, I have had an opportunity this year, serving on those three committees and subcommittees, to hear a great deal of testimony about our increasing educational needs and the growing educational lag because of the rapidly increasing number of scholastics, with our expanding population, and the inability to obtain qualified teachers in sufficient number to keep up with the demand. I understand there is at this time a shortage of about 140,000 classrooms in the schools of the United States and a shortage of from 135,000 to 140,000 qualified teachers. In fact, in many States, as was testified before the Education Subcommittee this morning, we are having difficulty obtaining qualified teachers. It is necessary to search for a long time to find teachers to fill vacancies.

Judging from the testimony we heard, I believe that this new medium of instruction, television, will do for education about what the automobile has done for transportation. The automobile has speeded transportation and brought it within reach of all the people. Some initial experiments have shown that may be true with regard to television.

I think the testimony last year and this year showed that Ohio and Alabama have made greater progress than any other States of the Union in the statewide educational television programs. I think that is the reason why former Senator Bricker, who was a Member of the Senate last year and a member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, was so active and so interested in working on behalf of the educational television bill last year.

The bill provides a modest amount. As has been pointed out, the money would be used only for the acquisition of land and the installation of facilities. There is nothing to be provided for operations, as has been pointed out by the distinguished minority leader.

It is expensive to operate these TV stations, but once people have an opportunity to see them in operation, I believe they will be willing to meet the cost of operation and that there will be no difficulty on that score.

In my State we have had a great deal of difficulty in getting a good program under way. The Federal Communications Commission reserved 18 channels for use in my State, but unfortunately 12 of them were the ultrahigh frequency channels, and only 6 were the VHF stations. We did get into operation in our State the first noncommercial educational TV station in the country, at the University of Houston, which was opened in 1953 and is still in use.

Mr. President, private industry wants these channels. The legislatures of some of the States have fought the actual operation of the channels. There has been some success in my State in inserting in our appropriation laws, hamstringing restrictions, to prevent the State colleges from building stations under the allocations made by the Federal Communications Commission.

However, once the stations are built and are in operation and the people have an opportunity to see the beneficial results, once the stations have demonstrated their use for educational purpose, considering the growing cost of education and the efficiency of educational TV, I think the program will grow like a snowball, and the Federal Government will then have exercised in educational matters a function which it has exercised so many times in the Nation's history, namely that of furnishing the first stimulus.

I have not had an opportunity to read all the arguments surrounding the passage of the Morrill Land Grant College Act in 1862. That was the first great national education act. I rather suspect that many of the arguments used at that time would reveal that it was urged that the cost of operating the Land Grant College Act would bankrupt the Federal Government. But the act has operated successsfully, and the States bear the cost of maintaining those institutions. More than 90 great institutions of higher learning were founded under the impetus of that act. The States took them over and operated them at their own expense. That has happened in the case of many other programs.

This bill is not designed to put the Federal Government into the business of operating educational television stations. It represents the initial stimulus or impetus, to give the States and local subdivisions an opportunity to obtain the equipment to establish their stations. They will operate them at their own cost.

The amount of money we are spending on education is about 4 percent of our gross national product. We spend more on alcohol, tobacco, and cosmetics than we spend on education of all kinds. Education in this country is lagging because of that fact.

This proposal represents one way to stimulate teacher aid and training aid in connection with one facet of our overall educational program.

The need for educational improvement is so great that I do not believe we, as a body, can afford further to delay in helping our educational institutions to gain this additional training aid, and put into operation in the many States which now have no educational television of any kind.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I should like to direct a few questions to the chairman of the committee.

Referring to page 34 of the committee report, it is stated, in connection with my own State:

> On September 12, 1958, the Joint Council on Educational Television in Washington, D.C., representing 10 national educational organizations, petitioned the FCC to reserve VHF channel 12 in Wilmington for educational use, inasmuch as it appeared that the authorization for commercial station WVUE would be (and subsequently has been) surrendered.

My question is this: Under the rules, just what has the Joint Council on Educational Television in Washington, D.C., to do with telling the Federal Communications Commission whether or not the only channel in the State of Delaware should be an educational facility, or whether it should or not?

I understand that the bill is being presented on the basis that no Federal control is involved. If no Federal control is involved, does the recommendation of this organization or any other out-of-State organization have any weight?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Let me say to the Senator from Delaware that surely the people of Delaware have a right to insist on keeping channel 12 in Wilmington. Whether they use it for educational television or whether some commercial group wishes to take it over, is a matter for the Federal Communications Commission to decide.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Let me finish.

The Joint Council on Educational Television has the right, along with anyone else, to petition the Federal Communications Commission. But what weight the Federal Communications Commission will give to its petition I do not know. But surely the people of Delaware themselves have the right to make the decision, and to petition the Federal Communications Commission.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That was the point I wished clearly to establish. I talked with the chairman of the committee previously, and I think we understand each other; but I wish to make the record clear. I do not think that this is a decision to be made by the FCC but rather a decision to be made based upon applications from Delaware.

There are those in our State who earnestly believe that this channel should be reserved for educational facilities. They have a right to that belief and to petition accordingly. Many other interests feel that it should be reserved for commercial television. They, too, have a right.

The position I have taken in connection with educational television, supported by my colleague, the junior Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR], has been that this is a decision which should be made solely by the people of the State of Delaware inasmuch as this is the only channel in the State. It is our position that recommendations from interests outside the State of Delaware should not be taken into consideration.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I cannot speak for the Federal Communications Commission, but if I were a member of it, I would give more weight to the views of the people of Delaware than to the views of outsiders. I understand that there has been some suggestion that this channel be moved to a location farther north. If I lived in Delaware I would protest such a suggestion.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. It has been protested.

I merely wished to make sure that those advocating the allocation of the channel for educational television could

not come back to this report later and use it as a background in support of their position.

Reading further from the report of the committee:

Since that time, nearly 200 organizations—public schools, colleges, PTA's, private schools, professional societies, health and youth associations, and others in the area which could be served by channel 12—have officially supported the JCET petition.

The report does not indicate that there is any opposition whatever. That is not the situation. I think the RECORD should show that the Governor of the State of Delaware, in a letter addressed to the Governor of Pennsylvania and also in a report which has been submitted to the Department downtown, has taken the position that this channel should not be allocated for use as an educational facility.

I notice from the report that among other agencies cited as being in favor of the pending proposal is the Wilmington Board of Public Education.

I ask unanimous consent to have included at this point in the RECORD an article which appeared in the Wilmington Journal-Every Evening of February 18, 1959, incorporating a statement by Dr. Ward I. Miller, Superintendent of Wilmington Public Schools, in which he states that it would be unwise to make this allocation strictly on an educational basis, which shows that the report is definitely in error when it lists that agency as being in support of the proposal.

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

TRI-STATE TV PACT RAPPED AS UNWISE—SUPERINTENDENT OF CITY SCHOOLS WANTS CHANNEL 12 KEPT IN DELAWARE, COMMERCIAL OPERATION

Dr. Ward I. Miller, superintendent of Wilmington public schools, said today he felt it is unwise at the present time to enter into any educational television agreement with Pennsylvania and New Jersey.

It was the first time any educator has voiced opposition to a proposal of the Delaware Educational Television Association to have Delaware's channel 12 assigned as an educational channel and turned over to a tri-State group of educators.

The group has petitioned the Federal Communications Commission to designate the channel for education, but has come up with no plan for operation or financing.

Meanwhile, two applications for licenses to operate the channel commercially are before the FCC, one from Rollins Broadcasting Co., the other from an out-of-State combine.

Dr. Miller, in a letter to Senator J. ALLEN FREAR, Jr., (Democrat, of Delaware) made public today, expressed the opinion that retention of channel 12 for Delaware is of extreme importance.

In his letter, copies of which were also sent to Gerrish Gassaway, executive vice president of the Delaware State Chamber of Commerce, and Gail C. Belden, city board of education president, Dr. Miller declared that until there is more information on the use of television for instructional purposes and until money for the purpose is available it is better for educational authorities to work cooperatively with a commercial operator in the use of TV.

"Television is still in its infancy," Dr. Miller wrote. "While much has been done to improve the quality of programs and the technical aspects of telecasting, it is my conviction that the future will see major improvements along many lines.

"Particularly in the adaptation of television to educational purposes the experimentation to date suggests great potential," Dr. Miller continued. "Nevertheless, much must be learned both by the schools and by the stations before television can be utilized as an effective supplement to classroom teaching.

"In no sense can it replace the teacher," Dr. Miller continued. "I believe that the experimentation should continue so that there may be developed the best ways to use this marvelous medium of communication.

"In my judgment, it is unwise at this time to enter into any arrangements with the States of Pennsylvania and New Jersey in the establishment of a tri-State authority to take over channel 12 for educational programs," the superintendent declared. "I feel that we are not ready to embark upon a project of such magnitude, first, for the reasons given above and second, because of the financial implications of such a proposal.

"The fiscal condition of the State of Delaware is such that no funds should be utilized for the purchase of the station nor for the annual cost of operation. We should hold fast to the educational gains that have been made up to this point and not sacrifice any of them for a project which is certain to require considerable additional money."

WOULD LOSE CONFLICTS

"It is extremely doubtful," Dr. Miller said, "that it is in the best interests of Delaware to become part of a tri-State authority. Conflicts of interest will occur from time to time. These can hardly be resolved in favor of Delaware unless we are ready at the particular time to participate in the actual purchase. This, I feel, we shall not be ready to do for some time.

"It is of extreme importance that channel 12 be reserved for Delaware," Dr. Miller emphasized. "I believe that both the educational and commercial interests of our people can be served if this is done. Every step should be taken to avoid losing the channel to outside interests."

Dr. Miller concluded by stating, "Until we are better informed concerning the use of television in instructional procedure and until money is available that can properly be used to support the cost of its operation, in my judgment it is better to work cooperatively with a commercial operator. If it should happen later on that a different situation exists, it will be possible to reconsider the matter and develop a program which will further enrich and supplement the instruction which our students are now receiving."

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The report also lists the University of Delaware as being in favor of the pending proposal. I venture to say that at no point can it be shown that the University of Delaware has gone on record as indicating that the channel should be allocated to educational facilities. On the contrary, I have been advised of the opposite. I wonder if the chairman of the committee has any further information in that connection.

Mr. MAGNUSON. If the Senator from Delaware will read the entire section of the report, it may throw some light on the question. I agree with the Senator from Delaware that there should not be any such implication as that to which he refers. The report indicates that for several years the Delaware Educational Television Association has planned and produced educational programs, and has made the plans for the activation of an educational television station. The report merely says:

The membership of this organization includes the State Department of Public Instruction, the University of Delaware, the Wilmington Board of Public Education, the Delaware State Educational Association, and the Delaware Congress of Parents and Teachers—plus 17 participating organizations and an advisory council of representatives of business and industry.

We do not say that they approve of the allocation of this channel for educational television. We merely point out that there has been activity in Delaware by this association looking to the planning of educational programs, and that its membership includes certain organizations and agencies.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I understand what the committee is trying to do, but I wish to make the record clear.

Mr. MAGNUSON. If the implication to which the Senator refers is present, the Senator does well to correct it. We were merely pointing out the wide interest of the membership of the association, which had planned some of the educational programs; but there was no reference to channel 12.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The point I wish to make clear in the RECORD is that whether responsible State authorities in Delaware petition to have this channel allocated for educational facilities or whether the people of the State of Delaware decide that they want it for commercial purposes, theirs is the decision, no outside recommendation should be considered. That is a question which we should decide in our own State without any outside interference.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Federal Communications Commission would certainly give the greatest weight to the desire of the people of Delaware in this connection.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I appreciate that.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Let me say to the Senator from Delaware that I am aware of the so-called discussion or controversy in Delaware. Beginning on page 110 of the printed hearings, we have printed in full a long letter addressed to the editor of the Journal-Every Evening, of Wilmington, Del., by Richard M. Saul, executive director of the educational group, which I think makes the situation pretty clear.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I have not seen that letter. On what page is it?

Mr. MAGNUSON. It begins on page 111 of the hearings.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. All I wished to make clear was that the RECORD should show that it is our understanding that in making these allocations and in deciding how this channel should be awarded the Federal Communications Commission should take primarily into consideration the wishes of the people of the State of Delaware.

If there are pending before the Commission petitions from interests in the State that it be allocated for use as educational facilities, such petitions should be considered, along with any others which may be pending urging that the channel be used for commercial purposes. I respect the right of the Commission to consider all such petitions; however, I believe that petitions urging the use of the channel for certain purposes should originate in the State of Delaware, and not somewhere else.

Since there is only one channel assigned to the State of Delaware, I wish it to be clearly understood that we should not be told what we must do with it.

As I said before, the Governor of the State is opposed to this proposal, and many of our State educational associations are opposed to it. I have a letter from the Delaware Chamber of Commerce opposing its allocation for educational purposes. I shall not labor the point further in the Senate, but I wish it to be clear in the RECORD that we have received many petitions from people throughout the State of Delaware stating that the channel should be kept for commercial use and there are some who support the educational allocation, all of these petitions coming from the State should be considered by the Federal Communications Commission, but we do not want any outside interests interfering. We do not want anyone coming into our State and telling us what we should or should not do with the one channel we have. I wish it clearly understood that it is not a function of the Federal Communications Commission to go into a State and tell it what it is to do with its one allocated channel.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I agree entirely with what the Senator from Delaware has said.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I appreciate the cooperation of the chairman of the committee in clearing up the point. I join the Senator from Illinois in opposing the passage of the bill. This was not included in the budgetary estimates. This may well prove to be the first wedge in a much more extensive program and one in which there may be greater Federal control than is visualized. I agree that the Senator from Washington has tried—and I know he is sincere in his intention—to keep it strictly outside Federal control, but I doubt if it can be done if we once launch the program. I shall therefore vote against the bill.

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

The bill (S. 12) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I move that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The motion to table was agreed to.

CONSTRUCTION OF MODERN NAVAL VESSELS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 145, H.R. 3293.

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

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 3293) to authorize the construction of modern naval vessels.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

AUTHORIZATION FOR THE COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE TO REPORT LABOR BILL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare be permitted to file its report on S. 1555, to provide for the reporting and disclosure of certain financial transactions and administrative practices of labor organizations and employers, to prevent abuses in the administration of trusteeships by labor organizations, to provide standards with respect to the election of officers of labor organizations, and for other purposes, during the adjournment of the Senate, together with minority and supplemental views.

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

ADJOURNMENT TO WEDNESDAY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in accordance with the order previously entered, I move that the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon on Wednesday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3:45 o'clock p.m.), in accordance with the previous order, the Senate adjourned until Wednesday, April 15, 1959, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate April 13, 1959:

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE

Philip B. Taylor, of New Jersey, to be Assistant Secretary of the Air Force.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

Cecil P. Milne, of Wisconsin, to be Assistant Secretary of the Navy.

Rear Adm. Ralph K. James, U.S. Navy, to be Chief of the Bureau of Ships in the Department of the Navy for a term of 4 years.

COLLECTORS OF CUSTOMS

Orley McGlothlin, of Colorado, to be collector of customs, with headquarters at Denver, Colo. (Reappointment.)

Harry D. Youse, of North Webster, Ind., to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 40, with headquarters at Indianapolis, Ind. (Reappointment.)

IN THE ARMY

The nominations of Loring B. Bean, and 136 other officers for promotion or appointment in the Regular Army, which were confirmed today, were received by the Senate on February 26, 1959, and may be found in the Senate proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, for that date, under the caption "Nominations," beginning with the name of Loring B. Bean, which appears on page 3042, and ending with the name of Leon A. Young which is also shown on page 3042.

IN THE REGULAR AIR FORCE

The following-named officers for appointment as Reserve commissioned officers in the U.S. Air Force under the provisions of section 8351, title 10, United States Code, and section 8381, of Public Law 861, 85th Congress:

To be major generals

Brig. Gen. Lewis A. Curtis, AO729140, New York Air National Guard.

Brig. Gen. Howard F. Butler, AO403692, Tennessee Air National Guard.

To be brigadier generals

Col. Barnie B. McEntire, Jr., AO396288, South Carolina Air National Guard.

Col. William R. Sefton, AO668649, Indiana Air National Guard.

Col. Howard T. Markey, AO442531, Illinois Air National Guard.

Col. Willard W. Millikan, AO885404, District of Columbia Air National Guard.

Col. Raymond L. George, AO426384, New York Air National Guard.

Col. Jack W. Stone, AO1646956, California Air National Guard.

Col. Ross C. Garlich, AO397879, Missouri Air National Guard.

Col. Jack Parsons, AO396885, Alabama Air National Guard.

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR AIR FORCE

The nominations of William E. Fletcher, and 407 other officers for promotion in the Regular Air Force, which were confirmed today, were received by the Senate on March 19, 1959, and appear in full in Senate proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for that date under the caption "Nominations," beginning with the name of William E. Fletcher, which is shown on page 4640, and ending with the name of Lois M. Heath, which occurs on page 4641.

IN THE NAVY AND THE MARINE CORPS

The nominations of Peter D. Abbott, and 1,460 other officers for appointment in the Navy and Marine Corps, which were received by the Senate on March 29, 1959, were confirmed today, and appear in the Senate proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for that date, under the caption "Nominations," beginning with the name of Peter D. Abbott, which is shown on page 3593, and ending with the name of Otis P. Tibbetts, which is shown on page 3597.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, APRIL 13, 1959

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Charles W. Holland, Jr., pastor, Fountain Memorial Baptist Church, Washington, D.C., offered the following prayer:

In I Timothy 3: 2 and 6, the writer says: *A bishop then must be blameless * * *. Not a novice, lest being lifted up with pride he fall into the condemnation of the Devil.*

Omniscient and eternally righteous God, when we stop to realize that one of the besetting sins of Satan was pride, as we meditate about the fact that as pride enters our heart wisdom is depleted; we entreat Thee to help us to overcome the temptation to be proud.

Dear God, we know that humility is the foe of pride; therefore help us to be cognizant continually of the need of humility. Help us that we will not be led into a false humility through trickery; but give us a humility that is genuine.

Father, help us to be humble, even as we make this petition in Thy name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday, April 10, 1959, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Ratchford, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill and concurrent resolutions of the House of the following titles:

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

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

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills of the House of the following titles:

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

H.R. 3648. An act to regulate the handling of student funds in Indian schools operated by the Bureau of Indian Affairs, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills and a joint resolution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 96. An act to govern the salaries and personnel practices applicable to teachers, certain school officers, and other employees of the dependents schools of the Department of Defense in overseas areas, and for other purposes;

S. 201. An act for the relief of Chiyoko Korematsu and Aiko Korematsu;

S. 211. An act for the relief of Aurelia Marija Medvesek-Pozar;

S. 264. An act for the relief of Athena Nicholas Euteriadou;

S. 313. An act for the relief of Collingwood Bruce Brown, Jr.;

S. 449. An act for the relief of Clarita Martinez;

S. 451. An act for the relief of Mohammed Ali Halim;

S. 461. An act for the relief of Androula Neofitos Stephanon (Androula Kyriacou Stephanou);

S. 634. An act for the relief of Grace C. Ream;

S. 643. An act to amend the act entitled "An act relating to the levying and collecting of taxes and assessments, and for other purposes," approved June 25, 1938;

S. 644. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for compulsory school attendance, for the taking of a school census in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved February 4, 1925;

S. 645. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to remove dangerous or unsafe buildings and parts thereof, and for other purposes," approved March 1, 1899, as amended;

S. 701. An act for the relief of Arie Abramovich;

S. 745. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to create a Board for the Condemnation of Insanitary Buildings in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved May 1, 1906, as amended;

S. 899. An act to provide for the discontinuance of certain reports now required by law;

S. 900. An act to amend section 204(b) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to extend the authority of the Administrator of General Services to pay direct expenses in connection with the utilization of excess real property and related personalty, and for other purposes;

S. 901. An act to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to authorize the Administrator of General Services to make contracts for cleaning and custodial services for periods not exceeding 5 years;

S. 902. An act to provide for the receipt and disbursement of funds, and for continuation of accounts when there is a vacancy in the office of the Disbursing Officer for the Government Printing Office, and for other purposes;

S. 949. An act for the incorporation of the Ladies of the Grand Army of the Republic;

S. 1143. An act for the relief of Harvey Hiroaki Horiuchi;

S. 1217. An act to add certain public domain lands in Nevada to the Summit Lake Indian Reservation;

S. 1242. An act to authorize the use of the revolving loan fund for Indians to assist Klamath Indians during the period for terminating Federal supervision;

S. 1271. An act to donate to the pueblo of Isleta certain Federal property in the State of New Mexico;

S. 1456. An act to provide for the appointment of two additional judges for the juvenile court of the District of Columbia;

S. 1631. An act to provide for the establishment of a Commission on Unemployment Problems; and

S.J. Res. 61. Joint resolution to amend Public Law 305 of the 85th Congress relative to the establishment of a commission to commemorate the 100th anniversary of the Civil War, to authorize the manufacture and sale of a Civil War centennial medal.

DEDICATION CEREMONY, TAFT MEMORIAL TOWER

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. 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 Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I have requested this time to announce that tomorrow morning the dedicatory exercises for the Taft Memorial Bell Tower on the Capitol Grounds, just across Constitution Avenue, will begin at 10 o'clock. All Members of Congress, of course, are invited, along with their wives. Tickets have been sent to each Member of the House and each Member of the Senate, two tickets to each. Special reserved seats have been arranged and are being held for the use of Members of Congress.

If I may take just a second or two, I should like to tell you something of the program:

The Indian Hill High School Band, which comes from the little community where Senator Taft lived, will give a part of the musical program, which will start about 10 minutes of 10. Then the U.S. Marine Band will follow.

The presiding officer to open the meeting will be Representative B. CARROLL REECE of Tennessee, who is the president of the Robert A. Taft Memorial Foundation, Inc.

The invocation will be given by Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, Chaplain of the Senate.

The meaning of the tower will be explained in a short address by Representative REECE, who will present, in a body, the 100 trustees of the memorial foundation.

The meeting will then be turned over to me as the chairman of the Physical Memorial Subcommittee, and I in turn will introduce, first, Senator STYLES BRIDGES, who will speak for 4 or 5 minutes for the Senate, then Senator HARRY FLOOD BYRD, who will speak also for the Senate for about the same length of time, to be followed by William Howard Taft III, the eldest son of Senator Taft, former Ambassador to Ireland, as you recall. He will respond for a minute or so in behalf of the family.

Following I will present the former President of the United States, the chairman of the board of trustees of the foundation, the Honorable Herbert Hoover, who will deliver a eulogy on Senator Taft.

Next, the President of the United States, Dwight D. Eisenhower, honorary chairman of the foundation, will be presented, and in turn he will dedicate the memorial by turning over symbolic keys to the Vice President of the United States and to Speaker RAYBURN, of the House, both of whom will respond in behalf of the Congress.

Following the address of Mr. Speaker RAYBURN, the benediction will be given by the Acting Chaplain of the House.

This memorial, as you know, which cost approximately $1 million, is being presented to the Congress of the United States by the Taft Memorial Foundation, and the Congress will serve as its custodian for the benefit of the American people.

Following the speaking program, there will be a 20-minute carillon concert so that those assembled may have the opportunity to hear these famous bells for the first time.

COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight tonight to file certain privileged resolutions.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary may sit during general debate today and for the balance of the week.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

HON. MRS. CECIL HARDEN

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. 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 gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, last Friday afternoon, April 10, 1959, I had the great pleasure of attending a ceremony at which our former colleague from the Sixth District of Indiana, Mrs. Cecil Harden, was sworn in by the Postmaster General as his special assistant.

In his remarks, Mr. Summerfield paid tribute to Mrs. Harden and spoke of the responsibilities she has already assumed as his principal adviser with regard to women employees in the postal service.

We who knew her so well since she first came to the Congress in 1948, know that her long experience and dedicated work as a member of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee will be of inestimable service to Mrs. Harden in carrying out her important postal responsibilities.

In her new assignment, Mrs. Harden will work closely with the Postmaster General and with Assistant Postmaster General Eugene J. Lyons, head of the Bureau of Personnel, on matters dealing with more than 55,000 women currently employed by the Post Office Department.

I know, Mr. Speaker, that every Member of the House of Representatives joins me in wishing Cecil Harden the greatest possible success as she continues her work in the service of her Government.

A SPECIAL STAMP FOR "DIXIE" AND "UNCLE DAN" EMMETT

Mr. LEVERING. 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 Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. LEVERING. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill authorizing and directing the Postmaster General of the United States to issue a special postage stamp of such denomination and design as he may determine to honor Daniel Decatur Emmett, who composed the song "Dixie," just 100 years ago this spring.

The stamp, if issued, would honor both the song, which is known wherever freemen live and sing, and its composer, Daniel Decatur Emmett, who was born and died near Mount Vernon, Ohio, in my 17th Congressional District. He was known as "Uncle Dan" to his many thousands of friends and devotees while he was alive, and he still is known affectionately as "Uncle Dan" among the people whose fathers and grandfathers knew him personally in the area around Mount Vernon.

As my colleagues will recall, I spoke on Daniel Decatur Emmett, and his most noted song, "Dixie," in the early part of February, in the House of Representatives in connection with the Lincoln sesquicentennial ceremonies. Since then, I have had letters from every section of the Nation from people who agree with me that his memory, and his song, are worth commemorating. It will be remembered "Dixie" and other compositions, such as "The Blue Tail Fly," were favorites of President Lincoln.

The bureaucracy at the U.S. Post Office Department does not seem to agree with me that a stamp should be issued to commemorate the 100th anniversary of this great song, and to honor this composer. I nevertheless am asking my colleagues on the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service to cut through the bureaucratic redtape and to approve this legislation, notwithstanding the fact that a board, or a group, in the Post Office Department shows little interest in the idea. I think that there is so much bureaucracy connected with every little action a Congressman has to take in Washington that it is high time we in Congress reassert our prerogative to get things done, in spite of the opposition of this or that bureaucrat who may be appointed to his job for varying periods.

Despite the views of the principal bureaucrats charged with approving stamps, and stamp designs, in the U.S. Post Office Department, I, and hundreds of my constituents in Ohio, can see no valid reason at all why a stamp cannot be issued this year to commemorate the 100th anniversary of this beautiful song, and, of course, its composer, whose gentility and kindness and genius was recognized in his own day, and might well be remembered in this day and age.

It would be a shame, in my humble opinion, to let this year go by without commemorating Daniel Decatur Emmett, and "Dixie," on a national basis.

I am happy that the Kiwanis Club at Mount Vernon, Ohio, of which I am a proud member, is planning a 2-day celebration on June 26 and 27 this year to commemorate the composition of "Dixie" on a cold, wet Sunday by Uncle Dan Emmett 100 years ago. I would be most happy, Mr. Speaker, if between now and then we could report out this new bill to cause a stamp to be printed in his honor so that I might report it to my people. This is a little thing in a certain sense and yet, in another sense, it is a big thing. In any case, I think it is the right thing to do and I urge my colleagues to support my resolution.

LIBERALIZING PROVISIONS OF TARIFF ACT OF 1930

Mr. LINDSAY. 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 New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to liberalize various provisions of the Tariff Act of 1930 respecting the importation of works of art. The bill is identical to one introduced in the other body by Senator JACOB K. JAVITS, S. 948, and in this body by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. THOMPSON]. It stands high in the interest of many of my constituents, including New York City's most magnificent art museums.

The bill would amend various paragraphs in the Tariff Act to include on the duty-free list modern-art forms presently of questionable status under the act, or which have actually been determined to be presently dutiable. The bill would also provide for duty-free entry of primitive and aboriginal art and scaled reproductions of original works, and would facilitate the entry of art for use in exhibitions on a duty-free basis.

The bill was prepared in close conjunction with, and with the full cooperation of, the American Association of Museums' committee on customs, and after consultation with a great many authorities in both the fields of art and of customs. Its effect on the revenues received from customs would be negligible. Some experts have estimated the loss of revenue at not more than $10,000 a year. Whatever the exact figure, surely it would be outweighed by the value—not monetary, but esthetic—of such a desirable stimulus to the growth of American culture.

Mr. Speaker, this is legislation which certainly ought to be given high priority. Not only would its passage greatly aid the progress of many of our great museums and educational institutions, but it would effectively accelerate the free exchange of art ideas and cultural thought, from which our Nation as a whole stands greatly to benefit.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that this legislation will receive the wide support of a great many of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA LEGISLATION

The SPEAKER. This is District of Columbia Day. The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. McMILLAN] is recognized.

GEORGE MASON MEMORIAL BRIDGE

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I call up the bill (H.R. 5534) to designate the bridge to be constructed over the Potomac River near

14th Street in the District of Columbia, under the act of July 16, 1946, as the George Mason Memorial Bridge, and for other purposes, and I ask unanimous consent that the same be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, does this cost any money?

Mr. McMILLAN. It does not. It only names the bridge.

Mr. GROSS. It does not provide for the construction of another bridge across the Potomac River at the expense of all the taxpayers?

Mr. McMILLAN. No, sir. That was provided for in 1956. This just names the bridge.

Mr. GROSS. Does this bill provide for some kind of a celebration once the bridge is completed.

Mr. McMILLAN. I do not know anything about a celebration. It will be 2 or 3 years before the bridge is built.

Mr. GROSS. It is contemplated, according to the last paragraph of the bill, to hold suitable ceremonies in connection with naming of the bridge and I want to make sure that will not cost the taxpayers any money.

Mr. McMILLAN. Not to my knowledge.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman will state definitely that it will not cost any money when they get around to celebrate completion of the bridge?

Mr. McMILLAN. Perhaps the gentleman from Virginia can answer the gentleman.

Mr. BROYHILL. It is provided for following the completion of the bridge. It is rather confusing what we mean by "the 14th Street Bridge," because there are two of them. Last year we named the incoming northbound 14th Street Bridge as the Rochambeau Bridge and they had appropriate unveiling ceremonies designating it as such. This bill provides for the naming of the old 14th Street Bridge as the George Mason Bridge, and it is provided for an unveiling celebration. I will not say it will not cost any money, but I do not think the cost of such a ceremony is an undesirable cost.

Mr. GROSS. With that response I would like to put the House on notice now that it may expect a bill later on. The bridge ought to have a name, but I see no reason why all the taxpayers of the country should provide the money to hold a celebration to open this bridge.

Congress does not provide money for the opening of a toll bridge across the Mississippi River that is built by private enterprise and paid for by those who use it; the Federal Government does not spend money, nor should it, for any such ceremonies in the Midwest, and I know of no reason why the taxpayers of Iowa should be called upon to pay for any ceremony in connection with this bridge or any other bridge across the Potomac.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection, but I want to serve notice here and now that if I am a Member of Congress when this bridge is completed I will oppose the appropriation of a single dime of taxpayer money for the bridge-naming celebration.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina that the bill be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole?

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 the bridge to be constructed over the Potomac River from a point near Fourteenth Street in the District of Columbia to a point in Virginia, under authority of the Act entitled "An Act authorizing and directing the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to construct two four-lane bridges to replace the existing Fourteenth Street or Highway Bridge across the Potomac River, and for other purposes", approved July 16, 1946 (60 Stat. 566), shall be known and designated as the "George Mason Memorial Bridge". Any law, regulation, map, document, record, or other paper of the United States in which such bridge is referred to shall be held to refer to such bridge as the "George Mason Memorial Bridge".

SEC. 2. The Commissioners of the District of Columbia shall—

(1) place on the George Mason Memorial Bridge a name plaque of suitable and appropriate design; and

(2) in connection with the opening of such bridge to the public, provide for suitable ceremonies honoring George Mason, the American statesman of the Revolutionary War period from the State of Virginia, who drafted the renowned Virginia Declaration of Rights which became the basis for the first ten amendments to the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, section 1 of the bill provides that the bridge which will replace the existing 14th Street or Highway Bridge across the Potomac River shall be known and designated as the "George Mason Memorial Bridge."

Section 2 provides that the Commissioners of the District of Columbia shall, first, place on such bridge a name plaque of suitable and appropriate design; and second, in connection with the opening of such bridge to the public, to provide suitable ceremonies honoring George Mason, the American statesman of the Revolutionary War period from the State of Virginia, who drafted the Virginia Declaration of Rights which became the basis for the first 10 amendments to the Constitution of 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.

AMENDING THE LIFE INSURANCE ACT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia I call up the bill (H.R. 1844) to amend the Life Insurance Act of the District of Columbia approved June 19, 1934, as amended by the acts of July 2, 1940, and July 12, 1950, and ask unanimous consent that it be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

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 10(1) of chapter V of the Life Insurance Act, as amended (sec. 35–710(1), D.C. Code, 1951 edition), is amended (1) by striking out "twenty-five employees" in subsection (c) thereof, and inserting in lieu thereof "ten employees", and (2) by striking out the period at the end of subsection (d) thereof and adding the following: "unless 150 per centum of the annual compensation of a covered employee exceeds $20,000, in which event all such insurance shall not exceed $40,000, or 150 per centum of such annual compensation, whichever is less."

SEC. 2. Section 10(3) of chapter V of the Life Insurance Act, as amended (sec. 35–710(3), D.C. Code, 1951 edition), is amended (1) by striking out the words "twenty-five members" in subsection (c) thereof and inserting in lieu thereof "ten members", and (2) by deleting "issued to the union" in the second sentence of subsection (d), and (3) by striking out the period at the end of subsection (d) thereof and adding the following: "unless 150 per centum of the annual compensation of a covered union member exceeds $20,000, in which event all such insurance shall not exceed $40,000, or 150 per centum of such annual compensation, whichever is less."

SEC. 3. Section 10(4) of chapter V of the Life Insurance Act, as amended (sec. 35–710 (4), D.C. Code, 1951 edition), is amended by striking out the period at the end of subsection (d) thereof and adding the following: "unless 150 per centum of the annual compensation of a covered person exceeds $20,000, in which event all such insurance shall not exceed $40,000, or 150 per centum of such annual compensation, whichever is less."

SEC. 4. Section 10(5) of chapter V of the Life Insurance Act, as amended (sec. 35–710(5), D.C. Code, 1951 edition), is amended by striking out "fifty employees" and inserting in lieu thereof, "ten employees."

SEC. 5. Section 10 (generally) of chapter V of the Life Insurance Act, as amended (sec. 35–710, D.C. Code, 1951 edition), is amended by adding the following two new subsections, subsections 6 and 7:

"(6) A policy issued to an association which has been organized and is maintained for purposes other than that of obtaining insurance, which shall be deemed the policyholder, to insure members, or employees of members, of such association for the benefit of persons other than the association, or any of its officials, representatives, or agents, subject to the following requirements:

"(a) The members or employees eligible for insurance under the policy shall be all the members, and all the employees of the members, of the associations, or all of any class or classes thereof determined by conditions pertaining to their employment, or to membership in the association, or both.

"(b) The premium for the policy shall be paid by the policyholder either wholly from the association's funds, or partly from such funds and partly from funds contributed by the insured members or employees specifically for their insurance, or from funds wholly contributed by the insured members or employees specifically for their insurance. A policy on which any part or all of the premium is to be derived from funds contributed by the insured members or employees specifically for their insurance may be placed in force only if at least 60 per centum of the then eligible members or employees or a minimum of four hundred members, whichever is less, excluding any as to whom evi-

dence of individual insurability is not satisfactory to the insured, elect to make the required contributions. A policy on which no part of the premium is to be derived from funds contributed by the insured members specifically for their insurance must insure all eligible members or employees, or all except any as to whom evidence of individual insurability is not satisfactory to the insurer.

"(c) The policy must cover at least twenty-five members or employees at date of issuance.

"(d) The amounts of insurance under the policy must be based on some plan precluding individual selection either by the members or employees, or by the association. No policy may be issued which provides term insurance on any association member or employee which, together with any other term insurance under any group life insurance policy or policies, exceeds $20,000, unless 150 per centum of the annual compensation of such person exceeds $20,000, in which event all such term insurance shall not exceed $40,000, or 150 per centum of such annual compensation, whichever is less.

"(7) Any policy issued pursuant to this section, except a policy issued to a creditor pursuant to subsection (2) hereof, may be extended to insure the spouses and minor children of insured persons, or any class or classes thereof, subject to the following requirements:

"(a) The premiums for the insurance shall be paid by the policyholder either from the policyholder's funds or from funds contributed by the insured person, or from both. If any part of the premium is to be derived from funds contributed by the insured persons, the insurance with respect to spouses and children may be placed in force only if at least 75 per centum of the then eligible employees or association members, excluding any as to whose family members evidence of insurability is not satisfactory to the insurer, elect to make the required contribution. If no part of the premium is to be derived from funds contributed by the insured persons, all such eligible employees or association members, excluding any as to whose family members evidence of insurability is not satisfactory to the insurer, must be insured with respect to their spouses and children.

"(b) The amounts of insurance under the policy must be based upon some plan precluding individual selection either by the insured persons or by the policyholder, and shall not exceed with respect to any spouse or child, 50 per centum of the insurance on the life of such insured person.

"(c) Upon termination of the insurance with respect to the spouse of any insured person by reason of such person's termination of employment or membership or death, the spouse insured pursuant to this section shall have the same conversion rights as to the insurance on his or her life as is provided for the insured person under section 35–711.

"(d) Notwithstanding the provisions of section 35–711, only one certificate need be issued for delivery to an insured person if a statement concerning any dependent's coverage is included in such certificate."

With the following committee amendments:

On page 4, line 6, after the word "members" insert the phrase "or employees".

On page 4, line 9, strike the word "insured" and insert the word "insurer".

On page 4, line 11, after the word "members" insert the phrase "or employees".

On page 6, lines 9 and 10, strike "35–711" and insert in lieu thereof "11".

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, the District of Columbia Life Insurance Act presently authorizes, first, the issuance to an employer or to the trustee of a fund established by an employer of a group life insurance policy covering a group of at least 25 employees; second, the issuance to a labor union of a group life insurance policy covering at least 25 union members; third, the issuance to the trustees of a fund established by two or more employers in the same industry or by one or more labor unions, or by one or more employers and one or more labor unions of a group life insurance policy covering at least 100 persons and not less than an average of five persons per employer unit; and fourth, the issuance to certain designated Government officials of group life insurance policies covering at least 50 Government employees. In the cases of the first three classes of persons described above, the amount of insurance coverage per person may not exceed $20,000. Existing law does not now authorize an association which has been organized and is maintained for purposes other than that of obtaining insurance to be issued a group life insurance policy nor does existing law provide for the inclusion in any such policy of spouses and minor children of insured persons.

H.R. 1844 amends the act to authorize the issuance to an employer or trustee of a fund established by an employer, to labor unions, to trustees for one or more labor unions, two or more employers, or one or more employers and one or more labor unions, and to certain designated Government officials, group life insurance policies covering a minimum of ten persons. The bill also increases the limitation of insurance coverage from $20,000 to $40,000. Further, associations which have been organized and are maintained for purposes other than obtaining insurance are made eligible to be issued policies of group life insurance. The coverage of such policies may, under the bill, be extended to include the spouses and minor children of the insured persons.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word, and ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, this time would not be taken, but a letter was received this morning, enclosing a newspaper clipping that reads:

CONGRESSIONAL PAY ISN'T CHICKEN FEED

(By Inez Robb)

In the current congressional Easter recess, Members of the Senate and House are back home, so I read, trying to get a whiff of the political climate and taking the pulse of the electorate.

So far, my Congressman, much less my Senator, has not been around to lay ary finger on my pulse. But if either shows up, he'll find my pulse jumping like a yo-yo. And I'll be real happy to tell him why.

It isn't so much the present widespread revelations of nepotism (or me-and-my family firstism) that has my pulse leaping like a trout stream—there are chiselers in every profession—as what it all adds up to.

And what it adds up to is that American Congressmen are among the most highly paid and most lightly taxed executives in the country.

Frankly, I feel like a nitwit that for years I have swallowed the surface fact that Senators and Members of the House receive a flat salary of $22,500 annually.

The truth is that Congressmen receive from three to eight times that sum, for they belong to that most-privileged and lordly of all modern financial categories, the expense-account aristocracy.

Including all their extraordinary perquisites, which they have voted themselves over the years, the congressional take-home pay, the great majority of it tax exempt, ranges anywhere from $70,000 to more than $180,000 annually.

The Congress has been shrewd enough to vote itself a flat salary of $22,500 and to take the rest of its big, fat cut in the form of expenses, which are tax exempt.

The Congress has made it as difficult as possible for the public to assay the swag connected with membership in the club.

By law, the Members of the House are limited to $37,000 annually for secretarial help. The House recently put on the pressure to up that sum by another $14,500 for another administrative assistant.

And remember, fellow voter, all this lovely expense account money is tax exempt. And you really ain't heard nothing yet. Of course, you have read about the $1,200 annual allowance received by each Congressman for an office in his home town. Ah, those glassed-in front porches.

In Washington, each Congressman occupies a luxurious suite, in either the Senate or House Office Buildings, suites sometimes as large as seven rooms. Of course, the furniture and equipment of these offices are on Uncle Sam, too. (Remember the story recently about the number of congressional typewriters that have disappeared?)

The commercial rent on such splendid offices (and how vulgar of me to turn commercial) in a city as crowded as Washington, D.C., would be very costly, indeed, if a Congressman were forced to pay his way.

Then $3,000 of the $22,500 of acknowledged salary is tax exempt because of the "hardship" being forced to maintain a residence in Washington, D.C.

Note this paragraph:

And what it adds up to is that American Congressmen are among the most highly paid and most lightly taxed executives in the country.

Now, it seems to me that statement would be of interest to all of us. I am sure it will be of interest to people who are thinking of running for office.

Here is another quote:

Frankly, I feel like a nitwit. That for years I have swallowed the surface fact that Senators and Members of the House receive a flat salary of $22,500 annually.

Now, what this young lady—and I think she is young and beautiful—put in the press is amazing—if she has been around here for some time and is a young lady of discernment. That she did not know until recently what Congressmen are getting is most amazing, to me, especially from the Detroit Free Press. I know of the Detroit Free Press. The father of the editor, John Knight—and he has, I understand, three great papers—was once a Congressman from the Akron, Ohio, district, and, presumably, John S. himself is at least slightly interested in Congressmen, their qualifications—incidentally, their compensation. I know the Detroit Free Press has good people—a most excellent

reporter in Jim Haswell. He is on the ball all the time. He gets the news when it is news, and very accurately. I have never noticed any venom in his reports. But this girl—I assume she is a girl—just does not know what we are getting for the duties we are presumed to do.

Listen to this. She wrote:

The truth is that Congressmen receive from three to eight times that sum, for they belong to that most-privileged and lordly of all modern financial categories, the expense-account aristocracy.

Including all their extraordinary perquisites, which they have voted themselves over the years, the congressional take-home pay, the great majority of it tax exempt, ranges anywhere from $70,000 to $180,000 annually.

Now, if any of you have been in any doubt about what your take-home pay is, check up on this statement of Inez.

Where in the world does the dear lady get that kind of misinformation? If in doubt, she should have checked. Can anyone estimate the misunderstanding, the envy, that statements of that kind cause among the people of our districts? Perhaps some have known exactly what a Congressman receives. When they read this statement in the Detroit Free Press that some of us get $70,000, some $180,000, they see it "black on white" and, with the other misleading statements they read, straightaway conclude that the Congressmen who tell them, when asked, the true amount of their compensation, are liars.

While Inez may be young, she may also be old enough to remember that there was a day when the people, reading a newspaper, were of the opinion that the statements therein were true.

Now, I had a lame back for quite some time. My colleague, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT] has been here so long and he was limping around a little while ago. Maybe he and I had bad backs, that is, from carrying that money home, all of that $180,000. If they paid us in Lincoln pennies, it sure was some load. I do not know where Inez has been—upstairs, or down, eating. She sure did not get the facts right. I hope that the Detroit Free Press management will call her attention to the necessity of being approximately accurate because some folks read that paper and certainly Mr. Knight does not want his readers deceived. If his news stories are untrue no one will believe his editorials.

She states further:

The Congress has been shrewd enough to vote itself a flat salary of $22,500 and to take the rest of its big, fat cut in the form of expenses, which are tax exempt.

She should know better. Why mislead on that item? But just why does she charge us with getting tax-exempt sums when the record shows otherwise? If I said she weighed 50 pounds more than she does, would she be mad?

She states:

The Congress has made it as difficult as possible for the public to assay the swag connected with membership of the club.

May I ask my friend from Iowa [Mr. GROSS], What is the meaning of "swag"? What does that mean as Inez uses it?

Swag means "booty, boodle, plunder, also spoils," and, of course, Inez knows the meaning of the term. Sure, the Congressmen have their failings, as do a few other people. But after all, this is the people's Congress and one of the good things about the people is that even the sassiest, dirty-faced little brat is, by his mother, thought to be quite a child.

May I plead with Inez, in my behalf if in behalf of no one else. We are bad enough. Do not make us any worse than we are.

She also wrote:

By law, the Members of the House are limited to $37,000 annually for secretarial help. The House recently put on the pressure to up that sum by another $14,500 for another administrative assistant.

If I ever get one, I am going to lend him to Inez so that she may get the facts, write a true report. She needs information not imagination. A paper that continues to print fancy rather than facts soon loses the confidence of its readers.

She goes on to say:

And remember, fellow voter, all this lovely expense account money is tax exempt.

Of course, you have read about the $1,200 annual allowance received by each Congressman for an office in his home town.

Ah, those glassed-in front porches.

Bless your heart, dear Inez, you would be one of the first to kick if the Congressman did not ask you to be seated when you called in his home town—just what and the sum total of expense items would you allow, Inez?

Neither you nor the Detroit Free Press nor the other papers pays any gallery rent, but Inez, you have been sitting up there in the comfortable press gallery and on those nice, soft cushions while waiting for a timid Congressman to leave the floor at your finger-crooking to answer your call in the hope you would send on a good word to your paper. So why do you let out an unladylike squawk?

Instead of worrying and complaining about the furniture used in the Capitol which the Congressmen are permitted to use, Inez might give a little thought to the fact that she is treated in the same way when in the Capitol. If she does not watch her step, she will get sore just sitting around waiting for something to happen. The services she gets are all tax free.

Surely she wants to leave us enough so that, when we come on the floor or down in the well, we will not be arrested for not being properly dressed.

She states further on:

In Washington, each Congressman occupies a luxurious suite, in either the Senate or House Office Buildings, suites sometimes as large as seven rooms.

You boys with seven rooms, let us know where they are. She says "seven rooms." Go over to my office and find out. I have tried to wriggle the Speaker out of a nice place up in front, but he keeps me in a back corner. I am glad he does because there are three windows on one side of my office. Of course, there are a couple of girls in there, but I do not mind that, although it is a little embarrassing sometimes when folks from back home come in, like the six or seven who came in this morning. But, we all get along and some way the work gets done. I wish, however, you distinguished Members of the House who have seven rooms would let us know where they are and how any of us can get them.

Of course, the furniture and equipment of these offices are on Uncle Sam, too.

She sits up there and pounds a Government typewriter, she and the rest of the reporters; lolls back in a comfortable chair, has a cigarette tray handy if she wants one, a glass of cool, clear water waiting in the hand of a Congressman if she wants it. I wish some of these boys and girls who are so critical of Congressmen would get a looking-glass—I will help pay for it—and take a look at themselves every morning before coming to work and see how much better they are than the rest of us—then be just a little charitable.

Ah, yes, furniture. Inez even complains about the furniture. I bought two surplus desks for the office one day and I would bet, if I was a betting man, when I go home pretty quick and take them along, someone will accuse me of stealing them.

Typewriters. Inez wrote:

Remember the story recently about the number of congressional typewriters that have disappeared?

Is a Congressman to blame if any are gone or once in a while a reporter lets one stick to his fingers? I do not think so. I have not the slightest idea that it happened. Inez writes:

The commercial rent on such splendid offices (and how vulgar of me to turn commercial) in a city as crowded as Washington, D.C., would be very costly, indeed, if a Congressman were forced to pay his way.

Do they want us to rent space here? And, Inez, I have a home in Allegan, Mich. Wife and I built it 59 years ago—house and lot, $1,200—rent one here for $110 a month. Inez, if I was getting $180,000 a year, tax free, I might think of paying $120 a month.

Writes Inez:

Then $3,000 of the $22,500 of acknowledged salary is tax exempt.

Poor dear. She does not know all she is writing about.

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.

ATTACHMENT AND GARNISHMENT OF WAGES IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H.R. 836) to amend the code of law for the District of Columbia by modifying the provisions relating to the attachment and garnishment of wages, salaries, and commissions of judgment debtors, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

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 the Act entitled "An Act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia", approved March 3, 1901, as amended, is amended by inserting after section 1104 thereof a new section as follows:

"SEC. 1104A. ATTACHMENT OF WAGES.—(a) Notwithstanding any other provision of this chapter, where an attachment is levied upon wages due a judgment debtor from an employer-garnishee, such attachment shall become a lien and a continuing levy upon the gross wages due or to become due to the judgment debtor for the amount specified in the attachment to the extent of (1) 10 per centum of so much of the gross wages as does not exceed $200 due or to become due to the judgment debtor from the employer-garnishee for the pay period or periods ending in any calendar month, plus (2) 20 per centum of so much of the gross wages as exceeds $200 but does not exceed $500 due or to become due to the judgment debtor from the employer-garnishee for the pay period or periods ending in any calendar month, plus (3) 50 per centum of so much of the gross wages as exceeds $500 due or to become due to the judgment debtor from the employer-garnishee for the pay period or periods ending in any calendar month. Such levy shall be a continuing levy until the judgment, interest, and costs thereof are fully satisfied and paid, and in no event shall moneys be withheld, by the employer-garnishee from the judgment debtor, in amounts greater than those prescribed by this section. Only one attachment upon the wages of a judgment debtor shall be satisfied at one time. Where more than one attachment is issued upon the wages of the same judgment debtor and served upon the same employer-garnishee, the attachment first delivered to the marshall shall have priority, and all subsequent attachments shall be satisfied in the order of priority set forth in section 452 of this Act.

"(b) It shall be the duty and responsibility of any employer upon whom an attachment is served, and who at such time is indebted for wages to an employee who is the judgment debtor named in such attachment, or who becomes so indebted to such judgment debtor in the future and while such attachment remains a lien upon such indebtedness, to withhold and pay to the judgment creditor, or his legal representative, within fifteen days after the close of the last pay period of the judgment debtor ending in each calendar month, that percentage of the gross wages payable to the judgment debtor for the pay period or periods ending in such calendar month to which the judgment creditor is entitled under the terms of this section until such attachment is wholly satisfied: *Provided,* That upon written notice of any court proceeding attacking such attachment or the judgment on which it is based, the employer shall make no further payments to the judgment creditor or his legal representative until receipt of an order of court terminating such proceedings. Any payments made by an employer-garnishee in conformity with this subsection shall be a discharge of the liability of the employer to the judgment debtor to the extent of such payment. Under this subsection the employer-garnishee shall not withhold or pay over more than 10 per centum of the gross wages payable to the judgment debtor for any pay period ending in any calendar month until the total amount of gross wages paid or payable to the judgment debtor for all pay periods ending in such calendar month equals $200, nor more than 20 per centum of the gross wages in excess of $200 payable to the judgment debtor for any pay period ending in any calendar month until the total amount of gross wages paid or payable to the judgment debtor for all pay periods ending in such calendar month equals $500.

"(c) It shall be the duty and responsibility of the judgment creditor (1) to file with the clerk of the court, every three months after the serving of an attachment, a receipt showing the amount received and the balance due under the attachment as of the date of filing, and (2) to file a final receipt with the court, furnish a copy thereof to the employer-garnishee, and to obtain a vacation of the attachment within twenty days after the attachment has been satisfied. If the judgment creditor fails to file any of the receipts prescribed in this subsection, any interested party may move the court to compel the defaulting judgment creditor to appear in court and make an accounting forthwith. The court may, in its discretion, enter judgment for any damages, including a reasonable attorney's fee, suffered by, and tax costs in favor of, the party filing the motion to compel the accounting.

"(d) If the employer-garnishee willfully fails to pay to the judgment creditor the percentages prescribed in this section of the wages which become payable to the judgment debtor for any pay period, judgment shall be entered against him for the whole amount of the judgment creditor's judgment, interest, and costs and execution shall be had thereon except that in no event shall judgment be entered against the employer-garnishee in an amount greater than the gross wages which became payable to the judgment debtor for the pay period or periods with respect to which the employer-garnishee willfully failed to pay to the judgment creditor the percentages prescribed in this section. If the employer-garnishee fails—but not willfully, to pay to the judgment creditor the percentages prescribed in this section of the wages which become payable to the judgment debtor for any pay period, judgment shall be entered against him for an amount equal to the percentages with respect to which such failure occurs.

"(e) If a judgment debtor resigns or is dismissed from his employment while an attachment upon his wages is wholly or partly unsatisfied, such attachment shall lapse and no further deduction shall be made thereon unless the judgment debtor is reinstated or reemployed within ninety days after such resignation or dismissal.

"(f) For purposes of this section, the term 'wages' means—

"(1) wages, salary, commissions, or other remuneration for services performed by an employee for his employer, including any such remuneration measured partly or wholly by percentages or share of profits, or by other sums based upon work done or results produced, whether or not the employee is given a drawing account, and

"(2) any drawing account made available to an employee by his employer.

The term wages shall not include any amount paid or payable to an employee who is not a resident of the District of Columbia as remuneration for services performed within the District of Columbia, if the period for which the employee is engaged by the employer to perform such services within the District of Columbia is less than fifteen consecutive days' duration; and any such amount shall be subject to attachment without regard to this section.

"(g) The per centum limitations prescribed by subsection (a) of this section shall not apply in the case of execution upon a judgment, order, or decree of any court of the District of Columbia for the payment of any sum for the support of maintenance of a person's wife, or former wife, or children, and any such execution, judgment, order, or decree shall, in the discretion of the court, have priority over any other execution which is subject to the provisions of this section.

"(h) No attachment issued by the municipal court for the District of Columbia upon a judgment of such court duly docketed in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, and levied within 6 years from the date of such judgment upon the wages due or to become due to the judgment debtor from the employer-garnishee, shall lapse or become invalid prior to complete satisfaction solely by reason of the expiration of the period of limitation set forth in section 4(c) of the Act of April 1, 1942 (56 Stat. 193; D.C. Code 11–755).

"(i) Where the judgment debtor claims or is proved to be rendering services to or employed by a relative or other person or by a corporation owned or controlled by a relative or other person, without salary or compensation, or at a salary or compensation so inadequate as to satisfy the court that such salary or compensation is merely colorable and designed to defraud or impede the creditors of such debtor, the court may direct such debtor to make payments on account of the judgment, in installments, based upon a reasonable value of the service rendered by such judgment debtor under his said employment or upon said debtor's then earning ability.

"(j) Where an attachment levied under section 1104A is based upon a judgment obtained by default or consent without a trial upon the merits, the court, upon motion of any interested person, may quash such attachment upon satisfactory proof that such judgment was obtained without just cause and solely for the purpose of preventing or delaying the satisfaction of just claims."

SEC. 2. Subsection (b) of section 1089 of the Act entitled "An Act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia", approved March 3, 1901, as amended (D.C. Code 15–304), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "This subsection shall not apply with respect to an attachment upon wages to which section 1104A of this Act applies."

SEC. 3. Section 1098 of such Act, as amended (D.C. Code 15–312), is amended by striking out "If" and inserting in lieu thereof "Subject to the provisions of section 1104A of this Act, if".

SEC. 4. Section 1107 of such Act, as amended (D.C. Code 15–403), is amended—

(a) by striking out "earnings, salary" each place it appears in subsections (a) and (b) and inserting in lieu thereof "earnings (other than wages, as defined in section 1104A);" and

(b) by striking out "salaries" in the proviso in subsection (a).

SEC. 5. (a) Section 456 of such Act, as amended (D.C. Code 16–312), is amended by adding at the end thereof as follows:

"(c) Any attachment issued under section 445 of this Act solely on the ground that the defendant is not a resident of the District of Columbia and levied upon wages as defined in section 1104A(f) shall be subject to the provisions of section 1104A of this Act, except that the employer-garnishee shall pay over the wages withheld pursuant to such section only pursuant to the order of the court which has jurisdiction of the case. In applying the provisions of such section to any such attachment, the term 'judgment debtor' as used in such section shall be considered to refer to the defendant in the case in which such attachment is issued; and the term 'judgment creditor' shall be considered to refer to the plaintiff in such case."

(b) Subsection (b) of such section 456 is amended by striking out "Wages" and inserting in lieu thereof "earnings".

SEC. 6. The amendments made by this Act shall apply only with respect to attachments

upon wages (as defined in section 1104A(f) of this Act) which are issued on or after sixty days from the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 7. If any section, subdivision, or clause of section 1104A shall be held to be invalid, the remainder of the Act shall not be affected thereby.

SEC. 8. The judges of the municipal court for the District of Columbia and of the United States District Court for the District of Columbia shall establish such rules of procedure for their respective courts as may be necessary to effectuate the purposes of this Act.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 5, line 3 following "(d)", strike the following: "If the employer-garnishee willfully fails to pay to the judgment creditor the percentages prescribed in this section of the wages which become payable to the judgment debtor for any pay period, judgment shall be entered against him for the whole amount of the judgment creditor's judgment, interest, and costs, and execution shall be had thereon except that in no event shall judgment be entered against the employer-garnishee in an amount greater than the gross wages which became payable to the judgment debtor for the pay period or periods with respect to which the employer-garnishee willfully failed to pay to the judgment creditor the percentages prescribed in this section."

On page 5, line 15, strike the comma and the following: "but not willfully".

On page 7, line 5, after the period, add the following: "In the case of execution upon such a judgment, order, or decree for the payment of such sum for support or maintenance, the limitation shall be 50 per centum of the gross wages due or to become due to any such person for the pay period or periods ending in any calendar month."

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Speaker, under existing law in the District of Columbia a judgment creditor may issue an attachment of a debtor's wages called a garnishment, which garnishment requires that the employer withhold all of the debtor's wages until it can be judicially determined how much of the attached wages should be turned over to the creditor.

Under existing law if an exemption is claimed the debtor is required to file a written claim of exemption which claim is set down for a hearing in open court at which the debtor must be present. During the time this hearing is pending the entire wages are still held up.

The exemption provided for under present law is unworkable and economically unsound in that the majority of defendants never take advantage of it, and it promotes a coercive influence on defendants due to the holdup of the defendant's salary until the litigation is determined.

There are approximately 3,500 cases of garnishment heard before the municipal court of the District of Columbia every month.

The purpose of H.R. 836 is to provide an attachment on wages of a judgment debtor's earnings to the extent of 10 percent of gross wages not exceeding $200 per month, 20 percent of gross wages over $200 but not exceeding $500 per month, and 50 percent of gross wages exceeding $500 per month, until the judgment is fully paid.

The provisions of this bill shall be effective as to wages, salary, and commissions of an employee-judgment debtor on or after the date of the enactment of this act.

A subcommittee of the House District Committee held hearings on H.R. 836 on March 4, 9, and 16, 1959. At the time the hearings were held the chief judge of the municipal court of the District of Columbia appeared, and other judges of the municipal court, the corporation counsel for the District of Columbia, representatives of the District of Columbia Bar Association, and many other interested public citizens who testified in favor of this bill. There were a number of individuals who appeared and testified in opposition to H.R. 836 or any other bill which would amend the law relating to attachment or garnishment on wages, salaries, and commissions in the District of Columbia. It might be well to point out that these persons who testified against amending the present law were representatives of various businesses who have extended credit in what could be called a reckless manner to the very individuals who were always brought into court with these proceedings.

The purpose in the amendment on page 5, line 3, following subsection (d) and on page 5, line 15, striking out the words "but not willfully" would reduce punishment for employers who failed to deduct attachments from debtor employees' checks. The Bar Association of the District of Columbia wanted such employers liable for payment of the total debt under attachment. The committee limited the employers' liability to an amount equal to the payment he failed to make.

The purpose of the amendment on page 7, line 15, adds a new sentence and is explained as follows:

Subsection (a) of the new section 1104A provides there shall be certain percentage limitations on the amount which shall become a lien and levy on gross wages due a judgment debtor. Such percentage limitations vary depending upon the amount of the gross wages of the debtor.

Subsection (g) provides that these percentage limitations shall not apply in the case of a judgment order or decree for payment of sums for the support or maintenance of a person's wife, a former wife or children. Thus it would seem to be possible for all of the debtor's wages to be attached on this type of case.

The purpose of the amendment is to provide that not more than 50 percent of the gross wages due the judgment debtor can be attached in the case of execution upon this type of judgment order or decree. This 50 percent limitation is without regard to the amount of the gross wages due the debtor.

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.

BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 3648) to regulate the handling of student funds in Indian schools operated by the Bureau of Indian Affairs, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Line 7, after "Affairs" insert "in accordance with the purposes of such deposits."

Line 7, after "deposits" insert "and disbursements."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DEFENSE FACILITIES PROTECTION ACT OF 1959

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, the Department of Defense has for many years urged the Congress to enact legislation which will allow the removal of persons within the defense organization who are a threat to the security of our country.

At the present time there are individuals employed with organizations performing services for the Department of Defense who are known to be or to have been members of the Communist Party.

The legal authority of the Department of Defense presently is limited to the protection of classified information or material in the possession of the Department of Defense. Based on this authority, access to such classified information or materials is denied to persons who are determined under appropriate rules and regulations to be security risks. This authority does not extend, however, to the removal of potentially dangerous individuals from facilities where unclassified, though highly important defense work, is being performed; or to removal of such individuals from support facilities such as powerplants, basic material plants, and transportation facilities.

One of the most significant areas where this problem exists is in the communications field. At the present time, vital communication facilities of the Defense Department are under the control of a union known as the American Communications Association.

In testimony developed by the House Committee on Un-American Activities, in hearings held in 1957, it has been conclusively established that this union was expelled from the AFL-CIO due to its being dominated by the Communist

Party. Members of this union, many of whom took the fifth amendment when asked about their affiliation with the Communist Party, are in a position to intercept vital defense messages which may issue or be received by the Department of Defense.

The legislation I have introduced will give the Department of Defense authority to remove these security threats from sensitive positions.

There is no room in our defense structure for anyone who is a member of or sympathetic to the Communist Party. It is shocking to know that this type of individual can today legally penetrate our defense organization.

I feel very proud and honored as an American to be able to join with some of my colleagues, in introducing this legislation in an effort to further shore up our defenses.

THE HOUSING BILL AND OUR RESPONSIBILITY TO POSTERITY

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. HIESTAND] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, unpaid bills and crushing national debts, if passed on to our children, will surely boomerang. Those children will bitterly condemn their reckless forebears. Even today, constituents are becoming concerned about the future of the American economy. With alarm they are catching on to the Democrat trick of backdoor spending.

No generation should live for itself alone. Our sole objective should be saving this Nation for the generations to come.

In other words it should be "what's best for our country" rather than the lust for immediate power by spending, spending, and spending the Republic into disaster.

There is a clear difference between the Republican and Democrat Parties, despite all this talk about a new image. Nearly a century ago, Abraham Lincoln summed up the Republican perspective:

> Fellow citizens, we cannot escape history. * * * The fiery trial through which we pass will light us down in honor or dishonor to the latest generation. * * * We shall nobly save or meanly lose the last best hope of earth.

The Republicans have heeded and the Democrats have ignored this exhortation to be responsible to posterity. The Republicans preach fiscal discipline and austerity today in order that our children shall inherit economic freedom, prosperity, and progress tomorrow.

The Democrats, on the other hand, continue their extravagance with the public money and apparently think that the public can be bought. They forget the cruel and crushing burden that the debts for their excesses will place upon all our children years hence.

The Republicans want every American family to have good housing. But this does not mean an extravagant, ill-conceived housing program that is going to create such national debts that those same families would one day curse the authors of the seemingly good program.

Those politicians who subscribe to the Democrat spending philosophy deny that there is any parallel between a family-balanced budget and a Federal-balanced budget. Although admitting that every tenet of common sense demands that a family live within its means, they claim that such common sense does not apply to the Nation.

I would like to live in a bigger and better house myself. To have this luxury, however, if I have to assume a crushing mortgage which after my death would bankrupt my wife and children, I want no part of the new house.

The Democrats have completely misunderstood grass-roots sentiments across the Nation when they claim that the public favors massive housing programs charged off to future years. The many polls clearly demonstrate that the Nation is on the side of the balanced budget. The citizens of this country do see a parallel between public fiscal responsibility and private fiscal responsibility, whether the Democrat politicians do or not.

It is responsible, however, to spend for housing money that we do have. This is exactly what President Eisenhower has advocated in the administration's housing bill. Economy in Government does not mean no spending, but it means spending within the framework of the balanced budget. It means paying as you go, and not as your children go.

Plainly, the difference between an extravagant and a progressive economy is the difference between the committee housing bill and the administration housing bill. The committee bill would ultimately spend $6 billion and unbalance our budgets. The administration's bill would ultimately spend $1.65 billion and keep the budgets balanced.

If the Democrats will truly decide to face history rather than escape history, they would become more concerned about adding a burdening indebtedness to the lot of those who come after us. Was it not this type of flabby, indolent, unconcerned attitude that led to the decline and fall of the once great Roman and Spanish empires? As the Teutonic tribes challenged the supremacy of Rome, and as the French and English challenged the supremacy of Spain, so today the Soviet Union challenges America for world leadership.

Stalin declared:

> Thus in the course of further development of international revolution two centers will form on a world scale: a socialistic center, binding to itself the countries that gravitate to socialism, and a capitalist center, binding to itself the countries that gravitate to capitalism. The struggle between these two centers for the possession of the world economy will decide the fate of capitalism and communism in the whole world.

In this hour of challenge, will Americans respond by spending and squandering borrowed money and by making still other loans? Is this flight from reality and escape from hardships the way that the early American settlers met the problems of their day and cradled a great and free civilization for us?

Clearly, no missile and no submarine can protect a nation against burrowing communism when that nation lets its economic muscle turn into such excess fat.

What alarms me is that many Democrats have rationalized their way out of what is called, in plain language, extravagance. Leon Keyserling seems to be the fountainhead of the spending theories. The bigger the national debt, he seems to feel, the better off is the Nation's economy. That a country can spend its way into a greater gross national product is a pure speculation totally without historical foundation or current justification.

Since 1913 Government spending has risen about 50 times, according to the Tax Foundation. If Keyserling's theories were right, the gross national product should have multiplied dozens of times during that time. But the hard fact that the gross national product rose only 11 times during those years indicates how wrong Keyserling's ideas are.

Mr. Speaker, this may shock a few Members, but Henri de La Chapelle, an able economic consultant, has calculated that because of inflation and taxes a single person:

To match a 1939 income of—	One had to have in 1957—	But the way things are going, 1975 income must be—
$2,000	$4,810	$10,540
4,000	10,100	24,420
7,500	21,180	58,000
15,000	54,210	128,000
25,000	85,000	255,000
50,000	333,380	835,390

To my way of thinking, the majority leader of the other body has issued a wise warning about slipshod ideas that have never worked:

> We cannot afford to go broke in tinkering with our economic system merely because an idea is appealing or attractive. The ideas must be tested in the market place of ideas.

Overseas the need for financial discipline within nations is becoming more and more discussed. In Europe and South America, creditors have been telling France, Argentina, Chile, Turkey, and other countries that they are living beyond their means and that runaway deficit spending is heading them toward disaster. The principal creditors are agencies like the International Monetary Fund.

France, Argentina, and Turkey have responded with austerity programs that may mean less luxury benefits for their people today but will mean greater financial stability and prosperity decades hence. Dire necessity has made these hard pressed countries abhor such theories as those of Keyserling and the Democrat Advisory Council. How critical does the financial condition of this country have to be before the Democrats will cast off these irresponsible philosophies and respond as have the people of France, Argentina, and Turkey?

The creditors in the United States are not agencies like the International Monetary Fund. The creditors are you and I, as well as the widowed and the retired—all those who have purchased Government bonds. And people like us are not buying as many bonds as they once did. This wild deficit spending does not have the confidence of the people. American workers and housewives have become educated to the robbery which is known as inflation; they are worried that interest payments on the debt are the second-largest budgetary expenditure. As has been often pointed out, at the rate we are going, by about 1987 we shall have spent in interest the total amount of the debt, and we shall still owe the debt.

I shall now treat some major objections to the Senate-passed housing bill and the House subcommittee housing bill.

First of all, both bills are exorbitant and excessive. The Senate housing bill would authorize commitments and ultimate expenditures of $3½ billion. The House bill would amount to $5.8 billion. Of these authorized budget expenditures, only $575 million could ever be recovered. Thus, $5.2 billion in the committee bill is in the form of outright grants.

Compare this extravagance with the administration's bills which would total only $1.65 billion and of this amount, $200 million would be in the form of loans.

Secondly, both the Senate and the House bills will be a strong wind which will excite raging fires of inflation. Of course, some Democrats assert that the House committee bill will have little immediate impact on the budget. They boast that considerable time would elapse before these vast expenditures. This type of logic is just another illustration of my original premise. The Democrats do not care how great is the national indebtedness, so long as they can foist it off on the next generation.

A major part of our this year's $12 billion deficit is the mushrooming growth of the Federal aid projects voted in 1955, 1956, and 1957, and prior thereto. Little inflation from those measures was felt in years they were voted.

But not only will the next generation pay—this one will, too.

In the excellent minority report on S. 57, there is a discussion of 11 provisions of this bill which will accelerate expenditures within available authorizations. Not one of these provisions is found within the sound and responsible administration bill.

While the committee is proposing a measure far more inflationary than even their bill last year, which failed to pass, the entire Nation is becoming more conscious than ever of the danger of fiscal extravagance. I want to enter into the RECORD at this point tabulations comparing last year's and this year's Democratic bill. This table makes it readily apparent that the Democrats are ignoring the Soviet strategy to bankrupt America. The table is documentary evidence that the Democrats are glossing over the dangers in inflation which cripple the income of the aged and the retired.

[In millions]

Program	Authorized budget expenditures	
	Bill last year upon which House voted	Present committee bill
Public housing	[1] $195.0	[2] $3,700.0
Urban renewal	[3] 400.0	[4] 1,500.0
College housing	300.0	400.0
College classrooms	125.0	0
Elderly housing	50.0	100.0
Federal National Mortgage Association	[5] 0	75.0
Hospital construction	15.0	15.0
Urban planning	0	10.0
Farm housing research	.3	.1
VA direct loans	100.0	[6] 0
Total	1,185.3	5,800.1

[1] Estimated contract amounts under 40-year annual contribution contracts with credit given for reducing contract amounts by excess receipts at fiscal 1958 rate. Gross contract amounts $236,000,000.

[2] Estimated contract amounts under 40-year annual contribution contracts with credit given for reducing contract amounts by excess receipts at fiscal 1958 rate. Gross contract amounts $4,480,000,000.

[3] 1-year program.

[4] 3-year program.

[5] $250,000,000 authorization contingent upon direction of the President not included in this tabulation.

[6] Separate bill has already passed the House, this Congress, providing $300,000,000 for these loans.

Thirdly, by the decrease in FHA downpayments and by requiring FNMA to purchase mortgages at par, and thus pay more than the market price, the Democrat Senate and House bills would further promote inflation. This special-assistance fund of FNMA is a direct backdoor drain on the Treasury.

Both the Senate and House bills are a further step toward subversion of the traditional American system by substituting statism for private activities. By the FNMA par purchase requirement, it would generally be impossible for private investors to purchase these mortgages, since par would be in excess of the market price. By maintaining artificially low interest rates on Government housing loans, private investment would be further driven from the field. By the Senate bill eliminating existing provisions of law designed to prevent competition between public and private housing, and subject income limits for public housing to almost unrestricted local political pressures, private housing will almost be excluded from the middle-income brackets.

Fourthly, the Senate and House proposals represent a further attempt toward centralization. This comes at a time when the administration is seeking to share financial responsibility with the States and localities.

There is an alarming contrast between the approach of the House bill and that of the administration bill.

In the past urban renewal projects have been predominantly residential. The House bill would increase capital grants for nonresidential projects. The administration proposes a sound loan program, instead of a Federal giveaway program, so that private enterprise on a local level will be advanced rather than be retarded.

The Senate bill, of course, would sabotage local responsibility even more than the House bill. The provision for 5-year retroactive credit for local improvements would greatly reduce or eliminate cash contributions by many communities. Lack of responsibility in the Senate bill is also characterized by the attempt to put the Federal Government into speculative land purchases for urban renewal. Federal loans for acquisition of urban renewal project land would be authorized even before a project has been firmly approved or a sound plan agreed upon. The Federal Government, then, would become like the wild speculators in Florida during the roaring twenties. They got rich quickly or else went broke.

Both the Senate and House committee bills obviously were written in a rushed manner with no real concern for the future. The individual homeowner would suffer. For example, the Senate bill would sell public housing units to over-income tenants. The unsafe sales formula is such that the equity accumulated by purchaser of the housing unit would be comparatively worthless. In a typical case, the purchaser would have equity of only $750 after making payments for 10 years. This would hardly cover depreciation.

The Democrat housing bills typify an approach that ignores the Soviet challenge which must be met by a sound economy, and that lacks consideration for generations of Americans who will come after us. The Democrat-controlled 85th Congress created a record of irresponsibly spending the taxpayers money that shocked America. The Democrat proposals in the 85th Congress, if all passed, would have amounted to over $200 billion over the next 5 years.

By 1959 the spending tag had been firmly pinned on the Democrat donkey. Suddenly the pressure of irate constituents became so great that panicky Democrats began to shout that the Republicans were the spenders. They chattered about what amounts to Republican "front-door" spending through the Appropriations Committee, and ignored their own deceptive "back-door" spending. Through the rear entrance to the Treasury vast obligations were built up for the Government that never went through the Appropriations Committee. The Democrats thought they were fooling the Nation.

Plainly, the Democrat housing bill is another attempt not only to bust the President's budget, but to bust the budgets of our children.

We need good housing legislation. The funds which authorized FHA home mortgage insurance program, slum clearance, and college housing are almost exhausted. Administration Representatives, on the first day of this session of Congress, proposed in House Joint Resolution 89—McDONOUGH, WIDNALL, and BETTS—remedial action, but the Democrats denied the real needs of the country in their attempts to put through Congress an extravagant omnibus housing bill. They needed these three urgency arguments to force this great omnibus

housing bill through Congress. Their present bills of the Senate and the House committees represent dangerous proposals and display a gross lack of responsibility toward the long range welfare of our Nation. These bills approach the problems of housing in ways harmful to private enterprise and local government. They apply a philosophy which is alien to the greatest traditions of the American way of life.

We do not have to vote this housing hodgepodge monstrosity. The administration bill is a sound practical approach, and it provides all the legislation needed by the Nation at this time. It is a positive program.

If the Members of this body vote for the Democrat housing bills, they are voting for a luxurious extravaganza their children will some day condemn. When the Members of this body vote for the administration bill, they are voting for a continuance of the principles that have made America the greatest Nation in the history of the world.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HIESTAND. Glad to yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CEDERBERG.]

Mr. CEDERBERG. I agree with all the sentiments expressed in the gentleman's fine explanation of the fiscal problems which will arise if the Democratic proposed housing bill is enacted. It seems to me if there ever was a time when we should get our fiscal house in order, it is now. I say to the gentleman he has made a very valuable contribution in pointing out the differences that exist between the administration's proposal and the Democratic proposal which will probably be up for consideration by the membership of this body in the very near future.

I intend to support the administration proposal because I believe it is a proposal that will be in the long-term best interests of the citizens of this country. It strikes me very forcibly when I find that our Democratic friends have no consideration whatsoever about the future generations of this country. Here we are faced with a deficit of something over $280 billion, yet spending proposals come into this body year after year.

Of course, I believe there is a little politics in some of these spending proposals because the most shocked people in the entire country would be some of those who vote for all these proposals, when they wake up to the realization of what they will be faced with in reality. I think it is slightly dishonest to propose these grandiose spending bills whether they be for housing or other public works unless they have the intestinal fortitude to provide the revenue to foot the bill.

We have mortgaged the earnings of the future generations of this country by far too much already.

I intend to stick with the position of the Republican members of the Banking and Currency Committee on this housing legislation because I think they are absolutely right and that that they will not be inflationary.

Mr. HIESTAND. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. It's excellent.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HIESTAND. I yield to my distinguished colleague from California.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. I, too, wish to compliment the gentleman from California on his splendid and clear statement in which he so well points out some of the things inherent in one of the pending housing bills. I hope all Members of Congress will take the trouble to read and study these remarks, because they are very much worth while.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HIESTAND. I yield to my able colleague from Arizona.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I want to compliment the gentleman on his very fine statement concerning this housing bill which is pending and which will probably be on the floor before too many days have elapsed.

Does the gentleman recall that last week, I think it was, the Democratic Advisory Council in a statement suggested that the economy should be propped, that there should be some sort of props put under the economy. Such a statement coming from the floor as it did struck me as rather strange, since it seems to be pretty well understood that this year coming up will be the second most prosperous year in the history of the Republic, if not the most prosperous. I wonder if the gentleman from California has any ideas as to what the Advisory Council means when it says that we should prop up the economy in a year such as this?

Mr. HIESTAND. I thank the gentleman from Arizona for his question. I am at a loss to account for such an expression. It would be more like knocking the props out in a prosperous year if we continue along the lines of the committee bill. Certainly there is nothing that I can see on the horizon justifying such a statement.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. HIESTAND. I yield.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I wonder if the gentleman might agree with me that this particular proposal, the housing bill is another example of what I have called the worm's-eye view of the economy, as proposed by gentlemen from the other side of the aisle? In other words, they are so intent on looking at the little hills and valleys immediately ahead that they loom large and out of proportion and they lose the true perspective of the whole countryside and what really lies in the future.

It is like a worm going over the terrain. If you are a worm, those hills look pretty big; however, if you get up and above them and are able to look at the whole thing, you probably are able to chart a better course because you are not worried about a few little things which in the long run are not going to turn out to mean much.

I cannot help but remark also concerning the so-called unemployed march on Washington last week. Certainly nobody wants to belittle anyone who is unemployed or to do anything but feel a great sense of loss at the plight in which some of these people find themselves.

The official statistics released last week by the Department of Commerce and the Department of Labor, showing the greatest increase in employment in 8 years, apparently caught the prophets of economic gloom in this country by surprise.

Unfortunately, one person caught off base was George Meany, President of AFL–CIO. Mr. Meany had not previously been a member of the gloom and doom team. However he was forced into a most embarrassing role by an action of the AFL–CIO which he personally opposed. This action was dictated by Walter Reuther against the better judgment of Mr. Meany and many more responsible leaders of the AFL–CIO.

This action was the so-called unemployment march on Washington. It was designed by Mr. Reuther to create an impression at home and abroad that our American economy was in precarious position and that unemployment was continuing to rise. It is my feeling also, Mr. Speaker, that it was a cheap attempt to exploit the misery of those Americans who are unemployed, for the political gain of Walter Reuther and the furtherance of his schemes to spend our economy into another ruinous cycle of inflation.

Mr. Meany after it was too late, apparently saw that the unemployed would reach Washington at about the time that the most spectacular rise of employment since 1951 had been announced. Therefore being a good soldier, Mr. Meany tried to save the situation by issuing the following statement:

> During the period from February to March, there is a normal seasonal improvement in the unemployment figures of approximately 5 percent. That would mean that, if the normal seasonal improvement is reflected in the March figures, unemployment would be down approximately 250,000 to 300,000.
>
> Even a substantial drop, far in excess of that figure, would still leave us with a serious unemployment problem. If the figure were in the 250,000 to 300,000 range, it would mean merely seasonal improvement and no change in the overall unemployment situation. On the other hand, if the improvement figure were less than 250,000, it would mean the unemployment situation had worsened.

Actually, the increase in jobs during March was 1,106,000 and the decrease in unemployment was 387,000. This was the greatest jump in employment since 1951, and the greatest decline in unemployment since 1950.

The unemployment march, of course, had fallen flat. Its preparation had been accompanied by numerous difficulties local unions had in finding unemployed members to attend. I am not minimizing, Mr. Speaker, the actual plight of those Americans who remain unemployed, but I think we all deplore such attempts to exploit their situation for purposes of political or personal ambition.

I am sorry that Mr. Meany found himself in this position, through no fault of his own. I am even more sorry that he

went so far to justify an ill advised position of his organization as to make the following statement:

The drop in unemployment was mostly seasonal. There is no appreciable improvement in the overall picture. Certainly well-staged propaganda announcements will not solve the problem.

Mr. Meany knows the regular monthly releases of unemployment figures are not propaganda announcements, but are based on the best information available by the Department of Labor.

I prefer to believe that Mr. Meany's true feelings about our economy were expressed in the AFL-CIO News in January of this year in his forthright answers to an article in Trud, the official Soviet organ for trade unionists:

Trud refuses to admit that economic recovery has been quite rapid and that the recession in the United States is almost over. Personal income has reached a new high of $360 billion per year in November 1958. This is an increase of $14 billion over the previous high in August 1957. Industrial production has recovered about two-thirds of the drop experienced during the recession. Productivity is now increasing at a rapid rate—perhaps as much as 6 percent a year.

Our trade unions have continued to obtain substantial wage advances, while prices have remained relatively stable. For the first half of 1958, almost 55 percent of the wage adjustments provided an increase of 10 cents or more. More than one-fourth of the hourly wage increases were 13 cents or more. Real wages are showing very significant increases. This means a continuously rising American standard of living.

It is most unfortunate that Mr. Meany's association with the politically ambitious Mr. Reuther has put him in the position of talking out of both sides of his mouth. This is not characteristic of the always forthright George Meany. It is my hope that this apparent change in image will not be a permanent one.

I wish to thank the gentleman from California again for his very fine statement.

Mr. HIESTAND. I rather imagine that the gentleman from Arizona will agree with me, in view of Mr. Meany's mistake, that the most untenable position of all is trying to defend a mistake, will he not?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I think that is the point I tried to make. We here see a man who, I think, got himself in a position he did not want to get into. It was against his better judgment. But, like the good soldier that he is, he tried to do the best he could, but he got himself into an untenable position. And I have a great amount of respect for Mr. Meany.

Mr. HIESTAND. I thank the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HIESTAND. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. I wonder, if in putting the facts together or the statement together that the gentleman just made, in what I think is rather a partisan manner, he had considered a few points of interest. One is this: I happen to be of a generation that was permitted, and was proud to do so, to serve some time in the service in the early forties. During that period of time our generation, which is the succeeding generation now—and you are talking about another one—is the generation that made no profit out of the war, but the generation that made the profit out of the war is largely represented by you gentlemen who are now complaining because we cannot have investments in public buildings, and those are the gentlemen who profiteered at the expense of the bondholders or the people who invested in bonds $200 billion in extent. We went into debt $200 billion, and now we are paying the interest on that $200 billion that your generation profited from, and as the result of this and as the result of the increase in the interest rate, due to the fact that the administration has failed to support the bond market, we have this tremendous debt. Now, the result is because your generation profited to the extent of $200 billion in bonds, and you are now increasing the interest rate down here to an extent of several billion dollars a year, we have less money with which to invest in school buildings, for example, so that this generation that fought the war can have no place to send their children to school.

Mr. HIESTAND. I wish the gentleman could suggest some method to sell bonds at a price less than is being paid.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. I am surprised there is a question along that line, after the last 3 or 4 years. When the Government supported the bond market there was no trouble getting rid of the bonds and the people were willing to invest at a lower interest rate, but just as soon as you failed to support the bond market they refused to buy them at that interest rate, because they are pretty largely going down.

Mr. HIESTAND. The support of the bond market was the most inflationary measure that this country ever adopted and is in large measure responsible for the falling value of the dollar and the increased cost of living.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HIESTAND. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CEDERBERG. I am always interested in these experts on bonds and the management of the national debt. The same people who are such experts on bonds and the same people who are such experts in the management of the national debt and so forth are the very same people that put us into this mess of two hundred and eighty-some billion dollars as far as deficit is concerned. Now, if your party had as much concern in previous years, as far as spending is concerned, as you are in giving advice as to how to manage the debt, we would not be in this predicament.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. All you have to know is to know how to read to be able to see the statistics which are very much available on these bonds. When the Government bond market was supported we had lower interest rates than we have now. The interest rate has almost doubled as a result of the Government's failure to support them.

Mr. CEDERBERG. All the gentleman has to do is to remember that the national debt is something like $280 billion, and if his side of the aisle will do as much as this side of the aisle is doing in an effort to keep the budget balanced and spending down, we will not be faced with these problems in future years.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. It was $280 billion when the interest rate was lower, too.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HIESTAND. I yield to the senior ranking member on the Housing Subcommittee, my very able colleague from California [Mr. McDONOUGH].

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the statement that my colleague from California has been making on this very crucial problem of debt management, debt obligation, the fiscal policy of the country, and the omnibus housing bill that will soon be coming up for action.

While we are talking about the public debt and its monumental size of $288 billion, we seem to forget that in 1937 we passed the original Housing Act which provided that all of the bonds subscribed for the building of public housing units in this country—and there have been some 444,000 of them built at a cost of $3,331 million—all the bonds for those public housing units are tax-exempt; that is, the interest on them is tax-exempt. The little taxpayer who buys a savings bond has to pay a tax on the interest that he receives from that bond. But the big bond houses and the wealthy people who in many instances bought these public housing bonds get them tax-exempt.

An attempt was made in the original act to make it appear as if public housing bonds were a municipal responsibility, and an obligation against the credit of the city or the county or the State in which they were sold. This is not true. Public housing bonds that are sold in any city or county in the United States are not part of the debt obligation of that city or county, and therefore they are not in the same category as a municipal bond issued for the building of a sewage-disposal plant or a highway or public building. But this was an attempt to sugar up, to entice the public to buy public housing bonds. So, the interest on them was made tax-exempt. So, the small taxpayer is paying that additional tax, while the large bondholders are exempt. And, in addition, there is a $222 million subsidy to maintain these bonds, to make them tax-exempt.

Mr. HIESTAND. That is, per year?

Mr. McDONOUGH. Yes.

Mr. HIESTAND. I thank the gentleman for his statement. His contribution is very pertinent and valuable.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HIESTAND. I'm happy to yield to the very able gentleman from Texas.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, I merely wanted to tell my colleague that he has been of great help to me in the past on the matter of housing and other matters that come before his committee. I

want him to know that those of us who are sitting in committee now, while this House is in session, would be here if it were not for the other responsibilities which they have to take care of in the committee.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say to the gentleman that I have admired his work in the past as he has striven to maintain fiscal responsibility in the Housing bill. I am particularly concerned, in addition to what the gentleman from California [Mr. McDONOUGH], has said about tax-exempt public housing bonds, about the public housing provisions contained in the two bills, and I should like to ask the gentleman a question for the purpose of clarification about the Republican and the Democrat bills. I understand they are now before the Committee on Rules and will be coming up in the House very soon. Is it not true that there are many thousands of units included in the Democrat bill, but in the Republican bill there are no new public housing units? Is that correct?

Mr. HIESTAND. That is correct.

Mr. ALGER. Can the gentleman give me the figures contained in the Democrat bill for this year?

Mr. HIESTAND. The Democrat bill does not mention dollars, but it includes making available 190,000 new public housing units in addition to those that are now in. If we extend the amount of subsidy per unit per month for the 40 years the bonds will have to be subsidized, the cost to the taxpayers would amount to some $3,800 million.

Mr. ALGER. This is not to say, then, that we do not believe in housing, as far as taking care of the basic wants of those who need housing, but there is a difference, a conflict in viewpoint, between the two groups as to the best way of getting housing for the people that need housing. Is that not correct?

Mr. HIESTAND. That is correct.

Mr. ALGER. Public housing is not necessarily the way to do it. There are other means for getting good low-cost housing for people without burdening the Federal taxpayer more at the present time.

Mr. HIESTAND. As a matter of fact, the present laws are working pretty well. They are spreading housing very rapidly and at low cost.

Mr. ALGER. Would the gentleman agree that whatever merit there might be to public housing—and this is giving the proponents of public housing the benefit of the doubt, I think the gentleman and I would agree, before we contest the merit of public housing in the first instance—whatever merit there might be is absolutely beyond consideration at this time because of the unbalanced nature of the budget, the $13 billion deficit this year. Many times we have to tighten the belt even on worthy programs if we are going to be fiscally responsible and keep the budget in balance and preserve the integrity of the dollar bill. Does the gentleman agree with that?

Mr. HIESTAND. I do. I might remark to the gentleman that it is certainly a fact, as I have mentioned, that a large part of the deficit of this year is from votes of this House and this Congress in previous years. These laws became effective and the totals are now piling up. That is a major share of the deficit of this year. If we adopt this Democratic bill, the effect on this year's budget will not be heavy, but on future budgets will be very heavy. It will have to be covered by appropriations each year. The present maximum liability per year is $138 million.

Mr. ALGER. That was the point I was making. I want to thank the gentleman for that answer.

Is it not a fact that if we try to be responsible by balancing the budget and protecting the value of the dollar bill, what we are doing is actually preserving the buying power of every dollar bill in the pockets of the workingmen throughout the country?

Mr. HIESTAND. The gentleman is absolutely correct. I agree with him. I thank him for his statement.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HIESTAND. To one of the soundest thinkers in the Congress. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I want to compliment the gentleman on his fine statement of the housing picture and the way he proposes to meet this problem. However, I have been intrigued by again hearing people from the other side of the aisle pay tribute to this will-o'-the-wisp, this idea of getting low interest rates for Federal bonds, as if that can be accomplished without creating economic damage in another way.

What I should like to ask anyone from the other side of the aisle, and I have asked it before on the floor of the House and I have asked it in the Joint Economic Committee, and I might say there are more responsible people—that is my definition of course—on your side who recognize that that is a will-o'-the-wisp—is that those of you who still think you can get low interest rate bonds without economic damage and want to undertake this difficult chore, go back and find out why in 1951. That was a year when the Democratic Party was in control of the Congress and of the executive branch of the Government, we abandoned the program of bolstering the Government bond market and went to the Federal Reserve accord. I think if you will review a little bit of history you will find that it became so apparent to the leaders of your own party that that was an erroneous economic theory that they went to the 1951 Federal Reserve accord, which was to try to have the Federal bonds marketed on the open market so that to some degree, at any rate, the actual cost of money was reflected in the interest rate.

I personally think it is a much healthier situation, although I will say this: I think it is a very proper area for us to undertake to review, to see whether or not we went too far, possibly not far enough, but whether or not the 1951 accord was the best that we could have done. But this fiction of the cost of interest rates on Federal bonds and trying to make a political issue out of it is just nonsense. I think it is about time the people on the Democratic side of the aisle who want to make an issue of it start talking in terms of sense. The best way to start is to review why you abandoned that program in 1951.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. HIESTAND. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HIESTAND. I yield to my colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. McDONOUGH].

Mr. McDONOUGH. This is with reference to the public housing bonds that we were speaking about a moment ago, and the responsibility that the present act places upon the Federal Government to keep them at par, and maintain them at 100-percent value and at the same time give tax exemption on the interest. It seems to me that the responsibility for public housing originating as it does in the community in which the public housing units are built, should be the responsibility of the States, cities, and counties and that they should maintain the parity of the bonds that are sold to build these units. If that were the case there would be local responsibility and the debt of those bonds would be on that city or county and not on the national debt, as it is, on the Federal Government.

Mr. HIESTAND. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

THE WOBURN TIMES, WOPURN, MASS.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. 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 gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, many times since I have been a Member of the House of Representatives, I have spoken here on this floor and elsewhere in public of the very great honor I consider it to have the opportunity to represent the Fifth Congressional District of Massachusetts.

My district in a very large sense is where American freedom was born and where our independence as a nation began.

One of the historic communities in my district is the city of Woburn located 10 miles west by northwest of Boston. Only a few days from now, the people of the city of Woburn will celebrate the 19th of April when the Minute Men of Woburn joined with those of every Middlesex village and farm in the first battle for American liberty. The city of Woburn was first settled around 1638 to 1640, and in 1642 was the first incorporated township set off from Charlestown. The city was named after Woburn in Bedfordshire, England, a town about 50 miles northwest of London.

The city of Woburn received its charter in 1888. It was long noted as the most important leather manufacturing center in New England, and now it has many

diversified industries. Among its distinguished citizens have been the ancestors of the four Presidents—Grover Cleveland, Benjamin Harrison, Franklin Pierce, and James Garfield.

Over the last 50 years, one of the institutions for which the people of Woburn are grateful and proud is the city's daily newspaper, the Woburn Daily Times. Without question, the Woburn Daily Times is one of the very finest newspapers in all the world. It certainly ranks among the best in the United States of America. Always constructive, it never has been destructive. The publishers of the Woburn Times through its history always have considered news as information beneficial to mankind. If information had no beneficial qualities it failed to measure up to news.

In these days of rivalry, bitterness, selfishness, and lack of respect for the individual and lack of consideration for the right of privacy, the publishing principles of the Woburn Times are unique and outstanding. This distinguished newspaper seems like a breath of fresh, clean, wholesome air.

Because of the tremendous respect I have had for its publishers over many years, I consider it worthwhile and appropriate to bring to the attention of the American people the outstanding principles which make the Woburn Daily Times an outstanding newspaper. Just as wealth alone does not make any man great, neither does size alone make a newspaper great. Compared with our large metropolitan daily newspapers, the Woburn Times would be considered small. Compared with any newspaper in America on the basis of quality, however, none will rank any higher than the Woburn Times.

The Woburn Daily Times has been the recognized news publication for the city of Woburn, Mass., almost since its inception on the 9th of October of 1901.

It was instituted by the late James D. Haggerty, Sr., on a very modest basis and it has reached its present pinnacle of success through the practice of golden rule journalism. This daily newspaper has placed a ban on news in which scandalous developments flare, and down through its 58 years of existence, it has never scandalized a person or a family, nor has it glorified the developments of the courtroom.

The principle of keeping the news columns of the Times clean of scandal was of primary importance to Mr. James D. Haggerty, the publisher and founder. To his reporters he gave this advice and counsel:

> Never publish a name of a defendant in a court case or names and identities in cases that even border on scandal. Remember, I want the Woburn Daily Times to be a family newspaper and I want it kept so clean that every member of the family can read it without any compunctions. Regardless how criminal a Woburn boy or man or girl, for that matter, develops, just remember that the person came from a family who have earned the right to be free from disgrace. They are entitled to live with their neighbors and their families are entitled to grow up without suffering the burden brought about by the sins of the guilty member of the family.

When a court case of importance becomes a matter of news compulsion, the Woburn Daily Times still refrains from the use of names and calls the criminal or the defendants "a Woburn man" or a "local resident." The person's identity is not made public through the columns of the Times.

The passing of James D. Haggerty, Sr., the founder of the Golden Rule policy, brought his two sons in charge of publishing. They are Paul L. Haggerty, publisher, and James D. Haggerty, Jr., editor in chief.

Under the management of the Haggerty brothers, changes and expansion have been made and perfected. The newspaper has been enlarged and the machinery of operation increased and modernized. They have kept abreast of the times, and, as a matter of fact, from an operational viewpoint have kept ahead of the demands. The circulation has grown until now the newspaper serves the people in many neighboring towns, suburban to Woburn. There is one old-fashioned precept of the Times which has not been abandoned, however, and that is the prohibition against the use of names and the scandalizing of families in court and police news.

The two Haggerty sons of the founder, James D. Haggerty, Sr., have found this doctrine to be a cornerstone on which the reputation of the Times was built and became the family newspaper, and not only that, they too personally believe that the family of the unfortunate should be spared from the spotlight of pitiless publicity.

When the metropolitan dailies give attention to Woburn news events and developments which stigmatize the families of those to be unfortunately involved, the Times continues to adhere rigidly to the founder's original principle: "No names in cases involving scandal."

The Woburn Daily Times is nonpartisan, and in political conflict, opens its columns to both sides of any controversy. Both political parties are invited to submit news items, and both Democratic and Republican leaders on many occasions have acclaimed the eminent fairness of the Woburn Daily Times.

The Times is very proud of its record for Golden Rule journalism. Also, it is proud of the record of never having missed getting an issue published, delivered, and on the street regardless of power failures, storms, and other handicaps. Every patriotic and civic crusade of benefit to the city of Woburn and the Woburn people has had the unlimited support of the Woburn Daily Times.

The people of Woburn and the surrounding communities are proud of their daily newspaper. To them it is a friend that gives them not only the news but valuable information about their community and their day-to-day living. It is a medium upon which the people depend. It is like an old friend to them for it is respected and dependable.

The founder of the Woburn Times, Mr. James D. Haggerty, Sr., and Mrs. Haggerty, the former Mary Lovell, distinguished among the citizenry of Massachusetts, have contributed greatly to their community and their Commonwealth. A lovely and charming lady, today Mrs. Haggerty possesses countless friends, among which I am so proud to say I believe I am included.

Mr. and Mrs. Haggerty were blessed with 11 children, and the Haggerty family circle always has been an active and a happy one. There are two boys and nine daughters, all of whom are married. James is the oldest. The two Haggerty brothers, James and Paul, together with three brothers-in-law, presently operate the Woburn Times organization. The daughters of Mr. and Mrs. Haggerty are Mrs. John E. Gaffney—Mae; Mrs. Dennis Dooley—Madeline; Mrs. John Bundy—Dorothea; Mrs. Nelson Blinn—Arlene; Mrs. Joseph L. McCarthy—Lorraine; Mrs. Elmer Franson—Janice; Mrs. Robert W. Varey—Norma; Mrs. John B. McGowan—Joan; and Mrs. William F. Sullivan—Bernice. There are 37 grandchildren in this wonderful family.

In conclusion, I should like to say that the Woburn Times is a very friendly newspaper, possessed and operated by a very friendly organization. If at any time any Member of the Congress should happen to be passing through Woburn or visiting friends in this friendly city, they are not only welcome, but would find it interesting and pleasant to call in at the Woburn Times. They would be graciously received.

LEST WE FORGET—SOVIET DIPLOMACY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WRIGHT). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MADDEN] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, the 1959 meeting of Foreign Ministers and the proposed summit conference may decide the destiny of world freedom and self-government for generations to come. The cold war conducted by the Kremlin since World War II will meet success or failure at the coming summit meeting. Appeasement and the granting of concessions to the demands of the Communists will shatter hope for millions behind the Iron Curtain and greatly weaken the confidence of neutral nations in free world leadership.

Our State Department and allied representation attending the conference must not forget the history of Soviet international diplomacy over the last 30 years.

The record of Communist leaders as it pertains to violation of international agreements, treaties, and pacts with other nations should be No. 1 on the summit meeting agenda. Our leaders at the proposed summit meeting would commit a gross injustice to millions of enslaved people behind the Iron Curtain if they did not demand a complete review of the treaty and international agreement violations which the Soviets have committed in the last 30 years. The sanctity of international agreements and the wholesale violations of the same must be placed on the coming summit conference agenda.

Representatives to the summit conference from the free world will, by their silence, be accused of endorsing and rati-

fying the Soviet international treaty violations and aggression crimes by millions of people now under Communist enslavement.

The Congress of the United States in the 82d and 83d Congresses authorized and created two special congressional committees for the purpose of investigating methods and facts pertaining to violations of international agreements and crimes committed by the Soviets in their unlawful aggressions.

The special congressional committee which investigated the Katyn Forest massacre in the 82d session and the Select Committee on Communist Aggression in the 83d Congress collectively heard sworn testimony from over 400 witnesses and recorded hundreds of exhibits revealing the true facts regarding the international record of the Soviet leaders. Dozens of witnesses testified concerning violations of treaties, agreements, pacts, and other Soviet criminal methods to enslave people and nations in their long range program for global conquest. For over 5 years these incriminating hearings, records, and reports on Soviet diplomacy of these two congressional committees totaling nine volumes, have been available to our State Department.

Communist leaders have won the support of millions throughout Asia, Africa, South America, and other areas by spreading false propaganda and lies about capitalism and the free world. Why has our Government neglected or refused to set up an effective international information department and give the true facts about Communist diplomacy to millions throughout the world who have been misled by false Soviet peace propaganda?

Millions throughout the globe believe the Soviet propaganda that the people in satellite countries voluntarily submitted to Kremlin control. Our State Department has been negligent in not utilizing the true facts of Communist aggression as recorded in testimony and reports of two congressional committees in 1952 and in 1954.

These two congressional committees held hearings in America, England, and Europe. Sworn testimony was received from Poles, Hungarians, Bulgarians, Rumanians, Estonians, Latvians, Lithuanians, Ukrainians, Byelorussians, Germans, Czechs, Slovaks, and Russians. The cross section of witnesses included members of former leaders of now captive nations as well as ordinary workers and peasants; internationally known generals, political leaders and soldiers; members of the formerly free parliaments and governments, clergymen of all denominations, heads of great institutions of learning, teachers and students, businessmen, labor leaders, seamen and housewives; intellectuals and even children. They were people who escaped from the Communist-controlled homelands just a few months before our hearings as well as those who escaped during and after World War II. All who testified had one thing in common; they were eyewitnesses. They saw. They experienced. They were there. Most of them suffered the tortures of communism.

A great number of former leaders and officials of captive nations testified that the Soviets succeed in enslaving their countries by violating agreements, promises, and treaties, then through infiltration, intrigue, and subversion which was supported by the Red army and supervised by the Kremlin, took control of their governments.

The Committee on Communist Aggression, after its exhaustive hearings, unanimously adopted 12 separate findings from the evidence. I will read only 3 of the 12 committee findings.

First. Page 24, interim report:

(5) As far as the Communists are concerned, treaties, mutual-assistance pacts, nonaggression pacts, or solemn covenants are mere scraps of paper. Agreements or pledges made at the conference table are broken any time such action serves the Communist table for world conquest.

Second. Page 23, interim report:

(1) Communism never has come to power by legal or by democratic processes in any of the areas now under its ruthless domination. It uses the tactics of penetration, subversion, threat of military invasion, and finally, occupation by military and political elements under the direction and control of the Kremlin.

Third. Page 23, interim report:

(2) Once communism seizes control it immediately seeks to clothe itself with respectability and legality by conducting so-called elections which are in no sense of the word free elections guaranteed by the secret ballot. Moreover, the results are predetermined long in advance of the first vote cast.

I again repeat that the testimony and reports, in full, of these two above-mentioned select congressional committees are available to our State Department and are of immense value to our representatives at the coming Ministers and summit conference. The disgraceful record of the Communist leaders in the past for maliciously violating international treaties, agreements, and pacts must be placed on the coming summit meeting agenda.

I am hereby submitting excerpts from the testimony of but a few of the witnesses who testified before our two select committees in the 82d and 83d Congress concerning the stability and value of Soviet international agreements, pacts, and treaties.

I am submitting to the House Foreign Affairs Committee and also our State Department these recommendations with the hope that the coming Foreign Ministers' meeting take necessary action in an effort to remind and inform millions in the free world and neutral nations the true facts involving Moscow and its false propaganda concerning treaties and agreements for world peace.

The following are excerpts from the testimony before the Select Committee on Communist Aggression.

Herbert Hoover, ex-President of the United States, volume 2, pages 221–222:

Hon. HERBERT HOOVER. I had to deal with the Communist movement beginning in 1918. I was delegated by the allied governments to look after 12 Communist revolutions in Western Europe. I naturally was interested in the Communist movement per se. From that time on I became quite an earnest student of the whole of Communist literature and Communist processes as applied to international life. No one can read the speeches of Lenin and Stalin and Molotov and ever believe that agreement with Russia has more than temporary value. There are occasions when I think agreements could be made which would be to their interest or to the mutual interest, but those are pretty rare occasions. Such agreements would last only just so long as it suited the Russians. You have to bear in mind that during the interval between the First World War and the Second World War it suited the Russians to have a peaceful front. During that time, they made 36 different nonaggression pacts or treaties guaranteeing nonaggression activities. Every one of those went by the board the day they made the agreement with Hitler in 1939. That ought to indicate the sacredness of an agreement in the mind of a Russian when it doesn't suit him.

Hon. Juozas Kajeckas, counselor of the Lithuanian Legation, volume 2, page 8:

Honorable KAJECKAS. In a speech delivered at the 18th Congress of the Communist Party, Stalin stated that under the existing political circumstances the time was ripe "for reappraisal of existing international pledges and agreements." That same year a map appeared, published by the Russian general staff, showing Lithuanian territory as a component part of the territory of the Soviet Union. In addition to its military significance, this map shows that the attack on Lithuania by the Soviet Union was premediated.

Dr. Anatol Dinbergs, Charge D'Affaires, Latvian Legation, volume 2, pages 35–36:

Doctor DINBERGS. The carrying into effect of the present pact must in no way affect the sovereign rights of the contracting parties, in particular their structure, their economic and social system, and their military measures.

By signing the above agreement in good faith, even though under duress, Latvia had underwritten the door of her liberty, unaware of the fact at that time that the fate of the Baltic Republics had already been sealed in the Stalin-Hitler agreement of friendship and nonaggression of August 23, 1939.

Hon. Johannes Kaiv, Acting Consul General in Charge of the Legation at Estonia, volume 2, pages 35–36:

Congressman MACHROWICZ. Do you feel there is any freedom or chance for freedom of your people through negotiations with Soviet Russia?

Mr. KAIV. It is difficult to reply, but it depends upon what is in the negotiations. When you negotiate a treaty with them, according to Estonia, there is no reason—I myself don't know of any international agreement to which Soviet Russia is a party, which they have not violated.

Gen. T. Bor-Komorowski, of Poland, page 1126, volume 3:

Congressman MADDEN. Now, General, one final question: With all your experience as a soldier and statesman, and dealings with the Communist do you think that these meetings and conferences that are being held at Geneva, Panmunjom and Korea, do you think that the free nations are ever going to make any progress or gain anything by conferences with the Communists?

General BOR-KOMOROWSKI. I do not think the free nations will come to any real conclusion with the Communists through conferences. The Soviet aim is to conquer the

world. They need conferences only in order to have time for their underground and fifth column preparation to undermine the world.

Congressman MADDEN. In other words, their conferences are part of the strategy to get more time in order to carry out their program to conquer the world.

General BOR-KOMOROWSKI. Yes.

Gen. Wladyslaw Anders, of Poland, pages 1180, 1186, 1189, volume 3:

General ANDERS. I understand, but I must explain that I am not a politician. I am a soldier. From my long experience as a soldier I know that when an army attacks everything depends on the leaders. If the leaders advance well in front of a company, all the men will follow them, but if the leaders stop and waver the whole company is sunk. The situation today is similar. If the United States leads with determination and strength, all other people will go with them. But if the United States were to stop at words without facts and action to confirm them, such weakness would spread to other people. But I think the U.S. military leaders do not realize that today the leadership is theirs. It is necessary to understand that today it is the United States that leads the free world against its greatest enemy—Soviet Russia.

General ANDERS. Yes; that is right. Molotov said that it was very fortunate. You must remember that Poland had a nonaggression pact with Russia at the time, which Russia broke on the 17th of September 1939 by invading Poland. But I ask you what agreement has not been broken by Russia? Only one, that was with Hitler from 1939 to 1941, because Hitler was strong.

* * * * *

General ANDERS. I think you are absolutely right. Conferences are regarded necessary by the Bolsheviks only for two reasons: One is to spread their propaganda across the world, the other to gain time. Ever since Lenin and Stalin, the Bolsheviks have said the same thing: Their aim is to dominate the world. If necessary, they will use blackmail. If necessary, they will momentarily retreat—if such is the decision of the Communist heirarchy, they will go ahead again with double force.

Mr. Charles Rozmarek, president, Polish National Alliance and Polish American Congress, page 703, volume 3:

Mr. ROZMAREK. I think history has demonstrated since 1939 that you cannot do business with Soviet Russia, and in view of the fact that you cannot do business with them as a civilized nation, I think it certainly is time to put them outside the pale of the families of civilized nations.

Joseph Lipski, former Polish Ambassador to Germany, page 802, volume 3:

Congressman HILLINGS. Then would you say this is correct that every effort that has been made in the past to work out some sort of peaceful coexistence with the Soviet has not been successful?

Mr. LIPSKI. Yes; I am quite definite on that because I firmly believe that guiding principles of a moral nature are decisive principles in the international life of nations. If these principles are lacking, my experience has shown me that there are no good results with all these agreements if they are not based on international ethics and morals. The same happened with Hitler. I had quite a good insight for 6 years, being Ambassador in Berlin and I followed up the whole thing. I am speaking here as somebody who worked on these matters very thoroughly.

Ambassador Waclaw Grzybowski, Polish diplomat, scientist, and farmer, Ambassador to Moscow, page 960, volume 3:

Congressman FEIGHAN. Mr. Ambassador, when were you first aware of the contents of the Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact?

Ambassador GRZYBOWSKI. There was two, there was one official, and they signed on August 23, which was normal pact of nonaggression and of consultation. It was a normal pact of nonaggression and of consultation. It was only one more example of the duplicity of the Soviet Government which negotiated with Great Britain and France a pact of mutual assistance and at the same time negotiated a quite opposed pact of not mutual assistance but nonaggression and consultation with Germany.

Ambassador Edward Raczynski, of Poland, page 973, volume 3:

Ambassador RACZYNSKI. I think that negotiations with the Kremlin are only possible if your strength and your position are such that you can impose conditions which they will be forced to execute or to fulfill. But if you put trust in their word and expect them to fulfill it for fulfillment's sake, you are certain to be disappointed.

Ex-King Michael of Rumania, page 1009, volume 3:

Committee Counsel MCTIGUE. Is it not true, Your Majesty, that during the course of your discussions with Vishinsky you referred to the Yalta agreement which had just been consummated.

King MICHAEL. That was in his violent audience. In my reply, I said, "I am doing things in our manner and according to the interests of my country, and besides, the conference at Yalta says that every country is free to choose its own form of government." Whereupon he said, "In this case I am Yalta and I tell you what to do."

Alfreds Berzins, Latvian Minister of Public Affairs, 1934 to 1940, and Congressman Bonin, page 178, volume 2:

Congressman BONIN. It is apparent from your official capacity, and from the facts that you experienced, the Russian Government violated every agreement that they had with your country; is that right?

Mr. BERZINS. That is correct. Well remember that once in the League of Nations Litvinoff said that each agreement is only a piece of paper. And for the Soviet Union, each agreement is only a piece of paper.

Voldemar G. Ludig, U.S. member of the board of the Estonian National Committee of New York, page 145, volume 2:

Congressman KERSTEN. Mr. Ludig, would you place any reliance on the word of a Communist from your experiences with them?

Mr. LUDIG. No, sir; I wouldn't believe a Communist. You read in the papers about some conference that is going to take place again. May I ask you, what kind of a conference or what kind of agreements have the Russians kept in the past? To the best of my knowledge, they didn't keep a single one.

Mihail Farcasanu, president, League of Free Rumanians, former editor and publisher of the Rumanian paper Viitorul, pages 77, 78, volume 4:

Mr. FARCASANU. I consider that in view of the situation, after 10 years of experience with the Red government of Rumania, their infringements of every international agreement, infringements coming also from all the satellite puppet governments, which were installed by Moscow in the countries behind the Iron Curtain, to make trade with those governments means to help consolidate their tyranny, to condone their crime, one of the greatest crimes ever perpetrated upon formerly free people.

In the records of the committee hearings in Washington, D.C., on December 2, 1954, can be found interesting statements and ideas concerning coexistence in Rumania.

Peaceful coexistence meant for Rumania the destruction of the country as a free and independent nation. Peaceful coexistence meant the murder of the innocent, the criminal persecution of the church and of the clergy, the destruction of free thought, the destruction of free economy, the destruction of family, and the national destruction through deportations. These things are still going on today.

Coexistence with the Communists means without question and in every case, the destruction of those who want to peacefully coexist. Coexistence, peaceful coexistence, means at the same time helping in the preparation of a major war at the most favorable moment for the Communists. Coexistence means a spell of tranquillity for the Communist world, during which they will endeavor to destroy your free economy, through economic treacherous means, to destroy the morale of the free countries and to prepare militarily for a showdown with you; for your destruction is their ultimate objective.

Interim report on Communist aggression, page 22:

If the free world were to accept such a policy, it could only be based on the vain hope that, given time, the leaders of the Communist regime and the Communist tenets of government would gradually lose their aggressive and inimical attitude toward the West—that the U.S.S.R. would eventually become a peaceful member of the society of nations. But all the evidence heard before our committee conclusively proves that the Communists want time—not to become civilized—but to digest their gains and to mold their millions of captive peoples into willing slaves of greater aggressions.

The testimony of Dr. Jaroslav Stransky, Minister of Justice in Czechoslovakia has particular significance on the proposition of coexistence. He was a Socialist, and like most Socialists, sought to cooperate with the Communists:

Congressman KERSTEN. Just one final point. Do you think that the history of Czechoslovakia proves beyond any shadow of a doubt that there is no such thing as a peaceful coexistence between the free world and communism?

Dr. STRANSKY. That is right, and we only fear that the other world will not realize it. This was the fruit of our example.

Congressman KERSTEN. It meant the downfall of Czechoslovakia to try in every way to get along with the Communists; did it not?

Dr. STRANSKY. Yes.

The history of Czechoslovakia is the history of every government that tried to coexist, or cooperate, with the Communists.

Msgr. Bela Varga, president, Hungarian National Council, pages 12–13, volume 4:

Msgr. BELA VARGA. I had my first personal encounter with communism in 1919. At Csorna, Hungary, the village next to ours, the best citizens were being hanged on the trees around the church. The memory of these events accompanied me throughout my life, a life dedicated to the fight against communism. In later years, 1945, 1946, 1947, I again came into contact with communism and found it the greatest threat to human liberty, dignity, and love. Now that I have had to

leave my own country and live in exile, I can only urge every free nation and every free man to unite against this greatest, most brutal foe of mankind: godless communism that has set out to conquer the entire free world. On this solemn occasion let me quote the words of Abraham Lincoln, your great American President, who said, "You cannot escape the responsibility of tomorrow by evading it today." Gentlemen of the committee, through you I am relaying to the American Congress and to the whole free world the anguished cries of a nation sentenced to slow death by the crushing power of Soviet imperialism to which I add my humble but urgent plea for help for final liberation."

Ference Nagy, former member of the Hungarian Parliament, page 121, volume 4:

Mr. NAGY. Yes, Congressman; I am speaking of the mistake, first of all, of the Asiatic peoples. They are mistaken when they believe communism will liberate those who are still under colonialism, will bring social justice among them, will raise and increase their living standards. I am speaking about them. I think it is our duty to fight communism, not only in the field of diplomacy and not only in the field of armaments but in the field of people, the working people. We have to convince those underdeveloped nations that all their desires, national and personal desires, may be fulfilled only by democracy, and first of all, by the American sort of democracy.

THE COMMUNIST SEIZURE OF HUNGARY

Soviet Russia could have imposed a Communist dictatorship on powerless Hungary shortly after the occupation of the country by the Red army. This was probably not deemed opportune because of the various interallied agreements and the internal situation in Hungary, where the Communist Party had no popular support. Instead of attempting to introduce the Soviet system in one sweeping move, the Kremlin decided to follow a more cautious policy. There moved with the Soviet Army into devastated Hungary, a group of Hungarian emigrees, members of the 1919 Communist regime of Bela Kun—the so-called Muscovites—the number of whom was estimated at 160. At the hearings of the Subcommittee on Hungary held in New York on August 23, 1954, special reference was made to the persons and activities of the Muscovites by Monsignor Varga, former President of the Hungarian Parliament:

Congressman BENTLEY. You said when the Russians came into Hungary they brought about 160 Communists with them. Were they Russians or Hungarians?

Msgr. VARGA. They were of Hungarian origin, but they had become Russian citizens. All of them had Russian citizenship.

Congressman BENTLEY. They came in and they organized the Hungarian Communist Party and, as you say, they actually began the Hungarian Communist Party out of what had been the Hungarian Nazi Party.

Msgr. VARGA. Yes; that is correct.

These Muscovites were entrusted to apply the Communist recipe for conquest. Some of them had played an important role in the international Communist movement and had fulfilled missions as Communist organizers in various foreign countries. Their only loyalty had been absolute obedience to the Kremlin.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include certain excerpts from the testimony of witnesses who appeared before the committees mentioned.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. I yield.

Mr. MACHROWICZ. I want to thank the gentleman very warmly for his valuable contribution to a situation which is so very important to us at this time; and I want to say, having been a member of both these committees and knowing General Komoroski, that his assistance contributed greatly to the successful operation of those two committees. I remember also that at one time our chief delegate to the United Nations told me that the findings of this committee had been extremely valuable and helpful to him in presenting the situations at various times at the United Nations.

I think it would be extremely valuable for those contemplating attending or participating in the forthcoming conferences dealing with Berlin to study seriously the findings of these committees, for from them they will find how the Communists have violated all their agreements. I think it is a cardinal precept of diplomacy that they should go to the meeting armed with all the facts available to them.

Again I want to compliment the gentleman and thank him for taking the time to bring this to our attention today.

Mr. MADDEN. I thank the gentleman. I might say that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MACHROWICZ], was a member of the committee that investigated the Katyn Forest massacres and also a member of the committee in the 84th Congress that investigated Communist aggression at hearings in this country and Europe. The gentleman's services were very valuable especially during the Katyn hearings concerning the massacre of over 14,000 Polish leaders. Poland, a country of which he has great knowledge, is his former homeland. His ability to speak several languages was a great help to both committees.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD], now on the floor, was also a member of the Katyn investigating committee and contributed greatly to the work of the committee in recording the evidence which was submitted. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ROMAN PUCINSKI], a new Member, served as special investigator on the Katyn Forest massacres investigation and also contributed greatly to the work of that committee.

The other member of the Katyn committee now serving in Congress was ALVIN O'KONSKI who contributed greatly to the success of the hearings.

In the 83d Congress, MICHAEL FEIGHAN, of Ohio, and ALVIN BENTLEY, of Michigan, also THOMAS DODD, of Connecticut, now serving in the other body contributed greatly of their services on the select committee which investigated Communist aggression.

RUSSIA AND THE AMERICAN NEGRO

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. FORRESTER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FORRESTER. Mr. Speaker, a U.P. story by Louis Cassels bylined from Washington and appearing in the Albany Herald of April 7, 1959, tells of the reaction of the Communist press to an article appearing in the latest issue of America Illustrated.

America Illustrated is a Russian language magazine, distributed in the Soviet Union by the U.S. Information Service at taxpayers' expense.

The article in America Illustrated told of the "dramatic progress" Negroes in the United States have made in recent years in income, education, and housing. For instance:

The average dollar income of Negro workers has gone up 415 percent since 1940, while the average income of white workers has risen 277 percent.

Also, America Illustrated showed pictures of "mixed Negro and white groups at work in offices and scientific laboratories, worshipping in church, playing basketball, attending school, and participating as equals in civic meetings."

Mr. Cassels says that the Soviet newspapers charge that America Illustrated has juggled figures and hidden facts and, charged that there were "Negro ghettos" in New York, Washington, and Chicago, and that discrimination is being practiced in those cities.

It is completely disgusting to know that the U.S. Government is spending taxpayers' money in any such manner. Anyone spending taxpayers' money for such things does not have enough sense to get out of a shower of rain. The people that I represent are sick, tired, and disgusted over their tax money being spent in any such way, and they think it is high time that the United States quit kow-towing to Russia.

Russia well knows that America has gone crazy over the Negro issue just as Russia wanted the United States to do. Russia well knows that the income of Negro workers has gone up 415 percent since 1940, while the average income of white workers has risen only 277 percent. I am satisfied, however, that Russia does not understand how the income of the Negro has increased so much more than the income of the white people. As a matter of fact, I feel certain that Russia does not understand just how it is that 25 percent of the workers in Government are Negroes, although the Negro population is about 15 percent.

I am certain that Russia does know that she has already sold many in this country her foolish and false theory of the brotherhood of man, a theory completely at variance with the Protestant, Catholic, and Jewish religions. Russia knows that she has made us look ridiculous, and that if she will continue to agitate some people in this country will turn somersaults in an effort to do things far more foolish and more ridiculous.

The story by Louis Cassels is proof positive that our United States propaganda analysts are doing us far more

harm than good. America Illustrated is a magazine that the United States Government should close out. It is one that never should have been brought into being.

TENTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE TONEMASTER MANUFACTURING CO., OF PEORIA, ILL.

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, Members of this House are becoming accustomed, I believe, to my singing the praises of my home town, for we have so many institutions which make us proud that we hail from Peoria, Ill. Peoria's products, ranging from tractors and heavy earth-moving machinery to the finest distilled spirits, are known the world over, and in between these two extremes we have many smaller industries, many of which are dominant in their field. One of these, Tonemaster Manufacturing Co., is one of our fastest growing industries, celebrating its 10th anniversary in Peoria.

The history and growth of this company, now celebrating its 13th year in business, represents, and indelibly reiterates, the basic principles upon which our country has been founded that an economy built upon private enterprise provides the greatest opportunity for the enterprising individual to rise just as high as his talents, inventiveness, and willingness to work will take him.

Paul B. H. Smith, of Peoria, president of Tonemaster, long ago realized that people with hearing deficiencies belong usually to one of two classes: Either they are totally unaware of being hard-of-hearing or, knowing this, they are supersensitive in this respect, believing that they will be considered apart from others and thus limit their social and professional opportunities.

Some 15 million Americans suffer from one or another kind of hearing impairment, but only 1 million are courageous enough to wear a hearing aid. Thus enabled to physically conceal their deafness, they have created a greater problem.

In the case of students, teachers believe such pupils are indifferent to their studies or backward. In the case of employees, bosses often believe that the man or woman who has concealed the fact that they are hard-of-hearing are uncooperative and poor workers, which is the element that actually retards their progress.

In all instances, the hard-of-hearing who are sensitive about letting the world know of their problem, present very often a hazard to others in the factory or on the highway and public streets.

Paul Smith came to the conclusion that the automobile driver who is hard of hearing or the operator of a factory machine is as much of a menace to his neighbors as a man or woman assuming similar responsibilities who suffer from poor vision. Smith has campaigned among State legislatures and motor vehicle departments to make it mandatory that persons applying for an automobile operator's license submit to a hearing test, just as they must submit to a vision test. This was initiated not so much to sell hearing aids as to inaugurate greater safety on the highways.

The New York State Legislature has recently passed a bill making employers responsible for total compensation for employees' loss of hearing, unless adequate tests have been conducted prior to actual hiring—New York Laws, chapter 974, 1959.

Until a short time ago hearing tests were really catch-as-catch-can undertakings, or else they turned out to be long, embarrassing and detailed processes. The tuning fork methods are outmoded and undependable. The clinical audiometer requires the setting of dials for each ear separately at every stage of testing from 125 cycles per second through 4,000—the full range of normal speech. It is also inaccurate.

Smith prevailed upon William R. Hutchins to create an audiometer which was positively accurate and could be depended upon to give a complete test in a matter of minutes, instead of hours as the ordinary audiometer requires. Hutchins helped Edwin H. Armstrong invent frequency modulation and the superheterodyne. He is currently head of our Government's ballistic missile defense branch of the Institute of Defense Analyses in Washington and the inventor of the guided missile fuse, a polyphase generator and microwave ferrite devices.

In collaboration with James A. Depew, Jr., noted audiologist of New York's famed Eye, Ear, Nose, and Throat Hospital, Hutchins invented the Tonemaster speech frequency audiometer. After exhaustive tests at the New York Eye, Ear, Nose, and Throat Hospital over a period of 4 years in the clinic, the speech frequency audiometer, requiring only a single dial setting and completing tests in seconds, was declared to be 100 percent accurate. It is now in use in schools, hospitals, industrial plants, motor vehicles bureaus, and in private practice.

This instrument, manufactured in Peoria, Ill., has gained world renown and universal acceptance. It is responsible for increased public safety, the improvement of psychological behavior, school marks and employment averages where otherwise believed to be dissident persons were revealed as being guilty of no worse than being hard of hearing.

Smith's second contribution to humanity was the encouragement of his engineers and audiologists to invent and design hearing aids—often no larger than peanuts—which can be worn as earrings, eyeglass frames, or lapel buttons, free of any exposed wires or telltale sound boxes, thus completely concealing the wearer's affliction. This innovation in hearing has bolstered human morale, given assurance and confidence to millions and contributed to public safety and industrial safety. Like the speech frequency audiometer, Tonemaster hearing aids are made and shipped from Peoria to all parts of the world.

Thus a human and benevolent undertaking has brought employment to hundreds of Peoria men and women, enriched the entire community because of the firm's weekly payroll, but more important, enriched the lives of confused thousands and added to the safety of all of us. This is the American way of private enterprise; the story of success won through sheer inventiveness, intensive application of ideas and muscle and the ability to dream and see beyond distant horizons.

The 10th anniversary of Tonemaster Manufacturing Company is therefore not only celebrated now in Peoria by all its people, but it should likewise be at least officially recognized by our democracy as proof that no ideology or state controlled system of government can ever improve upon the doctrine of free men and women in a free economy.

INTERNATIONAL CULTURAL EXCHANGE AND TRADE FAIR—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs:

To the Congress of the United States:

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

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *April 13, 1959.*

PLENTIFUL SUPPLY OF PURE WATER IS PRINCIPAL NEED OF AMERICA

Mr. CASEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, one of the essential requirements of America is plenty of pure water for homes and domestic use, for industry, and for agriculture. Civilizations have risen and fallen because of the existence of an adequate supply or lack of an adequate supply of pure water for use by mankind.

The President's budget cuts funds for water pollution construction grants to $20 million from $45 million authorized and appropriated since passage of Public Law 660. This is complete disregard of one of the principal needs of America. For example, grants to Michigan cities will be cut from $1,394,500 to $561,000, hardly enough to make the program worthwhile in Michigan.

One of the shameful things about this country has been the manner in which we have destroyed, wasted, and squandered our water resources. The worst waste of water is pollution, both municipal sewage dumped into our rivers and streams and dumping industrial wastes into waters which are used by individuals for drinking, bathing, and recreation.

For years the construction rate of sewage disposal and waste treatment plants on the municipal level did not even keep pace with the growth of new population. During World War II and the Korean incident there was virtually no municipal sewage construction work done. In 1956 Public Law 660 of the 84th Congress became law and grants to municipalities on a matching fund basis to clean up municipal sewage began to be felt. In 1957, the first full year of grants under this, witnessed $351 million spent for municipal water pollution abatement plants and facilities. The rate of construction from 1952 to 1956 was only $222 million. In 1958 tentative figures show us that municipalities spent $390 million on sewage abatement facilities. This is the highest year on record. Construction of facilities without Federal assistance still averages about $222 million. The stimulus in construction because of the Federal grants is for 1957 some $130 million and for 1958 some $170 million, or an expenditure of only $45 million in Federal funds.

Clearly, Public Law 660, both insofar as the construction grants feature and insofar as the enforcement feature has been a wonderful thing. It is my hope and the hope of all who are interested in pure water for Americans living and yet unborn that it will be possible to continue the wonderful work being done under this law to clean up our rivers and streams and provide clear, pure water for home use, for industry and for recreation.

I insert here a breakdown showing what the dollar loss to the States will be if the full amount of this program is not appropriated. The loss of higher values is incalculable.

State allotments—Water pollution control construction grant program

	Fiscal year 1957	Fiscal year 1958	Fiscal year 1959	Fiscal year 1960
Total	$50,000,000	[1] $50,000,000	[1] $50,000,000	[2] $20,000,000
Alabama	1,150,125	1,157,175	1,144,725	448,840
Arizona	566,725	578,400	576,450	236,700
Arkansas	1,047,925	1,030,100	1,024,975	404,500
California	2,053,325	2,052,475	2,048,825	818,290
Colorado	624,300	636,675	635,700	253,210
Connecticut	628,275	626,575	624,100	248,080
Delaware	350,350	346,450	336,325	135,260
District of Columbia	445,650	453,675	454,575	181,800
Florida	910,775	907,550	899,575	359,880
Georgia	1,137,700	1,136,150	1,128,600	449,310
Idaho	576,475	593,325	592,125	236,770
Illinois	1,752,825	1,749,050	1,749,450	700,450
Indiana	1,027,400	1,029,725	1,039,850	416,330
Iowa	873,075	882,450	883,875	358,570
Kansas	733,550	749,150	758,325	305,980
Kentucky	1,067,225	1,075,525	1,073,825	428,990
Louisiana	993,975	993,350	986,350	390,040
Maine	627,125	634,650	625,725	252,690
Maryland	750,350	750,000	754,525	304,050
Massachusetts	1,137,125	1,126,450	1,123,575	447,090
Michigan	1,389,675	1,386,275	1,394,550	561,270
Minnesota	929,450	923,250	929,175	371,200
Mississippi	1,180,375	1,172,550	1,162,925	466,600
Missouri	1,059,775	1,060,950	1,063,350	424,450
Montana	503,650	503,325	512,475	206,570
Nebraska	661,075	674,150	683,850	274,660
Nevada	$325,775	$330,200	$335,325	$142,210
New Hampshire	543,150	529,825	521,925	210,310
New Jersey	1,113,600	1,110,125	1,109,775	445,520
New Mexico	631,850	627,850	631,350	245,710
New York	2,749,675	2,746,550	2,744,325	1,094,240
North Carolina	1,270,675	1,272,425	1,260,950	504,450
North Dakota	702,575	676,250	671,725	264,550
Ohio	1,653,325	1,655,100	1,658,600	662,330
Oklahoma	865,825	858,725	862,175	345,380
Oregon	647,125	651,575	657,300	264,500
Pennsylvania	2,097,650	2,098,725	2,102,975	839,700
Rhode Island	520,500	509,600	514,475	210,170
South Carolina	995,100	1,007,525	1,022,525	409,540
South Dakota	660,775	664,050	676,700	272,280
Tennessee	1,136,050	1,130,075	1,129,400	449,630
Texas	1,716,475	1,716,350	1,714,800	685,430
Utah	591,175	588,525	591,875	238,640
Vermont	575,325	556,650	545,600	219,460
Virginia	1,027,450	1,025,525	1,019,100	409,890
Washington	755,850	756,050	762,825	307,880
West Virginia	891,525	904,200	900,000	348,580
Wisconsin	971,725	974,625	981,025	392,740
Wyoming	440,375	450,750	458,050	181,530
Alaska	426,525	425,100	425,275	169,490
Hawaii	496,100	504,325	513,475	209,140
Puerto Rico	1,185,550	1,177,725	1,168,100	468,670
Virgin Islands	830,000	822,175	812,550	326,450

[1] Appropriation is for $45,000,000 but appropriation act provides that allotments to States be based on $50,000,000.

[2] Tentative allotments based on President's budget.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. BARING (at the request of Mr. LIBONATI), for the balance of the week, on account of official business—World Congress of Flight.

Mr. MULTER (at the request of Mr. LIBONATI), for the balance of the week, on account of illness.

Mr. WHITENER, from April 15 through April 17, on account of official business, attending the World Congress of Flight at Las Vegas, Nev.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. FORRESTER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BOWLES (at the request of Mr. MCCORMACK), for 90 minutes on Monday, April 20.

Mr. MICHEL, today, for 5 minutes.

Mr. DENT (at the request of Mr. CASEY), for 90 minutes, on Tuesday, April 21, 1959.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona, for 1 hour, on Monday next, April 20, 1959.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. PRICE in two instances and in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HERLONG.

Mr. BOLAND and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. PORTER.

Mr. PELLY in three instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. REECE of Tennessee and include extraneous matter.

Mrs. BOLTON and include extraneous matter.

Mr. LINDSAY in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ALGER (at the request of Mr. RHODES of Arizona) in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. AVERY (at the request of Mr. RHODES of Arizona) and to include extraneous matter.

The following Members (at the request of Mr. CASEY) and to include extraneous matter:

Mr. BUCKLEY and to include a table relating to the subject.

Mr. MACDONALD.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

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.

SENATE BILLS AND A JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

Bills and a joint resolution of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 96. An act to govern the salaries and personnel practices applicable to teachers, certain school officers, and other employees of the dependents schools of the Department of Defense in oversea areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S. 201. An act for the relief of Chiyoko Korematsu and Aiko Korematsu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 211. An act for the relief of Aurelia Marija Medvesek-Pozar; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 264. An act for the relief of Athena Nicholas Euteriadou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 313. An act for the relief of Collingwood Bruce Brown, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 449. An act for the relief of Clarita Martinez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 451. An act for the relief of Mohammed Ali Halim; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

S. 634. An act for the relief of Grace C. Ream; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 643. An act to amend the act entitled "An act relating to the levying and collecting of taxes and assessments, and for other purposes," approved June 25, 1938; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 644. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for compulsory school attendance, for the taking of a school census in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved February 4, 1925; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 645. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to remove dangerous or unsafe buildings and parts thereof, and for other purposes," approved March 1, 1899, as amended; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 701. An act for the relief of Arie Abramovich; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 745. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to create a Board for the Condemnation of Insanitary Buildings in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved May 1, 1906, as amended; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 899. An act to provide for the discontinuance of certain reports now required by law; to the Committee on Government Operations.

S. 900. An act to amend section 204(b) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to extend the authority of the Administrator of General Services to pay direct expenses in connection with the utilization of excess real property and related personalty, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

S. 901. An act to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to authorize the Administrator of General Services to make contracts for cleaning and custodial services for periods not exceeding 5 years; to the Committee on Government Operations.

S. 902. An act to provide for the receipt and disbursement of funds, and for continuation of accounts when there is a vacancy in the office of the Disbursing Officer for the Government Printing Office, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

S. 949. An act for the incorporation of the Ladies of the Grand Army of the Republic; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 1143. An act for the relief of Harvey Hiroaki Horiuchi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1217. An act to add certain public domain lands in Nevada to the Summit Lake Indian Reservation; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 1242. An act to authorize the use of the revolving loan fund for Indians to assist Klamath Indians during the period for terminating Federal supervision; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 1271. An act to donate to the pueblo of Isleta certain Federal property in the State of New Mexico; to the committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 1456. An act to provide for the appointment of two additional judges for the juvenile court of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S.J. Res. 61. Joint resolution to amend Public Law 305 of the 85th Congress relative to the establishment of a commission to commemorate the 100th anniversary of the Civil War, to authorize the manufacture and sale of a Civil War Centennial Medal; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. CASEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 32 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, April 14, 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:

839. A letter from the Director, Administrative Office, U.S. Courts, transmitting a report on tables of bankruptcy statistics for the year ending June 30, 1958, pursuant to section 53 of the Bankruptcy Act (11 U.S.C. 81); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

840. A letter from the Under Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to provide a flexible rate of interest for Government financing under the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

841. A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Civil Service Commission, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to provide certain survivor annuities payable from the civil service retirement and disability fund"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

842. A letter from the Clerk, U.S. Court of Claims, transmitting a certified copy of the opinion rendered by the U.S. Court of Claims on April 8, 1959, re *Government of Norway and Government of the United States of America* (Congressional No. 6-57); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

843. A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to strengthen the Commissioned Corps of the Public Health Service through revision and extension of some of the provisions relating to retirement, appointment of personnel, and other related personnel matters, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

844. A letter from the Under Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend title 35 of the United States Code relating to patents"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BOLLING: Committee on Rules, House Resolution 236. Resolution for consideration of H.R. 1321, a bill to amend Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1953; without amendment (Rept. No. 266). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. DELANEY: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 237. Resolution for consideration of H.R. 2228, a bill to provide for the acquisition of additional land along the Mount Vernon Memorial Highway in exchange for certain dredging privileges, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 267). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. O'NEILL: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 238. Resolution for consideration of H.R. 4601, a bill to amend the act of September 1, 1954, in order to limit to cases involving the national security the prohibition on payment of annuities and retired pay to officers and employees of the United States, to clarify the application and operation of such act, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 268). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. COLMER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 239. Resolution for consideration of House Joint Resolution 254, joint resolution to authorize participation by the United States in parliamentary conferences with Canada; without amendment (Rept. 269). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MADDEN: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 240. Resolution for consideration of S. 1096, an act to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for salaries and expenses, research and development, construction and equipment, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 270). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANFUSO:

H.R. 6288. A bill to establish a National Order of Science to provide recognition for individuals who make outstanding contributions in science and engineering; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mr. ASHLEY:

H.R. 6289. A bill to require public financial reports from Members of Congress, certain civil and military officers, and select employees of the executive and legislative branches of the Government and related departments and agencies; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. ASPINALL:

H.R. 6290. A bill to consolidate, revise, and reenact the public land townsite laws; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BARING:

H.R. 6291. A bill for clarification and classification of certain tungsten basic materials; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BENNETT of Florida:

H.R. 6292. A bill to authorize the acceptance by the Government of gifts to be used to reduce the public debt; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 6293. A bill to establish an immediate program to aid in reducing the public debt by providing that certain receipts from the sale of capital assets of the Government shall be used for such purpose; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BENNETT of Michigan:

H.R. 6294. A bill to amend section 31 of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 6295. A bill relating to certain inspections and investigations in metallic and nonmetallic mines and quarries (excluding coal and lignite mines) for the purpose of obtaining information relating to health and safety conditions, accidents, and occupational diseases therein, and for other

purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 6296. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to permit social security coverage under State agreement for policemen and firemen in cities and other communities having a population of 25,000 or less; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BOYLE:

H.R. 6297. A bill to authorize the establishment of the Indiana Dunes National Monument; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana:

H.R. 6298. A bill to amend the National Science Foundation Act of 1950 to provide financial assistance to educational institutions for the development of teaching facilities in the field of oceanography, and to provide fellowships for graduate study in such field; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

H.R. 6299. A bill to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for salaries and expenses, research and development, construction and equipment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mr. BROYHILL:

H.R. 6300. A bill to preserve the rates of basic compensation of wage board employees in certain cases involving reductions in rates of basic compensation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 6301. A bill to amend the act of April 10, 1924, to provide a refund to retail dealers for taxes paid the District of Columbia on motor-vehicle fuels lost due to evaporation and shrinkage; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 6302. A bill to amend section 66 of the act entitled "An act to provide for the organization of the militia of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved March 1, 1889 (District of Columbia Code, sec. 39-805), with respect to the compensation of certain civilian employees of the District of Columbia National Guard, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BUCKLEY:

H.R. 6303 A bill to authorize appropriations for the Federal-aid primary system of highways for the purpose of equitably reimbursing the States for certain free and toll roads on the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. CHAMBERLAIN:

H.R. 6304. A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to permit donations of surplus property to volunteer firefighting organizations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. CRAMER:

H.R. 6305. A bill to make the Civil Service Retirement Act Amendments of 1956 applicable to certain persons who retired under the automatic separation provisions of the Civil Service Retirement Act prior to the enactment of such amendments; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 6306. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to reduce from 72 to 70 the age at which beneficiaries are no longer subject to restrictions on outside earnings; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 6307. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to eliminate the reduction in annuity elected for a spouse when such spouse predeceases the person making the election; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 6308. A bill to make permanent certain increases in annuities payable from the civil service retirement and disability fund; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FOLEY:

H.R. 6309. A bill to amend section 46, title 18, United States Code, with respect to transportation of water hyacinths and seeds; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6310. A bill to provide for investment of the civil service retirement and disability fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. LANKFORD:

H.R. 6311. A bill to amend title 13 of the United States Code, relating to census, to grant preference in the employment of additional personnel for the conduct of the respective censuses to those employees separated from Government service in reductions in force; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H.R. 6312. A bill to preserve the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees transferred from the General Schedule of the Classification Act of 1949 to a prevailing rate schedule; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 6313. A bill to preserve the rates of basic compensation of wage board employees in certain cases involving reductions in rates of basic compensation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. LEVERING:

H.R. 6314. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in commemoration of the song "Dixie," composed by Daniel Decatur Emmett; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. LINDSAY:

H.R. 6315. 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. LOSER:

H.R. 6316. 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.

By Mr. McFALL:

H.R. 6317. A bill to amend section 4242 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to exempt from the club dues tax certain charges made by nonprofit clubs for the use of facilities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

H.R. 6318. A bill to provide Federal support for State defense forces, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MITCHELL:

H.R. 6319. A bill to amend chapter 55 of title 38, United States Code, to establish safeguards relative to the accumulation and final disposition of certain benefits in the case of incompetent veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. POAGE:

H.R. 6320. A bill defining the interest of local public agencies in water reservoirs constructed by the Government which have been financed partially by such agencies; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. PRICE:

H.R. 6321. A bill to provide additional dental care for dependents of members of the uniformed services; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. RAY:

H.R. 6322. A bill to amend title 9 of the United States Code to provide for correction of defects and omissions in it relating to the regulations of arbitration, to provide for judicial review of questions of law arising in arbitration proceedings, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 6323. A bill to amend the Federal Reserve Act with respect to the number, term of office, and qualifications of members of the Board, to abolish the Open Market Committee and transfer its functions to the Board, and with respect to the qualifications of directors of Federal Reserve banks; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ROBERTS:

H.R. 6324. A bill to strengthen the Commissioned Corps of the Public Health Service through revision and extension of some of the provisions relating to retirement, appointment of personnel, and other related personnel matters, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 6325. A bill to extend certain traineeship provisions of the Health Amendments Act of 1956; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida:

H.R. 6326. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to provide that equal-time provisions shall not apply to news programs; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 6327. A bill to amend chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 in regard to certain investments by dealers in real estate; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SCHWENGEL:

H.R. 6328. A bill providing for construction of a highway, and appurtenances thereto, traversing the Mississippi Valley; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. UDALL:

H.R. 6329. A bill to set aside permanently certain land in McKinley County, N. Mex., for use of the Navajo Tribe of Indians; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 6330. A bill providing that no memorial shall be placed on Federal property (other than within U.S. Capitol buildings) in the National Capital region until 50 years shall have elapsed from the event or the date of death of the person which the memorial is intended to commemorate; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. WILSON:

H.R. 6331. A bill to authorize the Federal Government to guard strategic defense facilities against individuals believed to be disposed to commit acts of sabotage, espionage, or other subversion; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WOLF:

H.R. 6332. A bill to increase the annual income limitations governing the payment of pension to certain veterans and their dependents; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. CANNON:

H.J. Res. 336. Joint resolution making a supplemental appropriation for the Department of Labor for the fiscal year 1959, and for other purposes.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. DADDARIO: Resolution of the General Assembly of the State of Connecticut, memorializing Congress to amend Public Law 316 of the 85th Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FORAND: Memorial of the Rhode Island General Assembly memorializing Congress and particularly the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in Congress, asking each to work for legislation increasing the minimum wage from $1 to $1.25 an hour; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. IRWIN: Senate joint resolution No. 26 of the General Assembly of the State of Connecticut memorializing Congress to amend Public Law 85-316; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KOWALSKI: Resolution of the General Assembly of the State of Connecticut

proposing an amendment to Public Law 85-316; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the State of Connecticut urging support of an amendment to the Constitution relative to the imposition and collection of taxes on income by the States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Alaska, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States urging that Senate bill 910 of the 86th Congress be passed by both Houses of Congress; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Alaska memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to urging that all necessary action be taken to encourage, pass, and approve Federal legislation to extend the limits of Public Law 85-739 for 4 years beyond March 15, 1960; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to establish and maintain a Pacific area veterans' home; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to provide for the replacement of vehicles supplied to amputee veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CLARK:

H.R. 6333. A bill for the relief of Milka Lackovic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CRAMER:

H.R. 6334. A bill for the relief of Mercedes Castro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAVIS of Georgia:

H.R. 6335. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Lourene O. Estes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DEROUNIAN:

H.R. 6336. A bill for the relief of Hanson-Gorrill-Brian, Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRANT:

H.R. 6337. A bill for the relief of Carl C. Golson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. IRWIN:

H.R. 6338. A bill for the relief of Miss Hedwig Dora; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6339. A bill for the relief of Angelina Rainone; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Maryland:

H.R. 6340. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Marie Jervis Chapin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANKFORD:

H.R. 6341. A bill for the relief of Donald O. Olin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H.R. 6342. A bill for the relief of Joseph E. Murphy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROGERS of Colorado:

H.R. 6343. A bill for the relief of Peter Hrom; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILSON:

H.R. 6344. A bill for the relief of Jose Bernarado Delgadillo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WRIGHT:

H.R. 6345. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Josefina Moreno-Trujillo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Interstate Highway Repayment Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. BUCKLEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 13, 1959

Mr. BUCKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced H.R. 6303, designated as the "Interstate Highway Repayment Act," authorizing appropriations to reimburse States which have built toll and free highways which have been made a part of the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways.

The proposed bill authorizes the appropriation over a 15-year period of the total net reimbursable amount shown on the annexed exhibit A. This amount is based upon the report—House Document No. 301, 85th Congress—of the Secretary of Commerce concerning the depreciated cost of the free or toll roads, or portions thereof, included in the Interstate System.

All funds proposed to be appropriated under this bill are required to be used by the States solely for highway construction on the Federal Aid Primary System. These funds are to be expended under the present Federal aid legislation with certain exceptions. No matching by the States is required. The bill provides for the apportionment of the funds on the basis of the relative contribution made by each State so that the result is that at the end of the 15-year period each State shall have received the matching ratio of its depreciated cost, less any Federal aid payments already made.

This statement supports the proposed bill for the following reasons, each of which is discussed below:

First. There is an obligation to the contributing States.

Second. This obligation should be met at once.

Third. It is feasible to meet it now as done in the proposed bill.

Fourth. Toll roads are entitled to the same credit as free roads.

Fifth. The national interest is well served because the proposed bill provides for the construction of roads where the need is great.

I. THERE IS AN OBLIGATION TO THE CONTRIBUTING STATES

The construction of the Interstate System is a project national in scope. This is recognized by the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1956 when it states in section 108(a):

> It is hereby declared to be essential to the national interest to provide for the early completion of the National System of Interstate Highways.

That section further states that:

> It is the intent of the Congress * * * that the entire system in all the States be brought to simultaneous completion. Because of its primary importance to the national defense the name of such system is hereby change to the "National System of Interstate and Defense Highways."

This declaration by Congress made only a few years ago would seem to make it clear beyond any doubt that we are dealing with a national project.

Other factors also indicate that this conclusion is inescapable. The Federal share payable for this construction varies between 90 and 95 percent of the cost. The standards are uniform throughout the country and are so developed that the highways and bridges will carry military equipment, which was not the case formerly, since in some States the bridges were not designed to support heavy loads and the grades were too steep or the roads were too narrow. It was planned and designed as a National System of Interstate Highways as indicated by the requirements of section 7 of the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1944.

Since in law and in fact it is a national project, it is distinguishable from the usual Federal aid concept. Federal aid is given to the States for a multitude of purposes including the construction of roads. In the usual Federal aid case, funds are required to be matched by the States on a 50 percent basis. Generally Federal aid highway projects are dispersed into a number of different places within a particular State so that all of its counties within a few years may receive the benefit of some new Federal aid road construction. The aid is given to assist and foster highway construction within that particular State. This is a vastly different concept than the concept of the Interstate System which is a National System of connected roads, which is to be brought to simultaneous completion, and constructed because of a national interest in its construction.

The difference is emphasized by the difference in mode of payment. The amount of Federal aid authorized to be appropriated in any given year has been based in a general way on the realization that the States needed assistance in road building and the amount has been gradually increased over the years. But there has been no criterion other than the general need. In the case of the Interstate System the amount of the authorization was based upon the original estimated cost. For ordinary Federal aid, the amount authorized has been apportioned to the individual States on old and established formulas of area, population, and road mileage. The apportionment in the case of the Interstate System is based upon the cost of construction to the individual State of its specified mileage in that State, and when such construction has been completed the apportionment ceases.

Once the difference between usual Federal aid and the construction of the Interstate System is clearly understood, few will dispute that a State which contributes highways or a portion thereof to the Interstate System is entitled to a credit for that construction. The point can be illustrated in numerous ways. For example, if the Federal Government in connection with its establishment of post offices should find certain public buildings in some States adequate and adaptable for use as post offices, certainly no one could contend that because these had already been constructed and were ready for use, the Federal Government would not be required to pay for them; but that it would be required to pay some other State to construct a post office which was not at the time in existence. The position that payment should not be made in either case is clearly untenable. The reason that it seems so clear in the post office case is that the establishment and operation of post offices is a Federal function carried out entirely by the Federal Government.

There is no distinction between the post office case and the highway case, once it is conceded that the construction of the Interstate System is a national project, 90 to 95 percent of the cost of which is paid for by the Federal Government. If a State has supplied a road, or a portion thereof, already constructed, it is just as entitled to a credit for this as it would be if it had contributed an established public building that could be used as a post office.

This point of view has important backing. The Clay Committee report which was submitted to the President in January 1955 after stating that some States had already constructed sections of the Interstate System made this comment at page 21:

> Such construction should not be discouraged by this report since our goal is maximum highway improvement.

It continued at page 22 with the definite recommendation that:

> Those States in which sections of the Interstate System have been provided to meet the presently established standards for the completed system should receive appropriate credit.

The suggestions in this report were incorporated in H.R. 4260 and similar bills introduced in 1955. These bills were generally believed to be the administration bills, so that as late as 1955 it may be said that the administration was in favor of giving States a credit for their road construction to the Interstate System.

While it is a fact that in the following year the Secretary of Commerce reversed this position and opposed the inclusion of a provision authorizing a credit in H.R. 8836, it was opposed, not so much on the ground that the States were not entitled to a credit, as on the ground of expediency. In his statement to the committee the Secretary said that he did not favor a credit at the present time—see hearings before Subcommittee on Roads, 1956, page 11. He also stated:

> Obviously more roads can be completed, if those already built are not bought. Furthermore, the States would not appear to be hurt by failure to extend credit for such roads. In general, toll roads have been set up on a sound fiscal basis, and have not cost the States a penny. No amount has been included in the authorizations for the Interstate System for toll and free road credits, and it would, therefore, be necessary to increase the authorizations or cancel a part of the needed program if such credits are to be extended.

The last sentence probably expresses the fundamental reason for the change in position of the Secretary of Commerce. It is usually the principal reason relied on by other persons who oppose recognizing this obligation. The argument is that there is not enough money; that it is not feasible. These persons do not take the position that it is unfair to give the States credit, but rather that it is not feasible so to do. Few persons say that it would be unfair. It is difficult to see how they could.

In conclusion, fair play and equity demand that this obligation be recognized and that a credit be allowed those States which have constructed highways or portions thereof on the Insterstate System, and thus relieve the Federal Government of a tremendous expenditure for a project of national scope which was planned in the national interest.

II. THIS OBLIGATION SHOULD BE MET AT ONCE

Four years have elapsed since the Clay report and the introduction of the first bills with respect to authorizing funds for the Interstate System. Three years have elapsed since the passage of the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1956 which did authorize the necessary funds. Section 114 of the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1956 represented a temporary solution of the controversy between those persons favoring a credit for free and toll roads and those opposed. It was a solution that seemed sound at the time. No one could state with any accuracy at that time which roads would be incorporated into the Interstate System and what they cost. A definite basis for action prior to a final decision by Congress seemed advisable. This was accomplished by section 114.

The report called for by section 114 was transmitted to the House on January 7, 1958, and has been designated as House Document No. 301. A hearing was held on this report before the Committee on Public Works on March 25–26, 1958. No action was taken following that hearing.

The necessary facts are set forth in that report and there is no reason for further delay. Fair play requires the immediate recognition of this obligation to the contributing States. It is no answer to say that the Federal Government cannot afford at this time to meet this obligation. These are the most prosperous times according to all business statistics that this Nation has yet encountered. If this obligation cannot be met today, it never can be met. Postponement is not an answer.

Most persons who urge postponement, and yet do not argue that it would be inequitable or unfair to allow this credit, are in effect stating that the Federal Government is not in a position to meet its just obligations. It is, indeed, a sad commentary on our moral conscientiousness that expediency should rule, rather than equity. There is an obligation or there isn't an obligation. If there is one, it should be repaid at once. Part I of this statement clearly demonstrates that there is such an obligation.

III. IT IS FEASIBLE TO MEET THIS OBLIGATION TODAY

The proposed bill authorizes appropriations over a 15-year period commencing with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962. While these authorizations total the net reimbursable amount shown by exhibit A of $4,295,600,000, the amounts involved for any one fiscal year range between $225,000,000 and $360,000,000. These annual authorizations are clearly within a feasible area.

Apportionments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, must be made prior to January 1, 1961, and therefore will be made probably in the fall of 1960. Thus, the States will be entitled to contract for the work on the basis of the apportionments next year. They will also have the knowledge of the definite amounts that will be apportioned to them over the ensuing 15 years.

The proposed authorization for a 15-year period departs from the usual authorization of Federal aid for roads in that the regular Federal aid authorizations are generally for a 2-year period. However, this would not be the first departure from the usual practice, since the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1956 authorized the entire original estimated cost of the Interstate System to be spread over a 13-year period. The reason in that case was the need for constructing the Interstate System as an entirety, and for the States to have knowledge of their apportionments so that they could engage in long-range planning. The reason was adequate, and Congress approved the long-term authorizations spreading over 13 years. There is also an adequate reason for a similar long-term authorization in the proposed bill. There is an obligation to be repaid, and the only way to repay it is to authorize payment of the entire obligation. Spreading it over a 15-year period does this in a feasible way.

It is provided in the bill that appropriations can be made from general treasury funds, not otherwise appropriated, rather than from the highway trust fund created by section 209 of the Highway Revenue Act of 1956. The reason for this is clear. The Federal Government is repaying an obligation. The repayment of an obligation should not be contingent. It should be certain and fixed. The highway trust fund is contingent, depending upon the amount of revenues collected. The proposed bill is a clear authorization for appropriations and apportionments which will permit contracts to be entered into by the States after the apportionments have been made. The only way the Federal Government can repay its obligation is to make it fixed and certain.

Certainly it is clearly feasible in this day of $70 billion budgets to authorize the appropriation of from $225 million to $360 million per annum over a 15-year period. The contention that the Federal Government cannot afford to meet its

just obligation to the contributing States has no basis whatsoever under the proposed bill.

IV. TOLL ROADS ARE ENTITLED TO BE PLACED IN THE SAME CATEGORY AS FREE ROADS

At the outset, it is important to understand the distinction between Federal aid for the construction of a toll road and the inclusion of a toll road on a Federal aid system. In 1921 Congress enacted a provision—section 9—in the Highway Act of that year to the effect "that all highways constructed or reconstructed under the provisions of this act shall be free from tolls of all kinds." At the time of the enactment of this provision there were many toll bridges throughout the country, toll ferries, and also some toll roads. Many of these facilities were entirely private; that is, had been constructed by privately owned corporations for profit. Congress undoubtedly felt that it was undesirable to have Federal money go into private enterprise. It is important to bear in mind that there was no opposition to toll facilities as such, but rather to the use of Federal funds in their construction. The proposed bill contemplates the construction of free roads, like any other Federal aid funds.

That the Federal Government was not opposed to toll roads as such is indicated by the fact that in many instances toll bridges and toll ferries were included in the Federal aid primary system. There has not been any opposition to this inclusion down to the present time. In fact, in the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1956 Congress included section 113 which specifically provides for the inclusion of toll roads, bridges, and tunnels within the Interstate System. The entire history of Federal road legislation therefore indicates clearly that the Federal Government has never opposed toll facilities. It not only has made use of them to complete its earlier Federal aid systems, but now is making use of them on the Interstate System.

Not only is the foregoing true, but since 1927 the Federal Government has participated in the cost of toll bridges and tunnels. The 1927 act and subsequent acts have been incorporated into section 129 of title 23, United States Code. While Federal participation is subject to certain restrictions principally directed towards making the facility free as quickly as possible, it is clearly another indication of the fact that the Federal Government, far from opposing toll roads, even goes to the extent of participating in the cost of the construction of toll roads and bridges.

In view of the foregoing, it is difficult to understand the objection to giving a credit for toll roads. One of the most frequent arguments used is the statement that the traveler has to pay a toll, as well as a tax on gasoline, motor fuel, and any other so-called highway user taxes, the proceeds of which are used for highway construction. An analysis of this argument indicates that it is based upon a false premise. The false premise is that the highway user taxes in all States are the same. In fact they are not. The rates of these taxes vary from State to State.

If these taxes were uniform in all of the States it might be claimed that the toll road user was being subjected to an extra burden for the use of the highway. Whether such an extra burden should, by itself, warrant a refusal to allow a credit for a toll road is highly questionable. The road is there and available for use. Its use must be economical or travelers would not pay the tolls. The construction of a free parallel road would be an economic waste. All of these considerations indicate that the contention is invalid even if the premise were sound.

However, these taxes are not uniform. A person traveling across the country pays one tax in one State and another in another. When a traveler goes from State A where he has paid a 4-cent tax into State B where he has paid a 7-cent tax he is paying more for the use of the highway just as he is when he uses a toll road and pays the toll. Can it be claimed that State B, because it charges a higher tax, should not receive credit for its free roads since it places an extra burden on the traveler from State A? To put the question is to answer it. Obviously our whole form of government contemplates that the different States may have different laws and different taxes. When the user of a toll road pays a toll, he does no more than pay a higher tax, just as he does in a State which charges him a higher tax for his gasoline. Certainly the payment of the toll cannot be a fair ground for differentiation between giving a State a credit or not giving a State a credit.

This is clearly true when it is borne in mind that roads usually are paid for by the people who use them. It is indeed difficult to understand why the form of the tax should require a distinction. In some States roads are paid for out of the general treasury and it is not possible to trace just which taxes were used, although the so-called highway user taxes contribute to the general funds. In other States containing constitutional provisions against diversion of certain highway user taxes it is easy to point to the particular tax which pays for the roads. In the case of toll roads the construction is paid for by the person who actually uses that particular road. Whether the taxes are paid from the general funds, from specific so-called highway user taxes, or by the person using the road is immaterial insofar as the ultimate fact is concerned that the road is there, that it is being used, and that it is part of the Interstate System.

Another argument advanced against the recognition of toll roads is that those States contributing toll roads would not be hurt, because the toll roads do not cost the States a penny. In the first place, the question is not whether the States would be hurt or would not be hurt, but whether they are entitled to a credit. It has been pointed out above that, since these States have supplied the roads and the toll is merely another form of tax, they clearly are entitled to a credit. Accordingly, this negative approach or argument loses its force at the outset.

However, it can be said with equal force that the free roads have not cost the States a penny where there is a constitutional provision against diversion of highway user taxes, or where there has been no increase in such taxes since the passage of the Hayden Cartright Act by Congress. In these States the highway user taxes are paid, but they are not received by the State as general funds. They are required to be used only for road construction purposes, and for no other purpose. What is the difference between one of these States and a State that has created an authority for the construction of a toll road which is being paid for by those persons actually using the toll road. In neither case has the State paid a penny out of its general funds. In both cases the tax or the toll has gone directly into the roads. Whether it cost the State a penny is immaterial to this discussion. The effect on the State treasury is the same in both cases. When these considerations are taken into account it is indeed difficult from this point of view to distinguish between free and toll roads in many of the States of this country.

Before closing on this point the actual economic benefit of the toll road should not be forgotten. The toll road would not have been constructed at the outset unless it was believed that the need was there. In most cases the estimates were accurate enough so that the toll roads have succeeded. They must be considered beneficial by the traveling public or persons using them would not continue to do so. It is also true that no one is compelled to use toll roads and that there is always a road paralleling the toll road which may be used by a person not desiring to pay the toll. Toll roads are not monopolies, but the traveler always has his choice and can take either a toll road or a free road.

Toll roads are entitled to consideration and should be placed in the same category as free roads. The Federal Government has not been opposed to toll roads and in fact has included them in the Interstate System. It is therefore getting the use out of them. The toll in fact is analogous to a user tax. Taxes vary in the different States so there is no uniform base upon which a person from one State can claim to be penalized by traveling through another. There is variety in every State. It is a question of degree rather than kind. The contention that a toll road does not cost a State a penny is a negative argument rather than a positive argument, and is equally applicable to many States with antidiversion provisions. Finally, the proposed bill does not contemplate the use of Federal funds in the construction of toll roads. It will not be contrary to the longstanding provision of the 1921 act that highways constructed with Federal funds shall be free from tolls.

V. THE NATIONAL INTEREST IS WELL SERVED BECAUSE THE PROPOSED BILL PROVIDES FOR THE CONSTRUCTION OF ROADS WHERE THE NEED IS GREAT

The proposed bill requires the States to use the funds authorized for construction of highways under the Federal aid primary system. It limits the use of these funds to this system because it is felt that the primary system is the most important system and construction of roads on it will contribute most to the present highway needs. It does not pro-

vide for use of these funds on the Interstate System because it is felt that the mileage of the Interstate System should be limited to the 41,000 miles now authorized, at least until those 41,000 miles have been entirely completed.

Use of the funds for more roads on the primary system will be helpful in contributing to the highway needs of this country where the need is clearly apparent. The States which built the free roads and toll roads in the decade following the war did so to meet the pressing needs of that decade. No toll road could succeed unless the demand of the traffic was sufficient to insure its use. No freeway would be necessary except for heavy traffic. It must be borne in mind that all these roads eligible for the Interstate System were built to standards which accommodate a heavy traffic load. Those States which were the largest contributors to the Interstate System had the heaviest traffic demands. It seems likely that this demand will continue just as heavy in the ensuing decade. The proposed bill will contribute to this need and will place the funds in those States where the need is clearly urgent.

VI. CONCLUSION

The proposed bill will accomplish two important objectives.

In the first place, it repays a valid obligation of the Federal Government to the States. The Federal Government has used facilities of the States to support a project clearly national in its scope and purpose, and their contribution to this national project is an obligation which in all fairness and equity should be repaid.

In the second place, it requires the funds to be used exclusively for highway construction, and they will be so used to the greatest extent in those States where the need is clearly urgent. Both objectives make serious consideration of the proposed bill imperative.

EXHIBIT A.—INTERSTATE HIGHWAY REPAYMENT ACT

Net reimbursement amounts based on 90 percent of depreciated original cost less Federal aid already paid toll and free roads

[Dollar amounts in millions]

State	Miles	Total cost less depreciation	Less State's share of cost	Less Federal-aid payments already made	Net reimbursable amount	Percent of national total
Alabama	93.3	$18.2	$16.4	$9.7	$6.7	0.16
Alaska						
Arizona	457.9	41.9	39.5	25.0	14.5	.34
Arkansas	52.6	14.0	12.6	8.9	3.7	.09
California	850.2	379.9	348.1	87.5	260.6	6.07
Colorado	272.7	45.8	41.8	24.8	17.0	.40
Connecticut	143.6	326.6	293.9	15.5	278.4	6.48
Delaware	4.1	34.9	31.4		31.4	.73
Florida	97.4	35.5	32.0	5.4	26.6	.62
Georgia	137.6	68.7	61.8	24.2	37.6	.88
Idaho	117.7	11.8	10.9	7.5	3.4	.08
Illinois	549.7	550.1	495.1	84.4	410.7	9.56
Indiana	306.9	180.6	162.5	16.2	146.3	3.40
Iowa	52.1	12.1	10.9	7.0	3.9	.09
Kansas	307.9	109.3	98.4	10.3	88.1	2.05
Kentucky	56.4	37.6	33.8	10.2	23.6	.55
Louisiana	37.8	33.3	30.0	12.6	17.4	.41
Maine	72.9	38.7	34.8	3.7	31.1	.72
Maryland	178.1	165.3	148.8	13.4	135.4	3.15
Massachusetts	152.7	292.0	262.8	13.2	249.6	5.81
Michigan	291.3	283.1	254.8	59.8	195.0	4.53
Minnesota	159.4	25.9	23.3	10.8	12.5	.29
Mississippi	92.5	12.5	11.3	6.6	4.7	.11
Missouri	373.1	113.8	102.4	50.8	51.6	1.20
Montana	206.9	15.0	13.7	11.1	2.6	.06
Nebraska	13.2	1.4	1.2	.5	.7	.02
Nevada	226.9	10.9	10.4	9.7	.7	.02
New Hampshire	$24.0	$10.1	$9.1	$2.3	$6.8	.16
New Jersey	84.2	356.4	320.8	22.0	298.8	6.96
New Mexico	321.5	20.0	18.5	13.7	4.8	.11
New York	568.6	1,036.2	932.6	133.5	799.1	18.60
North Carolina	270.4	58.5	52.7	24.2	28.5	.66
North Dakota	145.4	6.9	6.2	4.5	1.7	.04
Ohio	328.4	300.1	270.1	50.7	219.4	5.11
Oklahoma	251.5	101.8	91.6	13.7	77.9	1.81
Oregon	378.9	106.0	97.9	31.9	66.0	1.54
Pennsylvania	388.2	432.6	389.4	102.4	287.0	6.68
Rhode Island	10.4	19.2	17.3	6.9	10.4	.24
South Carolina	63.1	9.5	8.6	5.4	3.2	.07
South Dakota	137.3	9.8	8.9	5.2	3.7	.09
Tennessee	16.7	14.8	13.3	9.2	4.1	.10
Texas	1,440.6	285.1	256.6	97.7	159.5	3.71
Utah	208.3	18.3	17.4	13.5	3.9	.09
Vermont	7.8	3.2	2.9	1.9	1.0	.02
Virginia	161.8	123.0	110.7	14.5	96.2	2.24
Washington	378.6	90.3	81.9	20.8	61.1	1.42
West Virginia	92.2	105.9	96.1	4.5	91.6	2.13
Wisconsin	62.3	12.7	11.4	5.5	5.9	.14
Wyoming	304.0	23.1	21.5	15.6	5.9	.14
Hawaii						
District of Columbia	4.8	16.2	14.6	9.2	5.4	.12
Puerto Rico						
Total	10,953.9	6,018.6	5,432.7	1,137.1	4,295.6	100.00

Where Federal Aid to Schools Would Have No Strings

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 13, 1959

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I am joining certain other Members of the House of Representatives and have introduced legislation to provide that expenditures in connection with the submission to an electorate of issues affecting the business of a taxpayer shall be allowed as a deduction under the Internal Revenue Code of 1954.

This bill would read in part as follows:

> No expenditure which otherwise qualifies as an ordinary and necessary business expense * * * shall be disallowed as a deduction because incurred in opposing or advocating measures duly submitted to an electorate upon any issue affecting the business of the taxpayer.

My thought is, Mr. Speaker, that in many local matters, such as school bond issues, the cost of informing the public is a business and civic, not a political, expense and has an important effect on the taxpayer and his business.

I have in mind that other desirable or necessary elections for local improvements not alone for schools but for municipal and State facilities of all kinds would be affected. Public support could be enlisted, with the incentive in my bill, for parks, playgrounds, civic centers, urban renewal projects, and all manner of worthy and meritorious issues requiring a vote of the people. However, I am thinking in particular of educational bond authorizations or school levies where under election laws many times the referendum fails for want of information or adequate public interest. The outcome of these elections is certainly one of community welfare and affects the customers and employees of business firms themselves in the area. In my congressional district often bond issues voted on to provide funds received majority approval, but the measures fail due to an insufficient number of voters going to the polls and a required legal percentage of total votes not being cast. Defeat is due to lack of publicity and promotion.

I would hope, Mr. Speaker, that with passage of this legislation contributions to groups such as parent-teacher organizations and chambers of commerce, by public spirited citizens or organizations would become tax deductible as a normal and proper business expense. I want to make it clear my purpose is not to allow deductions of gifts to personal political campaigns, although frankly I would not be against limited deductions of that nature, but this legislation would cover public issues only and not personalities or people.

Also, let me explain, as one who fears Federal controls, that the purpose of my bill is to make it easier for local communities to do things for themselves rather than to be forced to come to the Federal Government for help.

Take education as the case in point. If State and local financing is insufficient, the pressure increases on the national level. The only answer, I can see, is to assist communities and encourage them to accept their responsibility. In the case of schools, classroom shortages must be filled and teachers must be paid decent salaries. To turn to the Federal Treasury in order to provide these needs may be the easier way but it is the wrong way in my opinion.

For example, the National Defense Act was passed last year. I voted against it because I just could not, in all conscience, support a program putting the Federal Government further in the education business. Most educators in my district did not seem to worry on this score, but I am sure they have recognized that my opposition to Federal aid is genuine and they respected my objections. Educators do not favor Federal controls, but they favor adequate funds, and I do too. So we agree to a great extent. Our State Superintendent of Public Instruction, Lloyd J. Andrews, has agreed with me about the danger of Federal school aid and on the basis of actual experience he has found that Federal programs always include Federal requirements and standards, which a State must accept or else it forfeits the funds. I support his stand as to the threat of Federal aid.

However, I agree if local communities shirk their responsibilities then there is no alternative—the school boards must look to other sources of income.

Out in my State recently in order to increase voter activity and obtain needed percentage of votes in a school election, voter registration campaigns have been conducted. Teams of members of eight parent-teacher association units covered shopping districts of Bothel, Woodinville and Kenmore, which is mostly in my congressional district. With registration books scheduled to close shortly, prospective voters in Northshore School District 417 were canvassed. Through the courtesy of the Aero Mechanics Union a mobile registration bus was stationed in the population centers, and PTA workers in various stores enlisted new registration. A special deputy registrar was appointed so it was not necessary for eligible voters who were not registered to go to the county official's office.

If business contributions toward advertising this drive had been deductible, the drive could have been much more effective, and of course this is only one example of where donations in behalf of community or State campaigns submitted to the electorate could increase voter response and make democracy more effective.

Here is a means of assisting local groups to inform the voters on issues. It deserves consideration.

Bataan Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 13, 1959

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, the evil days of World War II bequeathed us many unhappy memories and untold miseries. For more than 3 years our fate and future seemed to be in jeopardy, and at times the whole issue was kept in precarious suspense. The day of infamy, which began with Pearl Harbor, cast a pall over the Nation that grew darker with the fall of Bataan 4 months later. During those months and long thereafter the whole free world, and we in the United States as its leader, were on trial—physically, spiritually, ideally, and morally. And in that supreme trial, that life-consuming and soul-scorching trial, many had their finest hour. We survived; we overcame the enemy; and finally were victorious through the sterling qualities of our fighting forces on all fronts. And those qualities: resourcefulness and resiliency, tenacity and ingenuity, proved their worth better at Bataan than anywhere else during the early phase of the war.

OUR FORCES OUTNUMBERED AND EXHAUSTED

Our forces, numbering about 20,000, plus about 100,000 Philippine citizen army, were no match for Japan's more than 200,000 seasoned troops. The enemy had succeeded in eliminating our Air Force there; the island was cut off from the outside world; and the best of the combined American-Filipino forces were cornered at the strategic Bataan Peninsula. At Bataan our isolated and far outnumbered forces withstood the unrelenting and intensive enemy attack for more than 3 months. Finally, when sheer physical exhaustion doomed our forces, they surrendered to the enemy on April 9, 1942, 17 years ago. In that great battle, waged far from our shores, our men proved their bravery and courage, and they willingly sacrificed their lives for the good and glory of their beloved country. On this anniversary we bow our heads and pray for their blessed memory.

CURRENT AMERICAN-PHILIPPINES RELATIONS

Mr. Speaker, the New York Times of last Thursday printed a timely editorial on the Bataan Day anniversary and it pointed up recent events in American-Philippines relations which should be of concern to every Member of this House.

I had originally asked permission last Friday to include this editorial with my remarks above, but later I learned that the New York Times editorial had been inserted in the RECORD by Senator KEATING of New York. I want to take this opportunity to express my complete agreement with the editorial relative to Filipino loyalty and the matter of outstanding Philippine claims.

Letters to the Editor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. S. HERLONG, JR.

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 13, 1959

Mr. HERLONG. Mr. Speaker, you will remember that some time ago Elmo Roper made a study of the earmarks of the active citizen. One of these behavior patterns was the habit of writing letters to the editor. It is for that reason that I call your attention to two major articles in the Editor and Publisher, the fourth estate's trade journal, dated January 31 and February 14. These articles were based on two reports issued by the Center for Practical Politics located at Rollins College in my Fifth Florida District. These reports, in which there has been national interest, are entitled "Policy of Florida Newspapers on Letters to the Editor" and "Letters to the Editor," a content analysis case history of letters written by a citizen with a socialist background to a conservative southern newspaper.

Now, Mr. Speaker, my reason for mentioning these studies is that the Orlando Sentinel, one of the great newspapers of America, is located in my district, and prints more letters to the editor than any other newspaper in Florida. The study makes that fact clear. Martin Andersen, the Sentinel's publisher, says he thinks he publishes more letters than any other newspaper in the world. Anyway, I want to emphasize the importance of these letters in our great democracy. The Sentinel says it has found it good business, that it gets more reaction per printed word from its 100,000 circulation than most newspapers twice the size. It provides readers with a voice of their own. The Sentinel uses that voice to back up its editorial policy or to make the editor back down. In either case, it circulates ideas for the improvement of the Sentinel's service to the community.

Mr. Andersen says he gets letters written in stubby pencil on penny tablets and old wrapping paper; on rag paper with electric typewriters; on special stationery from elderly people; on childish sheets from youngsters just beginning to form words. About half the daily volume of letters are handwritten.

I wish to say "on the record," Mr. Speaker, that the Orlando Sentinel is operating as an engine of democracy in providing this important channel for the interaction of opinions. I congratulate Martin Andersen and the Center for Practical Politics on their teamwork in encouraging active citizenship.

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 13, 1959

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newsletter of April 11, 1959, to constituents:

WASHINGTON REPORT

(By Congressman BRUCE ALGER)

APRIL 11, 1959.

The clash of traditional constitutional government of Federal-State prerogatives against ever-increasing Federal centralization was never better demonstrated than in the Unemployment Compensation Act of 1959, during public hearings which are now before the Ways and Means Committee. The proponents of the bill are attempting to prove the bill's stated findings that: (1)

States are failing to carry out the purposes and objectives of employment stabilization and security against unemployment; (2) the benefit amounts paid aren't enough; (3) State programs vary, are not uniform in eligibility, amount, and duration of benefits. Therefore, to strengthen the economy and provide for the general welfare of the Nation, it is necessary to impose Federal standards on the States. Witnesses testifying included economists, employment experts, business representatives (mostly opposed), and AFL-CIO spokesmen, culminating this week with Mr. George Meany, AFL-CIO president.

Present law continues the original intent of leaving jurisdiction in the States. State legislatures, therefore, have each developed their programs to solve their own unemployment. Employers of four or more pay a tax generally of 3 percent on each employee's first $3,000 of income. Federal Government requires States to pay in three-tenths of 1 percent of this for Federal administrative costs. States are permitted to charge whatever tax they choose to meet their needs, although all States must extend each employer a reduced tax rate commensurate with the stability of employment in his company. This is called experience rating. In 1958, the estimated average State tax was 1.4 percent; 5 States were paying 2.7 percent, while 12 States were paying less than 1 percent. Each State maintains its own reserve fund and can borrow without interest from the Federal Government. The States have $7 billion on hand for unemployment contingencies. The legislatures are representative of the people's wishes and the present law is the result of agreement of labor and management at the State level. The very flexibility of State law matches the varying economic patterns and needs of the Nation.

So it is a matter of grave concern to me that labor leaders now attempt to brand the States as failures in this field. Should they succeed in changing the law without proving their allegations with facts, this Nation will have sustained another body blow threatening the very freedom and solvency of every citizen. Consider these facts, in relation to imposing Federal standards: (1) The employer pays all the tax, the employee nothing; (2) we are told we must force the States to broaden eligibility, to increase benefits and duration, regardless of State experience; (3) increased taxes to business means higher costs, thus higher prices to consumers. Labor leaders, therefore, would be cutting everyone's buying power in imposing arbitrary increases; (4) increased taxes and costs to business could force more labor layoff and so more unemployment; (5) the unemployed drawing benefits are over 50 percent without dependents, including seasonal workers, and family members where others in the family work, too—so it isn't the family head primarily being helped; (6) actually, we have gone beyond the area of temporary unemployment compensation and are treating welfare and relief on the one hand or the need for more jobs on the other; (7) the increased benefit wages are getting close to the worker's take-home pay; we are placing a premium on idleness and evasion of working, drawing benefits instead; (8) we are asked to forget the judgment of 7,613 State legislators; (9) the most heavily unionized areas, represented by the Detroit mayor and AFL-CIO leaders, are the ones most desiring Federal control. Having the greatest failure in providing jobs, these men plead most for unemployment compensation.

It seems it's time we tried to create new job opportunities locally—not beg for Federal control and aid. Whether new jobs or relief are needed, it's certainly not a "guaranteed annual wage" for not working. Oddly enough, that seems to be the aim, intended or not. Labor leaders want Federal control—why? So they can straitjacket the Nation? To do what they've done to Michigan—a bankruptcy of economy and ideas? No matter how sincere their intentions, leaders of the 13.5 million AFL-CIO workers cannot be allowed to run roughshod over the 67 million labor force—nor should labor leaders get by unquestioned as representatives of 13.5 million workers.

I suggested to Mr. Meany that the U.C. Federal standards would defeat his stated purposes to relieve unemployment and increase purchasing power; rather it would do the opposite. The real trouble (beyond the political power of labor leaders over Congressmen) is the Full Employment Act of 1946 which Mr. Meany admittedly likes. This act, through broad language, makes the Federal Government responsible for everyone working—this exceeds the constitutional prerogatives of Federal Government. It should be repealed.

The U.C. debate proves again the failure of some to understand, even recognize, the blessings of the constitutional balance of power between State and Federal Government, and the dangers in destroying this balance.

Address by the Honorable Fred A. Seaton, Secretary of the Interior, at Gettysburg College Convocation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. AVERY

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 13, 1959

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, the following is a very outstanding address given by the Honorable Fred A. Seaton, Secretary of the Interior, Gettysburg College convocation, Gettysburg, Pa., Friday, April 3, 1959.

I highly recommend that each Member of Congress read Mr. Seaton's remarks:

ADDRESS BY THE HONORABLE FRED A. SEATON, SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR, GETTYSBURG COLLEGE CONVOCATION, GETTYSBURG, PA., APRIL 3, 1959

It is a rare honor for me to speak tonight of the liberal arts, of education, and of history here at Gettysburg—the scene of a historic battle between the North and the South, the site of an immortal address, and the home of a great President of the United States.

What more fitting place can there be to do this, than here in the chapel of a college, founded 127 years ago—Gettysburg College—whose very name encompasses that battle, the presidential speech of dedication and the home address of President Eisenhower?

More than a century ago Daniel Webster said of his beloved Dartmouth College, up in the New Hampshire wilderness, "It is little, yet there are those who love it."

How fortunate we are that, by and large, liberal arts colleges all over the United States still enjoy such loyalty from their trustees, alumni, other supporters, and from their undergraduates.

That is not to say the future of independent colleges and universities is assured. There are many people, and they include some prominent names in education, who fear that the days of many small, independent colleges are numbered.

They see ahead an ascending curve of costs and of enrollments which give them doubt that tuition fees and private gifts can be increased enough to insure financial solvency. In short, they believe altogether too many of the Nation's independent educational institutions either will be eventually forced to close their doors, thus losing their very existence, or necessarily turn to State or Federal Governments for money, thus losing their independence.

I do not concur in such a prophecy. On the contrary, I believe there are valid reasons why these sincere and well-meant doubters will prove to be wrong.

For an example, in February the Council for Financial Aid to Education reported that nongovernmental contributions to educational and general income of American colleges and universities had risen from a World War II level of 41 percent to a current level of 51 percent of the total. In other words, despite massive increases in Federal grants for research, nongovernmental sources of financial aid had produced so much more as to take the lead.

It is important to note there is no apparent reason to question in the foreseeable future a continuance of this rising curve of support.

This is welcome encouragement to all believers, as I am emphatically am, in the national necessity of keeping one sector of American higher education, and a large and most influential sector, vigorously independent of any form of governmental direction.

Admittedly, an encouragement in itself is not an automatic guarantee, and we must confess much remains to be done to make it so.

For one thing, the council estimates that in just a decade, American colleges of whatever description will need for all purposes, for current operations, plant, and equipment, and endowment, about $9 billion a year, or twice the amount they now have.

Right there, some will say: "How can you expect gifts, tuition, and fees to go up enough to do the job while governmental support of all kinds goes up as well?"

That is a good question, but in answer, I think you can properly remind them that, in the past decade, tuition and fees have already gone up almost 130 percent and private gifts and grants 247 percent, while Government help has increased by 63 percent.

On the evidence, I believe this: We can accomplish the task before us if we do three things—positively inform the American people of the importance of the educational job to be done, plainly tell them the cost of that job, and emphasize the necessity of refusing to permit any source, including the Federal Government, to acquire a monopoly over American education.

I sincerely believe one of the greatest services each of us can render to our colleges, our country, and our fellow citizens is to rouse up more active support for privately financed education.

There's a second job which is inextricably entwined with this first one, and that is to help make certain that the American dollar retains its power to buy.

All our educational institutions, of whatever description, have a life and death interest in that.

To illustrate, here are some sad but true fiscal facts.

In 1929-30, the total current income of American colleges and universities was $555 million; by 1953-54 it was nearly $3 billion, almost 5½ times as much. Now, on the face of it, that seems wonderful, but a particularly vicious and stealthy thief, inflation, was at work. That thief stole away so much of the value of the dollar that by 1954 it was worth only 62 cents. Simply put, that meant for every dollar the universities and colleges gained in income, they lost 38 cents to price increases.

You cannot get away from the fact that inflation hurt these institutions. And specifically it hurt their faculty members.

While it is true that in the past 20 years the dollar tag on teachers' salaries has indeed been going up, it is just as true that all the while the purchasing power of those salaries has been going down.

Universities and colleges can hardly be expected to put escalator clauses into their administrative and teaching contracts. That's because nobody can guarantee them escalator clauses in their incomes. Professors can't dodge inflation simply because universities and colleges can't either.

What they can do, and I hope they will, is to join with those of us who are working with all our might for fiscal integrity in government, whether it is local, State or Federal.

In that connection, we have only to recall to mind one widely publicized situation as proof that such an endeavor should be our common cause.

In Michigan, a political force under a professedly liberal banner has for a decade avoided the hard realities of the management of the State's finances and relied heavily on deficit financing. As a result, the Governor of Michigan is presently known far and wide as a dealer in deficits.

Today, after 10 years, the people of Michigan have finally found out that there is no such thing as a free lunch: Sooner or later somebody has to pick up the check, with interest charges added.

As of today, Michigan has a $7 million lag in old age and children's aid funds. It is $27 million short on payments to its public schools. It is $15 million behind in payments to its three leading State universities.

As a result, Michigan State University and the University of Michigan have had to go to banks to get money to meet their payrolls.

No wonder some of the best faculty members are looking elsewhere for jobs.

What has really happened in Michigan is that for too long the present was allowed to cannibalize the future.

Now, I ask you, is a governmental policy which leads to such a deplorable state of affairs a truly liberal one? Or is it only openhanded to the extent that everybody's pockets finally get emptied?

Certainly, as citizens, without regard to politics, we have every reason to abhor the preemption, the narrowing, and the twisting of the word liberal by men who, on their own record, have traded away any legitimate title to it.

Once trained to define and divide, a process which Aristole considered central to the pursuit of knowledge, you should be able, I believe to distinguish liberalism from prodigality.

You should be equipped to see through the self-styled liberal whose liberalism largely consists of advocating more and more public spending and who thus simultaneously undermines, in the end, even governments' power to borrow money to carry on the very programs he espouses.

And you should be able to penetrate the disguise of those who oppose all progress by resisting every demand the Government enter into new fields or accentuate its share of responsibility in old fields by crying "Socialism." Those people, left to their own devices, would have us mentally replant our feet in the 19th century and resist every attempt to move us forward to the present.

What I am saying is that there is a sensible and sane middle ground between the two schools of political and economic thought and it is our solemn obligation to search it out.

Finally, you should be capable of detecting the inconsistency of the self-styled intellectual who cries out that politicians are never the leaders of thought in a society and simultaneously calls for an administration in Washington to produce new ideas.

Here in Gettysburg, as a result of living, working, and studying in the midst of historical surroundings, all of you—young and old—should surely be able and ready to help make our country's future in every way worthy of its glorious past.

Here, despite Lincoln's modest disclaimer, the Gettysburg Address and the deeds of brave men, living and dead, northern and southern all together, have consecrated Cemetery Ridge and Little Round Top and the Wheatfield. This is indeed hallowed ground, and here, to rich and poor, and young and old; patriotism, virtue, honor, and freedom all have, in Shakespeare's phrase, a "local habitation and a name."

Ever since Biblical times, when the author of "Ecclesiasticus" said, "Let us now praise famous men," peoples have found in their honored heritage from the past a guide and an inspiration for the performance of their duty in the present and in the future.

Gettysburg is indeed a place of such praise. You and I will agree that it must always be so, and further you and I agree that together we can keep it so.

When the question is asked, "What is the importance of all such shrines and monuments and parks?" to answer "Manifold" is not to be in error. Surely, many of us have had the same experience as the young soldier in the U.S. Army who wrote to John D. Rockefeller, Jr., that he had never seen "the greatness of this country with more force and clearness" than when he had walked the red brick sidewalks of the Duke of Gloucester Street in Williamsburg.

The monuments which visitors come to see are in themselves clues to a pattern of events which Sir Winston Churchill has woven into the "History of All English-Speaking Peoples." Moreover, our history is also becoming a part of that of many other peoples and races—some speaking such strange tongues as Hindi and Bahasa-Indonesia and Urdu, living in faraway lands, worshiping in vastly different ways.

On the other side of the world, the President of Indonesia, Sukarno, professes almost a veneration for Abraham Lincoln and Thomas Jefferson. The American town of Concord, Mass., and nearby Walden Pond are, through Mahatma Ghandi's admiration for Henry David Thoreau, part—and an almost central part—of the history of modern India. Our monuments—and the human feelings they have awakened in distant, different peoples beyond the seas—indeed, remind us again and again that no man is an island, any more than a nation is an isolated citadel.

Do you recall the words of Carl Sandburg on February 12 of this year, when he addressed a joint session of Congress in honor of the 150th anniversary of the birth of Abraham Lincoln? "The people of many other countries take Lincoln now for their own," Mr Sandburg said. "He belongs to them. He stands for decency, honest dealing, plain talk, and funny stories. Look where he came from—don't he know all us strugglers and wasn't he a kind of tough struggler all his life up to the finish?"

Surely, in a time when the United States is trying to advance the cause of understanding and mutual aid with people all over the free world—all kinds of people, a good many of them strugglers—isn't it only practical for us to praise the famous men of our history, to share their example of deeds and devotion to the cause of liberty?

Abraham Lincoln, George Washington, Thomas Jefferson—few countries have anybody like them. Surely, we should be lacking in humility and be unwise in the extreme to forget them or our other great men and places, and the examples and lessons they have taught us.

Theodore Roosevelt once said, "There is nothing more practical in the end than the preservation of beauty." Agreeing, we can add: "There is also nothing more practical than the preservation of those places which cause us to remember the great days and great men in our history and which help show people all over the world what we as a nation really are."

It is to those ends that historians and scholars study the past. And it is to those ends that, in Lincoln's own words, we preserve the honored battlefield and the marble monument along with the well assured and more enduring one in the heart.

To study the past, to act in the present, to consider carefully the future—and to do all three with wisdom and magnanimity—those are the continuing obligations of every educated man and woman.

In our time, not only the searching for but the finding of the correct answers to these problems is more important than it has ever been before. That is so, you see, because the atomic and hyrdogen age neither brooks delay nor allows mistake, lest man perish by his own hand and his own works.

As we are gathered here, we can be sure all mankind cries out in its heart for peace, no matter what some mad men may say or do.

How else, I ask you, can we sustain such a state of world affairs, if we do not, in the Apostle Paul's own words, "follow after the things which make for peace"?

You students here at Gettysburg College, a Christian educational institution, are being trained to meet this great challenge as are your fellows everywhere. Your college is doing its best for you. It now remains for you to do your best for it, for yourselves, and for your country in the years ahead.

The Greater Cleveland Council No. 440 of the Boy Scouts of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 13, 1959

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, in January of this year, Greater Cleveland Council No. 440 of the Boy Scouts of America adopted an ambitious 10-year program known as the Greater Cleveland plan. It is designed to make possible a tremendous growth in Boy Scout membership each year until 1968, when it is hoped that the Greater Cleveland area can serve some 82,000 boys. This would be 50 percent of all available boys at that time. The plan not only envisions reaching all boys who desire to be scouts, but provides for a continual up-grading of the program offered.

It was gratifying for me to learn last week, Mr. Speaker, that the plan now having been in effect for 3 months, can point to more than 110 new scout units registered during that short period. One hundred ten units in 3 months is more than the number registered in any previous 1-year period.

I wish to congratulate the leaders in the Greater Cleveland council. They are men of vision and high purpose. They seek to make the opportunities of Scouting possible for thousands of new boys each year, and they are ever alert to see that the quality of the program offered shall be increasingly good. Dur-

ing these past 3 months, the leaders have seen that the master plan of operation was carefully drawn and is both practical and workable. The one element yet to be proven is their faith that the people of Greater Cleveland will back their council with the necessary support, in both time and money.

Service hours totaling hundreds of thousands are given each year by dedicated volunteers in order to make effective the splendid character-citizenship training program of the Boy Scouts of America. If these hours were to be translated into dollars and cents, the price of the Boy Scout program would be staggering. Since this is not the case, however, Scout budget needs are very very modest indeed. Particularly is this seen by comparing the Scout budget with a recent request from two correctional institutions in the Cleveland area, which have asked for $185 million for rehabilitation purposes. How much better to put only a fraction of this cost into the ounce of prevention the Scouting movement represents.

The Boy Scout program all over America is doing a truly magnificent job in fostering the ideals of true Americanism in our growing boys. In fact, I am inclined to agree with the statement once made by the beloved Will Rogers, "The only trouble with the Boy Scouts is there just ain't enough of them."

The Greater Cleveland council is to be commended on making a sincere effort to remedy that situation.

Moscow's Cold War Air Force

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 13, 1959

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, in recent weeks the Russian-provoked crisis over Berlin has again focused the attention of the West on that island of democracy behind the Iron Curtain. Though 10 years have already passed since the blockade of Berlin, we are reminded of the hastily organized but highly successful Berlin airlift. From the end of June 1948, to the 12th of May 1949, when the blockade was lifted, more than 2 million tons of foodstuff, coal, and other goods were airlifted into West Berlin in approximately 200,000 flights.

It was a magnificent achievement by the men and the planes of the immediate postwar era—before the advent of the jet age, when there was no question of America's air supremacy over Soviet Russia.

Today, however, we are faced with a new cold-war threat from Russia. Quite apart from their military aspirations, we see the Soviets using the jet plane as an economic and propaganda weapon in the growing commercial battle for jet age supremacy.

My distinguished colleague, Senator BARTLETT, of Alaska, and a member of the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, recently spoke of this threat in a speech before the Queens County Committee of the American Legion, in Jamaica, N.Y. I ask unanimous consent that his well-documented talk on "Moscow's Cold War Air Force" be printed in the RECORD.

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

MOSCOW'S COLD WAR AIR FORCE

For the past several years, our newspapers and our radio and television broadcasts have carried in great detail the latest developments in the international arms race between our Nation and the U.S.S.R.

In recent months, this struggle for world supremacy has even been carried beyond the limits of our atmosphere into the void of space.

Aside from the military significance of these fantastic developments, the news about them is in itself important. The word of progress on the part of either great competitor reaches every enlightened corner of the world. Each success or failure affects the prestige of the nation concerned, and prestige is an extremely important factor in influencing the peoples of the world who waver between espousal of the democratic or the communistic way of life.

To you opinion leaders, who I am sure have followed closely each of these new developments in defense, I can offer nothing new on the subject of our defense posture vis-a-vis the Soviet Union. Instead I would like to talk tonight about another area of competition between the United States and the Soviets. It is one which has not been so widely publicized, but one which rivals defense progress in the international prestige battle. It is also highly important to the relative economic status of the two nations.

This is the field of civil air transportation, an area in which I have a dual interest both as member of the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, which studies closely our national air commerce, and as a representative of the people of the State of Alaska.

We are figuratively fighting a cold war with our Russian competitors in this field of commercial air transportation, and I regret to report that it is one more area where, at the moment, we are behind them.

Our American jets started actual airline flying just 5 months ago, but the Soviets have been carrying passengers in jet airliners for almost 3 years. Only one American airline is flying our jets beyond our own borders. Its Boeing planes have made limited appearances in four European capitals, and only since last October.

The Russian jets, on the other hand have been flying to a great many European cities for more than 2 years and they are also flying regularly to the Middle East and to Asia. The Soviets are planning further extension of their jet routes to Africa and the Far East, in particular to Japan.

In addition, they are building new and even more modern airliners and will in a very short time have in service a giant prop-jet passenger plane which can carry 170 passengers 5,000 miles nonstop at a speed about equal to that of our jets, although we can match neither that range nor passenger capacity. This massive airplane has an elevator, a sky-restaurant which can seat 48 and even a motion picture theater.

The Soviets have stated publicly that they are planning a large-scale expansion of their civil air operations, in terms of added aircraft and a great extension of their already tremendous air route system. They are, of course, less interested in developing air commerce beyond their boundaries, but they are equally interested in parading their aircraft showpieces before the peoples of other nations for prestige purposes.

They are, for instance, currently negotiating for landing rights in Ghana, the newly independent republic in Africa. Whether the traffic potential justifies such a route is a moot point, but unquestionably the Soviet Union can chalk up some prestige points by showing off their jets to this nation which has not yet seen an American jet transport. The Soviets are shrewdly aware of the propaganda value of such a handsome piece of modern machinery as a jet airplane, and they are masters at exploiting it.

Let me tell you something about the Soviet civil air organization which is conducting this facet of the cold war. It is called Aeroflot, or Air Fleet. It is considerably more than an airline as we know airlines. It is in effect a cold war civil aviation force and its operating heads are two marshals of the Red air force.

Aeroflot embraces all aviation in the Soviet Union that is not military. It operates a large scale air ambulance service, which flies doctors to isolated areas and evacuates emergency cases to hospitals.

It operates an agricultural service for aerial crop dusting and seeding, pest control in swamplands, geologic surveys, and fire control.

It has its own very modern weather service.

It provides other miscellaneous services, which show that the Soviets are fully aware of the potential of aviation in their national economy. For instance, Aeroflot operates helicopters and aircraft in conjunction with the Russian fishing fleets. These planes fly out ahead of the fishing boats in search of schools of fish and radio back the best locations.

Aeroflot also has airborne cowboys, who herd cattle in the central plains by light aircraft or helicopter. From their aerial lookout posts, the "cowboys" spot the best grazing grounds for the herds, then push the cattle in those directions by "buzzing" them with the airplanes.

These are, of course, internal services which are not of particular relevance in the cold war. I mention them because I feel they illustrate how energetically the Soviets exploit all their resources to better their economy, and their overall economic status is very important to us, since their leaders have frequently challenged us to do battle in this area, rather than with weapons.

The transport operations of Aeroflot are of more importance, both from the economic and diplomatic standpoints.

A few months ago, the Soviets issued a massive document with the title "Targets for the Soviet Economy." It was a résumé of economic and production goals of the 7-year plan for 1959 through 1965.

Newsweek magazine called this report "the most comprehensive blueprint ever compiled for the destruction of capitalism and the overthrow of the United States in a global economic war."

Premier Khrushchev stated that the 7-year plan called for a sixfold increase in air transportation. Air Chief Marshal Pavel Zhigarev, who heads Aeroflot, added some of the details of the proposed economic penetration in the field of aviation. They included:

An increase of almost one-third annually in the number of passengers carried and the number of ton-miles flown;

A tremendous construction and expansion program for air facilities on the ground, with 90 major airports scheduled for construction or rebuilding and annual expenditures for improvement of service of three times what they are today;

Addition of thousands of miles of new routes, a great portion of this expansion to come outside the Soviet Union.

The marshal predicted that by 1964 the annual traffic increase would be as great as the total traffic in 1958. This means an

expansion of truly staggering proportions in Soviet civil air operations—and we have learned in the last year or so that they are not given to idle boasting.

To handle this traffic growth, the Soviet aircraft industry is turning out numbers of modern turbine aircraft. This reequipment program started long before the formation of the new 7-year economic campaign. Although the Soviets do not provide too many details, it appears that their first jet transport was flying in 1955.

Named the Tupolev 104 after its designer, this plane was first shown to the Western World when it made a surprise visit to London in March 1956. It is a 70-passenger plane with speed only slightly less than that of our new jets.

The Russians used a short-cut approach to developing this jet, by using the basic design of a tested bomber. In so doing, they skipped the intermediate step of development—the four-engine propeller-driven transport.

The Tupolev 104 was placed in scheduled service in September of 1956, when our first jet was still in an early test stage. For the following 2 years, the Soviets had the only airline jet service.

During that period, the Soviets developed and started flying three other turbine planes of the propjet variety.

Today, they are readying for service two much more impressive aircraft.

One is the Tupolcv 110, a big brother to the Tupolev 104. It has four jet engines instead of the earlier version's two and can carry 100 passengers.

The giant showpiece I mentioned earlier is the Tupolev 114, also called the Roossia. It is a propjet, with four of the largest turboprop engines ever built anywhere. In addition to the extras such as the elevators and the restaurant, it has its own telephone system and private cabins for deluxe service.

This fleet of modern planes will make ideal propaganda equipment for the Reds, for each plane is a symbol of the technological capacity of the building nation.

Now, although we can do nothing about the time we have lost in this area of the prestigial battlefront, our own situation is looking up. We already have in airline service three turbine types of aircraft, the Boeings I spoke of and two propjets built by Lockheed and Fairchild.

Two more jet transports, built by Douglas and Convair, are now being test flown. They will be in airline service this year and in 1960.

Our American turbine planes are being built by the hundreds and they are scheduled for service all over the world. Under the banners of our own American-flag carriers, they will be flying into a great many foreign cities in a year or two. In addition, these American-built planes have been ordered by almost 40 foreign airlines.

Although we know that the Soviets have made some effort to interest airlines outside their boundaries in their aircraft, they have as yet made no penetration.

There is another plus on our side of the ledger. In general, our turbine planes are much bigger and faster than their Russian counterparts, with the single exception of the king-size Roossia. As symbols of American industrial capacity, they will stand up well in comparison with Soviet airline equipment.

From the economic standpoint, our airplanes are attractive to foreign buyers because they are designed and built with an eye toward making a profit for the operator. The Soviets, in their haste to develop new transports, were not able to achieve economy of operation. Their Tupolev 104, for instance, is a fuel gobbler and carries only slightly more than half as many passengers as our Boeing 707.

In their later planes, however, it appears that they have concentrated on this factor, and we cannot overlook the fact that they may become competitors for aircraft sales.

Our manufacturers of airliners employ hundreds of thousands of people and have more than 5,000 small companies supplying parts and equipment. This represents a substantial portion of our national economy and we must watch closely any Soviet attempt to influence it.

So, after a late start, we are catching up and may surpass the Soviets in this area of economic and aero-diplomatic competition. What is of concern is the next step.

Remember, the economic health of our airlines dictates the speed at which we can put new aircraft in service. These planes are not developed and bought by the Government, as is the case in the Soviet Union.

It took our airlines a long period of gradual transition from two-engine to four-engine propeller planes before they were ready for jets. They had to build up passenger volume over many years before they could afford these planes, which cost more than $5 million each.

The Soviets were able to leapfrog the intermediate steps because development and operating costs of the planes were not a factor under communistic economy.

The next step is the passenger-carrying transport which flies faster than sound, probably two or three times as fast, or between 1,300 and 2,000 miles per hour.

Fantastic as that might seem, our engineers say that we have the technological capacity to start work on such planes right now. We do not, however, have the economic capacity.

Our airlines are investing close to $3 billion in these new jets. Obviously, it will take a long period of time to pay for these aircraft, and another period before the airlines can accrue the necessary backlog to think of even faster equipment. There are so many problems connected with the introduction of our current jets, airline officials don't even want to think of tomorrow.

The Soviets are hampered by no such economic restrictions. When the designers say that such planes can be built, more than likely they will get the government go-ahead.

I need not dwell on the economic and propaganda effect of such a development. The effect on the impressionable layman, to whom our current jets are fantastic machines, would be almost as devastating to our national prestige as was the first sputnik.

In the interim, our American airlines with their jets will be carrying abroad demonstrations of the type of product a free economy can produce. They cannot fail to impress. As American civil cold war ambassadors, these free enterprise airlines with their free-enterprise planes deserve all the support we can give them.

Westinghouse Air Brake Co. Suffered in Every Segment of Business During 1958 Except in Sales to Government—Boss Complains of U.S. Spending

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 13, 1959

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, we have heard a good deal of late from businessmen who seem to think that the Government of the United States is in the hands of enemies of the people, wild-eyed so-called spenders whose desire is to compel price inflation and throw the economy into ruin. From these sources, we also hear a great deal about how businessmen must get into politics to save the Nation.

An example of this attitude recently came to my attention in the form of a communication from the president of the Westinghouse Air Brake Co., of Pittsburgh, addressed to employees of that firm. This gentleman, one A. King McCord, explained why the company did less business, hired fewer people, and made less money in 1958 than in 1957.

You must not believe that Mr. McCord had the slightest feeling that anything might have been wrong with his direction of his company's affairs. Indeed not. He seemed convinced, from his letter, that everything was somebody else's fault. It was the fault of the Government—the "spenders," both Federal and State. It was the fault of wage and salaried employees who, he suggested, had somehow gained "arbitrary" increases that were "not compensated for by increased productivity." And it was the fault of the geniuses at the Department of the Treasury. Even in the present administration Mr. McCord of Westinghouse Air Brake Co. is not satisfied; he thinks that our Government's debt management policies are "improper" and that the Humphrey-Anderson long-time "tight money" policy has really been a loose policy designed to provide "cheap money."

There is a bitter irony embedded in the heart of this McCord letter, Mr. Speaker, and I shall call attention to that irony in a moment. But first let me talk about Mr. McCord's general approach.

I do not see the slightest objection to Mr. McCord's suggestion that the citizens employed by his company should interest themselves in public affairs. Indeed, that is their right, and I hope they will feel it is their duty.

We who are in political life could benefit from the participation of more and more Americans in the business of governing the country. I have been under the impression, from history books and the reports of campaign contributions, that businessmen of the status of Mr. McCord have been active in politics for many generations, but if the base can be broadened by getting other Westinghouse Air Brake employees active in public affairs, I think the country will be very much better off. All of us here are responsible to the people, and despite the theories of some, there is not a Member of this House who does not recognize his obligation to the people.

I think it no more than fair, however, to point out that Mr. McCord's idea of practical politics is to issue a set of shrill complaints about what he calls "spending" in general.

He does not say what programs he thinks the Government should abandon. He doesn't say whether he thinks we should cut off our Defense Establishment, or knock out our investment in defense highways, impacted school areas, hospitals, public health, cancer and cardiac research, services for veterans or interest on the public debt. He does not

say we should destroy federally financed research that improves the chances of industry for service.

He echoes the gentlemen now in charge of the executive branch of the Government by being against "spending" in general. He adopts the political viewpoint of those whose attitude was repudiated by the people last November and calls for an attack on inflation.

Never once does he suggest, in his communication, that maybe the 6 million people left jobless or only partially employed by the recession are any responsibility of his or of the country's. He does not raise a question about the policies that have discouraged the full economic growth of this Nation in the past 6 years. He simply rails at spending.

Now let us get to the irony, Mr. Speaker. It is the cream of the jest. Mr. McCord acknowledges in his letter to his employees that the only way their company gained last year was in sales to the Government.

Westinghouse Air Brake Co. lost business from the railroads. It lost in every other section of its business, also, except in the one classification of sales to the Government.

I am not going to suggest that if Mr. McCord thinks all Government spending is terrible, it would be patriotic for him to stop bidding on Government contracts. I do suggest that it is peculiar for him to assail the policies decided upon by the elected representatives of the people, to suggest that all his troubles are due to these policies, and brag in the same letter that these policies saved his own company from larger losses in business.

To let the House read the communication to which I refer, I insert the full text of Mr. McCord's letter in the RECORD:

WESTINGHOUSE AIR BRAKE CO.,
Pittsburgh, Pa., March 6, 1959.

To All WABCO People:

The general business recession, experienced in the United States during 1958, adversely affected, in serious degree, employment by the company and profit from operations. We were hit hardest in sales to the railroad industry. Other segments of our business, except Government sales, also suffered, but not to the same degree. Government sales, and employment and earnings resulting therefrom, exceeded our 1957 experience.

Net profit per dollar of sales fell from 5.1 percent in 1957 to 4.3 percent in 1958, and total profit decreased 27.2 percent. Were it not for the diversity of WABCO products and markets and the increase in Government sales, our employment and profit experience in 1958 would have been much worse.

Nothing causes so many economic hardships to employees and business managers, or is more threatening to national security, than boom-and-bust gyrations of the national economy. Why is it not possible for overall general business to operate on a gradually ascending scale, with short leveling-out periods rather than abrupt and severe declines? The answers being given today are many and diverse and, in too many cases, are slanted because of special or selfish interest. We at WABCO have an answer—it's considered old fashioned—but we believe it has the support of most impartial economists.

Our answer is that inflation is the major contributing cause. An inflationary boom has always been followed by a bust—the bigger the boom the bigger the bust. In the process everyone is hurt—not only workers and stockholders, but all who have savings accounts and those who are living on past savings or depending on insurance or pension payments.

What causes inflation? We think we know; we believe inflation is caused by:

1. Spending by Governments—Federal and State—resulting in unbalanced budgets or taxes so high that they become a contributing inflationary force.

2. Arbitrary increases in wage rates and salaries not compensated for by increased productivity, and,

3. Improper Government debt management and interest rate policies designed to provide so-called cheap money.

If this is so—and we believe it is—what can we do, as individuals associated in a mutual enterprise, to help ourselves, our neighbors, and our country?

We can, by our own conduct, in personal budgeting and work standards, improve our lot and set an example for others to follow. We can support people in public life who are not advocates of high spending and high taxes and who do not support a cheap money policy. We can make our influence felt in our social, civic, and fraternal organizations; in our work and business associations, and in our governments. If we, if the people of America, do not do these things—then inflation is the forecast for the future bringing higher prices, higher taxes, and bigger booms and busts.

Those of us charged with managing WABCO's business are going to exert our best efforts to resist inflation. Your help in this approach—your understanding of the economic problems of today—is solicited because we know that by giving this help you will be helping yourself.

Sincerely,

A. KING MCCORD,
President.

Unemployment Compensation—Clash of Viewpoints

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 13, 1959

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, in the Washington Post and Times Herald of April 13, 1959, a portion of the transcript of the unemployment compensation hearings before the House Ways and Means Committee quoted Mr. George Meany, president of the AFL-CIO, and me.

Since this exchange between us represents a sharp conflict in basic ideology of the role of Federal Government in our lives, I feel that my colleagues and others would be interested in the entire transcript which follows; and I believe speaks for itself:

Mr. ALGER will inquire, Mr. Meany.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Meany, I had the privilege and pleasure of reading and studying your statement last evening. I want to stick close to this statement and limit my questions to the subjects I am particularly troubled about.

On page 1 and at the top of page 5 you discuss the people who are unemployed, and the figures keep coming up of labor force compared to unemployment. Here it is 5.8 million or 7.6 percent of the labor force.

Has the AFL-CIO made a comprehensive study at any time of the constituency of this labor force that is unemployed? Specifically, how many of them are heads of families with dependents, as compared with single people or wives or seasonal workers by choice that do not have to work? Have you ever broken it down in that way? I tried with the figures I have here, and I must tell you I have some, but I am not satisfied with the figures I have.

In fairness to this entire subject, I believe this committee should have such a breakdown, and we ought to benefit from whatever you have to give us.

Mr. MEANY. Our own unions have done it; we have not done it ourselves on a national scale. However, we have a report of findings made up by a special group, by the University of Michigan. We have that report which gives some information on it.

Mr. ALGER. I am particularly interested because I see in the report that I have here—and this is available for you to study later, to give us more information on if you can—that this particular publication shows that Michigan has 37 percent of the workers that are drawing unemployment compensation at this time—and this is a typical week—did not have dependents.

That is the exception almost to the rule of the other States. In almost all of these other States 50 percent or in some cases more than 50 percent of the unemployed had no dependents. Then before this committee, the gentlemen from Arkansas, Kentucky, Indiana, Utah, and elsewhere have pointed out and additional information has been submitted to us in the record that a number of workers are of the seasonal type where there is another breadwinner in the family.

I am not saying that single workers who are only supporting themselves do not need protection. Of course, they do. But if we are trying to eliminate the greatest suffering and need, we ought to work more with the family breadwinners.

That is what is troubling me in these things.

Mr. MUNSEY. Could we have the page reference there, please?

Mr. ALGER. Yes. It is table B-12.

I am mentioning these things, Mr. Chairman, so that if the record could be left open we could benefit from the help of the legislative staffs of the AFL-CIO to add to these figures.

I certainly will study them myself as you present them to us.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Meany, if it is the thought that any additional information can be added to this record in answer to any questions, we would like to have it.

Without objection, that information will be inserted in the record.

Mr. MEANY. Yes; we will be glad to supply, to whatever extent possible, any of the statistical data that either we have available or that we can secure for you on any of these questions.

(Material not furnished reporter.)

Mr. ALGER. What percentage of unemployment would you consider to be minimum if you defined minimum unemployment as the number of people who really do not have to work or are working by choice, or possibly too lazy to work unless they get exactly what they want? I think this is important.

Mr. MEANY. You are not talking about what we call technological unemployment. You are not talking about people who are between jobs. You are talking about people who just should not figure in the working force at all. In other words, they do not need to work or they are too lazy.

During the war there was a figure came up which was one-half of 1 percent of the working force.

Mr. ALGER. I appreciate your point on that. I have a feeling from some of the material I am getting that the figure is larger than that. But again I think here is an area that needs to be explored so that we do not feel mistakenly that a certain percentage means there is heavy unemployment when actually a lot of these people are the secondary breadwinners.

Mr. MEANY. Could I say this, that, by rule of thumb or some more or less accepted theory, with the potential work force of 65 million, something under 2½ million would be considered, let us say, a normal unemployment. In other words, people between jobs and people not seeking work because they want to lay off for a while and do not need work and so on.

Mr. ALGER. That sounds fair, and certainly I want to keep that in mind.

Mr. MEANY. In other words, we never got excited when the unemployment was at that figure or below, but when it starts to go up, then we get concerned.

Mr. ALGER. To continue on in the middle of the next page, page 2, and it refers again to it on page 3, you state, "When the fundamentals are so generally accepted, when the sights of so many are fixed on the same target, why is it that year after year we continue to fall short of the mark?"

I am impressed that the States are trying to do a job and that they seem to be doing it.

We of this committee report back to the people, and so do the State legislators. As a matter of fact, the State legislators have less latitude than we do, I think. They are right there at home with their people.

Has it ever occurred to you that, good or bad, the present unemployment compensation system is what the legislators and the people themselves actually think is proper?

Mr. MEANY. I cannot buy that.

When you say the people themselves, I do not know who you mean. You are surely not speaking for the potential beneficiaries of the system.

Mr. ALGER. These legislators keep going back home and are buttonholed by their constituents, and then they are reelected or rejected, and you mention Texas on the next page of your statement, and you find fault with our system.

But you know we have to go back to our people, and justify our positions up here. Even more with the State legislators. If they have not been pleasing the people in this matter of providing unemployment compensation, I am sure the people back home would have gotten after them. Or, to put it another way, maybe the people feel the unemployment compensation system is coming along satisfactorily enough. And they do not want us to cram something down their throats.

Mr. MEANY. You realize that the State legislature is made up of people with diverse backgrounds and obligations and from various areas, and the legislators who are in a nonindustrial area do not hear from the people on this because there is no problem. The problem lies in the large urban areas where you have an industrial situation.

Mr. ALGER. We all have unemployment whether industrialized or urban, and I think all of us are troubled by it.

Mr. MEANY. I might say in my State the dice are loaded against the industrial areas by a system of representation that has existed for many, many, many years. The people in two small counties, for instance, over in the southern tier of the State of New York, from the point of view of representing people, outweigh the cities 30, 40 to 1.

Mr. ALGER. I can appreciate that, and a lot of us have been very puzzled frankly by the pattern or the path that Michigan has taken and the city of Detroit. It seems very odd to me that this heavily industrialized and heavily unionized area should be the one most in trouble.

Mr. MEANY. Your theory would be correct, I would say, if the legislators voted on the basis of numbers of people they represent affected by this law and the numbers of people they represent also who are unaffected by the law. In other words, if it was a weighted vote, if everybody had a numerical vote the same as we vote at AFL-CIO conventions, I would accept your theory that the law is what the people want it to be.

Mr. ALGER. That is a very interesting thought. In fact, I would like to paraphrase that this way:

If there are 67 million people in the work force, or whatever that total is, and 13½ million of them are unionized and use that union properly to direct their own legislative thinking and then try to effect changes in legislation, here we legislators are torn between what the entire work force of 67 million want from government in protecting labor as against what 13½ million want.

Mr. MEANY. May I submit to you that you do not know what the rest of the work force wants, and there is no one in America that can say that they speak for the rest of that work force.

The only work force that has a voice is the work force that is organized, and I challenge you to show me anything, any single little item that gives anyone the right to say that he speaks for the other 50-odd million of the work force who are not organized.

Mr. ALGER. I respect your opinion, but you are hearing my opinion, that I, as a Congressman, and my colleagues are hearing from our constituents all the time.

Mr. MEANY. But you say it is the weight of the 13½ million or the 17 million that are organized as opposed to the nonorganized work force. I say that nobody can speak for the unorganized work force because they do not speak for themselves, by the mere fact that they are not organized.

Mr. ALGER. I agree with that, but let me get back to my point.

The legislators and the Texas legislature, representing the entire constituency, which includes that percentage of the total work force that resides within the boundaries of Texas, have seen fit to set up the kind of unemployment system we have.

You can say we are wrong, and you are entitled to your opinion. But the people in Texas think that we are right.

Now, are we to completely negate what they say, at a Federal level, from 1,500 miles away, laying down the law and saying, "No. You legislators who are elected every 2 years, and you people whom they represent are wrong. We in Washington know better and feel that these Federal standards would be better for you than what you think yourselves."

That presents a dilemma, in a sense, which I think all the legislators face.

The Texas legislature sent me a resolution saying they feel that unemployment compensation should be left to the State.

Mr. MEANY. Is it not a historic fact that most of the legislators did not act until the Federal Government acted in this field?

Mr. ALGER. I think that is partly true, but I do not believe that that means the States do not have initiative. They have, but it is being taken from them.

I might say to you that when labor succeeds, if you are to succeed, in completely imposing Federal control on the States, labor itself could easily be the greatest loser. I do not think that is what you intend.

Mr. MEANY. I do not think this is so. But actually what we have here is Federal standards that are now imposed upon the States in this field, and we are pointing out from years of experience where we think these standards should be improved.

Mr. ALGER. I certainly appreciate your interest.

Mr. MEANY. We are arguing for a complete law, and certainly we do not agree there should not be any Federal standards, because the States have accepted some Federal standards, and Congress has enacted them.

We are saying, in fact, that the time has come to evaluate our experience in this field, and that the effect of Federal standards should be amended in certain respects.

Mr. ALGER. You mentioned original intent several times in your statement. While I was not so active in the original intent as certainly you were, I did listen with some interest to the gentleman from Texas, Mr. Farmer, plus men from four other States of the Interstate Conference of Employment Security Agencies who testified about how the States they represented and the organizations in which they participated, the employment security commission, I think it was, say as to how the States felt with regard to original intent.

The original intent, according to their understanding, was that are areas of decision on such things as eligibility, duration, benefit amount, and the other provisions to be made in the compensation field were to be left to the States for the reason that they were closest to the people. They know the local and State needs better than the Federal Government. So, by intent, the States were to follow that. Is that not correct?

Mr. MEANY. Yes; I think so, but now we are saying it has not worked so well, and there is a precedent for Federal standards in this field. The Labor Department can verify that, and we are saying that the law has not worked so well. We are pointing out where, and we feel that the correction can be made by improving the Federal standards.

Mr. ALGER. In the final paragraph, on page 4, Mr. Meany, you mentioned something that I think is at the heart of this, and sometimes we miss the obvious. You point out that the question of where Federal responsibility starts and where it ends is what we should be studying.

This is something that has troubled me and possibly some of the other Members of Congress. I went back to find out and I got the Employment Act of 1946. If I am not mistaken, that came about at the end of the war when people thought there was going to be large-scale unemployment. We passed the bill, and yet the unemployment did not materialize as many people thought might be the case. But there is still the law today, and if you read the language in the preamble of that particular act, every conceivable Federal regimentation or control of the work force can be justified by this language; or the labor unions as a work force, and the working people, or of all of us throughout the entire economy. It is all covered by that particular bill.

I do not know whether you recall that language, but it is all-inclusive.

Mr. MEANY. You are referring to the Full Employment Act of 1946?

Mr. ALGER. Yes.

Mr. MEANY. That is another story, and I would like to discuss that some other time.

We like the act, and we wish someone would give real effect to it.

Mr. ALGER. I just wish that this committee and the rest of Congress would study the language of that act, and think about communism, socialism and free enterprise at the time they read the act.

I submit to you that every single facet of socialism is found in that one preamble of the Full Employment Act of 1946, and I think that is some of our trouble now. Once we admit that that is the law, then there is no reason why Federal standards cannot be imposed on everything, including everything the working force does.

Mr. MEANY. The Employment Act of 1946 has contributed nothing to our problem. In

fact, it has not done anything one way or the other. It has just not been implemented.

Mr. ALGER. I guess it has just contributed to my problem. It is difficult to justify. Providing jobs is not the role of government.

On page 5 you mention the Temporary Unemployment Compensation Act, and the fact that it is being continued partially for another 3 months shows a recognition on the part of the Congress of a degree of Federal responsibility in this area.

I can only speak for myself on the committee, but the termination of the TUC, as far as I was concerned, showed that we did not feel that it was the responsibility of this Congress but, rather, that it should be handled another way, if even we should have had it in the first place. After all, only 17 States took advantage of it.

Mr. MEANY. But you will concede that the Congress felt that there was some responsibility when they enacted the law last year and said it would be in operation until April 1 of this year.

Mr. ALGER. Most certainly. But you are pointing out that our continuing it at this time shows our recognizing our responsibility. You are interpreting it for us quite the opposite of my own interpretations. I simply do not want that to stand.

I say I am among those who terminated it because we felt it was no longer our responsibility.

Mr. MEANY. You did not terminate it. You extended it to a degree, which we say indicates the acceptance of a degree of Federal responsibility.

Mr. ALGER. No, Mr. Meany; we did not intend to continue it, we "feathered it off" so as not to hurt those already qualified. We did not want to be unfair with the people who could qualify.

Maybe this Federal standard for unemployment compensation coming so soon after, was the reason that there was such quick agreement. I do not know, but I want you to know that that was not the entire concensus of this committee.

To move on quickly, the experience rating has been treated. I shall not dwell on that although I must tell you in fairness, after reading your statement and listening to the gentleman from Michigan who has been a fine spokesman for his viewpoint, Mr. MACHROWICZ, I am still slightly bewildered by the fact we are told you are giving a choice in this bill.

When I read the language on page 6 I think either it will result, intended or not, in destroying experience rating. I just leave it there. I realize it would be quite a debate in itself. I think we are going to have to resolve that before we are through.

Mr. MEANY. I am not going to argue that point except to say that, according to our experts—and I consider these people experts—they tell me that it does not wipe out the experience rating.

Mr. ALGER. I appreciate your statement. You did say in your statement that you did not think it was relevant. I maintain this is the one of the most relevant things in the act.

You say on the bottom of page 6 "it is not relevant to the proposals now before this committee."

I believe that experience rating is one of the most relevant things we are talking about because the whole idea of it is to preserve the incentive in the employer for stable employment, and this will make less unemployment, which is certainly desirable.

Mr. MEANY. We said it was not relevant because the bill does not wipe it out, and you disagree with that.

Mr. ALGER. On page 8 you quote the Manufacturers Association of Connecticut. This is what they say, as you quoted them:

"Our State is competing today for more markets and new industries. Hiking the cost of doing business in Connecticut is not the road to more jobs, but to less jobs."

As I read it, I do not find fault with competition because we all agree that competition is the heart of the free enterprise system, of course.

This matter of hiking costs and doing business. I wonder if study has been given this matter of purchasing power and the fact that if you hike the cost to a businessman he has got to pass it on. If he does not pass it on and collapses, then all the people he hires are unemployed and you have more unemployed. If, however, he passes on this cost to the consumer it makes higher prices of things that the entire working force of 67 million must buy, therefore limiting the purchasing power of all of them.

So on the one hand, if you unduly help provide money for those who are unemployed—it does have this effect of raising prices throughout the country—are you not hurting the very thing you would protect, and that is your purchasing power?

Mr. MEANY. You evidently have not studied the economic history of the last 50 or 60 years in this country, because actually purchasing power accompanied by increased production per man leads not to a greater cost but, in the final analysis, to a lesser cost and a wider market.

If you accept your theory, then there should never be any wage increase that is passed on to the consumer.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Meany, I have not been a student as long as you because I haven't been here as long, but I think in the time I have studied and I have tried hard to understand, that the increased productivity you mention has not accompanied the increase of prices and wages in this country, and I think that is one of our problems.

Mr. MEANY. I think statistically you can be proven wrong on that.

Mr. ALGER. If we increased the prices of these items without increasing productivity through putting additional cost on business which they pass on in higher prices, do you not then, by the very definition, cut down the purchasing power of the entire work force of this Nation?

Mr. MEANY. But the history of it shows it does not work that way.

Mr. ALGER. This is what history exactly shows, Mr. Meany.

I think you and I can agree that neither one of us has to yield to the other as to sincerity and interest in these workers.

I simply feel that is exactly what it shows, and if you can understand my concern and provide more information to me, you will help me in straightening out my thinking on this matter if that's what I need.

Mr. MEANY. We certainly can supply more information on that subject.

Frankly, we have a high price-high wage economy here in this country, and under it we have more prosperity compared to any other part of the world. I can remember when eggs were 25 cents a dozen and butter was 25 cents a pound. Of course, now they are almost three times that, but there are more people now who have the 60 and 70 cents than there were people who had the 25 cents during those days.

Mr. ALGER. That is exactly right. But that does not prove that increasing inflation necessarily solves the buying problem. We have got to have increased production to match the increased wages, else we are not accomplishing what we both want, that is, real increased purchasing power.

That study is actually in the field of the joint economic committee. I realize that, and I should not take more time on it now. But I want you to know, Mr. Meany, that unless I can have a little help solving this, you will have to recognize I might be opposed to Federal standards in all sincerity, not because I am opposed to solving the problem. As a matter of fact, I can go further and say that, based on what this committee has been told, this bill imposing Federal standards, if enacted, will actually limit purchasing power; it will create more unemployment, and therefore will accomplish what you, least of all, want to see accomplished—more unemployment and reduced purchasing power.

Mr. MEANY. I think you will concede that we do not want to cause more unemployment, we do not want to limit purchasing power.

Mr. ALGER. That is what I said. I know you do not.

Mr. MEANY. And I presume you do not want to either.

I do not question the sincerity of anyone who disagrees with me on this problem. But we certainly are prepared to try to convince you by whatever statistical data we have that we are right in our position on Federal standards.

Mr. ALGER. I know you feel that, and that is one reason I am taking the time to question it, because I am benefiting by what you are telling me.

Do you believe at this time that employees should match the employer in unemployment tax or not, to make it actually more an insurance program, since you have spoken so strongly and well for the need of preserving insurance feature as a basic principle?

Mr. MEANY. You have got me in an embarrassing position because from the very earliest days—and I took a large part in the writing of the New York State law; was a member of the commission that was set up by the Governor to study the problem before the bills were presented to the legislature—and I have always believed in employee contribution. However, some of our people do not so believe.

But you run into the problem of merit rating immediately as part of this problem.

Personally I have always felt and still feel that employees should contribute, if for no other reason than that it gives them a greater sense of responsibility for better administration of the law, and also a greater voice in improving the law on the basis of experience. But that, of course, is a case where there is a difference of opinion among labor people themselves.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Meany, I believe that there should be retained in this bill the right for the States to disqualify a worker in cases of fraud, dishonesty, or other matters. As I read the bill, unless I am wrong, it says that the State cannot disqualify.

Mr. MEANY. I don't think it says that.

Mr. ALGER. It is on page 3. Let me read it:

"Compensation shall not be denied to any eligible individual for any week of total unemployment during his benefit year by reason of exhaustion or reduction of benefit rights or cancellation of wage credit until he has been paid unemployment compensation for not less than 39 weeks during such year."

Am I misinterpreting that?

Then the next paragraph 9 restates that.

Would you be agreeable, in other words, to amending it?

Mr. MEANY. If it meant what you said I would be agreeable to that. I am not so sure it does.

Mr. ALGER. I read the exact language and am just talking about the idea now. But I am disturbed that from the States is entirely taken the right to disqualify who gets the unemployment compensation.

Mr. MEANY. I think this is subject to legal interpretation. I do not interpret it just the way you do.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the indulgence of this committee and yourself. This is the first time I have had the privilege of even meeting Mr. Meany much less questioning him on something with which I am so vitally concerned.

If I may, Mr. Meany, I want to compliment you further for what you had to say to Mr. Mikoyan and others of his type when they were here. The only thing that troubles me deeply is this—when I analyze the legislative program of the AFL-CIO that Mr. Biemiller and others send us every year and the criticism that you and the other members of the union send to us—but the criticism of legislative stands and legislative programs you ask.

I cannot determine in my thinking the difference between your program and what is honest-to-goodness socialism. If there is a difference—I am not talking just about wages, which is your field in economics, but the entire program you ask of us as Congressmen. I cannot see the difference between this total program and socialism, by basic definition. If there is a difference I would like an answer now or at any time you can give it to me.

Mr. MEANY. Let me say this. I do not know what socialism is. I have read Marx and I have read all the people who interpret him, and I still do not know what socialism is. If socialism is public ownership of the means of production, we are a little bit socialistic in this country, and we were before I was born and we have continued in that direction. In my lifetime, I have seen the means of transportation in the large cities of the country converted from private ownership to public ownership. Of course, that was always one of the things that the so-called socialists advocated.

Back in the early days of this Republic, water for instance was a medium for private profit. There were private water companies all over America. They sold water to the people. The people decided that they did not want water to be a medium of private profit. By process of legal condemnation and other processes, they put these people out of business and took that particular public service over themselves.

We hear about the socializing of the Bank of England. Our British friends claim that in 1916 America went much further in socializing banking and finance than the Britains have gone to date, when we established our Federal Reserve System. I am not an expert on that, but I am saying that is one of the charges.

If it is socialization to use public money to supply milk for school children—and of course, that charge is always made that it is socialization—then is it socialization to supply the airline companies, through the means of Federal subsidy, with an incentive to develop an airline industry, which we badly need in times of war? Was it socialization to appropriate $2 million to rehabilitate an abandoned lead mine in Colorado because the country happened to need some lead? Was it socialization when we subsidized a railroad company some years ago, when they pushed on to the Pacific coast?

I do not know, but I do know this: that during the Roosevelt administration, many things were done by the Federal Government, and very few of them that were advocated by the President under the so-called New Deal were not characterized as socialism. However, one of the officers of one of our national business organizations, according to the record, pleaded with President Roosevelt in the early days of March 1933 to take over all business at the time the banks were closed.

A few years ago I picked up, in about 1953, a brochure issued by the Central Hanover Bank of the city of New York. This is a bank which has the cream of the crop. This is a bank that is a private bank for the private fortunes of practically all of the big millionaire set in the city of New York, with a branch at 62d Street and Fifth Avenue, or somewhere close to that so-called "Gold Coast" up there. This brochure was written by some economist working for the bank, and it was distributed to the depositors of the bank. It said that there was going to be a slight recession, there was a slight recession on the way, which did come, of course, in 1954. This economist in this brochure distributed by the bank to its upper-crust customers said that they did not have to worry too much because, unlike in the thirties, we now had built-in safeguards in our economy that would prevent this thing from going too far. He pointed out what they were: unemployment insurance; that we had a reservoir of money waiting to give something to the unemployed so that they would not be totally out of the market as customers of business the day after they got unemployed. That was one of the things. The Federal deposit insurance business was another thing, under which you did not have the problem of long runs on savings banks when people got unemployed, because the Federal Government, through this deposit insurance system, insured the savings accounts of the small people. I guess it is safe to say that there is hardly a savings bank in this country that is not under that system.

He pointed out that the Securities and Exchange Commission, with its restrictions on gambling in the stock market, keeps that down.

These were the safeguards that were going to prevent us from being in real trouble in 1954 because of a slight recession. May I point out to you, Congressman, that every one of these safeguards was characterized as being socialistic at the time they were before the Congress, every single one of them.

I still do not know what socialism is, despite the things that I have read. But if socialism means that under a democratic system this republican form of government that we have, there are people who desire to secure for the great mass of the people, the workers, the wage earners, the farmers, and others, a better share of whatever wealth the economy produces, and that by providing that better share we provide a broad base of purchasing power to keep the economy moving forward—if that is socialism, then I guess I am a socialist and have been a socialist all my life. I do not figure that, but if that is what socialism means, that is the sort of thing I am interested in.

Despite my belief in the American system, despite detesting almost everything I see done in other parts of the world under the banner of socialism, I am not too concerned when I am charged with being socialistic because I advocate something that brings a little more sunlight into the lives of the great mass of the people in this country.

I submit again that the record will show that almost everything that meant a better life for the little people was attacked as socialistic. I can recall when the National Association of Manufacturers, through its State branches, was opposing the installation, the mandatory installation of dust-eliminating devices in factories where abrasive materials were being used, materials injurious to the health of the workers were permeating the air. It was demanded that there be devices in the way of small fans, and as a matter of law employers were compelled to put in these devices to protect the health of their employees. There were safeguards on the cutting tools so that there would be less chance of an employee losing a hand through some kind of a cutting device. Many of the States have these laws, but I can recall, in every one of the States where these things were advanced, the National Association of Manufacturers and its State branches opposed these things, and they opposed them on the ground that they were socialistic in nature.

So the mere characterization of some proposal as socialistic does not bother me at all. I know that I believe in this American system, and there is no other system on earth I know of or that I can read about that ever compares with it. I believe it is the best system because under this system, a little better share of the wealth that is produced by management, labor, finance, and industry gets down to the little people; and that is the thing in which I am interested.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Meany, you have done a magnificent job of telling us here how you feel, and I think you practice in your daily life what you have told us here. But I want to close by saying this in rebuttal, since I asked you the question in the first place:

Some of us with children and others with grandchildren, possibly yours, are very concerned that in this concern for little people——

Mr. MEANY. That is one thing you and I can agree upon, is grandchildren.

Mr. ALGER. There are several other things we can agree on, Mr. Meany, including providing safeguards for workers and purifying the air. In fact, I suspect you and I, in our views as opposed to foreign isms witness Mr. Mikoyan, are like two fingers on a hand. Maybe it is just that we do not get together enough to talk about it.

But I do feel this, Mr. Meany: generations yet unborn cannot vote, yet we are loading on their backs now not only taxes, if you please, but a staggering debt which they must inherit because we perpetuate what we are doing; we are not facing up to eliminating programs or paying as we go. We are passing on to future generations a staggering load.

Without discussing with you any one of these things you have mentioned, although I would love to discuss some of them with you, to try to find out where we could have drawn the line, I simply say you and your generation and now I in mine ought to do something instead of coming to Uncle Sam demanding more Federal control, more Federal expenditure. We ought to do something now to try to cut down this staggering cost.

All we are doing is coming up here and demanding more Federal programs and demanding more spending. Some of us have got to say, "No. We can't vote for that."

Why? Why not just vote for all these things?

It would be a lot easier when we got back home maybe. But it is because we are trying to cut the cost to be fiscally responsible.

If I can paraphrase everything you said, although that may not be a fair way to do it—I am oversimplifying it.

But what I think we are talking about are two ideas like this: On the one hand some believe in this country that we can all have more by sharing more equally what there is now here. On the other hand some of us believe that the only way for more of us to have more is to produce more.

I say we are not making the effort to produce more, but spending too much of our time trying to divvy up what already is here, and in the course of all this we are creating Federal centralization of power and the abridgement of personal liberty and freedom.

This is how I would like to take every one of these issues and talk about—What are we doing to a man's freedom?

Obviously when you protect him in his factory you are helping his freedom, but there are times when you are saddling generations coming on with bills and bills of debt that we are not paying for because of our nice cars and clothes and the way we think we should live today. I do not think it is right.

I have only made this little speech to you because I do not want you to think that whenever I criticize your viewpoint I am criticizing your sincerity, as some folks on

your side have done to me and others. They have left the impression, when they have taken sides in this and come down to my district, since I am a zero according to labor's box score, to give me heck, saying that I am not interested in the little fellow.

I do not know who the "little people" are. Down in my country everybody thinks he is as big as he wants to be.

But whoever they are I am just as interested in feeding and clothing the poor as anyone. But I do not want to subsidize goldbricks or those who want to sit on their rockers and draw as much money as they can through almost a guaranteed annual wage proposition.

Some of the people coming in here representing the AFL–CIO seem to feel that we ought to give a man a guaranteed annual wage under unemployment compensation for doing nothing.

To close, I simply say to you that it looks to me in this bill like we are trying to do two things that this bill is not intended to do: On the one hand we are treating it as relief or welfare, and on the other hand we are faced with the stark realization there must be more jobs. That is what you want, and more jobs are not provided by the unemployment compensation bill. What we are doing is treating the result of the sickness in this bill and not the cause of one sickness itself.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I surely appreciate your forbearance.

Contrasting Political Philosophies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 13, 1959

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, families living in the United States who were on moderate and fixed incomes suffered great hardship due to rising prices and the cost of food, shelter and clothing from 1939 to 1952 when, except for the 80th Congress, control of both the legislative and the executive branches of the Federal Government was in the hands of the Democrats.

On March 9, 1959, the House-Senate Joint Economic Committee issued its 12th annual review of the President's Economic Report and the budget. The 10 Democrats on this committee must have forgotten about what happened during those previous years because in their views on the review they charge the present Republican administration policies reflect too much concern with price rises. Committee Republicans reject that criticism, as do, I am sure, all lower income persons who have experienced the effects of a shrinking buying power of the dollar.

Very rightly, it seems to me, an administration must concern itself from day to day and month to month with the threat of the possible diminishing value of the dollar and a resultant rise in the cost of living. The time to give attention to such a situation is before any such drop in the value of the consumer dollar occurs—not afterward when counteraction is too late.

Let us remember that prior to 1952 under Democratic administrations, the cost of living rocketed some 90 percent, shrinking the value of wages and true income to about 52 cents. A $1,000 laid away in a savings account in 1939 for a rainy day as a result shrank to about $520 by 1952.

Let us not forget either another thing which added to the economic plight of the wage earner during this same period. In addition to the cut in income dollars of nearly one-half, due to lower value of the dollar, his burden of taxes was increased. Between 1939 and 1952. lower income groups were drastically hurt by the Democratic Congress through a reduced personal income tax exemption from $2,500 to $1,000 for a married couple, and from $1,000 to $500 for a single worker.

On top of this, adding to a worker's woes, the Democrats increased the minimum rate of taxation from 4 percent on the first $4,000 of income to 23 percent on the first $2,000 of income.

This is the record as to the treatment of lower income workers and retired persons.

Furthermore, only once during those years was there a tax reduction—that occurred in 1948 when the Republican 80th Congress, over the veto of a Democratic President, increased exemptions and reduced the minimum income tax rate.

Of course, the New Deal-Fair Deal philosophy of economics embraces bigger taxes and more spending. The Democrat Party in its basic principle has been consistent in this respect over the past 27 years. It is still the party of high taxes and a shrinking dollar. The Democratic Advisory Council goes further and advocates keeping Federal spending of borrowed, deficit dollars as a vital factor to a growing national economy.

Not all Democrat legislators believe in Federal Government controls and big spending. Many Democrats oppose the welfare state idea, but these are out of step with the program of the majority party of the Congress. The outstanding Democratic savers, economizers, and those who consistently represent a basic ideology contrary to their own party leadership, of course, are entitled to full credit as individuals. However, under our political system it is the party that offers a program and, Mr. Speaker, in my opinion the record is clear that between the two political philosophies it is the Republicans who favor low taxes and seek to protect the economy of the consumer.

American Diplomacy in Sports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 13, 1959

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, about 2 weeks ago a plane touched down at La Guardia Airport bringing back from Paris an important American diplomatic mission. The leading member of the mission did not wear striped pants or carry a briefcase. In fact, the leader of this good-will group was a lovely young lady. She had spent 10 days in the important European capitals involved in the present tense situation, but she had not appeared at a conference table or in front of a lecture during her tour. In Berlin, in Paris, in Geneva, she had gone directly to the people with a simple message of human understanding and light and hope from the United States. Her name is Carol E. Heiss. She is the world ladies' figure skating champion.

I do not mean to treat the present difficult world situation lightly when I speak of Carol as an instrument of American diplomacy. This young lady, who represents the best of the spirit and skill of amateur sport, speaks to the people of the world in a common language of art and athletic skill that can help to bridge the gap built by misunderstanding between the citizens of different countries. Along with other amateur athletes who take part in trips and exhibition tours to other countries, she helps to prove that the interests that unite people throughout the world will prove, in the end, stronger than the interests that divide them. And at the same time, by developing habits of mind for peaceful competition and fair play, great athletes like Carol Heiss bring to life the famous words: "On the playing fields of our land are sown the seeds that, on other fields, on other days, will bear the fruits of victory."

There are a number of reasons that ice skating and Carol Heiss should be specially chosen as a model diplomatic courier for our Nation. One of them is that skating is a universal sport, not only because its techniques and rules spread uniformly to all countries, including those behind the Iron Curtain, but because it is a sport which can be participated in and enjoyed by persons of all ages and all classes. It is a sport where the premium is on the difficult virtues of patience, control, consistency, and sportsmanship. I speak from experience, because my own tentative attempts to figure skate have taught me both the perils and pleasures of the sport. I also have had the pleasure of knowing Carol Heiss and have admired her not only for her achievement but for her unassuming charm and warmth of character.

Ice skating offers the attraction of speaking in the same language in any country, and Carol Heiss holds unchallenged sway as its leading interpreter. Those who have seen her skate never forget the soaring mastery, the perfect precision of her performances. All this has come from patience and dogged determination, the two great requirements of any athlete. She has fought her way to this pinnacle of art and skill against great odds. Born the daughter of a baker in New York City, she and her family have known the sacrifices which are necessary to train the raw skill of a little girl into the grace of a champion. For 12 years, 5:30 in the morning has meant rising time for Carol; and even as champion, she spends 4 or more hours a day on the ice, both to maintain her rank and to help improve the technique

and art of the sport for future champions. After years of this regimen of work, when only 16, she captured the coveted world figure-skating title in 1956, at Garmisch-Partenkirchen in Germany, and she has successfully defended it three times since. In Colorado Springs, Colo., in February of this year, she outskated all the competition again to secure her fourth world crown.

Only one new laurel still remains open to Carol, and it is the symbol of world brotherhood through sport that she embodies so well. The five linked rings of the Olympic games will fly from a flag at Squaw Valley, Calif., just a year from now. At the Olympic Village, athletes of all nations, from East and West, from the farthest reaches of Scandinavia to the villages of Africa, white, black, brown, and yellow, will meet together to speak through strength, skill, and beauty universal language that always unites man. Among those athletes will be skaters from many lands, who will give Carol battle for the prize that every champion hopes for. This will be the great test of her diplomatic skill, and of her ability to carry this country's message, through herself, and her skates, from a humble home in America to all the world. We wish Carol good luck on this most difficult mission.

The Appeal of U.N. "Presence" in Berlin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES O. PORTER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 13, 1959

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting a copy of a press release from my office, dated April 10, 1959, and a feature story by William R. Frye in the Washington, D.C., Sunday Star, April 12, 1959.

PRESS RELEASE, APRIL 10, 1959, FROM THE OFFICE OF REPRESENTATIVE CHARLES O. PORTER, WASHINGTON, D.C.

The U.S. Department of State has commented officially on the proposal by Members of the U.S. House of Representatives and the British Parliament that the whole of Berlin should come under United Nations responsibility.

In a letter dated April 9, 1959, addressed to Representative CHARLES O. PORTER, Democrat of Oregon, the Department of State termed the proposal "among the most carefully thought out of the various proposals on this subject which have been brought to the Department's attention" and said that it "has a very definite appeal."

The resolution was sent to the Department for comment by Representative PORTER on March 31. He conferred with members of the Parliament when he was in London about 2 weeks ago.

Answering for the Department of State, Assistant Secretary William B. Macomber, Jr., said the joint British-American proposal would be given serious study. In his letter to PORTER, he said:

"While the idea of United Nations action has a very definite appeal, the specific proposals generally overlook two important factors of the Berlin situation. The first of these is the special responsibility which the United States, the United Kingdom, France, and the Soviet Union bear for Germany as a whole and for Berlin. This responsibility is based on the Four Powers' occupation of Germany and upon the agreements which they concluded among one another during and after World War II. The problem which has arisen with regard to Berlin has its origin in an attempt on the part of the Soviet Union to evade its obligations under those agreements, notably the obligation to restore German unity in peace and freedom. The second factor usually overlooked in proposals for United Nations action is the danger of attempting to deal with the Berlin question in isolation. A real and lasting solution to the problem of Berlin can be found only in German reunification, and it is the Department's view that primary emphasis should be put on making progress toward a resolution of the larger underlying problem rather than on interim or palliative measures to deal with the lesser problem."

PORTER said he had hoped the Berlin proposal would be considered at the Foreign Ministers' meeting "along with other proposals." He said he was not ruling out such action.

Among the six British Members of Parliament signing the proposal was Clement Attlee, former Labor Prime Minister.

Signing the original proposal in this country were 10 House Democrats: STEVEN V. CARTER (Iowa), FRANK M. CLARK (Pennsylvania), BYRON L. JOHNSON (Colorado), WILLIAM H. MEYER (Vermont), CLEM MILLER (California), CHARLES O. PORTER (Oregon), HENRY S. REUSS (Wisconsin), GEORGE M. RHODES (Pennsylvania), RALPH J. RIVERS, (Alaska), and LEONARD G. WOLF (Iowa).

Other House Members indicated interest in the resolution. One of them, Representative CHESTER BOWLES, Democrat, Connecticut, wrote PORTER Thursday, "I agree that the suggestion for a United Nations force in Berlin is a constructive and meritorious one. I have felt all along that if there was some way to involve the U.N. more directly with the Berlin controversy, it would be helpful."

[From the Washington Sunday Star, Apr. 12, 1959]

USE OF U.N. PRESENCE ADVANCED AS A SOLUTION TO BERLIN PROBLEM

(By William R. Frye)

UNITED NATIONS, N.Y.—To one who has just returned from 6 weeks in the Middle East, talk of a United Nations presence in and about Berlin has a familiar ring.

The U.N. has established its presence in the Middle East in a variety of forms, ranging from one man (Pier P. Spinelli) with a small staff in Amman, Jordan, to a 5,000-man army in the Gaza Strip.

The U.N. is present on Israel's borders in the form of a small corps of observers (the Truce Supervision Organization). The U.N. came and went in Lebanon as a very different kind of observer team.

Exactly how the idea could be borrowed for Berlin, and in what form, is by no means easy to foresee. It depends in large part, of course, on Soviet Premier Khrushchev.

A good deal of preliminary thinking and planning has been done, however, on the Western side—notably by the Canadians, who are credited with the original proposal, and by Secretary-General Dag Hammarskjold, who has just come back from Moscow. Some of the thinking is still secret; some can be reported.

HOW IT MIGHT BE DONE

The starting point is that no conceivable U.N. army could be mustered to hold open the approaches to Berlin by force. Even if it did not have to clash directly with the 350,000-man Soviet occupation force in East Germany, it would still have an East German Army of some 200,000 men to deal with.

A military operation on this scale, against organized opposition, is well beyond the U.N.'s capacity. It would require, in practice, the deputizing of NATO forces to act on behalf of the U.N.—something the Security Council could not do, because of the Soviet veto, and the General Assembly would not do, out of fear of world war.

The U.N.'s role, therefore, would be that of executing, or supervising the execution, of a plan agreed upon by the great powers.

If the Big Four were to agree to make West Berlin a free city under international auspices, the U.N. could provide the government, and Western occupation troops could be called U.N. troops. The U.N. has never done this kind of job—governing a city—but was prepared to do so both in Trieste and in Gaza until events removed the necessity.

If a summit conference were to agree upon a new formula for Western access to Berlin, giving East Germans some or all of the functions now exercised by Russians, U.N. observers of the TSO type could be stationed along the route to see that there was no interference.

ANALOGY IN MIDDLE EAST

The analogy perhaps is not auspicious, but the TSO does this kind of thing now in relation to Mount Scopus, the Israeli enclave inside Jordanian territory in Old Jerusalem, next to the Mount of Olives. TSO observers check cargo manifests and try to make certain Jordan does not interfere with legitimate Israeli convoys.

There has been intermittent trouble despite the TSO's efforts, but no one doubts that it would have been much worse without the U.N. on hand.

If the East Germans must check Western convoys to Berlin—and Khrushchev seems inflexible on this point—the West obviously would rather have the U.N. there than leave the job wholly to the Germans.

There should be no illusions about the extent of the U.N.'s potential authority. It would not have power to compel the East Germans to do or not to do anything. It does not have that power today in the Middle East. The U.N. is not a super government.

If Khrushchev (and the East Germans) would let the U.N. actually man the checkposts, it would be a different matter. But preliminary soundings in Moscow appear to rule out that idea. Possibly—just possibly—the point can be negotiated.

In practice, however, the best attainable solution probably will be one in which the U.N. role would be that of a troubleshooter who would observe the checkposts, investigate complaints, iron out genuine misunderstandings, and publicize willful violations, depending on the pressure of world opinion in the latter case to provide the necessary sanction.

From the point of view of real politik, this would mean that if the West were forced to ram its convoys through to Berlin by force, the moral justification for such action would have been established in advance by an authority few would challenge.

All this, of course, is in the realm of preliminary thinking and planning. There are those within NATO who resist the whole idea.

Why, they ask, should the West purchase from Khrushchev at the price of a considerable contribution to the stability of Communist East Germany—including its de facto recognition by the U.N.—a set of rights and privileges which should belong to the West in any event? There should not, of course, be any challenge to the West's position in Berlin. A U.N. role should not be necessary.

Those who argue in favor of the purchase contend that, like it or not, the West's position in Berlin has been challenged. That

position, they say, cannot be maintained by force without unacceptable risk of world war. A segment of NATO is unwilling to face up to that risk.

This preliminary question—whether to accept any change in the status of Berlin—will obviously have to be settled before the West dickers with Khrushchev over the nature and functions of a U.N. presence there.

A FACE-SAVING DEVICE

If, however, the ultimate decision is to buy off the threat to Berlin at the lowest price available—and Chancellor Adenauer's sudden decision to give up the reins of power in Bonn suggests that it probably will be—then use of the U.N. should be an excellent face-saving device.

A U.N. regime in and about Berlin need not look like a diplomatic defeat; it might not even be one. It would not be a defeat if the West, as part of the same package, got from Russia compensatory advantages, say in the field of inspection and arms control.

For maximum face saving, U.N. people believe the negotiations at one stage or another should become, in fact or in appearance, U.N. deliberations. They should take place, it is argued, under a U.N. roof.

This is why there is private urging that the summit conference be held at U.N. headquarters—or if this is not considered feasible, then elsewhere, but still as a meeting of the U.N. with heads of state acting as U.N. delegates. The agreement then would partake the moral aura of a U.N. decision.

A U.N. presence is not an automatic cure-all. UNEF is generally credited with being a success; the TSO is helpful, but by no means wholly effective. Spinelli has practically nothing to do, which perhaps means he is a success. UNOGIL was very nearly a flop, because it was put into an impossible position without adequate tools to do the job.

In Berlin, given a reasonable chance, U.N. people believe a presence could be the smoothest way out of a very deep hole.

The Extreme Urgency of a Realistic Urban Renewal Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TORBERT H. MACDONALD

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 13, 1959

Mr. MACDONALD. Mr. Speaker, we will soon be considering on the House floor the housing and urban renewal bill, which is designed to assist local governments to eliminate slums, eradicate blight, and to renew our Nation's cities.

No thinking person can deny that the United States has progressed from a rural to an urban Nation at a phenominal rate of speed. Even with our suburbias we are still essentially a nation of city dwellers. I do not intend to review all of the facets of urban expansion today, but I do want to emphasize the need for a vast and realistic program of urban renewal.

The two substantial factors in this expansion process have been, first, population growth; and second, the migration of population and industry. The problems created by this growth and resettlement are of a scope which could not be predicted by even the most expert of population analysts. New industries, urban sprawl, and highways have diminished available space. Substandard residential areas are becoming more and more prevalent in our suburbs, our larger cities, and our smaller townships. In this, the space age, we cannot afford to develop an age of less space, nor can we condone less than the highest attainable economic use of all available space.

A recent editorial appearing in a Washington newspaper warned against the apparent indifference to the gobbling up of our great open spaces in the face of a growing population which bids fair to reach 200 million in less than 10 years hence. The editorial noted:

> The simple fact is that the country cannot absorb 25 million additional inhabitants every 8 years without careful planning on the one hand or chaotic consequences on the other.

Recent history should make it clear to all concerned that efficient planning, rural and urban, is a must if we are to save our blighted cities, and preserve our rich farmlands and other natural resources and create desirable future cities. Time and again we have read and heard the warnings against the creation of rural slums and against haphazard growth of large cities. We must furnish our communities with every possible tool for orderly development and necessary redevelopment.

The Housing Act of 1959 which will soon be before us contains many of these needed tools. This act consists of provisions for several programs which are aimed at stimulating home construction—public and private—and the improvement of housing standards, chief among these are proposals for expanded and continued urban renewal aids. It is for these vital urban renewal tools that I am urging your support today. Through this program we have helped cities to help themselves, by clearing slums, by removing blight, and preventing further deterioration. Only through an adequate, continuing program of Federal aid can we help meet the needs of the cities and townships of the Nation in their efforts to halt blight; and only through planning can we hope to prevent a recurrence of the run-down conditions which currently necessitate such a program.

The House bill also provides for an effective housing program to meet the special housing needs of our senior citizens. Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out that the first housing project—Highland Gardens Apartments—for elderly persons in the United States under the Federal program was constructed last year in Somerville, Mass., which is a part of my Eighth Congressional District. The success of this project proves that we need more of this type of housing. I am, therefore, very pleased that the House bill provides for a new program designed to provide rental housing for elderly persons at rentals which they can afford.

There are those who argue that urban renewal is not a problem of the Federal Government, that it is a local problem, to be solved by local government and local private enterprise. I am in complete agreement with this. The Federal program under title I of the 1949 Housing Act is based upon this very premise. Urban renewal programs are initiated, planned and executed locally. The Federal Government shares the cost of the project—that is, the difference between the cost of the cleared land and the price offered by the developers. This sharing with the local government is on a two-thirds Federal, one-third local basis. Each step taken by the local government is subject to Federal approval based upon the proper and efficient operation of the basic law. I am sure we are all agreed that in any instance in which Federal aid is granted, an accounting of the use of funds is not only necessary, but desirable. I do not agree, however, that the Federal Government should not render assistance.

It is obvious that the local units do, and should, bear the brunt of the responsibility for planning and execution of urban renewal projects. But, this does not mean that it is solely a local problem. Urban renewal and redevelopment, the clearance of slums, are undeniably and clearly a part of a national problem to provide a decent home and suitable living environment for each and every American family. Urban renewal will play a large part in stemming the rise of juvenile delinquency. Federal urban renewal aids are investments in better families, better citizens and better communities. These are investments which will return dividends in higher national income, and increased sources of revenue for local, State and Federal Governments. These are investments which, if neglected, can result in economic and social retrogression in place of progress.

Currently, the urban renewal program is moving along at a reasonably rapid pace. Testimony at hearings of the Committees on Banking and Currency, and other published data have revealed that one of the reasons for some of the lack of interest in this field was that many communities were reluctant to launch into the projects because they were afraid that Federal aid would not remain available. Cities were acutely aware of the need for renewal and the prevention of further deterioration, but they did not feel that such a financial venture was within their means. Since the program has taken on an air of permanency, more and more communities, large and small, have availed themselves of the various aids which are a part of the Federal urban renewal program. Should the Congress fail in providing a well-rounded, fully adequate program for the next several years to come we will be sorely remiss in our duty to maintain economic stability.

Albert M. Cole, former Housing Administrator, predicted in 1958 that "any city that does not set in motion by 1960 a comprehensive program to halt blight will be flirting with municipal ruin by 1965." Now is the time to guard against municipal ruin by 1965, 1975, or 25 years hence. Now is the time for the Federal Government, through the Congress, to provide our municipalities with the necessary financial and planning guidance which will assist them in their fight against decay and deterioration and help them in the provision of healthy, sound communities. We cannot

afford a lapse in our support of this worthwhile program such as occurred in the failure to pass a Housing Act of 1958. The 85th Congress was the first Congress in several years not to rally to the support of our communities in their war against stagnation and retrogression. We cannot let this happen in the 86th Congress. I for one, shall do everything in my power to see that a meaningful urban renewal program is forthcoming.

What would constitute such a program? First, and foremost, the urban renewal authorization must be adequate to assure the continuation of the urban renewal program at a sufficiently high level to avoid any curtailment or postponement of urban renewal projects contemplated. In addition, it must not bar the applications of cities which for one reason or another, have not completely set in motion their urban renewal plans. It would seem to me that an adequate measure could be no less than the program provided by the house bill. This bill provides for a total authorization of approximately $2.1 billion. Under this bill $500 million would be available for urban renewal grants in each of the next 3 years. It would also increase relocation payments to relieve the hardship suffered by families and businesses displaced from urban renewal areas by government activity. An additional $10 million would also be provided for urban planning grants. Under this bill all communities would be provided with incentive to move forward with needed projects. Under this bill the Federal Government, the local government, and local private enterprise could work together, cooperatively, to assure all citizens a livable home in desirable surroundings. Under this bill, some of our unemployment problems will be erased through an increase in construction volume. Under this bill, we could assure healthy national, State, and local economies. Realistic Federal urban renewal will preserve tax values, stimulate private industry and thereby increase our tax returns.

Mr. Speaker, if a program of this magnitude is enacted into law it will provide hundreds of communities across the Nation, including my Eighth Congressional District of Massachusetts, with reasonable assurance of the availability of adequate funds so that the urban renewal program will continue to be carried out. This program, it seems to me, is one that we all should promote as having the highest priority of a forward looking program for the benefit of all the United States.

Secretary Benson's Speech in Dallas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 13, 1959

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include Secretary Benson's speech in Dallas before the 50th annual convention of Texas Cotton Ginners' Association, April 7, 1959:

ADDRESS BY SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE EZRA TAFT BENSON AT 50TH ANNUAL CONVENTION OF TEXAS COTTON GINNERS' ASSOCIATION, DALLAS, TEX., APRIL 7, 1959

I am delighted to join you in this 50th annual convention of the Texas Cotton Ginners' Association. This, I understand, is the largest meeting of its kind anywhere in the United States. It is both a signal honor and a challenging responsibility to have the opportunity to meet with so many representatives of the entire cotton industry.

And, may I add, your Texas welcome leaves nothing to be desired. There is an old saying, "The glory of the house is hospitality." Hospitality is also one of the glories of the people of this great State.

But I did not come here simply to sing the praises of Texas. My mission is to talk frankly with you about agriculture in general and cotton in particular.

The facts indicate that 1958 was a year of substantial improvement for most U.S. farmers.

The per capita income of our farm people, from all sources, rose 10½ percent to $1,068. This was a new high. It was 9 percent above the previous record of $983 in 1951—a war year.

The fact is that the per capita income of our farm people had a more favorable relationship to the income of nonfarm people last year than it did in 1952—the year before this administration took office.

Farm operators' realized net income rose to $13.1 billion in 1958. This was the highest in 5 years. The gain over 1957 was $2.2 billion, or 20 percent.

Prices received for farm products averaged 6 percent above 1957 and were the highest since 1953.

The value of farm assets, the proportion of farms owned by their operators, and the standard of living of farm families were all higher in 1958 than ever before.

The total assets of U.S. agriculture at the beginning of this year reached $200 billion. Farmers' net equities, after all debts, were $177.4 billion. This was a gain in equities of about $11 billion over a year earlier, and a gain of $134 billion since 1940.

This is not to say, however, that agriculture's major difficulties have all been solved. Far from it. We still have surpluses of some crops. The cost-price squeeze is still pinching our farm people. We still have many underemployed, low-income farm families. A few crops are still under programs which are outmoded, too costly, discriminatory and harmful to agriculture as a whole. The President's message of January 29 clearly showed the need for prompt action in this regard.

Now, what about cotton? Here, too, the situation is not all that we would like—but assuredly it is better by far than it was a couple of years ago. You will recall that the cotton carryover in mid-1956 was at a tremendous record high of 14.5 million bales.

Since then, largely through the vast subsidized export program, supplemented by acreage reductions, the carryover has been reduced by 40 percent. It stood at about 8.7 million bales as of August 1958. It will be at about that same level next August. Although still burdensome, this is the smallest carryover since 1953–54.

Domestic consumption of cotton is picking up beyond previous estimates. Business conditions are generally good, and that favorable fact is being reflected in increased mill use of cotton. If the current rate of consumption is maintained, we will use about 8.5 million bales here at home this marketing year. That would be a substantial gain over last year and the year before.

I wish I could say the same for exports. At present, it looks as though about 3 million bales will be exported this year. Thus, total disappearance will be about the same as the 1958 production.

Now, I don't want to get into a second guessing contest with anyone. But I do object strongly to the mistaken notion that the Department of Agriculture has been, or is, dragging its feet on the cotton export program.

Let's look at the facts. Since the beginning of the 1956–57 marketing year, and through this marketing year, our cotton exports will total about 16.5 million bales. This is an average of over 5 million bales a year. I recall quite clearly that in testimony and debate at the time the export legislation was discussed, 4.5 to 5 million bales was then regarded as a "fair historical share of the world market" for U.S. cotton. Of course, this estimated share is not a static figure. It may vary up or down from one time to another.

I want to say with all the earnestness at my command that I will continue to seek a fair share for American cotton, whatever that share may be.

During the 1956–57 marketing year we exported 7.6 million bales of cotton, the highest since 1933.

In 1957–58 we exported 5.7 million bales.

The total of more than 13 million bales in the 2 years was an outstanding record of successful, competitive exports—far above the expectations of many cotton men.

Cotton exports could not be expected to continue at these high levels. Foreign stocks, which had been low, were built up to high levels. This is one reason why our exports during the current marketing year have fallen off. But the record shows that our export programs have been effective. They have moved a lot of cotton in the interests of the American cotton grower and in line with the expressed wish of the Congress.

I do not believe, however, that the cotton export program is a permanent solution. We must seek markets on a sound competitive basis through normal market channels.

We must not lose sight of the fact that we have moved this cotton under the subsidy program at a substantial cost to U.S. taxpayers. It will continue to be expensive to do this.

The export subsidy rate which we have announced for the beginning of the next marketing year will be about $40 per bale exported. To this cost must be added that of the difference between the purchase price for choice A cotton and the resale price for unrestricted use. After taking into consideration the administrative expenses, this phase of our subsidy operations will result in a cost of about $20 per bale. This means that on the choice A cotton which is exported the subsidy will cost taxpayers $60 a bale.

No matter how you figure it, this adjustment to meet competitive world prices will be costly. Why? Because of the long continued use of unsound programs.

Textile activity both at home and abroad is picking up. This upsurge should reach substantial proportions in the coming marketing year.

The new cotton law, with which you are all familiar, should help producers and the entire cotton industry. It is designed to provide more freedom to plant, to market, to compete, and to make decisions.

A total of about 69,000 farm operators have elected the choice B upland cotton program for their farms for 1959. Allotments for these farms are thereby increased from a total of 2.5 million acres to 3.6 million acres.

I imagine one of the questions uppermost in your minds is how the Department is going to operate its purchase and sale of choice A cotton. Although we have not yet announced all of the details, we are cur-

rently planning to operate somewhat along the same lines as the loan program. Purchases and sales will be made through local people.

This would mean that qualified persons or firms—ginners, banks, cotton buyers, cotton merchants, cotton cooperatives, or warehousemen—would be permitted to enter into agreements with the Government and act as agencies for the purchase of choice A cotton from local producers. An approved purchasing agency could be approved as a sales agency to sell choice A cotton locally.

I must stress that this is not final. Many details still have to be settled. But I assure you that we adhere firmly to the principle of making maximum use of private trade channels. That has been our philosophy from the beginning. We hold to it strongly.

Another question you want answered is, When are we going to start? We expect to have the purchase program out in time to take care of your early crop areas. The sales program details may take a little longer, but they will be ready before the August 1 beginning of the new crop year. Sales of cotton under the provisions of the new program cannot begin until then.

It is my belief that the Agricultural Act of 1958 as it applies to cotton can help this great industry move toward expanded markets at home and abroad.

On the other hand, it is by no means a complete solution to our cotton problems. Over the past 20 or 25 years the cotton industry has become involved in a complex—almost bewildering—situation which is by no means easy to unscramble.

My complaint about the old cotton program is simply this: Over the years it was loaded down with so many conflicting gadgets that it became wholly unworkable.

The price-support mechanism was frozen at a production-incentive but market-destroying level. Markets were handed to synthetics on a silver platter. We have spent 6 years trying to thaw out the system, and the job isn't finished yet.

In addition, over the years special fringe benefits, such as the ⅞ Middling provision, were provided, which had the effect through 1954 of making the actual support level even higher than the unrealistic 90 percent of parity.

On the other hand, a number of special provisions, plus the technological revolution, made acreage controls almost ridiculously ineffective.

All this added up to a classic example of trying to have your cake and eat it too. It just can't be done—not for cotton or any other commodity.

The effects of such contradictory policies are even more evident in the case of wheat. Despite the control programs, we now have by far the greatest wheat surplus in all history.

By July 1960 the carryover of wheat will be about 1½ billion bushels—enough to supply our normal domestic requirements 2½ years. We will have $3½ billion tied up in wheat alone.

We have spread the Wheat Belt all over America. Wheat acreage has increased in areas of high cost, while acres have been cut back in areas where production is most efficient. This doesn't make sense.

Not only have surpluses of a few crops piled up, the cost of the price-support program is staggering—indefensible.

Our total investment in price-supported commodities is now $9 billion. It will probably exceed $10 billion by the end of the next fiscal year.

It is estimated that during the next fiscal year we will spend more than $1 billion—$1 billion—just for storage, transportation, and interest on these Government-held surpluses.

It is apparently impossible for a Secretary of Agriculture to deal effectively with the present critical problems of agriculture always on the basis of just necessity or just economics—he must sometimes face up to the politics.

There is nothing disgraceful in the word politics or in the word "politician." Politics is the art of government and good politics makes for good government. The very foundation of this Government was a document divinely inspired that was drafted and adroitly handled by politically educated men to become an instrument for freedom. What we must strive for in the political factor of the formula is to have political action governed by the economic facts. And this is where the failures have occurred.

I think it must be admitted that in the past there has been an overemphasis on political approaches to farm problems which are basically economic.

Agriculture must not be sacrificed on the political auction block. Agriculture is neither Republican nor Democrat. It is American.

Let us be candid. Both major parties share responsibility for the situation in which we now find ourselves. But more important is the responsibility for getting to the solution. Congress has our recommendations. It is my sincere hope that the action so urgently needed will be taken without further delay.

No one has more concern than I about the cost of these farm programs. This Secretary of Agriculture has been administering, and is still required to administer, within the straitjacket of outmoded laws, the most costly, irrational, hodgepodge program ever patched together. It is the result of 25 years of political attempts to solve economic problems, seemingly with an assiduous determination to pretend that economics does not exist.

Do you think that as a farmer, the son of a farmer, yes, the grandson of a farmer, and as a former county agent, and now as a spokesman for farmers, I enjoy for one minute the distinction of administering the third largest item in the Federal budget? Of course not.

But be assured, I would not hesitate to defend this program if it were serving the best interests of our farm families and the people of the Nation. The truth of the matter is that these stupendous surpluses and heavy costs are not only sapping the vitals of free agriculture, they are also a threat to the solvency of this Nation.

The Secretary of Agriculture is subject to many pressures and crossfires. Opposition to change—to sound economic solutions to economic problems—has been almost unbelievable. My opponents can't agree on a constructive solution of the farm dilemma. Really, the only general agreement among my opponents is this:

"Let's saddle Benson with all of the ills of agriculture, and especially with the cost of the mess we helped cook up for him."

With smoke screens of distortions and half-truths, those who would dodge responsibility for obvious failures seek to obliterate the facts. But a rising crest of informed and aroused public opinion is beginning to penetrate the fog of confusion.

One of the largest national farm magazines recently invited farmers to tell Congress what to do about price-support programs.

In replying to that poll, 55 percent voted for "no supports, no controls, no floors, free market prices; get the Government clear out."

This is a significant increase over the 50 percent who in a similar poll a year ago favored getting the Government out of farming.

Another 15 percent favored emergency supports only "to prevent disaster from a huge crop or sudden loss of markets; floors set at, say 50 percent of parity, or 75 percent of the average 3-year market price and no production controls."

Another 8 percent wanted adjustment supports "such as 90 percent of the average 3-year market price, permitting gradual adjustment to normal markets and moderate production control when necessary to ease adjustments."

Only 22 percent wanted more Government price help. This breaks down into 14 percent who favor a return to supports at 90 percent of parity or more and 8 percent who asked for production payments.

This nationwide poll showed that 8 out of 10 of the farmers want greater freedom and less Government in farming. In the South the figures are 81 percent for more freedom in farming as against 19 percent for more Government in farming.

Yes; the voice of the American farmer calls in louder and louder tones for more freedom to act, and less Government interference.

If this is what farmers want what are we waiting for—what is Congress waiting for? I repeat, we've made our recommendations. Why don't they act?

In January, the President again asked the Congress to make forthright changes in our farm price supports. He urged that price supports no longer be related to a standard 45 years old, but to a percentage of the average market price during the immediately preceding years.

If the Congress still prefers to keep existing parity standards, the President urged that the Secretary be given discretion to establish the support level for all commodities in accordance with guidelines fixed by law. This is now permitted for all of the 250 commercially produced commodities except the 16 for which supports are mandatory.

Either of these changes would be constructive. Under either course, the surplus could be reduced, the cost cut, production controls relaxed, and markets developed. Our farm people could make more of their own decisions. The Government could resume its proper function of promoting farm research, expanding and developing markets, protecting soil and water resources, improving farm credit, and so on. We would help stabilize markets, not price ourselves out of them.

Congress recognized the need for farm program revision last year by passing the Agricultural Act of 1958. This act made some limited changes in the program for corn, cotton, and rice. Now we need prompt and effective action in behalf of producers of the other three basic crops, wheat, tobacco, and peanuts.

The American people want and deserve a program that makes sense. The poll I referred to is one further evidence that most of our farmers want it, too.

Our old costly farm programs are not only harmful to agriculture, they also contribute to unbalancing the budget—and this adds to the threat of inflation. That is of utmost concern to every citizen. No nation can go on indefinitely living beyond its income and cheapening the value of its currency.

I am intensely concerned about this. The course of inflation is subtle. Its ends are destructive. It mounts quietly, almost unseen in the short-term view, but it is utterly devastating over time.

The President has called for tight reins on Government spending, and for a balanced budget. He has called upon all of us, as citizens for self-discipline in our economic actions, both as individuals and as groups. Government alone cannot win the battle against inflation. To win it—and we must win it—will require the united efforts of the American people—business, labor, banking, agriculture, and all economic groups.

Our expanding Federal Government has boosted the average family's tax bill from $120 to $1,600 a year. How much further can we go in this direction?

Many pressures are now being exerted to add more billions to Federal spending in the

coming fiscal year, and beyond—billions that can bring on further deficits and inflation.

Contrary to what some people would have us believe, the Federal Treasury is not a bottomless grab bag which never needs to be conserved or replenished. To act as though there is no limit to what the Treasury can spend is an open road to the destruction of private enterprise, and its replacement by a socialistic economy.

We must have a tax policy which is not confiscatory and a budget policy which prevents inflation. The Nation must have sound farm programs—just as it must have sound banking and finance—and sound wage and price policies.

In the interests of the whole Nation, we need less government in farming. Quit trying to fix prices unrealistically from which flow the twin evils of production for Government warehouses and Government control of farmers. Emphasize markets, increased efficiency, and competitive selling. Eliminate Government's stranglehold on agriculture.

This is the solution to the farm dilemma.

We have made limited progress. We are on the right track. If we can push ahead soundly and keep the train from being derailed by those who put their faith in panaceas and quack remedies, agriculture in general and cotton in particular will regain lost markets, expand old markets, develop new markets.

Cotton is gaining in domestic use for clothing, about holding its own in household uses, falling far behind in outlets for industrial purposes. From 1947 to 1957 the domestic use of cotton for clothing increased 44 percent. But industrial use of cotton dropped 40 percent.

Always we come back to the essential point—markets depend on quality, price, and promotion.

Cotton ginners are a vital link in the chain of progress. I know that you have long had an important part in promoting quality improvement and in helping cotton on its way to the mills at minimum costs. Many of you have accepted the responsibility for taking cotton samples and shipping them to classing offices. Some of you are spokesmen for farmers, unhappy because grades are below expectations.

I urge you also to take an active interest in accurate price quotations. We must all strive to make further improvements in quality and market efficiency.

I hope ginners will be well represented at the universal standards conference to be held in Washington next month.

Some of you have seen the experimental "flight-bar" roller gin developed at our Mesilla Park Laboratory. In tests, it has turned out nearly 20 pounds of extra-long staple lint cotton per inch of roller per hour, an eightfold increase over the average commercial roller gin. Its capacity for relatively shorter staple upland cotton is 13 pounds, a sixfold increase over the average commercial roller gin.

Many mills are now using the machinery designed by our engineers to open, blend, and clean cotton. This year some 4 billion yards of new fabric will be given finishes that make cotton garments and household goods soil and crease resistant, with the wash-and-wear qualities demanded by today's homemaker. These finishes were developed with the aid of our chemists.

A year ago an industry-USDA study group recommended a pilot spinning facility be set up as part of the marketing research program for cotton. This plant is now being established at Clemson, S.C.

These many efforts are the starting point for knowledge on which a whole new technology can be based, a technology that will mean more efficient machinery in the gin as well as new cultural practices and processing techniques of benefit to the entire cotton industry.

All this is heartening, encouraging, stimulating.

I am not impressed with gloomy prophecies and defeatist talk about the future of cotton and agriculture as a whole. The future can be exciting, profitable, satisfying, progressive, a good time to live and work and raise a family.

What is called for is a joint undertaking to which our wholehearted cooperation is dedicated. I challenge you of the entire cotton industry to give us your cooperation and I pledge that you shall have ours.

I am dedicated to doing what is economically sound, fair, and right to help improve the position of farmers in our economy. I shall continue to pursue that goal of a more prosperous, expanding, and free agriculture.

With God's help, and the understanding and cooperation of groups such as this, whose futures are so closely allied with farmers', we shall reach that goal.

Is the Alaska Statehood Act Unconstitutional?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 13, 1959

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, in view of a recent statement by Alaska's Governor Egan to the effect that Alaska would not agree to let any fish traps operate and that he feels Alaska can challenge the constitutionality of provisions of the act of Congress upon which the Alaska statehood depends, I wish to point out that such a challenge places Governor Egan and the State of Alaska in a most peculiar position. The act authorized statehood only on the basis that the people of Alaska voted to approve the conditions set out in the act. Among these was one that there should be a period of transition as to control of fish and game, and that during such period, the Federal laws should continue in effect and fish and game remain under Federal management.

The important law, and the one in question to which Congress referred, is the White Act, under which fishing with traps is permissible, subject to general conservation limitations, the same as any other fishing gear.

It is well known that the opposition against the use of fish traps has nothing to do with conservation; in fact, traps can be more effectively regulated for conservation purposes than mobile gear. Representative WESTLAND and myself, in whose districts so many fishermen live who are dependent on fish traps for their jobs, were responsible for this provision. It was added for the express purpose of giving those fishermen, as well as the operators, a period of time to adjust themselves and their operations, instead of having an immediate shutdown of fish traps.

If Governor Egan is correct that these provisions are unconstitutional, there can be a serious question as to whether or not Alaska is a State. In such case, Alaska may still be a Territory, or at least I have understood it to be a rule in interpreting laws that if a provision of the law is unconstitutional, then if the court finds that the law apparently would not have been passed without that provision, the whole act must be thrown out.

My good friend, the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. RIVERS] himself has admitted that the Alaskans voted to accept statehood subject to the conditions imposed by Congress, but he contends that they did not wish to do so—they did it only because they wanted statehood—and therefore should not be bound by their votes.

I do not believe the people of Alaska can accept conditions imposed by Congress and later, after having attained statehood, reject those provisions as not binding upon them.

Meanwhile let me suggest that any threats of lawless violence with respect to fish traps, if such are allowed to operate under Federal law, do not lend credit to the new State. In a frontier community, as with the Old West, one expected occasional brawls, but self-government and statehood are supposed to mean the end of disorder and asurance of the principle of a government of law and not of men.

Statement of Hon. Melvin Price, of Illinois, in Support of Federal Unemployment Compensation Standards Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 13, 1959

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith my statement to the House Committee on Ways and Means in support of legislation to estabilsh Federal unemployment compensation standards:

STATEMENT OF HON. MELVIN PRICE, OF ILLINOIS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, TO THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS IN SUPPORT OF FEDERAL UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION STANDARDS LEGISLATION

Mr. Chairman, I congratulate this committee for scheduling hearings on the critical issue of improved Federal standards for unemployment compensation and I am deeply grateful for the courtesy of the committee and of the chairman for allowing me to state the reasons I believe the committee should report a bill establishing such improved standards.

The bill I have introduced, H.R. 3580, like others before you, would strengthen the already existing Federal Standards Act under which the unemployment compensation laws of every State now operate. It would increase the number of workers eligible for unemployment insurance benefits, and in addition it would provide improved benefits for a maximum of 39 weeks in all of our States. These higher benefits would be payable so that a worker thrown out of a job by no fault of his own could draw weekly payments of at least

two-thirds of his ordinary salary or wages, or one-half of the average of salaries and wages in his State, whichever is smaller.

Mr. Chairman, this expert committee is intimately familiar with the details of such legislative proposals and with the taxing programs that would be required to finance them. I believe that in the technical and tax fields my bill is sound, but I would like to discuss the general principles involved.

What is the origin of our unemployment compensation systems in our various States? Why, they came into existence by Federal action. A bill was passed by Congress, in the depths of the great depression nearly a quarter of a century ago, establishing a Federal tax upon employers to finance unemployment benefits. But the bill also contained a provision that if the States would set up their own systems, meeting certain standards laid down in the Federal law, most of the tax receipts would be remitted to the States for operating their systems.

And what has been the history of the systems? An enormous variety has come into existence, over and above the standards required by law, by which some States pay much more and some States much less than each other and than the average. There are differences in the eligibility rules, in the length of time for benefits, of the size of benefits, in the tax rates that employers now must pay to finance the systems that have been recognized as socially desirable.

This has had two very bad results. In the first place, there is a quite natural tendency in the State legislatures not to make swift and major improvements in their local systems that may lay a burden on business that does not exist in neighboring States. The members of this committee are practical, knowledgeable, well informed. You know the force of a witness' argument, before a State legislative committee, urging that taxes and social welfare programs be kept at a level that enables the State to remain competitive.

In the second place, this system has prevented the Federal law from working as it was supposed to work. What are the reasons for unemployment compensation? They are both humanitarian and economic. The theory is that benefits for a worker thrown out of his job will ease the shock and loss until he is able to find a new job; this is for the benefit of the worker and his family. But the further theory is that payment of benefits will maintain the worker's purchasing power, at a reduced minimum, so that the economy does not suffer a total loss in periods of severe recession. The economic reasons for jobless compensation benefits are as imperative as the humanitarian reasons.

I think it can be considered as proved that under the existing law, neither the humanitarian nor the economic objectives are being wholly met.

The statisticians report that during the recent recession, the loss in wages and salaries resulting from the unemployment of nearly 6 million was not compensated for in any adequate way. Perhaps 40 percent of the jobless never became eligible for any unemployment benefits at all, either because they were not covered under the general terms of the State laws or under the specific exemptions. And out of the total, not more than 30 percent of the wage loss was recovered through benefits.

I urge this committee to consider very seriously whether the time is not past for the breaking of new ground, for a giant stride forward that would cure the deficiencies which all of us can see have developed across the past quarter of a century.

Unemployment compensation, Mr. Chairman, seems to me one of the wisest programs of our modern age. Our economy is a marvelously efficient enterprise, but it is subject to the shifts and changes that are a part of the price of freedom. Jobless benefits, financed through an orderly system set forth by law, offer the most effective protection against individual suffering and the most effective cushion against shocks to our national health.

When we deal with the subject of improved Federal standards, let us recognize that we are doing nothing unprecedented. We got our system in the first place by the setting up of Federal standards, and I think it fair to say that without these standards we would not today have unemployment benefit programs in all of our States. What we are confronted with is the question of whether it is not necessary now to modernize the standards, to remove as between the States competition in low tax rates and low benefits, to cure weaknesses that the passage of time has revealed in the law as it was first written.

I am well aware that the President has thrown his weight, at least negatively, against the bill and the program for which I speak today. I can merely say that I consider this attitude extremely shortsighted—an example of a deplorable tendency in the White House to confuse the letter of States rights with the spirit that infuses our entire system of government. There is no genuine issue of States rights involved here, but merely a broader question of how we can wisely use information now available to us to strengthen a program that is very much in the interest of the country, a bulwark of our free enterprice system and a proper protection of our people.

This committee is well aware that common report has it that the Secretary of Labor was prepared to support a new Federal standards program until he was overruled by others in the White House. It is well aware that the first chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers, Dr. Arthur Burns, believes that a swift improvement and expansion of our jobless compensation law is the greatest contribution we could make to maintaining a sound economy.

I respectfully suggest that this session of the Congress should take account of the passage of time since the unemployment compensation laws were written, should face the realities of the need for an improved system, should recognize its own opportunity to initiate a tremendous forward step. On this subject, I believe that bold thinking and bold action would meet with an overwhelming favorable public response.

Address by Representative William B. Widnall, of New Jersey, to National Committee of Section 608 Owners, Sherman Hotel, Chicago, March 18, 1959

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. B. CARROLL REECE

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 13, 1959

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, Members of Congress and the public generally have an important interest in the continuing success of the various housing programs carried on under the National Housing Act. One of the most important of these was the veterans emergency housing program carried out under section 608 of the act. By the time the program was completed in 1953, 7,045 apartment houses containing 465,683 rental units were built, with mortgages insured by the FHA in the sum of $3,439,678,928. The program was a great success and now that nearly a decade has passed, it is increasingly important that we continue to review its progress.

Recently, Congressman WILLIAM B. WIDNALL, a member of the House Banking and Currency Committee, Subcommittee on Housing, made a speech to the national committee of section 608 owners at Chicago. His report and recommendations on this particular program should be of interest to all of us, and I am including it in the RECORD for that purpose. Carl L. Shipley, of Shipley, Akerman & Pickett, who is counsel for the section 608 owners, is well known to me and I am sure that with his help the national committee of section 608 owners can perform a real public service by cooperating with the FHA in promoting the economic stability of these apartment house projects.

The address follows:

As I left Washington, the omnibus housing bill was going through the same procedure that always seems to delay and confuse housing legislation. There is substantial agreement in the Congress on many programs. Typical is FHA, where an open-end authorization is fully warranted and would be supported wholeheartedly by members of both political parties. However, administration efforts in this direction and toward meeting the critical needs of the college dormitory and urban renewal program have been sidetracked because of the early effort to force public housing through the Congress.

Last session there was no housing bill because of these tactics and because of the unwillingness of the majority leadership to sever the noncontroversial items from those that were highly controversial. Senator LYNDON JOHNSON issued a forceful statement at the beginning of this session, saying that the Democratic leadership would have a housing bill on the President's desk by the first part of February. There is almost a 2 to 1 Democratic majority in both the House and the Senate and yet the first day of hearing before the House Rules Committee has just been scheduled for April 8. This situation occurs purely and simply because of the attempt to stuff down congressional throats new vast spending programs and 190,000 units of public housing.

A sound, progressive, well-rounded housing program can be enacted tomorrow with just a few changes well known to the Democratic leadership that would bring the presently proposed House bill within the borders of the budget.

Why does one undertake a quick round trip from Washington to Chicago in the middle of a congressional session? My answer would be because I feel the subject matter to be discussed before the national committee of section 608 owners, under the National Housing Act, is one demanding full recognition and far more attention than it has been given until very recently. When I say "attention," I am sure you understand what I mean, and not the type of attention accorded the 608 program by Congress several years ago. Although I was not in Congress at the time that your program came into being, I am fully aware of the intent of Congress through reading the RECORD and discussions with Congressmen who were present at the time. There was urgent need for housing and it appears to me the bill as originally conceived was loosely drawn with the intent of encouraging the prompt building of critically needed units. Out of that

looseness came the windfalls and the practices that caused so much public clamor and placed the whole program in public disfavor. It seems to me this is the time to take a second look at the history and present status of the 608 program.

One of the very considerable accomplishments achieved under the National Housing Act was the FHA rental housing program in the period during and after World War II. At that time rental housing was badly needed, and private builders and investors like yourselves cooperated with the FHA in filling that need. Section 608 was added to the National Housing Act on May 26, 1942. It authorized the FHA Administrator to insure mortgages on property: "Designed for rent, for residential use by war workers." The principal amount of any such mortgage was limited to $5 million; and there was a further limitation of $1,350 per room. The act also provided that mortgages could not exceed 90 percent of the Administrator's estimate of the "reasonable replacement cost" of the completed project "including the land; the proposed physical improvements; utilities within the boundaries of the property or project; architects' fees; taxes and interest accruing during construction; and other miscellaneous expenses incidental to construction and approved by the Administrator." A further limitation was that the mortgage could not exceed the "amount which the Administrator estimates will be the cost of the completed physical improvements on the property or project exclusive of off-site public utilities and stores, and organization and legal expenses."

In addition, the FHA Administrator was authorized to require the mortgagor to be regulated or restricted as to "rents, or sales, charges, capital structure, rate of return, and method of operation." In order to enforce these restrictions effectively, the Administrator was authorized to acquire $100 of stock in any such mortgage corporation. In 1946 Congress amended section 608 of the National Housing Act to give priority of occupancy to veterans of World War II and their immediate families. The basis for the Administrator's estimate of cost was changed from "reasonable current cost" to "necessary current cost." In 1948 a maximum limitation of $8,100 per family unit was substituted for the previous maximum limitation of $1,800 per room which had been in effect since 1946. This turned out to be a very significant change in the law, and thereafter many projects were authorized in which 70 to 90 percent of the apartments were 1-room efficiencies. The 1948 amendment also provided that the principal obligation of the mortgage could not exceed 90 percent of the Administrator's estimate of the replacement cost of the property or project on the basis of costs prevailing on December 31, 1947, for properties of comparable quality in the locality. Also, a new requirement was added that the mortgagor must certify that in selecting tenants for the property covered by the mortgage, he would not discriminate against any family by reason of the fact that there were children in the family. During the years 1942–53, a total of 7,045 projects containing 465,683 rental units were built under section 608, with mortgages insured in the sum of $3,439,678,928. The great bulk of these projects were located in the East. For example, 18 percent of all the dwelling units were located in New York, 11 percent in New Jersey, 7 percent in Maryland, 6¼ percent in Virginia, approximately 4 percent in California, Pennsylvania, Texas, the District of Columbia, Georgia, Illinois, and Ohio. Florida, Alabama, Missouri, North Carolina and Michigan each had about 2 percent and the balance of the States had less than 2 percent, with 28 States having less than 1 percent. All in all, the 608 program was a remarkable feat, and while arguments have been made in some quarters as to the economic soundness of these projects, experience has shown that they are basically sound, and if well managed, will continue to be. This presupposes that the FHA will manage this program intelligently.

A Senate investigation in 1954 indicated that 6 or 7 percent of these projects had mortgages in excess of costs. There was some feeling at the time that mortgaging out, plus the fact that rent schedules generally were based on the FHA estimates of cost rather than on actual cost, resulted in higher rentals in some projects than might otherwise be the case. However, the impact of the approximate 500,000 rental units built under the section 608 program must have had considerable competitive effect upon rent levels generally. In all likelihood the mass effect of the units developed under the 608 program reduced rents far more than rents were increased as a result of mortgaging out.

I know that some of you have been much concerned about rent ceilings which continue to be imposed by the FHA Commissioner on these projects. The charter of each section 608 corporation permits the FHA to establish maximum rentals. These rentals were determined in advance of construction by the FHA project analysis which was the basis of the FHA commitment to insure the mortgage. Rentals were based upon the lower of market rental being paid for comparable accommodations or rentals which would provide a return of all operating expenses (excluding interest and amortization) and a 6½ percent net return on the estimated cost of construction, after an allowance of 7 percent for vacancies and for other loss of rental income. I believe it is fair to say that in actual practice the yardstick for measuring such rents was the 6½ percent net return on the estimated cost of the project. It is my understanding that the present FHA policy is to permit an increase in rents if operating expenses, taxes, or other recurring items of expense increased to a level beyond those used in the original FHA estimate. I heartily concur in this policy, because I believe it was the firm intention of Congress when section 608 was written into the National Housing Act, that investors in such rental housing should make a fair return on their investment. Indeed, I cannot imagine how such a program could have succeeded then or can succeed now unless these properties continue to be an attractive investment. I am aware that some mortgagor-owners of these projects feel that rent ceilings should be removed or should be revised to bring the rents into line with true market conditions.

In this connection, we must bear in mind that the apartment houses built under section 608 were originally intended for warworkers and later intended for the occupancy of veterans and their immediate families. As a Member of Congress, I firmly believe we must hew to this statutory purpose. However, as a member of the Banking and Currency Committee, Subcommittee on Housing, I have come to realize that veterans and warworkers are no longer in desperate need of housing. Quite the contrary, many in these groups of persons have found accommodations in single family dwellings, many of them built under FHA programs. I believe the FHA must conform its present policies to the facts of economic life. Section 608 projects must be kept sound and healthy in order to protect the Government's contingent liability in the $3 billion of mortgages it has insured. The rental housing market in the areas where 608 projects predominate has changed from a sellers' market to a buyers' market. Competition has increased, newer projects which do not operate under FHA restrictions have swimming pools, tennis courts, offstreet parking, garage facilities, air conditioning, drugstores, and restaurants, and other facilities which make them competitively far more desirable. The FHA must help 608 projects meet this competition.

Most 608 projects have very substantial accumulations in their replacement reserves. I believe that the FHA, consistent with keeping enough money on hand to replace refrigerators, stoves, and similar items, should discontinue adding to this reserve after the 10th year of the life of a project. By that time, the 608 corporation has reduced the mortgage, and has a substantial equity in the property and an increased interest in replacing capital equipment as it wears out.

There may be occasions when it is necessary for the FHA to permit use of funds in the replacement reserve for capital improvements, such as swimming pools, air conditioning, awnings, landscaping, and other features, in order for a 608 project to maintain its occupancy and meet competition from newer rental housing. The rule of reason ought to be the test in every case, and not some outdated or inflexible regulation which was perfectly valid in 1944, but has no application today.

As I read the FHA annual reports, I am much concerned at the rate of defaults in 608 projects. If my memory serves me, nearly 700 of these apartment houses have been acquired by the FHA through assignment of the mortgage without foreclosure, or foreclosure and transfer of title to the FHA. This is a very serious matter both from the standpoint of the 608 program and the standpoint of the mortgagor-owner of the 608 corporation. I believe the FHA Commissioner has enough authority under section 223 and other provisions of the act, more particularly section 608 itself, to provide for indefinite deferral of amortization, or perhaps an administrative set-aside of a portion of the mortgage, to keep a project from going into default and ultimate foreclosure because of loss of occupancy, where this condition is due to causes beyond the control of the owner. Sometimes an important factory moves out of a community, or there is a localized recession and a 608 project loses more occupancy than can be absorbed and still meet monthly payments. In other cases, loss of occupancy may be due to the FHA single family dwelling program where, in some cases, the total downpayment and closing costs amount to less than the initial month rental and additional month security deposit required to get a new tenant into a 608. In these circumstances, it seems to me both the National Housing Act and the public interest require the FHA Commissioner to exercise all the authority he has to cooperate with the mortgagor-owner in saving the project from foreclosure.

Of course, I want to emphasize, I would not favor any help for 608 owners who give poor management or drain off all the earnings of a project so that it is in poor financial condition, or fail to cooperate fully with the FHA in maintaining the project.

In closing, let me say that section 608 of the National Housing Act places great authority in the hands of the FHA Commissioner. However, we Members of Congress on the Banking and Currency Committee have a responsibility to see that the law is administered fairly and intelligently and in keeping with its basic purpose. To that end we try to keep the various FHA programs under continuing review. There is at the present time pending in Congress a bill (S. 57) which gives former mortgagor-owners of 608 projects a priority of opportunity to reacquire a project in the event of foreclosure and ultimate resale by the FHA. Our committee reported out the Housing Act of 1959 with this amendment, and I hope it will stay in the bill when it becomes law.

In my opinion, 608 properties are basically sound, and given good management and a sympathetic and cooperative application of the law by the FHA Commissioner, will prove

to be excellent real estate investments for their owners, and will continue to furnish excellent housing for the rental housing market.

It has been a pleasure for me to be here with you today and I congratulate you and the other members of the national committee of section 608 owners on the good job you are doing in cooperation with the Government.

Individual Liberties, National Security, and the Courts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 13, 1959

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, I should like to include in the RECORD remarks that I made on the subject of the Supreme Court, individual liberties, and national security in a panel discussion conducted by the National Civil Liberties Clearing House in Washington a few days ago. I include these remarks in the RECORD because this subject currently is of such great importance and may come before the House shortly in the form of one or more bills designed to overcome certain decisions of the Court:

Today our attention is properly focused on the Supreme Court, which necessarily has been required to find a fulcrum between the forces seeking to broaden and tighten the circumference of our national security and those seeking perfection in the safeguarding of our individual liberties. It is the judicial branch, rather than the executive or legislative branches, that has been required for one reason or another, to assume the risks of decision in this field, and consequently has drawn the fire. If the lightning rod thus proffered by the judiciary has drawn the heat, the legislature and executive correspondingly have been spared. As a legislator I should be grateful for small favors. But I would be foolish if I didn't recognize that we are all part of this show, and will continue to be, and that responsibility for its proper performance must necessarily be shared by all of us.

I rather suspect it is a dangerous state of mind to become overly persuaded as to the cyclical nature of controversy over the Supreme Court. Like diseases of the body or intellect it will not do to adopt an "it will pass" attitude. If I am persuaded about anything it is that basic liberties do not maintain themselves and must continually be fought for. The mere fact that the Bill of Rights is pedestaled and permanently enshrined in the Archives Building insures us absolutely nothing. I fear that when one or more of our basic rights are destroyed they will not be felled like a giant tree under the woodman's ax, but will be whittled away, chip by chip, with no instrument more ominous looking than a pen knife.

It doesn't seem to do much good, however, to point out to those who view with despair and alarm certain decisions of the Supreme Court that the Court does not go about blithely creating constitutional dilemmas for itself; that the Court did not give the Negro darker skin than Caucasians; and that it did not plant in the minds of the Soviet dictatorship a thirst for world domination. And to those who seem to be guided by passion rather than reason it seems only to feed the flames of impassioned overstatement to point out that the Court must cut new paths in the course of resolving deep social and political clashes. These are clashes which are themselves made inevitable by the inexorable passage of time and the movement of history. And just as inevitably those paths lead across political soil. But if this be trespass, then time has stopped and the human situation remains frozen and unchanged.

Today the search for individual and collective security reaches such monstrous proportions that the preservation of the status quo has become a national craving. Material well-being, the sheltered life, and conformity blank out everything else. We assume that we will live forever and that what was good for us is necessarily good for our children and our grandchildren.

I do not mean to say here that in seeking new adjustments, in keeping with a changing world, the courts, or this Supreme Court, are infallible. Far from it. Their decisions and their methods of arriving at decisions are often quite properly subject to strong criticism, as often are the decisions and methods of the legislature and the executive. But there is need here for restraint. Being a legislator I of course reserve the right to be foolish. Being also human, I reserve the right to be nettled when the Court points out the error of my ways. But I can express my disagreement publicly—a prerogative that is not directly available to the courts. This is a distinction which legislators will do well to remember, along with the realization that the function of a judge is quite different from that of a legislator or administrator.

To the legislator, I suppose that Justice Holmes ought to be the ideal Justice. Alpheus Mason puts it this way, bringing in a rather well-known remark of Holmes: "Having himself no infallible measure of right or wrong, he (Holmes) upheld the programs and policies of legislators even though he considered them in error or foolish. As he himself said, 'I am so skeptical as to our knowledge about the goodness and badness of laws that I have no practical criterion except what the crowd wants. Personally I bet that the crowd if it knew more wouldn't want what it does—but that is immaterial.' Holmes was asked by a friend one day if he had ever worked out any general philosophy to guide him in the exercise of the judicial function, 'Yes,' the aged jurist replied. 'Long ago I decided that I was not God. When a State came in here and wanted to build a slaughterhouse, I looked at the Constitution and if I couldn't find anything in there that said a State couldn't build a slaughterhouse I said to myself, if they want to build a slaughterhouse dammit, let them build it.'" This would indicate a degree of judicial restraint that legislators would find admirable. But, I submit, it is a restraint which exists today in the Court far more than is generally recognized. And Holmes, like the present Court, was progressive in his interpretation of the Constitution and laws when the individual and personal liberties of human beings were at stake.

The briefest examination of previous uproars over the Supreme Court lends proof to the thesis "that time has upset many fighting faiths"; that much more is at stake in the present-day consternation about the Court than the reconsideration of a few decisions.

It is worth remembering, for example, that the political temperature surrounding the Supreme Court at the time of *Marbury* v. *Madison* was such that the new President, Jefferson, had refused to permit the Secretary of State to appear in the proceedings, and that the new Congress had not only repealed the Judiciary Act of 1801, defying Marshall and the Court, but even went so far as to legislate out of existence all terms for the Supreme Court scheduled for 1802. This step alone constituted one of the severest setbacks the Court has ever suffered. And then after Marshall had the audacity to hand down his opinion, now universally hailed, public statements condemning the Court came crowding in from every direction. The following excerpt from a contemporary letter to an editor is a mild example:

"Is it right, sir, that an extrajudicial opinion should be given * * * in any case? Is your tribunal organized to exhaust its time in dissertation on ordinary subjects of political speculation? To decide upon the merits of any cause without jurisdiction to entertain it (is) contrary to all law, precedent, and principle."

Some time later, after *McCulloch* v. *Maryland*, the South and the West lashed out at the Court for failing to strike down an act of Congress, much in the same tone that these sections had assailed the Court after *Marbury* v. *Madison* for having claimed the power to do so. As a matter of fact, Ohio refused to accept the McCulloch decision and forcibly seized money from the Ohio branch of the U.S. bank to cover the State taxes which the Supreme Court had flatly declared unconstitutional. Federal marshals had to unscramble that one.

No one here has to be educated about the attacks against the Court from the North after Taney's opinion in the Dred Scott case. The North's own Atlantic Monthly in protest wrote "* * * The most sacred and binding compacts of former years were annulled to make way for it; and the judicial department of the Government was violently hauled from its sacred retreat, into the political arena, to give a gratuitous coup-de-grace to the old opinions and the apparent sanction of law to the new dogma." And in a later issue: "Whatever the * * * Judges of the Supreme Court may seek to maintain, they cannot upset the universal logic of the law, nor extinguish the fundamental principles of our political system." Denunciations of this sort were immediately followed by plans and proposals to clip the Court's wings. There were few who foresaw that it would take a civil war to reverse Dred Scott. An error, no matter how basic, is not cured by abolishing or crippling the constitutional institution from whence it came.

The current consternation over some of the recent decisions of the Supreme Court in the area of national security is possibly small stuff compared to some of these more ancient battles that the Court has survived. But danger signs are nevertheless clearly present, particularly in the form of proposed legislation once again designed to curtail the jurisdiction of the Court.

History, common sense, instinct, and a small knowledge of the fallibility of systems, programs, and organizations all tell me that Watkins, Nelson, Cole, Kent, and Dayton are sound decisions and that the Court has properly exercised its legitimate powers in deciding them as it did. It misses the point to argue that these decisions and opinions give aid and comfort to those who would undo us. The function of the Court is not to oppose those who would overthrow us; it is to apply constitutional and legal principles to specific cases. It is even more absurd to attack the Court because of these decisions on the ground that the Court has overreached its powers. Even if one were tempted to call these decisions political moralizing they can hardly be said to break new frontiers—they only bring us back to a level of sanity below which this country had descended for a period of time, caught up as it was in a frenzy of fear out of all proportion to the facts. "Such fears as these," Learned Hand tells us, "are a solvent which can eat out the cement that binds the stones together."

May I comment briefly on one specific area, which is again before the Supreme Court in

another context, and therefore I approach it with restraint. This is the question of the use of confidential information in the administrative process. A few weeks ago, in discussing the problem of passport legislation I summed up what I conceive to be the danger here as follows:

"The authority to use confidential information in the administrative process, under imprecise standards, coupled with the power to delegate the authority to subordinates, can result in a breeding ground of arbitrariness in the course of which innocent people may suffer."

Most people might generally agree with this statement as a matter of principle. But then the "for"—"buts"—and "ands" commence and we are back where we started. The high-wire balancing act performed by those who press for the preservation of the device is interesting. The most current argument is that it is universally used in other democratic countries in dealing with the question of passports and other aspects of national security. On reflection. I find this relevant but hardly material. Not long ago this country was regarded as the cradle of a new liberty and we thought it important to set up a structure which would safeguard our liberties from the arbitrariness of the sovereign. That structure imposed standards which I like to think are just a bit higher, go a bit farther, in protecting the individual from the possibility of arbitrary or capricious acts.

On a more practical note, it is interesting to look back on the action taken by the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization following the decision of the Supreme Court in *Jay* v. *Boyd*. That happened to be a case argued by me for the Government and by our friend Will Maslow as amicus curiae for the petitioner. In a 5 to 4 decision the Court sustained the use of confidential information in connection with the Attorney General's discretionary power to suspend deportation, under certain circumstances, of aliens otherwise deportable. The funny thing was that after the hullabaloo was all over the Commissioner of Immigration, a man of courage and fair instincts, met the still lingering problem head on and took steps to abolish, for all practical purposes, the use of the device in this area. A recent check with the Commissioner's office reveals that no case presently exists in which resort to the use of such information was found necessary to a decision. My point is that not only may the damage that can be done to individual liberties under such procedures be all out of proportion to the needs of the security that we seek to safeguard, but the corollary is also true, namely, that the advances we make in the safeguarding of individual liberties, however small, do much to strengthen the foundation of our liberties and, often to our surprise, do not result in any shocking impairment of our safety and security.

There will always be disagreement with the work of the Supreme Court. The Court does not labor in a vacuum. We may support the Court's conclusions, or we may oppose them. We are of course secure in our right to approve decisions of the Court only insofar as others are secure in their right to criticize them. But there is a difference between criticism and ignoble attack. The Supreme Court is a naked institution. The Constitution has provided it with no means of enforcing its decisions; its effectiveness as an institution and as a constituent element of our system of government rests entirely upon the voluntary acceptance of its decrees by other elements of government and by the people. Disagreement with the Court's decrees will not enfeeble its institutional strength. But disagreement coupled with broadside attacks upon the institution itself or upon the character or purpose of the justices will surely erode the institution at its base.

We, who by reason of training or office are in positions of public responsibility, have a duty to expose the destructiveness of any attempt to weaken the judiciary as an institution. Particularly in times of stress we cannot risk the loosening of our strongest bulwark against any enemy, namely our Constitution and the fundamental liberties embodied in it. Without a strong and independent judiciary the weakening of both our individual liberties and our national security will surely result.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, APRIL 14, 1959

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Reverend Father Joseph E. Thorning, Ph. D., D.D., pastor of St. Joseph's Church, Carrollton Manor, Md., and associate editor of World Affairs, offered the following prayer:

Heavenly Father, author of life and of love, let the light of Thy countenance shine brightly upon the Speaker of this House and all the Members of the U.S. Congress.

Impart, we beseech Thee, Thy best blessings to the Presidents of all the American Republics, to public servants everywhere, and to the peoples themselves, granting them the divine graces they need to uphold human freedom, genuine social progress, and the important values of our Judaeo-Christian heritage.

In this moment of history, when the forces of aggression are mobilizing to flaunt the noble principles of the Organization of American States and to overthrow American governments that have proven their devotion to the cause of inter-American friendship and security, strengthen our God-loving leaders throughout the Western Hemisphere to maintain the peace and to win victories against the international masters of deceit who continue to foment hatred and destruction.

In our rededication to the ideals of the good neighbor policy on this 15th congressional celebration of Pan-American Day, we implore new gifts of wisdom, courage, resourcefulness, and imagination characteristic of men and women of prayer, that we may grow in Thy friendship and in our love for one another.

We humbly seek Thy daily blessings in the name of our Most Holy Redeemer, the Christ of the Andes. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 2575. An act to authorize the appropriation of $500,000 to be spent for the purpose of the III Pan American Games to be held in Chicago, Ill.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a bill and a concurrent resolution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 12. An act to expedite the utilization of television transmission facilities in our public schools and colleges, and in adult training programs; and

S. Con. Res. 20. Concurrent resolution extending greetings to the Honorable Harry S. Truman on the 75th anniversary of his birth, May 8, 1959.

HON. HARRY S. TRUMAN

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I call up Senate Concurrent Resolution 20, extending greetings to the Honorable Harry S. Truman on the 75th anniversary of his birth, May 8, 1959, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress of the United States hereby extends to the Honorable Harry S. Truman its greetings, felicitations, and warm regards on the seventy-fifth anniversary of his birth, May 8, 1959.

SEC. 2. The Congress expresses its admiration and gratitude to President Truman for his many years of distinguished service to the United States and to the world. As a public servant and man of the people in the highest sense, he has gained the respect of all as the "Man of Independence".

SEC. 3. The Congress expresses particular appreciation for his dedication as Senator, Vice President, President, and author and elder statesman, in the battle against the enemies of freedom. His great efforts in the years following World War II helped unite the free world in its resistance to the common aggressor.

SEC. 4. The Congress expresses the hope that divine providence may permit Mr. Truman many more productive years of life and service to his country and to the world.

SEC. 5. A copy of this resolution shall be transmitted to that distinguished citizen of Missouri, the Honorable Harry S. Truman.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of House Joint Resolution 336, making a supplemental appropriation for the Department of Labor for the fiscal year 1959, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I shall not object to this item because it was already in the appropriation bill which has been passed and is now over at the Senate. It takes the money that is appropriated out of that bill. But, I do want to call attention to the fact that this continued payment