Congressional Record

United States of America

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 86th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, MAY 20, 1959

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

O Thou God of grace and mercy, pausing in this quiet moment, may there be granted to us some steadying vista of the unseen and eternal.

Confirm our faltering faith, we beseech Thee, in the deep and holy foundations which the fathers laid, lest in foolish futility we attempt to build on sinking sand instead of rock.

In a day of violence and of swift and startling change, when the angry passions of men are bursting anew into the devouring flames of hostility and suspicion, enable these servants of the people in this free land, in the discharge of grave responsibilities of public trust, to be calm and confident, wise and just.

May their faith in the ultimate victory of Thy will for all mankind be as an anchor sure and steadfast—never doubting that out of the ruin and wreck of today, Thou art making all things new.

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

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, May 19, 1959, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILL

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on May 20, 1959, the President had approved and signed the act (S. 1559) to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 100th anniversary of the first significant discovery of silver in the United States, June 1859.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

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

S. 607. An act for the relief of the estate of Sinclair G. Stanley; and

S. 667. An act for the relief of Pauline D. Kimbrough.

The message also announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 947) for the relief of the estate of Verentes Bent, deceased, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bills and joint resolution, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 1509. An act for the relief of Leon Oswald Dickey;

H.R. 1547. An act for the relief of T. Sgt. Walter Casey;

H.R. 1579. An act for the relief of Basile Ignatios Mavridis;

H.R. 1601. An act for the relief of Thomas A. Howe;

H.R. 1711. An act for the relief of the Galveston, Houston & Henderson Railroad Co.;

H.R. 2011. An act for the relief of Leonora Holmes Mola;

H.R. 2078. An act for the relief of Gannon Boggs;

H.R. 2290. An act for the relief of Ronald Ragnar Long;

H.R. 3096. An act for the relief of Peony Park, Inc., and others;

H.R. 3817. An act for the relief of Jose Santiago Savedra Calza;

H.R. 4120. An act for the relief of Dr. Raymond A. Vonderlehr and certain other officers of the Public Health Service;

H.R. 4242. An act for the relief of certain aliens;

H.R. 5963. An act for the relief of Ivy May Lee;

H.R. 6080. An act for the relief of Forrest E. Decker; and

H.J. Res. 353. Joint resolution to facilitate the admission into the United States of certain aliens.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (S. 902) 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, and it was signed by the Vice President.

HOUSE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

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

H.R. 1509. An act for the relief of Leon Oswald Dickey;

H.R. 1547. An act for the relief of T. Sgt. Walter Casey;

H.R. 1579. An act for the relief of Basile Ignatios Mavridis;

H.R. 1711. An act for the relief of the Galveston, Houston & Henderson Railroad Co.;

H.R. 2011. An act for the relief of Leonora Holmes Mola;

H.R. 2078. An act for the relief of Gannon Boggs;

H.R. 2290. An act for the relief of Ronald Ragnar Long;

H.R. 3096. An act for the relief of Peony Park, Inc., and others;

H.R. 3817. An act for the relief of Jose Santiago Savedra Calza;

H.R. 4120. An act for the relief of Dr. Raymond A. Vonderlehr and certain other officers of the Public Health Service;

H.R. 4242. An act for the relief of certain aliens;

H.R. 5963. An act for the relief of Ivy May Lee;

H.R. 6080. An act for the relief of Forrest E. Decker; and

H.J. Res. 353. Joint resolution to facilitate the admission into the United States of certain aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1601. An act for the relief of Thomas A. Howe; to the Committee on Finance.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

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

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business, to act on nominations on the Executive Calendar, beginning with the nominations to the National Aeronautics and Space Council.

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

INTERNATIONAL SUGAR AGREEMENT OF 1958—REMOVAL OF INJUNCTION OF SECRECY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the injunction of secrecy be removed from Executive D,

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

86th Congress, 1st session, a certified copy of the International Sugar Agreement of 1958, transmitted to the Senate today by the President, and that it be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the injunction of secrecy is removed from the agreement, and the agreement, together with the President's message of transmittal, will be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations; and the President's message will be printed in the RECORD.

The message from the President is as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
May 20, 1959.

To the Senate of the United States:

With a view to receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to accession, I transmit herewith a certified copy of the International Sugar Agreement of 1958, dated at London, December 1, 1958.

I also transmit, for the information of the Senate, the report made to me by the Acting Secretary of State explaining the purposes and provisions of the agreement.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *May 20, 1959.*

(Enclosures: (1) Report of the Acting Secretary of State; (2) Certified copy of the International Sugar Agreement of 1958.)

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following favorable report of a nomination was submitted:

By Mr. ANDERSON, from the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy:

Paul F. Foster, of Maryland, to be representative to the International Atomic Energy Agency.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no further reports of committees, the nominations on the calendar, beginning with those to the National Aeronautics and Space Council, will be stated.

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE COUNCIL

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of William A. M. Burden, of New York, to be a member of the National Aeronautics and Space Council, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH] reported the nomination; and we are glad to hear from her at this time.

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, in connection with the nomination of Mr. William A. M. Burden, I should like to observe that this gentleman appeared before the Aeronautical and Space Sciences Committee on May 19, 1959, and a hearing was held.

Mr. Burden made a statement, supplied the committee with a list of his financial holdings, and was questioned by members of the committee.

Mr. Burden brings to the Space Council a background of public service in the aviation field. He served as Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Air from 1943 to 1947; as a member of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics during the period 1942 to 1947; was Special Assistant for Research and Development to the Secretary of the Air Force during the period of 1950 to 1952; and was made a member of the National Aeronautics and Space Council, pursuant to a Presidential recess appointment made September 4, 1958.

Mr. President, the committee voted unanimously that the nomination be reported favorably, and I hope the nomination will be confirmed unanimously by the Senate.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a memorandum of biographical data in connection with the nomination of Mr. Burden.

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

BIOGRAPHICAL DATA

Name: Burden, William A. M.

Born: New York, N.Y., April 8, 1906.

Education: Bachelor of arts cum laude, Harvard, 1927; doctor of science (Honorary), Clarkson College of Technology, 1953.

Married: Margaret Livingston Partridge, February 16, 1931.

Children: William A. M. Burden III, December 14, 1931 (Harvard, 1953); married: Leslie L. Hamilton, June 15, 1951; children: William A. M. Burden IV, September 16, 1954; Wendy Lee Burden, December 18, 1955; Robert L. Burden, January 18, 1934 (Harvard, 1955); Hamilton T. Burden, May 17, 1937; Ordway P. Burden, November 20, 1944.

BUSINESS ACTIVITIES

1928–32: Brown Bros., Harriman & Co., New York, N.Y., analyst of aviation securities.

1932–39: Scudder, Stevens & Clark (investment counsel), New York, N.Y., in charge of aviation financial research.

1939–41: National Aviation Corp. (aviation investment trust), New York, N.Y., vice president and director.

1941–47: In Government service (see below).

1947–49: Smith, Barney & Co., New York, N.Y., aviation consultant.

1949– : William A. M. Burden & Co. (a New York limited partnership which is engaged in investing its own funds for its own account), New York, N.Y., general partner.

GOVERNMENT SERVICE

1941–42: Vice president, Defense Supplies Corporation (subsidiary of Reconstruction Finance Corporation) in charge of division of American Republics Aviation.

1942–43: Special Aviation Assistant to Secretary of Commerce.

1943–47: Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Air; member, National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, 1942–47; member, U.S. delegation, International Civil Aviation Conference, Chicago, 1944; chairman, U.S. delegation, First and Second Assemblies of International Civil Aviation Organization, Montreal, 1946, 1947.

1950–52: Special Assistant for Research and Development to the Secretary of the Air Force.

1958– : Member, National Aeronautics and Space Council pursuant to Presidential recess appointment made September 4, 1958.

DIRECTORSHIPS

Union Oil & Gas Corp., of Louisiana, 1932– ; chairman executive committee, 1954– ; Runnels Gas Productions Corp., subsidiary Union Offshore Corp., subsidiary. The Hanover Bank, 1940– . Cerro de Pasco Corp., 1941– ; member, policy committee, 1954– . American Metal Climax, Inc., 1949– .

Educational, civic, and certain other nonbusiness activities:

President and trustee, the Museum of Modern Art, New York, N.Y.

Governor, the Society of the New York Hospital.

Life, trustee, Columbia University; member, committee on finance; member, special committee on investments.

Director, Council on Foreign Relations, Inc.

Member of council and past president, the Institute of the Aeronautical Sciences, Inc.

Trustee, Institute for Defense Analyses.

Trustee, Foreign Service Educational Foundation (Washington, D.C.).

Chairman, advisory committee for aviation research program, Harvard School of Business Administration.

Member, visiting committee, physics department, Harvard University.

Member, visiting committee, university library, Harvard University.

Member, executive committee, program for Harvard College.

Member, visiting committee, aeronautical engineering department, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

Trustee, French Institute in the United States.

President and director, France-America Society.

Political affiliation: Republican; chairman, United Republican Finance Committee for the State of New York.

Home address: 820 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.

Office address: 630 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to this nomination?

Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Dr. John T. Rettaliata, of Illinois, to be a member of the National Aeronautics and Space Council.

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, in connection with the nomination of Dr. John T. Rettaliata, I should like to observe that he appeared before the Aeronautical and Space Sciences Committee on May 19, 1959, and a hearing was held.

Dr. Rettaliata supplied the committee with a list of his financial holdings, and was questioned by members of the committee.

Dr. Rettaliata at the present time is president of Illinois Institute of Technology. He will bring to the Space Council an extensive background in mechanical engineering. Dr. Rettaliata from 1936 to 1945 was with the Allis Chalmers Co., during which time he served as head of the calculation and development division on steam turbines and as manager of the research and gas turbine development division. He has been with the Illinois Institute of Technology since 1945, and has served as professor of mechanical engineering, consultant in mechanical engineering for the Armour Research Foundation, dean of engineering, and president.

Mr. President, the committee voted unanimously that this nomination be reported favorably to the Senate.

I hope the nomination will be confirmed unanimously by the Senate.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a memorandum of biographical data in

connection with the nomination of Dr. Rettaliata.

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

BIOGRAPHICAL INFORMATION, DR. JOHN T. RETTALIATA, PRESIDENT, ILLINOIS INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY

Born: Baltimore, Md., August 18, 1911; parents, Theodore A. and Viola (Hall) Rettaliata.

Married: Barbara Hertha Herman, October 26, 1938.

Children: Brian, March 5, 1943; Stephen, July 19, 1947; Patricia, March 13, 1951.

Education: Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, bachelor of engineering, 1932; doctor of engineering, 1936; Michigan College of Mining and Technology, Houghton, doctor of engineering (honorary), 1956; Valparaiso University, Valparaiso, Ind., doctor of science (honorary), 1959.

Honor societies: Omicron Delta Kappa, Beta Circle, Phi Eta Sigma, Pi Tau Sigma, Sigma Xi, Tau Beta Pi, Tau Omega.

Academic fraternity: Triangle.

Professional record: Baltimore College Center, Baltimore, instructor in mathematics, 1934–35, head of the department of mathematics, 1934–35; U.S. Department of Agriculture, laboratory technician, 1935; Allis-Chalmers Co., Milwaukee, head of the calculation and development division of steam-turbine department, 1936–44, manager of research and gas turbine development division, 1944–45; Illinois Institute of Technology, professor of mechanical engineering and director of mechanical engineering department, 1945–48, consultant in mechanical engineering for Armour Research Foundation of Illinois Institute of Technology; 1946–48, dean of engineering, 1948–50, vice president of academic affairs, 1950–52; president of Illinois Tech, Armour Research Foundation of Illinois Institute of Technology, and Institute of Gas Technology, 1952– .

MEMBERSHIPS AND ACTIVITIES

Professional memberships: American Association for Advancement of Science, fellow, 1946; American Society for Engineering Education, 1946– , member, Lamme award committee, 1956–60; American Society of Mechanical Engineers, 1939– , chairman of the gas turbine power division, 1948, vice president of region VI, 1950–52; Engineers Society of Milwaukee, 1940– ; Navy League of the United States, 1955– ; registered professional engineer in the State of Wisconsin; Western Society of Engineers, 1946– ; member, Washington Award Commission, 1949–52, chairman, 1956–59; member, board of direction, 1952– ; member, finance committee, 1957–58; treasurer, 1957–58; second vice president, 1958–59; president, 1959–60.

Civic memberships: Air University: member, Board of Visitors, 1955–58; chairman, Board of Visitors, 1957–58; American Council on Education, member, committee on television, 1953–57; American Foundation for Greece, board of regents, 1957; American Legion national convention, 1958, citizen's committee; Argonne National Laboratory, chairman, ad hoc committee, 1956– ; board of education, member, special schools committee, 1952– ; Chicago Central Area Committee, chairman, planning and research committee, 1956– ; Chicago Plan Commission, member, 1957–62; All-Chicago Citizens' Committee, member, 1956– ; Chicago Educational Television Association, member, board of trustees, chairman, educational advisory board, 1953– , member, program policy committee, 1955– ; Chicago Museum of Science and Industry, trustee, 1959– ; Crerar Library, member, board of trustees, 1952– , first vice president, 1953– , chairman, committee on books, 1953– ; the Foundation for Economic Education, Inc., trustee, 1957–58; Governor's Committee on Metropolitan Water and Sanitation, 1954; Hospital Council of Metropolitan Chicago, member, 1957– ; Illinois Society for Medical Research, member, advisory council, 1953– ; Junior Achievement of Chicago, member, advisory council, 1952– , member, advisory board, 1956– ; Lumbermens Mutual Casualty Co., member, Midwest advisory board, 1957– ; Mayor Daley's cultural facilities survey committee, 1958; Metropolitan Housing and Planning Council of Chicago, member board of governors, 1952–58; National Association of Manufacturers, member, education advisory council, 1954 (3-year appointment); National Conference of Christians and Jews, 1952, chairman, educational committee of 1953 Brotherhood Week, State chairman of 1955 Brotherhood Week; National Italian-American Civic League, member, honorary board of trustees, 1952– ; National Scholarship Service and Fund for Negro Students, member, advisory board of college presidents, 1952– ; Newspaper Carriers' Association of Chicago, member, scholarship advisory committee, 1952– ; George M. Pullman Educational Foundation, 1952– ; Railroad Terminal Authority, 1957– ; Rotary Club of Chicago, member, jury of awards, 1953, 1955, 1957; the World Book Encyclopedia, member, editorial advisory board, 1956–59.

Directorships: American Motorists Insurance Co., 1957– ; American Steel Foundries, 1954– ; the Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway Co., 1957– ; Brunswick-Balke-Collender Co., director, 1956– , bonus committee, 1957– ; Chicago National Bank, 1954– ; DuKane Corp., 1957– ; First Federal Savings & Loan Association of Chicago, 1952– ; International Harvester Co., 1958– ; Peabody Coal Co., 1953; S. C. Johnson & Son, Inc., 1958– ; United Wallpaper, Inc., 1956– ; Western Electric Co., Inc., 1957– .

Special awards: Compiled report on gas turbines for special applications, National Science Foundation, Washington, 1940; American Society of Mechanical Engineers, junior award, 1941; special gas turbine award, ASME, 1951; citation of honor, Indiana Technical College, 1958; Jesuit Centennial Citation, Loyola University, 1957; Pi Tau Sigma gold medal award, 1942; studied British developments in jet propulsion, U.S. Navy, Bureau of Aeronautics, 1943; study and investigation of steam turbines developed by Germany for hydrogen peroxide submarine operations, U.S. Navy, Bureau of Ships, 1945; World War II certificate of commendation from U.S. Navy, 1945; National Conference of Christians and Jews, Chicago group citation, 1955.

Clubs: Beverly Country Club; Chicago Club; Chicago Commonwealth Club; Commercial Club of Chicago; Economic Club of Chicago, second vice president and member board of directors, president, 1957–58; Executives' Club of Chicago, member of executive committee and program committee, director, 1957–58; Tavern Club, member of the Governor's membership committee; University Club; Wayfarers' Club.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I concur wholeheartedly in what the very able Senator from Maine has said in regard to these two very fine nominations. Yesterday the committee—as the Senator from Maine has stated—conferred with these gentlemen personally; and they were subjected to extensive questioning. At the conclusion of the questioning, the committee voted unanimously to report the nominations favorably to the Senate.

I commend the Senator from Maine for the statements she has made; and I think it fair to say that I believe the two nominees are very able men. The entire committee feels as does the distinguished Senator from Maine regarding these nominations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to this nomination?

Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

NAVY AND MARINE CORPS NOMINATIONS PLACED ON THE VICE PRESIDENT'S DESK

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Navy and the Marine Corps which had been placed on the Vice President's desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, these 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.

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.

EXECUTIVE AND LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, there are three nominations about which I should like to speak briefly: The nomination of Mr. C. Douglas Dillon, of New Jersey, to be Under Secretary of State; the nomination of Mr. Strauss, to be Secretary of Commerce; and the nomination of Mr. George M. Johnson, of California, to be a member of the Commission on Civil Rights.

A short time ago, following action by the Foreign Relations Committee, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] asked me not to bring up by motion the nomination of Mr. Dillon for a few days, until the Senator from Louisiana could prepare material which he would like to present to the Senate during consideration of the nomination by the Senate. I asked the Senator from Louisiana how long he thought it would take to assemble the material; and he expressed the hope that he could do so within a week or 10 days.

So I hope that sometime early next week the Senate can proceed to consideration of the nomination of Mr. Dillon.

I am informed that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has acted on the nomination of Mr. Strauss, to be Secretary of Commerce. In the committee, there is a very close division on that question; and there was a very close vote. I am also informed that the hearings have been ordered printed, and that the report will be available the early part of next week. As soon as the hearings are available, I shall wish to study them thoroughly, as I know all other Members of the Senate will likewise wish to do, in order to make sure

that equity and justice are done. When the hearings are available, I shall arrange with the minority leader to bring up that nomination by motion at as early a date as possible.

The same will apply to the nomination of Mr. George M. Johnson to be a member of the Commission on Civil Rights.

I should like to inform the Senate that we shall give Senators adequate notice in connection with both the Dillon nomination and the Strauss nomination, once the reports and the hearings are available.

The Treasury-Post Office appropriation bill, I am informed, is likely to be reported tomorrow by the Appropriations Committee. Under the rule, we shall have to wait 3 days before taking it up. But I should like to have all Members know that the committee expects to report that bill tomorrow. If any Senators have objections or suggestions which they would like to pass on to the committee, I know it will be glad to consider them.

The same is true of the District of Columbia appropriation bill. It is understood that it will be reported tomorrow; and, under the rule, it, too, will have to lie over for 3 days.

But I should like to have all Senators on notice that although we have received some of the appropriation bills a little later than usual, we shall proceed with dispatch to act on them as quickly as possible; and we shall hope to dispose of those bills and of as much other business as possible the early part of next week.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield to my friend from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. With respect to the nomination of George M. Johnson to be a member of the Commission on Civil Rights, some slight question arose with respect to the nominee, but on Monday of this week the Judiciary Committee, or at least a very substantial majority of it, fully satisfied itself with respect to the nominee in question. Consequently the nomination was reported to the Senate by the full committee. There is no disposition to hurry action on the nomination. Members of the committee have some other questions on some matter they wish to go into which bears on the nominee.

I can say, in concurrence with what the majority leader has said on the Dillon nomination, that the distinguished Senator from Louisiana had some concern that there might be an endeavor to rush the consideration of the nomination, and that he could not adequately prepare the case he wanted to make. I gave him assurances on the floor of the Senate that, so far as the minority is concerned, there certainly would be no effort to hurry action on the nomination. We are content to bide our time so the Senator will have an opportunity to present his case fully and completely.

I am fully aware of the fact that there was a rather voluminous record made in the Strauss case and that it will take some time to analyze it and prepare the necessary reports. We fully appreciate that a little time will be required before the nomination can be presented to the Senate for action.

I should like to ask the majority leader a question. In addition to the District of Columbia appropriation bill and the Treasury-Post Office appropriation bill, I thought there would be a disposition to take up the wheat bill and the tobacco bill, which come from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. The majority leader may have made reference to those bills while I was off the floor.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. We have previously informed the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry that we wanted to be ready to take up those two bills. The international health joint resolution is pending before the Senate. There will be a call of the calendar. I am not informed at this moment what the thought of the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry is concerning the wheat bill, but we need to take early action.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I gather, then, there will be a call of the calendar, and the Senate will then resume the consideration of the international health joint resolution.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. There will be a call of the calendar; then the Senate will proceed to the further consideration of the international health joint resolution; and after that we will determine what business the Senate will proceed to consider from that point.

I do not anticipate that we shall take up the appropriation bills, if there is any objection, before the latter part of the week, if then. I rather think we will take them up the early part of next week. I am informed the agriculture appropriation bill should be ready about May 28.

Appropriation bills, as the Senator knows, have the highest priority. As soon as the rule has been complied with, we intend to call them up by motion.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

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

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

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 403 OF HOUSING AMENDMENTS OF 1955, RELATING TO TITLE INSURANCE ON CERTAIN HOUSING

A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Defense, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 403 of the Housing Amendments of 1955 so as to authorize an alternative procedure which may be utilized in lieu of title insurance on military family housing, and for other purposes (with an accompaning paper); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT ON REVIEW OF USE OF CONTRACTOR-FURNISHED DRAWINGS FOR PROCUREMENT PURPOSES, AIR MATERIEL COMMAND

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the review of the use of contractor-furnished drawings for procurement purposes, Air Materiel Command, Department of the Air Force, dated May 1959 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON EXAMINATION OF PROCUREMENT OF SPARE PARTS FROM BOEING AIRPLANE CO., SEATTLE, WASH.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the examination of procurement of spare parts from Boeing Airplane Co., Seattle, Wash., under Department of the Air Force contracts AF 33 (600)-22119 and AF 33 (600)-28223, dated May 1959 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

AUTHORIZATION OF USE OF FUNDS ARISING FROM JUDGMENT IN FAVOR OF THE COEUR D'ALENE INDIAN TRIBE

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the use of funds arising from a judgment in favor of the Coeur d'Alene Indian Tribe, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

ELIMINATION OF TERMINATION DATE FOR NONQUOTA IMMIGRANT VISAS TO CERTAIN ALIEN ORPHANS

A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to eliminate the date of termination of the provisions of law authorizing issuance of nonquota immigrant visas to certain alien orphans, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MILITARY PERSONNEL AND CIVILIAN EMPLOYEES' CLAIMS ACT OF 1955

A letter from the Administrator, Federal Aviation Agency, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the settlement of claims of military personnel and civilian employees of the Federal Government for damage to, or loss, destruction, capture, or abandonment of, personal property occurring incident to their service, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

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

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 Colorado; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"SENATE JOINT MEMORIAL 12

"Joint memorial memorializing the Congress of the United States to approve the Curecanti unit of the Upper Colorado storage project, and urging the appropriation of funds by the said Congress for initiation of the construction of the project at the earliest possible time

"Whereas the Secretary of the Interior of the United States has requested the official

opinion of the State of Colorado concerning the construction of the Curecanti storage unit of the Colorado River storage project; and

"Whereas this opinion was requested of the State of Colorado because of the adverse report on the project by the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife of the Department of the Interior, which declared that sport fishery would be damaged by said construction; and

"Whereas this conclusion of the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife on behalf of preserving stream fishing and wildlife habitat does in fact control, subordinate, and deny other uses, such as those for domestic, municipal, irrigation, industrial, and hydroelectric power purposes; and

"Whereas the fishing and all-family recreation facilities that will result from the Curecanti project will far outstrip the existing fishing, both in terms of numbers of fishermen accomodated and in public accessibility to that fishing; and

"Whereas with full knowledge of the results of the construction of fishing and wildlife values, the Curecanti storage unit project has been earlier approved by the Colorado Department of Natural Resources, the Colorado Game and Fish Commission, the Colorado Water Conservation Board, the Colorado Water Congress, and numerous agencies and citizens' organizations of the Gunnison River Basin; and

"Whereas a report of the National Park Service and the U.S. Forest Service supports the view that there will be a large increase in the recreational use of this water after the construction of the Curecanti unit: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the 42d General Assembly of the State of Colorado, the House of Representatives concurring herein, That this general assembly, as a matter of official policy, urges and recommends the approval of the Curecanti storage unit of the Colorado River storage project, notwithstanding the recommendation of the Bureau of the Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, and memorializes the Congress of the United States to appropriate funds for the initiation of construction thereon at the earliest possible time; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this memorial be transmitted to the President of the United States, the President of the Senate of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, Members of the Congress from the State of Colorado, and to the Honorable Fred A Seaton, Secretary of the Interior of the United States."

A resolution of the Legislature of the State of Nebraska; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"LEGISLATIVE RESOLUTION 34

"Resolution memorializing Congress to enact legislation relative to the establishment of a soil and water research laboratory in the Great Plains States

"Whereas there is a tremendous need for additional research in the conservation and development of the soil and water resources of the Great Plains region of the United States of America; and

"Whereas the conservation and development of these two basic resources will do much to stabilize the economy of this vast area, which in the past has been ravaged by drought, duststorms, and floods; and

"Whereas the establishment of a major soil and water research laboratory located in the Great Plains area has been recommended by the Great Plains Agricultural Council, the National Association of Soil Conservation Districts, and a Soil and Water Research Facility Committee appointed by the Secretary of Agriculture of the United States of America; and

"Whereas there are presently pending before the Congress of the United States of America several bills authorizing the establishment of a soil and water research laboratory in the Great Plains area: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the members of the Nebraska Legislature in the 69th session assembled:

"1. That the Legislature of the State of Nebraska is wholeheartedly in support of the establishment of additional facilities for an expanded program of research in soil and water conservation in the Great Plains area;

"2. That the President and the Vice President of the United States and the representatives in Congress of the United States be hereby urged and requested to take all necessary action to provide such assistance as may be necessary to establish a staff, equip, and maintain one major and strategically located laboratory in the Great Plains States to conduct research in soil and water conservation that is not possible or practical through existing programs;

"3. That certified copies of this resolution be promptly transmitted to the President and Vice President of the United States; Secretary of the U.S. Department of Agriculture; President of the U.S. Senate; Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States; chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry of the U.S. Senate; chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture; chairman of the U.S. Senate Appropriations Committee; chairman of the U.S. Senate Agricultural Subcommittee on Appropriations; chairman of the House Committee on Appropriations; chairman of the House Agricultural Subcommittee on Appropriations; U.S. Senator ROMAN L. HRUSKA; U.S. Senator CARL T. CURTIS; U.S. Representative PHIL WEAVER; U.S. Representative GLENN CUNNINGHAM; U.S. Representative DONALD F. MCGINLEY; and U.S. Representative LAWRENCE BROCK."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Illinois; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

"HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 26

"Whereas the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States are now considering legislation to establish a Youth Conservation Corps; and

"Whereas among the most pressing and depressing problems of today are the rise in unemployment, rising relief costs and increase of juvenile delinquency; and

"Whereas it has been established that a Youth Conservation Corps would be a most important resource of combating all of these three undesirable phases of our national life; and

"Whereas such a Youth Conservation Corps could achieve essential public improvements, worth more than the cost entailed; and

"Whereas the work most needed to be done generally lies in national forests, in national parks, or in such projects as flood prevention and prevention of soil erosion, far removed from the cities or States where most of the youths enrolled for such program now reside; and

"Whereas State and local governmental units, including Illinois, have camp programs for youths already under sentence by the courts, while the Federal Youth Conservation Corps should provide only for voluntary enrollment: There, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the 71st General Assembly of the State of Illinois, the Senate concurring herein, That we respectfully request and recommend that the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States give favorable consideration to the passage of bills creating a Youth Conservation Corps which would provide aid and assistance to youths who are in need of such opportunities through the development of natural resources; and be it further

"Resolved, That suitable copies of this preamble and resolution be forwarded by the secretary of state to the President of the Senate of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to the Senators and Congressmen representing the State of Illinois in the Congress of the United States, and to every member of the Labor and Public Welfare Committee of the U.S. Senate, and of the Education and Labor Committee of the U.S. House of Representatives.

"Adopted by the house, April 21, 1959.

"PAUL POWELL,
"Speaker, House of Representatives.

"Concurred in by the senate, May 7, 1959.

"JOHN WM. CHAPMAN,
"President of the Senate."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of New Mexico; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

"HOUSE JOINT MEMORIAL 13

"Joint memorial memorializing the President of the United States, the Secretary of the Interior; the Speaker of the House and the President of the Senate of the Congress of the United States; the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service; and the Commissioner of Indian Affairs to take notice of the petition of the Zuni Tribe that H.R. 3342 now pending in the House is a measure essential to the health and well-being of the Zuni tribe; and urging the New Mexico delegation in Congress to continue their efforts to secure for the Zuni people the facilities that their health requires

"Whereas the Public Health Service undertook in 1957 at the request of the Zuni tribe of New Mexico a review of health facilities and needs of the tribe and found that a high rate of gastroenteric diseases such as diarrhea has prevailed in the Pueblo of Zuni for years; and

"Whereas a Zuni sewer bill pending before the 85th Congress was permitted to die upon the close of the Congress to the detriment of the people of the Pueblo of Zuni and of New Mexico; and

"Whereas a new bill, H.R. 3342, to achieve the result sought has been introduced by the Honorable THOMAS G. MORRIS, Member of Congress: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved that this legislature does support and concur fully in the effort of the Zuni people to obtain the sanitary facilities they so badly require, and it therefore respectfully urges the proper officials of the Congress and the executive branch of the Government of the United States to take prompt action to alleviate the poor sanitary conditions of the Zuni Pueblo; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this memorial be delivered to the Honorable Dwight D. Eisenhower, President of the United States; the Honorable Fred A. Seaton, Secretary of the Department of the Interior; the Honorable Glenn L. Emmons, Commissioner, Bureau of Indian Affairs; the Honorable LeRoy E. Burney, Surgeon General, Public Health Service; the Honorable Richard M. Nixon, President of the Senate of the U.S. Congress; and the Honorable Sam Rayburn, Speaker of the House of Representatives of the U.S. Congress; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this memorial be delivered to the Honorable DENNIS CHAVEZ and the Honorable CLINTON P. ANDERSON, U.S. Senators from New Mexico; and the Honorable JOE M. MONTOYA and the Honorable THOMAS G. MORRIS, Representative at Large from New Mexico.

"ED V. MEAD,
"President of the Senate.

"MACK EASLEY,
"Speaker, House of Representatives.

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

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

Two joint resolutions of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 17

"Resolution relative to legislation concerning wilderness areas

"Whereas it has come to the attention of the legislature that there is pending before the Congress of the United States legislation whereby the Congress would give sanction to the designation as wilderness of millions of acres of federally owned and controlled public lands; and

"Whereas it appears that such legislation could conservatively encompass at least 17,400,000 acres of such land in the State of California, constituting 17 percent of the total area of the State, in the designation of which the State government would have no say whatsoever; and

"Whereas the continued growth and prosperity of the State of California and other Western States depend on the development of Federal lands within the States on a multiple-use basis; and

"Whereas such legislation could impair present and future payments to the State of California and the other Western States in lieu of taxes on Federal land, now amounting, in the case of the State of California, to the sum of $8,865,673: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate and the Assembly of the State of California, jointly, That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully memorializes the Congress of the United States to withhold all legislative action sanctioning the designation of additional wilderness of vast areas of Federal lands until the National Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission can present its recommendations on an orderly procedure for future beneficial use of all national recreation lands, including wilderness areas; and be it further

"Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate is hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States, to the U.S. Secretary of the Interior, and to the U.S. Secretary of Agriculture.

"ASSEMBLY JOINT RESOLUTION 16

"Resolution relative to the Auburn Dam on the American River

"Whereas there is presently pending before the Congress of the United States legislation introduced by Senators CLAIR ENGLE and THOMAS H. KUCHEL and by Congressmen HAROLD T. JOHNSON and JOHN E. MOSS, JR., to authorize the multiple-purpose Auburn Dam on the American River above Folsom Lake for construction by the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation, as a part of the Central Valley Project; and

"Whereas the multiple-purpose project of the Auburn Dam will furnish additional water which can be used in the American River watershed, the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta region, the San Joaquin Valley, and areas to the south; and

"Whereas the project will produce additional electric power which can be employed to pump water to areas of deficiency in the statewide water program; and

"Whereas the proposed Auburn Dam is a part of the California Water Plan and the project as outlined in the legislation would complement the State's efforts to meet the water requirements of California's rapidly expanding population: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Assembly and the Senate of the State of California, jointly, That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully memorializes the President and the Congress of the United States to approve, as soon as possible, the legislation now pending to authorize the Auburn Dam; and be it further

"Resolved, That the chief clerk of the assembly is hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States, to W. A. Dexheimer, Commissioner of Reclamation, to Harvey O. Banks, Director of the Department of Water Resources of the State of California, and to B. W. Cassidy, Chairman of the Auburn Dam Project Committee.

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 6

"Resolution relative to more than two terms for the President of the United States

"Whereas the 22d amendment to the Constitution of the United States now prohibits a person from being elected more than twice to the Office of President of the United States, or from being elected more than once if he has served for more than 2 years of a term to which some other person was elected President; and

"Whereas the holder of an elective public office is deprived of much, if not most, of his political effectiveness, when it is definitely known that he will not be a candidate for reelection; and

"Whereas consequently, the 22d amendment to the Constitution of the United States materially and substantially reduces the political effectiveness and national leadership of the President of the United States during his second term in office; and

"Whereas the undesirability of this mandatory restriction on the tenure in office of the President of the United States has been publicly recognized by the present incumbent of that office, Dwight D. Eisenhower, who is the first President to be so restricted in his tenure of office, and

"Whereas the two-term tradition started by our illustrious first President, George Washington, was followed in practice for over 140 years and provided an effective discretionary safeguard against a President holding office for too long a time; and

"Whereas it should therefore be left to the electorate in their political wisdom to decide whether or not in a particular instance the two-term tradition should be followed and the President of the United States should be free to seek reelection to more than two terms, if he so desired: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate and the Assembly of the State of California, jointly, That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully memorializes the Congress of the United States to commence proceedings for the repeal of the 22d amendment; and be it further

"Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate is hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from this State in the Congress of the United States."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Public Works:

"SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 14

"Resolution relative to Federal highway legislation

"Whereas the California Legislature has previously urged the enactment of Federal highway legislation substantially as set forth in the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956 except for the provision limiting the apportionments for each fiscal year for the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways to the amounts available in the highway trust fund as provided in section 209(g) of the act approved June 29, 1956; and

"Whereas it now appears that in the absence of Federal legislation during the current session, due to said provision, there will be no funds available for apportionment for expenditure upon the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways during the fiscal year commencing July 1, 1960, and ending June 30, 1961, and only a very small amount would be available for the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways during the succeeding fiscal year; and

"Whereas as a part of its long-range planning the Division of Highways of the Department of Public Works of the State of California has designed and prepared plans and specifications for a toll bridge spanning Carquinez Strait, and approaches, connecting the cities of Martinez and Benicia, certain of the approaches being included in said National System of Interstate and Defense Highways; and

"Whereas the California Toll Bridge Authority has authorized the issuance of, and is in a position to offer for sale, revenue bonds in an amount sufficient to finance the construction of said bridge and certain minimum approaches, no portion of the cost of which is to be paid by the Federal Government; and

"Whereas in order to gain the fullest and most effective use of said bridge it is essential that the approaches constituting a part of said National System of Interstate and Defense Highways and which will be financed by State and Federal highway funds, and not from bond proceeds, be constructed concurrently with the construction of said bridge; and

"Whereas this project is an outstanding example of the manner in which the orderly prosecution of work already planned will be disrupted by a failure to provide for the continuance of progress on the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways; and

"Whereas the completion of said bridge and all approaches thereto is a matter of vital concern to the people of the State of California: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate and the Assembly of the State of California, jointly, That the Congress is urged to provide for the continuance of the Federal-aid highway program as set forth in the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956 with the exception of the provision contained in section 209(g) thereof, including the approval of the cost estimates submitted to the Congress by the Bureau of Public Roads of the Department of Commerce as a basis for the apportionment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, to the end that the Benicia-Martinez Bridge project, as well as all other projects now ready for construction, will not be delayed and the orderly prosecution of planning and construction of the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways will not be disrupted; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of the senate is directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, the chairmen of the appropriate committees of the Congress, and to each Senator and Representative from the State of California in the Congress of the United States."

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of California; to the Committee on the District of Columbia:

"HOUSE RESOLUTION 238

"Resolution relative to home rule for the District of Columbia

"Whereas there are 826,000 Federal taxpaying residents in the District of Columbia, our Nation's Capital, who have long lacked

any voice in the government of the District of Columbia in which they live; and

"Whereas the taxpaying residents of the District of Columbia are without even a voteless delegate to represent them in the Halls of Congress; and

"Whereas the U.S. Senate has, during the last decade, four times passed legislation granting home rule to the residents of the District of Columbia; and

"Whereas such legislation has four times been killed in the District of Columbia Committee and the Rules Committee of the House of Representatives; and

"Whereas it is a matter of grave injustice to deny American citizens the right even to govern themselves as to matters of local interest, and particularly so when they are obliged to bear the costs of such government: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Assembly of the State of California, That this body favors legislation to grant home rule to the District of Columbia; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That this body urges the members of the California delegation in the House of Representatives of the United States to sign a discharge petition to bring a bill granting home rule to the District of Columbia onto the floor of the House of Representatives in the event that such a bill is again approved by the Senate and bottled up in either the District of Columbia Committee or the Rules Committee of the House of Representatives; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the chief clerk of the assembly is directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on Finance:

"HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 136

"Concurrent resolution requesting the Congress of the United States of America to amend sections 501 through 504 of the 1958 amendments to the Social Security Act (Public Law 85-840) to permit the Territory of Hawaii to again obtain the full benefits of the Social Security Act

"Whereas sections 501 through 504 of the 1958 amendments to the Social Security Act exclude both Hawaii and Alaska from the equalization formula based on per capita income provisions which are applied to the 48 States in determining the amount of Federal funds which would be available for meeting State public assistance expenditures; and

"Whereas it is our understanding that Alaska's exclusion was based on the fact that there is insufficient data on the per capita income in Alaska to include that jurisdiction but the necessary per capita income data is available for Hawaii; and

"Whereas Hawaii was included in section 601 of the said Public Law 85-840 along with the 48 States so far as the provision of said type of matching formula is concerned but Alaska was not so included; and

"Whereas it has been determined that the said exclusion of Hawaii from the subject provisions applying to the 48 States is resulting in a loss to the Territory of about $20,000 per month in Federal funds: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the House of Representatives of the 30th Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, the Senate concurring*, That the Congress of the United States be hereby respectfully requested to amend sections 501 through 504 (public assistance) of the 1958 amendments to the Social Security Act (Public Law 85-840) to provide for the inclusion of Hawaii within the equalization formula based on per capita income, which is applied to the 48 States, during those periods when the Commissioner of Social Security finds that Hawaii's per capita income is below that of the continental United States; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That certified copies of this concurrent resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States of America, to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, to the Secretary of the Interior and to the Delegate to Congress from Hawaii."

A resolution adopted by the Board of County Commissioners, of Pinellas County, Clearwater, Fla., favoring the enactment of legislation to provide funds for commencement of the West Coast Intracoastal Waterway from the Caloosahatchee River to the Anclote River, Fla.; to the Committee on Appropriations.

The petition of Lillian Burnette, of Marissa, Ill., relating to the repeal of the cabaret tax, and so forth; to the Committee on Finance.

The petition of Ernest L. Garrett, of Thurmond, W. Va., relating to unemployment; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

A resolution adopted by the Board of Education, Whittier, Calif., protesting against Federal aid to education; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION OF SOUTH CAROLINA LEGISLATURE

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and the senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], I present for appropriate reference, a concurrent resolution of the Legislature of South Carolina, memorializing Congress to remove the wartime excise taxes on telegraphic service.

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

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION MEMORIALIZING CONGRESS TO REMOVE THE WARTIME EXCISE TAXES ON TELEGRAPHIC SERVICE

Whereas in 1941 as an emergency wartime measure Congress imposed a 10 percent excise tax on all telegrams for the purpose of supporting the war effort and to discourage the use of telegraphic service during this emergency; and

Whereas telegraphic service has become an essential part of our economy and social life and under no circumstances can it be considered a luxury item tax as such; and

Whereas this tax stands out alone in that other household and business necessities, including electricity, water, and gas are not taxed; and

Whereas placing this high excise tax on such a necessity of life results in the taxation of those citizens who can least afford to pay in the same manner as those of unlimited financial means; and

Whereas the wartime emergency for which this tax was imposed and the restriction of the use of the telegraphic service has long since passed: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the senate (the house of representatives concurring), That the Congress of the United States be memorialized to remove the unfair and unequitable excise tax heretofore imposed upon the telegraphic service and that the tax be removed during the present session of Congress; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded by the clerk of the senate to the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to the two Senators and each Member of Congress from this State.

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

RESOLUTION OF NEW HAMPSHIRE MEDICAL, LEGAL, AND DENTAL CONFERENCE

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I present, for appropriate reference, a resolution adopted at a joint meeting of the New Hampshire Medical Society, the New Hampshire Bar Association, and the New Hampshire Dental Society, at Concord, N.H., May 9, 1959. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution may be printed in the RECORD.

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

RESOLUTION FORMALLY ADOPTED BY UNANIMOUS VOTE AT THE NEW HAMPSHIRE MEDICAL, LEGAL, DENTAL CONFERENCE, HELD AT THE NEW HAMPSHIRE HIGHWAY HOTEL, CONCORD, N.H., SATURDAY, MAY 9

On motion of former U.S. Senator Robert W. Upton, the convention gave full approval to this statement:

"*Resolved*, That the members of this conference hereby endorse the Keogh-Simpson bill, so-called, and favor the early enactment of this bill, or a similar measure, by the present Congress; and further

"*Resolved*, That our U.S. Senators BRIDGES and COTTON, and Senator BYRD, chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, be informed of the action taken here today, and also that this resolution reflects the unanimous sentiment of this conference."

CLINTON R. MULLINS, M.D.,
Conference Chairman.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

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

S. Res. 115. Resolution to authorize studies as to the effectiveness of present governmental organization and procedures for the development and execution of national policy for survival in the contest with world communism (Rept. No. 302).

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

S.J. Res. 69. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to the equal rights for men and women (Rept. No. 303).

REPORT ENTITLED "BUILDING FOR MUSEUM OF HISTORY AND TECHNOLOGY" (S. REPT. NO. 301)

Mr. ANDERSON, from the Joint Congressional Committee on Construction of a Building for a Museum of History and Technology for the Smithsonian Institution, pursuant to section 4 of Public Law 106, 84th Congress, submitted a report entitled "Building for Museum of History and Technology," which was ordered to be printed.

BILLS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. WILEY:

S. 2004. A bill to eliminate the date of termination of the provisions of law authorizing issuance of nonquota immigrant visas to certain alien orphans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

By Mr. WILEY (by request):

S. 2005. A bill to amend the War Claims Act of 1948, as amended, to provide compensation for certain World War II losses; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Texas (for himself and Mr. YARBOROUGH):

S. 2006. A bill for the relief of Dr. Wen Jung Chiu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

S. 2007. A bill to amend the National Defense Education Act of 1958 with respect to the determination of amounts to be paid as fellowship stipends under such act; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. SCOTT:

S. 2008. A bill for the relief of Carmen Gallardo Trejo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. 2009. A bill to assist voluntary nonprofit associations offering prepaid health service programs to secure necessary facilities and equipment through long-term, interest-bearing loans; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

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

By Mr. NEUBERGER (by request):

S. 2010. A bill to save and preserve, for the public use and benefit, a portion of the remaining undeveloped shoreline area of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

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

By Mr. SYMINGTON:

S. 2011. A bill to permit the transmission as third- or fourth-class mail of medical prescriptions with written or printed instructions for the use thereof; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

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

S. 2012. A bill to amend the Trading With the Enemy Act to provide for the divesting of certain interests in estates and trusts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

By Mr. MAGNUSON (by request):

S. 2013. A bill to amend section 511(h) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, in order to extend the time for commitment of construction reserve funds; 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. LONG (for himself and Mr. MCCARTHY):

S. 2014. A bill to clarify and amend the Capper-Volstead Act (42 Stat. 388, 7 U.S.C. 291–292), and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

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

By Mr. LONG (for himself and Mr. ELLENDER):

S. 2015. A bill authorizing the modification of the existing project for Red River below Denison Dam—Levees and Bank Stabilization, Texas, Oklahoma, Arkansas, and Louisiana; to the Committee on Public Works.

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

By Mr. CLARK:

S. 2016. A bill to provide for the addition of certain property in Philadelphia, Pa., to Independence National Historical Park; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CLARK (for himself and Mr. SCOTT):

S. 2017. A bill to provide for the free entry of certain stained glass windows for use in St. Mark's Seminary, Erie, Pa.; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. SYMINGTON (for himself and Mr. HENNINGS):

S. 2018. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, section 2667, to direct the Secretaries of the military departments to lease property for public school use without the reservation of monetary consideration therefor; to the Committee on Armed Services.

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

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

S. 2019. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain public lands in the State of Nevada to the Colorado River Commission of Nevada acting for the State of Nevada; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BEALL:

S. 2020. A bill to provide for the defense of suits against employees of the government of the District of Columbia arising out of their operation of vehicles in the scope of their employment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey:

S. 2021. A bill for the relief of Irene Milios; and

S. 2022. A bill for the relief of Lily Ang; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

EXPRESSION OF SENSE OF CONGRESS AGAINST DISCHARGE OF CERTAIN SEWAGE INTO SOURCES OF PUBLIC WATER IN WASHINGTON METROPOLITAN AREA

Mr. BIBLE submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 37); which was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that no treated or untreated sewage from the facilities of the public airport authorized to be constructed under the provisions of the Act entitled "An Act to authorize the construction, protection, operation, and maintenance of a public airport in or in the vicinity of the District of Columbia", approved September 7, 1950 (64 Stat. 770), should be discharged into any sources of public water supplies in the metropolitan area.

NONQUOTA IMMIGRANT VISAS FOR CERTAIN ALIEN ORPHANS

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to eliminate the date of termination of the provisions of law authorizing issuance of nonquota immigrant visas to certain alien orphans, and for other purposes.

Among the happiest letters I have received in recent days are those from American citizens who became the adopting parents of children brought from other countries. There are many American couples, childless or with children of their own, who are eager to care for deserted children and can provide them with good homes, but find it difficult to obtain such children in this country.

Within the past 10 years, more than 10,000 children have been admitted to this country to join American families. Experience has shown that orphans admitted under earlier special legislation have successfully adjusted to American family life.

The present law exempting such children from the immigration quotas expires on June 30.

The purpose of the bill I am introducing is to provide permanent authority for nonquota immigrant visas for such children. This bill strengthens the provisions of the law that existed and extends to children adopted abroad safeguards similar to those which now exist for children adopted in this country. Such provisions should eliminate any abuses which may have existed in the past.

An American couple wishing to secure a visa for a child adopted abroad would have to give assurances satisfactory to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare that the child will be well and properly cared for in a suitable home.

Also, a nonquota visa may not be issued to admit children to this country for adoption unless assurances have been given that they will be properly cared for and preadoption requirements, if any, of the State in which the child is to live, have been met.

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

The bill (S. 2004) to eliminate the date of termination of the provisions of law authorizing issuance of nonquota immigrant visas to certain alien orphans, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. WILEY, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

HEALTH SERVICES FACILITIES ACT

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, a constant preoccupation for many Americans today is how to pay doctor bills. Countless Americans also face the community problem, particularly in rural America, of how to find a doctor even if the means of paying the bills are available.

For this reason, I again introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to assist voluntary nonprofit, prepaid health service associations by providing for long-term, interest bearing loans. I firmly believe that this proposal can and should receive favorable action by the 86th Congress.

All over America there have recently been developing the institutions of prepaid health services and the group prac-

tice of medicine. All over our Nation there are American citizens who have found by experience that they can accomplish in a voluntary group what they cannot accomplish individually if they pool their potential need for medical care and agree to prepay the cost of that care through a medical fund.

The State of Minnesota has been the home of many such prepaid services operated on a group and cooperative basis. I have, in recent years, discussed the question of medical care with many of my fellow citizens. They tell me that there are two prerequisites for an effective and well-operated voluntary health program. The first is the need to establish a modern medical office and laboratory which will induce physicians to locate in the community where the citizens need and desire medical service. The second is the necessity to obtain a community pool of funds, derived from prepayments, which will insure adequate income for the physicians in bad times, as well as in good times.

Modern medicine is a very complicated matter. Good facilities for the doctor's workshop are essential. When such facilities are not available, it is difficult to induce good physicians to come to a community to practice medicine. In a number of smaller communities and in a number of large ones, too, adequate medical facilities are simply not available. Neither are minimum hospital facilities available to care for minor medical and surgical cases.

Six years ago, on December 18, 1952, President Truman's Commission on the Health Needs of the Nation reported the results of their intensive study. One of their recommendations was that "Federal loans be made to local organizations desiring to institute prepayment plans associated with group practice, for the purpose of encouraging the establishment of group practice facilities." That is the object of the proposed legislation I have introduced since the 81st Congress and which I introduce again today.

Mr. President, my bill provides that if a group of people in a community where health facilities are inadequate will get together to form a voluntary health plan organization and be prepared to assume the financial responsibility for working out their own problem, then they may apply for low interest, repayable loans from the Surgeon General—under the supervision of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare—to enable them to finance the facilities which their community requires.

This is the essence of my bill and is the essence of voluntary association. My basic aim is to encourage groups of people to take direct responsibility for the solution of their health care problems. The plan which these people develop must, of course, be sound, and warrant the approval of the Surgeon General.

The successful operation of this bill would attract doctors to areas where they are needed and would make it easier for the American people to pay their medical bills. It would bring health facilities to American people just as the principles of cooperative voluntary association brought electricity to rural America.

Voluntary association is the foundation of a democratic society. We are a nation of joiners. Our citizens belong to churches, Rotary Clubs, women's organizations, trade unions, junior chambers of commerce, Knights of Columbus, sewing circles—indeed, to many thousands of religious, fraternal, political, and social organizations. This is what creates the democratic spirit in our country. The process of voluntary association is the essence of freedom. A good government is one which stimulates that kind of association.

If freedom and democracy survive today's crisis, it will, in my judgment, be due primarily to the vigor of democratic people directing their own efforts through voluntary organizations for the solution of their pressing day-to-day problems. The partnership of government with people acting through voluntary associations is the inspiration of practical democracy.

Through bills such as the one I introduce today, we can apply this principle as we seek to solve the health needs of the American people.

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

The bill (S. 2009) to assist voluntary nonprofit associations offering prepaid health service programs to secure necessary facilities and equipment through long-term, interest-bearing loans, introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

ACQUISITION OF SELECTED NATIONAL SHORELINE AREAS TO PRESERVE SITES FOR PUBLIC RECREATIONAL USES

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, by request I introduce for appropriate reference an administration bill to authorize establishment of three national seashore recreation areas under the U.S. National Park Service.

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

The bill (S. 2010) to save and preserve, for the public use and benefit, a portion of the remaining undeveloped shoreline area of the United States, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. NEUBERGER, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, the bill provides for administrative selection of the three areas following appropriate studies, consultation and surveys. The sum of $15 million would be authorized for acquisition of land not to exceed a total of 100,000 acres for all three shoreline parks.

I submit this measure at the request of the Secretary of Interior. The bill will be marked to so indicate. However, I wish to state that I am in full accord with the basic purpose of the proposed legislation.

I am also introducing the bill at the suggestion of the distinguished Chairman of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], who is aware of my long-time interest in helping to conserve, as recreation reserves, some of the magnificent shoreline of our Nation.

A number of bills to establish national shoreline recreation areas are now pending before Congress. One of them is S. 1526, which I introduced in March 25, 1959. It would authorize creation of a National Seashore Park among the famous Oregon Dunes and at the Oregon Sea Lion Caves.

It seems to me that the Congress might well pass the measure which I introduce today during the current session, and then schedule hearings in the recess between sessions to assist in determining which particular seashores, should be established under the authorization proposed by the bill.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at this point in the RECORD the text of a press release issued by the Department of the Interior explaining this proposed legislation, news stories from the Eugene (Oreg.) Register Guard and the New York Times discussing this proposal, and the language of the bill which I introduce today.

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

DEPARTMENT PROPOSES SHORELINE AREA LEGISLATION

The Department of the Interior today sent to the Congress proposed legislation to preserve the remaining undeveloped shoreline area of the United States. The text of the letter of Acting Secretary Elmer Bennett to the President of the Senate follows:

MAY 13, 1959.

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

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Enclosed herewith is a draft of a proposed bill "to save and preserve, for the public use and benefit, a portion of the remaining undeveloped shoreline area of the United States, and for other purposes."

We recommend that the enclosed bill be referred to the appropriate committee for consideration and that it be enacted. Enactment of this legislation, in our opinion, is urgent and highly desirable in the public interest.

Our views in this regard are based in part upon a survey that we have concluded recently concerning the Atlantic, Pacific, gulf, and lakeshore coasts. This survey was made possible by funds that were donated for that purpose. The object of the survey was to determine the opportunities that remain to preserve outstanding natural shore areas for recreation and other public purposes.

Our survey shows that almost every attractive shoreline area, from the Canadian border to Mexico, that is accessible by road has been developed in some manner, has been acquired for development purposes, or is being considered for its development possibilities. The few accessible and undeveloped beach sites that are left are scattered sparsely along the coasts. These sites are relatively small, and they are going fast. Inaccessible sites, including islands, are almost the only hope for preservation today. Even many of these are now being purchased by real estate interests for subdivision purposes.

The Nation's shores are a limited and diminishing resource of scenic and scientific

interest for which there is no substitute. So many of them have been preempted by commercial and private developments, however, that opportunities for public use and enjoyment of this resource are being rapidly diminished. In the circumstances, we conclude that enactment of this proposed legislation is not only very desirable but urgent for the benefit of present as well as future generations.

In order to accomplish the objectives set forth in this proposed legislation of preserving a relatively small portion of the remaining shoreline area of the United States for public use and benefit, our studies indicate that a program for acquisition and preservation of the shore areas that are worthy of preservation should be undertaken by the Federal Government.

For these reasons, this proposed legislation would authorize the appropriation of $15 million for the purpose of acquiring the property needed to establish not to exceed three national shore areas. As prescribed in section 2 of the bill, the Secretary of the Interior would be required to select not more than three shore areas which he finds possess national significance because of their outstanding natural, public recreation, and scenic or other public values for purposes of the legislation.

We believe this program is needed and will be of material assistance in encouraging the various States to acquire and preserve suitable shore areas before it is too late to acquire such areas. A positive and effective program of acquiring and preserving these areas, in our judgment, should begin as soon as possible. The cost of shore properties will, no doubt, continue to increase with the rapid reduction of available shore property. We are convinced, however, from our surveys, that areas of outstanding significance can yet be acquired for addition to the National Park System if prompt action is taken. Such areas can be acquired and administered as worthy additions to that system.

As prescribed by the act of July 25, 1956 (70 Stat. 652), which requires that certain reports of the executive branch to Congress certain information pertaining to the number of civilian officers and employees required to carry out additional or expanded functions, we have prepared and enclose a statement concerning these matters.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised us that the enactment of this proposed legislation would be in accord with the program of the President.

Sincerely yours,

ELMER BENNETT,
Acting Secretary of the Interior.

STATEMENT TO ACCOMPANY RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR CONCERNING THE PROPOSED BILL TO SAVE AND PRESERVE FOR PUBLIC USE AND BENEFIT A PORTION OF THE REMAINING UNDEVELOPED SHORELINE AREA OF THE UNITED STATES, AS REQUIRED BY ACT OF JULY 25, 1956 (70 STAT. 652)

The following estimate concerning the additional man-years of civilian employment and expenditures for the first 5 years of the program that would be authorized by the proposed legislation recommended by the Department of the Interior. "To save and preserve, for the public use and benefit, a portion of the remaining undeveloped shoreline area of the United States, and for other purposes," is predicated upon anticipated future appropriations to carry out the program as indicated in the table:

	1st year	2d year	3d year	4th year	5th year
Estimated additional man-years of civilian employment: Executive direction:					
Project manager		3	3	3	3
Landscape architect	6				
Engineer		3	3	3	3
Stenographic	3	3	3	3	3
Total executive direction	9	9	9	9	9
Estimated additional expenditures:					
Land acquisition (Federal)	$4,134,000	$4,134,000	$2,934,000	$1,734,000	$1,734,000
Executive direction	60,000	60,000	60,000	60,000	60,000
All other	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000
Total estimated additional expenses	4,244,000	4,244,000	3,044,000	1,844,000	1,844,000

[From the Eugene Register Guard, May 14, 1959]

SEASHORE PLAN GETS ADMINISTRATION O.K.

(By A. Robert Smith)

WASHINGTON.—The Eisenhower administration has decided to throw its support behind a movement to preserve national shore areas such as the Oregon Dunes, south of Florence.

Administration support was indicated Thursday, when the Department of the Interior sent Congress a bill that would authorize expenditure of $15 million for acquisition of property for creation of three national shore areas.

The bill did not specify which areas should be preserved, but leaves that to the discretion of the Secretary of the Interior.

He would be required to select outstanding natural, public recreational, and scenic areas under terms of this legislation. Normally, the Secretary of the Interior bases selection of areas to be set aside on the basis of recommendations from the National Park Service.

PLAN OUTLINED

The Secretary's advisory board on national parks has recommended five shore areas for national status, according to Conrad Wirth, Director of the Park Service. They are the Oregon Dunes, the Indiana Dunes, Padre Islands in Texas, Cape Cod, Mass., and Port Reyes, Calif.

The land acquisition fund proposal was outlined in a letter from Elmer Bennett, Undersecretary of Interior, to Vice President Richard Nixon.

Bennett told this reporter that the only reason for limiting the number of national shore areas to three was due to "budgetary reasons."

"VERY DESIRABLE"

"The Nation's shores are a limited and diminishing resource of scenic and scientific interest for which there is no substitute. So many of them have been preempted by commercial and private development, however, that opportunities for public use and enjoyment of this resource are being rapidly diminished. In the circumstances, we conclude that enactment of this proposed legislation is not only very desirable but urgent for the benefit of present as well as future generations."

Administration officials in the past have been cool toward the idea of adding national seashores at this time to the Nation's park system.

ELEVEN AREAS LISTED

This shift of administration feeling comes at a time when the Senate Interior Committee has started hearings on legislation to create a seashore along Lake Michigan at the Indiana Dunes.

Senator Richard L. Neuberger said he hopes the committee will follow up with hearings on his S. 1526, authorizing creation of an Oregon Dunes national seashore.

While the administration proposal did not list any specific areas, an Interior Department official released a list of 11 shore areas that would get the most serious consideration.

Among these were the five recommended by the Interior Secretary's advisory board, plus Cape Flattery, Wash.; Cumberland Island, Ga.; channel islands off the coast of southern California, Santa Cruz and San Miguel; and three areas in Michigan.

The Interior Department proposal outlined a five-year program of private land acquisition. The first and second years would involve expenditure of $4,244,000 with declining amounts in the subsequent three years for a total of $15 million.

Bennett also pointed out that the Bureau of the Budget had cleared these proposed expenditures, another indication of administration support.

[From the New York Times, May 14, 1959]

CONGRESS IS GIVEN A SHORELINE PLAN—ADMINISTRATION'S BILL SEEKS 15 MILLION TO PRESERVE NOT MORE THAN 3 U.S. AREAS

(By Richard E. Mooney)

WASHINGTON, May 13.—The administration asked Congress today to authorize a limited program for the preservation of the Nation's vanishing shoreline.

It was the first official proposal to arise from the several shoreline surveys that the National Park Service has conducted in recent years with privately donated funds.

Elmer F. Bennett, Acting Secretary of the Interior, sent the administration's proposals to Congress with a letter that called the program "urgent and highly desirable." He said there were only a few undeveloped shoreline areas "scattered sparsely along the coast," and that they were "relatively small and going fast."

The administration's bill calls for an authorization of $15 million, plus authority to use privately donated funds and lands, to establish not more than three "national shorelines." The areas would be selected for their "outstanding natural, public recreation and scenic or other public values," Mr. Bennett said.

No areas were named, but the Park Service's advisory board has reviewed and approved a dozen possibilities, including Cape Cod's outer beach, the Oregon sand dunes, the Indiana dunes on Lake Michigan, the channel islands off the California coast, Padre Island, Tex., and Point Reyes, Calif.

PRIVATE FUNDS A FACTOR

The Park Service recently reported in detail on the desirability of preserving the Cape Cod beach, but the Department of the Interior took no position on it.

The price of the Cape Cod project alone has been estimated at $16 million, but it is noteworthy that the administration's proposal today asked for the authority to use private donations.

The reasons for not naming the shoreline areas to be acquired were several: No final choices have been made; the Department wants to have flexibility if it runs into insuperable opposition in an area it has selected, and the Department wants to be able to line up local support in advance, without having announced the boundaries of an area and the price it will pay for land.

Mr. Bennett's letter said that "almost every shoreline area from Mexico to Canada that is accessible by road has been developed in some manner, has been acquired for development purposes, or is being considered for its development possibilities." "Enactment

of this proposed legislation is not only very desirable, but urgent for the benefit of present and future generation," he declared.

Fred A. Seaton, Secretary of the Interior, was in New York today.

S. 2010

A bill to save and preserve, for the public use and benefit, a portion of the remaining undeveloped shoreline area of the United States, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That in order to save and preserve, for purposes of public recreation, benefit, and inspiration, a portion of the diminishing shoreline area of the United States that remains undeveloped, the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to take appropriate action in the public interest toward the establishment of national shoreline areas, including lakeshore areas, as set forth in section 2 of this Act.

SEC. 2. (a) The Secretary shall select not more than three seashore or lakeshore areas that he finds, after thorough investigation, possess national significance and usefulness because of their outstanding natural and scenic features, recreational and other public values, for purposes of this Act: *Provided,* That the total land area, not including submerged lands, to be acquired by the United States pursuant to this section shall not exceed 100,000 acres; *Provided further,* That before selecting such nationally significant areas, the Secretary shall obtain the advice of the Advisory Board on National Parks, Historic Sites, Buildings and Monuments, as well as the advice of the Governors of the particular States in which the areas to be selected hereunder are situated.

(b) Upon the selection of the aforesaid areas, the Secretary is authorized to procure, set aside, and develop in such manner as he finds to be in the public interest, the land and waters, or interests therein, that he considers necessary to assure adequate preservation and public use of such areas in furtherance of the purposes of this Act.

(c) When the Secretary finds that a sufficient quantity of land for each individual area has been procured by the United States for administration and public use, he may declare the establishment of and prescribe an appropriate designation for such area by the publication of notice thereof in the Federal Register. Following such establishment, and subject to the aforesaid acreage limitation, the Secretary may acquire additional lands for the national shoreline areas established hereunder.

(d) The administration, protection, and development of national shoreline areas pursuant to this Act shall be exercised by the Secretary of the Interior, subject to the provisions of the Act of August 24, 1916 (39 Stat. 535; 16 U.S.C., 1952 ed., secs. 1–4), as amended and supplemented, relating to the National Park System, and in accordance with other laws of general application relating to that System as defined by the Act of August 8, 1953 (67 Stat. 496; 16 U.S.C., Supp. III, sec. 1c).

SEC. 3. (a) The Secretary may procure land and water, or interests therein, for the national shoreline areas authorized by section 2 hereof, by donation or by purchase with donated or appropriated funds, and such authority to purchase with donated or appropriated funds shall include authority to condemn under the provisions of the Act of August 1, 1888.

(b) There is authorized to be appropriated, for the procurement of land and interests therein, and incidental costs relating thereto, for the national shoreline areas authorized by section 2 hereof, the sum of $15,000,000.

AMENDMENT OF TRADING WITH THE ENEMY ACT, RELATING TO DIVESTMENT OF CERTAIN INTERESTS IN ESTATES AND TRUSTS

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Trading With the Enemy Act to provide for the divesting of certain interests in estates and trusts, and for other purposes.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill may lie at the desk until the close of business on Friday of this week so that additional Senators may become cosponsors if they so desire.

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

The bill (S. 2012) to amend the Trading With the Enemy Act to provide for the divesting of certain interests in estates and trusts, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. BUSH (for himself and Mr. SALTONSTALL), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that a statement, prepared by me, in explanation of the bill, may be printed in the RECORD.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BUSH

On behalf of myself and the distinguished senior Senator from Massachusetts, Mr. SALTONSTALL, I have introduced a bill to amend the Trading With the Enemy Act to provide for the divesting of certain interests in estates and trusts, and for other purposes.

The bill is intended to correct the unfair and inequitable operation of the Trading With the Enemy Act pursuant to which income and principal of trusts established by Americans for their children and grandchildren continue to be seized by the Office of Alien Property when the beneficiaries are German nationals, long after the termination of World War II and years after the vesting of present property rights was terminated by Executive order in 1953.

There are a number of such trusts in which citizens of Connecticut are interested. Constituents of mine have criticized the unfairness of this continuing seizure of American property.

The Trading With the Enemy Act was intended to prevent the use of American property in such a way as to aid Nazi Germany during World War II. Today there can be no such possible purpose justifying the continued seizure of income from property located in this country which is lawfully payable to children, grandchildren, and other beneficiaries of American citizens.

The bill which I have introduced is very simple, providing only that income and principal becoming due in the future may be paid by these American trustees directly to the lawful beneficiaries even though they be German nationals. It has no effect on property already seized, nor on issues relating to the large industrial concerns.

I have been informed that the amounts of income and principal involved in these situations are comparatively small, but that they will do much to relieve hardship and suffering which had been caused partly by the war and its aftermath.

The continued seizure of income and principal by the Office of Alien Property of trusts which have been established by American citizens poses an acute problem for trustees. The obligation of trustees under the wills or deeds of gift of American citizens is to carry out the legal dispositions in accordance with the wishes of the persons establishing the trust in conformity with the law of the State where the trust is being administered. This is a basic legal principle in our American jurisprudence. It is completely contrary to the terms of these dispositions by Americans of their property, that, solely by reason of the fact that a beneficiary is a German national, the income and principal continue to be seized by the Office of Alien Property long after the end of World War II. Thus, the efforts of American trustees to carry out their legal obligations under State law are being completely and unjustifiably thwarted by the present application of the Trading With the Enemy Act. The bill which I have introduced would correct this.

At the present time the United States is deeply involved in diplomatic negotiations looking toward the ultimate reestablishment of a unified Germany. The Federal Republic of Germany is now an important friend and ally of the United States. The bill which I have introduced, if enacted, would eliminate a very unfair discrimination which our country is presently making against citizens of the Federal Republic of Germany who are descendents of the U.S. citizens. There is thus every justification from the standpoint of fairness and equity to descendants of American citizens and the best interests of the United States in the conduct of our foreign affairs abroad for the enactment of this bill.

I urge its favorable consideration.

AMENDMENT OF MERCHANT MARINE ACT, RELATING TO EXTENSION OF TIME FOR COMMITMENT OF CONSTRUCTION RESERVE FUNDS

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend section 511(h) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, in order to extend the time for commitment of construction reserve funds. I ask unanimous consent that a statement, prepared by me, in explanation of the bill, may be printed in the RECORD.

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

The bill (S. 2013) to amend section 511(h) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, in order to extend the time for commitment of construction reserve funds, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The statement presented by Mr. MAGNUSON is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MAGNUSON

On April 20, 1959, the American-Hawaiian Steamship Co., one of the oldest and, at times, largest of the Nation's intercoastal shipping lines, filed application with the Maritime Administration for insurance on a construction loan and mortgage to cover four vessels to be used in the intercoastal trade.

This bill would merely extend briefly the period during which the company's construction reserve funds must be committed, to permit time for finalizing plans for the projected trailerships in accordance with the most modern shipping concepts.

The company has approximately $11 million in its construction reserve funds under section 511 of the 1936 act which it plans to commit for the new ships. The time within which $1,600,000 of these funds must be committed under present law, expires on July 9, 1959. The balance of the funds must be committed at various times between February and November 1961.

The Federal income tax that would have to be paid if these funds are not invested in new ships amounts to approximately $2,500,000. Such tax, if paid, would be lost forever for investment in new ships.

The purpose of the legislation proposed under the bill is to encourage new construction toward the rehabilitation of our domestic merchant marine. The present plight of the intercoastal trade is a matter of record both in the Maritime Administration and the Interstate Commerce Commission. Government officials have repeatedly stressed the imperative need for a substantial merchant marine of oceangoing vessels to be available in time of war. Our domestic merchant marine today is but a shadow of what it was prior to World War II.

As a result of World War II, American-Hawaiian lost 22 of its 32 oceangoing vessels. The indemnities received are inadequate for a vessel program at present day cost of construction. The only Government aids available to operators in intercoastal trade are those provided under title XI of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 dealing with mortgage insurance, and section 511 of the act, dealing with construction reserve funds. No subsidy aid is available.

The American-Hawaiian Steamship Co. has had a long and successful history in the intercoastal trade of our country. Its reentry into this trade, with the contemplated fleet of modern trailerships, would be, I am confident, a tremendous boost for this most important segment of our transportation industry. Over the years since 1899 the company has been a leading factor in intercoastal shipping, and its vessels were a potent asset to national security in both world wars.

The American-Hawaiian Steamship Co. came into existence in 1899 and pioneered in the American building of modern, large steam freighters, the first four of which were placed in the intercoastal service in 1900. These vessels were coal burners and the voyages between the east coast and west coast were via the Straits of Magellan. Service was also provided to and from Hawaii.

In 1902, the first oil-burning equipment used by an American-flag vessel was installed in an American-Hawaiian Steamship Co. vessel. By 1907, the intercoastal service of American-Hawaiian Steamship Co. was performed by oil-burning steamers to and from railroad terminals on each coast of the Isthmus of Tehuantepec in Mexico, with the intercoastal traffic shipped across the isthmus by railroad. This operation continued with some minor interruptions until, by 1914, the company had 26 large, steel oceangoing freighters in its service.

In August 1914, American-Hawaiian Steamship Co. began using the Panama Canal but World War I soon caused the suspension of its intercoastal service and in 1917, the Government requisitioned the vessels for the war effort. American-Hawaiian Steamship Co. at the time had about 25 percent of the deadweight tonnage of large oceangoing freighters under U.S. registry. These were of immense value to the war effort.

The intercoastal service was resumed after the war, and by 1939 American-Hawaiian Steamship Co. had 39 vessels in the service, operating regularly scheduled sailings. However, in 1941 its service was disrupted by World War II and again the Government requisitioned the vessels—this time American-Hawaiian Steamship Co. contributed 32 large ocean-going freighters, fully manned, in first-class condition, immediately available for national defense.

During World War II, traffic formerly moving via intercoastal steamer was diverted to overland modes of transportation. Appreciating that the reorientation of this traffic would be a costly process for the intercoastal lines who had suffered total destruction of their trade during the war, the Government concluded to reestablish the services using Government-owned war-built ships, employing the former intercoastal lines as Government agents.

This agency operation began in 1945 and, because of heavy losses, was discontinued in the fall of 1947. Certain of the intercoastal lines, including American-Hawaiian Steamship Co., then chartered Government-owned vessels to continue the service without interruption. This arrangement prevailed until early in 1951, at which time the Government discontinued the chartering of vessels for use in the intercoastal trade. At this point, certain of the intercoastal lines, including American-Hawaiian Steamship Co., purchased vessels from the Government and, again without interruption, continued the service. It soon became apparent that the conventional type freighter was no longer capable of providing a profitable operation. Accordingly, in March of 1953, American-Hawaiian Steamship Co. was obligated to temporarily suspend its intercoastal service in order to conserve its resources.

Subsequently, the fleet of conventional freighters owned by American-Hawaiian Steamship Co. were sold, the last vessel being transferred to its new owners in September of 1956.

On August 26, 1955, American-Hawaiian Steamship Co. applied for mortgage insurance aid in the construction of a fleet of roll-on, roll-off type vessels for the U.S. intercoastal trade. The economics of the operation using roll-on, roll-off vessels, while an improvement over conventional freighters, in light of the high delivered cost of the vessels did not warrant consummation of the plans, and American-Hawaiian Steamship Co. then turned its attention to investigating other shipping concepts.

The present application of American-Hawaiian for vessel mortgage insurance results from investigations of new shipping concepts during the past year and involves the building of four trailerships for the intercoastal trade. Assuming a favorable determination on the application for mortgage insurance and the obtaining of needed financing, contracts would be awarded for ship construction about April 1960. If contracts are awarded about that time, the company estimates that the first ship would be completed near the end of 1962 and the three remaining ships thereafter, at intervals of 90 days, so that all four vessels would be in operation by autumn of 1963.

CLARIFICATION AND AMENDMENT OF CAPPER-VOLSTEAD ACT

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. McCARTHY], I introduce a bill to clarify and amend the Capper-Volstead Act (42 Stat. 388, 7 U.S.C. 291–292), and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, as requested by the Senator from Louisiana.

The bill (S. 2014) to clarify and amend the Capper-Volstead Act (42 Stat. 388, 7 U.S.C. 291–292), and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. LONG (for himself and Mr. McCARTHY), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

MODIFICATION OF EXISTING PROJECT FOR RED RIVER BELOW DENISON DAM

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and my colleague, the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to permit the engineering talent of our Nation to exercise their judgment in the matter of bank protection of the Red River of the South—the Red River that extends through the States of Oklahoma, Arkansas, Texas, and Louisiana.

Back in 1946, the 2d session of the 79th Congress passed a bill to provide for flood control on the Red River and its tributaries. At that time, the people of the Red River Valley were in desperate need for this program of flood control, and they had to take what they could get—they had to take the minimum program the Congress would adopt. That minimum program stipulated that adequate flood control may be provided economically by means of a reservoir-levee plan in conjunction with existing or authorized Federal and non-Federal flood control improvement.

But that program did not go all the way. It did provide for the construction of single-purpose flood control reservoirs at Boswell on Boggy Creek, Hugo on the Kiamichi River, Millwood on Little River, Texarkana on Sulphur River, Ferrells Bridge on Cypress Creek, and Mooringsport near the foot of Caddo Lake. It did provide for the operation of these reservoirs for the conveyance of peak flows of the design flood with a minimum freeboard of 3 feet after the program is completed, but only 1 foot in the interim. And, finally, it did provide for the construction of bank protection works at locations where levee setbacks are impossible or uneconomical.

It is with respect to that last provision—the providing of bank protection works at locations where levee setbacks are impossible or uneconomical—that the program did not go all the way. We are bound to ask ourselves this question: Why is the judgment of our engineers circumscribed in this manner? Actually, there is no reason. Let us look at the record:

In the first place, the Federal Government is responsible for the bank caving that is taking place on the Red River and should assume the responsibility for protecting those banks against the ravages of the river. This is the reason why the Federal Government is responsible for the loss of land that is now going on.

The Red River was formerly a navigable stream and considerable commerce moved upon its waters. This navigation was greatly hampered by the existence of a raft which extended from Natchitoches to a point considerably above Shreveport. In an attempt to improve navigation, the Corps of Engineers, beginning in 1828 and ending in 1872, removed this raft. While allowing for the clear passage of navigation, it also caused the lowering of stages in the river to such an extent that before many years navigation was not possible. It was only after the removal of the raft that the banks of Red River began to cave and the valuable farmlands were lost at an alarming rate.

At the present time, it is estimated that in the State of Louisiana alone, 2,300 acres of land are being lost each year as the result of caving banks.

At the present time, due to restrictions of the 1946 Red River Flood Control Act, it is estimated that Louisiana is losing 9,800 acres each year as the result of levee setbacks.

Adding these two together, 12,100 acres of land are lost each year—more than 1,000 acres each month as the result of the action of the river on its banks and, as the result of the inability of the Federal Government to arrest this intrusion because of the restrictions imposed upon it by the existing law.

Since the removal of the raft on Red River was in the interest of navigation, it would certainly seem that the Federal Government has an obligation to the valley in protecting the banks of Red River from caving.

Secondly, there are other results from the removal of the Red River raft: Once the river was free to flow in its channel, the river began to enlarge and shorten with each succeeding flood. There was a great flood in 1892 and again in 1908, which further shortened and enlarged the river. From 1892 to the present time, the distance along Red River from Natchitoches to the Louisiana-Arkansas line has been shortened from 256 miles to 213 miles, a distance of 43 miles. Obviously, a tremendous amount of loss of bank occurred during this period.

Because of the flood control needs of the Red River Basin, it was necesary for Congress to authorize the construction of reservoirs for the valley. To date, three reservoirs have been constructed: Denison was placed in operation in June, 1944; Texarkana in January, 1958; and Ferrells Bridge in partial operation in August, 1957. There are four other reservoirs—Millwood, Boswell, Hugo, and Mooringsport—yet to be built. It has become obvious that, although they are necessary for flood control, the reservoirs are prolonging the caving stages on Red River and are causing increased bank caving.

The loss of bank on the Red River from Shreveport to the Louisiana-Arkansas line increased from 2,408 acres between 1930 and 1944—when Denison Dam was placed in operation—to 6,598 acres from 1944 through 1958. This shows conclusively the tremendous increase in the rate of caving due to the prolonging of caving stages on the river by reservoirs.

Mr. President, it is high time that we remove the restrictions from our law and permit our engineering talent to exercise their judgment in the matter of saving our land from the ravages of this river. My bill will do just that. It will provide for the construction of bank protection works where they are justified by common sense and sound engineering principles.

When the river takes our land away by eroding its banks, it takes away top soil to a depth of 15 or 20 feet in many cases, but the sand bank it eventually leaves is not an even swap. Usually it takes 50 to 75 years before that sand bank can be converted into useful soil.

On at least two occasions so far, the Senate Appropriations Committee has indicated that it is ready to modernize the language of the old act and give the Engineers the legal authority to protect their investment, rather than to throw away that investment and start over with a new investment.

But because we have not actually changed the language of the law, we must proceed on the old basis. Where has that basis led us? Let us take a look.

There is the case of Vernon Meyer Bend, which might be called a typical example. We made four setbacks there simply because the law said that was all we could do. Finally, the situation got so bad the scale finally tipped the other way and the engineers were able to build a revetment to protect what we had left—but in the process we had lost some 800 acres of fine Red River land that we could be using today to the benefit of the people of this country.

Recently a man came into my office and brought with him some pictures to show the damage the Red River had done to his land. This man came to talk about the bend in Red River that bears his name—Herman Taylor Bend.

According to those pictures, he is losing his land at a fast rate. The Corps of Engineers has gone into his problem, but their hands have been tied by the present law. Under the law, they can put in bank protection, but, before they can do so, a local contribution of some $62,000 will have to be put up. The folks along Red River just do not have that kind of money. As a result, he will continue to lose his land unless we change the law.

Mr. President, I propose to change the law. I propose to change it by eliminating the ridiculous provisions which make it necessary for a setback to be impossible or uneconomical before it is possible for the banks to be protected. I propose to make it possible for the Federal Government to fulfill its obligation to the people along the Red River by stabilizing the banks of that river, and, by so doing, save the 1,000 and more acres of valuable land that are being wasted each month under the present law.

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

The bill (S. 2015) authorizing the modification of the existing project for Red River below Denison Dam—Levees and Bank Stabilization, Texas, Oklahoma, Arkansas, and Louisiana, introduced by Mr. LONG (for himself and Mr. ELLENDER), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

LEASING OF CERTAIN PROPERTY FOR PUBLIC SCHOOL USE WITHOUT MONETARY CONSIDERATION THEREFOR

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, earlier this year the Stella school district building near Neosho, in Newton County, Mo., was destroyed by fire. In order to meet the emergency situation, the Army allowed the school district to use an empty barracks building at Fort Crowder, Mo.

Recently, the Army presented a bill to the district for rental of the building. The district has also been asked to sign a lease covering rental of the facility at Fort Crowder for the next school year, as a new school building will not be completed until the following year.

The Stella district stands ready to pay maintenance expenses for the use of the building at Fort Crowder. But in view of the emergency situation, the expense involved in constructing a new school building, and the fact that the facility supplied by the Army would otherwise go unused, it would seem equitable to allow the Army to lease the property on a rent-free basis in such cases.

Mr. President, so as to give the Department of Defense this authority, on behalf of my colleague, the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS] and myself, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend title 10 of the United States Code. This amendment would provide for rent-free leasing of military property for public school use.

Similar bills have been introduced in the House by the distinguished chairman of the House Armed Services Committee [Mr. VINSON] and the able Congressman from the seventh district in Missouri [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a short statement by my colleague in support of this bill.

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

The bill (S. 2018) to amend title 10, United States Code, section 2667, to direct the Secretaries of the military departments to lease property for public school use without the reservation of monetary consideration therefor, introduced by Mr. SYMINGTON (for himself and Mr. HENNINGS), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

The statement of Mr. HENNINGS, presented by Mr. SYMINGTON, is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HENNINGS

Earlier this year a sudden fire destroyed the school building at Stella, Mo., leaving school district officials with the problem of building a new school and finding temporary quarters in which to hold classes until the new school could be built.

In searching for a new building, school officials naturally turned to nearby Fort Crowder, deactivated Army installation some 12 miles from Stella. School officials had hopes of negotiating with the Army for the temporary, rent-free use of one of the Fort Crowder buildings. They were disappointed.

The Army first demanded an annual rental of $13,000 for their empty building. Later the Army reduced its demand to $6,200 a year rental. The school district was further forced to pay insurance, lights and water, heating and transportation costs in order to use the Army building and these costs, exclusive of the rental charged, raised the district's current school year costs to some $10,000 over the district's annual budget.

The people of Stella, Mo., are somewhat dismayed.

It is difficult for them to understand why empty Army buildings, bought and paid for by just such taxpayers as those who live in Stella, should not be made available to the people who own them when the same people are faced with an emergency.

Frankly, there is a good deal of anti-Army sentiment in Stella today and, indeed, in all of western Missouri. People who live in the western part of my State remember that the Army spent some $2 million constructing new buildings at Fort Crowder and then, within weeks of completing the construction project, deactivated the fort and walked off and left the buildings, some of which have never been occupied.

This problem, of course, goes far beyond the borders of the Stella school district. School districts all over the Nation are often faced with the need for emergency quarters. It has happened before in Missouri and it will probably happen again.

Fortunately, the junior Senator from Missouri and the very able young Representative from Missouri's Seventh District recognize the national implications of the problems faced by the Stella school district. The Representative from Georgia's Sixth District, the veteran chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, also recognizes the need for corrective legislation. These able gentlemen, along with myself, have introduced a bill which will allow the Army to lease its property without monetary payment provided the property is to be used for public school purposes. The bill also requires that the lessee maintain, protect, repair, and restore the leased property as required by the Secretary of the military departments concerned.

It is a good bill. One which will help the Stella school district and other districts faced with sudden situations of emergency such as that faced this year by the Stella district.

I hope the Senate is able to act quickly upon it.

PRICE SUPPORT FOR TOBACCO—AMENDMENT

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I submit an amendment, intended to be proposed by me to the bill (S. 1901) to amend section 101(c) of the Agricultural Act of 1949 and the act of July 28, 1945, to stabilize and protect the level of support for tobacco, and I ask that it may lie at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received, printed, and lie on the desk.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, the amendment is needed to correct an oversight in the drafting of the bill. The bill was intended to make no change in the level of parity under the existing law. This amendment will correct this drafting oversight, and will put Maryland tobacco in the same position as other kinds of tobacco.

The authors of the bill, the junior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN] and the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] support the amendment as being consistent with the intent and purpose of the bill.

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:

Jefferson-Jackson Day banquet address by Senator HUMPHREY.

Jefferson-Jackson Day dinner address by Senator SYMINGTON.

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

Address by Representative HAROLD R. COLLIER on May 17, 1959, at dedication of the Bataan Memorial.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS TO BE HELD BY THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON SECURITIES OF THE COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, there are pending before the Subcommittee on Securities of the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency the following bills:

S. 1178, introduced by Mr. ROBERTSON, for himself and Mr. CAPEHART, at the request of the Securities and Exchange Commission, to amend certain provisions of the Securities Act of 1933, as amended.

S. 1179, introduced by Mr. ROBERTSON, for himself and Mr. CAPEHART, at the request of the Securities and Exchange Commission, to amend certain provisions of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, as amended.

S. 1180, introduced by Mr. ROBERTSON, for himself and Mr. CAPEHART, at the request of the Securities and Exchange Commission, to amend certain provisions of the Trust Indenture Act of 1939, as amended.

S. 1181, introduced by Mr. ROBERTSON, for himself and Mr. CAPEHART, at the request of the Securities and Exchange Commission, to amend certain provisions of the Investment Company Act of 1940, as amended.

S. 1182, introduced by Mr. ROBERTSON, for himself and Mr. CAPEHART, at the request of the Securities and Exchange Commission, to amend certain provisions of the Investment Advisers Act of 1940, as amended.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Securities, I wish to announce that public hearings will be held on these bills beginning on or about June 15, 1959.

All persons who wish to appear and testify at hearings on these bills are requested to notify Mr. J. H. Yingling, chief of staff, Committee on Banking and Currency, room 5300 Senate Office Building, telephone Capitol 4-3121, extension 3921, as soon as possible, and in any event, before the close of business on June 5, 1959.

THE ATLANTIC CONGRESS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I should like to address the Senate on the theme of the Atlantic Congress, which is scheduled to meet from June 5 to 9 in London. The title which the congress should bear is "The Atlantic Community in the Next 10 Years."

Delegates from all the NATO countries will attend the congress, which is being held under the auspices of the NATO parliamentarians conference, to which, together with other Members of this body, I have had the honor of being a delegate for the last 2 of its sessions.

Six hundred and fifty men and women from the Western world will attend the Atlantic Congress for the specific purpose of offering suggestions on how the Atlantic community might better steer the course of the NATO nations into a more secure and better tomorrow. The objective of these suggestions will not only be the preservation and the improvement of the free world, but the furnishing of help to the less developed areas to achieve their goals of modern living, greater freedom, and greater technological development.

The men and women delegates to the conference are free and independent citizens, bound by no official line, and have been selected from distinguished and responsible citizens in all areas of life in the Atlantic community.

The conference will divide itself into five committees: Atlantic Spiritual and Cultural Committee; Atlantic Political Committee; Atlantic Economic Committee; Free World Committee; and Communist Bloc Committee.

As one of the 130 American delegates who will attend this conference, I have been asked to serve on the Communist Bloc Committee, and specifically as chairman of the Economic Policy Subcommittee.

As the time approaches for us to go to London, I should like to emphasize how vital to the free world and to the very survival of civilized values will be the NATO decisions of the coming decade. I wish particularly at this time to emphasize the importance of the decisions on economic matters—the field in which I have been asked to serve at the conference.

The recommendations of the NATO parliamentarians at the last meeting on economic matters are critically important to the future of the NATO community. I shall ask to have them appended to my remarks.

I close by expressing the hope that the Members of the Senate will give grave attention to the Atlantic Congress. I believe there is a tremendous amount of "meat" in its deliberations, and especially its economic and cultural deliberations, for, as I see it, the days ahead for the Atlantic community will be days of intensive cooperation and deep coordination in the economic and cultural fields. I feel they are the essential preludes to a new order of integration of the political affairs of the NATO countries, which I have little doubt will come as we march forward in the joint effort for the defense of the free world and its values.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks the recommendations prepared by the economic section of the General Affairs Committee nearly 8 months ago, at the NATO parliamentarians conference in Paris, to which I was a delegate, and of which I was the rapporteur.

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

The flow of capital from the industrial countries of the Atlantic community to the less developed areas of the free world must be substantially increased by an expansion of the resources available to the International Bank. All the countries of the Atlantic community able to contribute should do so.

Technical assistance programs should be strengthened and expanded as a prerequisite for more effective economic development.

The Atlantic countries should support regional authorities for economic development, especially President Eisenhower's proposal for the Middle East, when the countries of a less developed region desire them and are prepared to contribute from their own resources whenever they are able. The International Bank and other United Nations agencies should provide guidance and technical assistance to regional development authorities to insure that they are soundly organized and administered.

The Atlantic countries should substantially increase the flow of private managerial and technical skills and capital to the less developed areas of the free world. To achieve this goal there must be additional incentives for private investment and greater use of the resources of the private economy under Government contract to make available managerial and technical skills. Especially, the Atlantic countries should consider a mutually agreed program to provide guarantees against the risks of oversea private investment.

The Atlantic countries recognize the need for increased growth in the less developed areas within the Atlantic community. The development of these areas can best be promoted by the freer flow of private investment supplemented by regional productivity programs and investment banks or funds to which the European countries would be the primary contributors as provided in the European Common Market Treaty and proposed for wider European free trade area under the OEEC.

THE CALL FOR LEADERSHIP

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, recently the distinguished senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] appeared in the State of Wyoming. It was my honor to accompany him on that trip and to introduce him on the occasion of his visit to Casper, where he delivered an address.

He called for wide interest in politics at all levels and in all parties. The address was so stirring and so provocative that I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the RECORD.

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

THE CALL FOR LEADERSHIP

(Remarks of Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, Democratic Party brunch, Casper, Wyo., Apr. 26)

Sunday is a day for sober thought about the things that are lost sight of in the clatter of the working week—a busy week for all of you as it has been for me traveling throughout this great West of ours.

It is in this respectful spirit of sober thought that I am here to talk about politics—the same kind of politics that sounded this morning from pulpits in Casper, Wyo., and from thousands of others across the land.

Here this morning, and everywhere else, congregations of Americans were called upon to rededicate themselves to two tasks.

The first task was to know the difference between justice and injustice, between freedom and oppression, between order and disorder.

The second and related task, was to act in the right as God gives us the power to know where the right resides.

I feel deeply this summons from the pulpit to unite the mind and the will in social effort.

To play a part in the art of government, to play a part in the mainstream of our political life, is to respond to that great summons.

Politics is a creative social act that must be engaged in by anyone who takes seriously the call to thought and action he hears from the pulpit.

Through the art of politics we define, advance, test, and decide whether this or that proposal can best serve the common interest.

Through the art of politics, public opinion makes its presence felt as a controlling, disciplining, and guiding force in the operations of government.

In this complex world of politics, as well as life itself, not all is sharply black or white, good or evil. People of differing views can have equal depth of conviction.

Neither political party in America is perfect; neither political party is all bad.

But having said that much, I proclaim my pride in being a Democrat.

We are the only national party there is in America—the only party with a representation in the National Government rising from the South as well as the North, from the West as well as the East.

Sure, if we were only a regional party like the Republicans we could talk to each other in whispers. But a national party has special communications problems. It must talk across great spaces, amid the roar of great rivers of humanity, and must overcome great barriers to sight and sound.

When a Democrat in Alabama speaks his heart and mind to a Democrat in Wyoming he has to raise his voice in order to be heard. For a Democrat here in Wyoming to be heard by one in New York he, too, has to raise his voice.

There may at times appear to be differences within our family, as there are on occasion in any family—but it would be a fatal mistake for our political opponents to ever think for a moment that we do not stand shoulder to shoulder together as Democrats for common goals of progress and development.

We have room for and want people of conviction who will speak up for those convictions within our party's framework. We are not a party of thought control or rigid intellectual discipline. We want to be a blend of the best that is in all of us—and all of us have something to contribute.

Incidentally, our new blend seems to have more of a western accent than ever before.

The fact that we Democrats argue among ourselves on occasion says something good and fine about the size and health of our family.

It says that we are the only party with interests that are as varied as the Nation itself. We are the only party that embraces the laborer and the businessman, the farmer and the miner, the rancher and the office-worker, the field hand and the white-collar professional, the young and the old, the consumer and the producer—and a lot more besides.

If we were like the Republicans, resting on but a few strong interests, the strongest of the few could have its way among us without argument. These few could act like the admissions committee for the Union League Club, blackballing any applicant who threatened to breathe the spirit of life into their overstuffed mausoleum.

In an otherwise uncertain world, there is at least one certainty. It is that any single interest in the Democratic Party, which tried to make every other interest act like all were a pack of identical twins, soon would find itself standing all alone in not so splendid isolation. A party in which so many strong national interests are included, will not tolerate dictation by any one or any combination of them. Instead, we are going to keep up a running debate about how best to adjust and resolve conflicts between equally legitimate claims for support by the party as a whole.

This, indeed, is the great single service the Democratic Party has performed for the Nation. We have a two-sided proof of how important this work is.

One side of the proof came in 1860. As of that year, the Democratic Party was the only political force which still held the Union together. But when the Democrats from the North and the South, along with their respective interests, pulled apart until each stood alone, the Government itself was torn apart and we had our Civil War.

The other side of the proof came in the years that followed the Civil War. The regular organs of the Government were then incapable of doing the work of national reunion. But at this juncture, the Democratic Party served the purposes of the Government when Northern Democrats and the pre-Civil War Southern Democrats reknit the broken ends of their national party—to talk and to argue with each other once more, and so to reestablish a sense of community.

Yes, we Democrats are restless as well as argumentative. Yes, we are never content to let well enough alone, but are always restless to get on with the business of exploring new horizons.

We are restless because we know that America cannot stand still and continue to live. It can live only if it grows. We are restless because we do not want to crop our size to the monuments of the national past. We want to honor the monuments of the past by building beyond them to an ever-expanding future.

We are restless because we do not want to be embalmed in the case of a mummy. In Pharoah's Egypt, the whole of the national energy went into the worship of death—but America is not such a Nation. We affirm the goodness of life, and we want to spend our national energy in liberating and purifying life from the corrosive presence of fear, disease, want, ignorance, and intolerance.

We are restless, because we are eager to redefine America as being something more than just a giant plot to make money. We affirm that our economic system can provide a living wage, a proper education, and a decent home for every American.

We are eager to redefine our national purpose in terms of something more than an IBM machine punching holes in a soulless stack of cards. We affirm the vitality of our constitutional principle of equality and the right of every man, woman, and child to human dignity without regard to race, religion, or ancestry.

We are restless because we reject the view that good government is fulfilled merely by good administration, or good bookkeeping. If that was all there was to good government then nobody should be allowed to stand

for public office except certified public accountants.

But to us, as Democrats, with our roots deep in the people, good administration is not a substitute for good policies.

We are restless for the same reason that Democrats were restless in the years immediately preceding the election of Woodrow Wilson in 1912, and the election of Franklin D. Roosevelt in 1932. Both times, the Republicans had held the control of the Executive for a long stretch. Both times in that long stretch, we had a Government dedicated to the postponement and evasion of solutions to urgent domestic and international problems. Both times, the weight of Executive energy was bent to the end that things should stand still.

But Democrats knew that an America which tries to stand still is an America that pronounces a sentence of doom on itself. That is why in 1912 and in 1932 the election of Democratic Presidents ushered in great creative periods in our national life. Under Wilson and again under Roosevelt, we at once leaped forward in a new birth of freedom. Unlike what happened after the change of administrations in 1953, we didn't have to spend 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, and now 7 years just studying problems. From the very day Wilson and Roosevelt took their inaugural oath, they were ready with action programs based on hard study of problems before, and not just after, they asked the people for the trust of the Presidential Office.

Today, once more, and for the same reason, we are restless to get on with the programs we have already formulated to serve America. We want this Nation of ours to breathe again. We are eager to be once more a people on the move, a people who voluntarily assume the yoke—and the glory that goes with it—of advancing mankind's best hopes for justice and peace.

We were in times past, and in a very literal sense, the giver and the protector of light in a sorely troubled world. There is no reason why that should not be the case right now. America still has tremendous, unsurpassed resources in material, strength, in energy, and in creative talents.

Why then have we come to live with a bad taste in our mouth—with a sense that despite our material comforts, we have no inner joy? Why then do we live with fear in our eyes—with the sense that tomorrow may be the day of the apocalypse? Why then do we live with shame in our hearts—with the sense that because of some self-inflicted wound, we have fallen from the heights we once occupied?

This bad taste, this fear, this shame, all have a common cause. The cause, dating from 1953, is the infectious disease of slothfulness and indifference caught from a breakdown in leadership at the very summit of the Nation.

There may have been a time when the Presidency could serve as a place of dignified retirement in one's old age.

There may have been a time when it could be awarded to a man as a sort of good conduct medal for performance in a lesser station.

There may have been a time when it was enough for a President to do nothing in particular but to do it very well—like some ceremonial figure in an empty pageant of States.

There may have been a time when a President could put himself so far above politics as to become politically invisible or unapproachable.

There may have been a time when the Presidency could resolve itself into a long and tedious exercise in attitudes, platitudes, and beatitudes—to the exclusion of concrete action.

But if ever there was such a time, that time is not now.

Now, the Presidency is the vital place of action—the only staff and command post that can unite and give direction and purpose to three worlds. One is the divided world of our Government proper. The second is the larger world of the whole Nation which encompasses the world of our governmental machinery. And the third is the still larger world beyond our shores—a world whose very survival may depend upon leadership from our own White House.

The Congress cannot do the President's work for him. Under modern conditions, the Congress can lay down general policy lines. It can revise policies it receives in draft form from the Executive. It can veto those policies. Or it can oversee the way they are executed by the President.

But Congress cannot fill the Presidential vacuum. If the President defaults on his role as a national and world leader, there is no force to fill that vacuum. The Congress was not designed to be and cannot be the Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces, the chief initiator of foreign affairs, the head of Government, the leader and interpreter of national and international public opinion.

The Congress is built along constitutional lines to give voice to local and regional interests. It does not have the unified energy, the staying grit, and the operational powers to give momentum to the whole of the national effort, and to that of the free world besides.

By the force of the Constitution, and by inescapable historical necessity, those powers are vested in, and are meant to be exercised by the President in person—though he is responsible to the courts in his legal character, and to the Congress and the people in his political character. If he fails to exercise those powers, every aspect of our political life falls into disarray.

That is exactly what has happened to us of late. What has happened is the reverse side of the truth once voiced by Lord Acton that all power tends to corrupt and absolute power tends to corrupt absolutely. The reverse side is, that the absence of power or its nonexercise under urgent circumstances, can corrupt just as thoroughly. The total default of Presidential leadership is the greatest corrupting influence in our Nation today.

What we have had of late is a caretaker Government, a mark-time Government, a do-as-little-as-you-can sort of Government, an artificial sunlamp government—a Government spouting aphorisms from Poor Richard's Almanac, while the Communists are everywhere on the march with their perverse zeal to remake the world in their own image. What we have had is a Government whose first and last line of defense always is that it means well.

Well, simply to mean well never was and is not now good enough in the affairs of great nations. The graveyard of history is crowded with the bones of peoples who had good intentions but lacked the imagination, the exact knowledge, and the driving energy that could translate those good intentions into specific realities in a formidable world.

Nor is it good enough these days for a great nation merely to wait for events to happen, and then to react to them. A great nation must march at the head of events, and by measures born of foresight, produce the events it wants.

The Democratic Party has absorbed this lesson of history. That is why it is the oldest political party, with the longest unbroken history of any political party in the world today. For the same reason, that is why it is an eternally young party, supercharged with eagerness to release the giant powers of America for greatness in building here, at home, and abroad. And again for the same reason, that is why our party at critical moments in American history has raised from its midst the Presidential leadership that has sounded the call to action stations the Nation was waiting to hear. It is waiting to hear that call right now. And our party is ready.

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, there has been editorial reaction to the appearance of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] in Wyoming. I have in my hand an editorial from the Wyoming Eagle, of Cheyenne, which passes along the State's judgment of the impact of the Senator's presence. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the RECORD.

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

HUMPHREY'S TRIP

Minnesota's Democratic Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY recently made a quick trip through several western States, including Wyoming. He spoke at a Democratic meeting at Casper a couple of weeks ago.

When he returned to the Senate floor, Senator HUMPHREY took a couple of minutes to tell his colleagues about his trip to the West. He said, in part:

"As a midwesterner, I can find many common bonds with the people along our west coast and the western mountain country. The pioneer spirit is still evident—the willingness to work together for progress, to take real sense of pride in every civic development and achievement. Perhaps too often some of us come to be too complacent about the underlying spirit of our country. If that is so, let me suggest a trip throughout the West as the tonic needed.

"I want my colleagues from Washington, Oregon, California, Utah, and Wyoming to know how deeply impressed I was with the warm welcome of the people in their States, and with the drive and energy these western people are displaying in tackling complex problems resulting from their rapid growth.

"I am convinced the West is going to make its voice increasingly heard in national affairs. And I am convinced, too, that the voice of the West will be good for the entire Nation—not just the West. For we need infused into our entire national thinking the spirit of progress and expansionism that is symbolized by the West, contrasted with a complacent satisfaction with the status quo that prevails too often in some parts of the country."

Senator HUMPHREY has let it be known that he would be delighted to run for President if Democrats should so decide. He thus can be expected to say nice things about almost everyone he meets during the next year or so.

But we are inclined to believe there is great sincerity in the Senator's remarks about the West. Certainly, there is great truth.

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE JAMES L. WHITLEY

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, it is my sad duty to report to the Senate the death on Sunday of one of my predecessors in the other body, the Honorable James L. Whitley. He passed away in Rochester, N.Y., following a long and distinguished career in public service and as an attorney.

Mr. Whitley's career in public office began at the turn of the century, and in length it represents a record for legislative service in Monroe County. At varying intervals in his career he served as a State assemblyman, State senator, and Member of Congress.

Elected to Congress in 1928, in my old congressional district, Mr. Whitley served

here for three terms. Among his outstanding accomplishments in the House was his authorship of the first measure to provide insurance for bank accounts and the law to regulate short selling of stocks on the stock market.

Following his return to private life he practiced law in Rochester for many years. He was a recognized leader of the bar and authored several books on legal subjects.

Mr. Whitley, a veteran of the Spanish-American War, was active in veterans' affairs, as well as in numerous civic and fraternal organizations. He was a longtime leader in Republican affairs in the Rochester community, and was on intimate terms with many national political figures.

Jim Whitley was a kindly, understanding man, with a wide circle of friends. When I first came to Congress he was extremely helpful to me with advice and counsel, for which I have always been grateful.

His death is a great loss to the Rochester community, and to his many friends. My thoughts go out at this time to his widow, son, sister, and other relatives, who have my deepest sympathy upon the passing of this fine gentleman.

USE OF ARMED SERVICES PERSONNEL AS SERVANTS

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, at his news conference on May 13, President Eisenhower charged that if our soldiers, sailors, and marines are not used as servants for the generals and admirals, we would have to hire civilians to do the job and, as he said, "you would probably have to pay a lot more money."

Mr. President, I respectfully suggest to the President that in this mid-20th century world, there is no excuse for the two, three, four or even five servants which too many admirals and generals now have. With labor-saving devices available to everyone in the home, with power steering and push-button control in our automobiles, servants are unnecessary except for the old, the infirm, or those Thorstein Veblen would call the conspicuous consumer, the displayer of the prestige of wealth. Now I suppose there is nothing very wrong with conspicuous consumption. But it should not be done on the taxpayer. And it should not demean an American boy who has been expensively trained to serve his country on the battlefield. If generals and admirals are too feeble to drive their own cars and help their wives wash dishes and with some of the heavy housework, then I suggest they are physically disqualified to serve in their country's Armed Forces.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the statement of the President to which I have referred be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

WHAT PRESIDENT EISENHOWER SAYS ABOUT MILITARY SERVANTS

President Eisenhower: "Well, I have had no report on this subject. Now, people are used for this kind of work, and, for example, all of the chauffeurs in the White House, except for my own Secret Service chauffeur, are all from the Army.

"And then there is, in the White House—there used to be a yacht, a big yacht, and the crew for that yacht was used for mess purposes here in the White House. The yacht is no longer in commission, but those people carry on that mess.

"Now, that kind of thing, I assume, goes in big headquarters, every place, in the Pentagon and so on down the line. So I have no report.

"But I imagine this: If we just got these things all done by civilians, you probably would have to pay a lot more money."

UNNECESSARY USE OF TRANSPORTATION FACILITIES

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, meeting in executive session on May 13, adopted a committee resolution urging approval of legislation sponsored by the distinguished junior Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] to repeal the excise tax on travel.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the committee resolution be printed in the body of the RECORD.

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

SENATE COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE—COMMITTEE RESOLUTION

Whereas immediately prior to World War II, the Congress enacted the excise tax on the travel of persons as an emergency measure primarily designed to discourage unnecessary use of the Nation's transportation facilities, so that they could be utilized to a maximum degree for the war effort; and

Whereas at that time the excise tax applied to both domestic and foreign travel; and

Whereas the excise tax on foreign travel has long since been repealed by the Congress, leaving this tax applicable only to domestic travel throughout the United States, and thereby giving a competitive advantage to foreign carriers over domestic carriers; and

Whereas the objective of this tax has long since been achieved and the sole reason for its imposition is that of a questionable revenue producing measure; and

Whereas the continued imposition of this discriminatory tax defeats a major objective of our overall national transportation policy to encourage and promote travel on regulated carriers by acting as an economic obstacle and artificial barrier thereby discouraging such travel; and

Whereas the tax particularly adversely affects low income families throughout the Nation who must of necessity use public transportation facilities; and

Whereas it is essential that economic incentives be provided for our common carriers in order to make it possible for them to combat the financial plight in which many of them now find themselves in order to strengthen and further promote our national transportation system so vital to the defense and economy of this Nation; and

Whereas much of the revenue which will be canceled out in this excise tax removal probably would be regained from added income to be derived from the transportation companies in corporate income taxes: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce that the objectives of the excise tax on the travel of persons have since been achieved; that the tax now operates as a discriminatory and regressive tax; that it operates as a drag on the economy; this reduction should be passed on to the fullest possible extent to the users of this transportation and for other reasons heretofore stated in this resolution, should be repealed at the earliest date; and that to this end the committee pledges its support and cooperation and urges the Committee on Finance and the Congress to give prompt and favorable consideration to the Smathers' bill, S. 5, which seeks to achieve this worthy objective.

"THE GALLANT HOURS"

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, great deeds and inspiring personalities in history have provided the theme for countless sermons, books, dramas, and essays which both educate and challenge successive generations of human beings. In this field, the American motion picture on numerous occasions has served as a forceful vehicle for acquainting persons of many nationalities and backgrounds with the accomplishments of those who have rendered unique service to mankind.

A motion picture which holds promise of being of incalculable worth as an object lesson and also as a merited tribute to a truly heroic character has just gone into production in southern California. I am indeed happy to bring to the attention of this body the fact that a film entitled "The Gallant Hours" will bring to theater audiences a powerful cinematic portrait of the illustrious Adm. William F. Halsey, Jr.

Countless thousands of men who wore the uniform of the United States—whether the sweat-stained fatigues of the Marines and Army, the helmet and jacket of the Air Force and naval aviation, or the whites and dungarees of the Navy—know well the indomitable courage, the spirit of sacrifice, determination, and confidence which "Bull" Halsey typified and the auspicious leadership he provided in turning back the merciless forces of Imperial Japan in the grim first year of the war in the South Pacific.

"The Gallant Hours" is conceived as a stirring condensation of the qualities and the achievements of a man of destiny who gave America its first taste of victory in the Pacific and sparked the tenacious resistance which was so vital in holding Guadalcanal.

The script for this motion picture shows imagination and understanding. This is to be expected, inasmuch as the producers are two respected, widely honored veterans of the American film industry, Robert Montgomery and James Cagney. With Montgomery directing and Cagney playing the title role, this picture will have a remarkable cast to portray a number of real-life characters who participated in grueling events related in the picture. Among those represented will be Father Gehring, "the Padre of Guadalcanal"; Vice Adm. Robert L. Ghormley, Maj. Gen. Alexander A. Vandegrift; Maj. Gen. Roy S. Geiger, the colorful Joe Foss and equally dramatic Col. Evans F. Carlson; and many others who have become legends.

Being filmed in part at the Marines' vast Pacific coast installation, Camp

Pendleton, "The Gallant Hours" will reproduce "Bull" Halsey's inestimable contribution to the ultimate victory. Reportedly, the whole treatment is in complete harmony with his classic comment "we are down to a shoestring, so we'll fight with a shoestring."

I wish to inform the Senate about this forthcoming production because I am confident all who ever had the good fortune to know or to serve under the undaunted Admiral Halsey will look forward eagerly to seeing it on the screen.

PROSECUTION AND CONVICTION OF LABOR RACKETEERING

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, during the past 2 years the Senate Select Committee To Investigate Improper Activities in Labor-Management Relations has uncovered shocking instances of labor racketeering. However, little has been said about the efforts the Attorney General and his assistants have made to prosecute and convict racketeers engaged in such criminal enterprises; nor has proper tribute been paid to the splendid investigative agencies of both the Justice and Treasury Departments, on whose ability to ferret out the facts all successful prosecutions are based. It is about time that the public be informed of those efforts and the results thereof.

It is for that reason that I rise to cite the record of the accomplishments of our Federal law-enforcement officials. From the very outset, this administration has placed great emphasis upon the prosecution of racketeers who prey upon legitimate business and labor. During the first 6 years these laws were in effect, there were only three convictions for violations of the Hobbs Act and the Taft-Hartley Act; but during the past 6 years under this administration, 134 convictions have been obtained by various U.S. attorneys throughout the country.

The record of this accomplishment has perhaps gone unnoticed, because the Government prosecutors cannot ethically seek publicity in criminal cases, and are restricted in the comments which they may make about any pending case. Local prosecutions of even the most notorious racketeers frequently receive no news coverage outside of the immediate locality involved.

For example, in St. Louis a number of labor racketeers, by threats of work stoppages, work slowdowns, and the final shutdown on the job, compelled contractors to pay them 3 cents a foot on a contract to lay 90 miles of pipeline in the St. Louis area. Prosecutions resulted in the conviction of five labor union officials, each of whom received a sentence of 10 years imprisonment and 5 years probation.

Racketeers, gamblers, and similar operators in all fields of organized crime have been convicted of violations of Internal Revenue laws. Frank Ericson, Frank Costello, Frank Leviorsi, Peter Licavoli, and Paul di Lucia were among those sentenced to imprisonment for income tax violations. One of the most recent convictions for this offense is that of Dave Beck. The successful prosecution of Veto Genovese and 13 others for a huge narcotics conspiracy is a tribute to the ceaseless efforts of the Department of Justice and the Treasury's Bureau of Narcotics against the most vicious and depraved form of racketeering.

The Criminal Division of the Department of Justice has organized and launched a nationwide, coordinated attack against the top hoodlums of the criminal syndicates. Throughout the country, U.S. attorneys have created special staffs to spearhead the attack on the racketeering element.

In order that the Senate may be better aware of the record of the Department of Justice in this field and the fine work done by the FBI and the Internal Revenue Service, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD "A Summary of Successful Racketeering Prosecutions, 1953 to 1959," and an article entitled "United States Tries New Approach to Racket Busting," which appeared in the Washington, D.C., Sunday Star on April 26, 1959.

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

A SUMMARY OF SUCCESSFUL FEDERAL RACKET PROSECUTIONS, 1953–59

The seriousness of the threat to the basic fabric of our society which organized syndicated crime represents today can hardly be over-emphasized. The public is only vaguely aware of this threat. You as U.S. attorneys sometimes have come in contact with its uglier manifestations. The full scope of organized crime remains a picture continuously to be developed by law enforcement agencies.

One part of the picture which has attracted little notice is the record of accomplishment by you, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, Internal Revenue Bureau and the Department of Justice during the last 6 years in prosecutions under the Hobbs Act, Taft-Hartley Act, and criminal tax laws. We realize that local prosecutions, even of the most notorious racketeers, receive no great amount of news coverage individually. Rules of decorum in the courtroom forbid television or even the taking of still pictures, and the prosecuting attorneys are restricted in comment they may make about a pending case. Quite properly, these same restrictions do not apply in other proceedings in which these same individuals may be involved.

The record of accomplishment during the past 6 years is a solid basis of experience from which the Department's intensified drive against racketeers can vigorously be pressed forward. The "Handbook for Prosecution of Racketeers," being distributed to all U.S. attorneys today, should help substantially in perfecting the arsenal of ready legal weapons which you can bring to bear on racketeers.

The Department's role in this campaign is to furnish support, guidance, and leadership. But we know the campaign's success depends in the last analysis on the aggregate results of hundreds of battles and skirmishes in the field conducted by U.S. attorneys, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and other law enforcement agencies throughout our country wherever racketeers are entrenched.

What energetic and thorough prosecution can do in this field can easily be seen from the record of what has been done in the past 6 years. With vigorous, thoughtful, and persistent action on your part, supported and guided by the Department of Justice, more such battles will be fought and won.

The tax prosecutions have resulted in the conviction of racketeers of all classifications. Some of these are listed in the latter part of this summary. One particularly vicious type of racketeering is labor racketeering, which exploits the rights and loots the funds of the workingman. Two special statutes have proved effective in this field. Let's look at the record since January 1953 under the Hobbs Act (18 U.S.C. 1951) and one provision of the Taft-Hartley Act (29 U.S.C. 186). The record is: 1946–52 (approximately 6 years) convictions, 3. January 1953 to March 1959 (approximately 6 years) convictions, 134.

That is the statistical record, which speaks for itself. However, in order to illustrate the full significance of what has been accomplished, we have prepared a summary of some of the typical cases included in the 134 convictions obtained by the Department since 1953. In this summary, the more interesting cases are outlined in terms of the persons convicted, the amount of money involved, and the punishment meted out by the courts. We have also prepared a list of some of the individuals convicted of violations of the internal revenue laws.

Many names will readily be recognized on both lists which follow.

MALCOLM R. WILKEY,
Assistant Attorney General,
Criminal Division.

1. Defendant, Ryan, Joseph P.; sentence, 6 months and $2,500 fine; amount involved, $5,500.

Who he was: Ryan was president of the International Longshoremens Association.

What he did: Ryan, by use of a slow-down, obtained payments of $5,500 from two companies in New York, J. Arthur Kennedy & Son, and Daniels & Kennedy, in return for assurance of labor peace.

(350 U.S. 299 (U.S. Supreme Court, 1956).)

2. Defendant, Dale, Evan R., sentence, 15 years and $10,000 fine; Kristics, John J.; sentence 5 years probation; Bateman, James; 5 years probation and $2,000 fine; amount involved, $1,030,000.

Who they were: Dale was president of the Southern District of Illinois Council, International Hod Carriers, Building and Common Laborers of America. Kristics was with the Hod Carriers, Building and Common Laborers Union. Bateman was business agent for local 160, United Association of Pipe Fitters.

What they did: Defendants conspired to make Ebasco Services Inc. (which had a contract with the AEC to build an electric power plant at Joppa, Illinois) pay them one percent of the contract price for "labor peace."

(223 F. 2d 181 (7th Cir. 1955).)

3. Defendant, Masiello, Philip; sentence 5 years; Stickel, Frances L.; sentence 5 years; amount involved, $64,000.

Who they were: Masiello was business agent for local 445 of the Teamsters Union. Stickel was secretary-treasurer of the same local.

What they did: Masiello and Stickel conspired to extort $64,000 from over-the-road milk haulers in the New York area by means of threats of labor trouble between 1949 and 1953. The chief victims of the conspiracy were milk haulers in the Albany, N.Y., area.

(235 F. 2d 279 (2d Cir. 1956).)

4. Defendant, Stirone, Nicholas A.; sentence, 3 years and $5,000 fine; amount involved, $31,274.13.

Who he was: Stirone was president, local 1058, Hod Carriers, Building and Common Laborers Union of America, in the Pittsburgh area.

What he did: In 1952, William G. Rider obtained the contract to supply ready-mixed concrete for the erection of a steel plant at Allenport, Pa. Stirone, by threats of labor troubles and obstruction of the work, succeeded in having Rider pay him at the rate of 50 cents per yard of concrete. Over a 2-year period this amounted to $31,274.13.

(262 F. 2d 571 (3d Cir. 1958).)

5. Defendant, Hulahan, Paul H.; sentence, 12 years and $8,000 fine; amount involved, $50,000.

Who he was: Hulahan was business agent of local 42 of the Hod Carriers, Building and Common Laborers, in the the St. Louis area.

What he did: Hulahan attempted, by means of labor disputes and work stoppages, to extort $50,000 from M. H. Carpenter, Inc., and two other St. Louis construction companies in return for "labor peace."

(214 F. 2d 441 (8th Cir. 1954).)

6. Defendant, Koonse, Edward; sentence, 3 months and 2 years probation; Hall, J. W.; sentence, 3 months and 2 years probation; amount involved, $1,800.

Who they were: Koonse and Hall were business agents of local 541, International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Kansas City, Kans.

What they did: Accepted payments of $600 per month for 3 months from the Rumsey Bros. Construction Co., which had a contract to lay a natural gas pipeline from a point in Kansas to a point in Illinois. The company official said it had anticipated trouble and made the payments to avoid it.

(U.S. District Court for Kansas (1955).)

7. Defendant, Doyle, Albert; sentence 2 years; Riggi, Emanuel; sentence, 2 years; Murphy, James; sentence, 5 years' probation and $2,500 fine; amount involved $1,960.

Who they were: Doyle was business agent for local 18, Bricklayers, Masons and Plasterers Union. Riggi was business agent of local 394, Hod Carriers, Building and Common Laborers. Murphy was a member of local 18.

What they did: Defendants conspired to extort money from the Chemsteel Construction Co., in connection with the construction of an acid concentrator at Linden, N.J. Acting under threats, the company put two fictitious bricklayers on its payroll and paid their weekly salaries to Doyle.

(265 F. 2d 57 (3d Cir. 1958).)

8. Defendant, Soucie, O.B.; sentence, 5 years and $10,000 fine; Rhodes, Orville; sentence, 5 years' probation and $3,000 fine; Highfill, Henry; sentence, 5 years' probation and $3,000 fine; amount involved, $9,200.

Who they were: Soucie (known as "The Duke of Indiana") was president of local No. 841, International Union of Operating Engineers. Orville (Dusty) Rhodes and Henry Highfill were business agents of the same local.

What they did: Defendants conspired to extort 1 percent of the contract price from two roadbuilding contractors in the East St. Louis area for "labor peace".

(U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Illinois (1955).)

9. Defendant, Bianchi, Carl; sentence, 10 years and 5 years probation; Poster, William; sentence, 10 years and 5 years probation; Callanan, Lawrence; sentence 10 years and 5 years probation; Thompson, L. A.; sentence, 10 years and 5 years probation; Secor, R. M.; sentence, 10 years and 5 years probation; amount involved, over $70,000.

Who they were: In the St. Louis area, Bianchi was business agent of local 513, International Union of Operating Engineers; Poster was secretary-treasurer of local 110, Hod Carriers, Building and Common Laborers; Callanan was business agent of local 562, Pipe Fitters Union; Thompson was business agent of local 574, International Brotherhood of Teamsters; and Secor was secretary-treasurer of local 916, Hod Carriers, Building and Common Laborers.

What they did: Bianchi, Poster, and Thompson, by threats of work stoppages, slowdowns and a final shutdown on the job, compelled a contractor to pay them 3 cents per foot on a contract to lay 90 miles of pipeline in the St. Louis area. These three, along with Callanan and Secor, obtained $28,000 from another contractor also engaged in the construction of a pipeline in the same area.

(219 F. 2d 182 and 223 F. 2d 171 (8th Cir. 1955.).

10. Defendant, Ricciardelli, Belmont; sentence, 2 years; Leanzo, Alfred; sentence 2 years; amount involved, $5,000.

Who they were: Ricciardelli was president and Leanzo was business agent of local 311, United Industrial Union of the International Toy and Doll Workers, at Jersey City, N.J.

What they did: When defendants failed to organize the employees of Merlin, Inc., North Bergen, N.J., a picket line was set up at the plant and company trucks had sugar put in their gas tanks, tires slashed, ignition wires pulled, etc. Defendants let the company know that the matter could be settled for $15,000. This proposal was rejected; however, the company subsequently agreed to pay $5,000. The defendants accepted with the proviso that $500 be paid on account. The company president then notified the U.S. attorney, who arranged to have agents of the Federal Bureau of Investigation witness the $500 payoff.

(U.S. District Court for New Jersey (1956).)

11. Defendant, Hudson, H. H.; sentence, 10 years; amount involved, $3,000.

Who he was: Hudson was the business agent for local 369, Electrical Workers.

What he did: Hudson extorted money from a construction firm engaged in building industrial plants in the Louisville, Ky., area by means of threats of labor violence. He was convicted under both the Hobbs Act and the Taft-Hartley Act.

(U.S. District Court for the Western District of Kentucky (1956).)

12. Defenfant, Lowe, James; sentence, 3 years and $10,000 fine; amount involved, $20,000.

Who he was: Lowe was business agent for local 11, Bridge Structure and Ornamental Iron Workers Union.

What he did: Lowe, by threats of labor disputes, work stoppages, and other labor trouble, extorted $20,000 from contractors constructing the Big Inch gas pipeline connection in northern New Jersey.

(234 F. 2d 919 (3d Cir. 1956).)

13. Defendant, Cape, Woodrow W.; sentence, 1 year; amount involved, $1,000.

Who he was: Cape was business agent for local 598, Plumbers and Steamfitters Union.

What he did: Cape extorted $1,000 by means of threats of labor disputes and work stoppages from the A. J. Curtis Construction Co., which was engaged in the construction of a natural gas pipeline from Pasco, Wash.

(U.S. District Court for Eastern District of Washington (1959).)

14. Defendant, Varlack, Henry G.; sentence, 5 years; Roche, David; sentence, 5 years; Kavalauskas, Samuel; sentence 5 years; amount involved, over $7,500.

Who they were: Varlack was a delegate of local 1291, International Longshoremen's Association (ILA). Kavalauskas was a business agent for the same local. Roche was on the staff of the ILA.

What they did: Varlack and Kavalauskas approached the American Sugar Refining Co. in Philadelphia and attempted to extort $2,500 each, in addition to an automobile and a place on the weekly payroll of the company, to assure the company that its raw bulk sugar, arriving in Philadelphia by ship, could be unloaded and would not spoil as a result of a strike. The company resisted and the union struck. Roche then came to Philadelphia as a representative of Joseph Ryan, president of ILA, and demanded $7,500, which was paid. Subsequently Varlack and Kavalauskas also received other money and the strike ended.

(225 F. 2d 665 (2d Cir. 1955).)

15. Defendant, Postma, Peter J.; sentence 4 years; McConnon, Joseph; sentence, 18 months; amount involved, $10,000.

Who they were: Postma was business agent for local 294 of the Teamsters Union. McConnon was president of Terminal Trailers, Inc., an Albany, N.Y. concern engaged in transshipping trailers on Hudson River barges.

What they did: Postma was engaged in trucking negotiations with the Highway Transportation Association of upstate New York, an organization of truck operators in the Albany area. McConnon, who was not a member of the association, acted as liaison between the association and Postma, advising the association that Postma would settle a strike for $10,000. After a subsequent demand for $30,000 was rejected, the association paid $10,000 to McConnon who in turn paid it to Postma.

(242 F. 2d 489 (2d Cir. 1957).)

16. Defendant, Pavlat, Edward J.; sentence, 2 years and $5,000 fine; Snyder, Edwin H.; sentence, 2 years and $2,500 fine; Long, Guy T.; sentence, 2 years and $2,500 fine; amount involved, $3,701.

Who they were: Pavlat was secretary, treasurer, and business agent for local 15, International Brotherhood of Teamsters at Galesburg, Ill. Snyder was business agent for local 80 of the Teamsters at Quincy, Ill. Long was president and business agent of local 532 of the Teamsters at Springfield, Ill.

What they did: By a series of strikes, slowdowns, stoppages, and other labor troubles, Pavlat and Snyder compelled the payment of $1,200 by J. L. Cox & Sons Pipe Stringing Corp., which was laying a natural gas pipeline from Oklahoma into Illinois. By similar activities Pavlat and Long compelled the payment of $2,501 by the O. R. Burden Construction Co. of Tulsa, which was engaged in the same project.

(U.S. District Court for the Southern District of Illinois (1955); two cases.)

17. Defendant, Arroyo, Wadelmiro; sentence, 9 months and $2,000 fine; amount involved, $15,000.

Who he was: Arroyo was president of local 178, International Longshoremen's Association, Puerto Rico.

What he did: Arroyo negotiated an agreement with a Puerto Rican company for a welfare fund for its employees with an initial contribution of $15,000 by the employer. The fund was to be administered by a committee of labor-management trustees; however, before they were appointed, Arroyo deposited the money in his personal bank account and used it for his own purposes.

(256 F. 2d 549 (1st Cir. 1958); certiorari granted by the Supreme Court October 13, 1958.)

18. Defendant, Malinsky, Morris; sentence, 3 years; Green, Irving; sentence, 2½ years; Rapkin, Louis; sentence, 1 year, 1 day; Meglino, Joseph; sentence, 3 years suspended, 3 years probation; Pfeffer, Albert; sentence, 3 years; Tillinger, Milton; sentence, 2½ years; Lustigman, David; sentence, 3 years; Schwartz, Isidore; sentence, 2 years; Vogel, Samuel; sentence, 3 years suspended, 3 years probation; amount involved, association dues and union dues.

Who they were: Four of the defendants were with the New York Pickle and Condiment Dealers Association, Malinsky as business manager, Green and Rapkin as past presidents, and Meglino as past business manager. Vogel was president of local 120, Pickle and Condiment Workers, affiliated with Confederated Unions of America. The others were affiliated with local 1648, Condiment and Table Suppliers Union, Pfeffer as secretary, Tillinger as vice president, Lustigman as secretary-treasurer and Schwartz as trustee.

What they did: The complex conspiracy in this case involved an attempt to monopolize the pickle and condiment industry in New York. Concerns in the industry were forced to join the association and to pay

union dues, and those refusing experienced difficulties with the union.

(19 F.R.D. 426 (S.D. N.Y., 1956).)

In addition to those described in detail above, others convicted one or more times under the Hobbs and Taft-Hartley Acts are: Adrian, William; Anderson, William; Bales, William; Baurhenn, Paul; Doyle, Albert; Floyd, Virgil; Ferrebee, Oscar; Flaum, Jack; Franzee, Dominick; Gibbs, Theodore; Geilhausen, Jack; Green, Jack; Hagen, Harry J.; Harmon, Guy M.; Higgins, Peter R.; Jochim, Stanley; Karpf, David; Lowry, Clayton A.; May, Thomas; Meisenhelter, Harry; Nedley, Raymond; Palmiatti, Claude; Patalito, Bruno; Schmidt, Henry; Sweeney, John; Valdario, Mario; Wright, Ralph; McKeever, Thomas; Morrison, Lawrence; Barrett, George; Nemirka, Michael Alexander; Tormas, Carmela; Brennan, Sidney; Connelly, Gerald; Coleman, John; Garcia, Alejandro; Gallagher, Edward; Hudson, H. H.; Jorgesen, Jack; Lowry, C. A.; Medina, R. S.; Moore, J.; Martire, Dante; Nathan, Isaac; Parran, James; Pecora, Thomas; Rodriguez, Ramon Mejias; Ventimiglia, Frank; Weibert, Peter; Williams, Eugene; Reshlian, Robert J.; Eichengrund, Seymour; Siegal, Abraham; Korholtz, Herbert F.; Bierig, Fred W.; Lopp, Cyril J.; Brown, Cecil E.

Labor racketeering is only one segment of racketeering. In addition to the convictions of individuals listed above, many other racketeers, gamblers, and similar operators in all fields of organized crime have been convicted during the past 6 years under the internal revenue laws. In most of the following cases, the defendant willfully evaded income taxes, and in some cases willfully failed to file a return or made false statements to revenue agents:

CONVICTIONS OF KNOWN RACKETEERS, GAMBLERS, ETC., UNDER THE TAX LAWS, JANUARY 1, 1953, TO MARCH 1959

Daniel Smith: Convicted June 5, 1953; sentence, 2 years; Massachusetts gambling wire service operator.

Frank Erickson: Convicted June 16, 1953; sentence, 6 months; New York gambler and known operator of gambling ventures in the country.

L. B. (Benny) Binyon: Convicted September 5, 1953; sentence, 5 years; well-known operator of gambling ventures in Texas.

Arthur H. Samish: Convicted November 17, 1953; sentence, 3 years; longtime lobbyist and representative of liquor industries in California.

Harry Gross: Convicted April 19, 1954; $2,500 fine; New York bookmaker.

Frank Costello: Convicted May 13, 1954; sentence, 5 years; nationally known, notorious New York gambling figure.

George W. Lewis: Convicted May 13, 1954; sentence, 1 year; California gambler.

Alex Birns: Convicted July 28, 1954; sentence, 3 years; notorious Cleveland underworld figure.

Sam Beard: Convicted October 1, 1954; sentence, 5 years; Washington, D.C., gambler and numbers operator.

Louis Berra: Convicted October 1, 1954; sentence, 2 years; St. Louis labor racketeer.

Emmett R. Warring: Convicted December 21, 1954; sentence, 3 years; Washington, D.C., gambler and numbers operator.

John Doyle: Convicted January 29, 1955; sentence, 2 years; Gary, Ind., bookmaker and slot machine operator.

William Giglio: Convicted February 18, 1955; sentence, 15 years; involved in wartime sugar black market.

Frank S. Livorsi: Convicted February 18, 1955; sentence, 15 years; associated with William Giglio in sugar black market.

Howard M. Lawn: Convicted February 18, 1955; sentence, 1 year and 1 day; associate to Giglio and Livorsi in sugar black market.

Louis "Red" Smith: Convicted April 22, 1955; sentence, 1 year and 1 day; St. Louis gambler and racketeer.

Umberto Anastasio: Convicted May 23, 1955; sentence, 1 year; notorious New Jersey racketeer, reputed to have been at one time the executioner for Murder Incorporated.

Evan Dale: Convicted June 24, 1955; sentence, 10 years; Illinois labor racketeer.

Charles Friedman: Convicted November 1, 1955; sentence, 2 years; (suspended) and 3 years probation. Member of the notorious S & G syndicate, one of the largest off-the-track betting enterprises in the South.

John Ward: Convicted March 23, 1956; sentence, 4 years; New York waterfront racketeer.

Michael Bowers: Convicted March 23, 1956; sentence, 5 years; New York waterfront racketeer.

James D. Irving: Convicted May 15, 1956; sentence, 3 years; Chicago numbers operator.

Lionel Dominguez: Convicted October 30, 1956; sentence, 2 years; New Orleans lottery operator.

Frank Nathan: Convicted June 7, 1957; sentence, 3 years probation; notorious Pittsburgh, Pa., influence peddler.

Sidney Brodson: Convicted May 2, 1958; sentence, 2½ years; Milwaukee gambling figure, prominent in the basketball scandals a few years ago.

Peter Licavoli: Convicted May 2, 1953; sentence, 2½ years; reputed leader of the so-called purple gang in Detroit.

Elmer "Bones" Remmer: Convicted June 3, 1958, sentence, 5 years; California and Nevada gambling house operator.

Paul (the Waiter) DeLucia (alias Paul Ricca): Convicted June 12, 1958; sentence, 3 years; one of the alleged successors to Al Capone in Chicago.

Orell B. (Duke) Soucie: Convicted June 12, 1958; sentences, 18 months; Illinois labor racketeer.

Edward W. Curd: Convicted December 10, 1958; sentence, 1 year and 1 day; Lexington, Ky., gambler, who was reputedly the key figure in the Kentucky University basketball scandal several years ago.

John F. O'Neill: Convicted December 10, 1958; sentence, 1 year and 1 day; an associate of the notorious William DeKoning of the Operating Engineers Union in Brooklyn and Long Island.

Glenn Smith: Convicted January 7, 1959; awaiting sentence; Tennessee Teamsters Union official who received $18,000 from his union and contended he paid the money to a judge to fix a criminal case against union members.

Hugh L. Culbreath: Convicted January 23, 1959; $30,000 fine; former sheriff of Hillsborough County (Tampa), Fla.; there was testimony that he received payoffs from the racketeering element in the Tampa area.

Dave Beck: Convicted February 20, 1959; sentence, 5 years; former president of Teamsters Union.

Others: Lorenzo Alagia, Earl Artis, Mateo Azcona, Rozier C. Bayley, Leon C. Chester, Thomas B. Callahan, William Cohen, Edward Copeland, Isadore Eisenstein, Jang Kay Fong, Young Ah Fook, Fred M. Ford, Joseph Frank, John J. Gannon, Martin Hughes, Frank Iaconi, Harold Jackson, John Kampmeyer, Herbert Kaufman, Daniel J. Keating, Joseph Koza, Leo Link, Alfred C. Marshal, Samuel Marosso, John L. McEwen, James D. Robinson, Sanders Scott, Fred Shaheen, Elaine Simpson, Edward Sindelar, Charles P. Spencer, Joe R. Steele, John A. Stewart, Fred Talbot, Justin Tappero, Charles Toye, Harvey Veino, Leroy B. Williams, Carrol Yates.

[From the Washington Sunday Star, Apr. 26, 1959]

UNITED STATES TRIES NEW APPROACH TO RACKET BUSTING

(By Miriam Ottenberg)

The Justice Department is making racket busters of its 94 U.S. attorneys across the country.

That is the latest development in Attorney General William P. Rogers' long-term push against the businessmen of crime—the racketeers.

The Federal prosecutors from Maine to California won't go it alone. Each will have his own rackets section directed and assisted from Washington.

Goal of the new setup is to pit nationwide prosecutive machinery against nationwide crime syndicates. Prime targets are the organized gamblers, narcotics traffickers, extortionists, white slavers, and labor racketeers whose annual take runs into billions of dollars.

The Justice Department's concentration on the racketeers got under way a year ago when M. Rogers set up a special group on organized crime to start a drive against the 100 most notorious underworld businessmen.

THE 100 TOP RACKETEERS

The special group, headed by Milton Wessel, of New York, and working under direct supervision of the Deputy Attorney General, was told to analyze the pool of information available on the 100 top racketeers, seek further investigation from the enforcement agencies, and request convening of investigatory grand juries.

Special group branches were set up in the four major headquarters of syndicated crime—New York, Miami, Chicago, and Los Angeles.

The infamous 100 were never identified publicly but it is known that a considerable dent has been put in the list during the last year. The special group is not directly credited with making the dent because getting at the well-cloaked top racketeers takes many months of investigation.

But the Justice Department thinks its publicized emphasis on the racketeers has had the effect of speeding up prosecutions, stiffening sentences, and keeping the underworld overlords off balance.

Special grand juries, convened at the request of the special group, are reportedly in operation in more than one city. In at least two cities, promising investigations are in the works.

Now, the Justice Department setup has been changed.

Mr. Rogers broke the news to the U.S. attorneys at their Justice Department conference earlier this month. They were told that the special group's operations will be integrated into U.S. attorney's offices, that antiracketeering units will be set up in the rest of the prosecutors' offices and that responsibility for the campaign against organized crime will be shifted from the Deputy Attorney General to the Justice Department's Criminal Division and its Organized Crime and Racketeering Section.

MEANING OF THE SHIFT

In some quarters, the announced shift was viewed with alarm. Was the publicized antiracket campaign petering out as so many similar campaigns have folded? Would the special group's work be halted just as it was beginning to promise results? Would the pin-pointed attack on the racketeers be blunted in the mass of land, tax, civil, and routine criminal cases handled by the U.S. attorneys?

The questions were put to Assistant Attorney General Malcolm R. Wilkey, a veteran prosecutor himself and recently named chief of the Criminal Division. His answers are not likely to comfort the racketeers whose illegitimate empires are threatened.

Instead of 18 attorneys specializing in racket prosecutions, the number will be expanded to many times 18 devoting full time to organized crime.

The special group branch offices chiefs will keep their titles as special assistants to the Attorney General and function as arms of the Justice Department. While, administratively, the special group personnel will

be under the U.S. attorney in each of the four cities where they now operate, they will become the racket section of the prosecutor's office and, as such, will be under the operational control of the Justice Department Criminal Division and its Organized Crime and Racketeering Section. In several offices, the racket sections will get increased staff.

The Organized Crime and Racketeering Section, meanwhile, will be relieved of routine chores and will be strengthened by the addition of several experienced trial attorneys.

RACKET SECTIONS SET UP

In the other prosecutors' offices throughout the country, each U.S. attorney is under orders to name one of his assistants as head of his rackets section. The assistant will have the same status as the heads of other sections of the prosecutor's office.

Mr. Wilkey visualizes the work of the rackets section chiefs this way:

Just as the special group accumulated information on the 100 top racketeers nationally, the racket-section chiefs and the U.S. attorneys they work for will tap the sources closer to home. From FBI, narcotics, Internal Revenue and customs agents, as well as local police, they will compile their own lists of racketeers. A man known to the FBI as a white-slave trafficker may be tagged by narcotics agents as a heroin importer or to Internal Revenue as a numbers king or to customs as a smuggler.

The prosecutor will then sift the combined information in search of the one slip, the one provable law violation in a hitherto unpunished career of lawlessness.

The list of racketeers will become familiar to the prosecutor's entire staff. If a narcotics "pusher" or numbers "runners" up for prosecution in the regular criminal section of the office, should drop a name on the list of racketeers, the chief of the rackets section will be alerted immediately to pursue the lead.

How can prosecutors unfamiliar with organized crime be turned overnight into racket busters?

A PROSECUTION HANDBOOK

Each U.S. attorney has been given a Handbook for Prosecution of Racketeers. Specified in the handbook are the 10 statutes considered the most effective in harassing the racketeers. The detailed analysis of these laws show how they can be applied, what cases have been decided under them, how convictions were won or lost and what facts are necessary to build an effective case. The pitfalls and advantages of the laws granting immunity to witnesses are explored and a flock of decisions are summarized for ready reference.

The Justice Department wants to awaken the prosecutors to all the possible tools to pry the racketeers out of their safe berths. Prosecutors know the tax, gambling, and narcotics laws, but the Justice Department wants to make them more conscious of the application of these laws to the previously untouched racketeers. The Justice Department also wants them to realize the effectiveness of a prosecution weapon which previously has been handled only in Washington—antitrust actions.

Since the racketeers are primarily big businessmen, in both legitimate and illegitimate business, they may well be violating the antitrust laws. This New York indictment is cited as a case in point:

LABOR AGREEMENT

An association of manufacturers had an agreement with a union to supply its labor force but a man on the outside seemed to be in a position of control. He could keep employees on the job or pull them off. He could make life hard or easy for the manufacturers. At first look, he didn't seem to be getting any income from his efforts. Investigation revealed, however, that he owned a trucking line which had expanded to 10 times its original size in just a few years. Through his control of the labor supply, he was forcing manufacturers to ship by his truckline. He was indicted along with the association and the union on charges of suppressing competition.

To encourage the prosecutors in their new assignment, the Justice Department has also distributed a summary of successful Federal racket prosecutions from 1953 to 1959, subtitled "What Has Been Done Demonstrates What Can Be Done."

Reporting 134 convictions of some of the big underworld names during these 6 years, the summary advises the prosecutors that the Department's intensified campaign against the racketeers "depends in the last analysis on the aggregate result of hundreds of battles and skirmishes in the field."

While the individual prosecutors seek the one vulnerable spot in their racketeer targets, the Justice Department is emphasizing two other weapons against the organized criminals—speedier justice and longer sentences.

Mr. Wilkey cited one instance where a big-time racketeer had been under indictment a year but hadn't been tried because of a crowded docket. Another judge has now been sent to the district to try him.

As for sentences, Mr. Wilkey said the Justice Department is advising its prosecutors to tell the judge—and the public—all about the men who have led lawless lives even if they never saw the inside of a jail. Where judges permit it, prosecutors have been told to recommend sentences—and make them long. Mr. Wilkey reported that in almost every recent case judges have thrown the book at the racketeers. He cited the case of 61-year-old Vito Genovese, the rackets king convicted of conspiracy in an international narcotics ring. Genovese drew a 15-year sentence and a $20,000 fine.

TO HARASS CRIMINALS

In urging prosecutors to seek the syndicates behind the small fry, Mr. Wilkey has told them:

"We intend, through continuous investigation and prosecution, to eradicate, eliminate, harass, and generally bedevil the overlords, underlords, underlings, and hirelings of organized crime.

"We have no illusion that we will wipe this out in 1 year or 5 years, or indeed that it can be wiped out completely at all.

"But it can be made very unprofitable. Any businessman—and these are in essence businessmen in organized criminal activity—must calculate the risk he runs compared to the profit he hopes to make. We do our best to raise the risk and at the same time eliminate the profit."

NOMINATION OF LEWIS STRAUSS TO BE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement I have prepared as to why in the committee I voted against favorably reporting to the Senate the nomination of Mr. Lewis Strauss to be Secretary of Commerce.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR LANGER

The Senate is being asked to put a stamp of approval on the appointee, Mr. Lewis Strauss, who as head of the Atomic Energy Commission, participated in one of the most gigantic conspiracies ever conceived to wreck a masterpiece of American ingenuity; namely, the Tennessee Valley Authority (TVA), and its companion, REA.

Realizing the significance of this, should this man Strauss be rewarded? Let's look at what took place.

On October 15, 1952, at Memphis, Tenn., President Eisenhower was a candidate and he pledged himself wholeheartedly and without reservation to continuation of TVA, and again in a telegram on November 1, 3 days before the election, through the News-Sentinel at Knoxville, Tenn., he once more reiterated his approval of TVA when he stated: "TVA has served well both agricultural and industrial interests of this region. Rumors are being maliciously spread in TVA areas that I propose not only to decrease the efficiency of the operation but to abandon it, which is grossly untrue and utterly false. If I am elected President, TVA will be operated and maintained at maximum efficiency. I have a keen appreciation of what it has done and what it will continue to do in the future. Under the new administration TVA will continue to serve and promote the prosperity of this great section of the United States."

But, beginning in January 1953, the conspiracy proceeded to take roots and the men who desired to wreck TVA and REA decided to work through one Mr. Lewis Strauss, then head of the Atomic Energy Commission and overnight the propaganda went forth, that instead of TVA being an asset to the American people, it was a form of, as President Eisenhower put it in a speech in South Dakota—creeping socialism.

Only by exceptional watchfulness on the part of a few Senators was this conspiracy nipped in the bud, and I am appalled at the idea that this Senate may reward one of the chief conspirators by confirming him as Secretary of Commerce.

Now that the hearings on Mr. Lewis Strauss are concluded, I must express my surprise and disappointment that a man who seeks to become Secretary of Commerce has continued to thumb his nose at the American people as represented by two committees of the U.S. Senate.

Not only has Mr. Strauss refused to answer questions of a subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee, of which I am a member and former chairman, but he has brazenly refused to answer similar questions propounded by the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee.

I had been hoping that in seeking promotion to be Secretary of Commerce, Mr. Strauss would divest himself of the arrogance with which he refused to answer the courteous and constitutional questions asked him by the distinguished Senators KEFAUVER and O'MAHONEY regarding one of the biggest conflict of interest cases in American history—the Dixon-Yates deal. He has not done so.

I do not see how any Member of the U.S. Senate who respects its rights and responsibilities to the people can vote to confirm a man who treats their representatives in the Senate with such insulting disrespect. Certainly I shall not do so.

Surely no Senator who has read the Dixon-Yates hearings and knows of the vicious attempt of Lewis Strauss and his cohorts to wreck the Rural Electrification program (REA) can vote for Strauss' confirmation and then honestly face his REA constituents.

Here is a proposed member of the Cabinet who is so highhanded that he defiantly announces that he would spurn an official opinion by another member of the Cabinet, the Attorney General, to answer questions asked by the Congress.

To confirm Mr. Lewis Strauss under these circumstances would be the seal of approval of his own insolent and self-asserted right to ignore constitutional questions essential to the interest of good government, thereby sealing off from the American people through their representatives in the Senate authority to ask similar questions of other Cabinet officials in the future.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, if there are no Senators who desire to address the Senate prior to the call of the calendar, and if morning business has been concluded, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. NEUBERGER. 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 CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the order previously entered, the Senate will proceed with the call of the calendar for the consideration of measures to which there is no objection.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 1075) to provide for the reimbursement of Meadow School District No. 29, Upham, N. Dak., for loss of revenue resulting from the acquisition of certain lands within such school district by the Department of the Interior was announced as first in order.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, I ask that the bill be passed over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 91) 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 was announced as next in order.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I ask that the bill be passed over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (H.R. 213) to provide additional time within which certain State agreements under section 218 of the Social Security Act may be modified to secure coverage for nonprofessional school district employees was announced as next in order.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, by request I ask that the bill be passed over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (H.R. 4601) 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, was announced as next in order.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, by request I ask that the bill be passed over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 690) to provide for the increased use of agricultural products for industrial purposes was announced as next in order.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, I ask that the bill be passed over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The joint resolution (H.J. Res. 254) to authorize participation by the United States in parliamentary conferences with Canada was announced as next in order.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, by request I ask that the joint resolution be passed over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be passed over.

REPRESENTATION OF INDIGENT DEFENDANTS IN CRIMINAL CASES

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 895) to provide for the representation of indigent defendants in criminal cases in the district courts of the United States.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I wish to be recognized in connection with the consideration of this bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the bill which is now under consideration by the Senate, S. 895, to provide for the representation of indigent defendants, is a historic step forward in implementing the rights guaranteed every accused person under the sixth amendment. It helps assure every individual adequate legal representation in criminal cases, where he is financially unable to secure his own counsel.

This bill is identical with S. 3275, which was passed by the Senate on July 15, 1958, but was not acted upon in the other body. I was proud to be the sponsor of that bill, together with Senators KEFAUVER and WILEY, the sponsors of the present legislation, and reintroduced in the present session, together with Senator KEFAUVER, a bill on this subject, S. 1079, identical with that originally proposed in the 85th Congress. The chief difference between these bills is that S. 1079 contained an additional provision, to make use of the very able and devoted talents of existing legal aid and defender groups and local bar associations, which have carried the burden of representing indigent defendants up to the present time. It would have provided grants for such groups in districts where the need for assistant public defenders or for counsel on a case-by-case basis is lessened by the services of such a group. These provisions had been recommended by the National Legal Aid and Defender Association, the American Bar Association, and by local legal aid and bar associations.

Since the bill reported by the Committee on the Judiciary did not contain such provisions, I contacted the interested bar groups for their views, meanwhile laying on the table proposed amendments to include such grants. The response of the associations was unanimous in the view that this bill represented such a major step forward that its enactment should not be delayed, even for the important additional provisions for grants, which they continue to recommend.

Since I am also of that opinion, I did not call up the amendments which have been lying on the table. However, as soon as this bill has become law, as I hope it soon will be, I intend to submit amending legislation to permit a new consideration of the provisions for grants to existing legal aid groups.

In addition, there has been some concern expressed by legal aid organizations regarding the provisions of this bill, that, when a defendant is unable to employ counsel, the court shall assign the public defender to act as counsel. Their concern is based on the fact that this mandatory provision may operate to exclude continued use of existing legal aid groups, even where the public defender is unable to carry the caseload or where conflicting interests exist among defendants in the same case. I feel that this was not the intent of the sponsor or of the committee—as a matter of fact, the sponsors Senators WILEY and KEFAUVER have indicated to me their willingness to accept a clarifying amendment on this point.

The first problem the bill presents, however—and this is the reason for my seeking recognition—is whether or not it will adequately cover the situation which occurs when legal aid societies or organizations help indigent defendants without cost.

A second problem arises when individual attorneys who may be associated with such legal aid societies or bar associations may be asked by a district court to act as counsel on a case-by-case basis.

It is a fact that I have on the desk amendments to the bill which would have made very clear the ability of the legal aid societies and bar association groups active in this field to operate. I ask that such amendments be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

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

On page 4, between lines 15 and 16, insert the following new subsection:

"(e) Upon the recommendation of the Judicial Conference of the United States, the Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts may make grants to legal aid societies, bar associations, or other similar groups providing free legal services to indigent defendants in criminal proceedings in United States district courts. Such grants shall be made in those districts where the need for the appointment of assistant public defenders or, in districts where counsel in particular cases is utilized in lieu of public defenders, the need for the appointment of such counsel is lessened by reason of the volume and quality of the legal services provided by such groups in behalf of indigent defendants in criminal proceedings. The aggregate amount of any such grants made annually in any judicial district shall not exceed $30,000."

On page 4, line 16, strike out the subsection designation "(e)", and insert in lieu thereof the subsection designation "(f)".

On page 4, line 22, immediately after the words "particular cases,", insert the words "and the amount of the grants,".

On page 5, line 1, strike out the subsection designation "(f)" and insert in lieu thereof the subsection designation "(g)".

On page 5, line 5, strike out the closing quotation marks immediately following the period.

On page 5, between lines 5 and 6, insert the following new subsection:

"(g) Nothing contained in this section shall be construed to impair the employment by any court of the United States of the services of any legal aid society, bar association, or other similar group in providing free legal services to indigent defendants in criminal proceedings."

Mr. JAVITS. However, after consulting with the many distinguished associations which are favorable to this proposed legislation, we have all come to the conclusion—in which I concur—that to endeavor to amend this bill would only result in delaying it—perhaps, indeed, it might result in blocking it.

I therefore have decided, with my distinguished colleague from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], to make a part of the legislative record the answer to two questions which will help us to go as far as we can go now. If the bill should become law, an effort may be made subsequently to amend it more precisely. For present purposes, the answers to these questions might be adequate. I invite the attention of my colleague from Tennessee to the following questions:

First. In the opinion of the Senator from Tennessee, would this bill preclude the use, without compensation, of attorneys from legal aid or defender organizations or bar associations, or other attorneys appointed by the courts to act for indigent defendants, where the interests of justice so demand, as is the case at present?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I am very happy to respond to the question of the Senator from New York. In making this response I wish to advise the Senate that I have gone into the matter very thoroughly with the staff of the Committee on the Judiciary, and with Mr. Olney and with Mr. Gasque of the administrative office of the Supreme Court.

In my opinion the bill would not preclude the use, without compensation, of attorneys from legal aid or defender organizations or bar associations, or other attorneys appointed by the courts to act for indigent defenders, where the interests of justice so demand. As a matter of fact, the office of the Supreme Court encourages the use of attorneys by this kind of appointment, and the bill would not preclude in any way their appointment for this purpose.

Mr. JAVITS. The next question is: In the Senator's opinion would this bill preclude the district court from appointing counsel on a case-by-case basis, where this is provided for, from among attorneys who are members or employees of existing legal aid and defender groups or similar organizations, or those which may be formed?

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I have advised on this question also with the staff of the Judiciary Committee and with Mr. Olney and Mr. Gasque. The bill, in their opinion and in my opinion, would not preclude the district court from appointing counsel on a case-by-case basis where this is provided for, from among attorneys who are members or employees of legal aid and defender groups. So my response to the question is that definitely it would not.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank my colleague from Tennessee.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point letters addressed to me by the American Bar Association, the committee on legal aid of the Association of the Bar of the City of New York, the National Legal Aid and Defender Association, the chairman of the committee on Federal legislation of the Association of the Bar of the City of New York and the chairman of the special committee on legal aid in the Federal courts of the Federal Bar Association.

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

AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION,
STANDING COMMITTEE ON
LEGAL AID WORK.
April 22, 1959.

Hon. JACOB K. JAVITS,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR JAVITS: This will acknowledge with thanks the receipt of your letter of April 13 addressed to the chairman of the committee on legal aid work of the American Bar Association. I have read with much interest your bill (S. 1079) "to provide for the representation of indigent defendants in criminal cases in the district courts of the United States."

This bill is along the lines of previously proposed legislation for the same purposes. The purposes themselves have been approved in principle by action of the house of delegates of the American Bar Association, and our committee in the past has gone on record as supporting similar legislation.

With regard to section (e) we favor the inclusion of such provisions in the legislation. However, we feel bound at the same time to state that if such a provision should prove an obstacle to the adoption of the remainder of the bill, we should not be opposed to eliminating section (e). In other words, we believe that the other provisions of the bill are important enough, and their adoption is so urgent, that it would be a mistake to have insistence on section (e) block the adoption of the remaining provisions of the bill.

As for the remuneration for public defenders, it would seem to us that the provisions of the bill as drawn are quite in order.

We appreciate the opportunity of expressing our views, and trust you will be successful in obtaining adoption of your bill.

With best wishes, I am,
Respectfully yours,
RICHARD BENTLEY,
Chairman.

ASSOCIATION OF THE BAR
OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK,
COMMITTEE ON LEGAL AID,
New York, N.Y., May 8, 1959.

Hon. JACOB K. JAVITS,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR JAVITS: As chairman of the committee on legal aid of the Association of the Bar of the City of New York, I am responding to your letter of April 13, 1959, in which you ask for our committee's views on your bill, S. 1079, relating to the establishment of a public defender system in the Federal courts.

Since the time of the receipt of your letter, my committee has also learned of the favorable report of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary in support of Senator WILEY's bill, S. 895. We are also advised of your intention to propose amendments to S. 895 when the latter bill is called up on the floor of the Senate.

Let me say at the outset that my committee believes that the passage by the Congress of S. 895 would be a tremendous forward step in dealing with the problem of providing representation for indigent defendants. Our committee has, for some time, supported the need for public defender legislation and we believe that such legislation is long overdue.

However, we enthusiastically support and applaud the features of your S. 1079 which are lacking in S. 895. We particularly support your efforts to have the law provide that the Federal courts may utilize the services of existing legal aid societies, bar associations, and others providing competent free legal services to indigent defendants. Your proposal that grants up to $30,000 per district might be made to such organizations, has our strong endorsement and we believe that in districts such as the southern district of New York, such a provision in the law might well produce a genuine economy.

We also believe that your proposal for payment of up to $16,000 a year as compensation for the public defender and your proposal that assigned counsel might be paid up to $100 a day, are far more realistic in a city such as New York, than the provisions of S. 895 which contain ceilings of $10,000 per year and $35 a day, respectively. Costs being what they are in this city, there are few lawyers who can pay for the necessary secretarial help and pay for their office rent and overhead and have anything at all left for themselves when compensation is limited to $35 per day. However, we are obliged to say that even the figure contained in S. 895 is $35 greater than what is being paid today to lawyers in this city who are assigned to represent indigent defendants in those Federal cases where our local legal aid society cannot act.

In the views which I have expressed above, the members of our committee are unanimous. Some members of our committee suggested that there were several areas in which both S. 895 and your S. 1079 could be improved in order to provide more ideal arrangements for the establishment of a Federal public defender system. However, the committee, as a whole, felt that the current proposals for creation of a public defender system were such a great step forward in and of themselves, that the suggestion of possible improvements might best be deferred until after the Congress has accepted and approved the public defender principle.

I am taking the liberty of sending a copy of this letter to Representative CELLER, so that the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives may have the benefit of our views in considering companion legislation now pending in the House.

Very truly yours,
J. KENNETH CAMPBELL,
Chairman.

NATIONAL LEGAL AID
AND DEFENDER ASSOCIATION,
Chicago, Ill., May 5, 1959.

Hon. JACOB K. JAVITS,
U.S. Senate, Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR JAVITS: Thank you for sending us a copy of your proposed bill, S. 1079, to provide legal assistance for indigent persons accused of crime in the Federal courts. As you know, the American Bar Association and our association have for many years favored the enactment of public defender legislation for the Federal courts. In those districts where local opinion favors the use of private organizations, such as legal aid societies, voluntary defender associations or bar association committees, it has been our view that such alternative sources of help should be utilized. Therefore, as I believe I

wrote you about a year ago, it appeared to us that the legislation you then proposed (and which is now numbered S. 1079) was well drawn and should be approved.

I am confident that our association continues to favor the inclusion of optional provisions such as are contained in section (E) of S. 1079. At the same time I must tell you that a number of persons have expressed the view that insistence upon these optional provisions may prevent the enactment of any public defender legislation. If this be true, then I believe we would take the position that it would be better to have the legislation without the optional privileges than not to have it at all. If legislation omitting the optional privileges should be enacted, we would hope that amendments would later be made which would include optional privileges along the lines you have proposed.

With best wishes.

Sincerely yours,

ORISON S. MARDEN,
President.

HUGHES, HUBBARD, BLAIR & REED,
New York, N.Y., May 19, 1959.

Hon. JACOB K. JAVITS,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR JAVITS: I am writing as chairman of the committee on Federal legislation of the association in response to your request for an expression of our committee's views on Senator Wiley's S. 895 and your S. 1097 to provide representation to indigent defendants in Federal criminal cases. We are advised that the Senate Committee on the Judiciary has favorably reported on S. 895, and that it will shortly be presented on the Senate floor. We are further advised that Congressman CELLER has introduced an identical bill in the House (H.R. 4185) and that hearings have already been held on that bill by a subcommittee of the House Committee on the Judiciary.

The chairman of the committee on legal aid of our bar association has already written you, under date of May 8, 1959, expressing the unanimous view of that committee that both S. 895 and S. 1079 represent a great step forward in what must necessarily be a continuing effort to improve representation for indigent defendants in the Federal courts. Our committee is unanimously in accord with that view. Although we have reservations concerning some features common to both S. 895 and S. 1079, it was felt that practical revisions might better await acceptance of the principles embodied in both bills and a period of experience under whatever legislation is passed.

We do, however, wish to express our support for features of your S. 1079 which are not found in S. 895. We believe that the provision in paragraph (b) of your bill for a maximum salary of $16,000 for public defenders is more realistic than the $10,000 maximum contained in S. 895; we consider the maximum of $100 per diem allowance to assigned counsel in particular cases contained in paragraph (c) of your bill to be both fairer and more realistic than the $35 maximum contained in S. 895.

We understand that you intend, on the Senate floor, to confirm that S. 895 will not prevent district courts from appointing lawyers from established legal aid societies and similar organizations as assigned counsel in particular cases in order to supplement, where necessary, the work of public defenders in jurisdictions where public defenders are appointed. Since we are proud of the work done in this field by the legal aid society in this city, we particularly support your effort to insure that the district courts will not be deprived of the right to continue to avail themselves of the services of such groups. We understand that S. 895 is not intended to have any such result.

Our committee likewise fully supports your proposal that, upon recommendation of the Judicial Conference, the Director of the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts may make grants to legal aid societies, where such groups may make the work of public defenders and assigned counsel more effective and more economical.

We are taking the liberty of sending a copy of this letter to Senator WILEY and to Congressman CELLER, so that they, too, may have before them the views of our committee.

Very truly yours,

RICHARD W. HOGUE, Jr.,
Chairman, Committee on Federal Legislation.

HEFFNER, BLOCK & BLOCK,
New York, N.Y., May 6, 1959.

Hon. JACOB K. JAVITS,
U.S. Senate, Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR JAVITS: Senate bill 1079, which I understand has been introduced by Senator KEFAUVER and yourself, has just come to my attention and I am writing to you in my capacity as chairman of the special committee on legal aid in the Federal courts of the Federal Bar Association, an organization composed of past and present Government lawyers, in support of the measure.

I was appointed to head this committee in September of 1957 by Hon. Paul W. Williams, who at that time was U.S. attorney for the southern district of New York and president of the Empire State chapter of the Federal Bar Association. Mr. Williams, in creating the committee, did so in the hope of being able to resolve the problem created by the fact that the judges in the U.S. District Court for the Southern District of New York had been unable to obtain counsel for indigent defendants principally in multidefendant cases. In such cases, the Legal Aid Society which regularly serves the court generally finds itself disqualified to act because of the conflict of interest arising from its representation of another defendant in the case.

I was able to form a panel of lawyers willing to take assignments without compensation. However, after 2 years' experience with the task of supplying counsel, I can assure you most emphatically that reliance on the ability of busy practitioners to volunteer their service is not satisfactory. I was wholly unsuccessful in providing counsel in cases involving lengthy trials. It is precisely, however, in such cases where the need for counsel is greatest. The defendant without counsel suffers because he is unrepresented at important preliminary phases and his codefendants suffer through being deprived of their right to a speedy trial.

The solution envisaged by U.S. Senate bill 1079, in my opinion, is sound from every point of view. The proposed maximum figures for the salary of the public defender and the fees for assigned counsel are more realistic than the pay scales fixed in the Senate bill 895, sponsored by Senator WILEY. From my experience, as an assistant U.S. attorney in the southern district of New York over a number of years and as a lawyer in private practice, I feel that the lower pay scales fixed in the Wiley bill will work to the detriment of the rights of defendants. Competent counsel, which it is the right of every defendant to have, cannot, in my opinion, be induced to undertake the difficult and testing task of representing defendants under the scales fixed in the Wiley bill. The same difficulties that arise now will obtain in connection with that grossly inadequate scale. Your bill, in my judgment, will go a long way toward alleviating the present difficult situation.

I am taking the liberty of sending a copy of this letter to Judge Walsh of the Department of Justice.

Sincerely,

FREDERICK H. BLOCK.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, this is a very important bill. It is identical with the one which was passed by the Senate during the last session. I hope it will be enacted, because it is greatly needed, and its enactment is urgently requested by the administrative office of the Supreme Court and by the Judicial Conference.

I wish also to say that the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] deserves a great deal of credit for the progress the bill has made. Both as a Member of the House and as a Member of the Senate he has for a long time strenuously advocated legislation of this kind. He was the principal sponsor before the Committee on the Judiciary of a measure similar to this bill but the bill of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] was reported. I wished to call attention to the important part the Senator from New York has played in the sponsorship of this proposed legislation.

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

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. I merely wish to express my gratitude for the work which has produced the bill under the leadership of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] and his colleagues on the Committee on the Judiciary, and to state my personal appreciation for his great help.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Tennessee has expired.

The bill is open to amendment. If no amendment is to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That title 18 of the United States Code, section 3006, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"§ 3006. Public defenders; representation of indigent defendants

"(a) Each United States district court may appoint a public defender at each place where terms of court are held. Whenever a district court is satisfied that the number of cases assigned to a public defender is greater than can be conveniently conducted by him, it may appoint one or more assistant public defenders. The public defender with the approval of the court may appoint necessary clerks as approved by the Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts. Public defenders or assistant public defenders may be full-time or part-time officers as the volume of work in the judgment of the court requires.

"Whenever a court in which there is a public defender is satisfied that a person charged with a felony or misdemeanor, other than a petty offense, as defined by section 1 of this title, is unable to employ counsel, it shall assign the public defender to act as counsel. Where there are indigent defendants with such conflicting interests that they cannot all be properly represented by the same counsel, the court may appoint counsel separate from the public defender for one or more of them and provide for the compensation and reimbursement of expenses of such counsel in the same manner as is provided for counsel appointed under subsection (c) of this section. The public defender shall act as counsel for each defend-

ant to whom he is assigned at every stage of the prosecution, unless after the assignment the court is satisfied that the defendant is able to employ other counsel. Each district court may adopt appropriate rules governing the conduct of public defenders subject to general regulations on the subject, which may be adopted by the Judicial Conference of the United States.

"(b) Each public defender and assistant public defender shall be paid a salary based upon the service to be performed, not exceeding $10,000 per annum, to be fixed by the Judicial Conference of the United States. He shall also be reimbursed for expenses necessarily incurred by him in the performance of his duties when approved by the district court.

"(c) If a district court in a district not having a city of more than five hundred thousand population considers that the representation of indigent defendants in criminal cases can be provided for more economically by the appointment of counsel than by the appointment of a public defender, and no public defender is appointed; or

"If a district court in a district having a city of over five hundred thousand population so considers, the judicial council of the circuit approves, and no public defender is appointed; the court may appoint counsel for indigent defendants in particular cases. Counsel so appointed may be compensated in amounts determined by the court upon the conclusion of the service, at a rate not in excess of $35 a day for time necessarily and properly expended in preparation and trial of the case, and may be reimbursed for expenses reasonably incurred in the representation and approved by the court. The aggregate amount expended for compensation and reimbursement of such counsel in any district may not exceed $5,000 in any fiscal year.

"(d) A public defender or counsel appointed by the court who represents an indigent defendant in a criminal case in the district court shall also represent him in appeal proceedings if either the district court or the court having jurisdiction of the appeal considers that there is reasonable ground for appeal and so directs. Services of the nature specified in this subsection rendered by a public defender are part of his duties and shall be performed without other compensation than his salary. Counsel appointed in the particular case may be compensated for such services in the measure specified in subsection (c) for such counsel and be reimbursed for their expenses. Sums so paid for compensation and expenses of services on appeal are included in the maximum limit of $5,000 in any fiscal year imposed by subsection (c) in the respective districts from which the appeals are taken.

"(e) There are authorized to be appropriated to the United States courts, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, sums necessary to carry out the provisions of this section. The salaries and expenses of public defenders and assistant public defenders and compensation and expenses of attorneys appointed by the courts to represent defendants in particular cases, above provided for, shall be paid out of appropriations available therefor under the supervision of the Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts.

"(f) The term 'United States district court' as used in this section shall include the District Court of the Virgin Islands, the District Court of Guam, and the district courts of the United States created by chapter 5 of title 28, United States Code."

SEC. 2. The analysis of chapter 201 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by striking out item 3006 and inserting in its place the following item:

"3006. Public defenders; representation of indigent defendants."

Mr. HRUSKA subsequently said: Mr. President, earlier in the day Calendar No. 220, Senate bill 895, was passed by the Senate. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD following the passage of the bill a statement which I have prepared concerning the bill.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HRUSKA

Mr. President, the inequities of the present system of providing representation for indigent defendants in our Federal courts have long been recognized.

No provision is now made to compensate attorneys assigned to represent the indigent. Perhaps even worse, the ordinary expenses that might be incurred in such a defense are not even reimbursed. And while counsel who is chosen may be an acknowledged leader at the bar, more frequently than not it falls to the lot of the younger, less experienced, members to handle such cases.

As a practical matter, therefore, the quality of justice often suffers in the cases of those who cannot afford to hire competent counsel. The problem, furthermore, has grown to such proportions in recent years as to require prompt, effective action on the part of Congress.

S. 895 will furnish the means to correct this deplorable situation. The option of using either a public defender system or the compensated assigned counsel system, which it provides, takes into account the variations in requirements of our Federal courts. Its flexibility of application is vital in this much-needed administrative venture. Likewise, the relative simplicity of its provisions gives the courts the required latitude in applying it to their particular needs.

The bill in its present form, Mr. President, has been approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States and the Department of Justice; it has received the support of many law societies and members of the legal profession; and it was twice approved by the Judiciary Committee and once passed by the Senate.

S. 895 may not, in this form, fulfill all the ambitions or realize all the desires of a public defender system. Experience will reveal through its actual application what additional provisions, if any, are necessary. But to the end that it safeguards and promotes the rights established under the sixth amendment to the Constitution, this bill deserves the unanimous support of the Senate.

REPRINTING OF HOUSE DOCUMENT NO. 451, 84TH CONGRESS

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 95) authorizing the reprinting of House Document No. 451 of the 84th Congress was considered and agreed to.

PARTICIPATION IN STRASBOURG CONFERENCE

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 23) authorizing participation in the Strasbourg Conference was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That, in response to an invitation received from the President of the Consultative Assembly of the Council of Europe, not to exceed fourteen Members of Congress shall be appointed to meet jointly with representatives of the Consultative Assembly of the Council of Europe at a Second Strasbourg Conference, to be held at a time when the United States Congress is not in session.

SEC. 2. Of the Members of the Congress to be appointed for the purposes of this resolution, the President of the Senate shall appoint seven Members of the Senate, including the chairman of the Senate group, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives shall appoint seven Members of the House of Representatives, including the chairman of the House group. Not more than four of the appointees from each House shall be of the same political party.

SEC. 3. The expenses incurred by Members of the Senate, Members of the House, and staff members designated by the respective chairman for the purpose of carrying out this concurrent resolution shall not exceed $15,000 for each House and shall be paid from the contingent fund of the House of which they are Members. Payments shall be made upon the submission of vouchers approved by the chairman of the respective Senate or House group.

STUDY OF THE FEDERAL JUDICIAL SYSTEM

The resolution (S. Res. 91) authorizing a study of the Federal judicial system was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, I ask that the resolution go over, by request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard to the consideration of the resolution. It will be passed over and remain on the calendar.

REFORM OF SENATE RULES AFFECTING APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an article by Robert C. Albright, which appeared in the Washington Post on May 12, and an editorial from the same newspaper of May 15, discussing the resolution (S. Res. 118), recently submitted by the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] on behalf of himself and several colleagues, including myself, which proposes that a majority of the Senate conferees shall reflect the prevailing opinion of the Senate on any bill in conference.

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

[From Washington Post and Times Herald, Tuesday, May 12, 1959]

LIBERALS SEEK ANOTHER REFORM IN SENATE RULES

(By Robert C. Albright)

A new and what could be a significant move to change the Senate rules is picking up strength from a nucleus of liberal-bloc supporters.

Unlike the rules-reform storm that blew in with the new Congress, the latest revision sentiment has nothing to do with limiting Senate debate. Its relation to the time-honored seniority system, as such, is equally remote.

It is aimed, instead, at another and less publicized area, the composition of the

House-Senate Conference Committees, which have the tremendously important function of ironing out differences in conflicting bills passed by the Senate and House.

CLEARCUT PROVISION

In a word, it would write into the Senate rules, a clearcut provision that a majority of those named to a Senate Conference Committee on any particular bill must have indicated by their votes, their concurrence in the Senate's prevailing opinion of the bill.

For as long as anybody can remember, this principle has been acknowledged by the Senate but only as a principle. It is stated in Cleaves' Manual, which is part of the Senate Manual, as follows: "Of course the majority party and the prevailing opinion have a majority of the (conference) managers." But it is not actually a part of Senate rules and it is not always enforced in practice.

As late as March 25—and this is the instance that inspired the latest revision move—four of the five Senators assigned to the House-Senate conference on the temporary unemployment compensation bill had voted against a Senate substitute amendment the Senate had adopted by a vote of 52 to 32. Despite that vote the Senate conferees receded in conference, and the substitute was dropped.

WHAT IT MEANS

Under the proposed amendment to the rules, a majority of the Senate conferees in the future would be required to be chosen from those who have indicated their sympathy with the bill as passed. If it was clear that they did not reflect the Senate majority will, their appointment would be subject to a point of order.

A bipartisan group of four Senators last week announced their intention to seek this change in Senate rules, in letters to Senate colleagues. They were Senators JOSEPH S. CLARK, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, Democrat, of Minnesota, JACOB K. JAVITS, Republican, of New York, and JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY, Democrat, of Wyoming.

NO EASY MATTER

They announced that their resolution will be introduced in the Senate this week and invited other Senators to become cosponsors. Since that letter went out, 15 Senate colleagues mainly of the so-called liberal persuasion have asked to add their names to the resolution, bringing the total number of sponsors to 19.

It is no easy thing to change the Senate rules, as champions of reform in the past can sadly testify. It may well be, as some have suggested, that the current revision move has little chance. But the rules have been changed in the past after demonstrations of compelling need, and proponents of more representative conference committees now are setting out to make such a case.

They deny the proposed revision is aimed at Senate seniority, even though conference committees under present procedure usually are composed of committee seniors. They say the same custom generally can be followed, without violating the prevailing opinion rule.

Although nearly all of the sponsors are liberals they disavow any relation between the resolution and the recent attack on the Democratic leadership by Senator WILLIAM PROXMIRE, Democrat, of Wisconsin and a few other advanced liberals. A number of the liberal cosigners of the bill are stanch friends and admirers of Senate Majority Leader LYNDON B. JOHNSON, of Texas.

DECISIVE FACTOR

The attitude of the Democratic leadership (as yet unexpressed on this resolution), is bound to be a decisive factor to determining what happens to it. Theoretically it may be possible to change the rules without the leadership's blessing, but as demonstrated as late as last January in tempering the Senate's famed rule 22, it isn't very likely.

Proponents of more representative conference committees quote some distinguished precedents for their position, among them the late Senator George W. Norris, Republican, of Nebraska, Norris resigned from the conference on the Muscle Shoals bill in 1925 because he could not support the Senate version of the bill.

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald, May 15, 1959]

A HOUSE IS NOT A CONGRESS

Senators CLARK, HUMPHREY, JAVITS, and O'MAHONEY are certainly right in their contention that the members of a congressional conference committee ought to reflect the majority sentiment in each House on the legislation before the committee. If the House as well as the Senate would adopt the Senators' proposal and reform its rules to assure such representation, the conference committee could become a much more useful and constructive part of the legislative process.

The present move in the Senate to change the methods of selecting conference committee members is a result of the actions in March of the majority of the Senators assigned to a conference committee on the extension of temporary unemployment compensation benefits. Four of the five Senators on the committee had opposed a liberalizing amendment adopted 52–32 by the Senate and failed to insist on retention of the amendment in the conference committee.

The members of a conference committee are appointed by the Speaker and the presiding officer of the Senate. The committee is usually made up of the ranking Republican and Democratic members of the standing committees which originated the legislation as well as the authors of the bill. Although a conference committee is supposed only to compromise differences between Senate and House versions of the bill under its consideration, sometimes a committee will make substantial changes in the legislation.

The four Senators who are trying to change the procedure for choosing conference committee members would have the support of one of the greatest congressional reformers, Senator George W. Norris, of Nebraska, if he were still alive. To Senator Norris the conference committee constituted a dangerous third house of Congress. Mr. Norris championed the unicameral legislature which has been adopted only in Nebraska, in large part because it offered a sure way to eliminate the evils of the conference committee.

Like the House Rules Committee, a conference committee should be primarily a procedural device—not a policymaking body.

ISRAEL LENDING A WELCOME HAND

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I invite the attention of the Senate to a most interesting article by Roscoe Drummond entitled "Israel Lending a Welcome Hand," which appeared in the Washington Post of May 17.

Mr. Drummond tells of the wonderful work Israel is doing in its program of economic aid and technical assistance to other countries.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this 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:

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald, May 17, 1959]

ISRAEL LENDING A WELCOME HAND

(By Roscoe Drummond)

Numerous Asian and African nations are today turning to a new-found ally and benefactor. This is a development of the greatest significance which is just beginning to gather momentum. It is a development which the free world can view with satisfaction.

The new Afro-Asian ally is Western in outlook, Middle Eastern in geography. It is democratic, anti-Communist and, since it is neither a large nor powerful country, it is basically a neutral source of assistance which gives its recipients no appearance of choosing up sides in the cold war.

I am referring to the young but mature State of Israel, which was reborn only 11 years ago and which is now embarking upon a wide-ranging, diverse program of economic aid and technical assistance where it is most needed.

A nation which has been greatly helped by its own friends, Israel is now helping others—to the advantage of everybody.

Israel's expanding investment assistance and technical aid ranges from Ghana to Burma. Its scope is illustrated by the fact that trainees from Afro-Asian countries and territories are now studying Israeli agricultural settlements and cooperative enterprises.

The best example of the burgeoning economic relationship between Israel and the Afro-Asian nations is what Israel and Ghana are doing together. To begin to finance an expanding two-way trade, Israel has provided Ghana with a $20 million credit over a 4-year period.

Israel is substantially financing—but taking only 40 per cent of the stock—of Ghana's newly organized Black Star Shipping Line and is providing the technical training for Ghanaian personnel to man its merchant marine. It is also helping Ghana develop its building industry by providing the necessary beginning capital and by training Ghanaians in construction techniques.

In other fields of technical skills, Israel is providing training in agriculture, city planning, irrigation, water resources and in consumer and producer cooperatives.

A group of Burmese farmers is now living and working on Israeli cooperative farms and it is not to be overlooked that a Burmese Army contingent is learning how the Israelis defend their frontiers with citizen volunteers who simultaneously till the fields and guard the nation.

There is no spirit of pacifism in Israel and Israel is teaching none to its Asian and African friends. Israeli universities and institutes are taking exchange students from many countries, including some trainees from Thailand, India, and Japan.

Obviously, Israel is not doing all this out of sheer goodness of heart.

For Israel, it has large political as well as economic advantages. The biggest boon from this growing relationship of trust and good will is that it enables Israel to free itself from the physical and psychological isolation of Arab encirclement. Israel's expanding trade and her enlarged horizon of friends mean that she cannot be surrounded either politically or economically by a Nasser blockade.

Israel's new-found allies are also blunting Egypt's efforts to recruit Afro-Asian support in its own cold war against Israel. At the Accra conference of Independent African states a year ago, Ghana almost singlehanded turned back Egypt's effort to aline all Africa against Israel.

Egypt could get nothing but a harmless resolution calling for a "just" settlement of Arab-Israeli disputes.

Because Israel is a small, pioneer-spirited new country, deficient in many physical resources and rich in nearly all human resources, it is in an ideal position to help others. It seems to me that the friends of Israel in the United States might well look for ways to nourish and enlarge what Israel is doing so well in this field.

ADDRESS DELIVERED BY SENATOR HUMPHREY AT THE SECOND NATIONAL CONFERENCE ON WORLD HEALTH

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on Friday night, May 8, it was my pleasure to deliver an address before a distinguished assembly of Americans interested in the World Health Organization.

I understand that more than 270 organizations were represented at the conference. The presence of their representatives constitutes a great testimonial to the interest of the American people in WHO, as well as in parallel bilateral and multilateral activity to serve human health throughout the globe.

I should like to commend the officers and board of the National Citizen's Committee for WHO, its executive secretary and all of the cooperating organizations.

INTERNATIONAL HEALTH YEAR

In my judgment, as I indicated that evening, they are called unto a high purpose, in view of the growing responsibilities of this great organization—WHO.

This is especially true in view of the approach of the International Public Health and Medical Research Year which we expect will commence in June of 1961 and about which my distinguished associate from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER] helpfully commented last week on the Senate floor. I should like to say that I have noted with pleasure news dispatches from the World Health Assembly in Geneva, concerning leadership by Surgeon General Leroy Burney in connection with plans for the International Health Year.

In the course of May 7–8 citizen's conference, a series of important panel meetings were held. Attention was given, for example, to the proposed vital National Institute for International Medical Research which would be authorized under Senate Joint Resolution 41. This is the joint resolution introduced by the distinguished senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] and by 60 other Senators including myself.

I know that the passage of this joint resolution is very close to the heart of all those attending this citizen's conference, just as it is of deep interest to all other health-minded individuals throughout our land.

IMPLEMENTING THE HEALTH YEAR

Another panel was devoted exclusively to the International Health Year. I know that the National Citizen's Committee will play an important role in connection with implementing plans for the year here in the United States.

I should like to see a U.S. Committee for the International Health Year established soon. It should be broadly representative of the great medical profession, of leading laymen, and of scientists in the life sciences, in public and private life. Toward that end, I am in contact with the National Science Foundation, the National Academy of Sciences, National Research Council, and leading professional organizations to which our Nation looks for leadership in connection with the year. I send to the desk now two items:

First. An outline of the program of the citizen's conference;

Second. The text of the address which I delivered.

I ask unanimous consent that these items be printed in the body of the RECORD at this point.

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

SECOND NATIONAL CONFERENCE ON WORLD HEALTH, SPONSORED BY NATIONAL CITIZENS COMMITTEE FOR THE WORLD HEALTH ORGANIZATION, MAY 7, 8, AND 9, 1959

PROGRAM

Thursday, May 17, 1959

Dr. Milton S. Eisenhower, Conference chairman.

10 a.m. to 2 p.m.: Registration.

During conference: Exhibits.

10 a.m. to 2 p.m.: Film showings; continuous showing of selected WHO and other films.

2:30 to 5 p.m.: Keynote session.

Greetings: Dr. Ernest L. Stebbins,[1] president, National Citizens Committee for the World Health Organization; director, School of Hygiene and Public Health, Johns Hopkins University.

Chairman: Dr. Milton S. Eisenhower, president, Johns Hopkins University.

Speakers: Hon. Andrew W. Cordier, Executive Assistant to the Secretary General of the United Nations.

Dr. Abraham Horwitz, Director, Pan American Sanitary Bureau, WHO Regional Office for the Americas.

Hon. Francis O. Wilcox, Assistant Secretary of State for International Organization Affairs.

Dr. Frank G. Boudreau,[1] president, Milbank Memorial Fund.

6 and 7 p.m.: First reception and dinner session.

Presiding: Dr. Milton S. Eisenhower, president, Johns Hopkins University.

Introducing: Members of the U.S. delegation to the 12th World Health Assembly (convening in Geneva on May 12, 1959); Dr. Leroy E. Burney[1] as chairman of the delegation.

Address: Hon. Arthur S. Flemming, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Friday, May 8, 1859

9:30 a.m. to 12 noon: Panel session, World Health for World Peace.

Chairman: Dr. Howard A. Rusk,[1] associate editor, the New York Times; director, New York University-Bellevue Medical Center Institute of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation.

Panel:

Mr. Leo Cherne, executive director, Research Institute of America; chairman of the board, International Rescue Committee.

[1] Member of policy commtitee, National Citizens for WHO.

Mr. John T. Connor, president, Merck & Co., Inc.

Hon. LISTER HILL, United States Senator from Alabama.

Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,[1] United States Senator from Minnesota.

Hon. WALTER H. JUDD, M.D.,[1] United States Representative from Minnesota.

Hon. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER, United States Senator from Oregon.

Dr. Thomas Parran,[1] president, the Avalon Foundation; past Surgeon-General of U.S. Public Health Service; past president, National Citizens Committee for WHO.

Mr. John J. Powers, Jr.,[1] president, Pfizer International, Inc.; senior vice president, Chas. Pfizer & Co., Inc.

Mr. P. C. Spencer, chairman of the board, Sinclair Oil Corp.

12:30 p.m.: First luncheon session.

Presiding: Dr. Leroy E. Burney,[1] Surgeon-General, U.S. Public Health Service; chairman of U.S. delegation to 12th World Health Assembly.

Address: Hon. WALTER H. JUDD, M.D.,[1] U.S. Representative from Minnesota.

2:30 to 5 p.m.: Alan Gregg memorial forum sessions.

Six forums running simultaneously in seminar style. Discussion leaders in each forum may enlarge on agenda suggested below and are responsible for preparing a report at the end of the afternoon for presentation in the reporting session at 10 a.m. Saturday forenoon. A stenographer will be on hand in each forum from 2:15 p.m. on and will transcribe her notes during the evening for delivery of the finished report to the designated discussion leaders at the close of the second dinner session that same evening.

Forum 1, Health and the American Image Abroad: How do we through health work add to this image? What is the experience in people-to-people programs? The side effects of international congresses in health and related problems. Factors in selecting and briefing personnel. Responsibilities and efforts of our educational systems in instilling cosmopolitan appreciation, judgment and command of languages.

Discussion leaders: Dr. Leonard W. Larson,[1] chairman; Dr. Peter D. Commanduras, Dr. Horace DeLien,[1] Mr. Frank L. Goffli, Mrs. Jeanne G. Singer.

Forum 2, An International Health Year: Defining concept and outlining potential activities within United States, for research and for health promotion.

(a) Worldwide taking stock of health status nation by nation (as we stand on threshold of space age).

(b) Focusing united intense effort on eradication of those diseases now within our power.

(c) Intensifying research effort and building new bridges of cooperation.

Do both research and promotion concepts fit equally well into the idea of a year? Should some agency or group other than WHO declare an International Health Year?

Discussion leaders: Dr. James E. Perkins,[1] chairman; Mr. Julius N. Cahn, Dr. Albert W. Dent,[1] Dr. James E. Hundley.

Forum 3, International Medical Research Cooperation: New plans and legislation. An international medical research institute. Is public health involved as well as medicine? Relationships to present international health agencies. Experiences and accomplishments as they indicate the potential role of the international agency in research.

Discussion leaders: Dr. Detlev W. Bronk,[1] chairman; Dr. James Shannon, Dr. Leonard A. Scheele,[1] Dr. R. Keith Cannan.

[1] Member of policy commtitee, National Citizens for WHO.

Forum 4, Health and Economic Development: Health in technical assistance programs and economic development, in financial and stabilization programs, in private economic development abroad. Potentialities and practical suggestions for use of local currencies available to United States abroad—Counterpart funds, etc. Industry's contribution to world health.

Discussion leaders: Mr. James P. Grant, chairman; Mr. Glen Leet, Mr. Philip E. Ryan,[1] Dr. Louis L. Williams.[1]

Forum 5, Training and Exchange Programs and Problems: Variety, scope, and volume of training and personnel exchange programs in world health work. Experiences with training abroad and by visiting experts. Training priorities. Selection of fields and skills. Training on installment plan. Infield training. Quality of personnel reservoirs. Experiences of private foundations and industry in training.

Discussion leaders: Dr. Ira V. Hiscock,[1] chairman; Dr. Irvin H. Breslow, Dr. Eugene P. Campbell, Dr. Howard M. Kline, Dr. Irvin Lourie.

Forum 6, Health and Population Dynamics: World health objectives and priorities. Their effects on population well-being, on educational capacities and coverage, on work quality and year-round production. Actual experiences with changing population and changing production available to consumer.

Discussion leaders: Dr. M. C. Balfour, chairman; Dr. Harold F. Dorn, Dr. John A. Gordon, Dr. Clyde V. Kiser, Prof. Frank Lorimer, Dr. Irene B. Taeuber, Dr. Charles L. Williams, Jr.[1]

6 and 7 p.m.: Second reception and dinner session.

Presiding: Dr. Thomas Parran,[1] president, The Avalon Foundation.

Address: Mr. Leo Cherne, executive director, Research Institute of America; chairman of the board, International Rescue Committee; vice president, Freedom House.

Address: Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, U.S. Senator from Minnesota.

Saturday, May 9, 1959

10 a.m. to 12 noon: Reporting session.

Presiding: Dr. James E. Perkins,[1] managing director, National Tuberculosis Association.

Reports and recommendations from each of the Alan Gregg Memorial Forum sessions held the preceding afternoon will be presented and revised by the conference for the final proceedings.

12:30 p.m.: Policy luncheon session.

Chairman: Dr. Ernest L. Stebbins,[1] president, National Citizens Committee for WHO.

Address: Mr. Clark M. Eichelberger,[1] executive director, American Association for the United Nations.

Mr. Eichelberger as one of the founders of the National Citizens Committee will review committee progress to date and lead into discussion by the audience and recommendations for future activities of the National Citizens Committee and services to sponsoring and participating organizations and their State and local affiliates—informational material, speakers, exhibits, assistance in organizing sessions on world health for regional and annual meetings.

DIRECTORY OF FORUM DISCUSSION LEADERS

Balfour, The Population Council (New York).

Breslow, chairman for international students, University of Pennsylvania School of Medicine.

Bronk, president, the Rockefeller Institute.

Cahn, project director, U.S. Senate Committee on Government Operations.

Campbell, Chief, Public Health Division, International Cooperation Administration, U.S. Department of State.

Cannan, Chairman, Division of Medical Sciences, National Academy of Sciences-National Research Council.

Commanduras, Secretary General, Medical International Cooperative (MEDICO).

DeLien, Chief, Division of International Health, Public Health Service, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Dent, president, Dillard University; vice president, National Citizens Committee for WHO.

Dorn, Chief, Office of Biometrics, National Institutes of Health.

Goffio, deputy director, Cooperative for American Relief Everywhere (CARE).

Gordon, professor (emeritus) of epidemiology, Harvard School of Public Health.

Grant, Assistant Director for Planning, International Cooperation Administration.

Hiscock, chairman, Yale University Department of Public Health.

Hundley, Special Assistant for International Health, National Institutes of Health.

Kiser, technical staff (population), the Milbank Memorial Fund.

Kline, Chief, Educational and Training Branch, Division of International Health, Public Health Service, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Larson, chairman, board of trustees, American Medical Association.

Leet, program director, Save the Children Federation.

Lorimer, professor of sociology, the American University.

Lourie, chief of fellowships branch, WHO Regional Office for the Americas.

Perkins, managing director, National Tuberculosis Association; treasurer and past president, National Citizens Committee for WHO.

Ryan, executive director, the National Health Council.

Scheele, president, the Warner-Chilcott Laboratories.

Shannon, Director, the National Institutes of Health.

Singer, associate director, World Affairs Center; editor of INTERCOM.

Taueber, office of population research, Princeton University.

Williams, C. L., Deputy Chief, Public Health Division, International Cooperation Administration.

Williams, L. L., consultant, Pan American Sanitary Bureau, WHO regional office.

NATIONAL CITIZENS COMMITTEE FOR THE WORLD HEALTH ORGANIZATIONS, INC.—OFFICERS

Ernest L. Stebbins, M.D., president; Charles W. Mayo, M.D., vice president; Harold S. Diehl, M.D., vice president; Edwin L. Crosby, M.D., vice president; A. W. Dent, LL.D., vice president; Leonard W. Larson, M.D., vice president; Herman E. Hilleboe, M.D., vice president; Malcolm H. Merrill, M.D., vice president; James E. Perkins, M.D., treasurer; George S. Stevenson, M.D., vice treasurer; Hazel Corbin, R.N., secretary; Philip E. Nelbach, M.P.H., executive secretary.

Policy committee and board of directors (partial list)

Gaylord W. Anderson, M.D.; George Baehr, M.D.; Robert N. Bass, M.D.;[1] Leona Baumgartner, M.D.; Frank C. Boudreau, M.D.;[1] Chester Bowles; R. T. Browning;[1] Detlev W. Bronk, Ph. D.;[1] LeRoy E. Burney, M.D.; Homer N. Calver; Eugene P. Campbell, M.D.; William M. Chadbourne; Lowell T. Coggeshall, M.D.; Hazel Corbin, R.N.;[1] Norman Cousins; Edwin L. Crosby, M.D.;[1] Horace De Lien, M.D.; A. W. Dent, LL.D.;[1] Albert Deutsch; Harold S. Diehl M.D.;[1] Clark M. Eichelberger; Martha M. Eliot, M.D.; Anna Fillmore, R.N.; Hon. John E. Fogarty; Buell G. Gallagher, Ph. D.;[1] Ruth E. Grout, Ph. D.; Hon. Wayne L. Hays; Victor G. Heiser, M.D.; Herman E. Hilleboe, M.D.;[1] Harold Hillenbrand, D.D.S.;[1] Ira V. Hiscock, Sc. D.; Hon. Hubert H. Humphrey; H. Van Zile Hyde, M.D.; Peter E. Joyce;[1] Hon. Walter H. Judd, M.D.; Leonard W. Larson, M.D.;[1] Mrs. Oswald B. Lord; Mrs. Edward A. Lusterman; Philip R. Mather; Berwyn F. Mattison, M.D.; Charles W. Mayo, M.D.;[1] Mary T. McInerney; F. G. Merckel; Malcolm H. Merrill, M.D.;[1] Brewster S. Miller, M.D.; S. C. Moody; Hon. Thomas E. Morgan; Franklin D. Murphy, M.D.; Basil O'Connor;[1] Agnes Ohlson, R.N.; Robert W. Osborn; Arthur S. Osborne, M.D.; Mrs. Guido Pantaleoni, Jr.;[1] Thomas Parran, M.D.;[1] James E. Perkins, M.D.;[1] Sol Pincus; John J. Powers, Jr.;[1] Ada Chree Reid, M.D.; Victor Reuther; C. F. Rhoads, M.D.; H. McLeod Riggins, M.D.; Dean W. Roberts, M.D.; Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt; Howard A. Rusk, M.D.;[1] Philip E. Ryan; Leonard A. Scheele, M.D.;[1] Marion W. Shehan, R.N.; James T. Shotwell, LL.D.; Ralph W. Sockman, D.D.; Harold E. Stassen, LL.D.; Ernest L. Stebbins, M.D.;[1] George S. Stevenson, M.D.;[1] E. Gifford Upjohn, M.D.; Marcella L. Van Tuyl; William Vogt; John B. Whalen; Mrs. Judith G. Whitaker, R.N.;[1] Ernst Wolff, M.D.; Abel Wolman, Dr. Eng.

Sponsoring and participating organizations (partial list): American Association for the United Nations; American Cyanamid Co.; American Dental Association; American Dietetic Association; American Heart Association; American Hospital Association; American Nurses' Association; American Public Health Association; American Social Hygiene Association; Association of Schools of Public Health; Association of State & Territorial Health Officers; Chas. Pfizer & Co., Inc.; Conference of Municipal Public Health Engineers; Hadassah; David Graham Hall Foundation; Maternity Center Association; National Association for Mental Health; The National Foundation; National Health Council; National League for Nursing; National Society for Crippled Children and Adults; National Tuberculosis Association; Planned Parenthood Federation of America; Shell Chemical Corp.; United Cerebral Palsy Association; U.S. Committee for UNICEF; Wallace & Tiernan, Inc.; Warner-Chilcott Laboratories.

Associated organizations (partial list): Altrusa Club of Essex County (N.J.); Altrusa Club of Springfield (Ohio); Tuberculosis Institute of Chicago and Cook County; Cleveland Health Museum; Borough of Cliffside Park (N.J.); Dutchess County Health Association (N.Y.); Easton Visiting Nurse Association (Pa.); Group Health Cooperative (Minn.); Kalamazoo City-Council Health Department; Kirby Health Center (Pa.); Middlesex Health Association (Mass.); Millbury Women's Guild (N.J.); Montgomery County Tuberculosis and Health Association (Pa.); Mount Vernon Chapter, AAUN; Central Nassau Medical Group (N.Y.); Nebraska Tuberculosis Association; New York League of Business and Professional Women; New York State Nurses Association District; Oak Park District Schools (Mich.); Ohio Tuberculosis and Health Association; Orange County Health Association (N.Y.); Oregon Tuberculosis and Health Association; Philadelphia Tuberculosis and Health Association; United Presbyterian Church; Rochester Tuberculosis and Health Association (N.Y.); San Francisco Chapter, AAUN; Scranton Visiting Nurse Association (Pa.); Syracuse Chapter, AAUN (N.Y.).

[1] Member of policy commtitee, National Citizens for WHO.

[1] Member of policy committee, National Citizens for WHO.

[1] Member of policy commtitee, National Citizens for WHO.

SENATOR HUMPHREY URGES WHO COORDINATION OF RADIATION RESEARCH: ASKS FOR "TOTAL WAR AGAINST DISEASE"

It is a pleasure to appear before this dedicated assembly of citizens in public and private life, seeking to strengthen a great international body—the World Health Organization.

I am particularly happy to pay tribute to the fine American delegation which, commencing next Tuesday, will represent this Nation at the 12th World Health Assembly.

It is a pleasure to share this evening with my friend, the Chairman of the Board of the International Rescue Committee, Leo Cherne. His outstanding work on behalf of "Medico" symbolizes the enormous contributions made by voluntary organizations in our country toward overseas well-being.

CONTRAST OF TWO MEETINGS IN GENEVA

The scene in Geneva next week provides an historic commentary on two parallel developments of our time.

At Geneva, the Foreign Ministers of the Great Powers will meet to attempt solution of the thorny West Berlin crisis and other major East-West issues.

Simultaneously, in Geneva, East and West, instead of disputing, will be joining in this other Conference on World Health.

The contrast between the two meetings is clear.

In the political area, we see, by and large, controversy, suspicion and fear. In the health forum, we see large-scale agreement, faith and eager anticipation for tomorrow's achievements.

In world politics, we see discord; in world health; we see unity.

ANOTHER TYPE OF FALLOUT

I know that it is the hope of everyone in this audience tonight that the type of atmosphere which will be represented at the WHO meetings will be carried over, so to speak into the atmosphere of the Foreign Ministers Conference.

No one need be reminded that there is a physical fallout of dangerous particles in the air from explosion of weapons of fission and fusion.

But now, from these inspiring WHO meetings, let there be a spiritual fallout of the sentiments of harmony, of brotherhood, of determination to find agreement on problems affecting all mankind.

The world feels today concern over the possible effect of ionizing radiation. But there is another type of radiation that the world does not fear.

It is the powerful radiation of man's brotherhood to man. I refer to the radiating good of men and women reaching out across continents—through WHO, UNICEF, FAO, Church Missions, CARE, the Red Cross and other means, to heal the sick, rehabilitate the disabled, feed the hungry, clothe the naked.

NEED FOR COORDINATED RESEARCH ON FALLOUT

On the issue of radioactive fallout as such, I should just like to make a few observations at this point.

In my judgment, the World Health Organization has an unparalleled opportunity for leadership on the radiation problem. WHO is uniquely qualified to play a far larger role than at present in securing a scientific "meeting of the minds" as to the effects on present and future generations of radioactive fallout.

Right now the limited scientific evidence on fallout is a maze of controversy, of charge and countercharge.

There is a multiplicity of national and intergovernmental organizations at work on isolated aspects of the fallout problem.

Internationally there are for example: WHO, the International Atomic Energy Agency, the International Labor Organization (so far as occupational health problems are concerned), the United Nations Committee on the Effects of Radiation.

Here in the United States, among the considerable number of interested agencies, are: The National Committee on Radiation Protection and Measurements, the Department of State, the Atomic Energy Commission, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and its Public Health Service, together with its Food and Drug Administration; in addition to the U.S. Weather Bureau, the Department of Defense, the Department of Agriculure, the Coast and Geodetic Survey, the Bureau of Mines, the National Science Foundation, the Department of Interior, the National Bureau of Standards, the National Academy of Sciences, and others.

The sheer number of these agencies, each with its separate pool of technical information and interest, makes it essential that there be coordination on both the national and international scene.

It should not be assumed that no coordination exists at present. Actually, the various staff members of the Division of Biology and Medicine of the Atomic Energy Commission alone have membership on 43 interagency committees.

At thet technical level scientists are striving earnestly. What is needed is top policy coordination and still more intensified research into genetic, leukemia and other problems.

Moreover, there must be more coordinated interpretation as to the results of research.

We need an unadulterated atmosphere of search for scientific truth. This must be a search which does not bend the facts to suit some particular bias or preconceived idea, but rather a search which lets the facts fall as they may and which informs the public promptly and accurately.

Bold new biochemical discoveries are possible and indeed essential in the radiation field. We may find it possible to counteract the harmful effects of radiation in the human body.

Strontium 90, is a vast but not insoluble question mark. However, only coordinated research, preferably under WHO auspices can solve its riddles.

THE WORLD'S BURDEN OF DISEASE

But there are a vast range of other issues in which WHO is called to a high purpose.

The nature of that purpose is illustrated in a series of factual publications which are, as most of this audience is aware, being issued by the subcommittee of the Government Operations Committee of which I am privileged to be chairman.

Next week, this subcommittee will issue a committee print, exclusively devoted to the World Health Organization. This publication will be based on my own intensive study of WHO. It will commend WHO's great contributions to international health within the 11 short years since its creation.

Many in this audience may have noted one of our previous commitee reports, "The Status of World Health." This chart book shows the appalling worldwide incidence of disease confronting the family of man.

Among the figures cited in this chart book are the following: 250 million cases of malaria, 250 million cases of filariasis, 400 million cases of hookworm, 150 million cases of schistosomiasis, 400 million cases of trachoma and infectious conjunctivitis, 50 million cases of yaws.

The blight of these and other widespread and largely avoidable diseases is a disgrace to the 20th century.

It is a blot on the conscience of man.

It is a formidable barrier to a world of progress, peace, and plenty.

DISEASE OBSTACLES BAR WORLD PROGRESS

Far too often, the political leaders of the world, in their attempt to solve major problems have forgotten that in vast regions of the globe—in many areas of Africa, South Asia, the Middle East and, yes, Latin America—we are dealing with largely sick populations.

We cannot solve these area's social and economic problems, without solving their health problems. And we cannot solve their health problems without coming to grips with their socioeconomic problems.

Improving health in the emerging areas means that population will increase, often spectacularly. This means that food and industrial productivity, must simultaneously increase, lest the good effects of better health be cruelly wiped out by mass hunger and unemployment.

EXAMPLES OF HEALTH PROBLEM IN INDIA

Here in Washington, this past week the Committee for International Economic Growth held a very important conference on the subject of the future of one great country, India. It was my pleasure to participate in this conference.

I know, however, that everyone interested in that nation is well aware that disease and disability are part and parcel of the fundamental problems faced by India today.

In India, life expectancy is only 32 years on the average. This is the second lowest rate in the world. (This Northern Rhodesia, life expectancy at birth is still lower, 28.)

India is plagued with malnutrition. In India, 43 kilograms of animal protein are consumed per person, per year (milk, meat, fish). This is estimated to be the lowest rate in the world. (Compared this to the 384 kilograms per person in Norway the highest in the world.)

THE VICIOUS CYCLE

Malnutrition breeds disease, disease breeds poverty, poverty breed disease. Somehow the vicious cycle must be broken with vision, with boldness, and with determination and action.

The fact of the matter is that as great as achievements in world health have been in the past, they have not made more than a slight dent in the backlog of diseases which has accumulated over the centuries.

At the slow rate mankind is coming to grips with certain mass maladies, it will be at best, 10, 20, 30, or 50 years before whole populations will have been relieved of the burden of avoidable diseases.

CONSIGNING PRESENT GENERATION TO ILLNESS

The question is: What do we propose to do about it, starting now?

A halfhearted, half-baked answer will not suffice.

Tens of millions of innocent people are sick and hungry today—at this moment—in India and hundreds of millions elsewhere.

We cannot say to them, "Sorry, we can't help very much. But never mind, the world may be better for your children and your children's children."

We cannot consign the present generation to endless disease and disability. We cannot fold our hands in resignation and pretend that the problem is insoluble within present lifetimes.

The fact is, that simply, from an economic standpoint it is far costlier to the world to tolerate the existence of avoidable disease than it is to seek mass eradication of disease.

Our experience in combating malaria has proven that.

Mere malaria control is infinitely costlier over a long period of time than is an intensified effort absolutely to eradicate malaria.

But if we are to deal effectively with these problems, we must have a long-range program, and we must begin to put it into effect today.

NEED FOR LONG-RANGE PROGRAM

A doctor cannot be trained overnight. The world's acute medical shortage is so severe that nothing short of a bold 10-, 20-, or 30-year program will solve it.

And the same is true in the case of the shortages of other categories of crucial health manpower—nurses, dentists, pharmacists, sanitarians, and various medical auxiliaries.

SIX-POINT CONQUEST OF DISEASE PROGRAM

I have said that we need a program. Let me now suggest a half dozen elements in that program.

1. First and foremost, the 88 members of the World Health Organization should endeavor to break through to a higher level of contributions to that organization.

The overall World Health Organization 1959 budget represented total resources of only around $26 million.

That included $15 million for the regular budget, $6 million for the malaria eradication special account, and $5 million from the expanded program of technical assistance.

Everyone who has studied the financial problem is aware that, particularly in today's inflationary situation, $26 million is grossly insufficient to cope with the problems of world health.

I am well aware that many of the emerging nations are already strained to meet even their present assessed contributions. It seems to me, therefore, that those better endowed nations which have larger financial capacity, particularly the industrialized Western Powers, including the Soviet Union, have a special responsibility to help provide larger financial resources for the World Health Organization.

ONE MILLION DOLLAR AMENDMENT FOR ERADICATION SURVEY

2. Secondly, the program of mass eradication of selected diseases must proceed full speed ahead.

The present antimalaria program must be pursued to final success, particularly in Africa where only a small area has been covered to date.

But we must begin to lay plans for mass eradication of other diseases with which the world has lived far too long.

For that reason I am introducing new amendments to the Mutual Security Act of 1959, S. 1451, under which the United States would contribute to the World Health Organization a sum of $1 million for field trials, surveys, and demonstrations as to the technical feasibility of mass eradication of such diseases as tuberculosis, African trypanosomiasis, schistosomiasis, and other maladies. In that way, we will test whether cure and prevention of such diseases can be placed on an inexpensive, effective, and relatively permanent basis through mass application.

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE LEADERSHIP

3. A third essential point is to flash the green light for the U.S. Public Health Service to make available its technical know-how to the world on a more expanded basis than at present.

Toward that end, another amendment which I am introducing to the mutual security bill would, for the first time on the statute books of our Nation, makes unmistakably clear the right of, yes, the mandate to the Surgeon General of the U.S. Public Health Service to join further in the prevention and conquest of disease throughout the world.

The Surgeon General would, of course, exercise this function through the President of the United States and the basic organ of foreign policy, the Department of State.

And the Public Health Service would work in a manner which would complement, and in no way duplicate, the work of the International Cooperation Administration.

FINDING ANSWERS TO CANCER, HEART DISEASE

4. A further element in the program is to accelerate man's search for answers to the riddles of baffling disease which still exact a terrible toll throughout the world.

Most important among these diseases are, of course, cancer and heart disease.

During World War II, 1.9 million people died in the United States of the diseases of the heart and the circulatory system. That represented eight times the loss of life in the Armed Forces.

Cancer in turn killed over twice as many as lost their lives in that war.

When I was in the Soviet Union, I pointed out to Premier Nikita Krushchev on December 1, 1958, that last year a quarter of a million Americans died of cancer (which is one every 2 minutes) and a quarter of a million Russians died as well. I said, let us join hands—bilaterally and through WHO—in warring against cancer. Premier Krushchev agreed. WHO can, therefore play an indispensible part in coordinating East-West research toward the conquest of that dread disease.

Toward this end, too, still another amendment which I am introducing would make available $1 million for WHO research planning in the specific fields of cancer and cardiovascular ailments.

This would be the first such money, the only such money, which the United States has ever designated to the World Health Organization for specific application against these two most universal killers.

And, I might point out, this would supplement the $1 million which the executive branch already proposes for research planning across the board against a vast spectrum of literally dozens of diseases.

Still another element in this program is the passage of legislation which I regard as indispensible on the research front. This is Senate Joint Resolution 41 the "Health for Peace Act," introduced by Senator LISTER HILL and cosponsored by 58 other Senators, including myself. Under this bill, there will be established a National Institute for Medical Research with, we hope, an authorization of not less than $50 million per year.

This Institute would become the channel for research grants overseas, for the support of international medical organizations, exchange of medical information, and other essential purposes.

FULL EFFORT UNDER THE INTERNATIONAL HEALTH YEAR

5. You are all aware that at the Assembly opening next Tuesday, one of the very important items on the agenda is the International Public Health and Medical Research Year.

This Year, which could commence in June 1961, could witness the greatest effort against disease ever waged in the history of man. It could break through to higher levels of governmental and world-wide health activity.

As the sponsor of the Resolution under which the Senate unanimously approved the concept of such a Year, I feel that all possible resources should be mobilized for the success of the Year.

Of course, a 12 month or 18 month period would simply be a beginning. But it could mark a bolder beginning than men have heretofore visualized. And the important aspect is not merely what is begun that year, but rather what is sustained and broadened and expanded thereafter.

PASS FOOD FOR PEACE ACT

6. Finally, I suggest that we use one of the greatest assets in the world today, America's food, for the health of mankind.

Food saves lives, restores lives, enriches lives.

American food sold abroad generates counterpart currencies which can then be reloaned for a wide variety of constructive purposes, including higher industrial and agricultural productivity, better schools, better sanitation systems, better health.

This is why I have introduced the Food for Peace Act, and it is why I shall strive for its passage.

TOTAL WAR AGAINST DISEASE

These six points are but a few elements of an overall program. They add up to one key theme. Let us declare total war against disease. Let us declare a way in which all the world will fight on the same side.

Let us wage this war with the same dedication, the same spirit of self-sacrifice, if need be, the same spirit of doing the impossible, such as occurs in time of military conflict.

The enemy of disease is not simply present in Africa, South Asia, and the Middle East. The enemy is here in the whole world—the bacteria, the viruses, the accidents, which kill and cripple man.

Here, in the United States, there are an estimated 23 million partially or totally handicapped persons, including 14 million with diseases of the heart and arteries, another 14 million with some type of mental problem, 11 million with arthritis and rheumatism.

We Americans would not today think of tolerating such former foes as smallpox, typhoid fever, plague, or pellagra.

So, too, there is no reason why we should adopt an attitude of helplessness in the face of the other types of diseases I have mentioned which now scourge so many of our own and other people.

And so next week, as the statesmen of the great powers meet to remove causes which might otherwise perhaps, lead someday to World War III, let a different type of war be declared simultaneously by the World Health Organization.

Let it be a war against the only enemy mankind seeks—the enemy which limits him, deprives him of his birthright, cuts him down prematurely—disease and disability.

And, let this war be an integral part of an overall war against poverty and malnutrition, unemployment and hopelessness.

This overall war can be won for the first time in recorded history. Mankind can at last gain an upper hand in conquering the foes which have blighted him since he first appeared on this earth.

In winning the war against this enemy, we may help to win against world war III.

In developing vaccines against disease, we may develop a vaccine of peace.

EMPLOYMENT OF SIX ADDITIONAL LABORERS

The resolution (S. Res. 113) authorizing the Sergeant at Arms of the Senate to employ not to exceed six additional laborers was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

FIDEL CASTRO

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point an article entitled "Some Questions for Fidel Castro," appearing in George Todt's column published in the Valley Times, of

North Hollywood, Calif., on Monday, May 11, 1959.

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

SOME QUESTIONS FOR FIDEL CASTRO

("No one can disgrace us but ourselves."—J. G. Holland.)

Now that the Cuban dictator, Fidel Castro ("all things to all men"), has made off like a whirling dervish from whence he came—wooing and winning certain segments of our more liberal press with answers out of both sides of his beard—we may well ask ourselves if anything was left unsaid by that loquacious worthy in his recent public relations tour of Washington, D.C. and New York City?

As one who has long been suspicious of Fidel's questionable antics in more ways than one, perhaps it would be considered a bit more fair by my readers if I permitted someone else to ask the $64 questions here.

Accordingly, let me bring you the straight-from-the-shoulder queries of a great U.S. Congressman, Representative ALVIN E. O'KONSKI, Republican, of Wisconsin, member of the important House Committee on Armed Services—a forthright man of raw American courage who never fears to speak out in behalf of what he considers to be the truth—as he recently put to Congress some 14 questions which Castro did not answer while he was amongst us.

These, according to the admirable O'KONSKI, are pertinent questions the fellow-traveling dictator didn't quite get around to clarify:

1. You said that in case of war between the United States and Communist Russia, Cuba should remain neutral. Do you not think that such an attitude would work in Russia's favor?

2. The Communist newspaper "Hoy" is now being printed in Havana on presses that you confiscated from their legal owners. Is your government leasing these presses to the Communists, or did you sell them outright, or did you maybe give them to them?

3. Former President Figuero of Costa Rica, said in a speech in Cuba, that in the event of war, that Latin American countries should support the United States. Why did you disagree publicly with Figuero on this point?

4. People of the United States have always been friendly toward Cuba. The U.S. Government made absolutely no effort to intervene in your revolution. Why did you say you were ready to kill 200,000 gringos if the United States stepped in to protect American lives and property they own in Cuba?

5. You have said publicly that news agencies, newspapers, and magazines have lied about you and your government publicly. Would you be specific as to just who lied?

6. Is it true that unemployment has increased to an alarming degree since you took over the government in Cuba? Unemployment in private enterprise as well as government agency unemployment?

7. By the way, why did you recently suspend 2,500 school teachers?

8. When you attacked army barracks in Santa Ana and were captured and then sentenced to 15 years in prison, Batista—then the head of the Cuban Government—let you out in about a year and a half. Since you have become Premier of the provisional government of Cuba, why do you not follow the same policies? Or do you find it easier to shoot your prisoners? Is it probably cheaper?

9. You have been looked upon as a fighter in favor of a democracy, and antidictatorship man. Why, then, do you give orders to your courts—and even ask reversals of decisions from "not guilty" to the "death sentence?" Is that democracy?

10. In the famous trial of the 43 air force pilots which took place in Santiago, is it true that they were acquitted and that you showed your disapproval, and that therefore the attorneys were expelled from the courtroom and detailed, among them a lawyer who once defended you? Is it not a fact that as a result of your orders, a new tribunal was formed under the supervision of your brother, Raul, and that he took the position of the district attorney, as well as the defense minister, and that he then accused his lawyers of being Batista sympathizers?

11. Is it not also true that these acquitted persons were tried all over again and the majority of them sentenced to 30 years at hard labor?

12. During the dictatorship which you fought against, the Embassies in Havana had no trouble whatsoever in getting out of the country those persons who took refuge in them. Why is there such a great contrast between what went on under Batista and what goes on today, regarding the right of refuge and asylum?

13. You have said that the executions in Cuba would not exceed more than 400. Yet there are more than 500 already—and 5,000 are still awaiting trial. Do you think such blood baths and purges are becoming to a democratic government that professes love for humanity?

14. Is it not true that your mother, Mrs. Lina Ruz Castro—your own mother—has said that during the Batista government she not only had personal guarantee of safety, but that her home and family properties were also protected? Would this policy not be better than the one your government presently engages in?

These are questions for the record which Congressman O'KONSKI is asking of the Cuban dictator—and they are valid questions which ought to be asked.

What sort of answers, if any, will be forthcoming from Fidel Castro?

While, as fellow North Americans, the people of the United States have nothing except affection and friendship for the Cuban people, themselves—I think that Joe Doakes, U.S. taxpayer, ought to receive a flock of correct answers to some of the foregoing questions posed by Representative O'KONSKI before being asked to shell out to any questionable "democratic" regime, such as Castro's in Cuba.

How gullible are we "gringos" supposed to be, Comrade?

Shall we stand for morality over expediency here?

Should we extend Castro a helping hand until the day he comes to us with a clean hand instead of a glad hand?

THE NOMINATION OF LEWIS L. STRAUSS TO BE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD at this point an editorial from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch entitled "The Senate Should Reject Strauss."

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

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, May 7, 1959]

THE SENATE SHOULD REJECT STRAUSS

In the exercise of its constitutional function to confirm or reject the President's appointment of Cabinet officers, the Senate must act with great care. Its Members should not permit differences over policy to control their decision. On policy questions, a Cabinet officer does not speak for the Senate; he speaks for the President. The President is entitled to appoint persons of his own and not the Senate's choice. He is also entitled to a prompt decision on their confirmation.

A decision on Adm. Lewis Strauss as Secretary of Commerce has been delayed much too long. With every day of further delay, the Senate convicts itself of playing politics with this important appointment.

The confirmation power would be an empty ritual, however, if the Senate simply accepted Presidential appointments without applying its own conscientious judgment to them. If a Cabinet officer must have the confidence of the President, he must have the confidence of a majority of Senators as well. Though the majority cannot fairly demand that a nominee agree with its views, it can and should demand that he possess qualifications of character and a record which warrant consent to his nomination.

We believe the Senate should reject the nomination of Admiral Strauss. We base this belief not on his views, with which we have often disagreed, but on his record as Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission. Three outstanding aspects of that record, in our opinion, disqualify Admiral Strauss for a vote of confidence by the Senate.

1. THE OPPENHEIMER CASE

One of Admiral Strauss' first acts, as AEC Chairman, was to become chief prosecutor and judge in the security investigation of a distinguished scientist, J. Robert Oppenheimer. We believe Dr. Oppenheimer was wronged, and that subsequent events have attested to his loyalty, integrity, and character. As Joseph and Stewart Alsop concluded from a detailed review of the case in 1954, Strauss' key charges represented a gross and flagrant distortion of the truth. His attack on Oppenheimer was both a craven surrender to and an unprincipled exploitation of the spirit of McCarthyism. We find quite plausible the conclusion of the Alsops that Strauss animus to Oppenheimer sprang from personal differences—that Strauss was guilty of venting the bitterness of old disputes through the security system of this country. Regardless of motive, however, the traits of character Strauss showed in the Oppenheimer case are not such as to warrant a vote of senatorial confidence.

2. THE DIXON-YATES CASE

Admiral Strauss was the principal architect of this abortive effort to cripple the Tennessee Valley Authority in partnership with a private utility syndicate. Thus, he used public office for the covert aid of private interests, and in doing so was far from candid with the public and the President. Strauss bears the responsibility for a doctored AEC record of the case which omitted the name of the key person in it, Adolphe H. Wenzell. Strauss misinformed and misled the President into defending for many months a contract which eventually had to be repudiated. He withheld terms of the contract from Congress and the public until this newspaper published it in full. He bludgeoned his fellow AEC Commissioners into accepting the contract against their better judgment. The traits of character he showed in the Dixon-Yates case are not such as to warrant a vote of senatorial confidence.

3. THE NUCLEAR INFORMATION CASE

Senator ANDERSON, of New Mexico, in his closely reasoned and well-documented testimony, demonstrates that Strauss repeatedly violated the law which requires the AEC to keep the joint congressional committee fully informed on atomic-energy developments. He shows that Strauss used devious publicity methods in his effort to discount the seriousness of radioactive fallout and to deceive the

public about a clean bomb. He proves that Strauss not only opposed the export of research isotopes to friendly countries, but has tried to mislead Senators as to what his position had been. From the beginning, Strauss gave the public and Congress a one-sided, inaccurate picture, which is only now being corrected, of the dangers of fallout from nuclear tests. The traits of character he showed in this controversy are not such as to warrant a vote of senatorial confidence.

Many Senators, like the Post-Dispatch, have disagreed with Admiral Strauss on such questions as the suspension of nuclear tests, the best ways to develop nuclear power, the degree of secrecy to be imposed on scientists. Their disagreement on these policies is not enough to warrant rejecting his nomination. But they must consider also the ways in which he sought to carry out his policies, the tactics with which he waged battle, the traits of character he revealed in action. We believe the record in that respect clearly argues against senatorial consent to his nomination.

THE RAILROAD RETIREMENT BILL

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, as one who has frequently criticized the President of the United States because of courses of action which he so frequently takes which, in my opinion, are not in the public interest, I believe that in fairness I should highly commend him for his signing, yesterday, of the railroad retirement bill.

The Morse-Staggers railroad retirement bill, which passed both Houses, by an overwhelming vote, is a bill in the interest not only of the railroad employees, but also of the general public.

I should like to have the President know that I believe he is to be highly commended for signing that bill. I wish to express my appreciation to all members of my committee, particularly to the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], on the Republican side, for the good work they did in behalf of the Morse-Staggers bill when it was before the Senate. I want the Republican members of my subcommittee and the Republican members of the full Committee on Labor and Public Welfare to know that I fully appreciate the fact that the Morse-Staggers bill would not have passed the Senate without the fine cooperation they extended to me as chairman of the subcommittee which handled the bill.

I wanted to say these words in commendation because I believe the President in signing the bill yesterday performed an act of statesmanship.

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

EMPLOYMENT OF SIX ADDITIONAL LABORERS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution, S. Res. 113, has been announced as next in order. Is there objection to the consideration of the resolution?

Mr. ENGLE. Over, by request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard. The resolution will be passed over. The next measure on the calendar will be stated.

EXTENSION OF THE PROVISIONS OF THE REORGANIZATION ACT OF 1949

The bill (S. 1474) to make permanent the provisions of the Reorganization Act of 1949 was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

THE RAILROAD RETIREMENT BILL

Mr. COOPER. I should like to comment on the statement just made by the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE].

First, I thank him for his very generous remarks concerning my part in the development of the amendment to the Railroad Retirement Act, which was approved by the President yesterday. I am very happy that the President signed the bill.

From a technical standpoint, the bill was one of the most difficult bills which had come before the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. Led by the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the subcommittee considered the subject for more than 2 years.

I believe the bill passed by the Congress, and which has now been approved by the President represents the best bill it was possible to secure after more than 2 years of work. It corrects the deficit in the railroad retirement fund and the unemployment insurance fund, and made them actuarially sound. It corrects many inequities in the present act. It provides benefits which are deserved by railroad employees.

I pay this word of appreciation to the senior Senator from Oregon for his just and patient work and for his full consideration, both of the claims of the railroads and railroad employees.

EXTENSION OF PROVISIONS OF THE REORGANIZATION ACT OF 1949

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill (S. 1474) to make permanent the provisions of the Reorganization Act of 1949?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Government Operations with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That subsection (b) of section 5 of the Reorganization Act of 1949 (63 Stat. 205; 5 U.S.C. 133z-3), as last amended by the Act of September 4, 1957 (71 Stat. 611), is hereby further amended by striking out "June 1, 1959" and inserting in lieu thereof "June 1, 1961".

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is advised that the amendment is a committee amendment in the nature of a substitute for the bill. The question is on agreeing to the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I wish to observe that we are proposing to pass on the call of the unanimous consent calendar a bill providing for an extension of the provisions of the Reorganization Act of 1949. The records of Congress will show that the initial proposal for the passage of a reorganization act, which would give to the President of the United States the authority to change existing laws and to consolidate, abolish, and amend the plans of the existing branches of the Government, produced much debate. The original Reorganization Act was the subject of considerable controversy. However, it has been developed and revised over a period of time, and it has become customary to extend it, sometimes with amendments.

I note with considerable interest that it is now proposed only to extend the life of the Reorganization Act, and that the amendment would continue the act as it was last amended by the act of September 4, 1957.

I observe on the floor the distinguished senior Senator from Minnesota, who, I understand, reported the bill for the Committee on Government Operations. I should like to have him confirm that it is true that the bill makes no substantive amendment to the present Reorganization Act, other than the extension of the time of its effectiveness.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I respond to the Senator from South Dakota by stating that there is no substantive amendment. The amendment merely provides for an extension of the general duration of the Reorganization Act for 2 years. That is what has been done every 2 years, I believe, during the past 10 years. The amendment permits that type of extension.

The Committee on Government Operations has legislative jurisdiction over this particular type of program, and seeks to review the reorganization program every 2 years to determine whether or not it is desirable to extend it. So there is no substantive change in the act at all.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. It should be noted, I think, that the passage of the original Reorganization Act developed bitter debate in both the House and Senate. There was considerable question whether Congress was in any sense delegating legislative powers to the executive branch. The formula which was eventually devised provides for the submission of reorganization plans to Congress and allows a certain time for Congress to consider them. Then unless either body adopts a resolution of disapproval, the reorganization plan becomes effective. Is that not correct?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct. On page 6 of the committee report the limitations and powers with respect to reorganizations are listed. They are the limitations in the basic law. We are now merely extending the basic law. On page 5 of the report will be seen the contents of the plans as submitted by the President, and a description of what the President may submit in the form of a reorganization plan.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I observe that the bill proposes to extend the authority of the act to June 1, 1961, which will be, substantially, 6 months beyond the date for the inauguration of the next

President of the United States. In doing so, apparently Congress would recognize that any President should have some leeway in effecting the recommendations or the policies he may wish to promulgate; but still an adequate opportunity is provided for Congress to pass upon his proposals.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from South Dakota is absolutely correct.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The matter is put on a nonpartisan plane, because no one today can precisely know who will be the next President of the United States, or from what party he will come.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, does the distinguished Senator from Minnesota, who is chairman of the subcommittee which handled the bill, not believe it would be a good idea that, at least once in a while, the powers surrendered by Congress should come back to it and temporarily reside in Congress, at least long enough for us to know that we have not surrendered our power forever?

I recall being a member of the committee with the distinguished Senator from Minnesota when we first discussed this matter, when President Truman was given the vast reorganization powers. We then worked what is the present reorganization law extension plan.

It seems to me that if no strong case is made for a reorganization plan, Congress should perhaps retain the powers in its own hands rather than surrender them.

In this instance, if the President has no plan, Congress will be surrendering its powers unnecessarily. I am willing to give the President the power to reorganize the Government when that is necessary. I suggest, however, that the surrender of power by Congress, not knowing whether the power is wanted by the President, creates a bad precedent.

Did President Eisenhower ask that these powers be surrendered for 6 months into the next President's term.

Mr. HUMPHREY. President Eisenhower, through the Bureau of the Budget, asked that the extension be made permanent, with no limitation. The subcommittee on Reorganization of the Committee on Government Operations decided, in keeping with the general philosophy expressed by the junior Senator from Louisiana, that these powers should not be extended on a permanent basis but, rather, that they should come to a halt and be reviewed periodically.

Each time the question of an extension has come up—and it has been my privilege to handle the matter two or three times—the committee has considered carefully how the powers of reorganization should be used under the act.

The committee has had serious discussion about this subject. The distinguished senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] has been keenly interested in the use of the reorganization powers and in the importance of having Congress hold a checkrein on them, so that we may review them periodically.

That is why the extension for only 2 years is proposed.

To have extended it for only 1 year would not have extended it until the completion of the term of the present administration.

To have extended it permanently would seem to me to have been unwise.

To extend it for 2 years will be to extend it until the completion of the term of the present administration and for only a few months into whatever new administration may come in, following January 1961.

Mr. LONG. I did not know the bill was even being considered by the committee. But it seems to me that somewhere along the line the President should show the graciousness of giving up this power for a brief period, in return for the surrender of the power by Congress to the President. Under those circumstances, I do not think it unreasonable to request that the President some day say, "I am willing to surrender the power back to you for a few months."

Why can we not ask President Eisenhower to get along without this power for a few months before the conclusion of his term of office, rather than simply to have the Congress surrender its power permanently or over indefinite or very long periods of time by force of habit?

Some persons expect the Congress to exercise its responsibilities, rather than to pass them on to others forever.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Let me respond politely but affirmatively to the question and the statement of the Senator from Louisiana: We can even consider having the Congress proceed as it did in the case of the proposed extension of the REA Act, in connection with which the Congress by an overwhelming majority voted to reverse a certain plan. But a Presidential veto prevented that. However, the Congress did exercise its prerogatives.

Perhaps the Senator from Louisiana can make a case for extending the act for only 1 year, 7 months, and 13 days, or some such period of time. But on four occasions the Senate has followed precedent by voting for 2-year extensions.

Each time the matter has been reviewed by the committee and by the staff of the committee.

With me today on the floor is Mr. Scull, of the staff of the Senate Committee on Government Operations. Each time the matter has been reviewed by the full committee, and each time the full committee has recommended an extension for not more than 2 years.

I really believe that our recommendation is valid and sound.

I say to the great Senator from Louisiana that this is not a matter which was brought before the committee in a routine way, given only cursory consideration, and then reported by the committee. Instead, this is a matter of the utmost concern to the committee; and it was given the most thoughtful consideration by the members of the committee and by the staff of the committee.

As the Senator from Louisiana knows, the extension now proposed has been recommended not only by this administration, but also by the prior administration, by the Hoover Commission, and, I believe, by most good Government groups.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, much as I admire the distinguished Senator from Minnesota and applaud his good intentions, I believe he has demonstrated how these reorganization plans can be used completely contrary to the will of Congress, once the Congress has surrendered its power.

The Senator from Minnesota sponsored a bill to protect the REA's, and his bill received the support of two-thirds of the Members of the Senate. The President vetoed the bill. More than two-thirds of the Senate voted to pass the bill, notwithstanding the President's veto. In the House of Representatives, the bill failed by only one vote from being passed over the President's veto. As a result of that situation, the Congress has lost control over that matter, because the congressional power has been surrendered.

Therefore, I think this matter should be studied very carefully. Accordingly, Mr. President, I object to the present consideration of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time available for debate on the bill, under the rule, has expired.

Objection has been heard to the present consideration of the bill; and the bill will go over.

The next measure on the calendar will be stated.

TEMPORARY SUSPENSION OF PROCESSING TAX ON PALM OIL

The bill (H.R. 147) to suspend temporarily the tax on the processing of palm oil, palm-kernel oil, and fatty acids, salts, and combinations, or mixtures thereof, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

FREE IMPORTATION OF CERTAIN CHAPEL BELLS

The bill (H.R. 3681) to provide for the free entry of certain chapel bells imported for the use of the Abelard Reynolds School No. 42, Rochester, N.Y., was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

HEALTH FACILITIES FOR INDIANS

The bill (S. 56) to amend the act of August 5, 1954 (68 Stat. 674), and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Act of August 5, 1954 (68 Stat. 674), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 7. (a) In carrying out his functions under this Act with respect to the provision of sanitation facilities and services, the Surgeon General is authorized—

"(1) to construct, improve, extend, or otherwise provide and maintain, by contract

or otherwise, essential sanitation facilities, including domestic and community water supplies and facilities, drainage facilities, and sewage- and waste-disposal facilities, together with necessary appurtenances and fixtures, for Indian homes, communities, and lands;

"(2) to acquire lands, or rights or interests therein, including sites, rights-of-way, and easements, and to acquire rights to the use of water, by purchase, lease, gift, exchange, or otherwise, when necessary for the purposes of this section, except that no lands or rights or interests therein may be acquired from an Indian tribe, band, group, community, or individual other than by gift or for nominal consideration, if the facility for which such lands or rights or interests therein are acquired is for the exclusive benefit of such tribe, band, group, community, or individual, respectively;

"(3) to make such arrangements and agreements with appropriate public authorities and nonprofit organizations or agencies and with the Indians to be served by such sanitation facilities (and any other person so served) regarding contributions toward the construction, improvement, extension and provision thereof, and responsibilities for maintenance thereof, as in his judgment are equitable and will best assure the future maintenance of facilities in an effective and operating condition; and

"(4) to transfer any facilities provided under this section, together with appurtenant interests in land, with or without a money consideration, and under such terms and conditions as in his judgment are appropriate, having regard to the contributions made and the maintenance responsibilities undertaken, and the special health needs of the Indians concerned, to any State or Territory or subdivision or public authority thereof, or to any Indian tribe, group, band, or community or, in the case of domestic appurtenances and fixtures, to any one or more of the occupants of the Indian home served thereby.

"(b) The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to transfer to the Surgeon General for use in carrying out the purposes of this section such interest and rights in federally owned lands under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior, and in Indian-owned lands that either are held by the United States in trust for Indians or are subject to a restriction against alienation imposed by the United States, including appurtenances and improvements thereto, as may be requested by the Surgeon General. Any land or interest therein, including appurtenances and improvements to such land, so transferred shall be subject to disposition by the Surgeon General in accordance with paragraph (4) of subsection (a): *Provided*, That, in any case where a beneficial interest in such land is in any Indian, or Indian tribe, band, or group, the consent of such beneficial owner to any such transfer or disposition shall first be obtained: *Provided further*, That where deemed appropriate by the Secretary of the Interior provisions shall be made for a reversion of title to such land if it ceases to be used for the purpose for which it is transferred or disposed.

"(c) The Surgeon General shall consult with, and encourage the participation of, the Indians concerned, States and political subdivisions thereof, in carrying out the provisions of this section."

SEC. 2. Section 6 of such Act is amended by striking out the word "This" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "Sections 1 to 5, inclusive, of this".

JOINT RESOLUTION PASSED OVER

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 41) to establish in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare the National Advisory Council for International Medical Research, and to establish in the Public Health Service the National Institute for International Medical Research, in order to help mobilize the efforts of medical scientists, research workers, technologists, teachers, and members of the health professions generally, in the United States and abroad, for assault upon disease, disability, and the impairments of man and for the improvement of the health of man through international cooperation in research, research training, and research planning, was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

Mr. PROUTY. I ask that the joint resolution go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be passed over.

The next measure on the calendar will be stated.

ARGYRIOS G. GEORGANDOPOULOS

The bill (S. 554) for the relief of Argyrios G. Georgandopoulos was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Argyrios G. Georgandopoulos shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

CHRISTOS KARTSONIS

The bill (S. 604) for the relief of Christos Kartsonis was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Christos Kartsonis shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

GEORGE A. ZIZICAS

The bill (S. 621) for the relief of George A. Zizicas was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, George A. Zizicas shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fee.

ARAM FAYDA AND HIS WIFE

The bill (S. 687) for the relief of Aram Fayda and his wife, Elena Fayda, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Aram Fayda and his wife, Elena Fayda, shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fees. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct the required numbers from the appropriate quota or quotas for the first year that such quota or quotas are available.

FEIGA ALTMANN ROCK

The bill (S. 770) for the relief of Feiga Altmann Rock was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Feiga Altmann Rock shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

STEPHANOS TSOUKALAS

The bill (S. 1042) for the relief of Stephanos Tsoukalas was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled. That for the purposes of sections 10(a)(27)(A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Stephanos Tsoukalas, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Mr. and Mrs. Michael Callas, citizens of the United States: *Provided*, That the natural parents of Stephanos Tsoukalas shall not, by virtue of such parentage, be accorded any right, privilege, or status under the Immigration and Nationality Act.

EFTHIMIOS CHONACAS

The bill (S. 1109) for the relief of Efthimios Chonacas was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Na-

tionality Act, Efthimios Chonacas shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

ANGELA MARIA STAIA LABELLARTE

The bill (S. 1192) for the relief of Angela Maria Staia Labellarte was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Angela Maria Staia Labellarte shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

TAXATION OF COSTS

The bill (S. 1643) to amend section 2412(b), title 28, United States Code, with respect to the taxation of costs was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That subsection (b) of section 2412, title 28, United States Code, is amended to read as follows: "In an action under subsection (a) of section 1346 or section 1491 of this title, or in an action against a collector or director of internal revenue, a former collector or director, or a personal representative of a deceased collector or director for the recovery of internal revenue taxes, if the defendant puts in issue plaintiff's right to recover, the district court or Court of Claims may allow costs to the prevailing party from the time of joining such issue. Such costs shall include only those actually incurred for witnesses and fees paid to the clerk."

UWE-THORSTEN SCOBEL

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 32) for the relief of Uwe-Thorsten Scobel, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment in line 3, after the word "of", where it appears the first time, to strike out "section 316 of", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, notwithstanding the provisions of the Immigration and Nationality Act relating to required periods of residence and physical presence within the United States, Uwe-Thorsten Scobel may be naturalized at any time after the date of enactment of this Act if he is otherwise eligible for naturalization under the provisions of the Immigration and Nationality Act.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

JOHN MACY

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 298) for the relief of John Macy, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That, notwithstanding the provisions of the Immigration and Nationality Act relating to required periods of residence and physical presence within the United States, John Macy may be naturalized at any time after the date of the enactment of this Act if he is otherwise eligible for naturalization under the provisions of the Immigration and Nationality Act.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

TATSUO KOCHI

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 317) for the relief of Tatsuo Kochi, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment in line 7, after the words "United States", to insert a colon and "*Provided,* That no natural parent of Tatsuo Kochi, by virtue of such parentage shall be accorded any right, privilege, or status under the Immigration and Nationality Act.", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of sections 101(a)(27)(A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child Tatsuo Kochi, shall be held and considered to be the natural born alien child of Master Sergeant and Mrs. Russell E. Schwartz, citizens of the United States: *Provided,* That no natural parent of Tatsuo Kochi, by virtue of such parentage, shall be accorded any right, privilege, or status under the Immigration and Nationality Act.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

STANISLAW (STANISLAUS) NAPORA

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 463) for the relief of Stanislaw (Stanislaus) Napora which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment in line 10, after the word "Act", to insert a colon and "*And provided further,* That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice has knowledge prior to the enactment of this Act.", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, notwithstanding the provision of section 212(a)(1) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Stanislaw (Stanislaus) Napora may be issued a visa and admitted to the United States for permanent residence if he is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that Act: *Provided,* That a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the said Act: *And provided further,* That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice has knowledge prior to the enactment of this Act.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

PETER R. MULLER

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 510) for the relief of Peter R. Muller, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment on page 1, line 7, after the word "visa", to strike out "fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available." and insert "fee: *Provided,* That nothing in this Act shall be construed to waive the provisions of section 315 of the Immigration and Nationality Act.", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Peter R. Muller shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fee: *Provided,* That nothing in this Act shall be construed to waive the provisions of section 315 of the Immigration and Nationality Act.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

SIGLINDE GINZINGER MAXWELL

The Senate proceded to consider the bill (S. 755) for the relief of Siglinde Ginzinger Maxwell, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment on page 1, line 11, after the word "Act", to insert a colon and "*And provided further,* That if the said Siglinde Ginzinger Maxwell is not entitled to medical care under the Dependents' Medical Care Act (70 Stat. 250), a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the Immigration and Nationality Act.", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, notwithstanding the provisions of paragraph (3) of section 212(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Siglinde Ginzinger Maxwell may be issued a visa and be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of such Act: *Provided,* That this Act shall apply only to grounds for exclusion under such paragraph known to the Secretary of State or the Attorney General prior to the date of

the enactment of this Act: *And provided further,* That if the said Siglinde Ginzinger Maxwell is not entitled to medical care under the Dependents' Medical Care Act (70 Stat. 250), a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the Immigration and Nationality Act.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

ANTONELLA GAMBINO

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 756) for the relief of Antonella Gambino, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment in line 11, after the word "Act," to insert a colon and *"And provided further,* That a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the said Act.", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, notwithstanding the provisions of paragraph (4) of section 212(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Antonella Gambino may be issued a visa and be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of such Act: *Provided,* That this Act shall apply only to grounds for exclusion under such paragraph known to the Secretary of State or the Attorney General prior to the date of the enactment of this Act: *And provided further,* That a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the said Act.

The amendments was agreed to.

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

SAEKO HIGA AND MASAKO HIGA

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 855) for the relief of Saeko Higa and Masako Higa, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment in line 5, after "section 202(b)", to insert "(3)", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Saeko Higa and Masako Higa shall be deemed to be within the purview of section 202(b)(3) of that Act.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

ANTHONY ELIO MONACELLI

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 896) for the relief of Anthony Elio Monacelli, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment in line 7, after the words "United States", to insert a colon and *"Provided,* That the natural mother of Anthony Elio Monacelli, by virtue of such parentage, shall not be accorded any right, privilege, or status under the Immigration and Nationality Act.", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of sections 203(a)(3) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Anthony Elio Monacelli, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Mr. and Mrs. Elio Monacelli, lawful permanent residents of the United States: *Provided,* That the natural mother of Anthony Elio Monacelli, by virtue of such parentage, shall not be accorded any right, privilege, or status under the Immigration and Nationality Act.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

JURIJ ANTIN NIMYLOWYCZ

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1128) for the relief of Jurij Antin Nimylowycz, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment in line 10, after the word "issued", to insert a colon and "*Provided,* That a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the Immigration and Nationality Act". so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Attorney General is authorized and directed to cancel any outstanding order and warrant of deportation, warrant of arrest, and bonds which may have issued in the case of Jurij Antin Nimylowycz. From and after the date of the enactment of this Act the said Jurij Antin Nimylowycz shall not again be subject to deportation by reason of the same facts upon which such deportation proceedings were commenced or any such warrants and orders have issued: *Provided,* That a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the Immigration and Nationality Act.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

APPOINTMENT OF COMMISSIONER FOR GRAND CANYON NATIONAL PARK, ARIZ.

The bill (S. 1164) to authorize the appointment of a Commissioner for Grand Canyon National Park, Ariz., was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the bill?

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, this bill has been recommended by the Administrative Office of the United States Courts and by the Department of the Interior. The Department of Justice has advised the committee that whether the bill should be enacted involves questions of policy on which the Department of Justice prefers to make no recommendation.

The proposed legislation provides that a special commissioner for the Grand Canyon National Park, Ariz., be appointed by the U.S. District Court for the District of Arizona, to hold office for 4 years unless sooner removed by the district court, and to be subject to the general laws and requirements applicable to U.S. commissioners.

The proposed legislation also provides that the jurisdiction of the commissioner in adjudicating cases brought before him shall be limited to the trial, and sentencing upon conviction, of persons charged with the commission of those misdemeanors classified as petty offenses relating to the violation of Federal laws or regulations applicable within the park, with the provision that any person charged with a petty offense may elect to be tried in the district court of the United States; and the commissioner shall apprise the defendant of his right to make such election, but shall not proceed to try the case unless the defendant, after being so apprised, signs a written consent to be tried before the commissioner.

The present difficulty in disposing of cases which involve petty offenses in the Grand Canyon National Park arises from the fact that the nearest U.S. commissioners are located in Kingman and Flagstaff, Ariz., some distance from the park.

The court itself could appoint a commissioner without this authority if it was clear that the Grand Canyon National Park was an area over which either the Congress has exclusive power to legislate or over which the United States has concurrent jurisdiction.

The question of the power of the court to appoint a commissioner without legislation of this kind has arisen because the jurisdiction of the United States over the Grand Canyon National Park is described as "proprietary."

To put the case in a nutshell, the reason why a commissioner is wanted is that in the petty cases which arise, persons involved will not have to travel from Grand Canyon to Flagstaff, Ariz., to have the cases heard. Because of the unusual status of Grand Canyon National Park, which is proprietary in nature, a legal question is raised whether courts would have power, in the absence of legislation of this character, to appoint a commissioner.

Mr. LANGER. How have they been getting along in the past?

Mr. ENGLE. The officers have been going to Flagstaff, Ariz., with the offenders. Not only have the law-enforcement officers been greatly inconvenienced, but the witnesses as well have been.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1164) to authorize the appointment of a Commissioner for Grand Canyon National Park, Ariz., which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment on page 1, line 4, after the word "the", to strike out "said national park" and insert "Grand Na-

tional Park, Arizona", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the United States District Court for the District of Arizona shall appoint a special commissioner for the Grand Canyon National Park, Arizona. The commissioner shall hold office for four years, unless sooner removed by the district court, and he shall be subject to the general laws and requirements applicable to United States commissioners.

SEC. 2. The jurisdiction of the commissioner in adjudicating cases brought before him shall be limited to the trial, and sentencing upon conviction, of persons charged with the commission of those misdemeanors classified as petty offenses (18 U.S.C. 1) relating to the violation of Federal laws or regulations applicable within the park: *Provided,* That any person charged with a petty offense may elect to be tried in the district court of the United States; and the commissioner shall apprise the defendant, of his right to make such election, but shall not proceed to try the case unless the defendant, after being so apprised, signs a written consent to be tried before the commissioner. The exercise of additional functions by the commissioner shall be consistent with and be carried out in accordance with the authority, laws, and regulations of general application to United States commissioners. The rules of procedure set forth in title 18, section 3402, of the United States Code, shall be followed in the handling of cases by such commissioner. The probation laws shall be applicable to persons tried by the commissioner and he shall have power to grant probation.

SEC 3. The commissioner shall receive an annual salary to be fixed by the district court with the approval of the Judicial Conference of the United States and shall account for all fees, fines, and costs collected by him as public moneys. He shall reside within the boundary of the park or at some place reasonably adjacent thereto designated by the Secretary of the Interior with the approval of the district court.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

MELANIE HOFFMAN

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 190) for the relief of Melanie Hoffman, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment, in line 4, after the name "Melanie", to strike out "Hoffman" and insert "Hoffmann", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Melanie Hoffmann shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

The title was amended, so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Melanie Hoffmann."

LEA LEVY

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 967) for the relief of Lea Levy, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment, in line 4, after the word "Act", to strike out "Lea Levy" and insert "Lea Levi", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Lea Levi shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

The title was amended, so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Lea Levi."

JESSE ISOBEL FOSTER

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1037) for the relief of Jesse Isobel Foster, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with amendments, on page 1, line 6, after the word "of", to strike out "Jesse" and insert "Jessie", and in line 7, after the word "said", to strike out "Jesse" and insert "Jessie", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Attorney General is authorized and directed to cancel any outstanding order and warrant of deportation, warrant of arrest, and bonds, which may have issued in the case of Jessie Isobel Foster. From and after the date of the enactment of this Act, the said Jessie Isobel Foster shall not again be subject to deportation by reason of the same facts upon which such deportation proceedings were commenced or any such warrants and orders have issued: *Provided,* That a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the Immigration and Nationality Act.

The amendments were agreed to.

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

The title was amended, so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Jessie Isobel Foster."

SU-MING TSENG AND HER DAUGHTER

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1073) for the relief of Su-Ming Tseng and her daughter, Wu-Mo Tseng, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Su-Ming Tseng shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

The title was amended, so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Su-Ming Tseng."

PRIVATE FISHERY RIGHTS IN PEARL HARBOR

The bill (H.R. 3248) to provide for the payment of just compensation to certain claimants for the taking by the United States of private fishery rights in Pearl Harbor, Island of Oahu, Hawaii, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EDUARDO PIRES—WITHDRAWAL OF SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 30) withdrawing suspension of deportation in the case of Eduardo Pires was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress, in accordance with section 246(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C.A. 1256(a)), withdraws the suspension of deportation in the case of Eduardo Pires (A-7483662) which was previously granted by the Attorney General and approved by the Congress.

EVA GARCIA DE ZEPEDA—WITHDRAWAL OF SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 31) withdrawing suspension of deportation in the case of Eva Garcia de Zepeda was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress, in accordance with section 246(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C.A. 1256(a)), withdraws the suspension of deportation in the case of Eva Garcia de Zepeda (A-8769233) which was previously granted by the Attorney General and approved by the Congress.

JOSE POBLET—WITHDRAWAL OF SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 32) withdrawing suspension of deportation in the case of Jose Poblet was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress, in accordance with section 246(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8

U.S.C.A. 1256(a)), withdraws the suspension of deportation in the case of Jose Poblet (A-3013924) which was previously granted by the Attorney General and approved by the Congress.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 33) favoring suspension of deportation in the case of certain aliens was considered and agreed to, 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 pursuant to the provisions of section 244(a)(5) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 214; 8 U.S.C. 1254 (c));

A-3424896, Grassi, John.
A-4064019, Sierra-Pecina, Plutarco.
A-1039385, Almeida, Jaime Caido.
A-7812725, Bedo, Joseph.
A-4263318, Cruz, Jesus.
A-3569897, Del Gatto, Giovanni.
A-1076121, Diaz-Morales, Matias.
A-5403399, Erenburg, Scheel-Levovich.
A-5539208, Governali, Vincent.
A-2219295, Granados, Rafael Flores.
A-4316081, Guerrero, Odilon.
A-2381741, Hassan, Kassan.
A-10841833, Koon, Wong Gim.
A-5297364, Ludorf, Edward Sebastian.
A-1301717, Mack, Henry Eino.
A-3020033, Medina-Becerra, Remigio.
A-2142402, Ortiz-Cabrera, Masedonio.
A-5635350, Quong, Joe.
A-5961863, Rice, Alvie Earl.
A-2894938, Rubio-Velazquez, Atanacio.
A-8831395, Ruiz, Ramon Guerrero.
A-8521028, Schultz, William.
A-1954680, Vargas, Garcia, Jose.
A-4963711, Weinstein, Arnold.
A-5741406, Femine, Ernest Delle.
A-1148737, Gastelo-Valenzuela, Felipe.
A-1315085, Garcia-Arias, Jose Maria.
A-10432465, Risa, Arne Michael.
A-3945465, Maldonado, Francisco.
A-5119438, Razzari, Guiseppe.
A-1377556, Vieyra-Landeros, Apolonio.
A-1120875, Vincent, Frank Medeiros.
A-11290619, Chin, Bing Kee.
A-5429423, Gutierrez, Joseph.
A-10448499, Hernandez-Perez, Eulalio.
A-5755208, Jacobson, Joseph.
A-5954258, Madonna, Joseph.
A-2539330, Mikkelsen, Hans Christian Gunnar.
A-7923286, McKelligan, Katherine Burke.
A-1933574, Barovai, Philip.
A-451853, Gaenther, Andreas.
A-11161876, Lemon-Barrera, Antonio.
A-6253520, Thomas, Herbert Otto.
A-4933047, Nunez, Baltazar.
A-4961824, Handlovits, Mary Elizabeth.
A-10605548, Madrigal, Sara.
A-9519314, Scordilis, Constantinos.
A-1691409, Tartakoff, David.
A-1981926, Andreini, Amadio Eugenio Giovanni.
A-8845161, Cohen, Henry.
A-5091649, Tereschenko, William Efim.
A-1273266, Gonzalez-Hernandez, Jose.
A-1966028, Lindsay, Harry Fairweather.
A-10293639, Martin, Walter Hans.
A-2931126, Black, Henry Max.
A-2471376, Gee, Chew.
A-5901606, Lukas, Benedict.
A-2427566, Slepnikoff, Michael James.
A-1867473, Guerrero, Salvador Ybarra.
A-5896096, Helmers, Herman Heinrich Gotthold.
A-11403968, Huey, Hong Hen.
A-6249664, Jazer, Taire.
A-4228026, Perrin, Maurice J.

ROCHESTER IRON & METAL CO.

The resolution (S. Res. 117) to refer to the Court of Claims the bill (S. 268) for the relief of the Rochester Iron & Metal Co. was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the bill (S. 628) entitled "A bill for the relief of the Rochester Iron and Metal Company," now pending in the Senate, together with all the accompanying papers, is hereby referred to the Court of Claims; and the court shall proceed with the same in accordance with the provisions of sections 1492 and 2509 of title 28 of the United States Code and report to the Senate, at the earliest practicable date, giving such findings of fact and conclusions thereon as shall be sufficient to inform the Congress of the nature and character of the demand as a claim, legal or equitable, against the United States and the amount, if any, legally or equitably due from the United States to the claimant.

STUDY COMMISSION FOR CERTAIN RIVER BASINS

The bill (S. 300) to amend the act of August 28, 1958, establishing a study commission for certain river basins, so as to provide for the appointment to such commission of separate representatives for the Guadalupe-San Antonio River Basins, and a representative of the Texas Board of Water Engineers was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Act entitled "An Act to designate the dam and reservoir to be constructed on the Cumberland River near Carthage, Tennessee, as the 'Cordell Hull Dam and Reservoir' and to establish the United States Study Commission on the Neches, Trinity, Brazos, Colorado, Guadalupe-San Antonio, Nueces, and San Jacinto River Basins, and intervening areas", approved August 28, 1958 (Public Law 85-843; 72 Stat. 1058), is amended by striking out "Guadalupe-San Antonio," where it appears in sections 201(a), 203(a), 203(b)(1), 207, and 208(1)", and inserting in lieu thereof in each such instance the following: "Guadalupe, San Antonio,".

SEC. 2. Section 203(b) of such Act is amended by striking out "fourteen" and inserting in lieu thereof "sixteen".

SEC. 3. Section 203(b)(3) of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"(3) One member, nominated by the Governor of Texas subject to the provisions of subsection (c) of this secton, who shall represent the Texas Board of Water Engineers, and eight members, nominated by the Governor of Texas subject to the provisions of subsection (c) of this section, each of whom shall be a resident of a different one of the following geographical areas of Texas:

"(A) Neches River Basin;
"(B) Trinity River Basin;
"(C) Brazos River Basin;
"(D) Colorado River Basin;
"(E) Guadalupe River Basin;
"(F) San Antonio River Basin;
"(G) Nueces River Basin; and
"(H) San Jacinto River Basin."

SEC. 4. Section 203(g) of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"(g) Nine members of the Commission, of whom at least five shall have been appointed pursuant to subsection (b)(3) or (c) of this section, shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business."

SALE OF CERTAIN LANDS TO THE STATE OF MISSOURI—BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 692) to authorize the sale of certain lands to the State of Missouri was announced as next in order.

Mr. ENGLE. Over, by request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard, and the bill will go over.

Mr. MORSE previously said: Mr. President, I must go to an official luncheon tendered by the State Department in connection with my work on the Subcommittee on Latin American Affairs, and will not be here when Calendar No. 265, S. 692, is called. I, therefore, ask unanimous consent that the statement which I now send to the desk on Senate bill 692 be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at the point of consideration of that bill. My statement merely bears on the point that the bill in no way violates the Morse formula.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MORSE

S. 692 authorizes the Secretary of the Army to convey not more than 50 acres by quitclaim deed for public park and recreational purposes to the State of Missouri at the fair market value. This land is presently leased to the State of Missouri by the Federal Government for public park and recreational uses.

Under the terms of the bill, the Secretary of the Army has the authority to assure that the State's use of this land will not interfere in any way with the operation of the Table Rock Dam project. S. 692 further provides that all mineral rights would be retained by the Federal Government and that if the land is not used for the purposes specified in the bill within 5 years, the land will revert to the United States.

The bill provides for the payment of the full market value. Therefore, Mr. President, I have no objection to the passage of the bill as it conforms to the Morse formula.

GEORGE EWING LOCK AND DAM

The bill (S. 846) to provide that the lock and dam referred to as the Cannelton lock and dam, near Cannelton, Ind., shall hereafter be designated as the George Ewing lock and dam was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That in honor of George Ewing and in recognition of his long and outstanding service in the Revolutionary War where he served with distinction with General George Washington and Baron Steuben at Germantown, Brandywine, and Valley Forge, and in recognition of his other contributions to the history of the United States as the father of Thomas Ewing, twice a United States Senator from the State of Ohio, and Secretary of the Interior under President Zachary Taylor, and as the father-in-law of General William T. Sherman, the Cannelton lock and dam on the Ohio River near Cannelton, Indiana, shall hereafter be known and designated as the George Ewing lock and dam, and shall be designated as the monument to his distinguished public service. Any law, regulation, map, document, or record of the United States in which such lock and dam is

referred to shall be held and considered to refer to such lock and dam by the name of "George Ewing lock and dam."

UTILIZATION OF STORAGE SPACE IN TABLE ROCK RESERVOIR

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 42) to authorize the utilization of a limited amount of storage space in Table Rock Reservoir for the purpose of water supply for a fish hatchery, which had been reported from the Committee on Public Works, with amendments, on page 1, line 7, after the word "of", to strike out "twenty" and insert "twenty-seven", and in line 9, after the word "exceed", to strike out "twenty-five" and insert "twenty-two", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Table Rock Reservoir project, White River, Missouri, approved by the Flood Control Act approved August 18, 1941, be hereby modified to authorize the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, to make available a maximum of twenty-seven thousand acre-feet of storage space in the reservoir to provide a regulated flow not to exceed twenty-two cubic feet per second for operation by the State of Missouri of a fish hatchery without reimbursement on such terms and conditions as the Secretary of the Army may deem reasonable: *Provided,* That nothing herein contained shall affect water rights under State law.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, the pending bill is one authorizing the utilization, by the State of Missouri, of a limited amount of water to be taken from the Table Rock Reservoir, located near Branson, Mo. The State would be allowed to use the water for supplying a State fish hatchery.

The bill could be explained in highly technical terms involving acre-feet and cubic feet per second of flow, but I do not think such an explanation is necessary.

What is involved is the need of the State of Missouri and the willingness of the Department of the Army, the agency controlling water use in the reservoir, to fulfill that need.

The Department of the Army has agreed to allow Missouri use of the Department's water. Missouri is appreciative and, on behalf of my home State, I urge the Senate to approve the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendments of the committee.

The amendments were agreed to.

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

CONSTRUCTION WORK ON HIGHWAY RIGHTS-OF-WAY

The bill (H.R. 4695) to amend section 108(a) of title 23 of the United States Code to increase the period in which actual construction shall commence on rights-of-way acquired in anticipation of such construction from 5 years to 7 years, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ACQUISITION OF ADDITIONAL LAND ALONG THE MOUNT VERNON MEMORIAL HIGHWAY

The bill (H.R. 2228) to provide for the acquisition of additional land along the Mount Vernon Memorial Highway in exchange for certain dredging privileges, and for other purposes was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, there is an amendment at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed, on page 4, line 3, after "D", to change the period to a colon and add the following:

Provided, That nothing contained in this act or any contract entered into pursuant to this act, between the United States of America and the Smoot Sand and Gravel Corporation shall be construed as interfering with the uninterrupted right of the Smoot Sand and Gravel Corporation to dredge in areas "C" and "D" for the periods specified.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from California.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, may I ask for an explanation of the amendment?

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, this is a perfecting amendment to clarify and facilitate making the exchange of property between the United States and the Smoot Sand & Gravel Corp.

The amendment, incidentally, has been furnished to me by the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], from the Committee on Public Works. It would remove possible restrictions on the sand and gravel company performing dredging operations at only certain seasons of the year, and permit them to dredge sand and gravel at any time. Since most of their dredging will be done in open water areas of the Potomac River, there should be no adverse effect on wildlife from a proper scheduling of their operations.

The amendment has the approval of the sponsors of the bill, the National Park Service, and the conservationists who are interested in protecting the fish and wildlife potentialities of the area.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the amendment?

Mr. PROUTY. I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

ALICE V. TENLY

The bill (S. 1887) for the relief of Alice V. Tenly was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) the election made under section 9(h) of the Civil Service Retirement Act by Charles E. Alden to receive a reduced annuity with an annuity payable after his death to his sister-in-law, Alice V. Tenly, shall be valid.

(b) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, benefits payable under this Act shall be paid from the civil service retirement and disability fund.

TRAINING OF POSTMASTERS

The bill (H.R. 4597) to provide for the training of postmasters under the Government Employees Training Act was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ADMINISTRATIVE AUTHORITIES FOR THE NATIONAL SECURITY AGENCY

The bill (H.R. 4599) to provide certain administrative authorities for the National Security Agency, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EXEMPTION FROM TAXATION OF CERTAIN PROPERTY FOR CHILDHOOD EDUCATION INTERNATIONAL OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The bill (S. 685) to exempt from all taxation certain property of the Association for Childhood Education International in the District of Columbia was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the real property situated in square 1908 in the city of Washington, District of Columbia, described as lots 11, 801, 806, and 807, owned by the Association for Childhood Education International, a District of Columbia corporation, and all personal property located thereon, is hereby exempt from all taxation so long as the same is owned, occupied, and used by the Association for Childhood Education International for its educational and other corporate purposes and is not used for commercial or income producing purposes, subject to the provisions of sections 2, 3, and 5 of the Act entitled "An Act to define the real property exempt from taxation in the District of Columbia", approved December 24, 1942 (56 Stat. 1089; D.C. Code, secs. 47-801b, 47-801c and 47-801e).

AMENDMENT OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA REDEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1945

The bill (S. 1370) to amend section 13 of the District of Columbia Redevelopment Act of 1945, as amended, was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I wonder if we may have an explanation of the

proviso in the bill starting on line 9, page 2.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FREAR. I shall be glad to attempt to give an explanation to the Senator.

The purpose of the proviso is to except from the provisions of the bill, which creates tax exemption for certain classes of properties in urban renewal areas, properties located within project areas for which redevelopment or renewal plans were approved by the Housing and Home Finance Administrator prior to July 1, 1958. Plans for southwest redevelopment project area B, southwest urban renewal project area C, and southwest urban renewal project area C–1 were approved by the Administration prior to this date. The Administrator has agreed to waive the requirements of local public agency letter No. 112 in connection with these projects and to provide funds for the payment of taxes on all properties acquired by the Agency in these areas, including unimproved properties and those which were tax exempt prior to acquisition.

This bill will, therefore, have the effect of permitting the Agency to pay taxes to the District on all properties in southwest projects between the time they are acquired and the date of their disposition.

In all other project areas, the Agency will pay taxes to the District on all properties except: (a) Properties which were tax exempt prior to their acquisition by the Agency; (b) properties which are unimproved.

Mr. PROUTY. I thank the Senator for his explanation. I have no objection.

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 13 of the District of Columbia Redevelopment Act of 1945, as amended (60 Stat. 799; sec. 5–712, D.C. Code, 1951 edition), is amended by inserting immediately before the period at the end of such section the following: ": *Provided,* That whenever the Agency shall obtain financial assistance from the Housing and Home Finance Administrator pursuant to the provisions of section 20 of this Act, the District Commissioners are authorized, in their discretion, to exempt from District of Columbia taxation, commencing on the first day of the fiscal year following acquisition, real property acquired by and titled in the name of the Agency if such property be clear of any improvements or if such property was exempt from taxation immediately prior to its acquisition by the Agency, but any such exemption to the Agency shall automatically cease upon the leasing or sale by the Agency or such exempt property, and such property shall be liable to taxation by the District of Columbia from the day of such leasing or sale: *Provided further,* That nothing contained in the preceding proviso shall be construed to be applicable to real property acquired or in process of being acquired by the Agency pursuant to a plan approved by the Housing and Home Finance Administrator prior to July 1, 1958".

ACQUISITION OF REAL PROPERTY UNDER THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA ALLEY DWELLING ACT

The bill (S. 1159) to facilitate the acquisition of real property under the District of Columbia Alley Dwelling Act was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That subsection (d) of section 3 of the District of Columbia Alley Dwelling Act, as amended (D.C. Code, sec. 5–105), is hereby repealed.

SEC. 2. That subsection (a) of section 5 of the District of Columbia Alley Dwelling Act, as amended (D.C. Code, sec. 5–107), is amended to read as follows:

"(a) The Authority shall make a report to the President, which he shall transmit to Congress at the beginning of each regular session, giving a full and detailed account of all operations under the provisions of this Act for the preceding fiscal year, including an itemization of all properties purchased during such fiscal year, setting forth the assessed value of such properties, together with the purchase price therefor.".

CORPORATE POWERS OF THE SISTERS OF THE VISITATION

The bill (H.R. 4282) to supplement and modify the act of May 24, 1828 (6 Stat. 383, ch. CXII), in so far as it relates to corporate powers of the Sisters of the Visitation, of Georgetown in the District of Columbia was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

AMENDMENT OF ACT MAKING APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA FOR THE FISCAL YEAR ENDING JUNE 30, 1911

The bill (S. 866) to amend the act entitled "An act making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1911," and for other purposes, approved May 18, 1910, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the second proviso of the first paragraph under the caption "CONTINGENT AND MISCELLANEOUS EXPENSES" of the Act entitled "An Act making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June thirtieth, nineteen hundred and eleven, and for other purposes", approved May 18, 1910 (36 Stat. 381; sec. 1–239, D.C. Code, 1951 edition), is amended to read as follows: *"Provided further,* That hereafter no department, board, office, or agency of the government of the District of Columbia shall include any illustration in any annual report prepared by it unless such illustration be authorized under order or regulation approved by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia".

EXTENSIONS OF PROVISIONS OF MERCHANT MARINE ACT, 1936, RELATING TO WAR RISK INSURANCE

The bill (S. 1234) to extend the provisions of title XII of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, relating to war risk insurance, for an additional 5 years, ending September 7, 1965, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 1214 of title XII of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended (U.S.C., title 46, sec. 1294), is amended by striking out "10 years" and inserting in lieu thereof "15 years".

ORGANIZATION OF THE STATE DEPARTMENT

The bill (S. 1877) to amend the act of May 26, 1949, as amended, to strengthen and improve the organization of the Department of State, and for other purposes was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Act of May 26, 1949, as amended (5 U.S.C. 151a–151c), relating to the organization of the Department of State, is amended as follows:

In section 2(b), revise the present language to read as follows:

"(b) There is established in the Department of State an Office which shall be entitled as designated by the President, either Under Secretary of State for Political Affairs or Under Secretary of State for Economic Affairs, which Office shall be filled by appointment by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The incumbent of such Office shall receive compensation at the rate of $22,000 a year and shall perform such duties as may be prescribed by the Secretary of State. Any provision of law vesting authority in the 'Under Secretary of State for Economic Affairs,' or any other reference with respect thereto, is hereby amended to vest such authority in the Secretary of State."

IMPROVEMENT OF CHANNEL TO PORT MANSFIELD, TEX.

The bill (S. 962) authorizing the improvement of the channel to Port Mansfield, Tex., in the interest of navigation, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, Calendar No. 281, S. 962, and Calendar No. 282, S.1632, are both harbor improvement bills. Both bills come to the Senate with clearance from the Bureau of the Budget. I do not expect to oppose either bill, but I wish to bring before the Senate and to place in the RECORD some observations with respect to certain principles involved in river and harbor projects, and a recent recommendation from the Bureau of the Budg-

et. This will probably take me more than 5 minutes, and though I could take 5 minutes on each bill I ask unanimous consent that I may be recognized at this time for 10 minutes, 5 additional minutes, rather than separating the presentation to 5 minutes on each bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota has requested that he be allowed to take 10 minutes to speak with respect to Calendar No. 281, S. 962, and Calendar No. 282, S. 1632. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, the very day these two bills came before the Senate Committee on Public Works there also came to the committee, by referral from the President of the Senate, a letter from the Director of the Bureau of the Budget proposing on behalf of the President legislation which, in the case of all flood control projects, all watershed projects, and all other water projects except harbor or navigation projects, would require the payment of not less than 30 percent of the cost by local communities or by other non-Federal sources. I shall ask at an appropriate time during my remarks to have that letter and the draft of the bill printed in the RECORD.

Senate bill 962 would authorize the improvement of the channel to Port Mansfield, Tex. Senate bill 1632 would authorize the modification of the existing project for Kahului Harbor, island of Maui, Hawaii.

Both bills came to the committee with the clearance and approval of the Bureau of the Budget, but since we had before us a letter from the Director of the Bureau of the Budget proposing that all projects for flood prevention or flood control, or watershed development should provide for a uniform 30-percent non-Federal payment of the cost, it seemed to me that we ought not to report these bills until we had a comment from the Bureau of the Budget.

S. 962, the bill which deals with the improvement of the channel to Port Mansfield, Tex., involves a total Federal cost of $3,431,000, with no request for a non-Federal sharing of cost. The estimated cost of maintenance is $165,000 annually, all to be Federal.

The total cost of the project at Kahului Harbor, Hawaii, as estimated in the amendment proposed by the Bureau of the Budget, is $944,500 Federal cost and $205,500 non-Federal first cost. The estimated cost of annual maintenance at Kahului Harbor is $5,000 Federal and $1,000 non-Federal. The $205,500, of course, is not exactly 30 percent of the $944,500, but approximates that percentage and apparently would be in keeping with the principle proposed in the letter of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget with regard to water projects not navigational.

Senate bill 962 does not have a similar proposal, but it should be noted, in all fairness, that the report on S. 962, prepared by the staff of the Senate Committee on Public Works, shows an estimate that local interests expended approximately $1,593,000 prior to September 1957. No reference was made to that in the statement by the Bureau of the Budget, but I recognize that if those dollars were expended, a substantial contribution was made from non-Federal sources.

Nevertheless, the proposed legislation which the Bureau of the Budget has recommended to the Congress does not embrace navigational projects. In view of that, I stated to the committee that, no matter what I thought about their merits I had some hesitation about reporting these bills on the same day we received a recommendation from the Bureau of the Budget, if such action could in any sense be interpreted as a sanction by the committee for the clearance of navigational projects, with no local or non-Federal contributions to the cost, and accepting full Federal responsibility for operation and maintenance, when landlocked States such as New Mexico, Oklahoma, Colorado, and South Dakota are to be asked to pay 30 percent of the cost of the water-use projects which concern them.

As a result, I suggested that the bills be not reported until the Bureau of the Budget was given an opportunity to comment on the seeming discrepancy in principle or the discrimination established in regard to the projects which deal with navigation as compared to those which deal with other types of water utilization.

The letter from the Bureau of the Budget transmitting the proposals suggested that there was a lack of uniformity in cost-sharing standards, and on the basis of avoiding discrimination it was proposed that a 30 percent yardstick be adopted for water resource development, which embraced the flood control programs of the Corps of Engineers of the Department of the Army; the Bureau of Reclamation of the Department of the Interior; and the Soil Conservation Service of the Department of Agriculture. I note the Soil Conservation Service particularly, because it would mean that small watershed projects which are attracting a great deal of attention now, and which are being prepared by and sponsored by the Department of Agriculture, would also have the 30 percent rule applied to them. In regard to those projects, as I have learned from examining them, in most cases the non-Federal contribution will exceed 30 percent, but in some cases that is not the fact. Indeed, in some instances it has been noted such projects may have as low as a 9 percent non-Federal contribution.

When we asked the Director of the Bureau of the Budget to submit a statement on the matter, he submitted a statement dealing with the recommendation of the President to provide uniform cost-sharing on certain Federal control projects. I shall ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the statement by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

Mr. President, I should like to read a paragraph or two from the latter part of the statement, which comments directly on the issue which I had raised. The Deputy Director stated:

> Finally, I should like to turn to the question raised in the committee hearings yesterday as to whether the same or similar principles of cost sharing which are recommended by the President for flood control should be applied to navigation and harbor projects.
>
> As a matter of general principle, I think that the answer must be clearly in the affirmative. But we must recognize that the application of the principle of cost sharing to navigation projects is considerably more complicated than its application to flood protection projects. Considerations of transportation policy and of the reciprocal use of harbors in foreign commerce represent two of the more important differences. There is, also, as this committee is aware, the long-standing question of the extent to which Federal investment in navigation and harbor projects should be defrayed through user charges for such waterways.

In that connection, I should like to read from the first Hoover Commission report, which made the following observations:

> Under present methods of developing flood control and navigation works, the immediate beneficiaries often do not have to pay directly any significant part of the cost. Their only contribution is through general taxation. Indeed, they are encouraged by this policy to promote costly projects which cost them nothing. Such subsidy of private individuals from the public treasury is at best unjust. Its greatest evil, however, arises from the removal of any sort of economic measure of value in terms of willingness to pay. It seems reasonable to assume that if the direct beneficiaries refuse to pay any part of the project costs, the economic soundness of the project must indeed be questionable (p. 87).

Also a report by the Presidential Advisory Committee on Water Resources policy in 1955 recommended cost sharing as follows:

> Navigation: Serious consideration should be given to repayment of a portion of the costs of new navigation projects, particularly those which will create navigability where none now exists, by the institution of user charges. Although it would appear logical, in the interest of a completely uniform policy as to the participation of beneficiaries in the costs of water resources developments, that user charges should be instituted which would at least bear the cost of operation and maintenance of such navigation facilities, it must be recognized that the subject of user charges involves not only water policy but also the whole field of transportation, including many other media. Therefore, it is a more appropriate subject for a survey of the entire field of transportation than one of water policy alone (p. 32).

Then the second Hoover Commission made this suggestion:

> For future projects (including future capital expenditures for projects now in operation), the charges should cover all Federal costs, i.e., maintenance, operation, and capital costs. All such charges should apply to regions, or system, rather than to individual projects, so as to avoid discrimination (p. 101).

I do not intend to discuss the subject further. However, these recommendations of the President were transmitted both to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President of the

Senate. The draft bill is in the committee. For the convenience of Members of the Senate who may wish to pursue the matter, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, certain additional material which is pertinent to this subject, consisting of statements prepared by the Bureau of the Budget, and by the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government. They are pertinent to the discussion which I have made.

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

MODIFICATION OF KAHULUI HARBOR, ISLAND OF MAUI, HAWAII

DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

Location: Kahului Harbor is located on the northern shore of the island of Maui in the Hawaiian Archipelago, which extends about 1,500 miles from east to west in the east-central part of the Pacific Ocean. The island of Maui, with an area of about 728 square miles, is second in size of the six largest islands at the eastern end of the archipelago, and was formed by two volcanoes which rose from the ocean floor at a depth of about 18,000 feet below sea level. West Maui, the oldest mountain geologically, has an elevation of about 5,800 feet and the eastern volcano, Haleakala, an elevation of about 10,000 feet. Kahului Harbor is 94 nautical miles east of Honolulu, island of Oahu, 125 miles northwest of Hilo, island of Hawaii, and 2,037 miles west of San Francisco.

Report authorized by resolution of the Committee on Public Works of the House of Representatives, adopted April 21, 1953. The report has been transmitted to Congress and is printed as House Document No. 109, 86th Congress.

Existing project: Provides for a harbor basin 2,000 feet long with a maximum width of 1,450 feet, and an entrance channel 600 feet wide between the breakwaters, all with a project depth of 35 feet. The east breakwater is 2,850 feet in length and the west breakwater is 2,390 feet long. The Federal project was adopted in the River and Harbor Act of June 15, 1910, and modified by subsequent acts. The project was completed in December 1931. The total Federal cost to June 30, 1958, was $4,155,887, of which $1,778,560 was for new work and $2,377,327 for maintenance. Terminal facilities were provided by local interests at a cost of $2,615,700. The breakwaters have been subject to extensive storm damage in the past.

Plan of recommended improvement: Modification of existing project to provide for enlarging the turning basin by dredging an area 600 feet wide and 2,400 feet long, to a depth of 35 feet, in the west end of the harbor.

Estimated costs (February 1958 price level)

Federal 1st cost: Enlargement of turning basin (dredging)	$944,500
Non-Federal 1st cost:	
Construction of dike and revetment	175,300
Cash contribution to construction	30,200
Total non-Federal cost	205,500
Estimated cost of annual maintenance:	
Federal	5,000
Non-Federal	1,000

Local cooperation: (a) Contribute in cash 3.1 percent of the cost of the new work dredging, presently estimated at $30,200, to be paid prior to commencement of construction, or, if an alternative site for spoil disposal is provided, pay any increased cost of disposal plus a cash contribution based on the relationship of net land enhancement benefits to total benefits, the final apportionment of cost to be made after actual costs have been determined; (b) provide without cost to the United States all lands, easements, rights-of-way, and spoil-disposal areas necessary for the construction of the project; (c) hold and save the United States free from damages due to the construction and maintenance of the project; (d) continue to provide and maintain at local expense adequate public terminal and transfer facilities, open to all on equal terms; and (e) accomplish without cost to the United States alterations and maintenance as required in sewer, water, supply, drainage, and other utility facilities.

Project economics

Annual charges	$47,200
Annual benefits:	
Reduction in delays to shipping	6,800
Reduction in marine accidents	3,700
Reduction in groundings	110,900
Reduction in maneuvering time	5,500
Land enhancement	8,300
Total annual benefits	135,200

Benefit-cost ratio, 2.9 to 1.

Benefits: The principal industries of the island of Maui are the production of sugar and pineapples. Commercial fishing, ranching, dairying, poultry raising, and truck farming are also important to the island's economy. The estimated population of the island was 37,600 in 1956. Kahului Harbor is the only deepwater port on the island. The total commerce through the harbor in 1956 was 701,925 tons. The principal items shipped were sugar, canned fruits and juices, and molasses; and the items received were various petroleum products. Barge commerce consisted of about 101,000 tons, which was about 50 percent of the interisland commerce.

Sugar has been Maui's greatest export industry for more than 80 years. In 1956 the island produced 260,176 tons of sugar valued at about $31,221,000. Total production of pineapples in 1956 was about 149,000 tons valued at about $22 million. The livestock industry products were valued at about $2,300,000, and produce from truck farming at about $1,143,000. A small fleet of commercial fishing vessels operate from Maui's small-boat harbors. Nearby channels between the small islands are favorite sportfishing grounds. The annual fish catch handled at Maui was about 480 tons in 1956, which was about half that of previous years. The tourist industry in Hawaii has experienced a phenomenal expansion since 1946, with the volume of tourists visiting the islands increasing from about 15,000 to 150,000 in 1957, with an estimated expenditure of $77 million. The volume of tourists visiting Maui is only a portion of the total visiting Oahu, as Maui has usually been considered as a stopover for tours of people visiting the island of Hawaii. The tours usually spend only a day in Maui and take the evening plane to Honolulu, with less than a third of the tour groups staying overnight. In 1957 the number of tourists visiting Maui was estimated at 31,500, who spent $844,000. Additional tourist facilities, resort hotels, and summer homes are being constructed.

The approach of Kahului Harbor is on a range due south. Vessels entering the harbor area are normally loaded light, which exposes a high freeboard to the prevailing northeasterly trade winds. This condition tends to force vessels toward the shallow water in the west and southerly portions of the harbor. Vessels entering the harbor between the two breakwaters must have sufficient headway to insure adequate steerageway and control, because once through the entrance a hard left turn is required to bring vessels alongside the dock, which turn brings the vessels broadside to the wind. The departure of a vessel from the dock is more difficult than the arrival, as it is necessary for it to back through nearly 180 degrees, turning against the prevailing wind, in order to get into position to head out through the harbor entrance. The present limited space in the turning basin imposes severe restrictions on the handling of vessels, requiring them to proceed at slow speeds and depend more on the use of tugs to turn the vessel rather than full use of the ship's power for steerage, with a longer time required to get a ship under way, and the danger of the wind setting the vessel down into the southwest corner of the basin, or grounding it.

The recommended plan of improvement will reduce the delays of vessel arrivals and departures due to inclement weather by at least 75 percent; permit vessels departing the harbor to be operated safely at greater speeds which would save a minimum of 10 minutes maneuvering time for each ship; prevent grounding of vessels in shallow water adjacent to the turning basin; preventing 75 percent of the marine accidents involving damage to shore facilities and aids to navigation; and provide increased safety to seamen and possible prevention of injury or death due to navigational accidents. Deposition of fill material will create about 32 acres of new land in a presently submerged area.

The proposed improvements will provide sufficient maneuvering space in the turning basin to care for the present and estimated prospective increase in commerce and size of ships using this harbor, where waterborne commerce will continue to be the most practical and economical means of shipping to the mainland and interisland.

GENERAL STATEMENT

The Chief of Engineers recommends modification of the existing project for Kahului Harbor, island of Maui, Hawaii, to provide for enlarging the turning basin by dredging an area 600 feet wide and 2,400 feet long, to a depth of 35 feet, in the west end of the basin, generally in accordance with the plan of the district engineer and with such modification thereof as in the discretion of the Chief of Engineers may be advisable, at an estimated cost of $974,700 for construction and $5,000 annually for maintenance in addition to that now required; provided that, prior to construction, local interests agree to provide without cost to the United States all lands, easements, rights-of-way, and spoil-disposal areas necessary for the construction of the project; hold and save the United States free from damages due to the construction and maintenance of the project; accomplish without cost to the United States alterations and maintenance as required for sewer, water supply, drainage, and other facilities; continue to provide and maintain at local expense adequate public terminal and transfer facilities; and contribute in cash 3.1 percent of the new-work dredging presently estimated at $30,200. With local interests assuming these costs, the cost to the United States for construction and annual maintenance of the recommended plan of improvement is presently estimated at $944,500 and $5,000, respectively.

The Chief of Engineers further recommended that the cash contribution by local interests be paid prior to commencement of construction, or, if an alternative site for spoil disposal is provided, pay any increased cost of disposal plus a cash contribution based on the relationship of cost to be made after actual costs have been determined.

The commerce of the island of Maui is totally dependent on water transportation, and Kahului Harbor is the only deep-draft harbor on the island. During recent years,

a large number of marine accidents and near accidents have occurred in the harbor, due to the inadequate size of the turning basin, which was designed many years ago and was last widened in 1931.

The present trend in the shipping industry is toward the use of larger ships because of the economy of operation. Due to the prevailing strong winds in the vicinity of Kahului Harbor, extreme difficulty in navigating the larger vessels inside the harbor is experienced. As a result, shipping interests have suffered, passenger vessels will not use the harbor, the economy of the area is depressed, and the use of this harbor to the Department of Defense in the event of emergency is drastically reduced.

The recommended plan of improvement for enlarging the turning basin will provide additional manevering area for the harbor, thus alleviating navigation hazards which would prevent ship groundings, eliminate marine accidents and delays, reduce delays in ship arrivals and departures during inclement weather, and reduce the maneuvering time of departing ships. The project modification has a very high benefit-cost ratio of 2.9.

DISCUSSION

The Committee on Public Works held public hearings on S. 1632, and received testimony on the emergency nature of the desired improvements to Kahului Harbor, and the large benefits that would accrue from such improvements.

The committee is aware that Kahului Harbor is the only available harbor on the island of Maui that can accommodate oceangoing and interisland vessels, on which the commerce of the island is dependent, since the only other available transportation by air is obviously unable to handle the large volume of commerce to and from the island.

The committee was advised that the width of the present turning basin is inadequate to permit the larger ships now regularly visiting the port to enter or leave safely under wind conditions usually prevailing. Serious accidents have occurred and costly delays are encountered. These unfavorable conditions cannot be entirely overcome by the service of additional tugs.

The committee was also advised that the risk of serious accident and the economic losses due to delays attributable to the presently inadequate turning basin are such that the larger vessels now in service threaten to bypass Kahului Harbor, and the island of Maui. This move would imperil the employment of many transportation workers, dock employees, and longshoremen, and threaten the entire economy of the island which is maintained and dependent upon ocean transportation.

As the island of Maui possesses great possibilities for agricultural and industrial expansion and continued growth of population, it is available for use for national defense purposes, and, with the increasing number of tourists visiting the island and the expansion of recreational facilities, removal of the hazardous conditions in Kahului Harbor is essential to improve economic conditions on the island and eliminate frequent and expensive maintenance of the existing jetties and harbor facilities.

The committee recommends enactment of this legislation. It feels that the modification of the existing harbor is economically feasible, and that the residents of the island of Maui should not be deprived of the best transportation facilities that can be provided for improvement of their economic life and continued development of the island. The committee further believes that the cost-sharing provisions on this project, including the cash contribution by local interests, is equitable and in conformance with existing policy.

AGENCY COMMENTS

The Department of the Navy commented favorably on House Document No. 109, and urged improvement of Kahului Harbor. Favorable reports of the Bureau of the Budget and the Department of the Interior are as follows:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D.C., May 11, 1959.

Hon. DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Chairman, Committee on Public Works,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR CHAVEZ: The Department of the Interior recommends the enactment of S. 1632, authorizing the modification of the existing project for Kahului Harbor, island of Maui, Hawaii, as a matter of urgent necessity.

The need for enlargement of the Kahului Harbor turning basin has become evident during the past few years from the number of near or actual accidents that have occurred.

The navigable portion of the harbor was designed originally for vessels of smaller size than those now in general use. Compared with pre-World War II statistics the increase in the size of the vessels using the harbor has been 100 feet in ship length and between 18.5 and 20 feet in beam. Moreover, the trend in the shipping industry is toward the use of larger ships because of the economy of operation. Unless the harbor, which has not been widened since 1931, is improved, the economy of Maui will suffer to a very great degree.

The difficulty with the present harbor turning basin arises from the prevailing strong winds and the broadside exposure of lightly loaded ships to these winds as they turn sharply past the breakwater into the harbor. The present east-west dimension of the turning basin (1,450 feet) leaves insufficient leeway for the vessels to maneuver at the low speeds necessary inside the harbor without danger of being blown by the winds to the shallows at the west edge of the turning basin. Additional difficulty arises when the departing ships must make a sharp backing turn of almost 180 degrees.

Freight tonnage moving through Kahului has increased by nearly 15 percent since 1951 to a total of 766,483 short tons in 1957 without significant gain in the number of vessels calling at the port. This illustrates the trend toward the use of larger vessels and the increased tonnage that can be expected in future years.

For these reasons, the Department of the Interior strongly supports the Kahului project. Gov. William F. Quinn fully endorses the project and considers it to be a matter of urgency.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that it has no objection to the submittal of this report.

Sincerely yours,

FRED A. SEATON,
Secretary of the Interior.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,
April 23, 1959.

Hon DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Chairman, Committee on Public Works,
U.S. Senate.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is in reply to your letter of April 13, 1959, requesting the views of the Bureau of the Budget on S. 1632, a bill authorizing the modification of the existing project for Kahului Harbor, island of Maui, Hawaii.

The purpose of the bill is to authorize the modification of the existing project for Kahului Harbor substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers contained in House Document No. 109, 86th Congress, at an estimated cost of $964,800.

It is noted that the name of the harbor in question is misspelled in the bill. The correct spelling is "Kahului." It is noted also that the cost estimate of $964,800 specified in the bill includes $18,300 for preauthorization studies and $2,000 for aids to navigation, items normally omitted from the estimated cost. Accordingly, "$964,800" on line 8 should be deleted and the following substituted: "$944,500 to the United States for construction."

The Bureau of the Budget would have no objection to enactment of S. 1632 if amended as noted in the preceding paragraph.

Sincerely yours,

PHILLIP S. HUGHES,
Assistant Director for Legislative Reference.

CHANNEL TO PORT MANSFIELD, TEX., GULF INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY

Location: Port Mansfield is located on the southern coast of Texas about 93 miles south of Corpus Christi and 38 miles north of Port Isabel. It is a shallow-draft harbor recently developed on the mainland shore of Laguna Madre, which lagoon is about 115 miles long, and is about 9 miles wide in the vicinity of Port Mansfield, with natural depths of less than 10 feet. It is separated from the Gulf of Mexico by Padre Island, a virtually uninhabited offshore bar formation which ranges from 0.5 to 2 miles wide and from 2 to 16 feet in elevation.

Report authorized by: Resolutions of the Committee on Public Works of the U.S. Senate adopted June 17, 1949, and of the Committee on Public Works of the House of Representatives adopted September 29, 1949, and April 21, 1953. The report has been transmitted to Congress and is published as Senate Document No. 11, 86th Congress.

Existing project: The Federal project for the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway provides for a main channel, 12 feet deep and 125 feet wide, extending from Apalachee Bay, Fla., to Brownsville, Tex., and for numerous connecting channels along the route. Between Brownsville and Corpus Christi, the main channel traverses Laguna Madre throughout its length. A tributary channel 12 feet deep and 125 feet wide extending 1.4 mile to a turning basin 12 feet deep, 400 feet wide, and 600 feet long at Port Mansfield, was completed in 1949 at a cost of $92,600. About $68,000 was expended on maintenance through 1954, including easing of the entrance curves. Local interests have extended the turning basin and have provided further harbor improvements consisting of an additional turning basin; a small-craft basin; a shrimpboat basin; and an outlet channel 10 feet deep and 100 feet wide extending from the existing tributary channel at the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway through Padre Island to a bar channel 16 feet deep and 250 feet wide into the gulf, flanked by concrete tetrapod jetties 1,600 feet long on the north side extending to the 15-foot depth, and 900 feet long on the south side extending to the 10-foot depth in the gulf. The estimated cost for the navigation improvements completed by local interests in September 1957 is reported to be $1,593,000.

Plan of recommended improvement: Modification of the existing project to provide for: (a) An entrance channel from the Gulf of Mexico, 16 feet deep and 250 feet wide to Padre Island; (b) a channel 14 feet deep and 100 feet wide from Padre Island to the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway, with two turnout curves, 12 feet deep and 100 feet wide; (c) a channel 14 feet deep and 125 feet wide from the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway to a turning basin at Port Mansfield, with the entrance curve into the turning basin widened to 200 feet, and with two turnout curves, 12 feet deep and 200 feet wide on the west side of the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway; (d) a turning basin 14 feet deep, 400 feet

wide, and 1,200 feet long with an irregular extension having a maximum width of 1,000 feet; (e) a shrimp-boat basin, 12-feet deep, 350 feet wide, and 1,450 feet long; (f) a small-craft basin, 8 feet deep, 160 feet wide, and 800 feet long; and (g) parallel rock jetties at the gulf entrance 2,300 and 2,190 feet in length.

Estimated cost (May 1958 price levels):

Federal first cost:	
Dredging	$472,000
Jetties	2,959,000
Total	3,431,000

Non-Federal first cost: None.

Estimated cost of maintenance, $165,000 (Federal) annually in addition to that now required.

Local cooperation: (a) Furnish free of cost to the United States all lands, easements, rights-of-way, and spoil-disposal areas necessary for construction and subsequent maintenance of the project; (b) hold and save the United States free from damages due to construction and maintenance; and (c) furnish satisfactory assurances that adequate terminal facilities for handling and icing seafoods will be provided, open to all on equal terms; and provided that no dredging shall be done by the United States within 50 feet of any established pierhead line, wharf, or structure, except in the small-craft basin, where dredging shall not be done within 30 feet of any structure.

Project economics:

Annual charges	$273,000
Annual benefits:	
Increased value of seafood catch	102,000
Reduced cost of transportation of fruit	4,000
Savings in operating costs of fishing vessels	156,000
Savings in operating costs of offshore oil exploration craft	32,000
Reduction in hazards to small craft	22,000
Total benefits	316,000

Benefit-cost ratio, 1.16.

Justification: The area tributary to Port Mansfield consists of about 4,200 square miles, with a population of 108,000. Raymondville, with a 1950 population of 9,136, is the largest city in the area, other communities being small. Most of the tributary area is semiarid but portions of Hidalgo and Willacy Counties are irrigated and produce cotton, citrus fruit, winter vegetables, and grain. Six oil fields, producing at a rate of about 3 million barrels annually, lie within 35 miles of Port Mansfield. Oil exploration is under way in Laguna Madre and offshore in the Gulf of Mexico. Laguna Madre produces large quantities of fish and the Gulf of Mexico has important shrimping grounds nearby. Terminal facilities at Port Mansfield for barges and small craft have been constructed by local interests at a cost in excess of $1,100,000. The Willacy County Navigation District owns about 3 square miles at Port Mansfield, has sponsored the harbor construction, and has extensive plans for future industrial and recreational development.

After completion of the project in September 1957, several severe storms occurred in November 1957, which caused extensive erosion and subsidence of the jetties and shoaling of about 3,000 feet of the Gulf entrance from 12 to 4 feet, which blocked the entrance channels for boats and ships to navigate through the pass, although the inside channel and harbor are in good condition. Redredging of the entrance channel is necessary and new jetties will be required to prevent further shoaling, permit safe navigation, and to confine tidal flows. The navigation district has expended $2,800,000 of local funds for the project. It has a taxable valuation of only $12 million, and cannot support additional revenue bonds for further improvements. The new channel from Port Mansfield to the gulf is badly needed as a harbor of refuge, as it is the only opening in the Barrier Island for 130 miles from Corpus Christi to Port Isabel. This harbor serves the fishing, pleasure, and shrimping fleets, and is used by the boats and rigs for oil exploration in the tideland and on the Continental Shelf. Development of this area will bring additional revenue to the State and Federal Government. Prospective commerce of about 2 million tons annually is anticipated.

This project is considered to be in an emergency category, as the storm damage has rendered the navigation facilities constructed by the Federal Government and local interests of little value, and expansion of these facilities to care for anticipated needs is believed essential. The recommended modification of the project is economically feasible.

STATEMENT BY DEPUTY BUDGET DIRECTOR ELMER B. STAATS IN SUPPORT OF THE PRESIDENT'S RECOMMENDATION TO PROVIDE UNIFORM COST SHARING ON CERTAIN FEDERAL FLOOD CONTROL PROJECTS

In his budget message of January 19, 1959, to the Congress, the President stated that legislation would be proposed to establish uniform cost-sharing standards for flood protection projects. In accordance with the President's recommendation, the Bureau of the Budget transmitted for consideration of the Congress a draft bill to accomplish this purpose.

In elaboration of the letter of the Budget Director of May 5, I should like to read a brief statement.

First, what is the need for uniform cost sharing on Federal flood control projects?

Since the inception of a national flood control program in 1936, flood protection has been provided largely at Federal expense. The largest program has been the construction of flood control reservoirs and works of local protection by the Army Corps of Engineers. The Department of Agriculture also administers a rapidly expanding program for development (including flood protection) of upstream watersheds. This program was authorized by the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act of 1954. It is estimated that in total these flood control and flood prevention programs will involve Federal construction expenditures of about $251 million in 1959 and $272 million in 1960. In addition, the Departments of Army and Interior will spend about $280 million this fiscal year and $330 million next year for construction of large multiple-purpose reservoirs that will provide flood control as well as other benefits.

Present laws require Federal agencies to conduct these various programs under different and inconsistent cost-sharing standards. Some local groups are therefore required to make substantial contributions for flood protection, while others are required to make little or none. Both inequity and disruption of sound administration of water resources development automatically follow. Furthermore, local groups are encouraged to seek projects not on the basis of maximum project worth but on the basis of minimum local financial participation.

In approving the Flood Control Act of 1959, the President stated his belief that the provision of that act requiring local interests to bear 30 percent of the cost of constructing hurricane protection works was equitable and sound. He also stated that it should be extended to all flood protection programs. Such a level of local financial participation is somewhat higher than the present average. For example, local interests now provide about 20 percent of the total cost for Army's local protection works. On the average slightly less is provided for agriculture's watershed projects. Virtually no local participation is now required for major reservoirs providing flood protection benefits. A higher level of local financial participation would increase the effectiveness of the limited Federal funds available for flood protection projects. Moreover, the higher requirement would further strengthen the best test yet devised for measuring project worth—the willingness of local people to invest their financial resources jointly with the Federal Government. It would spread available Federal funds over a larger number of local projects; in the current year this would have amounted to approximately $75 million.

Second, as examples of flood control cost-sharing inequities under existing laws, I cite the following:

(a) Two Public Law 566 projects, both estimated to cost about $1.1 million, required in one case 43 percent local cost sharing (Swan-Buffalo Creek, N. Dak.) and in another case 6 percent local cost sharing (Sulphur Creek, Tex.).

(b) Three Corps of Engineers local protection projects on the Mohawk River, N.Y., require 8 percent local cost sharing in two cases (South Amsterdam and Herkimer) and 53 percent local cost sharing for the third case (Rome).

(c) We have been advised that for local protection projects of the Corps of Engineers local cost sharing ranges between the extremes of 1.3 percent and 62 percent.

Third, why was 30 percent selected as a basis for local cost sharing?

There is, of course, no magic about 30 percent. At the present time non-Federal participation in Corps of Engineers local protection projects averages about 20 percent and something less than this for Agriculture's upstream watershed projects. For the future it was considered that something in the neighborhood of one-third of flood control project costs should be borne locally. The draft bill recently transmitted to the Congress proposes 30 percent local cost sharing in the interests of consistency with the cost sharing standard adopted by the Congress last year for hurricane flood control projects. At the time the President approved Public Law 85-500 he indicated that such local participation was equitable and sound and should be extended to other flood protection projects.

Finally, I wish to emphasize that the principle of greater local and uniform cost sharing for flood control projects is not new nor did it originate with the Bureau of the Budget. The following have made recommendations along these lines in recent years:

(a) The Task Force on Natural Resources of the First Hoover Commission in 1949.

(b) President Truman's Water Resources Policy Commission in 1950.

(c) President Truman's Missouri Basin Survey Commission in 1953.

(d) The Task Force on Water Resources and Policy of the Second Hoover Commission in 1955.

(e) President Eisenhower's Presidential Advisory Committee on Water Resources Policy—1955.

Excerpts from the reports of these groups are included as Attachment B.

Finally, I should like to turn to the question raised in the committee hearings yesterday as to whether the same or similar principles of cost sharing which are recommended by the President for flood control should be applied to navigation and harbor projects.

As a matter of general principle, I think that the answer must be clearly in the affirmative. But we must recognize that the application of the principle of cost sharing to navigation projects is considerably more complicated than its application to flood protection projects. Considerations of

transporation policy and of the reciprocal use of harbors in foreign commerce represent two of the more important differences. There is also, as this committee is aware, the long-standing question of the extent to which Federal investment in navigation and harbor projects should be defrayed through user charges for such waterways. National transportation policy as enunciated in congressional enactments has long included a prohibition against user charges for inland waterways and U.S. foreign policy has long recognized the desirability of encouraging international trade and commerce by keeping charges for the use of commercial harbors at nominal levels. This subject has also been studied by the same groups which studied the problem of flood control cost sharing. Excerpts from their conclusions are included as attachment C.

On the other hand, the principle of cost sharing for flood control projects is clearly recognized in existing law in spite of the many variations in legislative requirements. Moreover, it must be recognized that the problems of inconsistent cost sharing standards for flood control projects is made particularly acute because of the number of Federal agencies involved. Only the Corps of Engineers and the Tennessee Valley Authority have authority to construct navigation projects.

In spite of the above considerations, the Bureau of the Budget believes that additional consideration should be given to the subject of cost sharing by those who receive direct and identifiable benefits from navigation and harbor projects to assure that the principles of non-Federal participation are applied as nearly as possible on the same basis for all types of local water resource projects. Under present practices, local participation in the cost of harbor improvements is required generally where local recreational benefits are involved, where there is a single beneficiary of the improvement, or where it is necessary to provide disposal areas or utility relocations.

The Bureau of the Budget is giving further study to the problem raised by the committee in its discussions yesterday and hopes to be in a position to make recommendations with respect to any changes in existing policy for navigation and harbor projects. We believe that such recommendations must be closely related to the study of transportation user charges and transportation policy now under way in the Department of Commerce. It is our view, however, that action by the Congress on the flood control projects proposal should not and need not await the outcome of these recommendations because of the essential differences between the two problems as set forth above.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,
Washington, D.C., May 5, 1959.

The PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: In his budget message of January 19, 1959, to the Congress, the President stated that legislation would be proposed to establish uniform cost-sharing standards for flood protection projects. In accordance with the President's recommendation, I am transmitting for consideration of the Congress a draft bill to accomplish this purpose.

Several outstanding commissions that have studied the problems of sound development of our water resources, including the Presidential Advisory Committee on Water Resources Policy, have pointed to the pressing need for setting an equitable and consistent basis on which the costs of flood control or flood prevention projects may be shared by Federal and non-Federal interests, no matter which Federal agency undertakes the work. The lack of uniformity in cost-sharing standards creates, unfortunately, a situation in which local groups may find it to their advantage to play one Federal agency against another in order to reduce the local contribution. This is both unsound and inequitable, since funds provided by the Federal Government are furnished by the general taxpayer and should be made available to local interests on a uniform basis.

The enclosed draft bill applies to the flood control aspects of programs of the major agencies having wide responsibility for water resources development—the Corps of Engineers, Department of the Army; the Bureau of Reclamation, Department of the Interior; and the Soil Conservation Service, Department of Agriculture.

The bill provides that non-Federal interests shall bear at least 30 percent of the first cost of projects allocated to the production of flood control or flood prevention benefits. The value of lands, easements, rights-of-way, and other services which are now, in many cases, required by law to be furnished by local interests, would be counted as part of the non-Federal share. The balance would be payable as construction progresses or, where appropriate, within 50 years with interest. In the case of reservoirs that produce widespread benefits over a large geographical area, the bill requires non-Federal interests to bear at least 30 percent of the costs of providing only those flood protection benefits that are significant and accrue to identifiable groups.

In his signing statement accompanying Public Law 85-500, the President stated his belief that the local financial participation of 30 percent authorized by the Congress for the first projects in the new Federal program for hurricane flood protection, constitutes an appropriate division of costs between Federal and non-Federal interests, and should be extended to other major flood protection programs. The modest increase in the average level of non-Federal financial participation that this cost-sharing standard represents is a desirable strengthening of a truly effective test of project soundness—the willingness of local groups to contribute their own financial resources in a joint undertaking with the Federal Government. Moreover, greater cost sharing by local beneficiaries increases the effectiveness of the limited Federal funds which are available for flood protection programs.

The bill requires non-Federal interests to assume responsibility for the operation and maintenance of flood control or flood prevention projects, or to bear the cost of operation and maintenance if continued Federal operation of the project is found to be in the public interest. In the case of large reservoirs, non-Federal interests will bear a share of operation and maintenance costs found to be equitable in consideration of the benefits received.

In view of the large backlog of authorized projects involving flood protection benefits, it is essential that the cost-sharing standards of this bill be applied to all projects for which construction begins after the date of enactment. To provide otherwise would unduly delay correction of the conditions that this legislation is designed to remedy.

The Nation as a whole gains from programs that result in soundly conceived flood protection projects, even though the benefits of any single project may accrue chiefly to the residents of a relatively small area. The existence of both national and local benefits has been recognized in the various flood control acts, reclamation law, and the recent Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act. Similarly, in most cases, the corollary principle that those who benefit from flood protection projects have a responsibility to bear a fair share of the financial burden has also been recognized. This bill strengthens that principle and provides that this responsibility shall be extended uniformly to all identifiable groups who receive flood protection benefits, regardless of the type of project that produces them.

The need for a sound and fair pattern of Federal-local participation in flood protection projects is pressing. That need should no longer go unmet.

Sincerely yours,

MAURICE H. STANS,
Director.

A BILL TO PROVIDE UNIFORM COST-SHARING STANDARDS FOR NON-FEDERAL ENTITIES COOPERATING WITH THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT IN FLOOD CONTROL OR FLOOD PREVENTION PROJECTS, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That it is the intent of Congress that non-Federal entities cooperating with the Federal Government in projects providing benefits from flood control or flood prevention shall receive uniform and equitable Federal assistance, and that to this end it is the purpose of this Act to establish a cost-sharing policy applicable to projects which produce flood control or flood prevention benefits.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this Act—

(a) The term "flood control or flood prevention benefits" shall include but not be limited to (1) reductions in damages or losses from stream flows that exceed the capacity of the channel within which the flow of a stream is normally confined or from abnormally high levels of lakes and coastal waters caused by hurricane and other major storms; (2) reductions in sediment and erosion damages caused by flood runoff; and (3) increases in net return resulting from changed or more intensive use of flood plain property made possible by reduction of flood risks: *Provided,* That the term "flood control or flood prevention benefits" shall not include increases in net return resulting from any change in the average moisture content of the soil, over the growing season, attributable to improved drainage or irrigation.

(b) The term "project" shall mean any separable engineering work or system of closely related engineering works, or works of improvement for flood prevention except land treatment measures, which produce flood control or flood prevention benefits, including such works constructed pursuant to the Flood Control Act of March 1, 1917 (33 U.S.C. 703–704), the Flood Control Act of May 15, 1928 (33 U.S.C. 702), the Flood Control Act of June 22, 1936 (33 U.S.C. 701), and the Reclamation Act of June 17, 1902 (43 U.S.C. 391), and acts amendatory or supplementary to said acts; and such works constructed with Federal financial assistance furnished under the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act of August 4, 1954, as amended (16 U.S.C. 1001–1007), and the Small Reclamation Project Act of August 6, 1956, as amended (43 U.S.C. 422a–422k): *Provided,* That the part of the works represented by the cost allocated to the production of flood control or flood prevention benefits of any multiple-purpose project undertaken pursuant to the acts cited above shall be considered a project.

(c) The term "non-Federal entity" shall mean a State or any public entity created under State law or interstate compact, or any private entity, having authority to cooperate with the Federal Government in the planning, installation, maintenance, and operation of a project.

(d) The term "responsible Federal official" shall mean an official of the Federal Government authorized to carry out the provisions of the acts cited in subsection (b) of this section or acts supplementary or amendatory thereto.

(e) The term "first cost" shall mean all monetary outlays made and the value of goods and services contributed or provided

by various interests for the planning, design, and project construction, including contract work, materials and supplies, labor, and use of equipment; acquisition of lands, easements, rights-of-way, and water rights; relocation of facilities and settlement of damage claims; interest during construction; protection of public health; replacement of or prevention of damages to recreation and fish and wildlife resources; and prevention of loss of or damages to mineral resources and scenic, archeological, historical, and associated values: *Provided,* That the first cost shall not include the cost of investigations, surveys, and planning undertaken prior to authorization of the project or investigations and surveys financed by appropriations to Federal agencies other than the agency responsible for the project or having primary responsibility for furnishing Federal financial assistance for the construction of the project.

SEC. 3. After the effective date of this Act, no Federal agency shall incur any obligation for first cost except planning, design, and acquisition of water rights for a project or provide financial assistance for a project unless a State or, at the discretion of the responsible Federal official, one or more other non-Federal entities shall have entered, in advance, into an agreement satisfactory to said responsible Federal official to fulfill the requirements for operation and maintenance under section 4 of this Act and to assume at least 30 per centum of the first cost of the completed project allocated to the production of flood control or flood prevention benefits, payable as construction proceeds or pursuant to a contract providing for repayment with interest within fifty years: *Provided,* That the actual cost or fair market value, as determined or approved by the responsible Federal official, of such lands, easements, rights-of-way, and work performed or services rendered prior to completion of construction of the project which are furnished, or required by law to be furnished, by a non-Federal entity shall be included in the share of the first cost to be borne by the non-Federal entity: *Provided further,* That where a project provides flood control or flood prevention benefits that are widely dispersed over a large geographic area, non-Federal entities shall be required to bear at least 30 per centum of the share of the first cost attributable only to significant flood control or flood prevention benefits which accrue to identifiable groups of beneficiaries.

SEC. 4. The operation and maintenance of any project coming within the purview of this Act shall be a responsibility of a non-Federal entity or entities bearing the non-Federal share of the first cost thereof under the provisions of section 3 of this Act, or of any group of beneficiaries that the responsible Federal official deems appropriate in accordance with existing statutory requirements: *Provided,* That the flood control beneficiaries shall bear, in any case, their share of the costs of operation and maintenance: *Provided further,* That if the responsible Federal official finds that operation and maintenance of any such project by the Federal Government would be in the public interest, such official may arrange for operation and maintenance by the Federal Government if such non-Federal entity or entities agree to bear the cost thereof: *And provided further,* That where a project provides flood control or flood prevention benefits that are widely dispersed over a large geographic area, the non-Federal entity or entities shall bear that portion of the costs of operation and maintenance which the responsible Federal official determines to be equitable on the basis of the proportion of flood control or flood prevention benefits accruing to such non-Federal entities in relation to the total flood control or flood prevention benefits produced by the project.

SEC. 5. The provisions of this Act shall not be construed to modify any provisions of existing laws except the cost-sharing provisions thereof, nor to apply to any existing project or to any project determined by the responsible Federal official to be under contract or construction as of the effective date of this Act: *Provided,* That the duties, responsibilities, and financial obligations of non-Federal entities under the cost-sharing provisions of existing laws shall not be diminished by the provisions of this Act.

SEC. 6. This Act may be cited as the "Uniform Cost-Sharing Act for Flood Control and Flood Prevention."

Comparison of local cost-sharing requirements for flood protection under present legislation and policy and under provisions of draft legislation

Program and agency	Present legislation and policy			Draft legislation		
	Operation and maintenance	Lands, easements, and rights-of-way	Cash contribution	Operation and maintenance	Lands, easements, and rights-of-way	Cash contribution
1. Upstream watershed projects, Soil Conservation Service, Department of Agriculture.	Local	Local	None required	Local	Local	Local interests must bear 30 percent of first costs; value of lands, easements, rights-of-way, and other services provided locally count toward this requirement.
2. Local protection works (channels, levees, or reservoirs substituted therefor), Corps of Engineers.	do	do	None, except for 50 percent of construction costs allocated to increased land values resulting from changed land use.	do	do	Do.
3. Major reservoir projects (including flood control storage in multiple-purpose reservoirs), Corps of Engineers, Bureau of Reclamation.	Federal	Federal	None required	Local share required on basis of extent that significant flood protection benefits to identifiable groups are produced.	None required, but may be provided to satisfy some or all of required local financial participation.	Local interests must bear 30 percent of first costs of producing benefits to identifiable groups.
4. Hurricane-protection projects, Corps of Engineers.	Local	Local	Local interests must bear 30 percent of first costs; value of lands, easements, rights-of-way, and other services provided locally count toward this requirement.	Local	Local	Local interests must bear 30 percent of first costs; value of lands, easements, rights-of-way, and other services provided locally count toward this requirement.

Other provisions of draft legislation: (1) Proposed cost-sharing requirements, would apply to all projects not under construction as of the date of enactment. (2) Local cash contribution may be paid as construction progresses or over a period of 50 years, with interest. (3) Operation and maintenance may be performed by a Federal agency, with reimbursement, if in the public interest.

COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS OF VARIOUS COMMISSIONS REGARDING THE NEED FOR UNIFORM COST-SHARING POLICIES WITH PARTICULAR REFERENCE TO FLOOD CONTROL

"Task Force Report on Natural Resources," prepared for the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, January 1949 (First Hoover Commission):

"When the Federal Government first assumed definite responsibility for flood protection in 1936, costs were to be shared by the States and localities benefited, largely through the contribution of lands and rights-of-way. Removal of this condition in 1938 with respect to reservoir projects has had the effect not only of making the Federal Government assume 100 percent of the costs of these flood-control projects, but has removed one of the most effective restraints on the undertaking of projects of doubtful feasibility. States and localities were certain to scrutinize proposed projects with great care when they had to bear a significant share of the cost, but are inclined to ask fewer questions when the Federal Government supplies all the funds" (p. 21).

"The existence of a number of survey and development agencies has encouraged the perpetuation of special-purpose policies and has accentuated statutory inconsistencies. Varying administrative standards of feasibility, benefit-cost evaluation, and cost allocation have added to the confusion in these areas. Interagency rivalry has fostered a sort of Gresham's law with respect to Federal financial policies, the tendency being for higher standards of repayment by State, local, and private beneficiaries to be replaced by lower" (p. 23).

"Although the committee is not prepared to make specific recommendations, it believes that the most pressing need for statutory revision has to do with financial policy. As a general principle, costs should be repaid as far as practicable by the beneficiaries, more so than at present. Federal contributions should be limited to amounts proportionate to the estimated national benefits involved. State and local contributions should be required where practicable as a regular

policy on all projects where localized benefits demonstrably exist" (p. 28).

"A Water Policy for the American People," the report of the President's Water Resources Policy Commission, 1950 (Cooke Commission):

"This proposed reformulation of water resources policy is constructed on a simple framework of principles. These express: * * * The necessity for a system of repayment designed to treat alike all who enjoy the advantages of Federal investment. This will seek reasonable repayment, either through direct charge or assessment, for the opportunity which water resources programs offer for private gain, but will recognize that the great contributions of such programs to the general welfare warrant the assumption by the Federal Government of the remainder of the cost" (p. 9).

"Congress, in drafting new legislation or amending existing legislation, should provide for a uniform national reimbursement policy and specify the principles to be applied.

"Reimbursement procedure should aim, as far as possible, to recover a reasonable portion of the benefits accruing from public expenditures for water resources development. This should provide for charges for benefits where they can be collected, and agreements with interest States under which they would utilize their powers of taxation or assessment to assure reimbursement to the Federal Government for primary and secondary benefits not susceptible to direct collection" (p. 12).

"From the foregoing discussion, it should be clear that the Nation has no consistent reimbursement policy in relation to water resources development. In general, this situation has developed out of piecemeal legislation and administrative decisions dealing with single projects or with single functions within river basins. This procedure has given rise to serious inequities and inconsistencies in reimbursement policy.

"In the case of local flood control works, the local communities directly affected should assume an appropriate share of the cost, which could be apportioned on the basis of property values either by general taxation or by special assessment.

"In the case of extensive flood control works, involving large-scale upstream storage and land management programs, the States should establish special districts with the adequate powers to assume an appropriate share of the cost of providing protection against floods" (p. 85).

"Missouri: Land and Water," report of the Missouri Basin Survey Commission, 1953 (Lawrence Commission):

"Greater local financial responsibility: The general trend toward lower reimbursement requirements should be reversed. The problem is nationwide and application in any basin should obviously be conditioned on revisions being incorporated in national policy. Specifically, the Commission recommends that consideration be given to:

"(a) A general revision in national policy for the division of financial responsibility between Federal, State, and local groups in order to obtain higher contributions toward costs by beneficiaries, more systematic cost-sharing requirements for the various purposes, and greater interest and willingness to assume responsibility by groups immediately affected.

"(b) Provisions in national policy for assigning charges and assessments to specified beneficiaries in accordance with the following general principles: * * *

"Flood control: Primary beneficiaries, communities, and areas directly concerned, including States, should be assigned assessments up to the value of benefits, subject to reliable identification and measurement, with allowance for incentives and repayment ability" (pp. 15–16).

Local contribution to resource development: State and local interests could bear a greater share of the costs of projects from which benefits accrue to them. This is particularly true for flood control and navigation projects which for the most part are charged off as nonreimbursable, with the result that the Federal Government is bearing almost the entire cost.

"However, the entire cast of major projects should not be borne by local groups, despite the fact that the large share of benefits from these projects accrue to local interests. It would be impossible for the local governmental or private bodies to finance the entire, or perhaps even the major share of the costs of such projects. Nevertheless, the Commission is convinced that contribution or repayment policies are in need of revision in order to lessen the burden on the Nation as a whole and to stimulate the local groups within the basin to shoulder a larger portion of the financial burden. The Commission has continually encountered the demand that State and local governments be given a greater share in the determination and administration of the basin program, and it believes that this demand must be accompanied by an explicit willingness to combine administrative responsibility with financial support" (p. 16).

"Cost-sharing policy should promote: Greater consistency in the cost-sharing requirements for the various resource development programs. Some of the variations in current practice cannot be justified in terms of any systematic set of principles" (p. 234).

"Water Resources Policy," a report by the Presidential Advisory Committee on Water Resources Policy, 1955 (summary and major conclusions):

"It is believed that the principle of equal contribution for equal benefits received should be applied to the beneficiaries of all Federal water resources developments, although it is recognized that historically, the programs of the Federal agencies have differed widely as to the contribution required from the beneficiaries of such projects" (p. 3).

"Identifiable beneficiaries should pay an appropriate share of the cost of projects. The Committee believes that in most instances, direct identifiable beneficiaries should pay a larger share of the cost for benefits received than they now do.

"Responsibility for bearing the cost of maintenance and operation of Federal projects and for their management should be turned over to non-Federal interests as soon as it is soundly feasible in consideration of the Federal investment.

"All Federal agencies should use a uniform approach to cost sharing so that the division of costs between the Federal Government and non-Federal interests for any particular project would be the same regardless of the agency undertaking the project" (p. 30).

"The Committee recommends, as a general policy, that all interstate participate in the cost of projects in accordance with the measure of their benefits, and that the Federal Government assume the cost of that part of projects where the benefits are widely dispersed and represent substantial contributions to the general economic growth of the country or region, or to the national defense. The division of costs between Federal and non-Federal entities should be equitably determined on the basis of the degree and character of the respective interests, and the ability to identify direct beneficiaries. There the project is primarily of a local character, and where beneficiaries are readily identifiable, the Federal Government's contribution should be limited, with the non-Federal interests bearing a substantial portion of the construction costs of the project as well as the replacement, maintenance, and operation costs. In cases where projects supply or safeguard national needs, or where there are other special compelling considerations, the Federal Government may bear a larger portion of the cost if found in each case to be justified and consistent with criteria established by the Coordinator of Water Resources" (p. 31).

Task Force Report on Water Resources and Power to Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, June 1955 (second Hoover Commission):

"It is recommended, to assure that the Federal payment of project costs is kept within reasonable bounds, and that non-Federal beneficiaries pay or repay costs commensurate with their benefits—

"That the Congress enact legislation to establish cost distribution principles, which 'cohesive and clearly identifiable groups receiving substantial benefits' will be required to observe as a prerequisite of Federal participation in reclamation projects; to require that the appropriate Federal agency report on conformance of local groups in recommending projects to the Congress; and to include the following requirements in the principles:

"(a) That the benefits expected to result from any project be subdivided as follows:

"1. those accruing to groups of cohesive and clearly identifiable recipients of substantial benefits.

"2. all benefits not assignable to such groups.

"(b) That the allocated capital cost be distributed in proportion to the benefits assigned.

"(c) That financially responsible governmental or quasi-governmental agencies representing the groups of cohesive and clearly identifiable recipients of substantial benefits be required, as a condition of Federal participation, to bind themselves to pay at least 50 percent of the cost prorated to them under (b) above with interest.

"(d) That the Federal Government assume all other costs not assumed by such groups.

"(e) That, in general, non-Federal agencies assume the full cost of operation and maintenance" (pp. 98–99).

"Sharing of cost by non-Federal interests: A fair share of the cost of any project which the Federal Government either constructs, or contributes to, should be borne by those to whom substantial benefits accrue. This will reduce the drain upon the Federal Treasury. But it will do three even more important things: It will constitute insurance that the local interests are really convinced of the soundness of the projects; it will result in a more equitable distribution of costs, and; it will preserve the self-respect of the beneficiaries.

"All of the Commissions and other groups which have given mature consideration to water-resources development have supported the principle that beneficiaries should bear an equitable share of costs.

"Nevertheless, present laws are not, in general, in accord with this principle" (p. 758).

COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS REGARDING REIMBURSEMENT FOR NAVIGATION IMPROVEMENTS

Task Force Report on Natural Resources, prepared for the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, January 1949 (first Hoover Commission):

"Under present methods of developing flood control and navigation works, the immediate beneficiaries often do not have to pay directly any significant part of the cost. Their only contribution is through general taxation. Indeed, they are encouraged by this policy to promote costly projects which cost them nothing. Such subsidy of private individuals from the public treasury is at best unjust. Its greatest evil, however, arises from the removal of any sort of economic

measure of value in terms of willingness to pay. It seems reasonable to assume that if the direct beneficiaries refuse to pay any part of the project costs, the economic soundness of the project must indeed be questionable" (p. 87).

"A Water Policy for the American People," the Report of the President's Water Resources Policy Commission, 1950 (Cooke Commission):

"Reimbursement for various types of benefits from water resources programs should be determined in accordance with the following principles: * * * (c) for navigation it should be determined in connection with a general program for putting charges for all forms of transportation on a cost basis, including interest" (pp. 12–13).

"Decisions as to user charges, or tolls, for waterway commerce should be worked out as a part of the whole problem of reconciling and making workable a coordinated transportation system. But with rates for all forms of transportation based on full costs, an interconnected system of modern waterways, coordinated with land transportation, should be able to sustain itself with tolls based on full costs and yield returns on the public investment while contributing to the most economic use of the Nation's resources" (p. 16).

"Greater local financial responsibility: The general trend toward lower reimbursement requirements should be reversed. The problem is nationwide, and application in any basin should obviously be conditioned on revisions being incorporated in national policy. Specifically, the Commission recommends that consideration be given to:

* * * * *

"(b) Provisions in national policy for assigning charges and assessments to specified beneficiaries in accordance with the following general principles:

* * * * *

"Navigation: An assignment should be made to waterway users and, through agreement, to States and communities to the extent of their benefits, after allowance for incentives. Such assignments may partly be met by toll charges, if and when feasible" (pp. 15–16).

"Water Resources Policy," a report by the Presidential Advisory Committee on Water Resources Policy, 1955."

"Navigation: Serious consideration should be given to repayment of a portion of the costs of new navigation projects, particularly those which will create navigability where none now exists, by the institution of user charges. Although it would appear logical, in the interest of a completely uniform policy as to the participation of beneficiaries in the costs of water resources developments, that user charges should be instituted which would at least bear the cost of operation and maintenance of such navigation facilities, it must be recognized that the subject of user charges involves not only water policy but also the whole field of transportation, including many other mediums. Therefore, it is a more appropriate subject for a survey of the entire field of transportation than one of water policy alone" (p. 32).

Task Force Report on Water Resources and Power to Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, June 1955 (Second Hoover Commission):

"It is recommended, to help establish a consistent national water policy, to increase local responsibility, and to fix the limits of Federal activities in the development and conservation of water resources and power.

"That the Congress enact legislation to direct the appropriate Federal agency or agencies to apply the principles of national transportation policy, as expressed in the preamble of the Transportation Act of 1940, to the construction, operation, and maintenance of navigation facilities.

"That the Congress enact legislation to establish a system of user charges relating to the inland and intracoastal waterways, the Great Lakes and connecting channels, and seacoast harbors and channels of the United States. For projects now in operation, such charges should cover all costs of maintenance and operation by whatever agency incurred.

"For future projects (including future capital expenditures for projects now in operation), the charges should cover all Federal costs, i.e., maintenance, operation, and capital costs. All such charges should apply to regions, or system, rather than to individual projects, so as to avoid discrimination" (p. 101).

"Water Resources and Power," report of Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, June 30, 1955. (Second Hoover Commission):

"Recommendation No. 8:

"That Congress authorize a user charge on inland waterways except for smaller pleasure craft, sufficient to cover maintenance and operation, and authorize the Interstate Commerce Commission to fix such charges" (p. 85).

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

The bill (S. 962) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the modification of the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway-Channel to Port Mansfield, Texas, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers contained in Senate Document 11, of the Eighty-sixth Congress, at an estimated cost of $3,431,000.

SEC. 2. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next measure on the calendar will be stated.

MODIFICATION OF PROJECT FOR KAHULUI HARBOR ISLAND OF MAUI, HAWAII

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1632) authorizing the modification of the existing project for Kahului Harbor, island of Maui, Hawaii, which had been reported from the Committee on Public Works with amendments on page 1, line 3, after the word "for", to strike out "Kahuli" and insert "Kahului", and in line 8, after the word "of", to strike out "$964,800" and insert "$944,500 to the United States for construction", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the modification of the existing project for Kahului Harbor, island of Maui, Hawaii, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers contained in House Document Numbered 109, of the Eighty-sixth Congress, at an estimated cost of $944,500 to the United States for construction.

SEC. 20. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

The amendments were agreed to.

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

The title was amended, so as to read: "A bill authorizing the modification of the existing project for Kahului Harbor, island of Maui, Hawaii."

BILLS PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 1968) to strengthen the wheat marketing quota and price support program was announced as next in order.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, by request I ask that the bill be passed over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (H.R. 5674) to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, I ask that all the items from No. 284 to the end of the calendar be passed over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bills will be passed over.

The bills passed over are as follows:

H.R. 5674. A bill to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes.

S. 1901. A bill to amend section 101(c) of the Agricultural Act of 1949 and the act of July 28, 1945, to stabilize and protect the level of support for tobacco.

S. 218. A bill for the relief of Laurie Dea Holley and the legal guardian of Karmen Lael Holley, minor child.

S. 707. A bill for the relief of Demetrios Pappathakis.

S. 1291. A bill for the relief of Marko Klapan.

MARKO KLAPAN

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Calendar No. 288, Senate bill 1291.

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

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 1291) for the relief of Marko Klapan.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Marko Klapan shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

DEMETRIOS PAPPATHAKIS

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of Calendar 287, Senate bill 707.

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

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 707) for the relief of Demetrios Pappathakis.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, may I ask for an explanation of the bill?

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, this bill, which was introduced by the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary [Mr. EASTLAND], is for the relief of Demetrios Pappathakis, a minor child seeking to be adopted by citizens of the United States.

Mr. LANGER. I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of sections 101(a)(27)(A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Demetrios Pappathakis, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Mr. and Mrs. Paul Apostle, citizens of the United States: *Provided,* That the natural parents of Demetrios Pappathakis shall not, by virtue of such parentage, be accorded any right, privilege, or status under the Immigration and Nationality Act.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 4245) relating to the taxation of the income of life insurance companies; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. MILLS, Mr. FORAND, Mr. KING of California, Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania, and Mr. MASON were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

INTERNATIONAL HEALTH AND MEDICAL RESEARCH ACT OF 1959

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, yesterday the Senate had under consideration S.J. Res. 41, Calendar No. 232. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate may proceed to the further consideration of that joint resolution at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the joint resolution by short title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A joint resolution (S.J. Res. 41), the International Health and Medical Research Act of 1959.

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

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 41).

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I rise to support strongly the proposed legislation now pending before the Senate, the International Health and Medical Research Act of 1959. I am delighted and feel greatly honored to be privileged to join with the distinguished senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] in supporting the bill. This fine measure is the handicraft of the Senator from Alabama and his associates on the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

I should like to reiterate what I stated on March 10, 1959, when I appeared as a cosponsor of the resolution before a hearing of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, presided over by its chairman, the distinguished senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the sponsor of the measure.

At that time, as I indicated in the printed hearings, beginning on page 192, I stated that I regard the proposed legislation as one of the foremost landmarks of the 86th or any other Congress.

Senate joint resolution 41 is an inspiring example of humanitarian action by Congress. It is an illustration of enlightened self-interest at work. In strengthening cooperation among the medical scientists of the world, it strengthens the outlook for the health of the entire human family.

As I stated at the hearing, too, one fact is clear: The joint resolution is the proud work of the senior Senator from Alabama. It is his creation, and he deserves the fullest possible credit for it.

Our colleague and associate from Alabama has written many notable statutes for the improvement of human health, notably the Hill-Burton hospital construction law and the health research facilities law. But I venture to predict that when the history of these times is written, few of his great contributions will rank higher than the noble resolution which I know the Senate is about to approve.

The Senator from Alabama has worked on the resolution for a long time. He has sought counsel on it from experts throughout the land. He has unhesitatingly incorporated strengthening and clarifying amendments, for which we thank him. He has demonstrated eagerness at all times to make the resolution as fine and sound an instrument as possible. Some of the finest reading which any Senator could undertake are the hearings on Senate Joint Resolution 41.

When I think of the caliber and quality of the persons who testified, the outstanding professional people who came forward, voluntarily and eagerly, to give testimony in support of the resolution, it should warm the hearts of all Americans to know that there is such a spirit of understanding and humanitarianism in America.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. HILL. As the Senator from Minnesota has said, it would be almost impossible to compile a list of more eminent witnesses than those who appeared in behalf of the resolution. None testified more eloquently or more brilliantly than did the distinguished senior Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the great Senator from Alabama.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. I wish to commend the distinguished senior Senator from Alabama for the effective work he has done in bringing the resolution to the floor of the Senate and for the speech he made yesterday in support of it.

It is my good fortune to be a member of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare and to have had the privilege of attending the hearings to which witnesses from all over the United States brought their support to this most important measure. The resolution has well been called a health for peace resolution.

I know of the great interest which the senior Senator from Minnesota has taken in this matter and the fine testimony he gave in support of it. It seems to me to be almost incredible that there should be opposition in this Chamber to the provisions of the resolution, in view of the almost incalculable amount of good it can do throughout the world, with the very minimum amount of expense which the measure authorizes to be incurred.

I sincerely hope that the resolution will promptly be passed by the Senate and by the other body, and will become law.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator from Pennsylvania for his statement. I know I speak for the Senator from Alabama, as I certainly speak for myself, when I say that it is always gratifying to have the words of commendation and the splendid assistance of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK]. What he has said here today is indicative of his keen interest in health measures, particularly the international aspects of health.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I may say that the distinguished senior Senator from Pennsylvania is one of the sponsors of the resolution, as is the distinguished senior Senator from Minnesota. The senior Senator from Pennsylvania, who is a member of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, made really fine contributions to the formulation of the resolution and to the final action on it by the committee.

Mr. CLARK. I thank the Senator from Alabama and the Senator from Minnesota for their kind but quite unmerited words.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, America and the world are in the debt of the Senator from Alabama and his committee for this far-visioned measure. The reaction to the resolution has been virtually unanimous in its favor. A little later, I shall cite some of these enthusiastic reactions.

THE DANGER OF "BUDGET-ITIS"

The executive branch has wisely endorsed the principle of the resolution. But there is one factor—one condition—in the executive branch which does cause concern. It is what I call "budget-itis," a condition which spreads like a contagion from the accountants of the Bureau of the Budget. They are myopically more concerned with low but neat figures in the budget document than they are with the high costs of disease. They can see the $50 million ceiling of authorization in the resolution and profess to be alarmed about it. But they cannot see and are not alarmed about the hundreds of millions of dollars which disease is costing the American taxpayers, directly and indirectly, not to mention the incalculable toll in pain, suffering, and premature death.

LESS GUNS, MORE HEALTH FOR LATIN AMERICA

Let me say to the Senate and to the American people as a whole that if there is to be objection to the resolution because it authorizes $50 million—I repeat: $50 million; that is all—and if that $50 million will, somehow or other, work a great injustice upon the so-called balanced budget, I have a way to remedy it. The President's budget for foreign aid provides an increase of $50 million for military assistance to Latin-American countries. We are increasing the amount for military assistance to Latin-American countries to $125 million compared with some $35 million only 3 years ago.

I say to the great Senator from Alabama that if any Senator raises his voice about the cost of the resolution, I can assure him, from what I have heard in the testimony given before the Committee on Foreign Relations, that we will trim more than $50 million from some of the military assistance proposed to be sent to countries which do not need it.

If my voice can be heard in the villages, hamlets, towns, and cities of America, and if the people of the United States have a choice between spending $50 million to fight cancer, or $50 million to mobilize the scientific knowledge of the world against heart disease, and spending $50 million to send guns, planes, and tanks to South America, believe me, if the American people have the right sense and good judgment which I know they have, they will know where to put the $50 million. They will put it into health, by means of this resolution.

If the administration plans to raise any hobgoblins or ghosts by claiming that the $50 million here proposed will put the budget out of balance, we will balance the budget for it, and I will take personal responsibility for doing so. Fifty million dollars worth of guns, bazookas, planes, and tanks are not needed in Latin America. Latin America is fighting enough as it is already. What are needed in Latin America are some schools and some health. The Senator from Alabama, through the resolution, will do more good for Latin America with this $50 million than all the mutual security and military assistance put together.

I know of a few other places where some surplus military aid can be trimmed off. I venture to say that some medical care in certain parts of Asia and Africa will do more good than the sending of some F-86's or some B-47's. The cloak of secrecy compels me, regrettably, not to disclose to the Senate some of the kinds of equipment it is planned to send to some strange places. But it is planned to send military equipment to people who do not even know how to use it. It is necessary to train them to use it.

Mr. President, I want to forewarn anyone who opposes the resolution on the basis of the $50 million authorization that we who sponsor the resolution are prepared to do battle here, military assistance or no military assistance. We will not need bazookas, tanks, guns, or grenades to win this battle, because the American people want the great medical know-how of the U.S. Government and the medical know-how and scientific knowledge of other peoples throughout the world to be pooled in this great crusade against disease.

Think of the thousands and thousands of persons who today are suffering from cancer. Many of them are our neighbors. For all we know, one of us may be next.

When we think of what could be done with $50 million to combat disease on a worldwide basis, it is hard to conceive that any Senator will oppose this measure.

I want to be here to help. I assure the Senator from Alabama that I am here to do battle for this good cause. This is the Lord's work right here. This is doing the kind of work the Congress should be doing. As a matter of fact, I am a little worried that we are authorizing only $50 million. It seems to me that is a rather small authorization. But at least it is a beginning.

Mr. President, I wish to serve warning on the opponents of the joint resolution, because I really think this is the kind of legislation that every Member of Congress should be proud of, and should want to have his name attached to, and should want to vote for, so as to let the whole world know that the Congress of the United States is prepared to wage war on disease, and that all members of Congress are unanimous in that effort, and that we welcome allies from every corner of the world. We have one common enemy; and in the war against that enemy we can put every kind of scientist and doctor into the same uniform. All can unite in the same struggle, for the same purpose, against the same enemy—namely, in the fight for health, and in the fight against disease.

DISEASE HAS INFLATIONARY IMPACT

Mr. President, in speaking of those who have objected to this measure—and I refer in particular to the reports of the Bureau of the Budget—let me say that apparently they cannot see that disease is economically inflationary. It slashes working time and productivity. It raises economic costs. It reduces purchasing power. So, Mr. President, from the standpoint of our U.S. economy and from the standpoint of the U.S. Treasury, a healthy nation is a better and a more prosperous nation.

The Hill bill is an anti-inflationary measure—if we have to view it from the economic point of view—which will serve tangible economic goals, in addition to great humanitarian goals, for our country.

So, Mr. President, I trust that "budget-itis"—which, by the way, is a peculiar kind of disease, of a current and temporary nature, which can be cured by this joint resolution—will not prevail against the bill. I know "budget-itis" will not prevail here in the Senate. Just as I know that the sun rises in the east and sets in the west, I know that the Senate will not be deterred for a single moment—or, at least, not for many moments—from voting in favor of the enactment of this great measure. Likewise, I trust that no "budget-itis" disease will prevail in the House of Representatives. The inoculation against "budget-itis" is to be had by means of truth and knowledge, compassion and understanding.

I know that here in the Senate, thanks to our industrious colleague from Alabama [Mr. HILL], thanks to our distinguished majority leader [Mr. JOHNSON] and our able majority whip [Mr. MANSFIELD] and others, we are ready, willing, and eager to speed this bill intact to victory; and we are determined to retain in the bill the $50 million authorized ceiling.

Mr. President, there may be arguments against the bill, although I have not heard any; but I guarantee that one of them is not based on the $50 million authorization. Actually, more money than that is spent in the Post Office Department in trying to find a kind of glue which will stick. So I hope the $50 million authorization will not be reduced. I hope that no type of bargain-basement economy will be practiced on the $50 million authorization for world health.

AMPLE SAFEGUARD AGAINST OVERSPENDING

With regard to the actual expenditure of that authorized sum or any smaller sum, let me amplify the specific remarks which I made in the hearing of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

In the first place, I am satisfied that Dr. James Shannon and his associates at the National Institutes of Health can be reliably expected to utilize only such sums as are necessary, feasible, and desirable, and to expend them with efficiency, similar to the manner in which they have handled the funds which the Congress has already approved for the domestic operations of the National Institutes of Health.

SOUND ADMINISTRATION AT NIH

Mr. President, the General Accounting Office is able to find all kinds of waste in connection with foreign-aid programs and assistance, military programs, and so forth; but the General Accounting Office has never been able to find any waste in our medical programs. There is not a scintilla of evidence to show that the Surgeon General or the National Institutes of Health have improperly or unwisely used any funds which have been appropriated or made available to them.

This measure is an authorization bill; and later on the congressional appropriations committees will have to determine how much money to appropriate in connection with this authorization—whether the maximum amount of $50 million should be appropriated, or whether a lesser amount should be appropriated. I know our committees will decide on the basis of what they believe to be fair; and I know that the Surgeon General and Dr. Shannon, of the National Institutes of Health, and his associates will spend only what they can spend wisely, prudently, and effectively.

I know that the National Institutes have been giving a great deal of thought to the unique problems and opportunities of this new International Institute. I know that they are not going to relax the high scientific standards which previously have been followed in order to make sure that the American taxpayer gets full value from the money appropriated.

So, too, the new Advisory Council of the International Institute will provide for ample safeguards over the expenditure of the funds.

It is a fact that there are a host of special problems in spending research money abroad, as compared with spending money for research in the United States. Standards of living differ. Costs of manpower differ. Availability of facilities and equipment differs. Availability of technicians differs. Overhead differs. All of these and other conditions will be carefully borne in mind.

A million dollars spent abroad may buy the equivalent of two or more million dollars spent at home; or admittedly it might—theoretically—buy less, depending on the quality of administration. I have full confidence, however, in Surgeon General Leroy Burney and Dr. Shannon and their associates. I know they are going to get full value for the funds provided by the American taxpayers.

RELATIONSHIP WITH FOREIGN POLICY

As a member of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, let me state these additional points:

First. I believe that America's overseas health programs represent an important phase of our international relations. Not only do I believe that; I have seen it with my own eyes. I am just completing a report on my visits to the World Health Organization in Geneva, in my capacity as a member of the Foreign Relations Committee and as chairman of the Subcommittee on International Organizations. I visited the laboratories in Paris, in Geneva, in Copenhagen, in Oslo, in Stockholm, in Helsinki, in Moscow, and in London. I talked with administrators of hospitals and medical facilities. I believe that, as one Member of the Senate, I have some working knowledge of the importance of international oversea health programs. One of the reasons why I wanted to be here today and to associate myself with the work of the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] is that I am one of his followers; I am one of his workers in the vineyard of good health. My only regret—because of the wonderful work his committee does—is that I am not a member of the committee. What good work it does for the people, for the Nation, and for the world.

Because I believe that our oversea health programs represent an important phase of our international relations, last year I drafted amendments to the Mutual Security Act, to strengthen American health programs abroad. This matter comes within the jurisdiction of the Foreign Relations Committee. And this year I am, likewise, offering amendments—which I presented on yesterday—to the Mutual Security Act, to strengthen health programs.

SCIENTIST TO SCIENTIST GRANTS

Second. I disagree, however, with the concept, which has been voiced from the executive branch, to the effect that American medical research grants should be handled on anything but a scientist-to-scientist basis.

If a medical researcher, for example in the United Arab Republic, can make an important contribution toward solving the riddles of a major disease, and if he can use American grants, then I say let him have continuous assistance—I emphasize, continuous assistance—irrespective of whether at any one time we agree with the policies of the United Arab Republic government.

In fact, as I said to Mr. Khrushchev, nothing would make America happier than to have some Soviet scientist discover the answer to cancer. I do not care where it is discovered, so long as the discovery is made.

Science and medicine as healing arts for the benefit of humanity should know no politics; and Americans should establish that standard. If the Soviets want to make their scientists into ideological politicians, let them have that responsibility and burden on their backs. Let America have its scientists and its doctors, people who work for people, people who try to make a better world, people who know no race, creed, color, or national origin, but people who believe God created man in his own image, and who work in that spirit.

In recommending against political interference in health, I am following an overall policy which I have recommended consistently. For it will be recalled that I had protested against the cessation of CARE food shipments to Egypt—an unsound action which had been based on policy differences between ourselves and the Egyptian Government.

The great value of medicine is that it is based upon a universal credo. Ignoring that credo, a totalitarian state might distort medicine to suit its particular objectives. But I see no reason for the democratic Government of the United States to do so.

Third. Let me make it perfectly clear the President of the United States is responsible under the Constitution, for the conduct of foreign policy. The State Department is his chosen instrument.

American activity abroad, whether it be of a health, economic, social, or other character, must naturally be evaluated by the President and by the Department of State from the standpoint of our overall foreign relations. It is they who are responsible for dealing with foreign governments.

But let us proclaim to the world that the National Institute for International Medical Research will be headed by scientists for scientific purposes in accordance with the best scientific standards. Let us not make this into a political propaganda mechanism or a political mechanism of any type.

SENATE INTERNATIONAL HEALTH STUDY CONFIRMS NEED FOR THE BILL

Now, by way of background, let me point out that I approach this subject as one who has long been interested in health, and as one who has endeavored, down through the years, to strengthen the battle against disease through sound new Federal statutes.

It was once my privilege to serve on the health subcommittee which handled certain types of health legislation relating to drugs, pharmaceuticals, and other health measures. I base my views today in one particular capacity. As my colleagues are aware, it is my pleasure to serve on the Senate Committee on Government Operations under the chairmanship of the distinguished senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN]. In that capacity, I serve as chairman of the Subcommittee on Reorganization and International Organizations.

Last year, I introduced Senate Resolution 347, 85th Congress, for a comprehensive study of international medical research and assistance programs. That resolution was approved unanimously by the Committee on Government Operations and by the Senate. Thereafter, the chairman of our committee designated this subcommittee to make the study.

By Senate Resolution 42, 86th Congress, the study was extended until January 31, 1960, and $45,000 was provided.

I will not at the present time attempt to go into great detail on this study. I should like, however, to make one simple point. Everything that I have heard and read in the course of this study confirms fully the need for Senate Joint Resolution 41.

There is hardly a letter which I have received, hardly an interview which I had held in Europe in November and December 1958, with physicians, with Nobel scientists, with heads of State, in which qualified individuals did not indicate that they regard Senate Joint Resolution 41 as an act of American health statesmanship.

I wish to say to the Senater from Alabama [Mr. HILL] and my other colleagues that every place I went I was asked about the Hill bill. The Senator from Alabama may recall the bill introduced in the 85th Congress for the purposes of study, so Congress would have something to review, consider, and survey in the period between the time when the 85th Congress had adjourned and prior to the convening of the 86th Congress.

SCIENTISTS' ON-THE-SCENE COMMENTS IN EUROPE

I had a copy of the bill with me. Hour after hour of testimony was taken on tape recordings of statements by leading scientists of Western Europe in support of my bill—not only the support of leading scientists of the United States, but the leading scientists of friendly nations. They gave us volumes of information on how this bill might best be administered for the benefit of world health. That information was taken down on tape, so no one could have a moment's doubt as to what the leading physicians, health administrators, and scientists of the world think about the measure.

I wish it were permissible, under the rules of the Senate, to play back that testimony and, in addition, the hundreds of feet of film taken in the scientific laboratories and hospitals of Paris, Copenhagen, Stockholm, Oslo, Helsinki, and Moscow.

If any one act can help us make peace in the world, it is this measure which we are now considering.

MANY EXPERT STATEMENTS HAVE COME TO GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS COMMITTEE

Yesterday, the senior Senator from Alabama, in the course of his outstanding address, placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an inspiring series of quotations from American medical and lay leaders, urging approval of Senate Joint Resolution 41.

I should like to say that, in our independent study in the Government Operations Committee—which, by the way, is not a committee to study substance, but merely administration in the field of international health—we have been pleased to hear from many of the leaders who have been named and from others.

I should like now to invite the attention of the Senate to some of these added comments.

I should like also to set forth some facts as to our overall subcommittee review, showing how, from a separate but somewhat parallel course, we are in the process of objectively developing a series of findings which, in effect, attest to the need for this wise legislation.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS ON WORLD HEALTH STUDY

I have prepared a series of questions and answers designed to describe the work of the International Health Study Subcommittee.

I ask unanimous consent that the first of these questions and answers appear at this point in the body of the RECORD:

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

BROAD SAMPLING OF WORLD OPINION

Question. Are the scientific reactions referred to in these comments today based upon a broad sampling of opinion?

Answer. Yes. I believe that it is safe to say that few, if any congressional committees have ever attempted so broad a sampling of health reactions throughout the world as has this subcommittee. From the very start of our operations, we set in motion a dragnet, so to speak, for ideas from all possible qualified sources not only in the United States, but abroad. The dragnet has met, I believe, with tremendous success. Scientific reactions have been gratifying and fruitful. Let me list now the many types of sources with whom we have corresponded and whose judgment I summarized:

AMERICAN SOURCES CONTACTED IN INTERNATIONAL HEALTH STUDY

Deans of all leading medical schools.
Deans of all schools of public health.
Many national officers of American Medical Associations.
State American Medical Association societies.
All professional organizations in the healing arts—nursing, dental, pharmaceutical, etc.
Editors of medical journals.
Professional medical organizations in specialized fields.
Executive directors of leading related scientific groups—biology, chemistry, physics.
Executive directors of all leading voluntary health organizations.
Directors of all leading U.S. rehabilitation centers.
Directors of health, interested foundations and institutes.
Leading American hospital administrators.
All leading pharmaceutical companies.
American businesses with substantial health programs for their employees overseas.
All American Ambassadors accredited to foreign nations.
Leading scientists, e.g., winners of Lasker Awards.
Miscellaneous American private organizations.

FOREIGN SOURCES FOR MOST OF THE NATIONS OF THE WORLD

All ministers of health.
All presidents of medical associations.
All presidents of medical academies.
Deans of leading medical schools.
All ambassadors accredited to the United States.
All living Nobel Prize winners in the fields of medicine, physiology and chemistry.

ADDITIONAL SOURCES

A. All U.S. Government agencies concerned with health research

Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.
Atomic Energy Commission.
Veterans' Administration.
Department of Defense—Army, Navy, and Air Force.
Department of Agriculture.
National Science Foundation.
Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization.

B. International governmental organizations with health activities

United Nations (e.g. special scientific committees.
United Nations Technical Assistance.
World Health Organization.
Pan American Health Organization.
United Nations Children's Fund.
Food and Agricultural Organization.
United Nations Relief and Workers Agency (Arab refugees).
United Nations Education, Scientific and Cultural Organization.
International Labor Organization.
South Pacific Commission.
International Atomic Energy Agency.
International Civil Aviation Organization (e.g. health quarantine, etc.).

C. Other intergovernmental organizations

Office for European Economic Cooperation.
Western European Union.
North Atlantic Treaty Organization.
Colombo Plan.

D. U.S. departments and agencies responsible for policy and/or administering of international health assistance programs

Department of State.
International Cooperation Administration.
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

E. Others

Inter-Departmental Committee on Nutrition for National Defense.
National Research Council—National Academy of Sciences.

APPROVAL BY FOREIGN EMBASSIES

Mr. HUMPHREY. Now, let us ask, What is the reaction of foreign nations?

The answer is twofold: First, on the basis of my on-the-scene tour of nine European nations, I say unequivocally to the Senate that rarely have I seen a single theme which has been greeted more unanimously and more warmly by different nations than has the subject of our effort covered by the pending measure.

Secondly, as noted in the list of sources cited above, I supplemented the on-the-scene reactions gained from the European tour with correspondence with Embassies on a twofold basis—first, with our American Ambassadors in foreign countries, and, second, with foreign Ambassadors accredited here in the United States.

Here, again, of the scores of replies received from our American Ambassadors abroad, I can state every single one has indicated that, in the judgment of the chief of mission, research cooperation would be well received and would be helpful, directly or indirectly, in the country to which he is assigned.

I am referring in the RECORD today to the work of the Foreign Relations Committee and the work of the Subcommittee on International Organizations, because these committees, while not having legislative jurisdiction, and not being creators of this legislation, can fortify the remarkable record which has already been established for the pending proposal.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. HILL. But the Senator can, and does, in his very able, constructive, and devoted manner, investigate the facts, go into them, and arrive at conclusions based on the facts. What the Senator now is doing is bringing to the Senate the result of the studies and investigations and the indefatigable work he has done both as a member of the Foreign Relations Committee and the Subcommittee on International Organizations of

the Committee on Government Operations. Is that not true?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is my purpose. I hope my work has been indefatigable, and I hope it has been objective. It was the purpose that it be so.

AMBASSADORS HERE SENT EXCELLENT REPLIES

Now with regard to foreign Ambassadors accredited to the United States, here again, the response has been unanimous and approving.

I have had particularly gratifying reactions from the Ambassadors of those nations whose great scientific establishments would carry a heavy share of the load. I refer to their Excellencies from the United Kingdom, Sir Harold Caccia; the Republic of France, Herve Alphand; the Republic of Italy, Manlio Brosio; the Federal Republic of Germany, Wilhelm G. Grewe; the Kingdom of Belgium, Baron Silvercruys; the Republic of India, Mahomed Ali Currin Chagla; the Kingdom of Norway, Paul E. Koht; the Kingdom of Sweden, Gunnar Jarring; the Republic of Finland, Richard R. Seppala; the Kingdom of Denmark, Count Kield Gustav Knuth-Winterfeldt; and to Ambassadors of other nations which have already made strong contributions in medical research.

At a later date, I shall refer in the Senate to the wonderful reactions of these particular Ambassadors.

Mr. President, the files of the Subcommittee on Reorganization and International Organizations contain the letters, the statements, and documents from these countries and their ambassadors in support of the principles and objectives of the proposed legislation. At a later time I shall refer the Senate to the wonderful reaction of those particular ambassadors.

Mr. President, I have selected a series of excerpts from several of the replies from the ambassadors. I have taken the liberty of including only those portions of the letters which I felt might lend themselves to a public statement of this type. The basic viewpoint has been carefully presented.

I have before me copies of the letters, and I shall quote first from the letter of the Peruvian Ambassador, who says, in a letter addressed to me on April 15, 1959:

PERUVIAN EMBASSY,
Washington, D.C., April 15, 1959.

Mr. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
Subcommittee Chairman,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. HUMPHREY: * * * I have * * * noted with great interest of the manifold and far-reaching effects that may result from the Resolution 41, that you are cosponsoring, which is now under consideration by the Senate Committee of Labor; and also of your purpose to strengthen the health provisions of this year's mutual security bill.

These initiatives, it is heartening to state, are evidence of your preoccupation for the establishment of vital projects of world character, very much in consonance with U.S. international leadership.

* * * * *

While expressing to you my sincerest congratulations on this noble undertaking, may I wish for it a most successful outcome.

Sincerely yours,

FERNANDO BERCKEMEYER,
Ambassador.

I shall next read from a letter from the Ambassador of Saudi Arabia, dated March 30, 1959:

ROYAL EMBASSY OF SAUDI ARABIA,
Washington, D.C., March 30, 1959.

Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
U.S. Senator, Chairman, Subcommittee on Reorganization and International Organizations, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SENATOR: * * * I personally believe in and agree with you in your views about the importance and the urgency of the need in helping and alleviating the world crises by means of eradicating the ills and the physical diseases of people, especially those coming from the underdeveloped areas of the world, with the United States as the leading country of the world with democratic ideals to sponsor such a magnificent project.

It is indeed gratifying to know that as the elected chairman of this subcommittee, you would do much to work toward this end.

With my kindest regards and best wishes for the success of your most noteworthy project and endeavors, please accept my sincere congratulations on your having given such a wonderful press release concerning this project.

Very truly yours,

ABDULLAH AL-KHAYYAL,
Ambassador.

Mr. President, I received a letter from the Embassy of Guatemala, which is a Latin American Republic. The Ambassador from Guatemala sent me a 2½-page typewritten single-spaced letter which outlines for us in considerable detail the needs of his country. I invite my colleagues to listen to these words:

EMBASSY OF GUATEMALA,
Washington, D.C., April 16, 1959.

Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
Subcommittee Chairman, Subcommittee on Reorganization and International Organizations, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

SIR: * * * I have read the material which accompanied your kind letter with great interest, and I am pleased to learn that the Labor Committee of the Senate is currently studying a measure to authorize $50 million for continuing medical research projects in accordance with the resolution which you yourself so aptly cosponsored. I understand also that it is your personal belief that the sanitary and health provisions of the mutual security bill now under consideration should be strengthened, including the provisions covering the use of foreign funds for sanitary and health aid.

World health is an ambitious objective difficult of achievement. Efforts of individual countries in this direction are insufficient to effectively combat the threat of disease. For this reason it is highly desirable that nations coordinate their efforts, combine their knowledge and experience, study jointly the problems, and make available important knowledge and discovery to all mankind. In this way, strong nations can help the smaller countries in the common struggle against disease and ill health.

I share the view that illness and disease are the principal causes of poverty, misery and insecurity in the world today and that not only medical research but also technical assistance in this field, are of basic importance in the struggle to prolong the life expectancy and to improve the mental and physical health of the people. Through international cooperation, medical research activities could contribute to the betterment of all people. And through the medium of an adequate technical assistance program public health services will be strengthened, general hygiene will be improved, and preventive and curative medical efforts will be extended.

My country has many excellent doctors and modern hospital facilities. We are never satisfied, however, with the level of achievement attained. We know we must still do more. Guatemala has one doctor for every 5,500 inhabitants, approximately. Our high birth rate, 51.3 per 1,000 population, is offset by our alarming rate of mortality, 23.2 per 1,000 population. This high death rate is brought about today by numerous illnesses and diseases, the eradication of which is possible if the advances of modern medicine were available. Suffice it to mention, malaria, diarrhea, enteritis, respiratory diseases, and parasitic diseases, whose incidence is usually associated with a relatively low living standard prevalent in a period of economic and social transition.

Guatemala needs international aid in order to develop its own public health services and to achieve a higher health standard which as a logical consequence will bring about greater production and consumption and a corresponding increase in export and import merchandise. For these reasons, my country is very happy to be a working member of the World Health Organization, and its regional establishment, the Pan American Sanitary Bureau.

There is no doubt that the United States is the nation which has contributed most vastly toward the improvement of the health of mankind. A decision on the part of your Government to spread this contribution more widely would be most heartily received by all nations and by all peoples. The coordination of efforts, in accordance with the technical assistance program of the United Nations and in close collaboration with the World Health Organization, the Pan American Sanitary Bureau, and UNICEF and other international organizations, would make the effective aid of this country in the field of medical research and assistance most valuable to the growth and development of underdeveloped countries.

I would like to conclude this letter by congratulating the president of the subcommittee for the outstanding work the committee is doing for the benefit of world health, and I would like to assure him that the efforts he is expending with the Senate Committee on Labor will be highly rewarded through the gratitude of thousands of human beings all over our world whose lives will be made happier and more useful in being shown the road to good health.

With my best wishes, I remain,

Very truly yours,

CARLOS S. ANTILLÓN,
Ambassador.

This is the general tenor of one letter after another. In order to conserve time I shall not read the remaining letters, but I will say they come from all parts of the world—from Asia, from Africa, from Latin America, from Western Europe, and from the Middle East.

I have file cabinets full of records. Never in my experience as a legislator and a person in public life have I witnessed such an outpouring of generous and enthusiastic support as I have witnessed in regard to the pending legislation.

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

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

EMBASSY OF ICELAND,
Washington, D.C., March 31, 1959.

Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR HUMPHREY: * * * The valuable information contained in your message has been forwarded to the Ministry of Health and Education in Reykjavik, where I am confident it will be received with the greatest interest.

Personally I find the program of increased international cooperation in health most interesting, and such cooperation could lead to the most valuable results for the whole of mankind. I congratulate you on your excellent work in promoting such cooperation.

Sincerely yours,

THOR THORS,
Ambassador.

AUSTRALIAN EMBASSY,
Washington, D.C., April 14, 1959.

Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
Subcommittee Chairman, Committee on Government Operations, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR HUMPHREY: * * * Your proposals for support of medical research projects and for the strengthening of the health provisions of the mutual security bill strike me as being most worthy ones which can do much to promote friendly relationships between nations.

* * * * *

Your sincerely,

HOWARD BEALE,
Ambassador.

EMBASSY OF TUNISIA,
Washington, D.C., March 27, 1959.

Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
Subcommittee Chairman, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. SENATOR: * * * May I first congratulate you on the very humane and happy initiative of conducting the special study on international health cooperation. It is indeed a sore problem which fully deserves your highly appreciated care and concerning which I am eager to contribute as much as I, and the health department in Tunis, possibly can.

The two sides of the problem—strengthening world medical research and improving world medical assistance are intimately linked and could therefore be tackled simultaneously.

It well behooves the United States to take the lead in this program against disease and it is gratifying for us to see considerable efforts devoted to it, which inevitably will be crowned with success.

Mr. M. Essaafi, Secretary of this Embassy, will be very glad to assist the health study staff in any manner he possibly can, and I will, in this matter, remain constantly in touch with him, in the hope of bringing a hearty and spontaneous contribution to your great task.

Sincerely yours,

MONGI SLIM,
Ambassador of Tunisia.

EMBASSY OF PAKISTAN,
Washington, D.C., April 3, 1959.

Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
Subcommittee Chairman, Committee on Government Operations, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR HUMPHREY: I thank you for your letter of March 20, 1959, about the special study on international health cooperation which is being conducted under your chairmanship by the Subcommittee on Reorganization and International Organizations. I have read with interest the committee print and the release containing your observations on the need for vigorous action against what you have rightly described "mankind's universal enemy"—disease.

The need for international action in this field can hardly be overemphasized. The lead given by your great country in alleviating human suffering in the underdeveloped areas of the world is most heartening. I am greatly impressed by the work that is being done by the subcommittee under your able guidance. I am also confident that keeping in view the importance and magnitude of the problem of combatting disease all over the world adequate provision will be made in the mutual security bill for the purpose.

We are deply interested in the progress of the work of your subcommittee and will be only too happy to be of any assistance. You may, therefore, wish to inform Mr. Julius Cahn, your project director, to get in touch with Mr. Fateh for any help that this Embassy may be in a position to give.

Yours sincerely,

AZIZ AHMED,
Ambassador.

AMBASSADE DU GRAND-DUCHÉ DE LUXEMBOURG,
Washington, D.C., March 27, 1959.

Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR HUMPHREY: * * * Permit me to congratulate you for drawing the attention not only of the U.S. Congress and of other authorities, but of the world, once again, to the urgent problem of improving health conditions throughout the world, particularly in the less developed countries.

* * * * *

Yours sincerely,

GEORGES HEISBOURG,
Ambassador of Luxembourg.

APRIL 6, 1959.

Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Reorganization and International Organizations, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR HUMPHREY: * * * This mission is very interested in the project which it considers of great importance to the welfare of millions of human beings.

The publication, "The Status of World Health," which you kindly sent to me together with your letter, reveals the magnitude of the problem of sickness in the world and the need to multiply the efforts that are being made to solve it. I definitely agree with your statement that "Money for medicine is far more meaningful to mankind than simply more money for machineguns."

I believe that you and the members of your subcommittee deserve the highest praise for what they have accomplished.

* * * * *

With the assurances of my high esteem, I am,

Sincerely yours,

MARCOS FALCÓN-BRICEÑO,
Ambassador of Venezuela.

EMBASSY OF VIETNAM,
Washington, D.C., March 30, 1959.

Hon. HUBERT M. HUMPHREY,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR HUMPHREY: * * * Please accept my most sincere wishes for the success of your noble undertaking of promoting international cooperation in the field of medical research and assistance.

This cooperation is indeed most helpful, as is illustrated by two recent facts concerning Vietnam:

1. As you may know, the region of Saigon-Cholon has over 2 million inhabitants because of the influx of refugees and is at least as warm all year round as Washington is at the height of summer. It has been suffering for years, however, from an insufficient water supply, and the water has to be cut off for many hours each day. This situation is particularly unpleasant, hard and unhealthy, especially for poor people who cannot afford to have private reservoirs. An improved water supply system has been projected and is going to be built thanks to a loan of $19.5 million which has just been authorized by the Development Loan Fund.

2. Thanks to the private initiative of "Medico" and to the help of the ICA, a small team of American surgeons and nurses is leaving this week for Saigon to help train Vietnamese specialists in lung surgery.

I have asked our cultural officer, Mr. Truong Buu Khanh, to get in touch with Mr. Julius Chan, your project director, and to report to me on the work of your subcommittee.

I shall be most pleased indeed if I can be of any help.

Sincerely yours,

TRAN VAN CHUONG,
Ambassador of Vietnam.

IRANIAN EMBASSY,
Washington, D.C., April 1, 1959.

Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
U.S. Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR HUMPHREY: * * * I most certainly appreciate the idea of a special study on international health cooperation and I realize what a great work your subcommittee is engaged in. Indeed, I cannot but congratulate those who have been instrumental in advancing this idea and who have openly shown their feelings of support.

It will be my pleasure to designate Dr. Hoasein-Ali Esfandiary to be in touch with your health study staff, as you have suggested. Dr. Esfandiary, cultural counselor of this Embassy and supervisor of Iranian students in the United States, is also a medical doctor—familiar with field of medicine in Iran * * *.

Again, may I thank you and wish you every success in this very worthy project.

Sincerely yours,

Dr. ALI GHOLI ARDALAN,
Ambassador of Iran.

APRIL 20, 1959.

Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
U.S. Senate, Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR HUMPHREY: * * * May I offer to you my most sincere congratulations for your noble gesture in cosponsoring the resolution, Senate Joint Resolution 41, which the Senate Committee on Labor is now considering, and if approved, no doubt will lend a helping hand to thousands of health study technicians throughout the world who are now trying to work with inadequate resources, and it would bring many more technicians into areas of the world which do not carry any research work nor keep statistical figures.

Everyone who is conscious of his obligations toward society and the human rights of every member of mankind, cannot but wholeheartedly approve and support the projects contemplated in the U.S. Senate's resolution, Senate Joint Resolution 41, and in your comments expressed when releasing the latest subcommittee 81-page publication entitled "The Status of World Health".

Just as it is a sad truth that hundreds of millions of human beings are plagued by diseases and live in such unhealthy conditions that are degrading to human nature itself, it is also true that to properly and orderly conquer this killer that thrives in human lives through disease and hunger, the health status of every region of the world has to be known through statistical data and the ways of coping with specific diseases known by world medical research.

When this is better known, the medical assistance will be more effective and fruitful.

But as the cry for help from the sick in every corner of this world is heard, and as the research and study is being carried, we must try, each in its own effort, to help eradicate the staggering existence of avoidable diseases, which as you very truthfully said "* * * in this 20th century constitutes a blot on the conscience of civilized man," and I think that if the far-visioned bill that you cosponsor is approved, those funds authorized could be put to work in oversea aid for medical research * * *.

I am certain that this yearly aid from the United States of America would enable many nations of the world to keep up statistical data and to carry out research programs or improve the existing ones, whose results can be made available to other nations and gradually close the gaps that now exist on the research and compilation of data on world health.

Once again I would like to express to you and the other members of the subcommittee my congratulations for your wonderful understanding of human needs and for the practical way in which you are working to obtain the means to eradicate or reduce the human plagues of diseases and hunger.

Sincerely yours,

HECTOR DAVID CASTRO,
Ambassador of El Salvador.

PRAISE OF JOINT RESOLUTION BY NOBEL LAUREATES

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, what has been the response of the Nobel award-winning scientists? Their response has been similarly enthusiastic.

In Stockholm, at the world famous Karolinska Institute, I had met with Prof. Hugo Theorell, 1955 winner of the Nobel Prize in the field of medicine and physiology, and he had warmly endorsed the concept of expanded cooperation in research.

Now, after extensive correspondence, I have brought together a series of other replies from other Nobel winners. These include comments of Prof. W. M. Stanley, 1946 winner in chemistry; Prof. Selman A. Waksman, 1952 winner in physiology and medicine; Prof. Bernardo Houssay, 1947 winner in medicine and physiology; Prof. Hans A. Krebs, 1953 winner in medicine and physiology; Prof. Glenn T. Seaborg, 1951 winner in chemistry; Sir Alexander Todd, 1957 winner in chemistry; Prof. Joshua Lederberg, 1958 winner in medicine and physiology.

I should like to say that, almost without exception, the comments of the Nobel laureates have been detailed and helpful on a great many phases of the international health study.

For the moment, however, I shall include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD only those brief portions of their comments which are especially pertinent to today's consideration of the National Institute for International Medical Research.

However, so many additional worthwhile points were touched upon by these Nobel award winners that their recommendations are now being earnestly studied by the project director of the subcommittee and by myself.

Mr. President, the names I have stated comprise an array of the greatest scientists in the world. Some of these men are Americans. They support the joint resolution of the Senator from Alabama. They support it not because they want some little gift. These are men who give their lives to science. They are not getting rich. This is not some stock dividend deal. We are not splitting stock, and we are not giving tax credits. What we seek to do is to work with the scientists who seek to heal the sick. Every one of these men, without exception, comes forth voluntarily, wilfully, and enthusiastically to say, "Please give us this type of legislation."

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am happy to yield.

Mr. HILL. The distinguished Nobel Prize winners, to whom the Senator has referred, not only realize that we need additional, greater, and more intense medical research, but also realize that we need closer cooperation, and collaboration of the scientific communities of the world, so that the scientists throughout the world can work more closely together and can more easily collaborate with one another.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator is correct. I am sure my colleagues realize it is a most factual statement to say that we in America, with all our great achievements in medical science, have no monopoly on the subject. There is great knowledge around the world. As a matter of fact, some of the great discoveries—for example, such as those in regard to hypertension—have come from other countries including, for example, from India.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. HILL. The Senator has in mind the drug we know as rauwolfia.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HILL. The tragedy is that the drug lay dormant for 400 years. When by accident it got into a medical research laboratory at Boston, the testing of it began. It was tested for 5 weeks and did not seem to be effective. The scientists were about to give up on further tests, but said, "We will go along for one more week." They tested the drug the sixth week, and they got the result which the Senator from Minnesota knows so well. This is the most important drug we have today for the control of high blood pressure, and is also about the most important drug we have so far as many types of mental illness are concerned.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator is correct.

Another classic example is penicillin. Had there been previously international medical cooperation of the nature which is now proposed, the great miracle of penicillin might have been in use some 25 or 30 years earlier. Actually, it was being used, but as a mold on bread, by some country doctors who found it by accident. No great research had perfected it at that time.

Mr. HILL. As the Senator well knows, the sulfonamides came from Germany.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes.

Mr. HILL. Some assistant in a laboratory failed to pick up some component, and for 16 years we were denied the blessings and the benefits we now receive from the sulfonamides.

Mr. HUMPHREY. These are characteristic examples, as the Senator from Alabama can point out again and again, of what can be accomplished, and what new horizons are yet to be explored. That is what we are talking about—what is yet to be discovered.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. HILL. Is it not also true the history of science shows us that often we work and labor to find the answer with regard to one particular disease, though we might not get the answer with respect to that disease, we will get a result which will prove to be beneficial with reference to some other disease?

VITAL MOLECULAR AND PERINATAL RESEARCH

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is very true. I will say to the Senator that when I was in Paris, at the Pasteur Institute, I saw work going on in the field of molecular pathology—biochemistry, biology, and bacteriology which was absolutely fantastic.

I have seen work in prenatal research, care of the yet unborn infant, which touches one's heart. This is an area, by the way, in which much work is being done overseas, from which we could learn a great deal, and to which we could make a significant contribution, notably through our National Institute of Neurological Disease and Blindness with which I am in close contact. The Senator has pointed out the tangential benefits to be expected from such research.

Mr. HILL. The Senator spoke about the advances being made in the field of prenatal diseases. It is only as we have pressed forward in this field that we have become aware of the problem. There used to be an idea which prevailed, that a child in the mother's womb was in a fortress or citadel, and that we need have no concern. However, as we have pressed forward with medical research, we have realized how many things babies suffer from while still in the womb. It is only through medical research that we are making such discoveries today.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator is correct. How good it would make me feel as a U.S. Senator if I could do anything by my vote, word, or action to make the life of a mother a little happier, or the life of a child a little brighter and more healthy. That is what we are discussing here.

IMPORTANCE OF FULBRIGHT PROGRAM IN LIFE SCIENCES

Prof. Joshua Lederberg, for example, in his letter to me touched on a great many significant phases, including his previous experiences as a Fulbright visitor to Australia. I might mention in this connection some words of Professor Lederberg:

The Fulbright program has been a tremendous benefit.

I might say that one of the great and largely untold stories in world annals is in the contributions which have

been made by the Fulbright program down through the years in the fields of the life sciences. If the Fulbright exchanges had included no other specialties than these—and we know, of course, the program covers the spectrum of human learning—it would have made a contribution of incalculable benefit to the American people and to the world.

It is my hope that in the course of the health study's future publications we will be able to document how indebted this country is to my colleague from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] in this particular respect as in so many others.

The legislative jurisdiction for the Fulbright program is, of course, in the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations. But I think that our subcommittee's health study would not be complete if it failed to point out how very important the Fulbright program has been in the life sciences, just as the Smith-Mundt program has also been important.

EXCERPTS FROM NOBEL WINNERS' REPLIES

There follow excerpts of the Nobel laureates' replies which pertain to Senate Joint Resolution 41.

I ask unanimous consent that the excerpts from Nobel Prize winners, which I have used in my documentation, be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

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

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA,
Berkeley, Calif., Apr. 3, 1959.

Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR HUMPHREY: * * * You mention Senate Joint Resolution 41 proposed by Senator HILL, and I should like at once to indicate my very enthusiastic support of this bill. I have testified before committees under the chairmanship of Senator HILL during the past few years, and I am familiar with the very forward thinking of Senator HILL.

The Virus Laboratory, which I established here at the University of California in 1948, represents the type of organization operating in a new area of medical research which has had a very important influence in virology throughout the world. During the past 11 years approximately 25 percent of our senior scientific staff has consisted each year of representatives from foreign countries. We have had, in all, representatives from 17 different countries who have spent usually 1 but sometimes 2 or 3 years here in training and have then returned to their own countries where in some cases similar research institutes have been started. On the basis of my own experience, I am convinced that a U.S. National Institute of International Medical Research operating on a much broader and more extensive basis could be a great force for good throughout the world.

* * * * *

I believe that foreign aid in the form of medical technical advice and generally along the lines of helping people to help themselves represents by far the best type of aid. A U.S. National Institute of International Medical Research could be a very powerful influence for good not only insofar as direct medical research is concerned but perhaps equally important insofar as fostering better relationships between our country and other countries.

With kindest regards, I am,
Sincerely yours,
W. M. STANLEY.

RUTGERS UNIVERSITY,
New Brunswick, N.J., March 19, 1959.

Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
U.S. Senate,
Committee on Government Operations,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR HUMPHREY: * * * The control or perhaps even the potential elimination of infectious diseases has become a reality. Other diseases are attracting our attention. What we have witnessed during the last 20 years has resulted in the elimination of most diseases of childhood, and in the increase in the average lifespan of man by 20 years. We must carry on this battle. It is for us in the United States to take the lead, to set the example; the rest of the world will follow. There is no greater contribution that we can make to the role of democracy in modern society, to the world today, and to the benefits that will accrue to the peoples of the whole world than by concentrating our efforts to control disease and epidemics, and to make the world a better place to live in.

Respectfully yours,
SELMAN A. WAKSMAN,
Professor Emeritus.

UNIVERSIDAD DE BUENOS AIRES,
Buenos Aires, Argentina, March 25, 1959.

Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Reorganization and International Organizations, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I am glad to answer your kind letter of March 6, 1959. My reply shall first include certain opinions about the status of international medical research which shall then be followed by my recommendations regarding the proposals put forth in your letter.

1. Medical research is advancing rapidly and is producing a revolution, by prolongation of life, relief of suffering, increase of health and physical and mental abilities.

2. The United States has the leading position in the present world.

3. Today the United States has a prominent position as a center of discoveries and development of science, but some great and significant discoveries are made also in many different places in the world.

4. The insufficient knowledge of the achievements made abroad not only does not allow the utilization of important discoveries, but also develops in many countries the attitude of a lack of justice or disdain by the Americans in the appreciation of their contributions.

5. There is an almost universal feeling that the most advanced countries have a moral obligation and responsibility in the promotion of the advancement of the backward or less advanced countries. This feeling is deeply rooted in your neighbor countries of South America.

WHAT CAN BE DONE?

1. The organization of a U.S. National Institute of International Medical Research deserves my complete approval. It can aid in research projects abroad, in improvement of the most promising men, in support of international symposia, and in collecting and disseminating medical information, etc.

2. Visiting professors must go to other countries. American scientists must give theoretical and practical courses of the most intensive type from 2 to 10 months' duration, especially in branches of science not well advanced. Last year some courses in embryology (Patten), isotopes (Cooper and Hasterlisk), etc., had great success in Argentina. South American scientists can be invited to visit the United States, some of them to explain their original discoveries and others, such as those with leading positions as professors, chiefs of laboratories, etc., will go to acquire firsthand information in modern trends in teaching and research.

3. Fellowships would be most useful if the candidates are well selected and if there is agreement that they will have positions on return to their countries. For those that develop well and are promising men, the Institute could give them equipment to continue their research in their own country and the American professors who have directed them could continue to be advisers by correspondence, or eventually to visit the country if needed.

* * * * *

I hope that these opinions will be useful to your committee.

With best regards, I am,
Sincerely yours,
BERNARDO A. HOUSSAY.

UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD,
May 5, 1959.

Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, *U.S. Senate, Committee on Government Operations, Subcommittee on Reorganization and International Organizations, Washington, D.C.*

DEAR SENATOR HUMPHREY: I wish to thank you for your letter and for sending me a copy of the committee print "International Medical Research." In response to your request I would like to offer the following comments:

I admire the foresight and boldness of your subcommittee, as revealed by your letter and the printed document. Whilst everybody realises that disease knows no national frontiers, few people venture to draw the conclusion that nations must unite if the conquest of disease is to progress most favourably. The global attack on the major killing maladies which you envisage is a thing we sometimes dreamt of but hardly dared to discuss as a feasible proposition.

* * * * *

In reply to your specific question about the steps that should be taken to strengthen medical research and to foster international cooperation in the field of biochemistry I would say that the decision of the United States Government agencies to make grants to selected research workers in foreign countries is a great step in the right direction. I suggest that this policy be developed.

* * * * *

I am,
Yours sincerely,
H. A. KREBS,
Professor of Biochemistry.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA,
Berkeley, Calif., March 30, 1959.

Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Reorganization and International Organizations, Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR HUMPHREY: It is a pleasure to respond to your letter concerning the establishment of a U.S. National Institute of International Medical Research. This is indeed a most worthy project, deserving the greatest support.

You have raised a number of specific questions which I will attempt to answer. International cooperation in the field of medical research is essential if we are to make rapid progress in the conquest of disease. Scientific discovery knows no international boundary lines, and basic discoveries once made must be shared with others with all possible speed. We must take full advantage of the existing international scientific organizations, and provide them with the means to extend their activities.

* * * * *

You have my firm support in your project to establish a U.S. National Institute of In-

ternational Medical Research. Wisely administered, it should open further avenues of international cooperation in science.

Sincerely yours,

GLENN T. SEABORG,
Chancellor.

UNIVERSITY CHEMICAL LABORATORY,
Cambridge, March 20, 1959.

Senator H. H. HUMPHREY,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: I have to thank you for your letter of March 6 and for the subcommittee report which was enclosed with it. I do not know that I have a great deal to contribute at this stage beyond welcoming the action which it is proposed to take through the Hill bill to expand and strengthen medical research at an international level. The general lines of approach which you envisage and which are really a further development of the valuable work which the National Institutes of Health have been doing in recent years seems to cover most of the desirable lines of attack.

* * * * *

Yours sincerely,

Sir ALEXANDER TODD.

STANFORD UNIVERSITY,
Stanford, Calif., March 15, 1959.

Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR HUMPHREY: * * * The National Institutes of Health and their programs in support of research in the health sciences are now universally recognized to play an indispensable role in our national welfare. The administration of the NIH has always been responsive (to a remarkable degree) to the needs of our scientists, and I would be happy to recommend your confident reliance on the NIH in speaking for these needs in detail. This is in part a reflection of the important role played by many academic research workers throughout the country in implementing the review procedures and policy development of the NIH through their participation in study sections and advisory councils.

* * * * *

It is of course obvious that the American people will benefit equally from health advances made in other countries as those in the United States. Indirectly we are bound to share in the economic prosperity of other nations (with many of which we now wisely share some of our wealth); more directly, new knowledge and new methods of medical practice are immediately applicable to our personal needs, regardless of the nation in which they originate. Anything we can do to encourage medical research anywhere in the world is an investment in our own security, health and happiness.

These inferences are quite well brought out in the subcommittee print, and I perhaps need not enlarge further on them. However, perhaps there are some who do not fully appreciate the extent and importance of international communication in science, which is simply part of my daily experience in reading scientific papers which bolster and help define my own laboratory work, in my own visits to other laboratories and personal correspondence with scientists abroad, and in visits of foreign students and scientists to my own laboratory. For example, in my own laboratory at this moment I have students and colleagues from several countries (besides the United States) who are making important contributions to our research program—Australia, Japan, India, Great Britain.

* * * * *

As you can already judge from these remarks, international cooperation in medical research has already gone a long way. But it is certainly true that much more can be done both to help support research in other countries, and to foster better communication between scientists of diverse nationality.

* * * * *

A new Institute for International Medical Research could play an important role in the development of policy and as a clearinghouse for new thoughts.

* * * * *

Yours cordially,

JOSHUA LEDERBERG,
Professor of Genetics.

THIS IS NOT A SUBSTITUTE FOR FOREIGN ACTION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Might there be some misinterpretation abroad as to the purposes and procedures of the institute?

As in almost any other such new legislation, there is a chance of foreign misinterpretation.

For that reason, I made certain clarifying points in the course of my testimony before the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. Chairman HILL emphatically concurred in each of the following points:

First. The new institute would definitely not be designed as a substitute for sound action by foreign governments in fulfillment of their own responsibilities. On the contrary, it would be the hope of the Congress, as I believe foreign ambassadors here realize, that each nation will resolutely face up to its own financial responsibilities to strengthen medical research. This program is not to supplant the work of other countries, but to supplement it. It is a catalytic agent. It is the yeast which will produce more of the good product of medical science.

The United States should aid selected foreign projects, programs, and institutions to the extent that it is feasible and desirable so as to augment their existing capacity in a way which would not otherwise be possible, for example, because of genuine financial limitations in a foreign land.

Second. Funds under the institute would, moreover, in no way, be designed as a substitute for private activity, either in the United States, or in foreign countries.

On the contrary, the institute would be designed to encourage international private efforts by both American private organizations and foreign organizations.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. HILL. As the Senator knows, some very distinguished witnesses from private organizations appeared before the committee, emphasizing their determination to carry on with their voluntary, privately financed organization. However, they also emphasized how much this bill would help them to carry on the work which they are doing through free contributions and voluntary privately financed agencies.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I recall that testimony in the record. The representatives of voluntary organizations are as enthusiastic for this measure as was any witness who testified.

Voluntarism is a pattern which is perhaps best exemplified in the United States and in the United Kingdom, but which we would like to see developed further abroad. The institute should be a stimulus to voluntarism and not a substitute for it or a replacement of it.

Later on, I may say, the Senate Government Operations Subcommittee will publish a special report on voluntarism abroad.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. I was interested in the statement made a moment ago by my good friend from Minnesota, to the effect that this program would supplement the work already going on abroad.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes.

Mr. ELLENDER. Where specifically in the bill does this statement appear? This money could be used to construct buildings abroad in order to carry on work, as I understand it.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes; within limits and under certain conditions.

Mr. ELLENDER. I was under the impression that this program was to be carried on abroad in conjunction with other nations.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. On page 22 of the bill we find the following:

> (8) provide, through financial grants, loans, or contracts (without regard to the provisions of sections 3648 and 3709 of the Revised Statutes), for the improvement or alteration of facilities, including the erection of temporary facilities, for research and research training purposes when necessary to carry out the purposes of this joint resolution with respect to any project.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. To my mind this section means that we could go into a country and lend that country such funds as might be necessary to construct new facilities.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I have my own reply, but the author of the legislation [Mr. HILL] is present. This provision was rewritten in the committee.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. HILL. We endeavored to make it very clear in the report that this language is not intended to authorize any brick-and-mortar program. It may be that when we go into some place to make a study we shall find that we need some kind of temporary facilities. Or perhaps we have a laboratory, and we need some little alteration or change in equipment. So far as building laboratories is concerned, I can assure my friend from Louisiana that that is certainly not the intent or purpose. I believe he and I, as members of the Appropriations Committee, will see to it that no such thing is done.

Mr. ELLENDER. As the Senator knows, the program would start with an annual appropriation of $50 million. However, over the years I have found out that once we make a start on a program, it continues growing. And before we know it, we are doing things that the people of the nations abroad should do. The net effect has been to have the U.S. Government take over the complete care of projects which more properly should be in the care of those

people who get the most benefit from them—the governments of the countries where they are located.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. HILL. Let me say to my friend from Louisiana that the bill provides an authorization of $50 million, but, as the distinguished Senator from Minnesota has said, it will be up to the Appropriations Committee and the Congress to decide how much we shall appropriate through the years for this purpose.

Certainly we cannot appropriate, under the terms of the bill, more than $50 million. The intent and purpose, as clearly brought out in the hearings, and as we sought to make clear in the report of the committee, is that this money shall not in any way be used for the major construction of buildings in foreign countries. The buildings should be constructed by the country in which the work is being carried on. Of course, it is possible that there could be some isolated spot in a country where a research project might need a temporary facility.

Mr. ELLENDER. If the purpose of the measure is as the Senator states, why is it necessary to have available as much as $50 million?

Mr. HILL. The feature to which the Senator is addressing himself is, to my mind, a very small feature of the bill. The idea is that this money should go into research projects, such as those being carried on in the Senator's great State of Louisiana, at Tulane University and also at the medical school of the University of Louisiana. It is research work. We do have the provision in the bill with respect to temporary facilities, and to make some improvements, for example, in existing facilities, because in some places it might be necessary to enable the research project to be carried on.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator from Alabama has led the way in providing Federal funds for a great deal of medical research, particularly with respect to heart ailments, cancer, and many other diseases. He is the Senate's expert on these matters, and I wish to compliment him for it.

Mr. HILL. I thank the Senator very much.

Mr. ELLENDER. I wonder to what extent an organization of the type that would be established under the bill would duplicate work already being done by our own people in this country.

Mr. HILL. One of the very reasons we would put the institute at the National Institutes of Health, where we have the other institutes, is to prevent duplication. Out there they have had experience with activities of these kinds and with similar procedures. It is our plan to coordinate the whole effort. I should like to go back to the subject of facilities. The bill provides, "When it is necessary to carry out the purposes of this joint resolution with respect to a project." That means a particular project. That does not refer to the building of any laboratories or buildings.

Mr. ELLENDER. To what extent would this money be used exclusively in the United States?

Mr. HILL. To what extent could all of it be used?

Mr. ELLENDER. To what extent could any of it be used in this country? Suppose we go ahead and appropriate $50 million. Could all of it be spent in the United States?

Mr. HILL. Well, I would say this about it. That would be a matter to be decided by the Council, which would be set up under the joint resolution, together with the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service, subject, of course, to supervision by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. They would decide as to how best these funds could be expended to get the best results from the medical research.

Mr. ELLENDER. If the purpose of the bill is to more or less develop new methods of treatment, why does it carry the word "international" in its title?

Mr. HILL. It is called international for this very simple reason. It contemplates a cooperative effort on the part of research scientists in the United States and research scientists in other parts of the world. Some of them are carrying on research work of the same nature and looking to the same end that our scientists in the United States are engaged in. The program would bring about a cooperation and a collaboration in many instances.

Mr. ELLENDER. Is it not a fact that this is now being done to some degree?

Mr. HILL. It is, but in a limited manner.

Mr. ELLENDER. But it is being done now.

Mr. HILL. It is done, but in a very limited manner.

Dr. Gunnar Gunderson, president of the American Medical Association, in testifying before our committee, emphasized the fact that it is important that we tie in what we are doing in certain areas with what is being done in other countries. The Surgeon General emphasized the same point. Representatives from the American Dental Association, in testifying in support of the program, also testified to that effect and emphasized that point. Great emphasis was laid on the fact that we must tie all this in if we are to get the results we seek.

Mr. ELLENDER. The difference, then, between what we are now doing and what the Senator proposes we do, is to supplement the work now going on in this country and, in addition, to get a cooperative effort from institutions abroad. Is that correct?

Mr. HILL. I would say that we now get a cooperative effort, as the Senator says, from some institutions abroad. For instance, the laboratories at Tulane University, in the Senator's home State, and at L.S.U., might well tie in their wonderful work with the Pasteur Institute in Paris.

Mr. ELLENDER. As the Senator well knows, many of our colleges and institutions are now receiving substantial sums of money.

Mr. HILL. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. To make studies in certain fields.

Mr. HILL. Yes.

Mr. ELLENDER. This program, as I see it, would supplement the work now being conducted in this country, plus obtaining cooperation from institutions abroad.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes.

Mr. HILL. This would, as the Senator says, enlarge our efforts or tie them in much more closely with the efforts of those in other countries. That is the purpose of it.

Mr. ELLENDER. If we were to extend this cooperation abroad, could we expect the various countries to furnish us this information without charge?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Oh, yes.

Mr. HILL. We expect to be partners in this undertaking. I wish to be perfectly frank with the Senator, and I certainly would not want to mislead him. When I say partners, it might be that in some instances the part of the work done by a country abroad would be greater than ours, and in some instances ours might be greater than their work. When we get into the field of research, it is not possible to cut it into neat portions, like cutting a pie, for example.

Mr. ELLENDER. I notice that the money, if the Council should decide, could be used for grants to finance certain studies in medical research.

Mr. HILL. Some of it could be used for that purpose, just as it is now being done in the United States.

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes. As I said, the program would supplement what we are doing.

Mr. HILL. The Senator is correct. It would strengthen what we are doing now. In addition thereto, it would aid kindred or similar work which is going on in other countries.

Mr. ELLENDER. To what extent could any of the money be used to make grants to foreign students to come and study and do research in our country?

Mr. HILL. I would say that would be a matter for the Council and for the Surgeon General and for the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to determine.

Mr. ELLENDER. However, it could be done?

Mr. HILL. It could be done; yes. Surely, it could be done.

Mr. ELLENDER. I have a fear about this program. I think it is a good thing, but a program of this kind will bear watching.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes.

Mr. ELLENDER. The first thing that will happen, in my humble judgment, is that we are going to be asked to pay a great deal to foster the education of some people abroad. The Senator knows we are doing that through the Fulbright program and many other programs which are now on the statute books.

Mr. HILL. I should like to say this to the Senator. Any dividends which come from this research will directly and immediately affect the American people. It is not possible to make a discovery which will make any contribution to the cure of, let us say, arthritis or diabetes, or any other disease, with-

out ourselves in the United States becoming beneficiaries of that work.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Every person who suffers from diabetes in the United States owes a debt of gratitude to English and Canadian doctors. We did not discover the cure for diabetes.

Mr. HILL. It came from Canada. As the Senator from Minnesota has stated, penicillin came to us from Great Britain.

Mr. HUMPHREY. And the sulfa drugs came to us from Germany.

Mr. HILL. Yes. Vaccination came to us from England.

The science of bacteriology was developed by Louis Pasteur, in France. The science of antisepsis and asepsis was developed by Joseph Lister, of England. We could go on with a whole list.

Mr. ELLENDER. Our own scientists have done much work in this field themselves, and people abroad have made use of it. I would like to point out that these exchanges did not require a resolution of this kind.

All I say is that programs of this kind will bear watching. If they are not closely watched, the first thing we know, requests will be coming in for money to do this, that, and the other thing. Instead of appropriating $50 million a year to carry on a specific program, the amount might grow like Topsy.

Mr. HILL. If the Senator from Louisiana will join with me today in launching this program, he and I will stand together as members of the Committee on Appropriations to do that which he has suggested, and which should be done, namely, to watch this program carefully.

Mr. HUMPHREY. At the time of my testimony before the committee, I pointed out the very thing which the Senator from Louisiana has so well mentioned here, namely, that there are four separate checks upon the use of these funds. There will be not only the responsibility of the Surgeon General and of the Advisory Council, which the resolution creates, for the approval of any projects or grants, but also the Bureau of the Budget and the committees of Congress, first the authorization committees and then the Appropriations Committees of both Houses.

I thoroughly concur in the view that in this kind of program, as in any other kind of program which lends itself to substantial expenditures overseas, a careful, watchful eye is needed. The Senator from Louisiana is accustomed to and is mindful of that. He has alerted us to a very serious matter.

Mr. ELLENDER. As the Senator from Alabama and the Senator from Minnesota well remember, the foreign aid program, when it was started, was supposed to last 4 years. The total expenditure was to have been about $17 billion or $18 billion. The program has now been in effect since 1945. And from that time through the current fiscal year, almost $80 billion has been spent on that program, $50 billion of this total by way of grants. I think the United States has done its bit to assist the nations abroad in their recovery from the war.

I am very hopeful that this proposed program for medical research will do much good. However, I warn Senators that it must be watched closely. I hope it will never be allowed to grow so large that the countries abroad will cease to work for themselves and instead will depend on us to carry on work which they should do themselves.

Mr. HUMPHREY. As the Senator from Louisiana was entering the Chamber, I was commenting on that very point. The Senator from Alabama and I, in making the legislative history, have said that this is not a program designed to take responsibilities and duties away from other people. It makes my heart warm today to know that the Senator from Louisiana, who has served on the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and who has been interested in matters of health and human welfare, sees in this program the possibility for great good. At the same time, he admonishes us with respect to our responsibility for its proper administration. I, for one, am delighted that his participation has indicated his warm interest, and I hope that what he has said will help us greatly in securing the passage of the resolution.

INTERNATIONAL HEALTH YEAR

Mr. President, inquiry has been made about the International Health Year and the proposed new International Institute: What may be stated regarding the relationship between the proposed International Health Year and the newly proposed International Health Institute?

The answer is that the relationship would be an ideal one. The new International Institute would become the foremost single instrument whereby the United States could make the fullest contribution to the success of the International Health Year.

I was very much pleased to read in yesterday's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and also in previous issues of the RECORD, the excellent observations made by the distinguished junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER], who has set forth the great opportunity available to the United States through the International Health Year.

In what better way could the United States signify to the world that we are determined to make the International Health Year a success than by establishing the new International Institute?

Let it be noted that the International Health Year is not simply a medical year; it is a health year—meaning that it will enlist the cooperation of all the life sciences.

So, too, Senate Joint Resolution 41 does not simply provide for a medical institute; it provides for a health institute, for example, including nutrition research.

I may say that along this line I have been in touch with the broad spectrum of U.S. agencies concerned with health.

INTERRELATIONSHIP OF THE TWO SENATE COMMITTEES

Now let us ask, How has the work of the Government Operations Subcommittee interrelated with the work of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare?

The answer is, We have been working along somewhat parallel lines, at least in general, and we have benefited from the counsel given to us by the chairman of the Labor Committee and his diligent staff.

However, very specifically, let me confirm a few points of differentiation which I mentioned in the course of my testimony before the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, as may be found on page 192 of the hearings.

(a) The interest of our subcommittee is not in specific substantive legislation; rather it is in the subject of world health in general. By contrast, the Labor Committee bears exclusive responsibility for substantive health legislation.

(b) The Hill bill, Senate Joint Resolution 41, is a medical research bill; by contrast our subcommittee interest is in both medical research and medical assistance.

The fact of the matter is, however, that as I have indicated, virtually everything which our subcommittee has found to date confirms the need for this sound type of legislation. Every single publication which we have issued inevitably substantiates in effect the case for Senate Joint Resolution 41.

FINDINGS IN FOUR COMMITTEE PRINTS

I invite attention to the four committee prints which we have issued to date.

Our first committee print, entitled "International Medical Research," pointed out the great indebtedness of the American people to foreign science.

It pointed out further that already the National Institutes of Health channel $3.6 million in this fiscal year in research assistance overseas.

Let me point out that this committee print was subsequently filed, by unanimous action of the Committee on Government Operations, as Senate Report No. 160, 86th Congress.

Our second committee print was entitled "Statutory Authority for Medical and Other Health-Related Research in the U.S. Government." One of the conclusions of this committee print was that, at present, explicit statutory authority is lacking for U.S. agencies to engage in international medical research activities. While the Surgeon General no doubt has such authority in his broad powers, the committee print recommended that his authority be made explicit.

Our third committee print was entitled "The Status of World Health." This showed the appalling incidence of disease throughout the world. This committee print was subsequently filed as Senate Report No. 161.

Our fourth committee print will be published this Sunday. This will consist of my personal report on the World Health Organization. This report will point out that WHO can work and does work very effectively with the National Institutes of Health in strengthening medical research throughout the world.

Included in this report on WHO will be a new table which will list all of the principal diseases of the world according to the continent in which they appear. And it will indicate a series of

priorities, in the judgment of certain WHO experts, for attacking these diseases—including priorities for research.

I may say that WHO will cooperate very closely with the proposed new International Institute and vice versa. Institute funds will not and may not be used for direct sustaining operations by WHO. However, institute funds could, in my judgment, and should help out in WHO research planning, where necessary, and in WHO research in the testing of new drugs usable in mass eradication efforts against disease.

FUTURE PUBLICATIONS IN PROCESS

A whole series of other committee prints are in the making.

One important committee print, on which data is now being compiled by the National Cancer Institute, will be devoted to the epidemiology of cancer. Other studies may be devoted to the significant geographic incidence of other major diseases throughout the world, with the data being compiled by the other categorical Institutes at Bethesda.

Many of these studies contain important charts, such as Committee Print No. 3 designed to convey quickly and reliably a picture of world health conditions.

Having described the work of the subcommittee of which I am privileged to be the chairman, I wish to state that I have received most excellent cooperation from Dr. James Shannon, Director of the National Institutes of Health, in this work. This cooperation has been characteristic of the assistance to our subcommittee study from its very inception, as extended by Surgeon General Leroy Burney.

I wish to express our appreciation for the cooperation extended by the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, the Honorable John McCone; the Director of the National Science Foundation, Dr. Alan Waterman; the Secretary of Defense, Neil McElroy; and, of course, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Dr. Arthur Flemming, among others.

At a later date, I shall report in the Senate regarding other phases of the work of our subcommittee.

I am very happy to have had the privilege today to support this important measure. I hope it will quickly and overwhelmingly be passed.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. CARROLL. I have listened with great interest to the excellent presentations made by the distinguished senior Senator from Minnesota and the very able senior Senator from Alabama. I think the resolution is one of the most important measures to come before the Senate at this session.

I observed, as I read the report, that no person appeared to testify against the resolution. Is that correct?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Obviously, it was not possible for me to be present to hear all the testimony, but it is my recollection that there was no direct opposition except on budgetary matters.

Mr. HILL. There was not a single witness who opposed the purpose of the proposed legislation.

Mr. CARROLL. That is my understanding from a reading of the report. The able Senator from Minnesota spoke of the letters which have come from all over the world. I think what is proposed is the finest thing we can do, not only as a matter of humanitarian interest, but also as a matter of foreign policy. It will provide medical and scientific advancement which will benefit all people, not only by way of the cure of disease, but also in the development of preventive medicine.

I commend the distinguished Senator from Alabama and the distinguished Senator from Minnesota for their able presentations.

Mr. HILL. The Senator from Colorado is one of the sponsors of the resolution. He is on the team which is carrying the ball down the field.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from Colorado is simply too modest.

Mr. CARROLL. My part is that of a supernumerary. It is very small. I commend the Senator from Alabama and the Senator from Minnesota for the great work they have done.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I compliment the Senator from Minnesota upon his statement. I, too, have received letters on this subject from all over the world.

I think this is the appropriate time to call attention to the fact that a distinguished physician who came to this country from Yugoslavia has done outstanding work in the use of Krebiozen for the cure and prevention of cancer. The senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] has repeatedly proposed that a study be made of the value of Krebiozen.

Every Senator who fears cancer should study the value of Krebiozen.

During the 18 years I have been a Member of the Senate, the dread disease of cancer has taken its toll among the Members of this body and upon hundreds of thousands of their constituents.

The senior Senator from Illinois has taken the lead in bringing to the attention of the people of this country a drug known as Krebiozen, and requested an impartial investigation to ascertain whether or not Krebiozen may help the sufferers of cancer.

In this connection, I think it is peculiarly pertinent to bring to the attention of the Senate the answer of the Krebiozen Research Foundation to the background paper on Krebiozen of the American Cancer Society, and particularly the work of Dr. Andrew C. Ivy, one of the foremost authorities on cancer in America, and of Dr. Stevan Durovic, who has done such an outstanding job with Krebiozen. Every Senator who fears cancer should study the value of Krebiozen.

I ask unanimous consent that their statement be printed in full at this point in my remarks.

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

ANSWER OF KREBIOZEN RESEARCH FOUNDATION TO THE "BACKGROUND PAPER ON KREBIOZEN" OF THE AMERICAN CANCER SOCIETY

INTRODUCTION

On March 9, 1959, the American Cancer Society released what it calls a "Background Paper on Krebiozen," which has since been reprinted in the Journal of the American Medical Association.

It would be expected that in addressing the public on any matter relating to cancer, the American Cancer Society would exercise an exact regard for truth. Yet this paper is neither honest nor truthful. It misrepresents the facts, omits much pertinent material and makes use of half-truths and falsities in order to discredit Krebiozen and its supporters in the eyes of the public.

The overall aim of this paper is obviously to persuade the public by a variety of strategems that blame for the failure to test Krebiozen rests with Dr. Ivy and the Krebiozen Research Foundation rather than with the agencies which have refused such a test.

As a matter of actual fact, those chiefly concerned with Krebiozen experimentation have sought such a test since 1952.

At that time Dr. Ivy proposed it to the American Medical Association as a means of ending the controversy over Krebiozen. The American Medical Association refused.

In February 1958 in response to public interest, the American Cancer Society invited and the Krebiozen Research Foundation submitted a proposal for the testing of krebiozen. The American Cancer Society stalled this proposal for many months and finally rejected it.

Then in August, 1958, Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS in a Senate speech proposed that the National Cancer Institute undertake substantially the same test the Krebiozen Research Foundation had submitted earlier to the American Cancer Society and remarked: "This is a fair test. It can do no harm. It might do great good."

The Senator's proposal was immediately accepted by Dr. Ivy and the Krebiozen Research Foundation. The National Cancer Institute and its director, Dr. John R. Heller, rejected it.

Thus, a fair test to determine once and for all whether Krebiozen is active against cancer, has been sought from every responsible agency which could formally conduct it.

The fact that it has been refused by each in turn creates a paradox, very costly to the public, which is not easily explained in view of the extensive search for potential cancer remedies now being sponsored at great expense by two of these same organizations—the American Cancer Society and the National Cancer Institute.

Some 40,000 chemical compounds are being screened each year on the bare chance that they will show anticancer activity. Krebiozen alone—a drug which at the least has the evidence of some 300 doctors that it gives a 70 percent beneficial activity in advanced and terminal cancer patients—is denied a test by the very people who profess to be leading the search for drug remedies against cancer.

The "Background Paper" of the American Cancer Society is an attempt to rationalize this situation by an attack on Dr. Ivy, on Krebiozen, and on all others connected with it.

For purposes of reply, the charges, hints, and insinuations scattered through this document can be grouped under four main headings.

I. Regarding the test proposed by the Krebiozen Research Foundation and Dr. Andrew C. Ivy;

II. Regarding the substance itself, its discoverer, and his associates;

III. Regarding previous purported evaluations of the drug made by the agencies of organized medicine; and

IV. Regarding the attitude of the National Cancer Institute toward a fair test of Krebiozen proposed by Senator PAUL DOUGLAS, of Illinois.

I. REGARDING THE TEST PROPOSED BY THE KREBIOZEN RESEARCH FOUNDATION AND DR. ANDREW C. IVY

The American Cancer Society Paper states that, "The owners and proponents have demanded that the substance (Krebiozen) be tested according to their own terms, which are demonstrably unscientific." The fact is, that we have asked for the most scientific test possible. The double-blind test is standard in the laboratory and is the world over accepted as the best method for evaluating the activity of a drug.

In this connection it should be noted that at one of the meetings with Senator DOUGLAS between Drs. Ivy and Durovic and members of the National Cancer Institute staff, Dr. Durovic asked Dr. Heller if he "considered the double-blind test unscientific."

Dr. Heller answered: "No; of course not. It is our standard of drug evaluation at the National Cancer Institute."

Nevertheless, he admitted in answer to another question that, in his capacity as a director of the American Cancer Society, he had voted a little earlier that the proposal to evaluate Krebiozen by this method should be turned down as "unscientific."

This type of inconsistency has been manifest at every turn in negotiations for a test of Krebiozen. Yet, neither the American Medical Association, the American Cancer Society, nor the National Cancer Institute has ever stated that the type of test proposed by the Krebiozen Foundation would not give clear-cut results as to Krebiozen's activity. Nor could they do so. From Pasteur on, the double-blind test has been accepted in science as the most objective and certain method for evaluating a new therapy, since it rules out subjective impressions of both the physicians giving the treatment and the patients receiving it. Only results based on facts count.

Yet, the American Cancer Society and National Cancer Institute contend for one reason or another that this method should not be used for Krebiozen. One reason assigned for refusing the test, for example, is that its results—under the stipulated conditions—would "not be acceptable to the scientific community."

This is to misinterpret the problem. What is required in the present situation is not to find something "acceptable to the scientific community," but to establish a fact. A fact, once established, compels acceptance. It is not something which can be refused or rejected at the whim or pleasure of a guild or professional group.

And if Krebiozen is of value, who would wish to reject this truth? Surely not the humane and dedicated physicians who together make up the scientific community, and who are saddened almost daily at their helplessness to save patients in the late stages of cancer. It is they who are eager to do more than just lower the opiate curtain over the victims of malignancy.

Entirely invalid is the astonishing opposition to Dr. Ivy's assisting in the administration of the drug on the ground that this would not permit "an opportunity to determine whether physicians generally can obtain the same results." This is to suggest that Dr. Ivy is a magician. It ignores the fact that Krebiozen has been used by more than 300 qualified physicians, under suggestions from Dr. Ivy and his associates, as to the dosages and technique of administration. Dr. Ivy treated only a part of the patients personally. It is on the basis of reports of those physicians as well as Dr. Ivy's observations, that the foundation has ascertained Krebiozen's incontrovertible beneficial effects.

The Foundation has proposed that Dr. Ivy assist in the administration of the drug, because there is no denying that he has more knowledge and experience in its dosage-rates for different types of cancer than anyone else. Furthermore, his presence in administering the drug would be of inestimable value in avoiding possible errors, either intentional or inadvertent, which would make a thoroughly valid test unreliable. Neither Dr. Ivy, nor anyone else, could by serving in this capacity make an inactive drug give positive results. But relative novices in the administration of a new drug could inadvertently, unintentionally or through ignorance make a useful drug appear to be worthless.

II. REGARDING THE SUBSTANCE ITSELF, ITS DISCOVERER AND HIS ASSOCIATES

In its efforts to cast doubt on krebiozen, the American Cancer Society intimates that the very existence of this drug is problematical. And this in the face of certain established evidence of its chemical composition. To this end, it also attempts to create suspicion as to the character, methods and intentions of its discoverer, Dr. Stevan Durovic, and as to the motives and professional competence of physicians taking part in its experimental application.

It ignores and misrepresents the great amount of material published about Krebiozen during the past 8 years—material which includes accounts of the theory on which this drug is based, its process of manufacture, and what has been learned as to its chemistry.

Most glaring of all is the failure of the American Cancer Society even to refer to the great number of patients treated with Krebiozen, many of whom have gained positive results.

Thus, asking the question, "What is Krebiozen?" the American Cancer Society completely balks the true answer and calculatingly or out of ignorance, perverts the issue.

Krebiozen is a substance produced on the basis of a new concept of what cancer is and how it should be treated.

According to this theory, every living cell produces, among other substances, one which regulates its growth. If for any reason a cell is injured (by chemical, or physical means, for instance) so as to impair production of this substance, then such a cell becomes decontrolled and starts to divide. The result is a cancerous growth.

If this autogenous control factor—normally made by the cells themselves—can be supplied artificially, then the cancerous cell may be again controlled.

On the basis of this new approach, cells of healthy horses were stimulated by a growth factor (in this case an extract of actinomyces bovis, which causes rapid cell growth and division) in order to induce them to defend themselves by producing larger than normal quantities of the growth regulatory substance (Krebiozen).

Tried first on spontaneous tumors in animals, Krebiozen was found to be highly active against tumor growth. It was later established to have the same activity against human tumor; clinical trial demonstrating that the active single dose is 0.01 milligram of crude substance, which is dissolved in 1 cubic centimeter of mineral oil for administration.

It is important to note here that at the time of Krebiozen's discovery, no known substance was potent in such small amounts. Some years later, however, an even more potent substance was discovered in Aldosterone, a hormone produced by the adrenal glands and now used in the treatment of edema. In any case however, it has long been known that hormones act in the body in infinitestimal amounts.

On the basis of its biological activity as well as its chemical properties, Krebiozen is classified as a local hormone or autacoid.

The American Cancer Society paper deliberately disregards all of this scientific information and states only that Krebiozen is "an alleged anticancer drug said to have been produced by Dr. Steven Durovic." Nor does the American Cancer Society make any reference to the clinical investigation of Krebiozen, which in the number of patients and physicians involved, as well as in its duration, is probably the most extensive in the history of cancer research.

Since 1950, krebiozen has been used in the treatment of approximately 1,500 cancer patients by some hundreds of physicians in the United States and 29 foreign countries. The results can be summarized as follows:

1. A demonstrated activity in different dosages against all types of cancer.

2. Subjective improvement such as relief or complete abolition of pain in 70 percent of treated cases. Objective improvement ranging from decrease to complete disappearance of tumor in 50 percent of treated cases.

3. Of 500 hopeless patients treated 5 to 9 years, 10 percent have been free of detectible signs of cancer for 3 to 8 years.

The American Cancer Society chooses not to acquaint the public with these facts but continues that in making Krebiozen "Dr. Durovic claims that he injected 2,000 Argentinian horses with actinomyces bovis, a microorganism which causes 'lumpy jaw' in cattle, and from the blood of these infected horses he extracted two grams—about one-half teaspoonful—of a whitish powder which he named 'Krebiozen.'"

This is not accurate. The horses were injected with a sterile extract of actinomyces bovis. Hence the horses were not "infected." With this misleading statement, the American Cancer Society is trying to give the impression that Krebiozen is some concoction brewed from the blood of "infected" horses in impossibly small amounts. It is of a piece with what follows, namely that the "full details of the method of extraction have never been disclosed" and that Dr. Ivy has said that the "process of manufacturing Krebiozen has never been revealed."

These statements are also untrue.

Krebiozen is made by extracting the blood of injected horses with organic solvents (such as ether and benzene). The organic solvents are evaporated and the greasy-oily residue extracted with redistilled water, which when evaporated leaves Krebiozen powder.

These basic scientific steps were disclosed publicly in 1951 and have been published several times since. (Report of the Krebiozen Research Foundation, 1954; Observations on Krebiozen in the Management of Cancer, Ivy, Pick and Phillips, 1956; Medical Therapeutic Improvement of Canine Cataract, annual meeting of the Illinois Veterinary Association, February 1959.)

Dr. Ivy has never stated that this process has not been disclosed. He has said that the laboratory "flow sheet" or manufacturing details for krebiozen have not been revealed. Krebiozen is the property of Duga Laboratories, a pharmaceutical house incorporated in the State of Illinois, which financed the research leading to the drug's discovery. No pharmaceutical company reveals all of its manufacturing details on any substance.

Nevertheless, enough has been published regarding the manufacture of Krebiozen so that Dr. Ivy was able to make a batch of the drug from 46 horses in 1956, or to enable any other competent investigator to do the same thing.

Thus, it can be seen that the allegations of the American Cancer Society in this regard are false and directed not at an honest delineation of the actual situation but used to convince the public that Krebiozen is a "secret remedy." Having made this attempt, the American Cancer Society goes on to intimate that it may also be "nonexistent".

In this connection, it states "Dr. Durovic brought this powder [Krebiozen] to the United States. Here, without prior chemical analysis of the powder, he dissolved it in

No. 9 mineral oil in the ratio of 1 part of krebiozen to 100,000 parts mineral oil." And again, "He [Dr. Ivy] has neither seen or analyzed the original substance in the undissolved state."

Here, the American Cancer Society makes use of two statements which are technically correct to bolster its previous false statement that "the chemical composition of Krebiozen remains unknown" and to mislead the reader as to the scientific competence of Drs. Ivy, Durovic, and associates.

As a matter of fact, Dr. Durovic's procedure in dissolving krebiozen in mineral oil was correct and customary in science. In dealing with a new substance, the usual practice is not to spend time and money on chemical analysis until it is first shown that the product is active. For example, insulin was discovered and introduced in therapy in 1924 but its chemical formula was not established until 1956.

The basic chemical composition of Krebiozen was determined in 1952 and announced in 1953. Additional data was published in 1956. Further chemical analysis showed that Krebiozen is a lipopolysaccharide (a complex sugar linked to a fatty molecule). This gradual accumulation of chemical data regarding Krebiozen is similar to the progress made with insulin and cortisone and is in the best scientific tradition.

It is correct that Dr. Ivy did not chemically analyze Krebiozen powder before it was dissolved in mineral oil. But he did analyze it after it had been reextracted from the mineral oil.

The reader (of the American Cancer Society document), however, is meant to conclude that Krebiozen has never been chemically analyzed and that such analysis is necessary to show that the product is of value in treating cancer patients: none of which is true.

To reinforce the false impression it tries to create regarding Krebiozen, the American Cancer Society points out that two chemists, Drs. Paul Kirk, of the University of California, and Arthur Furst, of Stanford University, testified in 1958 that Krebiozen is nothing but nujol.

Dr. Kirk stated he received six ampules from Dr. Batchelder, chairman of the American Cancer Society division in San Francisco. Dr. Furst testified that he found one ampule at Stanford University and that another ampule was given him by the same Dr. Batchelder (scientific procurement?). As an experimental drug Krebiozen can only be obtained from the Krebiozen Research Foundation. Neither Dr. Kirk, Dr. Furst, nor Dr. Batchelder ever requested Krebiozen and none was ever sent to them by the Krebiozen Research Foundation.

Dr. Kirk also testified that by infrared spectroscopy he detected something other than mineral oil. In the next breath he denied finding anything but nujol.

Dr. Kirk was quick to qualify his testimony by saying, "The net results of these various tests has convinced me that at least the ampules I received—I don't know a thing about any samples except what I examined—but that the samples I received consist of good grade mineral oil." Thus, after this bold yet bland foray denying the very existence of krebiozen, Dr. Kirk sought to exculpate himself from legal consequences by saying, "I don't know anything about any samples except what I examined." He did not wish to be held accountable for any statement about Krebiozen in general but only regarding the six ampules which he used for his purported tests and which are no longer available, thus making it impossible to check the verisimilitude of Dr. Kirk's statements.

Still more striking is the testimony of Dr. Furst that he received only two ampules of Krebiozen, and with these two ampules made the following tests: (1) The ultraviolet spectrum; (2) several chemical tests; (3) extractions; (4) toxicity studies on animals; (5) therapeutic tests against sarcoma 180 in mice; and (6) therapeutic tests on Ehrlich tumor in mice. It is inconceivable that these tests could be done with two ampules of Krebiozen. To show how ridiculous Dr. Furst's statements are, it is enough to point out that only to perform the toxicological test, he would have had to inject 12 animals daily for 1 month. For this one test alone a minimum of 360 ampules of Krebiozen would have been required.

In any case, the testimony of these two chemists, referred to in the American Cancer Society report as "distinguished," is chemically preposterous, if indeed, they analyzed krebiozen ampules as they swore under oath they did. Krebiozen is dissolved in No. 9 light mineral oil. These men testified that the ampules they analyzed contained "nothing but nujol" which is heavy mineral oil. Since Krebiozen never was dissolved in nujol, but only in light mineral oil No. 9, which is quite different, what is to be inferred about the ability of chemists who cannot distinguish light and heavy mineral oil, which are so different that any schoolboy could tell one from the other.

Dr. Ivy challenged this testimony in an affidavit stating that either he or these two chemists were lying. Since statements of all three had been made under oath, he urged that the record of this hearing be submitted to a grand jury for a determination of perjury.

But the most significant point in all this mysterious analysis is the Machiavellian role played by the American Cancer Society. Dr. Batchelder, an official of the American Cancer Society, arranged this analysis. The testimony of Drs. Furst and Kirk was widely publicized in May 1958, just prior to the time when the American Cancer Society was reported ready to announce decision on our proposal for testing Krebiozen. Dr. Ivy's demand for a determination of perjury upset what was apparently a prearranged plan to use this testimony as the basis for the American Cancer Society refusal to test Krebiozen. The final American Cancer Society announcement to this effect was thus delayed until October when it was said that our proposal was "unscientific."

It is precisely this sort of unscientific maneuvering which underscores the need for the controlled "double-blind" test proposed by the Krebiozen Foundation. How incredible it is that the American Cancer Society can affect such concern as to whether the scientific community would accept this type of test, yet does not hesitate to offer testimony of the sort given by Drs. Kirk and Furst as proof that Krebiozen does not merit testing at all.

To bolster the impression that Krebiozen is ineffective, the author of the American Cancer Society paper cites the work of John B. Loeffer, Ph. D., who reported in the Journal of the American Medical Association on May 17, 1952, that Krebiozen failed to affect transplanted mouse leukemia and lymphosarcoma.

Krebiozen does not effect transplanted animal tumors and was never claimed to do so. This was established at the very beginning of our work with this drug and was reported by us in 1951 in the initial publication on Krebiozen. Thus, Dr. Loeffer's work only confirmed our own and if the American Cancer Society publication had been honest, it would have been referred to, if at all, in this sense.

The American Cancer Society paper makes much of the fact that publications concerning Krebiozen research have been privately printed and that Dr. Durovic, a research scientist, has published nothing in U.S. scientific journals during his 10 years in this country. The implication is that there is something blameworthy in these facts.

And indeed there is. But it does not accrue to Dr. Ivy and his collaborators or to Dr. Durovic.

The real fact is that all publication on Krebiozen in the medical literature has been systematically blocked—through the exercise of bureaucratic control by the American Cancer Society and the American Medical Association over the scientific community.

Publication of a report on 40 cases treated with Krebiozen at the Lankenau Institute has not been permitted. Ths report written by the man who treated these patients is still being suppressed.

Dr. Ivy is the author of 1,500 scientific papers, 65 of them accepted for publication since the time he has been working with Krebiozen. Yet he has never succeeded in publishing one article in a medical journal on krebiozen.

The monograph on this subject written by Drs. Ivy, Pick and Phillips was initially accepted by a medical journal but was later returned after pressure was brought to bear on the publisher. It was subsequently rejected by two other journals and in the end was published by a nonmedical publisher, Henry Regnery, Chicago.

If Dr. Ivy, prominent as he is, failed in this regard is it any wonder that Dr. Durovic, a stranger and a man under heavy calculated fire almost since his entry into the United States, could not succeed in securing publication for his articles. The latest attempt by Dr. Durovic to gain scientific publication was in December 1958 when he submitted to General Practitioner a very substantial article on the activity of Krebiozen against spontaneous tumors in animals. The article was rejected.

Needless to say, the American Cancer Society paper omits all reference to these facts. It never fails however, to identify men who have submitted unfavorable reports on Krebiozen as distinguished scientists. Those who have taken part in Krebiozen research are scarcely identified at all.

Dr. John F. Pick, of Chicago, for instance, is dismissed as a plastic surgeon; Dr. Louis R. Krasno, as a researcher in antibiotic dusts.

The American Cancer Society almost pointedly refrains from telling its readers that Dr. Pick is one of America's most eminent plastic surgeons, internationally recognized, author of a standard text "The Surgery of Repair" and well known for his demonstration among prisoners at Stateville penitentiary, Joliet, Ill., of the role of facial deformity in the genesis of criminality. This involved corrective surgery on more than 1,000 men and aided the rehabilitation of most, a feat for which Dr. Pick has been honored by the John Howard Organization, and scientific as well as legal groups the world over.

The American Cancer Society paper also omits mention of the fact that Dr. Krasno's work with penicillin dust won medal awards from both the Illinois State and the American Medical Associations in the year of its presentation. Nor does the American Cancer Society inform its readers that Dr. Krasno, a pioneer in aviation medicine, is currently director of medical research for United Airlines.

In support of its thesis that there is something questionable about those who have developed Krebiozen, the American Cancer Society attempts to indicate that they have avoided customary procedures for the patenting and marketing of substances designed for use in therapy. In this connection the American Cancer Society paper comments (1) on the status of the Krebiozen patent application, and (2) on licensing procedures.

As to the first it states: "Some years ago, the owners of krebiozen applied for a patent but when the U.S. Patent Office returned the

application with request for further information, the owners of Krebiozen failed to supply this information and did not resubmit their application. Hence, there is no patent or new application for a patent on Krebiozen, either the substance or the process, in the files of the U.S. Patent Office, as of January 1959."

This statement is false.

Dr. Durovic first filed for a patent (No. 254985) November 5, 1951. This application has been amended three times and is still pending under continuation dated May 5, 1958, with the serial No. 732785.

The American Cancer Society discussion of the problem of licensing is intentionally misleading, directed at making the reader believe that application to license Krebiozen for sale has never been made.

The facts are as follows:

The matter of whether Krebiozen is subject to the jurisdiction of the Public Health Service, which licenses serums and vaccines, or to that of the Food and Drug Administration, which licenses drugs, is in dispute.

The Duga Laboratories holds Krebiozen, by theory and chemical properties, to be a hormone and therefore subject to the Food and Drug Administration. In 1954 application for license was filed with this agency together with all necessary data for obtaining it. The Food and Drug Administration first accepted this filing under No. 9368, but later refused either to grant or deny a license and advised Duga Laboratories to submit Krebiozen to the jurisdiction of the Public Health Service.

The reasons for the Food and Drug Administration handling of the Krebiozen licensing application are plain to any one who knows the regulations governing the two agencies but they must be explained for the general reader who is not familiar with the technicalities of such procedures.

Under Food and Drug Administration rules, license is granted on a showing that the drug in question is not toxic in the prescribed dose. A showing of activity is not required. Petition for license must be passed on within 60 days. If the petition is not denied in this time, the drug is considered to be licensed. If the petition is refused, the decision is subject to court review if appealed.

Under Public Health Service regulations, however, proof of activity of the substance for which licensing is requested must be given. Furthermore, no time limit is set for decision, making it possible for the Public Health Service to hold up a license indefinitely. And lastly, no recourse to the courts is provided, either to force a decision or to appeal one which is unjust.

In view of the existing controversy over krebiozen and the prejudice against it, we believe that our clinical evidence would not be given consideration on its merits by the Public Health Service. And if this agency rendered an unjust decision, we would have no possibility of court action to rectify it.

This is the true statement of facts which the American Cancer Society distorts in order to convince their readers that the nature of Krebiozen is so questionable that its owners have not dared subject it to scrutiny of Government agencies even for their own protection.

Similarly, the American Cancer Society totally misrepresents the financial aspects of the Krebiozen problem.

As to the Krebiozen Research Foundation, the American Cancer Society paper states: "The Foundation Library Center reports that the Krebiozen Research Foundation has not published a list of officers, a report of activities, or a financial statement."

Under its articles of incorporation, the foundation must submit each year a list of its officers and a statement of its purposes to the Illinois Secretary of State. A financial statement is filed each year with the U.S. Department of Internal Revenue, where it is open for inspection like all income tax reports of not-for-profit organizations. In view of this, it is not at all clear why the American Cancer Society picks out of thin air the Foundation Library Center, as its "authorized" source rather than the official agencies.

For 5 years Krebiozen was given free and the cost of maintaining the office of the foundation, and of packing and shipping the drug to the doctors administering it and supplying forms for clinical reports, were paid by the Durovics.

In 1954, the foundation was told that the Durovics no longer were in a financial position to support the full cost of the foundation, and the foundation then agreed to accept contributions from patients or their relatives and friends who were financially able and willing to contribute toward the cost of supplying the drug. The foundation always had made it clear, however, that if the patient was unable to do so, it still would continue to supply the drug free of charge. Today about 60 percent of patients still receive the drug free. Relatively few contribute the production cost of the drug given them, and whatever revenue is raised from this source is used exclusively to maintain further experimentation.

No official of the foundation has ever received any compensation for his work. They rely on other sources entirely for their livelihood. All this is omitted in the American Cancer Society paper.

As for Dr. Durovic and his brother, who have borne almost alone the full cost of the foundation's activity in making Krebiozen available to those whom it might help, the American Cancer Society remarks:

"These individuals have made clear that they wish to recoup from the sale of the substance an investment claimed to be about $2 million and that they intend to sell the substance for profit as a proprietary drug."

Krebiozen was developed entirely at the expense of Duga Laboratories. If it should prove useful in the treatment of cancer, and commercialized, why should not Duga Laboratories, a pharmaceutical house, at least get back its investment? Is this not customary in every country outside Communist rule, and is it not the very basis of our American system of free enterprise?

In a further personal attack on the Durovics, the American Cancer Society declares: "The owners of Krebiozen have repeatedly petitioned health organizations supported by public funds to underwrite a test of the therapeutic activity of Krebiozen in collaboration with them. They hoped to use public funds to defray the cost, estimated at $500,000 or more, of testing this privately owned substance."

This is not correct.

Indeed, the whole discussion on this point is an intentional misrepresentation of the letter and the spirit of the effort to settle the Krebiozen controversy by means of a definitive test. As a matter of fact, the owners of Krebiozen have never petitioned anyone to test Krebiozen. The American Cancer Society invited the Krebiozen Research Foundation to submit a proposal for a test. Senator PAUL DOUGLAS asked the Public Health Service to give Krebiozen a fair test. Dr. Ivy requested the American Medical Association to cooperate in a fair test of Krebiozen. This is not to deny, however, that Dr. Durovic and his brother are eager to see such a test performed by one or other of these agencies, not in order that they defray the expense, but because they (the Durovics) still believe these agencies ostensibly competent to supervise it.

The indication in the American Cancer Society paper that "unproven methods or substances militate against possible cure of cancer by acceptable methods known at present" is misleading. The methods known at present, including surgery and X-ray, are unfortunately nothing more than palliatives. These are necessary and must be used until something better is found, but they are not in any way the final goal and answer to ultimate cancer therapy.

Krebiozen is a pioneer substance which opens a new approach to the problem of cancer. It is not destined to exclude surgery where it is indicated. As a matter of fact, until now Krebiozen has been used chiefly in cases where all "acceptable methods" have failed.

Unlike the American Cancer Society, Drs. Ivy and Durovic are very conservative about the use of the word "cure." What they do maintain, however, is that Krebiozen represents a very significant advance in the cancer field and that Krebiozen therapy is different in principle from any other now used against cancer.

These are all destructive, and too often self-defeating; as for example, the excision of cancerous tissue by surgery or its destruction by radiation. Krebiozen alone has a reparative function and represents an attempt to solve the biological problem of cancer on a biological basis, by supplying the substance which normally prevents cells from becoming cancerous. ("Observations on Krebiozen in the Management of Cancer," Drs. Ivy, Pick and Phillips, Henry Regnery & Co., 1956.)

Dr. Durovic began the work leading to the discovery of Krebiozen 27 years ago. When Dr. Ivy first presented Krebiozen and the ideas on which it is based in 1951, many serious scientists considered them "nonsensical." Then surgery, X-ray and more powerful forms of radiation, and cell-destroying chemicals were the best hope of cancer research. Today it is a consoling fact to Drs. Ivy, Durovic, and their associates, that their concept of a natural defense against cancer which may be exploited for the benefit of the cancer patient, is accepted in the scientific world by both friends and enemies of Krebiozen. As example we may cite the words of Dr. Warren H. Cole, president-elect of American Cancer Society and man who has twice turned thumbs down on Krebiozen. Writing in the Journal of the American Medical Association of April 11, 1959, Dr. Cole remarked: "Evidence of the occurrence of spontaneous regression of cancer supports the concept of biological control of cancer and reinforces the hope that more satisfactory methods of treating cancer than surgery and/or radiation may be found in future years."

Even more significant is the work reported last year by the Sloan-Kettering Institute. The American Cancer Society ignores its relationship to Krebiozen. Nevertheless this was known to the American Cancer Society, if from no other source, from the following letter sent on July 22, 1958, by Dr. Ivy to Dr. Harold S. Diehl, American Cancer Society vice president for research and medical affairs.

"I have just completed a study of the June 1958 'Progress Report of the Sloan-Kettering Institue for Cancer Research' which reviews their studies on the natural, body defense mechanisms against cancer.

"An understanding of this report emphasizes anew the importance of facilitating the performance of the 'double blind' controlled study of Krebiozen recommended in February 1958 to the American Cancer Society by the Krebiozen Research Foundation. The Sloan-Kettering report, as far as it goes, confirms in detail the theory on which krebiozen was produced, and provides additional evidence showing why our contention, that Krebiozen is therapeutically active in some cancer patients, should be correct.

"Since 1925, I have pointed out to my students that, physiologically, cancer is most likely due to the abnormal repair of an

injury of some type, that the body must have some mechanisms for resistance against cancer, and that the only real hope we possess that cancer can be cured is the observation that perhaps in 1 out of 100,000 cases the body of the patient cures itself of cancer. For this reason, I have maintained since 1945 that great research emphasis should be placed on a study of the body mechanisms which provide resistance to the onset, invasion, and metastasis of cancer. As a member and executive director of the National Advisory Cancer Council, I urged that research on the immunology and virology of cancer be energetically promoted.

"This thinking, however, was not new. As stated in a publication in 1956[1] 'the evidences for the existence of a natural resistance to cancer are numerous.' Many of these evidences were recorded years ago. By 1949 I had reviewed the entire literature to obtain a clue on which to start an investigation of the natural body defenses against cancer.

"It was at this time that Dr. Stevan Durovic came to me with a scientifically rational theory regarding the natural defensive mechanisms of the body against cancer, and a therapeutic product which had caused the liquefaction and disappearance of spontaneous tumors in some dogs and cats. The product was nontoxic per se. I believed a substance which regulated growth, which resisted the abnormal repair of injury, and which was secreted by the reticuloendothelial cells in response to an appropriate stimulation, should be nontoxic.

"Dr. Durovic theorized that 'Krebiozen is present especially in the reticuloendothelial (RE) cells, which as is well known, react to various stimuli. When these cells are appropriately stimulated, Krebiozen, which is not present in the blood (except in traces perhaps) under normal conditions, is released and can be extracted from the blood plasma' [1, 2]. To stimulate the RE cells, he chose an extract of actinomyces bovis, a mold which causes a tumor consisting in part of RE cells. He theorized that since this organism stimulates RE cells to multiply, it should cause RE cells to increase their secretion of an antitumor or anticancer factor into the bloodstream from which it could be extracted. He used an organic or a fat solvent, like benzene or ether, which is logical because certain psysiological active substances in RE cells are soluble in such fat solvents, as well as in water. After evaporating the organic solvent Krebiozen was extracted by water from the fatty residue.

"In our [Ivy, Pick, Phillips] monograph published in 1956 [1], it was stated: 'Since the start of this [the Krebiozen] investigation, and especially since 1951, we have been gratified to note the growing interest in the problem of the mechanisms concerned in providing the body with a natural resistance to cancer and how this resistance may be increased * * *.'

"It is gratifying to read in the Sloan-Kettering report the statement that 'There is reason now to believe that natural defenses against cancer exist. It has proved possible, by manipulating and enhancing these defenses, to cure laboratory animals with some types of transplanted cancer.'

"It is further stated in the Sloan-Kettering report, that 'different kinds of cancer may stimulate a common cancer resistance factor, or that different kinds of cancer have something in common that stimulates bodily resistance.' This agrees with our observations that krebiozen is of value in the treatment of some patients who have different types of cancer.

"More pertinent to the Krebiozen theory and our therapeutic observations are the statements in the Sloan-Kettering report 'that zymosan does not inhibit the cancer directly but acts in some way in mice to enhance their natural defenses, tipping the scales in favor of the endangered host and against the cancer,' and that 'zymosan, unfortunately, is too toxic in many for clinical use.' Zymosan represents a substance extracted from yeast. Actinomyces bovis is a mold, a relative of the yeasts. When an extract of actinomyces bovis is injected into mice with tumors, some tumors liquefy and slough out. But, the extract of actinomyces bovis, like zymosan, is too toxic to use on man. But, Dr. Durovic, to avoid this toxicity, injects horses with the actinomyces bovis extract, making the horses slightly ill, so that the RE cells secrete the resistance factor, 'Krebiozen,' into the blood from which it is extracted, and finally made ready to be given to the cancer patient without making the patient sick. Theoretically, zymosan, if injected into a horse, might also cause the secretion of Krebiozen into the blood.

"It is also very interesting to note in the Sloan-Kettering report that the substance called cytolipin H in cancer cells which stirs up body resistance in a person without cancer consists of 'two molecules of fat hooked to two molecules of sugar.' In 1956 we reported that the microchemical analysis of Krebiozen indicated that it could be a polysaccharide (a sugar-like substance) and a steroid (a fatty-like substance).[2] Since then further studies indicate that Krebiozen is most probably a polyhydroxycarboxylic acid or acids with some evidence of esterification. That is, a polysaccharide joined to or mixed with a fatty substance.

"The Sloan-Kettering report in summary states: 'If the hunches and hopes of the Sloan-Kettering researchers are fulfilled by further work, then these achievements could signal a major triumph.'

"It should now be clearly evident why I stated above that the Sloan-Kettering report emphasizes anew the importance of facilitating the performance of the 'double-blind' test by an arbitration type of committee. If the proposal of the Krebiozen Research Foundation is approved by the society, then the question of the value of Krebiozen can be quickly settled.

"Whereas the Sloan-Kettering report states that as yet no application of their discoveries can be made for the benefit of cancer patients, we believe we have at hand a practical weapon against cancer which was produced on the basis of the same theory on which they are now working. Furthermore, I believe if the financial resources were available that the production of Krebiozen could be markedly improved. I said in 1951, it may prove to be a key to 'the cure' and perhaps the prevention of cancer.

"In view of these considerations I should like to emphasize the great responsibility which now confronts the American Cancer Society. It is and has been my considered and sincere conviction that Krebiozen represents the only presently available fruit of this new understanding of the problem of cancer to which the Sloan-Kettering researchers are contributing so outstandingly.

"Krebiozen has already been withheld unnecessarily for several years from many cancer patients whom it might help, through no fault of our own, but by the excuses of pseudo-critics.

"The decision of the American Cancer Society will determine whether Krebiozen will be withheld still longer from use in cancer therapy until other workers slowly and laboriously duplicate our work in toto. This decision is a grave responsibility."

III. REGARDING PREVIOUS PURPORTED EVALUATION OF THE DRUG MADE BY THE AGENCIES OF ORGANIZED MEDICINE

In the section captioned "Has Krebiozen Ever Been Tested?" the American Cancer Society paper cites (a) the status report on Krebiozen of the AMA committee on research; (b) the report of the committee on cancer diagnosis and therapy of the National Research Council; (c) the report of a committee of six physicians, headed by Dr. Warren Cole, of the University of Illinois, commonly referred to as "the Cole committee report"; and (d) the opinion of Dr. Stanley Reimann, former director of the Lankenau Cancer Institute, Philadelphia, Pa.

All these reports and evaluations are presented in such a manner as to give a misleading impression that Krebiozen was thoroughly, scientifically, and honestly tested by authoritative institutions and found worthless. The American Cancer Society paper gives not the least indication that any of these reports and evaluations have ever been challenged nor of the circumstances surrounding them, though it has in its possession evidence showing how much of pressure, prejudice, and dishonesty went into their writing.

We present the facts in these matters. They are supported by uncontroverted documentation and testimony given under oath.

(a) "The Status Report of the Committee on Research of the Council of Pharmacy and Chemistry of the AMA" dealt with 100 cases allegedly treated with Krebiozen.

One-fourth of this report—24 case histories—was forged. The secretary of the committee, Dr. Paul Wermer, and Dr. Henry Szujewski, a young Chicago physician then only 2½ years in practice, simply elaborated out of whole cloth fictitious clinical histories for these patients. They used the names and diagnoses of patients treated by another physician, who had been sent to Dr. Szujewski along with other patients for enzyme tests, and on this basis they fabricated 24 case histories denying any beneficial effects to Krebiozen and stating that all these patients were dead or dying.

As a matter of fact, these 24 patients were the patients of Dr. William F. P. Phillips, one of the coauthors with Dr. Ivy of the monograph "Observations on Krebiozen in the Management of Cancer." Dr. Phillips treated these patients with Krebiozen, made full clinical records, and regularly reported his findings to the Krebiozen Research Foundation, and his reports on these patients are highly favorable.

When called as an adverse witness before the commission of the Illinois General Assembly investigating the krebiozen controversy, Dr. Szujewski admitted under oath that he had never treated any patient with Krebiozen.

This falsification was discovered when the commission subpenaed the AMA file on Krebiozen, and the patients identified. Ten of those declared dead or dying by the AMA in 1951, then in 1953 appeared before the Commission and filed the following protest:

"The Honorable WILLIAM E. POLLACK,
"Chairman, Krebiozen Investigating Commission, Chicago, Ill.

"DEAR MR. POLLACK: We have learned that Dr. Paul Wermer of the AMA in his affidavit to the commission has referred to Dr. Henry Szujewski who indicated that the Krebiozen patients whose blood was examined by him were dead or dying.

"We the undersigned were among those Krebiozen patients and herewith certify that we are alive and in good health for over 3 years.

"We desire to point out that such a false report could be a source of serious embarrassment to us in our social and business activi-

[1] Ivy, A. C., J. F. Pick, and Wm. F. P. Phillips: "Observations on Krebiozen in the Management of Cancer," published by H. Regnery, Chicago, 1956.

[2] Ivy, A. C.: "Krebiozen: An Agent for the Treatment of Malignant Tumors: Investigation of Clinical Activity," Chicago, 1951.

ties. Accordingly, we desire to file our protest with the commission.

"Yours sincerely,

"Mrs. Julia Howard, 2427 Bernice Avenue; Cecile Luebkemann, 2442 Rosemont; Mrs. Catherine Firnstal, 6205 North Oakley; Irene O. Kibby, 1830 North Byron Street; A. M. Howard; Eleanor Gahan, 1619 West Garfield Boulevard; Helen Arndt; Magda Johansen, 3810 North Roy Street; Evelyn Vogel, 1820 Nelson Street; Irene R. Pietrowicz, 3407 North Lowell Avenue."

Today, after 8 years, seven of these patients, all residents of Chicago, are free of cancer.

Of the remaining 76 cases dealt with in the status report, 40 were so close to death that they survived only long enough to receive two ampules of Krebiozen. (The first two ampules are administered 72 hours apart.) Of the remaining 36 cases, 23 were so close to death that they received only four ampules of Krebiozen. (Our patients have received an average of 80 ampules each.)

Excluding the 24 fabricated cases, the AMA report was based entirely on selected negative cases. Meanwhile, and this is very significant, the AMA had in its possession 140 clinical histories of patients treated in outstanding scientific and medical centers throughout the country, including 6 large university clinics and 2 world-famous medical centers. These reports were almost uniformly favorable to Krebiozen, and had been supplied the AMA in ample time to be included in its Status Report but the AMA did not include one of them. Thus, it is obvious that the AMA never intended that Krebiozen be honestly and scientifically evaluated, but that its report was and is a smear report.

The statement in the American Cancer Society paper that the case records for the Status Report were examined at the request of Dr. Ivy and his associates at the Krebiozen Research Foundation is untrue.

It is ridiculous to say or to suppose that Dr. Ivy or his associates requested that phony case histories should be reviewed or that they intentionally selected 100 negative cases, when our foundation had been regularly receiving favorable reports from some of the finest physicians in this country.

* * * * *

The records of the Legislative Commission show that an attempt to secure financial rights to Krebiozen and control of its commercial exploitation preceded publication of the AMA's Status Report. These facts, taken from sworn testimony and written material accepted in evidence by the Commission, were never denied under oath, though those concerned were given full opportunity to do so.

A group of businessmen headed by Mr. Edwin R. Moore, president of the Bell & Gossett Co., Morton Grove, Ill., attempted to use their acquaintance with the Durovics to gain financial control of Krebiozen. It should be borne in mind that these individuals had in no way contributed to the development of the drug financially or otherwise.

They enlisted the aid of Dr. J. J. Moore, then treasurer of the AMA, who brought pressure on the Durovics to give the financial exploitation of Krebiozen to these men. Dr. Moore had a very bitter discussion on this subject with Mr. Marko Durovic, as was testified to under oath by the interpreter Dr. Moore brought with him on this occasion. Subsequently, the Durovics were warned that the AMA would destroy krebiozen unless they made a financial arrangement with Mr. Edwin Moore.

When this warning was ignored, Dr. George Lull, secretary and general manager of the AMA, stated to the press: "The American Medical Association has begun a critical study of Krebiozen, the experimental cancer drug, and will issue a public report on its findings within the next 6 weeks."

Shortly thereafter, Franklin Bing, a former secretary of the AMA Council on Foods and Nutrition, wrote to Dr. Ivy informing him that he would be ruined unless he offered the AMA for publication a letter stating "Krebiozen has no value in the treatment of cancer." He offered Dr. Ivy a dubious recompense—let him first deny Krebiozen publicly and then he might—if he wished—continue his research on it in secret. Probably no scientist ever received a more astonishing or cynical suggestion. Dr. Ivy refused. This refusal was the real reason why the Chicago Medical Society was stirred up to discipline Dr. Ivy. The formal reasons—those given to the profession and the public—were merely invented and were on their face ridiculous, as the then president of the Chicago Medical Society tacitly admitted when he said the society's action against Dr. Ivy was a big mistake.

Thus the reason for the AMA "Status Report on Krebiozen" is apparent. It was never intended as a true evaluation of this drug. It had only one purpose, to destroy Krebiozen, whatever the consequences to science and humanity.

The transcript of the hearings of the Illinois Legislative Commission investigating the Krebiozen controversy contains the full record of this matter.

* * * * *

(b) As further evidence that Krebiozen has been tested and found worthless, the American Cancer Society paper cites the "Report of the Committee on Cancer Diagnosis and Therapy of the National Research Council," chairmaned by Dr. Ira T. Nathanson, who was also one of the collaborators on the AMA's status report.

The American Cancer Society paper attempts to convey the idea that this National Research Council Committee tested krebiozen. Actually, it did no such thing. It did not make a test. It only endorsed the forged report of the AMA. In 1954, Miss Isabella Wason, executive secretary of the committee, stated: "Dr. Ivy sent us Krebiozen to use in clinical trials, but it was not used."

* * * * *

(c) The society's paper also refers to the committee of six physicians headed by Dr. Warren Cole and known as the Cole committee. The report of this commitee presented as unfavorable to Krebiozen but the American Cancer Society paper omits two salient facts: (1) That this report recognized that krebiozen has some activity in the cancer patient, and (2) that this report was composed of two parts, one of which contradicts the other. The "Summary and Conclusions," which is substantially negative for Krebiozen, except that it recognizes its activity, was given wide publicity. The other part of the report, in which the evidence is analyzed, was marked "confidential," and was not published or released to the public until it was called in by the legislative commission. This part contains favorable evidence regarding the effect of Krebiozen against cancer. Indeed, the conclusions of the report do not seem to follow the findings. Here is one example:

In the published part, in "conclusions," the Cole committee report states: "We have been presented with no histological evidence by Dr. Ivy that the material produced degenerative or regressive changes in tumor cells."

In the confidential findings it is stated: "Microscopic slides were examined on nine patients, of whom six were included in the series of patients demonstrated to us * * * We concurred in the diagnosis of all except one patient. In this patient we considered the slide following Krebiozen therapy was negative for malignancy instead of positive as reported to us. Accordingly this difference in opinion does not reflect disadvantageously on Krebiozen therapy, but might reflect advantageously."

In this connection it should be emphasized that among the slides of the nine patients were, besides the case mentioned above, four others which were negative for malignancy. In other words, of nine patients in the diagnosis of whose slides the committee concurred, a total of five were negative for malignancy.

A fact worthwhile mentioning is that at the time the conclusions of the Cole committee were published, this report bore only the signature of its chairman, Dr. Cole. It was revealed at the legislative hearings that a plain signature sheet had been circulated to the other members, who signed without even reading the report.

* * * * *

(d) As fourth evidence which it seeks to use in establishing the ineffectiveness of Krebiozen, the American Cancer Society "Paper" quotes Dr. Stanley P. Reimann, director of the Institute for Cancer Research, Philadelphia, Pa., as saying, "We now know we have cured no patient [with Krebiozen] and we don't believe the length of life has been prolonged on any we have treated." The files of the Krebiozen Research Foundation reveal that shortly after Dr. Reimann made this statement discounting the effects of Krebiozen, we received a letter from the Institute stating, "We have had quite a bit of pressure here, even to the extent that for the benefit of the press Dr. Reimann felt it necessary to make a statement that we were discontinuing any further extensive clinical evaluation of the material."

At the Lankenau Cancer Research Institute, under supervision of Dr. Reimann, 21 months of experimentation was conducted with Krebiozen on 40 patients. The Institute presented a favorable report to the Krebiozen Research Foundation and the Cole committee, which confirmed the Krebiozen Research Foundation's mounting accumulation of case reports confirming Krebiozen's effectiveness. To show how warped is the view of the Reimann study of Krebiozen as presented by the American Cancer Society, we quote in part from the Reimann report as it was given to the Cole committee for review:

"In view of these observations of biological activity of this material [Krebiozen], we have been extremely interested in future possibilities of investigation.

"Our conclusions on the material to date, though quite preliminary, are that it is nontoxic per se and has definite biologic activity specifically against tumor cells either directly or indirectly, of sufficient degree to warrant continued investigation both clinically and more important from the basic investigation of its mode of action with the hope that improvements may be made or some further knowledge concerning the biologic factors controlling tumor growth may be contributed. Since this represents the first and only nontoxic chemical agent to show definite biologic activity of any degree against tumors of many types, it seems justifiable to encourage as much basic and clinical investigation as possible."

* * * * *

IV. REGARDING THE ATTITUDE OF NATIONAL CANCER INSTITUTE TOWARD A FAIR TEST OF KREBIOZEN PROPOSED BY SENATOR PAUL DOUGLAS, OF ILLINOIS

The American Cancer Society paper ends by expressing the hope that the "Krebiozen Research Foundation, Dr. Ivy, and Dr. Durovic * * * will recognize the integrity of the National Cancer Institute" and calls on us as a matter of duty to accept its proposal for the testing of Krebiozen.

This is a misrepresentation of the whole situation regarding our negotiations with the National Cancer Institute. We are and

have been eager to cooperate with the National Cancer Institute in a test which will determine the merits—if any—of Krebiozen. Unfortunately, the National Cancer Institute is unwilling to make such a test, despite public protestations to the contrary of its director, Dr. John R. Heller.

Since Dr. Heller has seen fit to tell the public and the Congress one thing while telling us another, we believe it our duty to present the record. The following is a summary of our conversations with the National Cancer Institute director undertaken in an effort to implement Senator DOUGLAS' proposal for the testing of krebiozen.

The Krebiozen Research Foundation and Dr. Ivy accepted the proposal of Senator DOUGLAS and at his invitation, Drs. Ivy and Durovic met in Washington with Dr. Heller, other members of the National Cancer Institute staff, and Mr. Frank McCulloch, the Senator's administrative assistant. This was on September 24, 1958.

At this meeting, it was unanimously agreed that the matter of giving Krebiozen a fair test be explored further and Dr. Heller suggested that the committee proposed by the Senator be enlarged to include five members instead of three.

Believing this suggestion was made in good faith, Drs. Ivy and Durovic accepted it since Dr. Heller apparently found no fault with the testing procedure suggested by Senator DOUGLAS. Nor did he at that time appear to question the principle of a joint committee.

At our next meeting on December 5, Dr. Heller for the first time declared that the committee he envisioned must be independent and that for this reason could not include Dr. Ivy, Dr. Heller agreed, however, that Dr. Ivy might serve as its consultant.

But as soon as Dr. Ivy stipulated the conditions under which he would serve this committee as consultant, Dr. Heller introduced a new feature and changed the function of the committee entirely from that of a testing committee to a committee which would decide whether a test of Krebiozen should be made or not.

He told Dr. Ivy in a letter of February 6, 1959, that prior to anything else the independent committee would have to examine the files of the Krebiozen Research Foundation and added:

"The committee could reach one of two major conclusions: (1) That the evidence of Krebiozen's effects is insufficient to recommend further clinical test, or (2) that a clinical test is recommended."

In other words the goal of Dr. Heller's succession of changes was apparently to create a situation which would relieve the National Cancer Institute of testing Krebiozen at all.

Thus, it is clear that in calling on us to comply with the conditions laid down by the National Cancer Institute for the testing of Krebiozen, the American Cancer Society is not advocating a test. What it is really asking is that we agree to accept as final, the opinion of still another committee.

If a sincere desire exists to determine the truth about Krebiozen, why should Dr. Ivy be excluded from such a committee?

Dr. Ivy, formerly executive director of the National Advisory Cancer Council and also a former director of the American Cancer Society, is an outstanding scientist, world-famous as a physiologist and author of hundreds of scientific papers. He represented world medicine as an expert witness at the Nuremberg trials on the subject of medical ethics and clinical investigation. Even his adversaries recognize that his integrity is unquestionable.

Dr. Ivy has experimented with Krebiozen for nearly 10 years. He has more knowledge of the dosage rate and the effect of the drug on various types of tumors than anyone else. In a committee of five, he would have only one vote, which could certainly not be decisive.

If Dr. Ivy had been a member of the AMA committee which prepared the status report on Krebiozen, the falsification and superficiality exhibited in this report would have been impossible.

If Dr. Ivy had been a member of the committe on diagnosis and therapy, this committee could never have issued an opinion indicating that it had tested Krebiozen when in fact it had not done so.

As a member of a committee to evaluate krebiozen, Dr. Ivy would at least safeguard the objectivity of its findings and guarantee their honesty.

If there were nothing else, the American Cancer Society paper in itself is evidence enough that some such guarantee is needed. In this connection we cite Senator DOUGLAS' reply to receipt of a copy of the American Cancer Society "Background Paper on Krebiozen," sent him by Dr. Diehl. We quote:

"Thank you for sending me a copy of the Cancer Society's background paper on krebiozen.

"With the final conclusion, that there should be a fair test, I obviously concur. That is what I have been urging right along.

"Perhaps it is a service to the efforts in this direction to have the summary you have made available.

"But I must respond in all frankness that your memorandum, if intended to be impartial, seems to me seriously deficient in several respects:

"(a) It refers to the results of the tests of Drs. Kirk and Furst (pp. 7–8), but takes no account of Dr. Ivy's rather devastating answer, a copy of which is enclosed;

"(b) It refers to the adverse findings of the AMA group, Dr. Reimann and the Cole Committee (pp. 8–10), without recognizing the critical analysis or rebuttals of these conclusions;

"(c) It gives a fleeting mention of the publications of Drs. Ivy, Pick, Phillips, and Krasno, without either identifying the publications or suggesting the general nature of their findings;

"(d) It makes no reference to the widespread treatment of patients in the intervening years and to the developing number of cases in which some positive results of treatment with Krebiozen have been observed. Some of these case histories, or brief summaries of them were given to Dr. Heller and his associates at the conferences you mention. Others were released in connection with the testimonial dinner to Dr. Ivy in February—when a number of patients who have apparently had amazing results from the treatment were on hand with their doctors;

"I do not assert these cases are a substitute for a fair and scientific test. I only suggest that the omission of any reference to them makes your selection of data for the memorandum appear quite one sided;

"(e) It sprinkles the words "propaganda," "promotion," "alleged," "ostensible," sufficiently through the text to give a rather hostile coloration to it all.

"In short, I regret that the memorandum is not more complete, better balanced and more objective. These deficiencies, I fear, no matter how unwitting, may do more to aggravate the fears and suspicions of prejudice that have made it difficult to reach a basis of agreement on a fair test.

"I end as I began by repeating my hope that we can somehow maximize the possibilities for the desired test—and not be content with rubbing salt in old wounds.

"I shall send a copy of this letter to Dr. Heller so that he may share the knowledge of my reactions to a brief reading of your memorandum."

Our answer shows why the American Medical Association, the American Cancer Society, and the National Cancer Institute—all of which have refused this test—are now insisting that we accept their alternative—a test by a so-called independent committee.

The record of organized medicine's opposition to Krebiozen, which has been outlined in this, our answer to the American Cancer Society, shows plainly that such a committee would be far from independent. Even if the physicians composing it were themselves not prejudiced against Krebiozen, they would be subject to outside pressures which in the past did not scruple to bring false witnesses against Krebiozen, organizations using their power and influence to hold into line men whose very careers depend on compliance.

Obviously, these organizations cannot admit at this late date that the campaign against Krebiozen, Dr. Ivy and his associates, begun by the American Medical Association in 1951 and carried on since by these other arms of organized medicine, was mistaken; that persecution and falsification have been invoked to nullify a genuine scientific effort in the cancer field.

This would be demonstrated beyond any doubt should Krebiozen be proved of value in the treatment of cancer via the double-blind test, where prejudice—for or against—is excluded by the very nature of the test. Hence, the refusal of the American Cancer Society to subject Krebiozen to this time-honored procedure.

Their real aim is to once again discredit Krebiozen without performing any test.

This is the reason behind their demand for an independent committee to pass on the patients' records of the Krebiozen Research Foundation; in fact, to avoid a test.

We submitted our file of 140 cases (all that we had at that time) to the AMA in 1951. The AMA did not use these records. Instead, they preferred to falsify 24 cases for their 100-case report. In 1953 we submitted to the Cole committee for evaluation our file on 500 cases, which were mostly favorable for Krebiozen. The Lankenau Cancer Institute submitted 40 cases to the same committee; the Tumor Clinic at Marquette University submitted 4 cases; 13 patients who were free of cancer after Krebiozen treatment were brought before this committee. All the Cole committee could determine from these highly favorable presentations was that "the substance [Krebiozen] was not entirely devoid of biological activity."

If we now submit our file to another committee controlled by the same people their attitude toward Krebiozen and our past experience would suggest that the only thing which could be expected would be the conclusion that Krebiozen does not merit a further test.

However, the Krebiozen Research Foundation has offered to submit its file to an arbitration type committee, once it has been agreed that this committee will perform the test suggested by Dr. Ivy and Senator DOUGLAS. At the same time the Krebiozen Research Foundation will be glad to present to the committee corresponding patients together with their physicians. We would then urge the committee to study our records as well as those on which the 100 case report of the AMA was based and of which we have photostatic copies. But to give our patient records to a loaded committee in advance of any agreement to test Krebiozen would simply be to write Krebiozen off.

It is significant to point out that most of the records of the Krebiozen Research Foundation are summarized in the monograph "Observations on Krebiozen in the Management of Cancer" published in 1956. This publication which is highly positive for Krebiozen of itself would be enough to indicate the value of Krebiozen and justify its further exploration and perfection. This publication was sent 3 years ago to all of these organizations and has been deliberately ignored.

CONCLUSIONS

1. All of the arguments supporting the negative stand of the American Medical Association, the American Cancer Society, and the National Cancer Institute toward Krebiozen are based on the AMA Status Report of 1951.

This report was based on partially falsified material and on completely superficial and misleading data (see pp. 19–22).

Therefore, this report does not have the most elementary requisite of an honest presentation and cannot serve as a scientific basis for the evaluation of Krebiozen.

2. Meanwhile Krebiozen has been tried clinically by three independent groups on a total of some 1,500 terminal cancer patients.

(a) Dr. Ivy and his group of collaborators in Chicago experimented the material on about 250 cancer patients.

(b) The Lankenau Cancer Institute, Philadelphia, tried the material on 40 patients.

(c) More than 300 physicians in hospitals, university clinics and medical centers throughout the country tested Krebiozen on more than 1,200 patients.

This work was directed by the Krebiozen Research Foundation, Chicago, under the scientific direction of Dr. Ivy and all data regarding these cases are in the files of the Krebiozen Research Foundation.

All three of these groups concluded:

(a) That Krebiozen showed beneficial activity against cancer in 70 percent of treated cases. To date, the Krebiozen Research Foundation can show some 52 previously terminal cases which are free of detectible cancer for the past 3 to 8 years.

(b) That Krebiozen is not toxic.

(3) The impossible situation of sustaining a negative stand against an apparently active anti-cancer agent and withholding it from cancer sufferers on the basis of falsified data from 1951 and without taking into consideration truthful data obtained before and after, is unprecedented and cannot be tolerated.

We respectfully call on the National Cancer Institute to accept the proposal made by Senator DOUGLAS for a fair test of Krebiozen in order to settle the controversy over this drug so that if it is active, as we consider it to be, it may be put at the disposal of cancer sufferers.

J. F. PICK, S.B., M.M.,
M.D., F.I.C.S., D.I.B.S.,
Secretary, Krebiozen Research Foundation.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, from this report above it is clear to me that it is the duty of this body in every possible way to back up the distinguished senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] in his attempt to have the merits of Krebiozen thoroughly investigated by the appropriate authorities.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, a little while ago I looked up a word in the dictionary; I had never encountered it before. It is the word "temerarious," which means "venturesome" or "bold." I suppose it also means "brash." So I suppose I am rather temerarious today to be opposing a measure which is sponsored by 64 or perhaps 67 Senators. But, Mr. President, that is not so unusual; I have done that often in 25 years in the Congress.

Today I oppose the pending joint resolution for what I esteem to be good, sound reasons.

I find comfort in the fact that so often Members of Congress who become sponsors of bills do not quite know the dimensions and the implications of the bills and how far they may go.

Nor do I yield to anyone, Mr. President, in my interest in the subject of human health in its every form and aspect. Having been beset when I was still in Congress by a malady which threatened my eyesight and, in fact, threatened my life, no person with such a background could be indifferent to the whole subject of human vitality and health. I have seen coronaries strike in my own family; I have seen apoplexy strike there; I have seen a great deal of bereavement in my family. So it shall never be said that I am indifferent to the subject of health and what it means to humankind, not only in our own country but in all the other countries of the world.

But, Mr. President, I am not so sentimental or emotional as to believe that the mere expenditure of dollars or the compounding of Federal agencies is peculiarly the answer. Certainly up to a point it is the answer; but I think we also reach the point where ofttimes we waste money and assume responsibilities which grow in almost direct proportion to the lack of good that sometimes is done.

I recall when we had the first appropriation, I believe, for the National Institute of Health—an appropriation of a little more than $2 million. At that time there was only one agency of that sort. I watched it grow; I watched its functions multiply. On one occasion in the Appropriations Committee I raised my voice and said that I should like to see some results for all the hundreds of millions of dollars which had been spent. I received from friends all over the country telephone calls to the effect that I must not talk that way, that I must just vote all the money which was requested.

I asked, "Where are the results?"

I think I heard it said, back in those early days, that 1 out of every 11 living persons would die of cancer. That statement was made 15 years ago. In 1959, 15 years later, I again hear it said that 1 out of every 11 living persons will die of cancer. I might be one of those to die from cancer; I do not know. Of course, I hope not. But then I go back and draw a line, and see all the hundreds of millions of dollars which have been spent for dental research, heart research, cancer research, rheumatism research, neuritis research, arthritis research, and all the rest. And then I ask, "Where are the results?"

Mr. President, I approve of research. I approve of it in its pure form, which sometimes becomes an academic exercise, when a scientist does not even know what he is looking for. I approve of that, too, because, as has been so well said here, good and fruitful things can come from research of that kind.

But I think ever so often we must stop, look, and listen; and I do so now, because—in the language used by my distinguished friend, the Senator from Minnesota—I think I am one of those who has "budget-itis"—which was the term he used.

Mr. President, I must say that I have never had "spender-itis"; I have never had "squander-itis." But I freely admit to having "budget-itis"; and there is a reason for it—because I have watched this Government in its every function grow.

In 1945—and I give only a simple example—the National Institute of Health received an appropriation of $2,835,000. What a modest sum. I have just now checked with the Budget Bureau; and I checked with the report on the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1960. I state the results—just for public health, $294 million, plus $20 million, plus $60 million—or a total of $374 million. That is a long way from less than $3 million 15 years ago.

These agencies have a way of growing. Does anyone think the program now under discussion will stop with the $50 million which is now requested for it? Mr. President, it will do nothing of the kind, unless it belies every experience with which I have become familiar, of every agency in Government over a period over a period of 25 years.

Let us not fool ourselves. This is going to grow. As a matter of fact, the Surgeon General, whose testimony is available, said that as of now he could only estimate $7½ million. But there is authorized in the bill $50 million annually—every year. It makes a difference.

Yes; I have budgetitis. I do not want to see this charge put upon the President's budget, if it can be avoided, or if it can be diminished. So I do not regard budgetitis as a mark of disdain and scorn. No, the President sent Congress a budget with some $70 million on the safe side, and we are in a bad way.

I said I would give Senators the figures before the week was out. I give them the figures now. I think they have been pretty carefully checked. Here is the story. I know how tricky figures can be, but as of now, on the basis of House action, not yet finalized, Congress has already exceeded the President's budget by $1,467 million. Referring to Senate action, we have exceeded the President's budget by $3,296 million.

Here is a very distinguished President struggling to dampen the fevers of inflation—which also has a human aspect. Mr. President, we can wax emotional about health and disease; but do not forget that the value of life insurance policies is involved here and that buying power of pensions is involved. It may be all right to wax sentimental and emotional—I could do it, too—but I would find it difficult to brush off all the changes which have been wrought as a result of inflation, because I know how deeply it strikes into the well-being of every family of America, rich and poor; and I know how it strikes into every life, young and old.

So, Mr. President, when it is said, "If any Senator opposes this joint resolution on the ground"—as my distinguished friend from Minnesota says, and I always like those great cadences of his—"that it involves $50 million, we will take them to task and meet them on the doorstep of every bill that comes on the floor of the Senate."

Well, Mr. President, I am willing. I hope it will be that way, because I shall be here. I say to those afflicted with "spendthriftitis," "squanderitis," budget busting, and "squanderamania," these figures speak for themselves.

They need no amplification from me. I think arithmetic figures are like Solomon's testimony to the lilies of the field. Their beauty needs no human embellishment. And so a figure combined with a dollar sign is one of the most stubborn facts I know.

When an attempt is made to spend more money and "bust" the President's budget further, I raise a very, very simple question. Any citizen can raise it. I say, What for? Why? Then come the waters, as the poet would say, in beautiful and measured cadence. But that is not enough for me. I have got to see the results. I have got to see where we are going. I have got to see where this program is leading.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] was right when he expressed some fears awhile ago. I entertain some fears about this program. So does the Budget Bureau. Oh, I know the Bureau is regarded as cold, hardhearted, mendacious, and made up of persons who have no sentiment, no sympathy, no emotion. But thank God for a few such persons. We still have a government left—a free government—and, God willing, it will be a solvent government.

So last night I burned the incandescent globe for a while to see what was here. I tell you, Mr. President, it is something to behold. It is almost charming in its scope. It is amazing in its dimensions.

I want to find those particular provisions of the resolution which I underlined last night, for when the question is raised as to whether any grant money is authorized by the resolution, I point out that it is almost all grant money. It is that simple.

A look at page 17 of the resolution will reveal a wonderful provision. It states that the international council will be authorized to:

> Advise, consult with, and make recommendations to * * * the Surgeon General * * * review applications for financial grants.

"G-r-a-n-t-s," a little word which appears in crossword puzzles, but no one should misunderstand what it means.

The resolution provides for the council to advise and make recommendations to the Surgeon General with respect to research of all kinds.

Now, listen, while I read from page 19:

> In carrying out the purposes of this joint resolution, the Surgeon General is authorized to encourage, support, promote the coordination of, and otherwise cooperate and assist in the training for, and the planning and conduct of, in foreign countries and * * * in the United States, research, investigations, experiments, and studies relating to the causes, diagnosis, treatment, control, and prevention of physical and mental diseases—

I say to my colleague the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER], does that language not speak for itself? I continue to read—

> including nutritional and other health deficiencies, or relating to the rehabilitation of the physically or mentally handicapped.

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. First of all, I realize that in asking a question of my distinguished friend I am likely to get an eloquent and incisive answer.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I will make a most mild one.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Even though the tone of his words makes it seem as though he has pronounced words of doom, when one reads the words in the right spirit and with the right heart, they are words of hope.

I should like to ask the Senator from Illinois what part of the language he is against. I trust he is not against rehabilitation. I think he is interested in combating mental disease and physical infirmities. I am sure he would want a diagnosis. He would want to aid the treatment. He would want to perfect the methods of treating particular diseases. I trust the Senator is against the spread of disease. So he would surely want to look into the possibilities of contagion.

The words which the Senator read in fine, senatorial tones—"causes," "diagnosis," and "treatment"—were emphasized. If one read those words with the spirit of a doctor one would say, "We should study the cause of diseases. We should diagnose diseases. We should have treatment of diseases."

That sounds entirely different. One sounds like a hope, and the other sounds like the end of the line.

I know the Senator is a good man and wants to find a cure for various diseases.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, the Senator had an hour or more, and I have heard his question. I am going to pour on a lot of the balm of Gilead.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I did not hear the Senator.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am not yet ready to answer the question. This is a prelude.

I was talking about the grants, because the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] raised the question. I do not know whether the Senator received a complete answer.

I go on to the rest of the grant language. May my voice be fairly drooling in hope, Mr. President, as I read:

> make financial grants to universities—

Mr. HUMPHREY rose.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I hope my friend will let me finish.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I want to say the Senator does not need to have his voice drooling; it should just be clear.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I want to oblige my friend from Minnesota—

> make financial grants to universities, hospitals, laboratories, or other public or private institutions or agencies, or to individuals, in foreign countries or in the United States, or contract with such institutions, agencies, or individuals—

Mr. President, I almost whisper this in tones of awe—

> without regard to sections 3648 and 3709 of the Revised Statutes.

We talk about a giveaway program; what I have mentioned is grant money. It refers to individuals at home and abroad, to laboratories at home and abroad, to agencies at home and abroad, to hospitals at home and abroad, and to universities at home and abroad.

Mr. BUTLER. Just give it away.

Mr. DIRKSEN. And for what? For mental illness, for physical illness, for the handicapped, for everything.

Can we measure the dimensions of this program upon which we are asked to venture?

The interesting thing is, Mr. President, that much of the authority proposed to be given is already provided for in the law. This is an effort to sort of bring it all together in one chunk and put an extra dollar sign on it to the tune of $50 million, although the Surgeon General says, as is shown in the hearings, that up to now he can only count up $7½ million, and he had to strain a point in order to do that.

We become pretty careless with the Government's money, I must say.

Mr. LONG. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am afraid I myself become careless on occasion.

I hope my friend from Louisiana will not chide me now for my carelessness along that line. I know by the glint in the Senator's eye exactly what he is going to say.

Mr. LONG. I was going to ask the Senator: Does he mean an extra dollar sign or an extra decimal point?

Mr. DIRKSEN. The question shows what an able arithmetician the Senator from Louisiana really is.

These are the purposes. The Senator from Illinois is not manufacturing words, but is reading words from the joint resolution itself, as it came from the committee.

Then, along with everything else, we are asked to facilitate the interchange of research scientists and experts between the United States and foreign countries. That is probably a good thing.

Then we are asked to "establish and maintain research fellowships within the National Institutes of Health," and the cute language is "and elsewhere."

It is those words which admit of interpretation which really disturb me a good bit. So we are asked to train research workers "within the National Institutes of Health and elsewhere."

Along with this, I will say to my colleagues, the Surgeon General can establish offices wherever he wants, practically without limit for the only limit being a little phrase in the resolution to the effect that what is done "shall be administered consistently with the foreign policy of the United States as determined by the President and the Secretary of State." The Surgeon General could set up offices anywhere. He could put an international office in the National Institutes of Health. He could bypass the President of the United States.

The language of the resolution says:

> This joint resolution shall be administered consistently with the foreign policy of the United States as determined by the President and the Secretary of State.

Would I like that, if I were the President? Would I like to have a domestic agency given an international flare and

permitted to roam the earth to set up offices? That is what is provided in the joint resolution. The language says that the Surgeon General shall have the right to set up offices. I thought the President of the United States was the author and the finisher, so to speak, of our international relations, with the consent of the Senate, of course.

What would have been a proper provision in the resolution? A proper provision would have been to grant the authority to the President and to direct the money to the President, if it were necessary.

This proposed institution will go much further than the International Cooperation Administration, if what I see in those words mean anything for the future. We shall go an extremely long way down that road.

When I say I certainly am not indifferent to our responsibilities in the field of health, I mean I certainly do not yield to anybody in that field, because my immediate and close family has had its share of the burden. I understand the incidence of disease and the burdens of doctor's bills. I have watched the research men. I used to do a little research work myself, once upon a time. I did not do very much, and it was not very complicated, but I did at least enough to know that it has to be done in order to meet problems which arise.

With a joint resolution having such scope as is provided—permitting the setting up of new agencies and additional functions, and granting $50 million a year—I contend it is about time to take a good look at the matter, to see where the President of the United States has been bypassed, except for a few consoling words.

Therefore, I must oppose the joint resolution. I would oppose it in any event, because of the amount of money, since the Surgeon General only counts up $7½ million and $50 million is provided in the resolution. I cannot swallow that, I am sure.

My main purpose, Mr. President, has been to show that while the joint resolution has some 64 sponsors and cosponsors, not including me, there is another side of the story to be told. I felt I had to tell it.

The letter from the Bureau of the Budget is printed in the hearings. I do not know whether I can lay my hands on it at the moment, but I have gone through it pretty carefully to see what the Director of the Bureau of the Budget had to say.

The Director of the Bureau of the Budget tells what the joint resolution would do. He states that it would create a new institute within the National Institutes of Health, that it would establish a National Advisory Council for International Medical Research and that it would authorize annual appropriations of $50 million. The Director also makes four very pointed comments.

He says, first, it will "further add to diffusion within the Government of responsibility for dealing with international problems."

Secondly, he says it will "increase the complexity of U.S. efforts in the field of international health."

Third, he says it would not "be desirable to establish a statutory institute to conduct international health research."

We have not done this before. We are contemplating a statute. Once a statute is enacted, once the resolution is signed, whatever powers have been denied to the President cannot be retrieved unless they are retrieved by the Congress.

Finally, he says that the joint resolution should not be enacted in its present form. There have been changes; but the money is still there. The testimony of the Surgeon General is still there. The diffusion is still there. The circumvention of the President in the field of international relations is there.

I have only one purpose today. I know how futile it would be for me to try to defeat this measure, with so many cosponsors. I wish to be sure that the legislative record is made in the Senate today, notwithstanding the fact that the resolution has such a fetching and alluring title that it is difficult, venturesome, and a little brash for anyone to undertake to stop it.

I know now about the letters which will reach my desk. There will be plenty of them, saying, "What do you mean? How inhuman can you be to oppose this great adventure into the field of human health and vitality?"

I know now what the letters will be like. That makes no difference. That is not my point. My point is that when we establish an agency such as this, we should be sure that it is within the frame of our free Government, that we preserve the traditions and procedures which have served us so well in other days, and that we place some limit on the scope. When we undertake to cope with mental illness, physical rehabilitation, and physical impairment over the whole wide world, we undertake a huge adventure. Our efforts may be spread so thin as to dissipate a great many of the results.

I know what the answer is. I hold in high esteem the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] for his work in this field. During all the time I have known him, both in the House and in the Senate, he has devoted himself to this field. I believe everyone in the country has reason to be grateful to him. But notwithstanding my gratitude, esteem, and admiration, I still believe that we are on the wrong track in the organizational pattern which is spelled out. We do not need the kind of money proposed to be provided. We set the level, and from there on we move up. The National Institutes of Health today are given appropriations of 130 times larger than was the case 15 years ago. Let no one be under any misapprehension as to whether this program will grow. It will be like Jack's beanstalk, with all that that implies.

What is the answer? The answer is that we must not intrude the Government too deeply. This is no government-to-government program. This is a scientist-to-scientist program, a person-to-person program. All I have to say is that science runs better when it runs upon tracks, notwithstanding all the imponderables, and notwithstanding all the creative aspects. If it were not so, why did we establish a National Science Foundation, with a hard core of responsibility at the top? Because we know that it works better that way under a free government.

When we established the national science education program we established it with the same thought in mind, because in a free government, if it were not so, the effects would in large measure be dissipated. I like to keep government as remote as I can, but I have learned, after 25 years of legislative experience, that unless the guidelines and the tracks are laid out where all can see, we should beware the results of the program.

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I have been very much interested in the remarks of the able Senator from Illinois. I should like to ask what I regard as a very pertinent question.

A few moments ago the Senator from Illinois mentioned the fact that the funds for the National Institutes of Health had risen some 130 times in relatively recent years. Does the Senator speak of that critically or favorably?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I speak of it in neither a critical nor a favorable sense. Earlier I made the point that I think our people are entitled to results. I am greatly distressed over the situation. I will tell my distinguished friend why. I was in the House when this program was launched long ago. I recall some of the men who once graced this body, like the late Senator Neely of West Virginia, and my distinguished predecessor, Bob Taft, who occupied this chair. He is here no longer because he was a victim of the dread killer, cancer.

Ever so often I have lifted my voice; ever so often I have drawn a line—before I left the Appropriations Committee. A few years ago I said to some of these gentlemen, "You have had hundreds of millions of dollars in appropriations. You have the facilities. Where are the results?"

I look at the Kettering-Sloan Institute, doing fine special work in the field of leukemia. So far as I know, they receive no public money. They work with far less money than do governmental institutions. I believe we have made more progress in that direction than we have under our own steam.

When I say that, I do not for a moment demean anyone. Perhaps there is something I do not know about. I should like to know about it. But I do know that we have breathlessly waited for results. I do not want to launch out into a program which has almost no limitation, over the seven seas and to the far corners of the earth, unless there are some guidelines and limitations, and unless the program conforms to our whole scheme of government, which, among other things, envisions the President as the leader in the field of foreign affairs and international relations—and it should be so.

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Has the Senator measured the increase in funds against the very substantial gains and advances which have been made by the National Institutes of Health in the field of so many diseases, in helping to prolong human life, making gains even in the field of cancer? A higher proportion of cancer victims than ever before are saved. It is my understanding that more than 70 percent of the funds devoted to cancer research go through the National Institutes of Health and other avenues of the Federal Government.

The Senator spoke of the Budget Bureau. I have respect for the Budget Bureau, but I believe the Budget Bureau is interested in saving money rather than in saving lives. When I came to the Senate in 1955, I think the National Cancer Institute was allocated $21 million. Today, I believe, it is allocated $75 million.

Last night I spoke on the telephone with one of the most eminent of cancer researchers, Dr. Sidney Farber of the Children's Cancer Research Foundation and the Harvard Medical School. He told me that they can use at least $109 million in the coming fiscal year, for programs and projects which have been analyzed and subjected to the most critical scrutiny. Therefore, from 1955 to 1960 the funds may have gone up—and I hope they will—from $21 million to $109 million. I dare say the Budget Bureau protested against virtually all those increases. If we had abided by the recommendations of the Bureau of the Budget from the beginning, we would still be at about the level of $21 million, as it was in 1955, rather than in the position of having achieved all the advances which have been made under the leadership of the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] and his associates.

To save those millions of dollars, apparently the Bureau of the Budget and the Senator from Illinois would be willing to discard all the gains which have been made in improved surgical techniques, in the field of chemotherapy and in the field of radiation with respect to cancer.

My wife and I had a most profound emotional experience before my own bout with this disease. We visited the Children's Cancer Research Foundation, where 350 children—not older people, but children—are under treatment for this disease. Dr. Ferber showed us that gains have been made in chemotherapy. The dread scourge of leukemia has baffled science for ages, but they had managed to keep one little boy suffering from leukemia alive for 8 or 9 years. That is despite the fact that formerly the average length of survival time was about 28 or 30 days after hospital admittance. So they have made some real gains.

It seems to me that when we look at that fact and when we look at the terrible anxiety of the parents whose children suffer from this dread disease, there is no money that we can measure alongside of that.

I know that the Senator from Illinois is just as sympathetic toward these people as is the Senator from Alabama, or I or anyone else. The only point I am making is this. If we had to abide by the Bureau of the Budget, we would still be back at about the minimum program, or no program at all, of many years ago. I do not believe that the Bureau of the Budget should be our principal criterion as to what we are going to do in fields like this.

I respect the Senator from Illinois. He is showing political courage in the discussion today. However, I do not agree with the conclusion that the Budget Bureau should be the criterion as to what we should do in fields like coronary, cancer, and other diseases.

When we consider the fact that it is from our Congress, from Members of the House and of the Senate, like Senator HILL, who have been responsible for these gains, we should not allow the Budget Bureau to be our measuring stick in such a realm. I thank the Senator for his courtesy in yielding to me.

Mr. DIRKSEN. In answer to my distinguished friend, I would merely say that if he will take the trouble to read the letter from the Director of the Bureau of the Budget to the chairman of the committee, he will find that the Bureau of the Budget has expressed no disapprobation or disapproval of the purposes and objectives here involved.

The Bureau of the Budget put its finger on greater diffusion and greater complexity, and on the fact that much authority already exists in law. Those are the things which are designed, of course, to make for an efficient public operation. Never has the Bureau of the Budget said anything about purposes and objectives.

I see no reason why I should labor this point much longer. I close the discussion by saying that I have tried to point out my objections, that the cost will go beyond the estimates of the Surgeon General, and that this matter should have been directed to the President as our national leader in the international field. I believe that some of the proposed authorities should have been carefully circumscribed.

I allude to one more point by merely reading from the resolution. At page 23, line 21, it is provided:

> (d) In carrying out the provisions of this joint resolution the Surgeon General is authorized to establish offices in foreign countries, for such areas as he may deem advisable, and for such purpose appropriations for carrying out this joint resolution shall be available for rental or lease outside the United States of offices, buildings, grounds, and living quarters to house personnel; maintenance, furnishings, necessary repairs, improvements, and alterations to properties owned or rented by the United States Government abroad; and costs of fuel, water, and utilities for such properties.

No ambassador can say, "Stop it. You are going too far." No representative of this Government, under the leadership of the President, can say, "Stop it. You are going too far."

There is certainly something lacking in this bill, particularly when we bypass the President, who in law and under the Constitution has been recognized as the conductor of our foreign affairs, and our representative directly in the field of international relations.

For the reasons stated, Mr. President, although I may be the only one to do so, I shall vote against the joint resolution. I earnestly hope, even though it is almost preordained that the resolution will go through the Senate, that these futile remarks of mine may catch a spark in the other body and that the Members there will take a closer look before the resolution gets out of committee.

I add one thing before I conclude. My deepest regret is that I could not have sat in on the hearings. That is a tragedy for me. I cannot attend four subcommittees of the Committees on Labor and the Judiciary every day, when they meet at one and the same time, and also discharge my duties as minority leader. But I work at it. My briefcase goes home with me every night. It becomes a chore to go through the hearings and read the testimony when I do not have the benefit of hearing the testimony in the committee room. But with all these limitations I try to give attention to those things which are important, particularly those which are important to the President of the United States in terms of authority, as well as the money involved and the purposes and the objectives of a legislative measure.

I have stated my case. I shall not even suggest a record vote, so far as I am concerned. I am quite content to let the matter stand as it is.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, first I should like to commend the distinguished minority leader for the presentation he has made. Since I shall disagree with him, I would appreciate having his attention while I say something commendatory.

I believe the distinguished minority leader has done a perfectly magnificent job in attempting to keep expenditures within reasonable bounds. He has made a politically courageous speech today, because the pending measure is a popular one. I commend him for that in the highest terms. Certainly if we are not able to speak our thoughts here and call our shots as we see them, then this body has lost one of its great reasons for existence, and one of the reasons why it has maintained itself as what we like to call the greatest deliberative body in the world.

Mr. President, I am conscious of the need for keeping our expenditures within bounds and for husbanding our resources, and for attempting whenever possible to achieve a balanced budget. I am greatly concerned over the dangers of inflation which have been so eloquently and accurately pointed out by the minority leader.

I am a little fresher from the hustings than some of my other colleagues. In the stress and turmoil of the campaign I was asked whether I am a liberal or a conservative. I have always rather shied away from both those terms. However, in general, I have said that in money matters I am a conservative. I am definitely for achieving a balanced

budget. I think it is extremely important to do so. However, I said that there are two areas where, if I were in doubt about what should be done, I would choose the higher figure of expenditure. Those areas are the areas of national defense and of national and international health. I believe these are two areas in which most of the American people would want us to vote that way.

It seems to me that the matter before the Senate today falls squarely within that area where we should certainly not pinch pennies. For example, I refer to a bill which was before the Senate only the other day. I hesitate to draw comparisons between expenditures; I never like to do it. But when a bill is before the Senate and a Senator says, "I favor spending this amount of money. Let us take it out of the funds for aid to our allies or out of mutual security funds," I do not think we should legislate it that way. I do not draw this comparison except in my own thinking, for such effect as it may have upon those who would share these views.

A bill which was before the Senate recently provided for the expenditure of about $400 million—eight times the amount involved in the resolution now before the Senate. I was one of the few Senators who voted against it, but the bill was passed by an overwhelming majority. I may have been wrong in the vote I cast, but I cast it because I am concerned about balancing the budget.

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

Mr. KEATING. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I call the attention of the Senator to the fact that the $400 million was a direct appropriation to be made at the time the bill was signed by the President; whereas the resolution now before the Senate provides only for an authorization. The Senator from New York knows that that is a different proposition.

Mr. KEATING. I believe that is an accurate statement. Whatever amount is authorized by the resolution is subject to a future survey by the Committee on Appropriations.

I cite this to illustrate the fact that I do not want anything I may say today to be construed as a departure in any degree from what I conceive to be one of the greatest and most important problems our country faces, probably the greatest problem on the domestic front, namely, the control of the inflationary trend.

But as a sponsor of the resolution, I endorse strongly and emphatically the sentiments which have been expressed in the debate by the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] and by other Senators concerning the worthy objectives of the proposal.

I believe none of us can pay too high a tribute to the distinguished Senator from Alabama, who, over the years, has rendered outstanding service to the cause of fighting disease and improving the health not only of the American people, but of people throughout the world. I can think of no objective which any Senator could have which would be more heartwarming to him or which would bring to him richer rewards than to be in the forefront of such a fight as that.

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

Mr. KEATING. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I thank the Senator from New York for his very generous words, but I call attention to the fact that he also is a sponsor of the joint resolution. He is on the team which is trying to carry the ball to the goal. The efforts which have been made and the work which has been done to advance the cause of medical research have all been the result of bipartisan action. The distinguished senior Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH] has been most interested in and devoted to this cause, not only in the Senate, but throughout the whole United States. The advances which have been made in this cause have been made by the efforts of the members of both parties. We have all worked together as a team to promote and advance the cause of health.

Mr. KEATING. I appreciate the remarks of the Senator from Alabama. I know that what has been done has been accomplished through a bipartisan or a nonpartisan effort. But certainly the distinguished senior Senator from Alabama has shown great leadership in this cause, a cause which has meant so much to America and to the world in terms of happiness and health. I know that our hats are off to him for his dedicated efforts.

It may well be that the International Health and Medical Research Act will prove to be LISTER HILL'S greatest contribution to the welfare of his fellow man.

I firmly believe that this measure can mark the opening gun in a great worldwide crusade against disease and pestilence, and against those scourges which throughout the ages have plagued mankind.

Reference has been made to the opposition of the Bureau of the Budget. The objective of the resolution appears to me to be the same as that recommended by President Eisenhower in his state of the Union message in January 1958, when he called for an international campaign against disease. The President's proposal was reflected in an amendment to the Mutual Security Act, in which Congress declared it to be the policy of the United States—

> to continue and to strengthen mutual efforts among the nations for research against disease, such as heart disease and cancer, and in which the World Health Organization is invited to initiate appropriate studies for this purpose.

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

Mr. KEATING. I yield.

Mr. BUTLER. Is it the opinion of the Senator from New York that the President of the United States, in making that statement, felt that the entire burden of such a program should fall on the United States?

Mr. KEATING. Not at all. No; I do not think so.

Mr. BUTLER. Does the Senator from New York think the President had in mind a measure such as Senate Joint Resolution 41, which would give the Surgeon General of the United States the authority to open offices throughout the world and to make grants to individuals throughout the world without restriction?

Mr. KEATING. I cannot answer for the President of the United States any more than can the distinguished Senator from Maryland.

Mr. BUTLER. The Senator from New York quoted the President of the United States and put some construction on his language.

Mr. KEATING. I quoted from the President's state of the Union message. Certainly he did not intend to convey the impression that the United States would do the entire job, nor is the——

Mr. BUTLER. Does not the Senator believe the resolution should be amended——

Mr. KEATING. Nor is the United States doing the entire job at present; nor is it intended that the United States should do so; nor do I believe the distinguished Senator from Alabama or his committee intends that the United States should do the entire job.

The United States is to cooperate in this effort; and I believe it is in a position to take the lead in an international effort to improve health of people everywhere.

Mr. BUTLER. Was there any testimony before the committee which reflected the viewpoint that other nations were willing to contribute to this program?

Mr. KEATING. I am not a member of the committee. I would have to refer the Senator either to the distinguished Senator from Alabama or to one of the other members of the committee.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield?

Mr. KEATING. I yield.

Mr. HILL. This is a scientist-to-scientist program. If the Senator will read the testimony before the committee he will find that the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] referred to Dr. Cornelius P. Rhoads, medical director of the Sloan-Kettering Institute, a great cancer research institute. Dr. Rhoads emphasized that scientists in other parts of the world would like to join with scientists in the United States, knowing that through combined, united efforts better results would be obtained than by traveling alone.

This is a scientist-to-scientist program; it is not an international program, a nation-to-nation program. It is not a proposal which smacks of international politics at all.

Mr. BUTLER. Could not the objective be accomplished more perfectly by working through the foreign governments, and asking them to have the people who they thought were most capable of cooperating with us sent here, not through grants from the United States? They do not needs grants. They are as much interested in health as we are. Foreign scientists are working in the field of cancer research. Their governments are perfectly willing to supply them with money to do so.

Why should the United States create an agency within the National Institutes of Health which will empower one man to go throughout the world and to make grants to individuals without any strings attached?

Mr. HILL. The resolution does not empower one man to do any such thing. It provides for a council; and unless the council approves the research grant, the Surgeon General cannot grant any money. In addition, the actions of the Surgeon General are under the direction and supervision of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Mr. BUTLER. Section 6(a) reads:

In carrying out the purposes of this joint resolution, the Surgeon General is authorized to encourage, support—

And so forth; I do not see any restrictive words—

financial grants to universities, hospitals, or other public or private institutions or agencies, or to individuals, in foreign countries, or in the United States.

The point I make is that if it is a good effort—and I believe it is—each country certainly is just as much interested in health as is the United States of America. So if it is a good effort, why cannot our Government talk to the governments of countries which also are interested in stamping out disease. Let them send their scientists to the United States, to cooperate with our scientists or have our scientists go to those countries, instead of having the Surgeon General open offices throughout the world, within the amount of the appropriation, to do this work?

Mr. HILL. The language of the joint resolution is very clear, as follows:

no financial grant made under the terms of this joint resolution shall be approved by the Surgeon General except after review and recommendation for approval by the Council.

Let me also call attention to the fact that all such actions of the Surgeon General are to be under the direction, supervision, and control of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Mr. BUTLER. Who, under the provisions of the joint resolution, will comprise the Council?

Mr. HILL. The members will be appointed by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Mr. BUTLER. Will its membership include citizens of other nations?

Mr. HILL. Oh, no. All of them will be Americans; and they will be appointed by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

The committee received testimony from a number of distinguished witnesses, such as Dr. Paul Dudley White, the great heart expert, of Boston; Dr. Sidney Farber, who today is waging the battle against leukemia, and he is professor of pathology at Harvard Medical School; Dr. I. S. Ravdin, who not only is vice president of medical development at the University of Pennsylvania, but also is the head of the surgery department there and is the surgeon who was brought to Washington when President Eisenhower had to be opearted on for ileitis—just as Dr. Paul Dudley White was brought to Washington when President Eisenhower had his heart attack—and many other distinguished surgeons and physicians, including Dr. Gunnar Gunderson, president of the American Medical Association; Dr. Matthew Beadine, representing the American Dental Association; and men of that type. All of them testified that the program now proposed is the way to get the job done—a job which will be of great benefit to the American people.

Mr. BUTLER. But could not it be done just as well by having the Congress by joint resolution express its willingness to appropriate $50 million a year for this purpose, provided other nations that are interested in health and matters relating to health join with our country in a common endeavor?

Mr. HILL. Not at all and I will state why: If we said we would appropriate that amount of money if other nations would do likewise, we would become involved in an international political matter, so to speak. Furthermore, we would then lose control of the projects to be worked on under this program.

As the matter now stands, under the provisions of the joint resolution, our country will make the determination of what projects will be studied.

Mr. BUTLER. I do not agree with the contention of the Senator from Alabama that thereby we would become involved in a political matter. I do not think we would lose anything by having such medical research become the common knowledge of all the world.

Mr. HILL. But the problem is that we want the funds spent in the most economical way and to the best possible advantage; and all the testimony shows that that will be done best by making a scientist-to-scientist approach, rather than a government-to-government approach.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President——

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield to me?

Mr. KEATING. I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from New Hampshire; but, first, I should like to make a comment in addition to what the Senator from Alabama has said.

I see no advantage—in fact, I see a possible disadvantage—in layering on several other Government departments, whose approval would have to be obtained before the money could be spent. If we were to require the approval of the Attorney General, the Department of Defense, the State Department, and several other departments of our Government, I do not believe as much value would be obtained from the funds spent as that which would be obtained by handling the matter in the way now proposed.

At this time I am happy to yield to the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from New York for yielding to me.

I should like to have the attention of the Senator from Alabama, because I wish to mention a particular matter, and then ask him a question.

Mr. HILL. Certainly.

Mr. COTTON. First, let me say to the Senator from Alabama that I greatly admire his work on the joint resolution. Much as I should like to follow my leader on this side of the aisle, I am inclined to believe that the objections to the joint resolution come late. I believe it would have been better to have offered amendments to the joint resolution. So I expect to support it.

But I cannot refrain from calling the attention of the Senator from Alabama to one fact; and then I wish to ask him a question:

In the 84th Congress, I believe, Senator Flanders, of Vermont, and other Senators, of whom I was one, sponsored a bill which would have changed restrictions on the use of the Hill-Burton funds so as to enable clinics in small, rural communities in the country to receive some assistance—assistance which they cannot now readily receive, because of the liability which would attach to hospitals which would have to take the responsibility for the clinics.

In the 85th Congress, that bill was introduced by Senator Payne, of Maine. Again we made an effort to have the bill enacted into law.

In this Congress—in view of the fact that Senator Flanders, of Vermont, and Senator Payne, of Maine, are no longer Members of the Senate—I introduced the bill, S. 1770. I have been informed by the staff of the Senator's committee that the committee is not likely to consider the bill, but is going to wait another year, at least, before it will take up any changes which might enable the small communities in the mountains and in the rural sections of the country to participate more fully in the Hill-Burton program.

If some of us are willing to still our doubts and our fears of certain provisions of the joint resolution, and since we recognize its fine objectives and have confidence in the distinguished Senator from Alabama and his committee to go on with this work, I hope the committee will exhibit the same solicitude for some of the rural communities in my State, Vermont and Maine, and in some of the other rural States of the Union, and will give us some of the consideration which this joint resolution seeks to give to the peoples of the world.

Let me ask what the chances are of that being done.

Mr. HILL. Would the Senator from New Hampshire like to come before the committee and present this matter to it?

Mr. COTTON. I certainly would.

Mr. HILL. I shall be delighted to have the Senator from New Hampshire come before the committee and do so.

Mr. COTTON. I take it that the Senator from Alabama is going to give me a chance to make a speech. Of course I should be glad to do so. I like the sound of my own voice, but I want something more than the opportunity to hear it. I wish to know whether there is a chance to obtain a little action on this matter.

Mr. HILL. Let me say to the Senator from New Hampshire—and at the same time endeavor to be as modest as pos-

sible—that any matter which deals with hospitals or the health of our people and with human suffering will find a sympathetic hearing by me and sympathetic consideration on my part.

In view of the statement the Senator from New Hampshire has made, I wish to say that of course the pending joint resolution has nothing to do with the construction of hospitals.

Mr. COTTON. Let me assure the Senator from Alabama that I did not mean to speak ironically or with sarcasm. The Senator from Alabama has always given us a sympathetic hearing. But I could not refrain from bringing up this matter now, because I have been informed that the committee has decided that it will not even consider such a bill this year. That would rather shut the door. I hope that in addition to the sympathy and the courtesy which we always receive from the beloved Senator from Alabama, we may receive a little action, too.

Mr. HILL. The Senator from New Hampshire has had no word from me that he would not receive a hearing and consideration of his bill, has he?

Mr. COTTON. No; there has not been any suggestion that we could not receive a hearing. But we understand that no action will be taken on that bill this year.

Mr. HILL. Since the Senator from New Hampshire has referred to me——

Mr. COTTON. Let me say that my reference was to the staff of the committee.

Mr. HILL. The Senator from New Hampshire has raised a question. Perhaps we can settle the matter, because I want to do everything I can to help rural communities whether in New Hampshire or in Alabama or in Kansas or in New York—wherever they may be. The question involved is one of having Federal funds used by any kind of clinic or diagnostic center or hospital that is not strictly a nonprofit organization.

Mr. COTTON. I can assure the Senator that I am not interested in any profitmaking institutions. The purpose of the bill to which I have referred is to try to get medical assistance in very sparsely populated sections, where people are struggling and doing their best to have some medical centers, and where, many times, people literally die because of the distance they have to go and because of the lack of medical facilities.

As the Senator knows, one of the difficulties is that small communities often have great difficulty in sponsoring Hill-Burton applications and the hospitals and medical centers of the larger cities are unwilling, understandably, to sponsor applications for clinics which are located at some distance. My bill seeks to resolve this impasse.

I will not take any more time, but I express the hope that this year action can be taken by the Senate, on a bill, with proper safeguards, which will take care of the situation to which I have referred—which is much nearer home than is the situation with which we are dealing today.

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

Mr. HILL. The Senator from New York has the floor.

Mr. KEATING. I yield to the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. BUTLER. I should like to ask the Senator from Alabama whether it is his desire that the yeas and nays be ordered on the joint resolution.

Mr. HILL. I understand that is the desire of a great many Senators.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I would say that question should be within the decision of the chairman of the committee.

Mr. HILL. I have talked to the distinguished majority leader. He thinks we ought to have the yeas and nays.

Mr. BUTLER. Will the Senator request the yeas and nays?

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the passage of the joint resolution.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, permit me to assure the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON] that my personal interest in the health of the people of New Hampshire is at least equal to, and probably greater than, my interest in the health of people in any foreign land. I join with the Senator in the hope that it will be possible to have hearings on the important measure to which he has referred.

All of us recognize that disease knows no national boundary line. No country is immune from the ravages of the great scourges with which our researchers and those in other lands are grappling.

Unfortunately, more often than not, disease strikes those who are least able to combat it and those who are least able to pay for its prevention and cure. At the same time, the technicians and researchers who can hold the key to solving the riddles of disease and pestilence are not concentrated in any one country, but geniuses in this field are found in every land.

One aim of Senate Joint Resolution 41 is to prevent, as much as possible, duplication of effort in the crusade for better health, by means of promoting cooperation and freer flow of information among the medical leaders of the world. It aims to help fill the critical need for international planning, programing, and pursuit of research. I believe it is a strong and firm step in that direction.

There is general agreement among leaders in this field that the great needs in the area of medical research are for a freer flow of knowledge and information among those working in the field, a coordination of efforts to avoid wasteful duplication, an expansion of programs for the exchange of trained personnel and teachers, and an enlargement of programs to train additional technicians and researchers.

This proposal seeks to provide the governmental machinery in the United States so that this country can efficiently and effectively do its part to fill those needs.

It provides procedures and the means by which we can mobilize our research facilities and resources to participate in various international programs which will translate the desire for an international effort to conquer disease into action. Enactment of this measure is essential if the United States is to play its proper role—and it should be a leading one—in this vital work.

It may very well be the wording of the precise approach to this problem can be bettered in the other body; but within the four walls of this measure are to be found provisions which, it strikes me, will be of great help in improving the health of people everywhere and in enhancing our reputation as a nation.

Mr. President, I would be the first to object if I felt that the funds called for by this proposal were to be wastefully expended or were not vitally needed and were not essential. But I feel strongly that leadership by the United States in the crusade against disease can demonstrate anew to the world, in these extremely critical times, that we are a people dedicated to peace and good will.

The positive approach to international health problems envisioned by Senate Joint Resolution 41, with its emphasis on cooperation and coordination of research, will surely capture the imagination of peoples the world over. It will command admiration and respect wherever people are allowed to know about what we are doing and what we are seeking to accomplish.

The enactment of this measure could well be a historical high point in launching America forthrightly and vigorously into the international war against disease. We can cut across national boundaries and through Iron Curtains and we can cut through governmental and political barriers to help the peoples of the world. Mr. President, one of the things I like most about this program is the elimination of too much bureaucracy.

Freedom from disease is an aspiration which all men hold in common. It is a specific freedom for which all men can work in harmony. I, therefore, urge the passage of Senate Joint Resolution 41 as a solid, concrete means by which the talents, energies, resources, and facilities of America can be brought to bear, not only to aid our own people but people the world over who seek good health and a better life. Enactment of this measure will mark a major historic step forward in mankind's unending war on disease.

I hope the vote in favor of the measure will be overwhelming.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, as a member of the Subcommittee on Public Health and of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, where I had the privilege of hearing the testimony for a number of days with regard to Senate Joint Resolution 41, I wish to express my appreciation to the senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], author of the joint resolution, for the leadership he has given to us, to the country, and to the world in this matter. He spoke with regard to this subject in the Senate on August 13 and August 16, 1958. He explained the joint resolution on February 2, 1959. The explanations of the resolution in the RECORD are ample. The purpose of the resolution are known. The

resolution has been thoroughly explained in some 230 pages of testimony before the committee.

The Public Health Service gave three fields of activity in which international health programs could be broken down and in which there should be continued work, including mass control and eradication of communicable diseases, building a strong health service, and development and intensification of scientific and medical research.

Mr. President, I could hardly believe my ears this afternoon when we heard an argument to the effect that the scientific research should not be done if money was to be spent beyond the bounds of the United States. We are reminded that in the early days of this country we had yellow fever in epidemic proportions as far north as Philadelphia. The control of yellow fever was not discovered until within the lifetime of many people now living, but it was discovered as a result of research by United States doctors in Cuba.

Many of the diseases which afflict our people at home and around the world can best be studied in other areas. If we wish to study the effects on the human body of prolonged and intense cold, where could we better study it than in the Antarctic? If we wish to study the effects of nuclear radiation from atomic explosions, where better could we study it than in Japan? These different studies can best be had in different areas.

The argument that we should not spend some of the modest appropriation of $50 million a year in some foreign country overlooks the fact that the object of the joint resolution is to control the diseases which cripple the human race—to control them at home and around the world, to study them where they can best be studied, and discover relief where it can best be found.

We have read a good bit of speculation as to what is going on in Geneva, both on top of the table, and under the table. We have a joint resolution on top of the table here today. It is Senate Joint Resolution 41. It could well mean more to the peace, prosperity, and happiness of mankind than what goes on over the table or under the table at Geneva today.

Mr. President, a yea-and-nay vote has been ordered. I do not think it is necessary to spend further time in discussion of the joint resolution, since it has been thoroughly and adequately explained by the distinguished senior Senator from Alabama and by the distinguished senior Senator from Minnesota. This is one of the finest measures in an international effort of international cooperation, to demonstrate American leadership in this field.

There has been some debate about who is leading the missile race today, but let there be no debate about who is leading in the fight against disease. I invite the attention of my colleagues to the fact that we have had testimony this year before the Public Health Subcommittee that while the United States is graduating some 7,000 doctors per year, the Russians are graduating 16,000 medical doctors a year, of which 2,000 are being trained particularly in the languages, customs, religions, and mores of the underdeveloped countries of the world, where no doubt they will be sent as medical missionaries on behalf of the Russian system of totalitarian control. We need Senate Joint Resolution 41 to extend American medical research and international cooperation in the eradication of disease, to all the world.

Mr. President, I think the joint resolution should be passed without further delay, as an example to the world that our interest is in something besides destruction. We are interested in the upbuilding of the human race. This is proof positive, and a major step for better health for ourselves and others. It means more health and happiness for all the world.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, yesterday, I spoke briefly in support of Senate Joint Resolution 41. In view of the fact that objections have been expressed to Senate Joint Resolution 41, since I am a member of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, I should like to respond briefly to some of the questions raised in the debate.

The question of cost was raised, was considered by the committee. As has been brought out in the debate, witnesses in the hearings stated that approximately $7½ million to $10 million could be spent now in the various activities which the resolution would cover, and that it would not be possible to determine the cost at this time.

The committee, determined that the authorization of $50 million provided by the joint resolution was a reasonable authorization. I can only say that the committee, led by the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], entertained the view this authorization would be small, if it would bring about a collaboration of the best scientific and medical abilities in the world. It would enable men and women, working together, in research, to make advances in the great objective of finding the causes behind the diseases which are the killers of mankind, of establishing better preventive medicine, and making possible the full use of the physical and mental capabilities of mankind.

These objectives present the viewpoint from which the joint resolution can be adequately considered, and from this broad purpose it was the almost unanimous judgment of the committee that the authorization proposed is modest.

I wish to reaffirm my support for the resolution.

This measure should not be partisan, and the fact that 16 members of the minority including 4 of the members of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare have joined in cosponsoring the resolution confirm its wide support. The chief point I desire to emphasize is that the committee considered the present measure to be an approach toward solving one of the great and eternal concerns of mankind.

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

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I merely desire to add, in view of the discussion which took place prior to the comments of the Senator from Kentucky, that there is available to the Members of the Senate an excellent compilation of the activities in the field of international medical research presently underway.

I have in my hand a publication, Report No. 160 of the 1st session of the 86th Congress, published by the Subcommittee on Reorganization and International Organizations, which is a rather extensive and comprehensive statement of the great research activities which are already underway on an international basis, country by country and disease by disease. The importance of additional research efforts is indicated in this study, and there is also indicated what could be done by a little more activity.

In response to the distinguished Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER], I will say that the rewards we would be able to obtain from international collaboration in the field of medical research are literally beyond calculation. At present we have all sorts of evidence as to what has already been achieved, not only by our own scientists, but also by the activity of others. I mention this only as a matter of background and reference for the legislative history of this measure, because it seems to me we can do very much more with just a little extra, as is outlined in the proposal.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I, too, am a member of the committee which developed this legislation, and I was honored to join as a sponsor of it. But I think it is important for my colleagues to know that the very questions which are being raised on the floor were not only raised in committee, but were determined factually by the witnesses who testified before us.

Rather than to add to the very eloquent pleas which have already been made for the legislation, in principle, by the chairman of the committee and by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], by my colleague from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], and my colleague from New York [Mr. KEATING], I wish to call attention to certain specifics in the record.

Senators will find, as shown on page 43 of the record, that I questioned Dr. Rusk, from my own city of New York. He is a very distinguished authority on vocational rehabilitation.

I questioned him as to why we could not entrust this program to the Surgeon General, and why we had to have a special institute; also why we could not use counterpart funds, of which we have hundreds of millions in the world, and why we had to have dollars.

Dr. Rusk answered those questions by pointing out, first, that it was not only necessary for us to send scientists abroad who could use counterpart funds in foreign countries, but it was also essential to bring those scientists here to work with our equipment and our scientists, in order to get the best results from international cooperation. Dollars would be required for their living expenses, and also for certain types of equipment.

Second, referring to the Surgeon General's activity, he said:

I think if it is scattered through all of the institutes here, it will be diluted out and lost for the reason I gave, that priority for those should first go to U.S. institutions.

He points out that if we gave priority to the Surgeon General, we could not include the work of the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation and the Children's Bureau.

There are practical and distinct reasons for adopting the administrative machinery contained in the joint resolution, and for providing specific dollar amounts in order to facilitate this activity.

It so happened that one of the witnesses before the committee was a very distinguished doctor, a leader in research, with whom I had the honor to serve in the Army during World War II. I refer to Dr. Cornelius P. Rhoads, medical director of the Sloan-Kettering Institute, probably the world's leading medical institute engaged in cancer research.

Dr. Rhoads, with whom I had personal experience when he was medical director of the Chemical Corps in World War II, and I served as a staff officer, is in my opinion one of the most astute and capable medical administrators living today. He has a great consciousness and a deep understanding of the massing of research means upon the solution of medical problems. Although we have not yet found a cure for cancer, after the manner of the great historic achievement of Dr. Jonas Salk with respect to polio, we have made major progress in many fields of cancer. Many people are being saved today who in earlier days would not have been saved. A great deal of that advance comes from the Sloan-Kettering Institute.

This is the most expert kind of testimony. There is no greater killer than cancer, in terms of a curable disease. Ultimately the world will weep with anguish when a cure is found for cancer, which is a unit disease, susceptible to attach by research means.

We may say that heart disease involves all kinds of strains and varieties, but cancer is a unit disease, which we can conquer.

Dr. Rhoads is the very top authority in the field. He is not only a thorough believer in massing research means to solve individual medical problems, but he testified before the committee on the efficacy of massing international research means, which he said could not be done without legislation of this character, for the reasons which he stated in his testimony.

It seems to me that if only for that reason, if only for the massive attack upon cancer in a worldwide way, if nothing else were involved, with only the faintest hope that a little faster progress could be made by the investment of even the entire sum authorized, $50 million, I doubt if any Member of the Senate, whatever may be our domestic needs, would feel morally justified in voting against the project.

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

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. HILL. First let me congratulate and commend the Senator from New York on the very fine statement he is making, and let me join with him in the tribute he has paid to Dr. Cornelius P. Rhoads, head of the Sloan-Kettering Cancer Institute in New York. Wonderful work is being done by that institute. It receives much money from private sources, by contributions from individuals and private organizations, but it also receives funds from the National Institutes of Health. If the National Institutes of Health did not have such funds, the researchers would not be able to make the progress they have made and are making. They would not be able to do the fine work they are doing today.

In 1958 the Sloan-Kettering Cancer Institute received $1,917,115 from the National Institutes of Health. For the present year it is expected they will receive $1,939,287.

These funds have been combined with funds received from private contributions; and together they have made possible the work of this dedicated man, Dr. Rhoads, and his fine associates on that staff.

Mr. JAVITS. I am grateful to my colleague.

Mr. President, those of us who are members of committees can help our colleagues best by being very specific. On page 88 of the record, Dr. Rhoads points out that there are studying at the institutes which he heads research specialists from all over the world.

I should like to read to the Senate Dr. Rhoads' testimony in answer to two questions which I think can be asked, and which could not be phrased any better by the most conservative Member of this body, regardless of party. I read from page 89 of the hearings:

In discussing this, I would make two points. First, one must be sure that the gains, the advances, in practical terms, fully repay the taxpayers' money which is to be expended; and second, we must be sure that this program will not detract from or interfere with existing programs.

It seems to me that that is the most hardheaded, feet-on-the-ground approach that could be made.

Dr. Rhoads continues:

I have gone to great pains in the past 2 years to think about these matters. I have had at least one member of my scientific staff in Europe in some other area all these past 2 years examining the facts pertinent to these two considerations.

We are satisfied that the potential for progress is enormous. I think I can assure you personally that the real gain in terms of useful scientific advance is worth far more than the money which will be spent.

We do not need to guess about these things. Here is one of the most gifted leaders of the search, who himself put the fundamental question. He went to great pains to arrive at a conclusion based upon the facts.

The Sloan-Kettering Institute is a heavily supported agency. It is one of those which probably needs the least the kind of financial assistance which will come from this measure. It is giving us the best results of its findings, based upon scientific experience and analysis, rather than upon the need of the institute itself, or any personal views.

Dr. Rhoads continues:

Second, we do not believe that this program would detract from or interfere with existing work. It certainly would not do so if properly administered by the procedures established. On the contrary, we know of many situations in Europe, and some in South America, where new work could be immediately complementary to the programs presently underway. We do not see a serious possibility of confusion or handicapping of the work here.

Again, I submit that in this work to find a cure for cancer, or a way to avoid it, when a great scientist tells us that there are things that could be done that we are not doing in connection with cancer research because we do not have the organization and the money, it seems to me that is an absolutely compelling reason in favor of voting for the pending measure.

Finally, I call attention again, in terms of specifics, to the testimony of Dr. Paul Dudley White, who has had a great vogue in this country, and for very understandable reasons. On pages 28 and 29 of the RECORD, he gives us his personal experience, to show that there is a really practical basis for cooperation between the United States and the doctors of the Soviet Union in this field. From his own experience and that of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], he is confident that such cooperation will be forthcoming.

Mr. President, again I submit that at a time when we are trying to build bridges not only of understanding, but also of working together in a practical way for the benefit of mankind, what more durable, what more effective way could there be than through the medical sciences, when there is cooperation available in those sciences?

I know of few measures which have ever come before us which should give us greater gratification in voting for than this one.

To my colleague from New Hampshire and to other Senators who are concerned about local needs, I say, how much better will local needs be served if by employing effectively—and it is obvious that we are not employing them effectively—the scientific resources, we can bring by one day or one month or one year sooner the time when we can deal effectively with cancer. In my view the costs, relative to the results, are so small as to be unworthy of our serious discussion.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I addressed the Senate on yesterday on the joint resolution and I do not desire to take further time. I do wish, however, to emphasize what the distinguished senior Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] has so well and so eloquently said.

My good friend from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] and I served together in the House in days when pressures were not so great, and when there was more time for relaxed conversation than there is today. We lived in the Mayflower Hotel.

In the lobby of that hotel he and I solved many problems not only for ourselves but for the country and for the world.

In connection with his remarks today, in opposition to the bill, with respect to the expenditures involved, I wish to emphasize what the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] has said. There is the other side of the picture. We have expended funds for medical research, and we are now expending funds for such research, but we have also received some very good dividends on those expenditures.

Only a few years ago one person out of every three who had cancer was doomed to death. Because of such work as the Senator from New York has spoken of being done today by Dr. Rhodes at the Sloan-Kettering Institute, and by other doctors, instead of one out of three being doomed to death, today only one out of four is doomed to death. Progress is being made against this dread disease.

I do not believe I need to take the time of the Senate this afternoon to call attention to what has been done in the case of cardiac diseases. I am sure Senators will agree with me that there was a time when, if a person had a coronary thrombosis, he was pretty well considered to be at the end of the road.

Because of medical research and because of the work which is being carried on in part, at least, by funds provided by Congress, we know that today there are many persons, who are living normal lives, including some persons in high places in Government, who are subjected to tremendous stress and strain, and are carrying on almost unbelievable work, even though they have suffered some form of heart attack. We know what is being done in the way of heart surgery. A surgeon can take out the aorta, the great blood vessel leading from the heart, and replace it with a plastic substitute.

I could mention disease after disease in which curative progress has been made during the past few years through medical research substantially financed by funds appropriated by Congress.

A year ago, for the first time in the history of our Nation, we stopped the increase in the number of people who had to be committed to a mental institution because they were suffering from some form of mental illness. We know that very definite progress has been made in the treatment of mental cases.

I wish to say again what I said earlier this afternoon, when my distinguished friend from New York [Mr. KEATING] was making an eloquent speech on the joint resolution, and that is that the program of medical research has been supported and advanced by members of both parties, members on the other side of the aisle and members of this side of the aisle, who have constituted the team which has been in such large measure responsible for the funds which have been appropriated for medical research.

An examination of the budget estimates will disclose that most of these funds would never have been granted had not we in Congress, exercising our authority and power as the representatives of the people, seen fit to act on our own independent judgment, instead of following the recommendations of the Bureau of the Budget.

The Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service, in his testimony before our committee, in a few brief words summed up what the joint resolution is all about when he made this statement:

> Many major problems of disease and disability can be studied effectively only on a worldwide or regional basis.
>
> The worldwide distribution of disease as related to natural and manmade environmental conditions may reveal variations which could provide significant insight into their causation and dissemination. Such variations and contrasts, studied systematically, may provide the key clues to the control or eradication of many diseases.
>
> For example, it is probable that clear understanding of and basic knowledge relating to the phenomena of the viruses, their origin, modification, and distribution, will be achieved only through long-range integrated studies on the part of the world's virologists working through a network of viral laboratories in cooperatively planned and uniformly pursued observation and study.

He closed with these words:

> There are many examples in medical research where knowledge has remained either indecisive or unused for unnecessarily long periods of time because of the lack of collaboration and communication among scientists working individually upon the same problems. Had they combined their efforts—

That is what we are talking about this afternoon—

> rather than continued in isolation, or had there been means for ready access to knowledge of the accomplishment of others, it is probable that more rapid progress would have been made in many important areas of research.

The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Dr. Flemming, had this to say about the resolution. I read from page 163 of the hearings:

> The aspect of our international health program that is covered by Senate Joint Resolution 41 provides another illustration of steps that can be taken to enable us to exercise meaningful leadership in the total international health field.
>
> Although most of the activities which Senate Joint Resolution 41 would authorize are now authorized under existing laws, it is clear that it would be advantageous, as this resolution does, to bring these authorizations together into one law.
>
> In so doing, we will be underlining the joint support of the executive and legislative branches for these activities.
>
> In addition, we will be taking a significant step in the direction of strengthening these programs as well as improving their coordination and administration.

The president of the American Medical Association, Dr. Gunnar Gundersen, speaking for the doctors of America, the men and women to whom we must look for the care of our health and the health of our wives, children, and other loved ones, said this in support of the resolution:

> Our association feels that medicine has no geographic boundaries, for it is truly an international science for the benefit of everyone. Furthermore, we believe that only through coordinated effort can physicians throughout the world bring to their people the maximal health benefits that modern medicine can provide.
>
> Today more than ever before medical men all over the world are interdependent.

If time permitted, I could go through the list of witnesses. For example, the representatives of the American Dental Association spoke, as did the representatives of the American Medical Association, of the need for the coordinated effort of scientists, whether they be in the United States or wherever else they may be, so that they might pool their efforts and carry on their work together, if we are to get the best results and get the answers in the battle against diseases, the killers and cripplers which have baffled and plagued mankind throughout the centuries.

I spoke earlier of the results of the research which has been carried on. I have just checked with the U.S. Public Health Service and have found that during the last 16 years, as a result of the research which has been conducted, the life span of the average person in this country has been extended more than 7 years. In other words, every man, woman, and child in the United States today can expect to live more than 7 years longer than he would have 15 years ago, before the great program of medical research was really started at the end of World War II.

I shall not delay the Senate longer. The language of the resolution was drafted in close association and collaboration with the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, in testifying, said he supported the purposes and objectives of the resolution.

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

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. I notice that the pending resolution is in the form of a complete substitute for the original language. Were many changes made?

Mr. HILL. No changes were made in the original intent, purpose, and substance, so to speak. We not only consulted with the witnesses who came before us, many of them distinguished physicians, to whom reference has been made in the debate; but also we conferred with the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, knowing that, under the resolution, the administration of the institute would be under the direction and supervision of that Department, through the Surgeon General of the U.S. Public Health Service. So we sought their best judgment as to the language of the resolution.

Mr. ELLENDER. As I pointed out earlier this afternoon, it is my belief that the general purpose and aim of this resolution is good. But I am trying to ascertain why it is that although this is described as, more or less, a cooperative venture our Government seems destined to be saddled with the entire cost. For instance, in section 6(a), on page 19, it is stated:

> SEC. 6. (a) In carrying out the purposes of this joint resolution, the Surgeon General is authorized to encourage, support, promote the coordination of, and otherwise

cooperate and assist in the training for, and the planning and conduct of, in foreign countries and (when deemed necessary to carry out such purpose) in the United States, research, investigations, experiments, and studies relating to the causes, diagnosis, treatment, control, and prevention of physical and mental diseases and impairments of mankind (including nutritional and other health deficiencies), or relating to the rehabilitation of the physically or mentally handicapped, and to these ends—

(1) make financial grants to universities, hospitals, laboratories, or other public or private institutions or agencies, or to individuals, in foreign countries or in the United States, or contract with such institutions, agencies, or individuals without regard to sections 3648 and 3709 of the Revised Statutes;

What does that envision? The distinguished Senator from Alabama previously stated that the language to which I referred with respect to the building of facilities did not mean the use of brick and mortar, but means, perhaps, the rental of existing facilities or the improvement of existing facilities. Can the Senator tell me just how the authority I have just quoted will be used. It is most broad.

Mr. HILL. Perhaps I can illustrate what is meant by quoting from one of the witnesses, Dr. Sidney Farber, Professor of Pathology at the Harvard Medical School and Children's Hospital, Boston. Dr. Farber has done and is doing dedicated work in the battle against leukemia. In testifying before our committee concerning a great basic research institute in Sweden, he said:

In a great basic research institute in Sweden, the fundamental work of a distinguished pathfinder in research concerning the cell—

I do not want to digress to explain too much, but until more is known about the cell, we may not get the answer we are so desperately seeking concerning the cure for cancer—

could double his research activities, and the number of scientists trained in this field, where trained men are so rare, with a relatively small increase in his budget.

With the approval of the Council, and under the supervision and direction of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Surgeon General of the U.S. Public Health Service could enter into an agreement with the Research Institute in Sweden—I am using that as an illustration—and could make certain grants to carry on this specific work. He could determine what work was to be done to carry on the research in connection with the particular project.

Mr. ELLENDER. If this is to be a cooperative effort by the United States and other countries, why do not the other countries help?

Mr. HILL. It will be cooperative.

Mr. ELLENDER. It will not be cooperative if the United States sustains the costs of the participating nations. I do not call a venture "cooperative" when it involves our sending money abroad to allow other nations to carry on work.

Mr. HILL. No, no. I simply took this statement from the testimony. The institute in Sweden is a going institute today.

Mr. ELLENDER. I understand.

Mr. HILL. If certain work is being done, we may want the work enlarged, or perhaps we may want a little change made; perhaps we would like something more profound to be done, something which the institute is not now doing. We could go to them and say, "If you will continue what you are doing with your personnel and your funds, we will give you a grant—a little more money—so that you may go into some phase of the work which you are not now exploring." That is a procedure being followed today in this country.

I do not know whether the Senator from Louisiana was on the floor when we referred to the Sloan-Kettering Institute, which gets its name from Alfred P. Sloan, chairman of the board of the General Motors Corp., and the great inventor, Mr. Kettering, who first invented the self-starter for automobiles, and made many other important inventions. That institute was begun with funds which they donated. We also provide for utilization of the funds of other institutions, so as to enlarge the work.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield further to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey in the chair). Does the Senator from Alabama yield further to the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. As I understand the interpretation given by the Senator from Alabama to section 6(a)(1) of the joint resolution, such grants will be made to increase work which already is being done in certain institutions.

Mr. HILL. Oh, no; if it were already being done, no grants would be made. If it were already being done, there would be no sense in going into that work under the provisions of this measure.

Mr. ELLENDER. But the Senator from Alabama spoke of enlarging these programs.

Mr. HILL. No; the expression used by Dr. Farber was "double the research activities."

If the work were already being done, not one penny of the proposed funds would be used in that connection. But if it were believed that by using that institute and that particular scientist or group of scientists, it would be possible to come nearer to solving the problems which now are being worked on, and for which solutions are now being sought, then that could be done.

Mr. ELLENDER. In section 6(a)(4) I notice the following:

(4) provide to such institutions or agencies, and pay the compensation and expenses of, scientists and experts from the United States and other countries and facilitate the interchange among foreign countries of scientists and experts (including the payment of travel and subsistence for such scientists and experts when away from their places of residence);

This is shotgun language. As I understand the Senator's explanation, the authority I have quoted is designed to permit the exchange of U.S. and foreign research scientists. Yet, the authority I have quoted is sufficiently broad to permit our paying the expenses of sending French scientists to Sweden, or Swedish scientists to Timbuktu, for example.

There, again, our country would be embarking on a program of exchanging scientists—this is as I understand the matter and if I am in error I should like to be corrected—under which the Council would have legal authority to pay all expenses, if it saw fit to do so.

Mr. HILL. If there were in a foreign country an outstanding or distinguished scientist who the Surgeon General and the Council thought could well be brought to the United States and who would make a real contribution to what the Surgeon General and the Council was seeking to do, and if they believed that he would bring knowledge, experience, wisdom, and perhaps in some instances genius to the work of trying to achieve the best results that could be done.

Mr. ELLENDER. I notice section 6(a)(5). As the Senator from Alabama knows, the World Health Organization is a part of the United Nations.

Mr. HILL. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. And in order to pay for the operations of the United Nations, our country's contribution, as I recall, is a little more than one-third of the total U.N. budget. It is my recollection that we also spend additional funds for some of the work of the United Nations.

Why should we contribute further, under the provisions of this measure, for assistance in planning various projects of the World Health Organization? Is it contemplated that our country shall contribute funds to carry out plans which may be suggested by the World Health Organization?

Mr. HILL. Let me read to the Senator from Louisiana from page 20 of the report:

In this respect the committee wishes to emphasize that funds appropriated under the terms of this joint resolution shall not be employed to provide for the direct sustaining operations of the World Health Organization or any other international organization comprised of representatives of national governments.

Is that clear?

Mr. ELLENDER. But in the joint resolution, provision is made for further assistance which can be made available by the——

Mr. HILL. If the World Health Organization were carrying on a research project and if this organization were able to carry on a similar research project, the work of the two could be coordinated. But the joint resolution makes it very definite and clear that none of the funds shall be available for sustaining operations of the World Health Organization.

Mr. ELLENDER. I have one more question; I am simply trying to find out the extent to which these funds could be obligated.

Mr. HILL. I realize that, and I am glad the Senator from Louisiana is asking the questions.

Mr. ELLENDER. I am looking in the joint resolution for provisions which

would lead me to believe that there will be real cooperation on the part of other countries who should be just as much interested in these projects as are we.

Mr. HILL. And they will share in any discoveries which result from this program and from the provisions of this joint resolution.

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes.

In section 6(a)(7), we find the following provision:

(6) encourage and support the coordination of experiments and programs of research conducted in the United States with related programs conducted abroad, by facilitating the interchange of research scientists and experts between the United States and foreign countries and among other countries who are engaged in such experiments and programs of research, including the payment of per diem compensation, subsistence, and travel for such scientists and experts when away from their places of residence, as provided for experts and consultants in subsection (b) hereof;

Does that mean that the United States will pay for the training and expenses of men and women from abroad who might desire to come to the United States to improve their education in scientific fields?

Mr. HILL. Yes; if the Surgeon General and the Council wished them to come to the United States to engage in a research project.

Mr. ELLENDER. But it is my understanding that existing fellowships would help solve this problem.

Mr. HILL. A fellowship involves further training, to make one better prepared.

Mr. ELLENDER. But, as I understand the matter, a fellowship is an advanced course of study in certain facets of medicine or other subjects.

Mr. HILL. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. As I understand this provision of the joint resolution, the purpose would not be for research, but, rather, it would be to train such persons to do research.

Mr. HILL. The Senator from Louisiana is correct as to that.

Mr. ELLENDER. Why should our Government furnish money to enable foreigners to come to the United States?

Mr. HILL. To carry on these projects?

Mr. ELLENDER. No; to come here to further their own training in any particular branch of medicine.

Mr. HILL. If they were needed in connection with certain projects which the Surgeon General and the Council will carry on or if they were interested in them or if they were seeking to find answers in connection with them, some of them have to be trained.

Mr. ELLENDER. I can well understand that the travel expenses of a foreigner who already had been trained, and who was needed in this country for such work, might well be paid. That would be different from what we are now discussing.

But this provision of the joint resolution would permit the expenditure of funds to actually train foreigners in research work. That is the intent of the provision, is it not?

Mr. HILL. I would say that, with the approval of the Secretary and of the Council, if the Surgeon General wished to bring someone to this country, to train him, having in mind the thought that he could do a certain research job, and if it were desired to give him a fellowship, it should be given to him.

Mr. ELLENDER. Would it be used abroad, or in the United States?

Mr. HILL. That would depend upon the location of the project in which they were interested. It might be a particular project at Tulane University or at the University of Alabama or at the Pasteur Institute, in Paris.

Mr. ELLENDER. I can well understand that, insofar as American trainees or fellowships to Americans were concerned. But this provision would extend such assistance to a number of foreigners. Mark my words, Mr. President, there is no question but that under this program many demands would be made on our country—just as are now made under the Fulbright program and other programs. Then, no doubt, good old Uncle Sam would be called upon to pay all the expenses to train foreigners in the art of research and similar things. It is my feeling that this would be all right if they came to this country after they had been trained. But under this provision of the joint resolution, training in this country would be available to them at the expense of our Government. In other words, we could be asked to set up a free training program for medical students from all over the world.

Mr. HILL. The problem is that in some instances, in order to obtain the services of those who would be needed, they would have to be trained.

Mr. ELLENDER. I may say to the Senator I do not see any obligation on us to train people we may want to work here. We will simply open the doors for them to come here and be trained, then they could go anywhere they so desired. That would be my interpretation of the language.

Mr. HILL. That is a matter which the Council, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the Surgeon General would have to decide. They would be expected to operate the program so that persons would receive training which would make them valuable in programs and projects contemplated by the resolution.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. It was my privilege to serve on the subcommittee which first considered this resolution. I felt it an honor to be present at the hearings. I recall no adverse testimony at the hearings directed against this proposal. I do not believe there has been any adverse opinion received by the committee in any way, except perhaps the Budget Bureau's report. It seems to me this measure represents a feeling in this country of great hope and promise that it will carry us down the road toward finding the answers to questions about many diseases which have been as yet unanswered.

Mr. ELLENDER. I may say to the Senator from New Jersey I am not opposing the purpose of the resolution—although I must say that I intend to vote against the passage of the resolution.

To my mind, although there can be no doubt that the underlying purpose of the resolution is good and sound, it leaves too many loopholes. The provisions as enumerated in the pending resolution are too broad.

It is my fear that, despite the well-wishings and good spirits with which the agreements with foreign countries would be entered into, the ultimate result would be to have our Government paying the bill for everything.

Through my 23 years in the Senate I have seen this happen more than once. The United States is asked to bear its fair share in a cooperative venture. Yet when the time comes to settle the bill, it is Uncle Sam who is asked to pick up the whole tab.

For some strange reason, these cooperative agreements always end up that way.

It was the understanding of the Senator from New Jersey that there would be cooperation between our country and other countries in this program. Is that correct?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Yes.

Mr. ELLENDER. But, in my opinion, we will ultimately end up by paying all the bills for training and everything else. If that is cooperation, I do not know the true meaning of the word.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I think it will be a two-way street.

Mr. HILL. The Senator from New Jersey is a member of the Subcommittee on Health, and he was most diligent in his attendance on the subcommittee. He heard all the witnesses and all the testimony from eminent doctors and scientists from throughout the Nation and from representatives of great organizations such as the American Medical Association, the American Dental Association, the American College of Surgeons, and other organizations. The Senator asked a number of questions to bring out the facts, so the committee would be satisfied in its own mind that it was putting in the measure safeguards in order that a watchful eye might be kept on the whole program—the matter to which the Senator from Louisiana has called our attention.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I thank the Senator.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I wish it were possible for me to support this bill. I would like to do so. I am not unfamiliar with the problems facing American medicine today. One of my brothers is a physician. My only son is a surgeon.

I am sympathetic with the purpose of this bill, and if it were drafted in such a way that those purposes alone would be achieved, I would support it. However, Mr. President, that is not the case.

I have no quarrel with the purpose of this bill. I do believe, however, that the authority it contains is much too sweeping. If the authorization were amended to cover the specific examples cited by the distinguished Senators who have al-

ready participated in debate, I perhaps could support the bill.

I have already discussed with the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] the authority it contains for our Government to give research grants to foreign institutions. It strikes me that with the burdens we are already carrying throughout the world, such financing could and should well be done by those countries which are presently engaged in research activities.

However, as I understand it, if our Government took upon itself to decide that the Swedes were not moving as fast in leukemia research as we would like to see them move, then authority in this bill would permit Uncle Sam to offer the Swedes a little money in order to coax them into more strenuous efforts. It seems to me that we should finance the research work we have going on in our own country, to the maximum possible and feasible, before we embark upon a new program of making grants to foreign countries.

Under this bill, the authority exists for indiscriminate financing of programs involving the exchange of doctors and others between foreign countries—not only between the United States and foreign countries, but among foreign countries themselves.

Authority also exists for further contributions to the World Health Organization. I appreciate the fact that the report on the bill indicates that this authority would be limited in its application, but I remind Senators that the committee report is not the law.

The same is true of almost every other feature of this bill, and while I am in accord with its purposes, I cannot agree that the practically boundless authority it vests in the Surgeon General is either necessary or prudent. Under the terms of this measure, $50 million per year could be used for almost any purpose imaginable. I cannot endorse legislation which is so much broader in its authority than the purposes for which it is designed require.

In this connection, I specifically call attention to the fact that the resolution contains broad power for making expenditures, which ought to be furnished by the people who are supposed to cooperate with us. If the Senator will look at page 23 of the resolution, subparagraph (d), beginning on line 21, it reads:

(d) In carrying out the provisons of this joint resolution the Surgeon General is authorized to establish offices in foreign countries, for such areas as he may deem advisable, and for such purpose appropriations for carrying out this joint resolution shall be available for rental or lease outside the United States of offices, buildings, grounds, and living quarters to house personnel; maintenance, furnishings, necessary repairs, improvements, and alterations to properties owned or rented by the United States Government abroad; and cost of fuel, water, and utilities for such properties.

That is extremely broad authority. I am wondering about the extent to which a section like this will be used to provide facilities for students, rather than for research.

Mr. HILL. Certainly the Council, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the Surgeon General would go far beyond their authority if they did so, I will say to my friend from Louisiana. The facilities must be tied to a research project.

Mr. President, may we have a vote on the committee amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, may we have the third reading of the joint resolution?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, and was read the third time.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceed to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a brief statement which I have prepared concerning the joint resolution.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR JOHNSON OF TEXAS

Senate Joint Resolution 41 would mobilize the skills, resources, talents, and capabilities of the health scientists of the world.

This legislation reflects the abiding interest of the distinguished senior Senator from Alabama, LISTER HILL, in the welfare and well-being of humankind. It is another move in the march that has led the last two Congresses to do more to advance medical research than any of its predecessors.

This would be a joining of hands in a scientific project which has neither political, nor military, nor economic objectives.

The need is great. The potential for good is equally large.

There are annually about 90 million births and 49 million deaths in the world.

I am told that in some parts of Africa, the infant mortality rate exceeds one death for every four births.

Infectious disease knows no boundary. One out of seven of the world's population suffers from an infectious eye ailment that threatens possible blindness for many.

This project would demonstrate the good that can come from people working together. It would emphasize to the world our belief that man's mission on earth is to heal and to build and not to hurt nor destroy.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, the Senate is now considering Senate Joint Resolution 41, the Health for Peace Act. For the benefit of all mankind, this could be one of the most important measures we will consider this year, and I hope we can give it prompt and favorable action.

Under this proposal, the United States will become an active participant and a leader in a program which will serve all people through cooperative research by the world's best minds.

The credit for the inspiration and work behind this bill belongs to the distinguished senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL]. For many years he has been a leader in the cause of national and international health.

No Member of the Congress has given so much of his time and talent to this fine work. He has served not only the people of his State and his country, but also the people of the world.

Recently, the distinguished senior Senator from Alabama was honored at a health-U.S.A. testimonial luncheon, where he received an award "for distinguished contributions to the health of the American people." It was a deserved tribute for many years of legislative leadership in the field of health. I commend to the attention of my colleagues the acceptance address which Senator HILL made at that time, and which was inserted in the RECORD of May 13.

The resolution which we are considering will create a new National Institute for International Medical Research, within the National Institutes of Health, with an annual authorization of $50 million.

These funds would be used to encourage and support research and the exchange of information, the training of research personnel, and the improvement of research facilities in all parts of the world.

The progressive approach embodied in this measure recognizes the fact that medical research is so complex and interrelated that victory over any disease or disability results only from the research efforts of many scientists throughout the world.

As the eminent physician, Dr. Howard A. Rusk, pointed out recently in the New York Times:

The enthusiastic congressional support of the health for peace bill gives dimension and significance to the aphorism of the late Sir William Osler, who once said: "The great republic of medicine knows and has known no national boundaries."

The passage of this joint resolution will provide the world with a practical demonstration of this country's belief in the dignity of the individual, whoever and wherever he may be. The Health for Peace Act will put the United States at the forefront of a common crusade against the age-old enemies of mankind.

Our country can be dedicated to no more important task.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, in keeping with the mood of the Senate as we consider major measures to help mankind in its constant warfare against disease, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the May 14, 1959, issue of the Newport Daily News of Newport, R.I.

The title of the editorial is "Another Manhattan Project" and it asks an all-out battle on cancer as our No. 1 public enemy.

This editorial is written from the heart—from a personal tragedy in the home of the writer whose desire is to lift that shadow from other homes.

The editorial is deeply moving and thought provoking, and it reveals the pattern of thinking throughout our land. It is a distinct contribution to our deliberations.

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

ANOTHER MANHATTAN PROJECT

In what proved to be a successful effort to beat the Nazis in evolving the atomic bomb, President Franklin D. Roosevelt and his scientific and military advisers resorted to what was called Manhattan project.

Teams of highly qualified experts were given every facility they believed essential to the task set them. Money was no object. If laboratories were needed, these were built. Apparatus, technical impedimenta of all kinds, superexpensive materials—all were supplied without stint or limitation. The only consideration was the goal—produce the bomb. It was produced.

Many believe the time has arrived for this Nation to bring into being a new kind of Manhattan project. Only this time its objective would be not something to destroy life, but something to save life. A cure for cancer.

Cancer is the No. 1 public enemy. Of late the dark shadow of this terrible affliction has been seen in public life. Secretary of State Dulles is slowly dying of it. Arthur Godfrey, one of America's favorite entertainers, has been operated on for it. Gen. Nathan F. Twining, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, has just had part of a lung removed, and as this is written it is feared cancer has attacked him.

We appropriate billions of dollars for many things. We spend and spend and spend, sometimes not wisely, but far too liberally. Isn't it time we concentrated on discovering the cause, treatment, and cure of the most horrible disease that attacks the human body? Why not, then, another all-out project, not to destroy, but to save, human beings?

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

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senators from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR and Mr. MONRONEY], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] is absent because of a death in his family.

I further announce that the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART] is absent because of illness.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senators from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR and Mr. MONRONEY], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] would each vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] is paired with the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH]. If present and voting, the Senator from Virginia would vote "nay," and the Senator from West Virginia would vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] are detained on official business.

The result was announced—yeas 63, nays 17, as follows:

YEAS—63

Aiken	Fulbright	Magnuson
Allott	Gore	Mansfield
Anderson	Green	Martin
Bartlett	Gruening	Morse
Beall	Hartke	Moss
Bible	Hayden	Mundt
Bush	Hennings	Murray
Byrd, W. Va.	Hill	Muskie
Cannon	Humphrey	Neuberger
Carlson	Jackson	O'Mahoney
Carroll	Javits	Pastore
Case, N. J.	Johnson, Tex.	Prouty
Case, S. Dak.	Jordan	Proxmire
Clark	Keating	Scott
Cooper	Kefauver	Smathers
Cotton	Kennedy	Smith
Dodd	Kuchel	Sparkman
Eastland	Long	Symington
Engle	McCarthy	Williams, N.J.
Ervin	McGee	Yarborough
Frear	McNamara	Young, Ohio

NAYS—17

Bennett	Ellender	Robertson
Butler	Holland	Russell
Capehart	Hruska	Schoeppel
Curtis	Langer	Thurmond
Dirksen	Lausche	Williams, Del.
Dworshak	McClellan	

NOT VOTING—18

Bridges	Hart	Randolph
Byrd, Va.	Hickenlooper	Saltonstall
Chavez	Johnston, S.C.	Stennis
Church	Kerr	Talmadge
Douglas	Monroney	Wiley
Goldwater	Morton	Young, N. Dak.

So the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 41) was passed.

The preamble was amended so as to read:

Whereas it is recognized that disease and disability are the common enemies of all nations and peoples, and that the means, methods, and techniques for combating and abating the ravages of disease and disability and for improving the health and health standards of man should be sought and shared, without regard to national boundaries and divisions; and

Whereas advances in combating and abating disease and in the positive promotion of human health can be stimulated by supporting and encouraging cooperation among scientists, research workers, and teachers on an international basis, with consequent benefit to the health of our people and of all peoples; and

Whereas there already exist tested means for international cooperation in matters relating to health, including the World Health Organization, the Pan American Health Organization, and the United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF), with which the United States is identified and associated, and it is highly desirable that the United States establish domestic machinery for the maximum mobilization of its health research resources, the more efficiently to cooperate with and support the research, research-training and research-planning endeavors of such international organizations: Therefore be it.

The title was amended, so as to read: "Joint resolution to establish a National Institute for International Health and Medical Research, to provide for international cooperation in health research, research training, and research planning, and for other purposes."

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the joint resolution was passed be reconsidered.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SUPPORT LEVEL FOR TOBACCO

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 285, Senate bill 1901.

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

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 1901) to amend section 101(c) of the Agricultural Act of 1949 and the act of July 28, 1945, to stabilize and protect the level of support for tobacco.

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. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, for the information of Senators, I wish to state, after consultation with the minority leader, that the tobacco bill having been made the pending business, no action will be taken, and debate will begin tomorrow as soon after the morning hour as possible. There will be no further votes today.

NATIONAL AND PROVINCIAL HEALTH PROGRAMS IN CANADA

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, frequently we focus our attention many thousands of miles away and forget what is taking place just north of us, in the land of our closest neighbor, Canada. The Oregon Daily Statesman of Salem, for May 15, 1959, published a most comprehensive and informative editorial about the health program now under way under the joint auspices of the Canadian National Government and the governments of 6 out of the 10 Provinces of Canada. Because this editorial provides so much information which has not been published widely elsewhere in the United States, I ask unanimous consent that it be included in the body of the RECORD. I might add that the editor and publisher of the Oregon Daily Statesman is Charles A. Sprague, distinguished journalist and a former outstanding Governor of the State of Oregon. The editorial is especially timely because the Senate today has passed Senate Joint Resolution 41, providing for International Health and Research under the NIH.

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

CANADA'S HEALTH PROGRAM

Canada, in its own way keeps moving along as a welfare state. Many of the Provinces, perhaps all, have universal old age grants and subventions for births. Now all but one have an insurance system which covers, or will when put into operation, hospitalization including ward accommodations, nursing, drugs, X-rays, surgical supplies and use of operating room. Quebec is the holdout. The Canadian Provinces haven't gone as far as Britain for full socialized medicine—services of physicians and surgeons are not covered under the plan as in the mother country.

The financing is contributory by the public except in Newfoundland and British Columbia where individuals are not assessed. In 6 of the 10 provinces participation in hospital insurance is compulsory. Ontario's plan is partly voluntary but 93 percent of the population are enrolled. There the fee is $2.10 per individual per month and $4.20 per family. These payments cover about a third of the cost. The remaining two-thirds are shared 50-50 by the Province and the Federal Government. The hospital program was launched by five Provinces July 1, 1958. Its spread has been rapid in the subsequent months.

In the United States reliance is still put on voluntary participation in Blue Cross or insurance plans save for such industries where companywide plans cover all employees. No effort has been made since early in the Eisenhower administration to establish a system of health insurance. In 1957 Representative FORAND, of Rhode Island, introduced a bill to have social security extend to provide hospital, surgical and nursing home benefits to the aged. It has been vigorously opposed by the American Medical Association, American Dental Association, and the hospital and nursing home associations. One reason for nonaction was the estimate by the Social Security Administration that the cost of care under the Forand bill would run to $835 million in 1959. Congress did pass a bill in 1958, H.R. 9822, for a White House Conference on Aging. This will be held in January 1961. Also for medical organizations created a Joint Council To Improve the Health Care of Aged, whose purpose was to find ways to get private sources to write health insurance for the aged.

In this country, the immediate concern is over medical and nursing care for the aged, while Canada launches a nearly universal program to provide hospital care for all. Spite of all these benefits, however, Canada still loses some 30,000 a year of its people who emigrate to the U.S.A.

PROPOSED REPEAL OF PRICE SUPPORTS ON ALL FARM COMMODITIES

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to submit, after the Senate adjourns tonight, an amendment to the so-called wheat bill, Senate bill 1968.

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

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, the amendment I propose to submit to the wheat bill, Senate bill 1968, would repeal all price supports on all farm commodities after this calendar year, or beginning January 1, 1960.

It would repeal all price supports on all the commodities the prices of which we are now supporting. It would likewise freeze the surplus or Government stockpile, except for certain purposes as directed by the President.

My amendment would permit sale from the stockpile for export. It would permit sale for the school lunch program. It would permit sales and grants to feed hungry people. The surplus could be disposed of in many other ways.

My amendment would likewise permit the President of the United States to sell in the domestic market anything from the stockpile at 100 percent of parity. If, in the opinion of the President, an emergency existed, if prices of farm products were out of line, if there were a drought, or if there were other circumstances which created an emergency, the President could permit the sale out of the stockpile, but only at 100 percent of parity.

We must do one of two things. Either we must repeal the price support laws, which my amendment would do, or we must go back to 90 or 100 percent of parity, because the system under which we are operating will not work. My amendment will be printed and made available to Senators tomorrow. It is a proposed amendment to the Wheat Act. It would freeze the surplus. We could thereby dispose of the $9 billion to $10 billion worth of surplus commodities which the Government has on hand, and any other commodities which might come into the stockpile during the remainder of the year. The surplus could be disposed of in an orderly fashion. I believe it would require at least 5 years to dispose of it. My amendment would repeal price support laws with respect to all commodities.

Therefore, starting next January, the farmer could start the year as though there never had been any Government farm regulations or laws. We would freeze the $9 billion or $10 billion worth of surpluses and dispose of them in an orderly way.

We cannot continue to spend $5 billion a year on price supports, or $6½ billion a year to operate the Department of Agriculture, when all that is being accomplished is the building up of further surpluses, without doing any good for the farmers. In other words, what is happening at the moment is that the cost is going up, the surpluses are increasing and farm prices are staying at about the same level or are going lower. It is silly and it is ridiculous. It makes no sense.

I introduced an omnibus farm bill about 3 weeks ago. I could not get too much help on it. I am now submitting my amendment to the wheat bill. It would repeal all price support laws, in an effort to be helpful and in trying to solve the so-called farm problem. The farm problem is now getting as troublesome to the taxpayer as it is to the farmers. It is not doing the farmers any good, and it is costing the taxpayers many billions of dollars.

I hope the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and the Senate and the Congress will give real consideration to the amendment I am submitting. Perhaps there is a better way to solve the problem than my amendment proposes. If there is, let us find out.

However, I say the time has arrived when Congress must face the issue. We cannot afford to delay action until next year. We ought to face the issue this year.

We must either get rid of price supports or we should devise a plan, which is workable and will actually help the farmer, and which will be less costly to the American taxpayer than the present plan.

I am submitting the amendment because I feel we must have some place from which to start. I am doing it so that we may get everyone interested in it and so that we may have a great deal of debate on the subject on the floor of the Senate. I am doing it in behalf of the American taxpayers and the American farmers. They are both vitally interested in it.

Mr. Benson has told us that the present system is not working. The President of the United States has said it is not working. The cost of the program indicates that it is not working. Farm prices indicate that it is not particularly helping the farmer. So I say, Mr. President, let us have the courage to face the issue, because only Congress can change the law, and only Congress can establish new policies.

I repeat that my amendment to the wheat bill would repeal all price supports on all commodities after this year, effective as of January 1 next year. It would freeze the $9 billion or $10 billion surpluses on January 1. It would freeze the stockpile and would permit an orderly disposal of it, so that it would not interfere with what the farmers produce and what the farmers grow from that time forward.

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

Mr. CAPEHART. I am glad to yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I wonder if I clearly understood the Senator. Is he saying that after this crop year, starting in 1960, his amendment, if enacted into law, would repeal the price supports on all farm commodities?

Mr. CAPEHART. That is correct.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Does the Senator offer any alternative?

Mr. CAPEHART. We would freeze the surplus and dispose of it in an orderly way. On January 1, the $9 billion or $10 billion worth of surplus would be disposed of in an orderly way. My best judgment is that it would take about 5 years to do so. We would take the surplus out of competition with what the farmers would start to grow next year. We must get rid of this costly program, which is not helping the farmers. There may be other ways of doing it, but, in any event, this is one way of doing it.

Mr. Benson says the present program is not working. Mr. Benson says we ought to enable the farmers to operate their own farms and conduct their own business. I am sure he would be 100 percent for the amendment. I have not discussed it with him. It is my own idea. However, I am sure that he will be for it, because he has been telling us

the present program is not workable. The President has said so in his annual message to Congress. I am certain that Secretary Benson will support this idea. I say that based on many statements he has made.

Our price supports are becoming so low—and the price supports set the market prices—that the farmers would be better off if we had no price supports at all. I say that because under the law a ceiling is provided. Under the law the Secretary of Agriculture must sell commodities from the stockpile at 5 percent above the existing support price. That means that if the support price on wheat is 75 percent, wheat is sold from the stockpile at 80 percent. That sets the market price. If we are to have support prices, we must at least get rid of that particular law. If we are going to push support prices farther down, as has been suggested by some, and have a law which provides that $9 or $10 billion worth of commodities in the stockpile must be sold at 5 percent above the support price, the program cannot work.

All we are doing is piling up more costs for the taxpayers and building up larger surpluses, and setting the market price at 5 percent above the support price. So I say let us do one of two things. I am submitting my amendment to eliminate price supports effective as of January 1. If Congress in its wisdom does not wish to do that, let us repeal the law which provides that the surplus must be sold at 5 percent above the support price. If we are to have support prices, let us put the support prices on a basis which will be helpful to the farmer. If we are going to tax the taxpayer $5 or $6 billion a year, let us at least make certain that it is going to help the farmer. It is not helping the farmer at the moment. Farm prices are going lower and lower. I shall hand the amendment to the desk in a moment. I have already obtained unanimous consent to file it tonight.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received and printed and will lie on the table.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I inquired from the distinguished Senator from Indiana as to his proposal, because it is so far reaching that I did not want to misunderstand its implications or its purpose.

I have known for some time that the policy of the administration has been to eliminate support prices. I believe that the Senator from Indiana, with his usual candor and frankness, has stated for us quite clearly what he believes to be the attitude of the Secretary of Agriculture and of the administration.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. Let me say that I have not discussed the matter with Secretary Benson or the administration. I am submitting the amendment on my own initiative.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I understand.

Mr. CAPEHART. I have not discussed it with anyone. I have said—and I now repeat—that the Secretary of Agriculture has said that the present program is not working. He is recommending lower price supports. The President in his annual message said that the program is not working. I have not discussed the proposal I am making tonight with either the President or the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I understand. I understand also that the Senator said he thought Mr. Benson would be in favor of it. He indicated quite frankly and honestly that the Secretary does recommend lower price supports.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. I said I thought the Secretary would be for it because he has repeatedly said that what he is trying to do is to get the Government out of the farming business, to permit the farmers to grow what they please and when they wish and how they wish. He has repeatedly so stated. He has said it in every one of his speeches. For that reason, I think he might well be for that proposal.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the Senator from Indiana is always frank and candid. There is a wholesomeness in his presentation.

In reality, the Secretary of Agriculture wants to get the Government out of the farm business. But the Secretary of Agriculture also follows a program of getting the farmers out of the farm business. We are really going through quite a process of elimination. Let us be quite candid about it. Let us be as clear in the statements which we make on agricultural policy as the Senator from Indiana is clear and precise in his amendment.

The administration has its own farm program. In the first 2 years, the administration said it could not be held accountable for the accumulation of surpluses and the rise in the cost of the farm program because until 1954, according to the administration's spokesmen, the administration was allegedly burdened with the policies of the previous administration.

But in 1954 a farm policy or program was adopted—not with my help, I might add—which was along the lines of the administration's proposals. Flexible price supports were written into the law on the theory that if price supports were flexed down, it would be possible to control production. The theory was that if price supports were lower, crop production would be lower.

At that time the administration did not talk about getting the Government out of the farm price-support business. It talked about getting the Government out of the 90-percent price-support program. The administration then wanted a 75- to 90-percent ratio. That was granted. It was not granted happily, but reluctantly. Nevertheless, it was granted.

Two other farm bills have been passed by Congress. Both have been vetoed by the President. Twice Congress has had to pass legislation which met the requirements and the standards of the administration. The price-support program which is now on the statute books is the price-support program which was testified to by the Secretary of Agriculture and his assistants in the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

It is true that the Secretary is now before the committee asking that supports be lowered even further, despite the fact that with price supports on oats and rye at 60 to 65 percent of parity, the production of those commodities goes up instead of down; despite the fact that when the supports on corn are lowered, the production of corn goes up instead of down.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. Not at the moment; I will yield later.

Despite a $1.10 bushel guaranteed price on corn under the present price-support program, which this administration wanted, and which it propagandized a minimum number of farmers into accepting in a referendum, less than 20 percent of the farmers even voting, the prediction of the Department of Agriculture today is that the corn crop will be the largest in the Nation's history.

I thoroughly concur in some of the statements the Senator from Indiana has made about this matter. He said that support prices are now so low that the prices on the market are going down and down. He continued by saying that if support prices are to be so low, they had better be taken off altogether.

The Secretary of Agriculture has recommended reducing support prices even more, without controls. This is what I call administrative hypocrisy. On the one hand, the administration talks about lowering support prices and removing controls in the face of a body of evidence that by so doing all that happens is to fill the warehouses, increase the amount in storage, and lower the market prices.

The only time a price-support program works is when it is good enough to provide an incentive to the farmer to cooperate in acreage and production controls. Without acreage production and controls, there should not be a price-support program.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. Anyone who farms knows that the lower the price he is to receive for the unit, the more units he must produce in order to create more dollars.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator is so right.

Mr. CAPEHART. Therefore, the lower the price, the more units the farmer will grow in order to get enough dollars to break even or to make a profit.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from Indiana is correct.

Mr. CAPEHART. The result has been that by lowering the support prices over the past several years, the surplus has gone up, production has gone up, the stockpile of the Government has gone up, and the cost to the taxpayer has gone up. That is why I have offered the amendment. It is designed to get rid of the price supports. We cannot go on as we are.

I do not say I have the answer to the problem; I am simply trying to find the

answer. I introduced an omnibus bill the other day. Now I am introducing this amendment. I have no pride of authorship. I am trying to get the administration, Congress, the public, if you please, the newspapers, and the farm organizations interested in doing something about a situation which, in my opinion, is intolerable.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from Indiana has stated with clarity and eloquence what I have attempted to state for years without, apparently, the clarity and eloquence of the Senator from Indiana. I have attempted to say that the reduction of price supports could result in only one thing—lower market prices. Lower market prices could result in only one thing—increased production, because the man on the farm—he does not have to be on a farm, he can be in business anywhere else—knows full well that as the unit price goes down, and the cost of production goes up, the only thing he can do to stay in business at all is to produce more. That is exactly what has happened.

I have stated not once, but many times, directly to the representatives of the Department of Agriculture that they were building their own Pandora's box, and that they were opening up the lid of their own Pandora's box, because as they reduced prices, the result could only be increased production. That has happened. Today, $9 billion worth of surplus commodities are in the possession of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. Neither the able Senator from Minnesota nor myself nor any other Senator needs to stand on the floor of the Senate and talk about this matter. The facts themselves prove what is happening. The record proves it. The cost is going up day by day; surpluses are increasing day by day; the prices the farmers are receiving are staying where they are or are getting lower. So it is not necessary to use oratory, if I may use that expression; the facts speak for themselves.

Technically, it would seem that the opposite should be true: That the lower the price becomes, the less the farmers will raise. That simply is not true in farming. I think it might be true in a manufacturing business. I think it might be true in a retail business. But it is not true in farming, because a year is required to grow most crops.

A farmer has X number of acres. He has a tractor, or more than one tractor, with which he tills the land. The lower the unit price he receives, the larger the crop he will try to grow, and the more fertilizer he will put on the ground to grow more units, because it is the number of bushels multiplied by the price which will give him the dollars.

I am one who has changed his mind in this matter. I am frank to say that I rather liked the idea of flexible price supports when they were begun. I voted for them. I had my doubts about them, but I voted for them. At least, I was willing to go along and try them.

The best answer is not oratory on my part or oratory on the part of any other Senator. The fact is that flexible price supports do not work. No one can show me or anyone else that they have worked.

Mr. HUMPHREY. It has been the contention of some of us who have been members of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry for a number of years that, of course, the administration's program has not worked. No more potent testimony has been given to the fallacy of the administration's economic theory on agriculture than the testimony of the Senator from Indiana; namely, that reducing price supports does not reduce production. The only way by which production can be controlled is by acreage controls, bushelage controls, marketing controls, and a price structure which will provide a commodity price sufficiently adequate to enable a farmer to afford to reduce his crop production. That has been the theory of some of us who have maintained that if there is to be a price-support program, it ought to be good enough so that regulations which we know are required will be accepted and complied with, because a good price is an incentive. That is all I am saying.

I do not wish to argue the merits of the respective programs any longer except to say that the program now in effect is the program the administration has asked for. The program which is now in effect is the worst program in the Nation's history. The program now in effect is pricing the farmers off the land. It is promoting bigger and bigger farms, at the expense of the family farm.

Finally, Mr. President, let me say that this program is going to be looked into meticulously, objectively, thoroughly, and fearlessly. The operations of the Commodity Credit Corporation and its policies, administration, and activities, and activities related to those of the Corporation are going to be looked into by the Senate Committee on Agriculure and Forestry.

This morning the distinguished Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] was appointed the chairman of a special subcommittee of six members, with a staff provided by the permanent staff of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. The subcommittee is going to look into the operations of this program. I predict that when that survey is completed and when the report on it is made, everything the Senator from Indiana has stated here today will be verified—namely, that the lowering of farm commodity price supports has resulted in the building up of mountains of surpluses, and has lowered farm income, and thereby has compelled farmers to produce more and more. I also predict that it will be found that the management of the Commodity Credit Corporation has not been to the benefit of the farm commodity producers or the farm commodity processors, and certainly not to the benefit of the consumers.

I wish to thank the Senator from Indiana for laying before us the most compelling arguments I have ever heard for changing the farm program the administration recommends. By the way, Mr. President, the administration merely recommends more of the same thing. It simply recommends larger doses of the same thing; its representatives say, "Just reduce the supports a little more." As the Senator from Indiana has said, if that is done, the only result will be greater production and increased storage and greater costs.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Moss in the chair). Does the Senator from Minnesota yield to the Senator from Indiana?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I have prepared amendments in the form of a substitute, and I shall call up the amendments later. I ask unanimous consent that my amendments in the nature of a substitute be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD, as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the amendments submitted by Mr. CAPEHART were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That (a) notwithstanding any other provision of law, no agricultural commodities, title to which has been or is hereafter acquired by the Commodity Credit Corporation, shall be sold or otherwise disposed of, except as provided in subsection (b).

"(b) Commodities referred to in subsection (a) may be disposed of, in accordance with directions of the President, as follows:

"(1) Donation, sale, or other disposition for disaster or other relief purposes outside the United States pursuant to and subject to the limitations of title II of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954;

"(2) Sale or barter (including barter for strategic materials) to develop new or expanded markets for American agricultural commodities, including but not limited to disposition pursuant to and subject to the limitations of title I of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954;

"(3) Donation to school-lunch programs;

"(4) Transfer to the national stockpile established pursuant to the Act of June 7, 1939, as amended (50 U.S.C. 98–98h), without reimbursement from funds appropriated for the purposes of that Act;

"(5) Donation, sale, or other disposition for research, experimental, or educational purposes;

"(6) Sale for new or byproduct uses;

"(7) Donation, sale, or other disposition for disaster relief purposes in the United States or to meet any national emergency declared by the President;

"(8) Sales at not less than the current parity price for such commodity, plus reasonable carrying charges, whenever the President determines that because of a shortage of the commodity such sale is necessary to prevent hardship;

"(9) Donations to penal and correctional institutions in accordance with section 210 of the Agricultural Act of 1956;

"(10) Sales for export;

"(11) Dispositions authorized by section 416 of the Agricultural Act of 1949; and

"(12) Sales for the purpose of rotating stocks or consolidating inventories, any such sale to be offset by purchase of the same commodity in a substantially equivalent quantity or of a substantially equivalent value.

"(c) Strategic materials acquired by the Commodity Credit Corporation under paragraph (2) of subsection (b) shall be transferred to the national stockpile established pursuant to the Act of June 7, 1939, as amended, or to the supplemental stockpile established by section 104(b) of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, and the Commodity Credit Corporation shall be reimbursed for the value of the commodities bartered for such strategic materials from funds appropriated pursuant to section 8 of such Act of June 7, 1939, as amended. For the purpose of such reimbursement, the value of any commodity so bartered shall be the lower of the domestic market price or the Commodity Credit Corporation's investment therein as of the date of such barter, as determined by the Secretary of Agriculture. In order to make payment to the Commodity Credit Corporation for any commodities so transferred to the national stockpile or the supplemental stockpile, there are hereby authorized to be appropriated amounts equal to the value of any commodities so transferred. The value of any commodity so transferred, for the purpose of this section, shall be the lower of the domestic market price or the Commodity Credit Corporation's investment therein as of the date of transfer to the stockpile, as determined by the Secretary of Agriculture.

"SEC. 2. Notwithstanding any other provisions of law, all provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, and the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, relating to acreage allotments, marketing quotas, and price supports for any agricultural commodity shall be ineffective with respect to the 1960 and subsequent crops of such commodities; but any right, claim, or action which accrued under any such provisions with respect to any crop prior to the 1960 crop shall not be affected.

"Amend the title to read as follows: 'A bill to provide for a new farm program.'"

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, again I wish to say that the amendments have only two parts. The first will freeze immediately the so-called stockpile, except for certain purposes.

The second will, on January 1, after this crop year, repeal all agricultural commodity price supports by the Government.

Mr. President, I submit these amendments in the hope that they will start a real argument in the Congress, and will get the administration and the people interested in doing something about this farm problem, because, as the able Senator from Minnesota and I and others have stated, something must be done about it.

I have no pride of authorship; all I seek to do is get people interested in this problem, because the present situation is far from good.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, let me say that the Senator from Indiana will not be disappointed; certainly the amendments will generate some arguments, as he knows.

Mr. CAPEHART. Yes, I think they will.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from Indiana will not be disappointed, for the administration will be interested, because his proposal is the consummation of the culmination of the procedure the administration is following. The only difference is that the Senator from Indiana would come to the point now, whereas the administration would like to drag out the matter a little longer. But the Senator from Indiana proposes that it be done now.

The Senator from Indiana has said he has no pride of authorship. Let me say that I do not blame him [laughter], because although I know the amendments are submitted in good faith, yet I also know that this proposal will only result in much more of what we already have; it will result in ever-expanded production, because the farmers will still have the same number of acres of land and the same amounts of fertilizer and the same number of tractors—or perhaps more—and there will be a substantial population to take care of; and I doubt that it will reduce production or will improve the prices of agricultural commodities.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield further to me?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am happy to yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. I am confident that it will increase the prices of agricultural commodities. Let me say that if the prices of agricultural commodities are going to get lower and lower and lower, and if the farmer is going to be in bad shape, I would prefer to have him be in bad shape in a free market, rather than to have the Government control the prices of agricultural commodities and control the agricultural policies, which today simply are not working properly.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The only change I would suggest is a change in administration, because the present farm program can work; it is not beyond salvation. It can be administered to the benefit of consumers and farmers and the Nation. I must say that it will not be so long before it will be administered in that way—in other words, in about 18 months.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, if the Senator from Minnesota will yield further to me, let me say that the Congress should proceed now to have it administered in the proper way, for the benefit of the farmers and the taxpayers. Certainly we should not wait 18 months.

Mr. HUMPHREY. We shall try; but every time the Congress attempts to do something constructive in regard to agriculture, Congress not only is threatened with a veto, but actually is met with one. I know about that; I have been serving on the committee which has been handling agricultural program bills. Each time, they are vetoed. I want the record to be crystal clear. I know that the administration would like to have the people believe that the farm program it is administering is one which was foisted upon it against its will. But that is nonsense. The program the administration is now administering is the one it asked for, and the one its representatives testified in favor of, and the one it rammed through—on the basis of a Presidential veto and the threat of a Presidential veto—as the administration's farm program; and today that program, as being administered by the administration, is wasteful, costly, and ineffective; but all that the administration is requesting is more of the same thing.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] and I, as members of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, want the administration to come forward with a new farm program which will give recognition to the facts of production and consumption. But the representatives of the administration say that all they want is to lower the price supports and remove the controls. As the Senator from Indiana has said, on the basis of his practical knowledge of business, all that will lead to is more agricultural commodity production and lower agricultural commodity prices; and he is correct.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield further to me?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. The amendments in the nature of a substitute which I have submitted to the wheat bill will give the American farmers and the Members of Congress and everyone else involved a chance to choose sides on the question whether they do or do not want the Government in the farming business. We have heard much about the matter; it has been written about a great deal; Mr. Benson has made many speeches in which he has said he wants to get the Government out of the farming business; and others have spoken along the same line. These amendments will bring that issue to a head.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from Indiana is correct.

Mr. CAPEHART. In the end, I may be sorry that I am the author of the amendments—as the Senator from Minnesota has said. But at least I am laying squarely on the table the questions whether we do or do not want to continue the program in the way it is now going; whether we want to eliminate entirely price supports, commencing January 1st; whether we wish to return to 90 percent of parity; or what else we wish to have done.

In other words, I am now placing those questions on the table; and now let us see who favor and who oppose the various proposals, and whether we mean what we have been saying, and whether we are willing to stand up and be counted and whether we have the courage now to get down to the business of making some necessary changes. Certainly something must be changed, because the present program is not working.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the Senator from Indiana is rendering a real service in bringing this issue to a head. He can rest assured that it will come to a head; the political boil which is the product of rather foolish and reckless administration will certainly be lanced in one way or another. I think we owe the Senator from Indiana a debt of gratitude for having had the frankness and the courage to say point blank that the administration's policies of lowering agricultural-commodity price supports can lead to only one result—namely, increased production and, ultimately, lower prices to be received by the farmers for the agricultural commodities they produce.

The Senator from Indiana has said he wants to get the Government out of the farming business. That is what the Secretary of Agriculture and the administration say they want, too. I should like to have the farmers have a chance to be in the farming business; and one of the ways to get that done is to have a sensible farm program which will provide marketing conditions which will be susceptible to fair prices and will give the farmers an opportunity to control their marketings, so they are not placed at the mercy of dumpings on the market during the harvest period, when the farmers must accept the prices which are offered, and so they will not have greatly reduced income with which to purchase in the nonmarketing periods the articles they need.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield to me?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. McNAMARA. I thank the Senator from Minnesota for yielding.

Mr. President, I hope the two Senators who are such experts—and I think it is encouraging to note that they agree——

Mr. HUMPHREY. We agree to disagree.

Mr. McNAMARA. I hope they will agree on the steps which need to be taken in order to decrease the surpluses. I think the Senator referred to $9 billion worth of surplus agricultural products. Is that the correct figure?

Mr. HUMPHREY. We are talking about an investment on the part of the Commodity Credit Corporation of some $9 billion in 1959, as compared with $1,200 million in 1952, when there were in effect 90 percent of parity price supports.

Mr. McNAMARA. We have been reading in the newspapers and hearing statements to the effect that we have been shipping the surpluses to needy people throughout the world. Does the Senator say that, despite such a program, there are tied up $9 billion worth of surplus foods?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is the figure. The Senator's observation is correct. The trouble with our overseas program is that it is a program of limited duration and limited amounts. If it were properly developed, a great deal more would be done.

Mr. McNAMARA. Is the new committee which is to be headed by the distinguished Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] going to take into consideration the fact that there are still throughout the world hordes of hungry people who need the food surpluses? Will the committee give consideration to that fact?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes.

Mr. McNAMARA. While large surpluses have existed for 4 or 5 years, they have been building up to tremendous proportions; and yet there are many needy people throughout the world. Is it not correct to say that the problem involved is getting proper distribution of the food surpluses to hungry people, and that consideration of that problem should be brought into the picture?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator is correct. Furthermore, there is involved the question of utilizing our food and fiber as a part of our foreign program for peace and security in the world. Any administration that cannot plan how to use food and fiber for that purpose is, may I say, bankrupt in imagination and initiative.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, May 20, 1959, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 902) 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.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate stand adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 13 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, May 21, 1959, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate May 20, 1959:

THE NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE COUNCIL

William A. M. Burden, of New York, to be a member of the National Aeronautics and Space Council, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

Dr. John T. Rettaliata, of Illinois, to be a member of the National Aeronautics and Space Council.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE NAVY AND MARINE CORPS

The nominations of David K. Bishop, and other officers for appointment in the Navy and in the Marine Corps, which were confirmed today, May 20, 1959, were received by the Senate on May 7, 1959, and appear in full in the Senate proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for that date, under the caption "Nominations," beginning with the name of David K. Bishop which is shown on page 6912, and ending with the name of Herman B. West, which is shown on page 6919.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, MAY 20, 1959

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Psalm 118: 24: *This is the day which the Lord hath made; we will rejoice and be glad in it.*

O Thou who hast blessed us with the gift of a new day, may there be nothing in this day's work of which we shall be ashamed, when the sun has set nor at the eventide of our life when Thou shalt call us to Thyself.

Establish within us those loyalties and integrities which cannot be shaken but will be our support in our times of temptation and trial.

May the strength and splendor of our faith in Thee be made manifest as we daily strive to discharge those tasks and responsibilities which Thou hast committed unto us.

Fill us with a deep longing to have a larger part in opening for men and nations everywhere the gateway to the more abundant life.

To Thy name we ascribe all the glory. 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, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 4245. An act relating to the taxation of the income of life insurance companies.

The message also announced that the Senate insists on its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. BYRD of Virginia, Mr. KERR, Mr. FREAR, Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware, and Mr. CARLSON to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 72. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Navajo Indian irrigation project and the initial stage of the San Juan-Chama project as participating projects of the Colorado River storage project, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1094) entitled "An act to amend the Bretton Woods Agreements Act," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. GREEN, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. WILEY, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, and Mr. LANGER to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

JOSE FIGUERES

Mr. PORTER. 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 Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I should like to call attention to the presence in the United States of the distinguished former President of Costa Rica, Jose Figueres, with his lovely American wife, Karen. Pepe, as he is affectionately known by his many friends in the Western Hemisphere and in Europe, has fought, with social, political, economic, and military weapons, against dictators and communism and for democracy and human rights.

Figueres, who is both an idealist and a practical politician, an economist, and a successful farmer, reports that we—the

free world, that is—are losing the cold war in Latin America, even though the fight against dictators is being won. He asks that we make our love of representative democracy better known. He asks that we concentrate on the development of trade, not aid.

I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that we warmly welcome this keen and salty leader of the free world fight in the Western Hemisphere. We respect him. We listen to him with special interest in this time when we want to develop a much more effective and friendly relationship with our good neighbors to the South.

DEPARTMENTS OF STATE, JUSTICE, AND THE JUDICIARY APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations may have until midnight tomorrow, Thursday, to file a report on the bill making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and the Judiciary, and related agencies.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOW reserved all points of order on the bill.

HON. JAMES L. WHITLEY

Mrs. WEIS. 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 New York?

There was no objection.

Mrs. WEIS. Mr. Speaker, it is with a deep sense of regret that I report to the House the passing of a former colleague and one of my predecessors, the Honorable James L. Whitley, of Rochester, who passed away on Sunday evening.

Jim Whitley, who would have been 87 next Sunday, dedicated his entire life to the public service, and his friends and acquaintances among the leading political figures of his day were legion. Presidents, Governors, Senators, Congressman, State legislators—he was close to many of them. Perhaps even more important, he was equally close to a host of party workers and to the little people of our community.

A lifelong Republican himself, Jim Whitley's friendships knew no party bounds, and the late Al Smith, former Governor of New York and the 1928 Democratic Presidential candidate, was one of his closest and dearest friends.

He was a warm, outgoing man, whose greatest source of satisfaction came from serving the people he represented, and he served them long and well, in a variety of posts.

He was first elected to the New York State Legislature in 1906, and in 1918 he moved to the State senate, where he served with distinction until his election to the House of Representatives in 1928 as the Representative from New York's 45th District. In both Albany and Washington his record was a distinguished one.

Mr. Speaker, Jim Whitley was a personal friend of mine, and I know I speak for all of his friends when I say that he will be sorely missed. To his wife, Ora, and his son, Jim—both of whom have my deepest sympathy—I can say only that we who were privileged to know Jim and count him as a friend share fully in your deep sorrow at his passing.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION

The SPEAKER. The unfinished business is on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill H.R. 7007.

The question was taken.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 294, nays, 128, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 46]

YEAS—294

Adair	Cohelan	Halleck
Addonizio	Conte	Halpern
Albert	Cook	Hargis
Alford	Cooley	Harmon
Anderson, Mont.	Corbett	Harris
Anfuso	Cramer	Hays
Arends	Curtis, Mass.	Healey
Ashley	Daddario	Hechler
Aspinall	Dague	Herlong
Avery	Daniels	Hess
Bailey	Davis, Tenn	Hogan
Baker	Dawson	Holland
Baldwin	Delaney	Holt
Barden	Dent	Holtzman
Baring	Denton	Hosmer
Barr	Diggs	Huddleston
Barrett	Dingell	Ikard
Bass, N.H.	Dixon	Irwin
Bass, Tenn.	Dollinger	Jennings
Bates	Donohue	Johnson, Calif.
Baumhart	Dooley	Johnson, Md.
Beckworth	Dorn, N.Y.	Johnson, Wis.
Belcher	Dorn, S.C.	Jones, Ala.
Bennett, Fla.	Dowdy	Karsten
Bennett, Mich.	Downing	Karth
Betts	Doyle	Kasem
Blatnik	Dulski	Kastenmeier
Blitch	Durham	Kearns
Boland	Dwyer	Kee
Bolling	Edmondson	Keith
Bonner	Elliott	Kelly
Bowles	Everett	Keogh
Boykin	Fallon	Kilday
Boyle	Farbstein	Kilgore
Brademas	Fascell	King, Calif.
Breeding	Feighan	King, Utah
Brewster	Fenton	Kluczynski
Brock	Fino	Kowalski
Brooks, La.	Fisher	Lafore
Brooks, Tex.	Flood	Lane
Brown, Ga.	Flynn	Lankford
Brown, Mo.	Foley	Levering
Broyhill	Forand	Libonati
Buckley	Forrester	Lindsay
Burdick	Frazier	Loser
Burke, Ky.	Frelinghuysen	McCormack
Burke, Mass.	Friedel	McDonough
Burleson	Fulton	McDowell
Cahill	Gallagher	McFall
Canfield	Garmatz	McGinley
Carnahan	Gathings	McGovern
Carter	Gavin	McSween
Casey	George	Macdonald
Celler	Giaimo	Machrowicz
Chelf	Glenn	Mack, Ill.
Chenoweth	Grant	Mack, Wash.
Chiperfield	Gray	Madden
Clark	Green, Oreg.	Mailliard
Coad	Green, Pa.	Martin
Coffin	Griffiths	Matthews
	Hall	Merrow
Metcalf	Poage	Springer
Meyer	Porter	Staggers
Miller, Clement W.	Powell	Stratton
Miller, George P.	Price	Stubblefield
Miller, N.Y.	Prokop	Sullivan
Milliken	Pucinski	Teague, Calif.
Mills	Quigley	Teague, Tex.
Mitchell	Rabaut	Teller
Moeller	Rains	Thompson, La.
Monagan	Randall	Thompson, N.J.
Montoya	Reece, Tenn.	Thompson, Tex.
Moore	Reuss	Thornberry
Moorhead	Rhodes, Pa.	Toll
Morgan	Riehlman	Tollefson
Morris, N. Mex.	Riley	Trimble
Morris, Okla.	Rivers, Alaska	Udall
Moss	Rivers, S.C.	Ullman
Moulder	Rodino	Vanik
Multer	Rogers, Colo.	Van Pelt
Mumma	Rogers, Fla.	Van Zandt
Murphy	Rogers, Mass.	Vinson
O'Brien, Ill.	Rogers, Tex.	Wainwright
O'Brien, N.Y.	Rooney	Wallhauser
O'Hara, Ill.	Roosevelt	Walter
O'Hara, Mich.	Rostenkowski	Wampler
O'Neill	Roush	Watts
Oliver	Rutherford	Weis
Osmers	Santangelo	Westland
Passman	Saund	Whitener
Pelly	Saylor	Wier
Perkins	Scott	Willis
Pfost	Selden	Withrow
Philbin	Shipley	Wolf
Pilcher	Sisk	Wright
Pillion	Slack	Yates
Pirnie	Smith, Iowa	Young
	Smith, Miss.	Zablocki
	Spence	Zelenko

NAYS—128

Abbitt	Gross	Murray
Abernethy	Gubser	Natcher
Alexander	Hagen	Nelsen
Alger	Haley	Norblad
Allen	Hardy	Norrell
Andersen, Minn.	Harrison	O'Konski
Andrews	Hemphill	Ostertag
Ashmore	Henderson	Patman
Auchincloss	Hiestand	Poff
Ayres	Hoeven	Preston
Becker	Hoffman, Ill.	Quie
Bentley	Hoffman, Mich.	Ray
Berry	Holifield	Rees, Kans.
Boggs	Horan	Rhodes, Ariz.
Bolton	Hull	Robison
Bosch	Jackson	St. George
Bow	Jarman	Schenck
Bray	Jensen	Scherer
Broomfield	Johansen	Schwengel
Brown, Ohio	Johnson, Colo.	Shelley
Budge	Jonas	Sheppard
Bush	Jones, Mo.	Short
Byrnes, Wis.	Judd	Sikes
Cannon	Kilburn	Siler
Cederberg	Kirwan	Simpson, Ill.
Chamberlain	Kitchin	Smith, Calif.
Church	Knox	Smith, Kans.
Collier	Landrum	Smith, Va.
Colmer	Langen	Steed
Cunningham	Latta	Taber
Curtin	Lennon	Taylor
Curtis, Mo.	Lipscomb	Thomas
Davis, Ga.	McCulloch	Thomson, Wyo.
Derounian	McIntire	Tuck
Derwinski	McMillan	Utt
Devine	Magnuson	Weaver
Evins	Mahon	Wharton
Flynt	Marshall	Whitten
Ford	Mason	Widnall
Fountain	May	Williams
Gary	Meader	Wilson
Griffin	Michel	Winstead
	Minshall	Younger

NOT VOTING—11

Barry	Hébert	Nix
Byrne, Pa.	Laird	Roberts
Fogarty	Lesinski	Simpson, Pa.
Granahan	Morrison	

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Fogarty with Mr. Barry.

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Simpson of Pennsylvania.

Mr. Morrison with Mr. Laird.

Mr. HARRISON changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. PATMAN and Mr. DAGUE changed their votes from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TAXATION OF INCOME OF LIFE INSURANCE COMPANIES

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 4245) relating to the taxation of the income of life insurance companies, together with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments and agree to the conference requested by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas? The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. MILLS, FORAND, KING of California, SIMPSON of Pennsylvania, and MASON.

AGRICULTURAL LOANS

Mr. AVERY. 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 Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, several Members have questioned the full implication of the amendment I offered in the Committee of the Whole to the appropriation bill for the Department of Agriculture to limit the amount of a loan made to eligible producers by the Commodity Credit Corporation.

The limitation of $50,000 which I have proposed on Commodity Credit Corporation loans is intended as a limitation on the total amount of loans to be made on any one commodity produced on any one farm as the term "farm" is defined by the regulation of the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. DINGELL. 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 Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to find that the House is at last going to have an opportunity to vote on the proposal to limit the amount of price supports which may be made available to any one producer. During the last session of Congress, I introduced H.R. 11905 for this purpose, and on May 18 of this year, I reintroduced this measure. It is H.R. 7182.

For years the farm program, originally intended to protect the family farm, has been used to protect those who grow enormous quantities of foods for storage rather than consumption. I made a study of the largest payments for price support operation and found that for four commodities the following amounts were paid to the largest single producer:

Corn, $138,627.04 in Indiana.

Cotton, $1,446,605.67 in Mississippi.

Wheat, $312,998.02 in Montana.

Rice, $705,648.83 in Texas.

Limitation of the amount payable to any one producer at the rate of $50,000 per year will eliminate payments to less than 1 percent of our farms. According to the Library of Congress, only 134,000 farms, or fewer than 3 percent of all farms, sell products valued at more than $25,000 annually.

The Michigan junior Senator, the Honorable PHILIP A. HART, and my good friend the senior Senator from Minnesota, the Honorable HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, have also long been interested in this matter.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE AND FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION APPROPRIATION BILL, 1960

The SPEAKER. The unfinished business is the motion to recommit offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] on the bill (H.R. 7175) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and Farm Credit Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, and for other purposes.

Without objection, the Clerk will again report the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 27, line 18, strike out the period and insert *"Provided further,* That no funds appropriated in this section shall be used to process a Commodity Credit loan which is in excess of $50,000."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 261, nays 165, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 47]

YEAS—261

Adair
Addonizio
Alger
Allen
Andersen, Minn.
Anderson, Mont.
Arends
Ashley
Auchincloss
Avery
Ayres
Baldwin
Barr
Barry
Bass, N.H.
Bates
Baumhart
Becker
Beckworth
Belcher
Bennett, Fla.
Bennett, Mich.
Bentley
Berry
Betts
Boggs
Boland
Bolton
Bosch
Bow
Bowles
Boyle
Brademas
Bray
Brewster
Brock
Broomfield
Brown, Ohio
Broyhill
Budge
Burdick
Bush
Byrnes, Wis.
Cahill
Canfield
Carter
Casey
Cederberg
Chamberlain
Chenoweth
Chiperfield
Church
Coad
Coffin
Cohelan
Collier
Conte
Cook
Corbett
Cramer
Cunningham
Curtin
Curtis, Mass.
Curtis, Mo.
Daddario
Dague
Daniels
Delaney
Derounian
Derwinski
Devine
Diggs
Dingell
Dixon
Donohue
Dooley
Dorn, N.Y.
Dowdy
Dwyer
Fallon
Fascell
Feighan
Fenton
Fino
Fisher
Flynn
Foley
Forand
Ford
Frelinghuysen
Friedel
Fulton
Gallagher
Garmitz
Gary
Gavin
Giaimo
Glenn
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Griffin
Griffiths
Gross
Gubser
Haley
Halleck
Halpern
Hargis
Harrison
Hays
Hechler
Henderson
Hess
Hiestand
Hoeven
Hoffman, Ill.
Hoffman, Mich.
Holt
Holtzman
Horan
Hosmer
Irwin
Jackson
Jensen
Johansen
Johnson, Md.
Johnson, Wis.
Jonas
Judd
Karth
Kastenmeier
Kearns
Keith
Kelly
Kilburn
Kilday
King, Calif.
King, Utah
Knox
Kowalski
Lafore
Lane
Langen
Latta
Lesinksi
Levering
Lindsay
Lipscomb
Loser
McCulloch
McDonough
McDowell
McGinley
McGovern
McIntire
Macdonald
Machrowicz
Mack, Ill.
Mack, Wash.
Magnuson
Mailliard
Martin
Mason
May
Meader
Merrow
Metcalf
Meyer
Michel
Miller, Clement W.
Miller, George P.
Miller, N.Y.
Milliken
Minshall
Moeller
Monagan
Montoya
Moore
Moorhead
Morris, N. Mex.
Mumma
Nelsen
Norblad
O'Brien, N.Y.
O'Hara, Mich.
O'Konski
O'Neill
Oliver
Osmers
Ostertag
Pelly
Pfost
Philbin
Pillion
Pirnie
Poff
Porter
Price
Pucinski
Quie
Quigley
Rabaut
Randall
Ray
Rees, Kans.
Reuss
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rhodes, Pa.
Riehlman
Rivers, Alaska
Robison
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Rogers, Mass.
Roosevelt
Roush
Rutherford
St. George
Saylor
Schenck
Scherer
Schwengel
Shipley
Short
Simpson, Ill.
Simpson, Pa.
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Iowa
Springer
Stratton
Sullivan
Taber
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Thomas
Thompson, N.J.
Thomson, Wyo.
Tollefson
Udall
Utt
Vanik
Van Pelt
Van Zandt
Wainwright
Wallhauser
Walter
Wampler
Weaver
Weis
Westland
Wharton
Widnall
Wier
Wilson
Withrow
Wolf
Wright
Yates
Younger
Zablocki

NAYS—165

Abbitt
Abernethy
Albert
Alexander
Alford
Andrews
Anfuso
Ashmore
Aspinall
Bailey
Baker
Barden
Baring
Barrett
Bass, Tenn.
Blatnik
Blitch
Bolling
Bonner
Boykin
Breeding
Brooks, La.
Brooks, Tex.
Brown, Ga.
Brown, Mo.
Buckley
Burke, Ky.
Burke, Mass.
Burleson
Byrne, Pa.
Cannon
Carnahan
Celler
Chelf
Clark
Cooley
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Tenn.
Dawson
Dent
Denton
Dollinger
Dorn, S.C.
Downing
Doyle
Dulski
Durham
Edmondson
Elliott
Everett
Evins
Farbstein
Flood
Flynt
Forrester
Fountain
Frazier
Gathings
George
Grant
Green, Pa.
Hagen
Hall
Hardy
Harmon
Harris
Healey
Hébert
Hemphill
Herlong
Hogan
Holifield
Holland
Huddleston
Hull
Ikard
Jarman
Jennings
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Colo.
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Mo.
Karsten
Kasem
Kee
Keogh
Kilgore
Kirwan
Kitchin
Kluczynski
Landrum
Lankford
Lennon
Libonati
McCormack
McFall
McMillan
McSween
Madden
Mahon
Marshall
Matthews
Mills
Mitchell
Morgan
Morris, Okla.
Moss
Moulder
Multer
Murphy
Murray
Natcher
Norrell
O'Brien, Ill.
O'Hara, Ill.
Passman
Patman
Perkins
Pilcher
Poage
Powell
Preston
Prokop
Rains
Reece, Tenn.
Riley
Rivers, S.C.
Rogers, Tex.
Rooney
Rostenkowski
Santangelo
Saund
Scott
Selden
Shelley
Sheppard
Sikes
Siler
Sisk
Slack
Smith, Kans.
Smith, Miss.
Smith, Va.
Spence
Staggers
Steed
Stubblefield
Teague, Tex.
Teller
Thompson, La.
Thompson, Tex.
Thornberry
Toll
Trimble
Tuck
Ullman
Vinson
Watts
Whitener
Whitten
Williams
Willis
Winstead
Young
Zelenko

NOT VOTING—7

Colmer
Fogarty
Granahan
Laird
Morrison
Nix
Roberts

So the motion to recommit was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Laird for, with Mr. Morrison against.

Mr. Fogarty for, with Mrs. Granahan against.

Mr. MACHROWICZ changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. BAKER changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, by the adoption of this motion the benefits of the farm program are destroyed and it will cost double to the Government. Do I have any discretion as to when I would be required to offer an amendment in accordance with the instructions of the House?

The SPEAKER. Under the motion offered by the gentleman from New York, the gentleman must do it forthwith.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the instructions of the House on the motion to recommit, I report back the bill H.R. 7175 with an amendment.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 27, line 18, strike out the period and insert:

Provided further, That no funds appropriated in this section shall be used to process a commodity credit loan which is in excess of $50,000.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

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

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HOUSING ACT OF 1959

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (S. 57) to extend and amend laws relating to the provision and improvement of housing and the renewal of urban communities, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill S. 57, with Mr. WALTER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose on yesterday, the Clerk had read through line 19, page 89, which is the first section of the committee amendment.

Mr. HERLONG. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HERLONG: Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the text of H.R. 7117, as follows:

"*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That this Act may be cited as the 'Housing Act of 1959'.

"TITLE I—FHA INSURANCE PROGRAMS

"Property improvement loans

"SEC. 101. Section 2(a) of the National Housing Act is amended by striking out 'September 30, 1959' and inserting in lieu thereof 'October 1, 1960'.

"Section 203 residential housing insurance

"SEC. 102. (a)(1) Section 203(b)(2) of the National Housing Act is amended by striking out '$20,000' and inserting in lieu thereof '$25,000'.

"(2) Section 203(b)(2) of such Act is further amended—

"(A) by striking out '85 per centum' and inserting in lieu thereof '90 per centum';

"(B) by striking out '$16,000' each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof '$18,000'; and

"(C) by striking out '70 per centum' and inserting in lieu thereof '75 per centum'.

"(b) Section 203(b)(3) of such Act is amended by striking out 'thirty years' and inserting in lieu thereof 'thirty-five years'.

"(c) Section 203(b)(8) of such Act is amended by striking out the period at the end thereof and inserting in lieu thereof a colon and the following: '*Provided,* That such 85 per centum limitation shall not be applicable if the mortgagor and mortgagee assume responsibility in a manner satisfactory to the Commissioner for the reduction of the mortgage by an amount not less than 15 per centum of the outstanding principal amount thereof in the event the mortgaged property is not, prior to the due date of the eighteenth amortization payment of the mortgage, sold to a purchaser acceptable to the Commissioner who is the occupant of the property and who assumes and agrees to pay the mortgage indebtedness.'

"(d) Section 203(c) of such Act is amended by striking out all that precedes the first colon and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"'(c) The Commissioner is authorized to fix a premium charge for the insurance of mortgages under this title but in the case of any mortgage such charge shall be not less than an amount equivalent to one-fourth of 1 per centum per annum nor more than an amount equivalent to 1 per centum per annum of the amount of the principal obligation of the mortgage outstanding at any time, without taking in account delinquent payments or prepayments'.

"Low-cost housing in outlying areas

"SEC. 103. Section 203(i) of the National Housing Act is amended—

"(1) by striking out '$8,000' and inserting in lieu thereof '$9,000';

"(2) by inserting after '97 per centum' the following: '(or, in any case where the dwelling is not approved for mortgage insurance prior to the beginning of construction, unless the construction of the dwelling was completed more than one year prior to the application for mortgage insurance or the dwelling was approved for guaranty, insurance, or direct loan under chapter 37 of title 38, United States Code, prior to the beginning of construction, 90 per centum)'; and

"(3) by striking out ', and which is approved for mortgage insurance prior to the beginning of construction' and 'the construction of'.

"Section 207 rental housing insurance

"SEC. 104. (a) Section 207(c)(1) of the National Housing Act is amended by striking out '$12,500,000' and inserting in lieu thereof '$20,000,000'.

"(b)(1) Section 207(c)(2) of such Act is amended by striking out '90 per centum' each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof '95 per centum.'

"(c) Section 207(c)(3) of such Act is amended by striking out—

"(1) '$2,250' each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof '$2,850';

"(2) '$8,100' each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof '$9,000';

"(3) '$2,700' and inserting in lieu thereof '$3,315';

"(4) '$8,400' and inserting in lieu thereof '$9,500'; and

"(5) '$1,000 per room' and inserting in lieu thereof '$1,250 per room';

"(6) '$1,000 per space' and inserting in lieu thereof '$1,500 per space'; and

"(7) '$300,000' and inserting in lieu thereof '$400,000'.

"(d) The last paragraph of section 207(c) of such Act is amended by striking out '4½ per centum per annum' and inserting in lieu thereof '5 per centum per annum'.

"(e) Section 207 of such Act is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"'(r) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, the Commissioner is authorized to include in any mortgage insured under any title of this Act after the effective date of the Housing Act of 1959 a provision requiring the mortgagor to pay a service charge to the Commissioner in the event such mortgage is assigned to and held by the Commissioner. Such service charge shall not exceed the amount prescribed by the Commissioner for mortgage insurance premiums applicable to such mortgage.'

"Cooperative housing insurance

"SEC. 105. (a) Section 213(b)(1) of the National Housing Act is amended by striking out '$12,500,000' and inserting in lieu thereof '$20,000,000'.

"(b) Section 213(b)(2) of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"'(2) not to exceed for such part of the property or project as may be attributable to dwelling use, $2,910 per room (or $9,000 per family unit if the number of rooms in such property or project is less than four per family unit), and not to exceed 97 per centum of the amount which the Commissioner estimates will be the replacement cost of the property or project when the proposed physical improvements are completed: *Provided,* That if at least 50 per centum of the membership of the corporation or number of beneficiaries of the trust consists of veterans, the mortgage may involve a principal obligation not to exceed $2,970 per room (or $9,500 per family unit if the number of rooms in such property or project is less than four per family unit), and not to exceed the amount which the Commissioner estimates will be the replacement cost of the property or project when the proposed physical improvements are completed: *Provided further,* That as to projects which consist of elevator-type structures the Commissioner may, in his discretion, increase the dollar amount limitation of $2,910 per room to not to exceed $3,395, the dollar amount limitation of $2,970 per room to not to exceed $3,465, the dollar amount limitation of $9,000 per family unit to not to exceed $9,400, and the dollar amount limitation of $9,500 per family unit to not to exceed $9,900, as the case may be, to compensate for the higher costs incident to the construction of elevator-type structures of sound standards of construction and design: *Provided further,* That the Commissioner may, by regulations, increase any of the foregoing dollar amount limitations by not to exceed $1,250 per room, with-

out regard to the number of rooms being less than four, or four or more, in any geographical area where he finds that cost levels so require: *Provided further,* That in the case of a mortgagor of the character described in paragraph (3) of subsection (a) the mortgage shall involve a principal obligation in an amount not to exceed 90 per centum of the amount which the Commissioner estimates will be the replacement cost of the property or project when the proposed physical improvements are completed: *Provided further,* That upon the sale of a property or project by a mortgagor of the character described in paragraph (3) of subsection (a) to a nonprofit cooperative ownership housing corporation or trust within two years after the completion of such property or project the mortgage given to finance such sale shall involve a principal obligation in an amount not to exceed the maximum amount computed in accordance with this subsection without regard to the preceding proviso: *And provided further,* That for the purposes of this section the term "veterans" shall mean persons who have served in the active military or naval service of the United States at any time on or after April 6, 1917, and prior to November 12, 1918, or on or after September 16, 1940, and prior to July 26, 1947, or on or after June 27, 1950, and prior to February 1, 1955.'

"(e) Section 213(d) of such Act is amended by adding at the end thereof a new sentence as follows: 'Property held by a corporation or trust of the character described in paragraph numbered (2) of subsection (a) of this section which is covered by a mortgage insured under this section may include such community facilities and property held by a mortgagor of the character described in paragraph numbered (3) of subsection (a) of this section which is covered by a mortgage insured under this section may include such commercial and community facilities, as the Commissioner deems adequate to serve the occupants.'

"(d) Section 213 of such Act is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"'(i) Nothing in this Act shall be construed to prevent the insurance of a mortgage executed by a mortgagor of the character described in paragraph (1) of subsection (a) of this section covering property upon which dwelling units and related facilities have been constructed prior to the filing of the application for mortgage insurance hereunder: *Provided,* That the Commissioner determines that the consumer interest is protected and that the mortgagor will be a consumer cooperative: *Provided further,* That in the case of properties other than new construction, the limitations in this section upon the amount of the mortgage shall be based upon the appraised value of the property for continued use as a cooperative rather than upon the Commisisoner's estimate of the replacement cost: *And provided further,* That as to any project on which construction was commenced after the effective date of this subsection, the mortgage on such project shall be eligible for insurance under this section only in those cases where the construction was subject to inspection by the Commissioner and where there was compliance with the provisions of section 212 of this title. As to any project on which construction was commenced prior to the effective date of this subsection, such inspection, and compliance with the provisions of section 212 of this title, shall not be a prerequisite.'

"(e)(1) Section 213 of such Act is further amended by adding after subsection (i) (as added by subsection (d) of this section) the following new subsections:

"'(j) There is hereby created a Cooperative Management Housing Insurance Fund (herein referred to as the "Management Fund") which shall be used by the Commissioner as a revolving fund for carrying out the provisions of this title with respect to mortgages insured under subsection (a)(1) and subsection (a)(3) pursuant to commitments issued on or after the date of the enactment of the Housing Act of 1959 or mortgage insurance commitments reissued under subsection (n). The Commissioner is directed to transfer to the Management Fund the sum of $2,000,000 from the Housing Insurance Fund established pursuant to section 207(f). General expenses of operation of the Federal Housing Administration relating to mortgages the mortgage insurance for which is the obligation of the Management Fund may be charged to the Management Fund.

"'(k) The Commissioner shall establish, as of the enactment of the Housing Act of 1959, in the Management Fund, a General Surplus Account and a Participating Reserve Account. The aggregate net income thereafter received or any net loss thereafter sustained by the Management Fund in any semiannual period shall be credited or charged to the General Surplus Account and/or the Participating Reserve Account in such manner and amounts as the Commissioner may determine to be in accord with sound actuarial and accounting practice. Upon termination of the insurance obligation of the Management Fund by payment of any mortgage insured thereunder and/or at such time or times prior to such termination as the Commissioner may determine, the Commissioner is authorized to distribute to the mortgagor a share of the Participating Reserve Account in such manner and amount as the Commissioner shall determine to be equitable and in accordance with sound actuarial and accounting practice: *Provided,* That, in no event shall the amount of such distributive share exceed the aggregate scheduled annual premiums of the mortgagor to the year of payment of such share less the total amount of any share or shares previously distributed by the Commissioner to the mortgagor: *And provided further,* That in no event may any such distributive shares be distributed until any funds transferred to the Management Fund pursuant to section 219 have been repaid in full to the transferring fund. No mortgagor or mortgagee shall have any vested right in a credit balance in any such account or be subject to any liability arising out of the mutuality of the Management Fund, and the determination of the Commissioner as to the amount to be paid by him to any mortgagor shall be final and conclusive.

"'(l) There is hereby created a Cooperative Sales Housing Insurance Fund (herein referred to as the 'Sales Fund') which shall be used by the Commissioner as a revolving fund for carrying out the provisions of this title with respect to mortgages insured under subsection (a)(2) and individual mortgages insured under subsection (d) pursuant to commitments issued on or after the date of the enactment of the Housing Act of 1959 or mortgage insurance or commitments reissued under subsection (n). The Commissioner is directed to transfer to the Sales Fund the sum of $1 million from the Housing Insurance Fund established pursuant to section 207(f). General expenses of the operation of the Federal Housing Administration relating to mortgages the mortgage insurance for which is the obligation of the Sales Fund may be charged to the Sales Fund.

"'(m) The Commissioner shall establish, as of the enactment of the Housing Act of 1959, in the Sales Fund, a General Surplus Account and a Participating Reserve Account. The aggregate net income thereafter received or any net loss thereafter sustained by the Sales Fund in any semiannual period shall be credited or charged to the General Surplus Account and/or the Participating Reserve Account in such manner and amounts as the Commissioner may determine to be in accordance with sound actuarial and accounting practice. Upon termination of the insurance obligation of the Sales Fund by payment of any mortgage insured thereunder, the Commissioner is authorized to distribute to the mortgagor a share of the Participating Reserve Account in such manner and amount as the Commissioner shall determine to be equitable and in accordance with sound actuarial and accounting practice: *Provided,* That in no event shall any such distributive share exceed the aggregate scheduled annual premiums of the mortgagor to the year of termination of the insurance: *And provided further,* That in no event may any such distributive share be distributed until any funds transferred to the Sales Fund pursuant to section 219 have been repaid in full to the transferring fund. No mortgagor or mortgagee shall have any vested right in a credit balance in any such account, or be subject to any liability arising out of the mutuality of the Sales Fund, and the determination of the Commissioner as to the amount to be paid by him to any mortgagor shall be final and conclusive.

"'(n) The Commissioner shall be empowered to reissue under the Management Fund or the Sales Fund, as the case may be, commitments or the mortgage insurance for any mortgage insured under this section pursuant to a commitment issued prior to the date of the enactment of the Housing Act of 1959, provided the consent of the mortgagees to such reissuance is obtained, or a request by the mortgagee for such reissuance is received, by the Commissioner within ninety days after the date of the enactment of the Housing Act of 1959; but the mortgage insurance for any such mortgage shall not be reissued under this subsection if on the date of the enactment of the Housing Act of 1959 the mortgage is in default and the mortgagee has notified the Commissioner in writing of its intention to file claim for debentures. Any insurance or commitment not so reissued shall not be affected by the enactment of the Housing Act of 1959.'

"(2) Section 207(f) of such Act is amended by striking out 'and section 213' each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof 'and (except with respect to mortgages the mortgage insurance for which is the obligation of the Cooperative Management Housing Insurance Fund or the Cooperative Sales Housing Insurance Fund) section 213'.

"(3) Section 213(a)(3) of such Act is amended by striking out the semicolon at the end thereof and inserting in lieu of such semicolon a colon and the following: '*Provided,* That as to mortgages the mortgage insurance for which is the obligation of the Management Fund such stock or interest shall be paid for out of the Management Fund;'.

"(4) Section 213(a) of such Act is further amended by striking out the period at the end thereof and inserting in lieu of such period a colon and the following: '*Provided,* That as applied to mortgages the mortgage insurance for which is the obligation of the Sales Fund, the reference to the Housing Fund in section 207(b)(2) shall refer to the Sales Fund: *Provided further,* That as applied to mortgages the mortgage insurance for which is the obligation of the Management Fund, the reference to the Housing Fund in section 207(b)(2) shall refer to the Management Fund.'

"(5) Section 213 (e) of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"'(e)(1) The provisions of subsections (d), (e), (g), (h), (i), (j), (k), (l), (m), (n), and (p) of section 207 shall apply to mortgages insured under subsection (a)(1) and subsection (a)(3) of this section except that as applied to mortgages the mortgage insurance for which is the obligation of the Management Fund pursuant to section 213

(j), (A) all references to the Housing Insurance Fund or Housing Fund shall refer to the Management Fund, and (B) all references to section 207 or 210 shall refer to subsection (a)(1) and subsection (a) (3) of this section.

"'(2) The provisions of subsections (d), (e), (g), (h), (i), (j), (k), (l), (m), (n), and (p) of section 207 shall apply to mortgages insured under subsection (a)(2) of this section, except that as applied to mortgages the mortgage insurance for which is the obligation of the Sales Fund pursuant to section 213(l), (A) all references to the Housing Insurance Fund or Housing Fund shall refer to the Sales Fund, and (B) all references to section 207 or 210 shall refer to subsection (a)(2) of this section.

"'(3) The provisions of subsections (a), (c), (d), (e), (f), (g), (h), (j), and (k) of section 204 and subsection (p) of section 207 shall apply to individual mortgages insured under subsection (d) of this section, except that as applied to mortgages the mortgage insurance for which is the obligation of the Sales Fund pursuant to section 213(l), (A) all references to the Housing Insurance Fund or the Housing Fund in subsections (c), (d), and (f) of section 204 and subsection (p) of section 207 shall refer to the Sales Fund, and (B) all references to section 207 or 210 in subsections (c), (d), and (f) of section 204 and subsection (p) of section 207 shall refer to subsection (d) of this section.'

"(6) Section 219 of such Act is amended by striking out 'or the Servicemen's Mortgage Insurance Fund' and inserting in lieu thereof 'the Servicemen's Mortgage Insurance Fund, the Cooperative Management Housing Insurance Fund, or the Cooperative Sales Housing Insurance Fund'.

"Increased mortgage amounts in Alaska, Guam, and Hawaii

"SEC. 106. The first sentence of section 214 of the National Housing Act is amended by inserting after 'maximum or maxima otherwise applicable' the following: '(including increased mortgage amounts in geographical areas where cost levels so require.'

"FHA mortgage insurance authorization

"SEC. 107. (a) Section 217 of the National Housing Act is amended by striking out '$7,000,000,000' and inserting in lieu thereof '$13,000,000,000'.

"(b) Section 217 of such Act is amended, effective July 1, 1959, by (1) striking out 'July 1, 1956' and inserting in lieu thereof 'July 1, 1959', and (2) striking out '$13,000,000,000' and inserting in lieu thereof '$4,000,000,000'.

"Repeal of obsolete provision

"SEC. 108. Section 218 of the National Housing Act is repealed.

"Section 220 mortgage insurance

"SEC. 109. (a) (1) Clause (i) of subsection (d)(3)(A) of section 220 of the National Housing Act is amended by striking out '$20,000' and inserting in lieu thereof '$25,000'.

"(2) Subsection (d)(3)(A)(i) of section 220 of such Act is further amended—

"(A) by striking out '85 per centum' and inserting in lieu thereof '90 per centum';

"(B) by striking out '$16,000' each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof '$18,000'; and

"(C) by striking out '70 per centum' and inserting in lieu thereof '75 per centum'.

"(3) Subsection (d)(3)(A)(ii) of section 220 of such Act is amended by inserting before the semicolon at the end thereof a colon and the following: '*Provided*, That such 85 per centum limitation shall not be applicable if the mortgagor and mortgagee assume responsibility in a manner satisfactory to the Commissioner for the reduction of the mortgage by an amount not less than 15 per centum of the outstanding principal amount thereof in the event the mortgaged property is not, prior to the due date of the eighteenth amortization payment of the mortgage, sold to a purchaser acceptable to the Commissioner who is the occupant of the property and who assumes and agrees to pay the mortgage indebtedness'.

"(b) Subsection (d)(3)(B)(i) of section 220 of such Act is amended by striking out '$12,500,000' and inserting in lieu thereof '$20,000,000'.

"(c) Subsection (d)(3)(B)(iii) of section 220 of such Act is amended—

"(1) by striking out '$2,250' each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof '$2,700';

"(2) by striking out '$8,100' each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof '$9,000';

"(3) by striking out '$2,700' and inserting in lieu thereof '$3,150';

"(4) by striking out '$8,400' and inserting in lieu thereof '$9,500'; and

"(5) by striking out '$1,000' and inserting in lieu thereof '$1,250'.

"Section 221 relocation housing mortgage insurance

"SEC. 110. (a) Section 221(d)(2) of the National Housing Act is amended by striking out '$9,000' and '$10,000' and inserting in lieu thereof '$10,000' and '$12,000', respectively.

"(b) Section 221(d) of such Act is further amended—

"(1) by striking out '$9,000' and '$10,000' in paragraph (3) and inserting in lieu thereof '$10,000' and '$12,000', respectively;

"(2) by striking out 'the Commissioner's estimate of the value of the property or project when constructed, or repaired and rehabilitated" in paragraph (3) and inserting in lieu thereof "the amount which the Commissioner estimates will be the replacement cost of the property or project when the proposed improvements are completed in the case of a property or project approved for mortgage insurance prior to the beginning of construction, or the Commissioner's estimate of the value of the property or project when the proposed repair and rehabilitation is completed if the proceeds of the mortgage are to be used for the repair and rehabilitation of the property or project';

"(3) by striking out 'and' at the end of paragraph (3) and inserting in lieu thereof 'or'; and

"(4) by redesignating paragraph (4) as paragraph (5) and inserting after paragraph (3) the following new paragraph:

"'(4) if executed by a mortgagor which is not a nonprofit organization, and which is approved by the Commissioner—

"'(i) not exceed $12,500,000;

"'(ii) not exceed $10,000 per family unit for such part of such property or project as may be attributable to dwelling use, except that the Commissioner may by regulation increase this amount to not to exceed $12,000 in any geographical area where he finds that cost levels so require;

"'(iii) not exceed (in the case of a property or project approved for mortgage insurance prior to the beginning of construction) 90 per centum of the amount which the Commissioner estimates will be the replacement cost of the property or project when the proposed improvements are completed (the replacement cost may include the land, the proposed physical improvements, utilities within the boundaries of the land, architect's fees, taxes, interest during construction, and other miscellaneous charges incident to construction and approved by the Commissioner, and shall include an allowance for builder's and sponsor's profit and risk of 10 per centum of all of the foregoing items except the land unless the Commissioner, after certification that such allowance is unreasonable, shall by regulation prescribe a lesser percentage); and

"'(iv) not exceed 90 per centum of the Commissioner's estimate of the value of the property or project when the proposed repair and rehabilitation is completed if the proceeds of the mortgage are to be used for the repair and rehabilitation of a property or project:

Provided, That such property or project when constructed, or repaired and rehabilitated, shall be for use as rental accommodations for ten or more families eligible for occupancy as provided in this section: *And provided further*, That the Commissioner may, in his discretion, require the mortgagor to be regulated or restricted as to rents or sales, charges, capital structure, rate of return and methods of operation, and for such purpose the Commissioner may make such contracts with and acquire for not to exceed $100 such stock or interest in any such mortgagor as the Commissioner may deem necessary to render effective such restrictiions or regulations, with such stock or interest being paid for out of Section 221 Housing Insurance Fund and being required to be redeemed by the mortgagor at par upon the termination of all obligations of the Commissioner under the insurance; and' ".

"(c) Section 221(g)(2) of such Act is amended by striking out 'paragraph (3)' and inserting in lieu thereof 'paragraph (3) or (4)'.

"(d) Section 212(a) of such Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: 'The provisions of this section shall apply to the insurance under section 221 of any mortgage described in subsection (d)(4) thereof which covers property on which there is located a dwelling or dwellings designed principally for residential use for ten or more families.'

"Servicemen's housing mortgage insurance

"SEC. 111. Section 222(b) of the National Housing Act is amended—

"(1) by inserting 'or 203(i)' after '203(b)' in paragraph (1); and

"(2) by striking out '$17,100' in paragraph (2) and inserting in lieu thereof the following: '$20,000, except that in the case of a mortgage meeting the requirements of section 203(i) such principal obligation shall not exceed $9,000'.

"Builder's cost certification

"SEC. 112. Section 227(a) of the National Housing Act is amended by striking out clause (iv) and inserting in lieu thereof the following: '(iv) under section 221 if the mortgagor meets the requirements of paragraph (3) or paragraph (4) of subsection (d) thereof,'.

"Mortgage insurance for nursing homes

"SEC. 113. (a) Title II of the National Housing Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"'Mortgage insurance for nursing homes

"'SEC. 229. (a) The purpose of this section is to assist the provision of urgently needed nursing homes for the care and treatment of convalescents and other persons who are not acutely ill and do not need hospital care but who require skilled nursing care and related medical services.

"'(b) For the purposes of this section—

"'(1) the term "nursing home" means a proprietary facility, licensed or regulated by the State (or, if there is no State law providing for such licensing and regulation by the State, by the municipality or other political subdivision in which the facility is located), for the accommodation of convalescents or other persons who are not acutely ill and not in need of hospital care but who require skilled nursing care and related medical services, in which such nursing care and medical services are prescribed by, or are performed under the general direction of, persons licensed to provide such care or services in accordance with the laws

of the State where the facility is located; and

"'(2) the terms "mortgage" and "mortgagor" shall have the meanings respectively set forth in section 207(a) of this Act.

"'(c) The Commissioner is authorized to insure any mortgage (including advances on such mortgage during construction) in accordance with the provisions of this section upon such terms and conditions as he may prescribe and to make commitments for insurance of such mortgage prior to the date of its execution or disbursement thereon.

"'(d) In order to carry out the purpose of this section, the Commissioner is authorized to insure any mortgage which covers a new or rehabilitated nursing home, subject to the following conditions:

"'(1) The mortgage shall be executed by a mortgagor approved by the Commissioner. The Commissioner may in his discretion require any such mortgagor to be regulated or restricted as to charges and methods of operation, and, in addition thereto, if the mortgagor is a corporate entity, as to capital structure and rate of return. As an aid to the regulation or restriction of any mortgagor with respect to any of the foregoing matters, the Commissioner may make such contracts with and acquire for not to exceed $100 such stock or interest in such mortgagor as he may deem necessary. Any stock or interest so purchased shall be paid for out of the Section 207 Housing Insurance Fund, and shall be redeemed by the mortgagor at par upon the termination of all obligations of the Commissioner under the insurance.

"'(2) The mortgage shall involve a principal obligation in an amount not to exceed $1,000,000, and not to exceed 75 per centum of the estimated value of the property or project when the proposed improvements are completed.

"'(3) The mortgage shall—

"'(A) provide for complete amortization by periodic payments within such terms as the Commissioner shall prescribe; and

"'(B) bear interest (exclusive of premium charges for insurance) at not to exceed 5 per centum per annum of the amount of the principal obligation outstanding at any time.

"'(4) The Commissioner shall not insure any mortgage under this section unless he has received, from the State agency designated in accordance with section 612(a)(1) of the Public Health Service Act for the State in which is located the nursing home covered by the mortgage, a certification that there is a need for such nursing home.

"'(e) The Commissioner may consent to the release of a part or parts of the mortgaged property or project from the lien of any mortgage insured under this section upon such terms and conditions as he may prescribe.

"'(f) The provisions of subsections (d), (e), (f), (g), (h), (i), (j), (k), (l), (m), (n), and (p) of section 207 shall apply to mortgages insured under this section and all references therein to section 207 shall refer to this section.'

"(b) Section 212(a) of such Act is amended by adding at the end thereof (after the sentence added by section 110(d)) the following new sentence: 'The provisions of this section shall also apply to the insurance of any mortgage under section 229.'

"Technical amendments

"SEC. 114. (a) Section 8(g) of the National Housing Act is amended by striking out 'and (h) of section 204' and inserting in lieu thereof '(h), (j), and (k) of section 204'.

"(b) Sections 220(f)(1), 221(g)(1), 222(e), and 809(e) of such Act are each amended by striking out 'and (j) of section 204' and inserting in lieu thereof '(j) and (k) of section 204'.

"Inclusion of conveyance costs in debentures

"SEC. 115. Section 204(k) of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"'(k) Notwithstanding any other provision of this section or of section 604 or 904 and with respect to any debentures issued in exchange for properties conveyed to and accepted by the Commissioner after the effective date of the Housing Act of 1959 in accordance with such section, the Commissioner may: (1) include in debentures reasonable payments made by the mortgagee with the approval of the Commissioner for the purpose of protecting, operating, or preserving the property, and taxes imposed upon any deed or any other instrument by which the property was acquired by the mortgagee and transferred or conveyed to the Commissioner; (2) include in debentures as a portion of foreclosure costs (to the extent that foreclosure costs may be included in such debentures by any other provision of this Act) payments made by the mortgagee for the cost of acquiring the property and conveying and evidencing title to the property to the Commissioner; and (3) terminate the mortgagee's obligation to pay mortgage insurance premiums upon receipt of an application for debentures filed by the mortgagee, or in the event the contract of insurance is terminated pursuant to section 230.'

"Voluntary termination of insurance

"SEC. 116. Title II of the National Housing Act is further amended by adding after section 229 (as added by section 113 of this Act) the following new section:

"'Voluntary termination of insurance

"'SEC. 230. Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act and with respect to any mortgage covering a one-, two-, three-, or four-family residence heretofore or hereafter insured under this Act, the Commissioner is authorized to terminate any mortgage insurance contract upon request by the mortgagor and mortgagee and upon payment of such termination charge as the Commissioner determines to be equitable, taking into consideration the necessity of protecting the various insurance funds. Upon such termination mortgagors and mortgagees shall be entitled to the rights, if any, to which they would be entitled under this Act if the insurance contract were terminated by payment in full of the insured mortgage.'

"TITLE II—HOUSING FOR THE ELDERLY

"SEC. 201. (a) Title II of the National Housing Act is further amended by adding after section 230 (as added by section 116 of this Act) the following new section:

"'Housing for the elderly

"'SEC. 231. (a) The purpose of this section is to assist in relieving the shortage of housing for elderly persons and to increase the supply of rental housing for elderly persons.

"'For the purposes of this section—

"'(1) the term "housing" means a project or property having eight or more new or rehabilitated living units, specially designed for the use and occupancy of elderly persons;

"'(2) the term "elderly person" means any person, married or single, who is sixty years of age or more;

"'(3) the terms "mortgage", "mortgagee", "mortgagor", and "maturity date" shall have the meanings set forth in section 207 of this Act.

"'(b) The Commissioner is authorized to insure any mortgage (including advances on mortgages during construction) in accordance with the provisions of this section upon such terms and conditions as he may prescribe and to make commitments for insurance of such mortgages prior to the date of their execution or disbursement thereon.

"'(c) To be eligible for insurance under this section, a mortgage to provide housing for elderly persons shall—

"'(1) involve a principal obligation in an amount not to exceed $20,000,000, or, if executed by Federal or State instrumentalities, municipal corporate instrumentalities of one or more States, or nonprofit development or housing corporations restricted by Federal or State laws or regulations of State banking or insurance departments as to rents, charges, capital structure, rate of return, and methods of operation, not to exceed $50,000,000;

"'(2) not exceed, for such part of such property or project as may be attributable to dwelling use, $8,100 per living unit: *Provided,* That the Commissioner may, in his discretion, increase the dollar amount limitation of $8,100 per unit to not to exceed $8,400 per unit to compensate for the higher costs incident to the construction of elevator-type structures and may increase each of the foregoing dollar amount limitations by not to exceed $1,000 per room in any geographical area where he finds that cost levels so require;

"'(3) if executed by a mortgagor, which is a public instrumentality or a private nonprofit corporation, association, or organization acceptable to the Commissioner, involve a principal obligation not in excess of the amount which the Commissioner estimates will be the replacement cost of the property or project when the proposed improvements are completed (the replacement cost may include the land, the proposed physical improvements, utilities within the boundaries of the land, architect's fees, taxes, interest during construction, and other miscellaneous charges incident to construction and approved by the Commissioner);

"'(4) if executed by a mortgagor approved by the Commissioner which is not a nonprofit corporation, association, or organization, involve a principal obligation not in excess of 90 per centum of the Commissioner's estimate of the value of the property or project when the proposed improvements are completed (the Commissioner may in his discretion require such mortgagor to be regulated or restricted as to rents, sales, charges, capital structure, rate of return, and methods of operation, and for such purpose the Commissioner may make such contracts with and acquire, for not to exceed $100, such stock or interest in any such mortgagor as the Commissioner deems necessary to render effective such restriction or regulation. Such stock or interest shall be paid for out of the Housing Insurance Fund and shall be redeemed by the mortgagor at par upon the termination of all obligations of the Commissioner under the insurance);

"'(5) provide for complete amortization by periodic payments within such term as the Commissioner shall prescribe;

"'(6) bear interest (exclusive of premium charges for insurance) at not to exceed 5 per centum per annum on the amount of the principal obligation outstanding at any time;

"'(7) cover a property or project which is approved for mortgage insurance prior to the beginning of construction or rehabilitation, which is specially designed for the use and occupancy of elderly persons in accordance with standards established by the Commissioner, and which may include such commercial and special facilities as the Commissioner deems adequate to serve the occupants.

"'(d) The Commissioner may consent to the release of a part or parts of the mortgaged property from the lien of any mortgage insured under this section upon such terms and conditions as he may prescribe, and shall prescribe such procedures as in his judgment are necessary to secure to elderly persons a preference or priority of opportunity to occupy such property.

"'(e) The provisions of subsections (d), (e), (f), (g), (h), (i), (j), (k), (l), (m),

(n), and (p) of section 207 of this Act shall apply to mortgages insured under this section, and all references therein to section 207 shall refer to this section.'

"(b) Section 212(a) of such Act is amended by adding before the period at the end thereof ', and to the insurance of any mortgage under section 231(c)(4)'.

"TITLE III—FEDERAL NATIONAL MORTGAGE ASSOCIATION

"SEC. 301. Section 302(b) of the National Housing Act is amended by striking out 'exceeds or exceeded $15,000 for each family residence or dwelling unit covered by the mortgage' and inserting in lieu thereof 'exceeds or exceeded, for each family residence or dwelling unit covered by the mortgage, $18,000 in the case of a mortgage to be purchased under section 304 or $17,500 in the case of a mortgage to be purchased under section 305'.

"SEC. 302. (a) Section 301(a) of the National Housing Act is amended by inserting before the semicolon at the end thereof the following: ', and by aiding in the stabilization of the mortgage market'.

"(b) Section 304(a) of such Act is amended by striking out the last three sentences and inserting in lieu thereof the following: 'The Association shall, from time to time, establish and publish prices to be paid by it for mortgages purchased by it in its secondary market operations under this section. The volume of the Association's purchases and sales and the establishment of purchase prices, sales prices, and charges or fees in its sescondary market operations under this section shall be so conducted as to promote the interests of the national economy by aiding in the stabilization of the mortgage market to the maximum extent consistent with sound operation, and within the reasonable capacity of the Association to sell its obligations to private investors. The Association shall buy at such prices and on such terms as will reasonably prevent excessive use of the Association's facilities and permit the Association to operate within its income derived from such secondary market operations and to be fully self-supporting. Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, advance commitments to purchase mortgages in secondary market operations under this section shall be issued only at prices which are sufficient to facilitate advance planning of home construction, but which are sufficiently below the price then offered by the Association for immediate purchase to prevent excessive sales to the Association pursuant to such commitments.'

"(c) The last sentence of section 304(a) of such Act, as amended by subsection (b) of this section, is amended by striking out 'advance planning of home construction' and inserting in lieu thereof 'home financing'.

"SEC. 303. Section 305(e) of such Act is amended—

"(1) by striking out 'which do not exceed $200,000,000 outstanding at any one time' and inserting in lieu thereof 'not exceeding $200,000,000 at any one time, which limit shall be increased by such amounts, not exceeding $75,000,000, as may be specified from time to time in appropriation Acts';

"(2) by inserting after '$20,000,000 outstanding at any one time' the following: ', which limit shall be increased by such amounts, not exceeding $7,500,000, as may be specified from time to time in appropriation Acts';

"(3) by striking out 'a consumer cooperative, and (2)' and inserting in lieu thereof the following: 'a consumer cooperative, which amount shall be increased by such amounts, not exceeding $37,500,000, as may be specified from time to time in appropriation Acts, (2) of the total amount of advance commitment contracts and purchase transactions authorized by this subsection, such amounts not exceeding $37,500,000 as may be specified from time to time in appropriation Acts shall be available solely for commitments or purchases of mortgages where the cooperative involved is a builder-sponsor cooperative, and (3)'; and

"(4) by striking out 'which are not of the type described in clause (1) of this proviso' and inserting in lieu thereof 'other than those certified by the Commissioner as consumer cooperatives under clause (1) of this proviso, which amount shall be increased by such amounts, not exceeding $7,500,000, as may be specified from time to time in appropriation Acts'.

"SEC. 304. (a) That part of the first sentence of section 302(b) of the National Housing Act which precedes the colon is amended by striking out 'to make commitments to purchase and to purchase, service, or sell,' and by substituting therefor 'to purchase, lend (under section 304) on the security of, service, or sell, pursuant to commitments or otherwise,'.

"(b) The first sentence of section 303(b) of such Act is amended by inserting immediately before the period at the end thereof the following: '; and by requiring each borrower to make such payments, equal to not more than one-half of 1 per centum of the amount lent by the Association to such borrower under section 304'.

"(c) The first sentence of section 303(c) of such Act is amended by inserting 'or borrower' after 'seller' each place it appears.

"(d) Section 304(a) of such Act is amended by inserting '(1)' before 'To carry out', and by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"'(2) To carry out further the purposes set forth in paragraph (a) of section 301, the Association is authorized to make loans which are secured by residential or home mortgages insured or guaranteed under this Act, the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, or chapter 37 of title 38, United States Code. In the interest of assuring sound operation, any loan made by the Association in its secondary market operations under this section shall not exceed 90 per centum of the unpaid principal balances of the mortgages securing the loan, shall bear interest at a rate consistent with general loan policies established from time to time by the Association's board of directors, and shall mature in not more than twelve months. The volume of the Association's lending activities and the establishment of its loan ratios, interest rates, maturities, and charges or fees, in its secondary market operations under this section, should be determined by the Association from time to time; and such determinations, in conjunction with determinations made under paragraph (1), should be consistent with the objectives that the lending activities should be conducted on such terms as will reasonably prevent excessive use of the Association's facilities, and that the operations of the Association under this section should be within its income derived from such operations and that such operations should be fully self-supporting. The aggregate amount of all loans outstanding at any one time under this paragraph shall not exceed 10 per centum of the Association's total borrowing authority under this section. Notwithstanding any Federal, State, or other law to the contrary, the Association is hereby empowered, in connection with any loan under this section, whether before or after any default, to provide by contract with the borrower for the settlement or extinguishment, upon default, of any redemption, equitable, legal, or other right, title, or interest of the borrower in any mortgage or mortgages that constitute the security for the loan; and with respect to any such loan, in the event of default and pursuant otherwise to the terms of the contract, the mortgages that constitute such security shall become the absolute property of the Association.'

"(e) Section 304(b), section 309(c), and section 310 of such Act are each amended by inserting 'or other security holdings' after 'mortgages'.

"SEC. 305. (a) Sections 304(b) and 306(b) of the National Housing Act are amended by striking out 'and bonds or other obligations of, as bonds or other obligations guaranteed as to principal and interest by, the United States' and inserting in lieu thereof 'and obligations of the United States or guaranteed thereby, or obligations which are lawful investments for fiduciary, trust, or public funds'.

"(b) Section 310 of such Act is amended by striking out 'in bonds or other obligations of, or in bonds or other obligations guaranteed as to principal and interest by, the United States' and inserting in lieu thereof 'in obligations of the United States or guaranteed thereby, or in obligations which are lawful investments for fiduciary, trust, or public funds'.

"SEC. 306. (a) Section 306 of the National Housing Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following subsection:

"'(e) Notwithstanding any of the provisions of this Act or of any other law, the Association is authorized, under the aforesaid separate accountability, to make commitments to purchase and to purchase, service, or sell any mortgages offered to it by the Housing and Home Finance Administrator or the Housing and Home Finance Agency, or by such Agency's constituent units or agencies or the heads thereof, after such Administrator has found the acquisition thereof by the Association to be in the interest of the efficient management and liquidation of the mortgages. There shall be excluded from the total amounts set forth in subsection (c) hereof the amounts of any mortgages purchased by the Association pursuant to this subsection.'

"(b) In connection with the sale of any mortgages to the Federal National Mortgage Association pursuant to section 306(e) of the Federal National Mortgage Association Charter Act, the Housing and Home Finance Administrator is authorized, and any other official, unit, or agency selling such mortgages thereunder is directed, to transfer to the Association from time to time, from authorizations, limitations, and funds available for administrative expenses of such official, unit, or agency in connection with the same mortgages, such amounts thereof as said Administrator determines to be required for administrative expenses of the Association in connection with the purchase, servicing, and sale of such mortgages: *Provided*, That no such transfer shall be made after a budget estimate of the Association with respect to the same mortgages has been submitted to and finally acted upon by the Congress.

"TITLE IV—URBAN RENEWAL

"SEC. 401. Section 103(b) of the Housing Act of 1949 is amended by inserting after the first sentence the following new sentence: 'In addition to amounts otherwise authorized to be appropriated for such purpose, there are authorized to be appropriated for the purpose of making contracts, after appropriations therefor, for grants with respect to projects or programs assisted under this title, the sum of $100,000,000 for the fiscal year 1959 and the sum of $250,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 1960 and 1961; and any such sum so appropriated shall remain available until expended.'

"SEC. 402. Section 102 of the Housing Act of 1949 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"'(h) There are authorized to be appropriated such sums, not to exceed $400,000,000 in the aggregate, as may be necessary, in addition to funds obtained by the Administrator under (and within the limitations of) subsection (e), for loans under this title.'

"TITLE V—COLLEGE HOUSING

"SEC. 501. Section 401(d) of the Housing Act of 1950 is amended—

"(1) by inserting after '$925,000,000' the following: ', which limit shall be increased by such amounts, not exceeding $200,000,000, as may be specified from time to time in appropriation Acts';

"(2) by inserting after '$100,000,000' the following: ', which limit shall be increased by such amounts, not exceeding $20,000,000, as may be specified from time to time in appropriation Acts'; and

"(3) by inserting after '$25,000,000' the following: ', which limit shall be increased by such amounts, not exceeding $20,000,000, as may be specified from time to time in appropriation Acts'.

"SEC. 502. (a) Section 404(b) of the Housing Act of 1950 is amended by striking out 'and (4)' and inserting in lieu thereof '(4)' and by inserting before the period at the end thereof the following: ', and (5) any nonprofit student housing cooperative corporation established for the purpose of providing housing for students or students and faculty of any institution included in clause (1) of this subsection'.

"(b) Section 401 of such Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"'(g) In the case of any loan made under this section to a nonprofit student housing cooperative corporation referred to in clause (5) of section 404(b), the Administrator shall require that the note securing such loan be cosigned by the educational institution (referred to in clause (1) of such section) at which such corporation is located; and in the event of the dissolution of such corporation, title to the housing constructed with such loan shall vest in such educational institution.'

"SEC. 503. Section 402 of such Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"'(e) The Administrator shall take such action as may be necessary to insure that all laborers and mechanics employed by contractors and subcontractors in the construction of housing assisted under this title shall be paid wages at rates not less than those prevailing in the locality involved for the corresponding classes of laborers and mechanics employed on construction of a similar character, as determined by the Secretary of Labor in accordance with the Act of March 3, 1931, as amended (the Davis-Bacon Act); but the Administrator may waive the application of this subsection in cases or classes of cases where laborers or mechanics, not otherwise employed at any time in the construction of such housing, voluntarily donate their services without full compensation for the purpose of lowering the costs of construction and the Administrator determines that any amounts saved thereby are fully credited to the educational institution undertaking the construction.'

"TITLE VI—AVOIDANCE OF FORECLOSURE

"SEC. 601. Section 204(a) of the National Housing Act is amended by inserting immediately before the last proviso the following: ': *And provided further*, That with respect to any mortgage covering a one-, two-, three-, or four-family residence insured under this title, if the Commissioner finds after notice of default, that the default was due to circumstances beyond the control of the mortgagor and it is probable that the mortgage will be restored to good standing within a reasonable period of time, he may, under such regulations and conditions as he may prescribe, extend the time for curing default and enter into an agreement with the mortgagee providing that if the mortgage is subsequently foreclosed, any interest accruing after the date of the agreement which is not paid by the mortgagor may be included in the debentures'.

"TITLE VII—MISCELLANEOUS

"Reacquisition by former owners

"SEC. 701. (a) Title IX of the National Housing Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"'SEC. 909. Notwithstanding any other provision of law the Commissioner is authorized, in the disposal of properties acquired by him in insurance operations under the provisions of this title, to give former mortgagor-owners a preference and priority of opportunity to reacquire such properties: *Provided*, That such former mortgagor-owners shall be required, under such procedures as may be established from time to time by the Commissioner, to offer prices and terms reasonably commensurate with the value of such properties and not less favorable than prices and terms offered by other prospective purchasers.'

"(b) Section 608 of the National Housing Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"'(h) Notwithstanding any other provisions of law the Commissioner is authorized, in the disposal of properties acquired by him in insurance operations under this section, to give former mortgagor-owners a preference and priority of opportunity to reacquire such properties: *Provided*, That such former mortgagor-owners shall be required, under such procedures as may be established from time to time by the Commissioner, to offer prices and terms reasonably commensurate with the value of such properties and not less favorable than prices and terms offered by other prospective purchasers.'

"Surveys of public works planning

"SEC. 702. Section 702 of the Housing Act of 1954 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"'(f) The Administrator is authorized to use during any fiscal year not to exceed $50,000 of the moneys in the revolving fund (established under section (e)) to conduct surveys of the status and current volume of State and local public works planning and surveys of estimated requirements for State and local public works: *Provided*, That the Administrator, in conducting any such survey, may utilize or act through any Federal department or agency with its consent.'

"Disposal of Passyunk and Newport war housing projects

"SEC. 703. (a) The use of projects PA-36011 and PA-36012 (which were conveyed to the Housing Authority of Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, under section 406(c) of the Housing Act of 1956) for the housing of military personnel and civilians employed in defense activities without regard to their income, and the giving of a preference in respect of 700 dwelling units in such projects for such military personnel as the Secretary of Defense or his designee prescribes, for a period of five years after the date of the conveyance of such projects, is hereby authorized; and such use and the giving of such preferences shall not deprive such projects of their status as 'low-rent housing' as that term is used and defined in the United States Housing Act of 1937 and within the meaning of that term as used in section 606(b) of the Act entitled 'An Act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes', approved October 14, 1940, as amended. The Housing and Home Finance Administrator is authorized and directed to agree to any amendments to the instruments of conveyance which may be required to give effect to the purposes of this section.

"(b) Section 406(c) of the Housing Act of 1956 is amended by striking out 'three years' in the first proviso and inserting in lieu thereof 'five years'.

"Farm housing research

"SEC. 704. Section 603(c) of the Housing Act of 1957 is amended to read as follows:

"'(c) The authority of the Housing and Home Finance Agency to make grants under subsection (b) shall expire June 30, 1962. The total amount of such grants shall not exceed $300,000 during each of the fiscal years ending June 30, 1958, and June 30, 1959, and shall not exceed $50,000 during each of the fiscal years ending June 30, 1960, and June 30, 1961.'

"Hospital construction

"SEC. 705. (a) Section 605(b) of the Housing Act of 1956 is amended by striking out '1958' and inserting in lieu thereof '1960'.

"(b) Section 605(c) of the Housing Act of 1956 is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof the following: ', and the sum of $7,500,000 for the purposes of this section for each of the fiscal years ending June 30, 1959, and June 30, 1960.'

"Real estate loans by national banks

"SEC. 706. Section 203 of the National Housing Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"'(j) Loans secured by mortgages insured under this section shall not be taken into account in determining the amount of real estate loans which a national bank may make in relation to its capital and surplus or its time and savings deposits.'

"Savings and loan associations

"SEC. 707. (a) Section 5(c) of the Home Owners Loan Act of 1933 is amended by inserting before the colon at the end of the first proviso a comma and the following: 'and additional sums not exceeding 20 per centum of the assets of an association may be used without regard to such area restriction for the making or purchase of participating interests in first liens on one- to four-family homes, except that the aggregate sums invested pursuant to the two exceptions in this proviso shall not exceed 30 per centum of the assets of such association:'.

"(b) Section 5(c) of such Act is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "Participating interests in loans secured by mortgages which have the benefit of insurance or guaranty (or a commitment therefor) under the National Housing Act, the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, or chapter 37 of title 38, United States Code, shall not be taken into account in determining the amount of loans which an association may make within any of the percentage limitations contained in the first proviso of this subsection.'

"Voluntary home mortgage credit program

"SEC. 708. Section 610(a) of the Housing Act of 1954 is amended by striking out 'July 31, 1959' and inserting in lieu thereof 'July 31, 1961'.

"Housing for migratory farm labor

"SEC. 709. (a) Title V of the Housing Act of 1949 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"'Insurance of farm housing loans made by private lenders

"'SEC. 514. (a) The Secretary is authorized to insure and make commitments to insure loans made by lenders other than the United States to farmers, associations of farmers, and county governments for the purpose of providing dwelling accommodations and related buildings and structures for migratory farm labor in accordance with terms and conditions substantially identical with those specified in section 502; except that—

"'(1) no such loan shall be insured in an amount in excess of 90 per centum of the value of the farm involved less any prior liens in the case of a loan to an individual farmer, or 90 per centum of the total value

of the structures and facilities with respect to which the loan is made in the case of a loan to an association of farmers or a county government;

"'(2) no such loan shall be insured if it bears interest at a rate in excess of 6 per centum per annum;

"'(3) the borrower shall be required to pay such insurance charges as the Secretary deems proper, taking into account the amount of the loan and any prior liens. The initial insurance charge shall be at a rate not to exceed 1 per centum on the principal amount of the loan, and additional charges annually thereafter shall be at a rate not to exceed 1 per centum of the outstanding principal balance of the loan after each annual installment due date;

"'(4) the insurance contracts and agreements with respect to any loan may contain provisions for servicing the loan by the Secretary or by the lender, and for the purchase by the Secretary of the loan if it is not in default, on such terms and conditions as the Secretary may prescribe; and

"'(5) the Secretary may take mortgages creating a lien running to the United States for the benefit of the insurance fund referred to in subsection (b) notwithstanding the fact that the note may be held by the lender or his assignee.

"'(b) The Secretary shall utilize the insurance fund created by section 11 of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act (7 U.S.C. 1005a) and the provisions of section 13(b) and (c) of such Act (7 U.S.C. 1005c)(b) and (c)) to discharge obligations under insurance contracts made pursuant to this section, and

"'(1) the Secretary may utilize the insurance fund to pay taxes, insurance, prior liens, and other expenses to protect the security for loans which have been insured hereunder and to acquire such security property at foreclosure sale or otherwise;

"'(2) the notes and security therefor acquired by the Secretary under insurance contracts made pursuant to this section shall become a part of the insurance fund. Loans insured under this section may be held in the fund and collected in accordance with their terms or may be sold and reinsured. All proceeds from such collections, including the liquidation of security and the proceeds of sales, shall become a part of the insurance fund; and

"'(3) one-half of all insurance charges shall become a part of the insurance fund. The other half of such charges shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States and shall be available for administrative expenses of the Farmers' Home Administration, to be transferred annually to and become merged with any appropriation for such expenses.

"'(c) Any contract of insurance executed by the Secretary under this section shall be an obligation of the United States and incontestable except for fraud or misrepresentation of which the holder of the contract has actual knowledge.

"'(d) The aggregate amount of the principal obligations of the loans insured under this section shall not exceed $25,000,000 in any one fiscal year.

"'(e) Amounts made available pursuant to sections 511 and 513 of this Act shall be available for administrative expenses incurred under this section.'

"(b) The first paragraph of section 24 of the Federal Reserve Act (12 U.S.C., sec. 371) is amended by inserting after 'the Act of August 28, 1937, as amended' the following: ', or title V of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended'."

Mr. HERLONG (interrupting the reading of the amendment). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the amendment be dispensed with and that it be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. HERLONG. Mr. Chairman, I do not think there is any need to go into a lengthy discussion of this substitute at this time. It was thoroughly discussed, and I believe reasonably well explained during general debate on yesterday.

As I said at that time, I commend the housing subcommittee and its distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. RAINS] for the time and effort that they have put into bringing out a housing bill. There are some of us, however, who believe, as is our right, that the bill goes too far at this time. It would be fine if we could give everyone everything that they asked for, not only in this bill, but in all of the other bills that require Federal money. But, we just have not reached a high enough plateau financially to afford that.

Mr. Chairman, what I propose as a substitute is something which is not only within our reach, but will maintain our fiscal responsibility; will be within the budget, and which, more importantly, can become law. The two principal differences between the substitute and the committee bill are the elimination of further authorizations for public housing at this time and the requirement that the new authorization for moneys provided for be cleared by the Committee on Appropriations.

We have enough public housing units already authorized to keep us busy for about 3 years. If it develops next year, or later, that more are needed, the Congress will have an opportunity to work its will on them at that time.

May I also remind the committee that there are 45,000 units in the bill which passed the other body and which will be held in conference with whatever bill the House passes so you are not voting against any possibility of additional public housing units even now if you vote for the substitute.

The principle of requiring the Appropriations Committee to approve all new money authorizations seems to meet with almost universal approval. The only question that has been raised in this connection is—When do we start? I suppose it is just like saving money; there seems to be no convenient time to start. Believe me, I do not defend the action that has been taken so far in this Congress on certain bills to bypass the Appropriations Committee. I agree with the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN], who said that the principle of going to the Appropriations Committee for all new moneys ought to be applied to everything. But I do not agree that we should continue postponing the application of such a principle. Anyway, the issue is clear, and you will have an opportunity to express your will as to these principles.

Mr. Chairman, rather than submit these amendments one at a time, I have simply included them in one amendment in the nature of a substitute. I submit that there is a great possibility that those of you who are interested in the most liberal possible housing bill will come nearer getting it under this substitute than you will if you go back and amend the committee bill section by section. For example, there is $600 million in my substitute for urban renewal. There are a number of States in the United States including my own State of Florida, that cannot possibly benefit by this provision, and on the direct issue of whether or not there will be any urban renewal in the bill, many Members who could vote for the substitute might have to vote for an amendment to strike the whole title dealing with urban renewal from the bill because their States could not participate.

I regret, Mr. Chairman, that there has been a feeling expressed that what I have done in offering this substitute has been interpreted in some quarters as a lack of appreciation of the splendid work of the distinguished members of the Subcommittee on Housing. Believe me, I do appreciate the fine work that they have done and I think the fact that over 80 percent of the substitute bill which I have offered is exactly like the committee bill proves that that is the fact. There are some of us, however, who differ in philosophy from the majority of the members of that subcommittee, and I have tried to express that difference in my substitute so that there could be a clear-cut choice by the Members. I intended, and certainly hoped, that my offering of this substitute would instead be interpreted as an effective way to break the logjam that was holding up consideration of a housing bill in this House and give us an opportunity to work our will on such a bill. I think all of you know and will certainly agree that that has been accomplished by the offering of this substitute.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I think yesterday we reviewed the contents of the committee bill and some reference to the substitute bill was made in general debate.

There are some points I think that ought to be emphasized so far as the committee bill is concerned that are very devastating so far as the impact on the budget is concerned. And in spite of the fact that my distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. RAINS], for whom I have a great deal of respect, has implied that it will not increase the budget by more than $100 million, I should like to call your attention to the fact that on the urban renewal section of his bill alone, which provides for $500 million for each year for the next 3 years, you could commit this Nation to $1.5 billion in the next 14 months and tie the hands of the Committee on Appropriations to the point where such commitments are obligations and have to be met with appropriations.

The spending authorizations in the committee bill will increase the deficit in the current fiscal year and will result in increased budget expenditures in every year for the next 45 years because of the public housing section of the bill. The total new authorized budget expenditures impact of the bill is $5.8 billion. The argument has been made that it is less than that or about half that.

The actual figures are that it will total that over the life of the public housing section of the bill.

Another point is, if we should obligate ourselves for the total urban renewal obligations of the committee bill, even if we did that in the next 2 years, that is an offer to the city for additional aid that they may anticipate in future authorizations in a housing bill, and we will be obligating ourselves to rehabilitate the major cities of the Nation for years to come.

I think we ought to give some consideration to the fact that this is, as was stated yesterday by one of the Members in general debate, the first approach to the major spending program of this Congress because you have coming to you from the Committee on Banking and Currency an area development bill which will be an obligation of some $480 million for area development. You have a community facilities bill which amounts to some $2 billion for low-interest, long-term loans for the building of many public facilities that cities, counties, and States may make application for. You have pending in the Labor and Education bill an aid to education bill of some $4,400 million. That has not been reported, but nevertheless it is under consideration. In other words, we should stop and consider how far we are going to go in doing the things that the States, cities, and counties are incorporated to do for themselves. Are we going to build all of the highways and all of the sewage-disposal plants and build all of the public housing facilities—and incidentally, there are a number of States that have their individual independent public housing authorities that are not seeking any aid from the Federal Government. Are we going to take all of these responsibilities and make one large massive Central Government in Washington to dictate to the various political subdivisions throughout the country? Those are the things that I see as a danger in the committee bill as an approach in that direction. The Herlong bill would, on the contrary, offer a reasonable program for a reasonable amount of money to meet the demanding sections of urban renewal for some $600 million for the next 2½ years.

Another feature, I think, that we should not overlook is the tax-exemption privilege of the purchasers of public housing bonds. That is, the local authority can issue bonds to build these facilities and they are offered on the market on a tax-free basis. They are very attractive investments, but the Federal Government in its budgetary obligations must provide not only the substance to support these bonds, but the capital to maintain all of these facilities throughout the United States, and it is now amounting to something like $3 billion, and the added public housing units that will be in the committee bill will add another $3 billion.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the adoption of the Herlong amendment.

Mr. RAINS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, in more time than I have now, on yesterday, I attempted to point out the fact that it would be better in this instance to legislate in an orderly manner. I pointed out the fact also that if the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HERLONG] really wanted the amendment which he has mentioned, he would be in a better position to offer individual amendments to the committee bill instead of attempting to disrupt the legislative process by forming a coalition with our friends on the other side of the aisle and accepting a bill which my friends over here opposed in the committee. Practically every single item of title I was opposed by people of the Housing Agency as being inflationary and too liberal. But, in an effort to lure certain free enterprise groups into the snare of bypassing our committee, they accepted these inflationary things which they once so labeled and now come in and say this is wonderful legislation.

In doing it, Mr. Minority Leader, they leave aside the administration bill introduced by request by my friend the ranking Republican member of the Committee on Banking and Currency; and the bill is a bill upon which the present committee bill is in many respects patterned. I do not indeed understand the necessity——

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAINS. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. The gentleman speaks of this being an unusual procedure.

Mr. RAINS. Yes.

Mr. HALLECK. I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that just a few days ago in the case of the Railroad Retirement and Unemployment Compensation Act the House had before it a very good bill worked out by the committee. A substitute was offered and that substitute prevailed in the House, exactly the same thing as the gentleman now complains is wrong.

Mr. RAINS. I will say that is the truth and I voted for the substitute, but it was a substitute which was properly introduced, by the chairman of that committee. In addition to that, it did not come out of thin air like this Herlong substitute, which was not even printed when the rule on the bill was granted, and without even the chairman of the subcommittee being shown the courtesy of seeing it. Is that an analogous case? Absolutely not.

What I want to know is this: Does the minority leader believe that the proper thing is to take a bill not even printed at the time the rule was granted, making this bill in order, and then start holding caucuses and conferences on a bill that was not even printed, much less considered by the Housing Committee of this House?

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. RAINS. I do not yield further, not yet. I will say to my friends on this side of the aisle that this is a cleverly contrived deceptive proposition—and I am certain my good friend from Florida [Mr. HERLONG] did not realize it; he does not pose as any housing expert—this is a cleverly conceived piece of legislation aimed at two things: (1) Overthrow of the Democratic leadership in the Congress no matter what we have to take to do it; and (2) to give the private enterprise groups all they want, and at the same time kick the public interest groups in the teeth and give them nothing. That is what this bill is.

I say to you that the people of America are looking for college housing aids to a much greater extent than those proposed in the Herlong bill—they are looking for urban renewal, for public housing, for housing for the old folks that will really work. They do not want one of these hastily concocted, ill-conceived pieces of legislation not dedicated to the purpose of housing to become the law of this land.

And I would like to say that some people apparently do not realize that there is another body in this Congress, and whether we all like or not they will be around here as long as we are. If a substitute like this is sent to the other body, they will have something to say about it and we will have quite a different proposition staring us in the face. I can just imagine what the result will be.

Who is kidding whom? All we are doing now is marching up the aisle and back down again to please just a few people who are interested, I say again, apparently in other things than the overall housing problems and the housing needs of the American people.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to announce briefly that in case the substitute is voted down I intend to offer some five or six amendments that will take out of the committee bill all of the back-door financing.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of S. 57, the Housing Act of 1959, because it is one of the most comprehensive pieces of legislation ever presented. I take a deep personal pride in having played a role in the months and months of hard work that were necessary to finish this bill for presentation here today. I think both the Banking and Currency Committee and our Housing Subcommittee can be proud of our long and conscientious labors and for our awareness of the legislation we must have to meet the housing needs of our people.

The administration, as you know, is opposed to this bill and has tried to smear it as "inflationary." But do not be fooled. The inflationary argument, which is entirely false, is merely a smoke screen created to block legislation to provide decent housing at a low cost for the American people.

The opponents of this bill do not want us to do anything to provide housing for our low income groups. They do not want us to provide housing which our elderly citizens can afford. They do not want us to adopt measures which will encourage the rental housing and cooperative housing our cities must have. They do not want us to provide additional

funds for the successful college housing program so our young men and women will have a better opportunity to advance their education. The opponents of this bill do not want a program which will stamp out the slums in our cities. Neither do they want legislation that will help FHA homeowners keep their homes when they are unemployed as a result of the recession.

While this bill does not contain all that I would like to see in it, it is on the whole an excellent bill which will help us achieve economic recovery, make progress in eliminating slums, provide housing for our lowest income families, and generally improve the housing standards of the American people.

There are a number of provisions in the bill which will stimulate home construction activity and prevent a slump in homebuilding. The liberalizations of the FHA homeownership program, the special aids to stimulate rental and cooperative housing, are but two examples of measures in the bill which will speed up economic activity and create more jobs. Anyone who is sincerely interested in helping the plight of the unemployed must vote for the housing bill for these job-creating measures alone.

I am especially pleased that the bill will give us new weapons to help us in the constant fight on the terrible slum problem which afflicts Philadelphia and our other American cities.

The $500 million annually for 3 years which the bill will make available for Federal slum clearance grants is all too modest in terms of the size of the job to be done, but at least it is a beginning. Slums are not just concentrations of crumbling stone and rotting wood. They are the homes of people who must have better housing. Our Housing Subcommittee investigations have proved time and again that at least half of the families who live in urban renewal areas have incomes which are just not sufficient for them to afford decent private accommodations. No matter what misinformation on what propaganda you may have heard about the low rent public housing program, you must admit that it is the only program in existence which can take care of the housing needs of these low-income people.

The bill before us will breathe new life into the low rent public housing program. By restoring the unused units originally authorized in the Taft-Ellender-Wagner Act of 1949, the bill would permit the construction of about 140,000 units at the rate of 35,000 units a year. Personally, I think this total is only sufficient to scratch the surface of the problem of our ill-housed low-income families, but it is a step forward and it is a far cry from the completely reactionary, negative policy of the present administration.

I am especially pleased that the bill will liberalize the minimum age requirements for occupancy in low-rent public housing for single women and disabled persons. Presently, elderly single persons are eligible for admission only if they are 65 years of age or over. The bill would not change this age requirement for single men, but it would reduce it to 62 for women and to age 50 for disabled people. This is an excellent amendment and would conform the program to the age requirements of the Social Security Act.

One of the great unmet needs in the cities of our Nation, and particularly in Philadelphia, is the lack of rental housing. The bill seeks to correct this through liberalizing amendments designed to encourage the construction of more rental housing under the regular FHA section 207 rental housing program. Frankly, the rentals in this program are higher than I would like to see them, but at least if we get more construction under this program we will meet the rental housing needs of a substantial segment of our population.

Mr. Chairman, title II of the Housing Act of 1959 is very important and of special interest to me because it would establish an entirely new program of providing housing for our senior citizens. The new program in title II would strike at the root of the problem by permitting long-term 50-year loans to a nonprofit corporation at a very low interest rate. The maximum interest rate would be 3½ percent which is substantially below the 5½ percent which nonprofit sponsors will have to pay under the present program for housing the elderly.

By permitting a longer loan maturity and by reducing the interest cost substantially, we can bring rentals down sharply. For example, in a housing unit renting for $70 under the present program, the new program would reduce the rental to at least $55 and possibly down to $50 a month. With such a program we, for the first time, would really begin to get results and the success of this new program for housing the elderly could serve as a pilot program to point the way toward the middle income housing program which our country urgently needs and ultimately must have.

In closing, Mr. Chairman, I would like to discuss title VIII of the bill which is formally titled "Avoidance of Foreclosure," but which I think should be called the "Save our homes" section of the bill.

When the terrible effects of the economic recession hit the homeowners of the country, thousands were forced to lose everything they had invested because they were unemployed and unable to make their monthly payments. Unlike the GI loan program which has safeguards to prevent a veteran from losing his home because of temporary unemployment, the FHA program does not encourage the lender to extend forebearance and does not provide essential protection against foreclosure.

I am very pleased that the new bill would correct this glaring deficiency in the FHA program. It would do this by two important amendments. One would reduce the incentive on the part of the lender to a hasty foreclosure. The other, and more important amendment, would permit the FHA Commissioner as a last resort to take over the loan and save the borrower's home in cases where the lender is unwilling or unable to cooperate.

Mr. Chairman, this is a great bill and all of its titles have extremely important objectives. It is a bill that will give the American people the advantages to which they are rightfully entitled. I urge its unanimous passage.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. KILBURN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have the privilege of extending their remarks in the RECORD on the Herlong amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Chairman, Charles Dickens wrote a great story in the 1800's called a "Tale of Two Cities." Today, we of the 86th Congress have the privilege to write an even greater story. As a matter of fact, we have a choice of writing two stories. One could be entitled "The Death of Our Cities" and the other "The Survival of Our Cities." I refer of course, to the Housing Act of 1959. With which story would you, as Members of Congress, want to be identified as the author? It is, to me, somewhat ironic that the decision as to whether a city lives or dies nowadays rests with our national representatives, but this is no exaggeration. The facts of life which necessitate national action in the housing field are as well known to you as to me. And there is no longer any doubt that the cancer of blight is truly eating away at the vitals of our urban centers, large and small. The future of the fourth largest city in America, depends upon the passage of the Housing Act of 1959. Philadelphia, the fine old city whose citizens I represent, is among the cities with the most deep-rooted and widely spread decay in our Nation. We have had nearly 300 years in which to grow from William Penn's "greene countrie towne" to the vital and varied metropolis of today—nearly 300 years in which to accumulate a massive problem of rundown houses, mixed uses, congestion, obsolete industrial buildings, blight in all its forms.

The early builders of the city designed the city well and built good, sound homes. And we have learned, in recent years, to do the same in the context of modern needs. But, in the intervening years, the American approach of moving on to a new house rather than repairing the old one, of building a new factory when the old one got too small, of leaving it to private initiative to supply the many different community needs of the people—this traditional American approach of endless frontiers and endless resources has left us an inheritance which is rich in many ways but which, for the city, adds up to built-in blight.

All our larger, older cities are in the same position. But even the small towns and the relatively new developments have their spots of blight, which will spread and destroy if not eliminated.

The plight of our cities is indeed a national, not a special-interest, problem. Most of us live in cities these days. All of us are dependent on cities for the many services and amenities which only a city can supply.

Everybody needs the cities and the services the cities can give. But, Mr. Chairman, the cities cannot provide these services unless they are efficient, functioning units, geared to today's

needs. And this is not possible unless the cities' total problems are dealt with, not just one type of problem, not just an isolated project here and there, not something this year and maybe something next year. We must have a total program, a continuing program, a program flexible enough to let us strike at the right place at the right time.

The cities are the hearts of our metropolitan areas, and heart failure would be just as disastrous for these metropolitan areas as for the human body.

What is at stake here is not only the life of our cities but our lives. If our cities decay with the cancer of blight, then, Mr. Chairman, we and our constituents will also perish. For, where but in the great medical hospitals and research centers and universities of our cities can the cures for cancer, heart disease, mental afflictions, and the various other medical diseases be discovered?

What type of story do we of the 86th Congress want to write? Will it be one with a happy ending where the vast American urban population is achieving a better life in an improved environment or is it to be called "The Death of Our Cities" and end in decay and ruin for us all?

I should like to talk to you of Philadelphia's problems in housing and urban renewal. They are the same problems as the many other cities represented in the House here today face. We have to learn how to plan and build to meet modern needs. Philadelphia has been one of the cities to lead the way in this learning process. I think we know a good many answers to the problems of eliminating blight today. But the extent to which we in Philadelphia, and others throughout the Nation, can apply the lessons we have learned depends on the extent of Federal help which this Congress extends. The Housing Act of 1959 would supply the wherewithal to move forward in the fight to provide adequate living conditions for our urban dwellers, the bulk of the Nation's population.

Let me tell you a story of how five outstanding Philadelphia Institutions have joined together to combat the blight engulfing them. The University of Pennsylvania, Drexel Institute of Technology and three neighboring institutions are chartering a nonprofit corporation to reclaim blighted residential areas in West Philadelphia. Along with buying, improving, and selling residential real estate, the new corporation, to be called the West Philadelphia Corp., will pool the brains and resources of member institutions to obtain better police protection and enforcement of zoning; rework outmoded traffic and circulation patterns; and help neighboring residential areas to keep pace with the development of one of the Nation's great educational, medical, research and cultural concentrations.

There are three square miles involved in this project. Along with the University of Pennsylvania and Drexel, the institutions chartering the new corporation are the Philadelphia College of Pharmacy and Science, Presbyterian Hospital and the Philadelphia College of Osteopathy. The area within which the corporation contemplates working is bounded by Haverford Avenue on the north, 52d Street on the west, the Schuylkill River on the east and the Media tracks of the Pennsylvania Railroad on the south. This is some three square miles.

The new corporation has been under discussion for 6 months. Planning to date has been done by Sherwood R. Mercer, dean of the Philadelphia College of Osteopathy; John C. Atwood, Jr., executive vice president of Presbyterian Hospital; John E. Kramer, registrar and assistant to the president of the Philadelphia College of Pharmacy and Science; Allen T. Bonnell, vice president of Drexel Institute, and John L. Moore, business vice president of the University of Pennsylvania. The incorporators don't propose limiting membership to just themselves. West Philadelphia is characterized by identifiable residential neighborhoods with constructive evidence of organized citizens' pride and dedication to the community. It is with the neighborhood organizations which have fostered this pride and dedication that the new corporation hopes to work. The institutions emphasized that they don't want to absorb or destroy the identity of these neighborhood groups. The corporation is being created within this framework of demonstrable contribution to the city—of commitment to continued city location and of devotion to Philadelphia's future well-being.

The corporation will operate after a pattern set in Chicago and New York City. Testing has been done successfully in the neighborhood of the University of Chicago—the South East Chicago Commission—and the neighborhood of Columbia University in New York City. What the institutions here envision is a community which holds and attracts institutional and cultural facilities, compatible industrial and commercial uses, standard and marketable residential areas served by adequate schools, parks, churches and shopping, thus providing a supply and range of housing which will appeal to large numbers of the population not now attracted to the area. The boundaries of the area with which the corporation will deal are not rigid.

Although the new corporation's primary interest is in the area in which the five participating institutions are located, the corporation will extend its interest to other nearby areas when it is necessary or appropriate to accomplish its objectives. The institutions hope to obtain a charter in time to begin staffing the new corporation by next fall. Still undecided are questions of initial capitalization and where the corporation will start. Certainly they will have to do a lot of preliminary planning, conduct surveys on housing, incidence of crime, and school, recreation and traffic requirements before they can go to work.

What do you as Members of the 86th Congress have at stake if West Philadelphia becomes a blighted area? Will it affect the Representative from Georgia, California or Alaska?

The answer is that it most certainly will. Philadelphia's West Philadelphia section contains one of the Nation's great educational, medical research, and cultural concentrations. The following insitutions are located in this area:

First. The University of Pennsylvania—from which Dr. Isadore Ravdin came to perform the operation on President Eisenhower.

Second. Drexel Institute of Technology—one of the great engineering schools of the country.

Third. Philadelphia College of Pharmacy and Science.

Fourth. Presbyterian Hospital.

Fifth. Philadelphia College of Osteopathy.

Our university city program, designed to renew a great institutional area, where some of our finest universities and hospitals are clustered, hemmed in by blight at present, will take at least $10 million of Federal funds.

Federal funds are needed to work alongside the builders of the massive new Delaware Expressway which is to cut straight through Philadelphia, so as to offset the blighting effect it may well have in certain pockets which the expressway will cut up or cut off from the rest of the city. Now, suppose the Federal renewal aid authorized is cut in half, as the administration proposes. Then, the shoring up of the slivers created by the Delaware Expressway will just go undone, again with the probability that the inability to time the work with expressway construction will mean a bigger job to be done when the time comes. Under the Housing Act, we can take the necessary steps so that several sections which will be badly cut up by the expressway as it cuts its way through the city, will not be left to fester and decay hopelessly.

The following has so far been completed in the field of expressway development. The removal of the old "el" structure opened the west side of the Schuylkill River for extensive new private development and cleared the way for the $47 million Schuylkill Expressway which was opened last fall from the Pennsylvania Turnpike south to 30th and Market Streets. The Schuylkill Expressway is the first limited access highway to enter Philadelphia. It is part of a $456.7 million network of expressways being planned jointly by the city, the Pennsylvania Department of Highways and the Federal Bureau of Public Roads.

Two of these, the $27.5 million Roosevelt Boulevard extension of the Schuylkill Expressway and the $7.2 million Vine Street extension of the expressway are now under construction.

Both the Schuylkill Expressway and the proposed $200 million eight-lane Delaware Expressway will terminate in South Philadelphia at the approaches to the new Walt Whitman Bridge over the Delaware River, completed 2 years ago by the Delaware River Port Authority. Four main links in the expressway system form the boundaries of the main center city area to be redeveloped. The Schuylkill Expressway forms the western boundary and the Delaware Expressway will be the eastern border. The Vine Street extension, which connects with the Benjamin Franklin Bridge and downtown Camden, N.J., is the north barrier and a

proposed $40 million crosstown expressway some 14 blocks to the south will complete the oblong area.

One of these critical problems is housing for the American people. Our national goal was stated some 10 years ago in the Housing Act of 1949: "A decent home in a suitable living environment for every American family." We have made some progress toward that goal in the last 10 years, but not much. Estimates vary, but it is a fair statement that 10 million American families are presently living in homes which are either unsafe, unsanitary, or both. These are our slums—a national disgrace. Many of these slums are in rural areas, but a large majority of them are in the cities of America. (Senator JOSEPH S. CLARK, February 5, 1959, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

We must have adequate housing into which to relocate people who are displaced through the urban renewal program—or we will simply end up going in circles instead of going forward.

Let me hasten to point out that, even if the Federal renewal aid called for in the Housing Act were voted down, we would still have a displacement problem. First of all, the clearance projects for which Federal funds have already been allocated are just beginning to reach the stage where much displacement will occur all at once. Secondly, we have in Philadelphia a rapidly expanding program of code enforcement, which brings about displacement. As occupancy and facilities requirements of the housing code are enforced, families are forced to move—in numbers averaging about 700 a year. And this program too is just about now moving into high gear. Finally, our program of capital improvements—including the highway program—inevitably displaces people. For example, the Delaware Expressway alone is expected to require relocation of some 5,600 families.

Where are these people going to go? We must recognize that the vast majority of them are in the low-income category. At today's prices they have little choice but to go back into substandard housing if they cannot be placed in low-rent public housing. But the waiting list for our public housing projects continues to be in the neighborhood of 10,000.

Are we, then, going to say that it is all right for the family displaced from one substandard house to go back into another slum we have not yet had a chance to clear? Or to go into a declining older neighborhood and hasten its decline by overcrowding the housing there?

I think that we cannot avoid the fact that urban renewal and public housing are mutually dependent on each other. If we refuse to approve progress in either, we doom the tremendous effort which is going on to save our cities.

At this time Mr. Chairman, I would like to repeat a statement by Joseph T. Kelley, president of the Philadelphia Industrial Union Council, AFL–CIO, during hearings before the Subcommittee on Housing:

Since Philadelphia is an old city its needs are tremendous. In urban renewal and slum clearance alone the city government could and should use some $150 million of Federal grants in the next 6 years. Philadelphia city government schedules its capital improvement program on a 6-year basis and is prepared to provide the local participation in order to qualify for such Federal funds. If these funds are made available to Philadelphia not only will slums be cleared, but older and still desirable neighborhoods will be saved. There are many benefits to our lower income families and to the community as a whole from these programs. One of the major gains is opportunity for increased employment, particularly through private enterprise. If our economy is to be kept healthy construction must be at a high peak, particularly housing. Shelter construction stimulates business opportunities in other industries. The labor movement in Philadelphia is most concerned with the welfare of our less privileged citizens. Until we can wipe out our slums it will always be difficult to get at problems of disease, crime, and family relations. The private housing industry in the country has not been able to meet the needs of many families who would ordinarily not have a problem if they could remain where they are. Until such time as housing prices come down, the Government must take the responsibility of providing sufficient payments to enable decent relocation. It seems to us that operating procedure in between the slum clearance and public housing programs is necessary. Philadelphia labor movement has prepared a community effort to improve Philadelphia through better shelter. We believe it is essential that Federal programs be continued and improved at a far higher level than previously enacted.

Before leaving the subject of public housing, I should note—speaking strictly for Philadelphia—that we support the provision in this bill for extending the arrangements made for housing defense personnel in Passyunk Homes. We had thought the original 3-year period for this arrangement would be adequate, but this has not proved to be the case.

Also, I must speak briefly of three groups in the population whose special needs for better housing are widely recognized but to date only poorly provided for. One such group is the elderly, and I applaud this bill's provision for a new program of direct lending to make adequate housing available for this growing and richly deserving segment of our population. A new program of this type augmented by the housing to be made available to them under the public housing program, should go far to meet their needs.

Less favorable is the picture for the middle-income family—particularly the family in that income limbo between the top limit of eligibility for public housing and the income necessary to purchase adequate housing at today's prices. This family may get some help from the cooperative housing program—particularly as it would be revised by this bill. Or the family may get help through the revised section 203 or 207 FHA mortgage insurance programs. Or our family may fall in that substantial group whose needs neither program can meet. For this group, a special program is needed—preferably one providing for direct Federal loans at low interest rates and on long terms.

Least favorable of all is the picture for the minority group. Individual members of this group too may benefit from one or another of the other programs provided. But it is foolish to think that their problems as a whole will truly be solved until it is a standard requirement of all Government-underwritten housing that no discrimination be practiced in selling or renting the dwelling covered.

The liberalization of section 221 FHA mortgage insurance provided in title I of the Housing Act of 1959 should also be of help in the efforts to solve the relocation problem. This applies to both the increase in the maximum mortgage amount permitted to be insured and in the extension of the program to rental properties held by owners who are in the housing business for normal profitmaking purposes. We have had difficulty in using the section 221 program effectively to date. These changes might well make it possible to provide adequate rehousing for people who are not eligible for public housing and, hopefully, for some who are eligible but might still be able to go into private housing if the monthly costs were brought down far enough. The liberalization of the limitations on section 220 FHA mortgage insurance—which helps provide good housing in renewal areas—and the inauguration of a new program to help house the elderly. Both serve the dual purpose of facilitating the supplying of housing in what might be termed problem categories and thereby facilitate the entire renewal effort.

As a minimum, we should spell out more specifically that the section 220 program requires the FHA to view the house as it will be when the renewal program is complete for purposes not only of insuring the mortgage in the first place but also for purposes of arriving at higher valuations on properties and longer economic life of the property judgments. Even better would be a change to permit calculation of mortgage amounts on the basis of replacement costs, as is provided for new housing, instead of on appraised value, as is presently done for old housing. And perhaps a requirement that the mortgage term be for the full economic life of the property rather than the three-quarters of that period presently provided by FHA regulations. Better still, of course, would be the establishment of a completely new program of direct Federal loans for rehabilitation, on specially advantageous terms. That would really put a shot in the arm of the renewal effort to which we should all be dedicated.

Before I mentioned the section 221 program, which provides FHA mortgage insurance for relocation housing. I should like to go on record as strongly supporting H.R. 2357's adjustments in this program. The increases in mortgage amounts, the inclusion of rental housing owned by profitmaking concerns, the provision to permit insurance on properties near as well as in a community—all these are excellent improvements.

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, we all must realize that we have to get industry into the cities. We are now making a tremendous strive for that and are beginning to succeed. It cannot possibly be done without the aid of a Federal urban redevelopment program. The start which we have made in revitalizing our center city will grind to a halt. We now have an

allocation of Federal funds to do most of the first project in this area and are well on the way to starting the "pick-and-shovel" work itself. But this project is only the starting point. If that is all the work we can do in center city, we must say to our businessmen and downtown residents that they might as well give up any hope of saving the economic and cultural center of the entire metropolitan area. The obsolete buildings, congestion, inability to expand and modernize offices and parking facilities will continue. The possibility of fine new homes and restored colonial homes, to which many people had been hoping they could move, will be gone.

The plans for a new industrial reservation close to center city business facilities will come to nothing. And we will have to say to the businesses which had hoped to relocate in this spot, "go-ahead—leave the city—we cannot help you find the space to put in modern facilities, to expand your plant, to increase your employment." I need hardly point out how vital an issue this loss would be in the current situation of unemployment for the people and inadequate tax resources for the city.

Let us see some of the progress that has already been made in center city redevelopment under the city administrations of Mayor Richardson Dilworth and our now senior Senator of Pennsylvania, JOSEPH S. CLARK, JR.

In 1952, the Pennsylvania Railroad dispatched the last train from its 71-year-old Broad Street station opposite Philadelphia's City Hall and turned the building over to a wrecking crew. The railroad, which spent $22 million to tear down the station and the "Chinese Wall" that supported the tracks leading to it, has now completed about half of its $100 million Penn Center Development.

While the railroad was tearing down the station and the wall, the city was fulfilling its part of an agreement dating back to 1925, by building a tunnel under the Schuylkill River and 12 blocks of new subway for the Old Market Street elevated line that was a blight on the railroad's 30th Street Station on the west bank of the river, now its main passenger terminal.

Penn Center, which now contains three new 20-story office buildings and a 1,000-room Sheraton Hotel, the first in Philadelphia in some 20 years, provided much of impetus for ever-increasing cooperation between Philadelphia businessmen, most of whom are Republicans, and the second Democratic reform administration.

Penn Center, with its new buildings, restaurants, and even a new ice rink, opened last New Years Eve, to match New York's Rockefeller Center.

In August of 1957, the old Philadelphia Development Corp. was formed by a group of center city businessmen to aid in the Washington Square, east project, the first local step in the rebuilding of the overall center city area.

Another group of businessmen formed the Food Distribution Center Corp. to build a $100 million wholesale food center on 376 acres of lowland between the Delaware River and Broad Street in South Philadelphia.

In November 1957, the first wholesalers in the ancient Dock Street market area, slated for demolition as part of the Washington Square, east project, signed leases for space in the new center. With the New Food Center, Penn Center, Washington Square East, and University redevelopment projects at both Temple and the University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia's urban renewal plan was beginning to turn to the problem of broadening the city's real estate tax base while the city was being improved physically. The administrations of both former mayor, now Senator, JOSEPH S. CLARK, and Mayor Richardson Dilworth has cost Philadelphians increases in wage and property taxes and higher water and sewer rents. But all of these have been applied with remarkably little protest from the citizens of Philadelphia. This is evidence that Philadelphians see where their tax dollar is going and have no objections.

And this line of thought led to a third corporation, the Philadelphia Industrial Development Corp., financed jointly by the normally and always nationally Republican Chamber of Commerce of Greater Philadelphia and the reform Democratic city administration.

In Philadelphia today, it is considered normal for prominent Citizens for Eisenhower to serve as officers or members of any or all of these corporations or other committees designed to further the renaissance of Philadelphia. And this service continues while Mayor Dilworth appears before committee after committee in Washington and scores the Eisenhower administration for slowing down aid to big cities. All of our citizens from the big cities understand and desire this program of urban redevelopment. Shall we, in the 86th Congress, turn our back to their pleas and needs?

In April of 1951, the Philadelphia Redevelopment Authority opened Penn Towne, the first federally aided slum-clearance project in the United States. For some 4 years after Penn Towne, the city administration and the redevelopment authorities were unable to convince private builders that the construction of low or middle priced sales or rental housing on cleared slum land was a profitable venture. So the Philadelphia Housing Authority, which now has more than 10,000 low-rent units, became Philadelphia's principal slum clearance redeveloper and it was a case of the Federal Government subsidizing both the clearance and the construction.

After Penn Towne, the redevelopment authority moved across the street, cleared 5 more acres and the housing authority built its 203-unit Spring Garden Homes project. This was another first for Philadelphia, the first time Federal funds had ever been used under title I of the 1949 Housing Act to acquire and clear land for the construction of Federal low-rent housing.

The redevelopment authority repeated this process three times, twice more in north Philadelphia and once in west Philadelphia, while it preached the gospel of urban renewal to private builders.

Meanwhile, the authority continued to develop plans for Eastwick, the largest redevelopment project in the country, which started last December with the condemnation of 2,300 homes and Washington Square East, the renewal of part of William Penn's original "greene countrie towne," where condemnation is scheduled to start in June.

By late 1956, the authority was working with both the University of Pennsylvania and Temple University on plans for the expansion of both institutions.

A builder was found for a 230-unit low-rent apartment development at 10th and Jefferson Streets in the southwest Temple area. Shortly thereafter, one of two competing builders was selected for the construction of 300 single family homes for sale at about $10,000 in the same area. The authority has plans for 1,500 such homes in this area of north Philadelphia east of Broad Street.

In August of 1957, the authority started to clear 9 acres of land for a non-federally assisted luxury apartment project, along the Vine Street extension of the Schuylkill Expressway. The redeveloper, Parkway Triangle Corp., a syndicate of Philadelphia builders, became the first Philadelphia firm to qualify under FHA 220 financing.

The $125 million Eastwick project is designed as a city within a city and plans call for from 10,000 to 12,000 new homes plus an 80-acre industrial park.

The development will take an estimated 8 years to complete. The city estimates that on completion, the 2,500 acres will have a tax base of $186,250,000.

The existing area is subgrade land, 40 percent of which is now occupied by a wide variety of land uses ranging from junkyards and frame shacks to solid masonry middle-class homes.

The area is not served by sewers and the land and building are now valued for tax purposes at $10,784,315. At the time of condemnation, the city held tax liens for more than $1 million against the properties.

Bids will be asked this year for redevelopers in Eastwick. Before turning the area over to builders, the redevelopment authority will spend more than $30 million to acquire and clear the land and another $10 million to fill it to grade level. The city will spend $20 million for streets and sidewalks and an equal amount for sewers.

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, Philadelphia is identified in every history book with the Liberty Bell, the First Congress, the Declaration of Independence and the birth of our great Nation. Yet, we have allowed the area of our birth to perish into decay, ruin and filth. Now, we are on our way to make the "Cradle of Liberty and Independence" live again. The renewal of Washington Square will serve to preserve historic sections of the city which have great meaning to all Americans, and whose national significance has been ignored far, far too long already. Would Russia allow the "Red Square" and "Lenin's Tomb" areas to become solid seas of blight. Must we tell the people

of the Nation, "Come to see the birthplace of your national heritage but try to ignore the slums which crowd in upon it, which virtually overshadow it?" Do not look at the historic old residences nearby which have been let go over the years and which we had hoped to restore. They are decaying now and, by the time we may someday get money to save them, it may well be too late. Welb and Knapp, Inc., of New York and the Thomas Jefferson Square Corporation, a national syndicate, have already been selected from among four bidders as redevelopers for the $50 million Washington Square project. Demolition will be selective in this project and, in addition to building a total of six tower apartment buildings, and a number of new town houses, they are charged with rehabilitating existing structures that reflect by their architecture the early history of Philadelphia's growth.

As most of you men and women who have attended law school know, most problems are in the gray area. There is not a simple black and white answer to any problem. The same is true with blighted areas. There are older neighborhoods which circle our badly blighted central section and which are showing the beginning signs of blight. These are some of the gray areas which have been so much discussed of late in the press—the areas which must be saved if our major cities are not to become all blight and ruin. Their people are crying out to be saved. They are willing and able to make the necessary sacrifices. They only ask us for the help with this job. For the program of conservation aimed at saving our fine old neighborhoods from the blight that is starting there will require $60 million of Federal money over the next 6 years.

The signers of the Declaration of Independence would probably be amazed to learn that this great Nation was allowing the site of the cradle of American Liberty to sink into ruin. It was only a few short years back that visitors to Philadelphia would avoid a visit to Independence Hall due to the blight, filth, and ruined environment that it was situated in. Now, there are two separate projects to clear away the blighted buildings surrounding Independence Hall. Before these projects, the Independence Hall section was surrounded and virtually overshadowed by slums. Some historic old residences nearby, which are decaying, such as the home of the great American author Edgar Allan Poe could be restored now. But, if money is not forthcoming now by means of the Housing Act then it may well be too late. The Independence Mall-Franklin project alone calls for some $17 million of Federal money.

The U.S. National Park Service has taken responsibility for Independence Hall and the Federal Government, through the Park Service, is committed to spending some $14 million to clear a landscaped mall area to the east.

The State of Pennsylvania is committed to a like amount for the clearance of a block-wide mall to the north as far as Franklin Square, the plaza at the approach to the Benjamin Franklin Bridge. Both projects are partially completed, but should the flow of Federal funds necessary be stopped or curtailed then the work remaining will stay undone.

After 8 years of labor, toil, and money, Philadelphia's urban renewal program is where it can be seen by almost every citizen regardless of race or income level. At this point, bankers, railroad presidents, university officials, and merchants are as concerned as labor unions and neighborhood civic associations about the job of creating a new city. Would we want the people of our cities to remember the 86th Congress as the one that wrote the unhappy ending, "The Death of Our Cities."

Mrs. GRANAHAN. Mr. Chairman, the University of Pennsylvania is a private nonsectarian institution, devoted to the public service.

The university had its beginning in 1740, as a small local Philadelphia institution founded by Benjamin Franklin. In the intervening years it has grown to become an institution serving the State of Pennsylvania, the United States, and the world.

The many schools of the university offer courses of instruction, including physics, engineering, medicine, and dentistry to a student body in excess of 17,000. Two large teaching hospitals—the University Hospital and the Graduate Hospital—are operated by the university. Research contracts with Government and industry are in excess of $7 million. The university budget for the fiscal year 1958–59 is in excess of $43 million. Sixty-five hundred individuals are employed in all areas of the institution.

The university is located in an area composed of residential and commercial buildings. If the university is to expand it will be necessary to obtain some of the surrounding residential and commercial land areas on which to erect academic structures. The university expects to do its part to assist in providing an educational opportunity for the rising tide of students which will be upon us in the years ahead.

Since 1945, the university has erected academic structures in the amount of $24 million; $14 million of construction is now underway. To provide land area for these structures, the university has used all or most of its available land. The present campus comprises about 140 acres.

During the period 1960–70, it is anticipated that the university will need to increase its plant dollarwise in the amount of $70 million. The deficiency in land required for plant expansion is estimated at 63 acres.

Like many other urban institutions, the University of Pennsylvania is landlocked. It cannot expand unless it is given some instrument to assist it in its endeavors—statement of John L. Moore, University of Pennsylvania, business vice president, from hearings on Housing Act of 1959, Senate Banking and Currency Committee, January 1959.

In an enormous variety of ways, U.S. universities are already striving to meet their new civic-cultural responsibilities. They will need the most talented assistance in architecture, planning, and financial imagination to accomplish their purposes; if they succeed and if they can derive new strength from their more intimate contact with the community, they may provide the cultural focus for history's first great mass civilization.

What if we of the 86th Congress fail to meet our responsibilities to the universities? If we let them become immersed in the sea of blight, what can we expect? We can expect the end of our great research centers. No longer will eager students want to congregate in the city colleges and universities which are located in filth and ruin. They will enroll in new spacious modern schools far from our cities. This means that our present-day great educational and scientific institutions will become stagnant and progress toward the great educational and medical discoveries will be hindered. For example, if the West Philadelphia area already described becomes slum area, the cure for cancer or heart disease now being worked on in the great medical center of Philadelphia may be set back years and years. We must not allow the university section of the city to become unlivable for the teachers and students who come to these institutions not just from Philadelphia, nor even just from Pennsylvania, but from all over the Nation and indeed from all over the world. It is not so long ago that the shocking news was reported that a Korean student—In Oh Ho—at the University of Pennsylvania had been beaten to death by a group of teenage thugs. This took place in the very section our universities hope to renew. It was symptomatic of the deteriorated conditions there which are a disgrace to the American way of life. We will never know how many foreign and American students were deterred from coming to study and live at the University of Pennsylvania due to that shocking murder, and of the loss of possible advancements in research toward a longer and better life as a result thereof. Let us remember the horrible death of the Korean student and approve legislation that will bring life to our cities, colleges, and universities.

Now, what are the problems in Philadelphia alone, that we regard as absolutely essential, that our chamber of commerce regards as absolute minimum needs, that our groups, like our banking groups, our investment banking group, our greater Philadelphia movement all regard as absolute minimum? For the next 10 years we must have $250 million of Federal money. The fact is that unless we can get that kind of aid from the Federal Government, we are going to be absolutely swamped and just will not be able to meet this situation in any way, shape, or form.

The Eastwick project, which has just been described to you, is the biggest redevelopment project that any city has yet attempted. As a result of this redevelopment, we have the tremendous problem of relocation. We find that in a project that big, where we are going to move more than 20,000 people, that

amazing problems and extraordinary cases of individual hardship come up. Much needed are the changes proposed in the title IV provisions for relocation payments—again both in the increase in the amount of payments—from $100 to $200 in the case of family moving expenses and from $2,500 to $3,000 for businesses—and in the authorization of payments to people displaced in renewal areas by other activities than the redevelopment agency's acquisition. This is a matter of simple justice and brings this facet of the renewal program in line with the broadened concept of renewal recognized by the Housing Act of 1954. Similarly, we would welcome title IV's provisions for an increase to 20 percent in the proportion of Federal aid which can go for nonresidential redevelopment, and for the removal of university renewal areas from the area eligibility requirements. These are steps in the right direction—facilitating our efforts to approach renewal on a total city basis.

But there are other problems of hardship brought about by renewal on which I should like to comment specifically. Philadelphia is one of the few cities which has by now accumulated considerable experience with the actual carrying out, as distinct from the planning, of projects, and I think our experience has pointed up these problems.

First of all I should like to comment on the compensation which we are permitted to give to the people whose properties we take in order to renew an area. Some of these people are not adequately compensated under the existing Federal laws. It is true that they receive a fair market value for their properties. But this is not always adequate to enable a homeowner to obtain a comparable dwelling elsewhere. This is especially true to the owner of a house which is sound but surrounded by blight, or a house which is comfortable but obsolescent. Though these represent only a minority of the families displaced by clearance operations, they are special hardship cases and we should be able to give them special treatment—possibly through a revolving fund for direct loans at nominal rates, or some other special device. If Federal housing aids had not for so long a time encouraged the construction of high-priced housing this might not be such a serious problem at the present time.

Another hardship often falls on the small businessman. When he moves, and frequently even before that, he loses a clientele built up over many years. If he is renting the property, he may also lose money on his investment in equipment and facilities and on his lease. Therefore, we need also to give special consideration to this type of situation. Small businessmen should, in my opinion, be reimbursed for some of these intangible losses in addition to physical assets. And there should be a mortgage insurance program designed specifically to help them get reasonable financing for a new place of business..

It is impossible to think of relocation without also thinking, at once, of the importance of the public housing program. I have talked about the special hardship cases which we encounter in the relocation process. But if one considers instead the great mass of the people displaced by renewal, the conclusion is inescapable that the common denominator for Mr. and Mrs. Average Dislocatee is hardship, of a different type—the normal, everyday life of hardship of the poor. These are the slum dwellers, displaced by the law's requirement that each house must meet minimum standards of occupancy as well as facilities. All too often, these are the people who can afford none of the decent housing on the private market today.

Our renewal programs are rolling, all over the country. We are learning how to enforce our housing codes effectively. We are installing the modern community facilities which our cities need. All of this is necessary, important. And all of this means a sharply increasing relocation workload in the near future.

If we are to cope with this increase, we must expand our public housing program.

Mr. NIX. Mr. Chairman, Philadelphia provides a good example of what will happen if we fail to pass the Housing Act of 1959 as recommended by the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Probably the most graphic and clearly immediate result is the effect on renewal activities of a failure to pass this bill in its present form. Under its provisions, we in Philadelphia confidently expect that, in the next 3 years, we can:

First. Complete the work we have well underway in redeveloping our southwest Temple slum area in north central Philadelphia. This is one of the worst slum areas that we have in the city. All told, we have 60,000 slum units in the city of Philadelphia in which 200,000 people live, and when I say slum units, they are units in which you should not ask a dog or pig to live, and in which 200,000 people have to live today—statement of Richardson Dilworth, mayor, city of Philadelphia.

Without more Federal funds the clearance and redevelopment of an entire section of squalid slums in the north central section of Philadelphia will stand incompleted. This is the section where the first redevelopment work in the country started, and we are well on the way with these projects.

We have adequate Federal allocations to complete the work in East Poplar and much of the work in Southwest Temple. But, without new Federal authorizations, the completion of the Southwest Temple projects will just have to be postponed and the fine new buildings there will have to withstand the myriad bad influences of slum jungles in their midst. A symbol of the choice that you as authors decided to write. A story that could have had a happy ending to it if the last chapter was written by the passing of the Housing Act of 1959. It is absolutely necessary that the Housing Act be passed to protect the heavy investment in money, time, and effort which has already gone into this work.

Our program of conserving the older residential neighborhoods where blight is just beginning would just not get off the ground at all. We have Federal allocations to handle one small area—money which will go to remove the scattered spots of hopeless blight in support of citizen activities to encourage rehabilitation and constant upkeep of the dwellings there. Under the Housing Act we could help citizens of five other such areas to save their neighborhoods from sliding on down into slums—and thereby save the taxpayers the eventual cost of completely clearing these areas later on.

A private institution that has been admirably aggressive in its campaign to bring culture to a cramped, industrial city is Philadelphia's Temple University. Eight years ago Temple shocked the city by buying the 80-acre suburban site and preparing to move to it. But last year Temple committed itself to staying in the city by embarking on a 10-year, $55 million campus enlargement and improvement plan first outlined by the Philadelphia Planning Commission, later designed by architects Nolan and Swinburne.

Moreover, although Temple remains today a bumptiously independent private institution, it has been able to get financial assistance from Federal, State, and local government sources. First, Temple demonstrated its faith in its own program by putting up a 50-classroom building, financed entirely—$1.3 million—by university funds. Next it appealed to the HHFA for a Federal loan to build a $1.5 million women's dormitory—completed last year. Now it is concentrating on the planning of a $4 million science building which is to be completed by 1961. One-third of the money for this building's land will come from Pennsylvania's general State authority—a public body established originally to help finance hospitals and other State building projects but recently given the go-ahead to assist higher education's capital spending programs.

The remaining two-thirds of the land costs will come from Federal urban renewal funds channeled through the redevelopment authority of the City of Philadelphia. All the money for the building itself will come as a grant from the GSA.

Thus Temple has already proved that the battle to establish a visible cultural focus in the city is worth waging, worth recruiting allies for—and can be won.

Philadelphia citizens are ready to take on these renewal jobs. But they can take on only part of the job.

Title IV, section 401, permits the utilization of local public agencies which are established by States to operate on a statewide basis in behalf of smaller communities undertaking urban renewal programs. This will allow the Philadelphia urban renewal story to be practiced by smaller municipalities who do not have the source of tax revenue which our large cities have.

The capital grants provision of section 404 which increases the present $1,250 million capital grant authorization by $500 million on date of enactment of the bill is an absolute necessity to continue on with urban renewal projects.

Fellow Members of the House, we have told you half of Philadelphia's story. Now it is up to you to finish it. What title do you want to give it? "The Death of Our Cities" or the "Survival of Our Cities"? Do not forget the future of the fourth largest city in America depends upon the passage of the Housing Act of 1959. Will you, of the 86th Congress, write a happy ending to this Philadelphia story?

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Chairman, it appears obvious to me that due to the emphasis which is placed on the housing bill each year and the time spent in waiting for and vigorously debating the merits of this year's housing bill, most of you have firm convictions and have reached conclusions as to which of the conflicting bills or amendments you will support.

For the sake of the record, I will briefly review the important provisions of the original housing proposals and will emphasize what I feel should be considered.

The FHA title I program should be permanent or at least long-range. The proposals which extend this program for 1 year merely means that we must review it when there is almost unanimous support of the program and the results it has achieved.

Increasing building costs and increasing standards of living across the country indicate a need for increases in maximum mortgage amounts under section 203. From the general consensus of builders, financial institutions, and real estate men throughout the Nation, I think we could set a limitation of $30,000 on one-, two-, and three-family dwellings. I do not believe that we, at this time, ought to extend the maturity period under section 203.

The provisions for increasing new low-cost housing for rural and outlying areas to a maximum insurable mortgage of $9,000 is a sound one.

The general insurance authorizations for FHA for $6 billion for fiscal 1959 and an additional $4 billion for fiscal 1960 is a preferable and practical provision.

One of the greater controversies of this bill is the dollar amounts for capital grants under the urban renewal program. I firmly believe that the proposals under the Herlong bill are sound and under them we will get more urban renewal for less tax dollars.

Probably no greater issue seems to arouse the emotions of Members of Congress as the public housing provisions of this bill. I believe in all sincerity that no amendments whatsoever are needed in the public housing administration section of the bill. Various proposals would give more power to local public housing authorities and there are also the proposals for more public housing units in excess of the 108,000 now in the PHA pipeline. In principle, they would add up to an abandonment of the announced objectives of public housing to house only the lowest income families. We see this entire program developing vastly increased costs in subsidies at the same time that provisions in the original Rains and Sparkman proposals repeal Federal supervision of increasing expenditures.

In the area of college housing, we again see a program which is moving away from its original objective. We also see quite closely another direct withdrawal from the Treasury bypassing the proper appropriations process.

It has not been my intention, Mr. Chairman, to do any more than to point out in the simplest manner possible some of the pertinent sections of the bill.

I cannot conceive the necessity, in a year which indicates will see the greatest number of housing starts in the history of the Nation, a governmental program to thwart the spirit of free enterprise and to inflict huge numbers of socialistic public housing units in direct competition with the homebuilding industry.

In all due respect to the distinguished gentleman from Alabama [Mr. RAINS] this year's housing bill and the bills that he will present to us in the future will obviously fall short of creating a housing utopia. The facts of life are that the only sound, sensible answer to raising the housing standards of the American public to even greater levels lies in the techniques of modern homebuilding and the general rising of productivity in the standard of living of the American wage earner. I would suggest to the gentleman that the best long-range approach to this and other problems is to curtail inflationary proposals so that we might stabilize the value of the purchasing dollar which the average American family has to invest in new and improved homes.

Economic stability in the country will give us the favorable atmosphere needed for a tremendous new boom in housing construction and will give the incentive and confidence to the public to embark on the purchasing and investment in the ever-increasing number of homes that private industry rather than socialistic government should build.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Herlong amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the Herlong amendment, as the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. RAINS] has explained, has a joker in it which you will find in several instances on page 41, subsections (1), (2), and (3), all of these subsections containing the words "as may be specified from time to time in appropriation acts."

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS] has just announced to the House that he will offer an amendment to take out all back-door types of appropriations.

Now, let us see what this is going to do. Over the years the Congress has set up a number of programs and a majority of the Congress has said that these programs are worthwhile. They have provided certain guaranteed loans by the Federal Government, certain debenture arrangements, certain contract arrangements, prior to the receipt of appropriation money. This is a drive and is the same drive that was attempted on the airport bill when they tried to insert the provisions of House Resolution 161, a bill of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH]. This to concentrate in the Appropriations Committee all of the power of spending in the House. Let us make no mistake about that, that is what it is for.

Here are the programs it can affect, not only by today's amendment, but this amendment may be offered from time to time on every piece of legislation that comes up for consideration. This is the second time it has been offered. It is going to be offered again on others that may be selected. It may not be on all of them.

There are some of these programs a lot of us will go along on that are not particularly interesting to our district, but we will go along with them just like we did a few minutes ago in voting against the so-called Taber amendment.

Here are some of the programs now authorized by the Congress and financial obligations or loan guarantees authorized by the Congress as a whole and not the Appropriations Committee. Let me read them to you:

The Commodity Credit Corporation.

The Export-Import Bank.

Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation.

The Home Owners' Loan Corporation.

The Housing and Home Finance Administration.

The International Cooperation Administration.

Public Housing Administration.

Rural Electrification Administration, the REA.

The St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation.

The Secretary of the Army.

The Secretary of the Treasury, in certain functions which the Congress has directed him to perform.

The Small Business Administration.

The Tennessee Valley Authority.

The U.S. Information Agency.

The Veterans' Administration.

The Defense Materials Procurement Agency.

The General Services Administration.

The Secretary of Agriculture, in certain functions the Congress has directed him to perform.

The Secretary of the Interior.

These are some of the programs that the Congress has set up, the Congress as a whole, not the Appropriations Committee. Concealed in the Herlong bill is the opening wedge to take away from a majority of the Congress their wishes, their desires, and their directions on these important programs. Some of them you may be for and some of them you may be against.

Just remember, when you open the door and you put in your Appropriations Committee all of the power of expenditure in the House, you are opening the door to the same type of amendment for all the programs I have recited.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. WIDNALL. Is the gentleman in favor of the housing for elderly persons section of the Rains bill?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. What is that?

Mr. WIDNALL. The housing for elderly persons section of the Rains bill.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Yes; I am in favor of that.

Mr. WIDNALL. That provides $100 milion of authority. That will have to go through the Appropriations Committee. Does the gentlemen think that would destroy the housing for the elderly persons program?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I do not know what the Appropriations Committee will do. The Appropriations Committee sometimes pleases me and sometimes it does not. I say that when any committee of this House tries to take unto itself too much authority it is riding for a fall.

I may say to the esteemed members of the Appropriations Committee that they should leave a little bit of the judgment as to the programs which the Congress should accept to some of the legislative committees that have their functions, their privileges, and their responsibilities.

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the substitute.

Mr. Chairman, there is nothing new about the coalition that masterminded the substitute before us.

This alliance has made an annual appearance each year that I have been here—and long before—whenever housing legislation and certain other bills have come to the floor.

The common denominator of this group seems to be a desire to see low-cost public housing wiped off the books once and for all, to cut back and cripple the urban renewal program, and by eliminating the public debt transaction to hamstring the housing program in general.

Mr. Chairman, there is nothing new about the coalition behind this substitute, but it has certainly been a long time since the leadership on the other side of the aisle has gone quite so far as they have this year.

Apparently it has come to the point where they do not even fly their own banner any more, preferring instead to engage in the pretense that they are supporting a Democratic substitute.

From their standpoint the only trouble with this smokescreen is that it is transparent. Nothing could be more obvious than that the Herlong substitute is democratic only to the extent of the name of its sponsor. In effect it is the administration bill with a misleading label.

Mr. Chairman, if there is any question about what is back of this substitute, the answers are not hard to find.

In the first place, there is currently an opportunity to kill the public housing units authorized under the Housing Act of 1949. No one would expect an inviting opportunity like this to be overlooked and passed by—and sure enough the administration announced early in the session that it had had enough public housing, thank you, and was not anxious for any more.

Mr. Chairman, it would not be so bad if the administration and other supporters of this substitute really believed that public housing is no longer needed. But the administration admits that there is both a present and future need for this low-cost housing. It has conceded that half of the families displaced by urban renewal, highway construction, and other public activities cannot be rehoused except in public housing, and it has even gone so far as to estimate that of the 248,000 American families that will be displaced by Government action in fiscal years 1958, 1959, and 1960, 123,000—or nearly half of these families—will have incomes too low to rent or buy decent private housing.

Yet in the very face of these administration estimates the President has requested that public housing be abandoned.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to know where these 123,000 low-income American families are going to live after they have been displaced. The fact is that there is only one thing that they can do, and that is to move into or create new blighted areas and new slums. That is the hope and the helping hand offered by the Herlong substitute which carries out the administration decision to have done with public housing.

And the story behind the urban-renewal provisions in the substitute is not much different. What happened here is that the administration seems to have become disenchanted with the necessary cost of this program to preserve and save our American cities. But here a frontal attack was out of the question; so the administration, instead, came up with a proposal to change the two-thirds-one-third ratio by which the Federal and local governments share the cost of acquiring and clearing urban-renewal property. To scuttle the program, the administration proposed that the local contribution be 50 percent, instead of one-third. I do not think there is a mayor of a single major city in this country that appeared before our committee who did not testify that the local tax bases have been so stretched and strained that it simply would not be possible for them to participate in urban renewal on the proposed 50–50 basis.

Mr. Chairman, if the Herlong substitute is adopted, opponents of public housing and urban renewal will have won their greatest day, not only because these programs will have been killed or crippled, but because there will also have been won the device for keeping these victories intact, namely, the double-jeopardy requirement for Appropriations Committee approval.

Mr. Chairman, I urge defeat of the Herlong substitute.

Mr. RAINS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the Herlong substitute and amendments thereto cease at 2:30.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, this is a crucial point in a crucial bill. We have plenty of time. We have been loafing for 4 months in the House, as far as that is concerned. We are probably not going to do anything else this week. I hope the gentleman will not press his request at this time but will permit this debate to run along a little further. For instance, I would like to have a little time. I would want not less than 5 minutes, and I see a great many other gentlemen standing who want to be heard.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. RAINS]?

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

Mr. RAINS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the Herlong substitute and all amendments thereto cease at 3 o'clock.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama, Mr. RAINS?

There was no objection.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. McDONOUGH. How much time will that permit each Member?

The CHAIRMAN. Approximately 4 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER].

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman, for the last several hours I have heard considerable discussion here about the action of the Committee on Rules, on which I have the privilege of serving. I have heard about coalitions, and I have heard about attempts to ram something down somebody's throat, in an unorthodox and irregular manner. Mr. Chairman, nothing could be further from the truth. Let me say to you, in the first place, as one of those on the Committee on Rules who was responsible—and I take my full share of responsibility—for holding up this bill for several weeks, that to the best of my knowledge and information there never was any question in anybody's mind about preventing this House from considering a housing bill. That being true, what did some of us have in mind? We had in mind that if we could hold up this proposed enormous and unnecessary additional drain upon the Treasury of the United States, we might be able to work out something that would give you a housing bill, in the first place; and in the second place, that would be somewhere near the ability of the Treasury of the United States to sustain the impact. The result has been the Herlong bill. Now, what is so undemocratic, what is so unparliamentary about that? If anything, this is the most liberal rule you have had here in many a day. It is not only an outright open rule, but it also points up and provides for the consideration of a package bill such as I have just tried to outline to you that would have those qualifications.

You know, sometimes I wonder what motivates people to come down into the well of this House and talk about the Democratic Party and the Republican Party—and they do it on both sides of the aisle. Somehow I got the conception when I came to the Congress that my people elected me to come here to try to do the best things for the best interests of our great common country. I said to you on another occasion here very recently that I had gone down to

talk to the Secretary of the Treasury about our fiscal condition. I do not have the time to elaborate on that, but I just want to read to you what I said here—to be exact as to the time—on March 19, which is just about a month ago. I quote from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as follows:

I was talking with the Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Anderson. When I started that conversation I was worried about the future of my grandchildren. But, when I got through talking with this man who knows more about that than I do, I was worried about myself and not my grandchildren.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the time allotted to me may be granted to the gentleman from Mississippi.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, I must object.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman, I submit the following chart for the RECORD showing an analysis of the Senate bill, the Rains bill, the administration's recommendations, and the Herlong substitute:

Comparison of the financial impact of 1959 omnibus housing bills (including direct Treasury withdrawals, contracting authority for subsidies and grants, public debt transactions and authorizations for future appropriations)

Program	S. 57 as approved by Senate	S. 57 (House Banking and Currency Committee substitute)	Administration program	H.R. 711 (Herlong substitute)
1. Urban renewal capital grants	$2,100,000,000 [1] (5 years) through fiscal 1964.	$1,500,000,000 [1] (2 years)	$1,550,000,000 [1] (6 years with gradual decrease of Federal portion from 66⅔% to 50%.)	$600,000,000 [2] (2 years); on present Federal two-thirds formula.
2. Urban renewal temporary loans	Indeterminate; [3] repeal $1,000,000,000 ceiling on Treasury withdrawals.	Indeterminate; [3] repeal $1,000,000,000 ceiling on Treasury withdrawals.	Indeterminate; [3] repeal $1,000,000,000 ceiling on Treasury withdrawals.	$400,000,000; [2] retain statutory ceiling but authorize raise by appropriation.
3. Urban planning grants	$10,000,000 [2]	$10,000,000 [2]	$10,000,000.[2]	
4. New direct lending program for nonresidential development.			$150,000,000.[3]	
5. New program for Federal cash grants for graduate training of planners and housing technicians.	$1,500,000.[2]			
6. FNMA special assistance	Indeterminate	Indeterminate.		
Special assistance mortgages.	Would require all to be bought at par. FNMA now purchases these mortgages at prices below par.[3]	Would require all to be bought at par. FNMA now purchases these mortgages at prices below par. [3]		
Cooperative housing mortgages under FHA section 213.		$75,000,000; [3] would require par purchase.		$75,000,000;[2] par purchase not mandatory.
7. College loans:				
Direct loans for housing	$300,000,000 [3]	$400,000,000 [3]	$200,000,000 [3]	$200,000,000.[3]
New direct lending program for classrooms, laboratories, etc.	$125,000,000 [3]			
8. "Elderly" housing direct loans		$100,000,000 [3]		But liberalizes FHA Elderly Housing Program.
9. Public housing	$874,500,000 [1] (45,000 units) [4]	$3,700,000,000 [1] (190,000 units) [4]		
10. Veterans' direct loans	$150,000,000 [3]	$300,000,000 [3] (in separate bill, H.R. 2256).		
11. Farm housing research	$225,000 [2] (3 years)	$100,000 [2] (2 years)		$100,000 [2] (2 years).
12. Grants and loans for hospital construction.	$15,000,000 [2]	$15,000,000 [2]		$15,000,000.[2]
Total	$3,576,225,000 (plus indeterminate withdrawals for urban renewal loans, item 2 above).	$6,100,100,000 (plus indeterminate withdrawals for urban renewal loans, item 2 above).	$1,910,000,000 (plus indeterminate withdrawals for urban renewal loans, item 2 above).	$1,290,100,000 (total, no hidden budget impact).

[1] Authorizes irrevocable contracts pledging faith of U.S. Government. Congress is bound to appropriate money in future years.
[2] Subject to Congress appropriating the necessary money.
[3] Direct Treasury withdrawals noted on books of Treasury as "public debt transactions."
[4] Estimated contract amounts under 40-year annual contribution contracts with credit given for reducing contract amounts by excess receipts at fiscal 1958 rate.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, a good many years ago we started this housing program. The Federal Government has already sunk better than $10 billion in it and they have built housing projects all over the United States in places where there was no shortage of housing and where there were good places for people to live. The money has gone out. A great number of people have been employed as a result. But, now we are facing a condition where the deficit today in this fiscal year is $15 billion and at the end of the year it cannot be less than $13 billion. It is time that we began to put on the brakes.

Mr. Chairman, what does this bill do, as it has been reported to us by the committee? It makes available enormous sums of money. The total runs practically to $6 billion in addition to what has already been provided. It is spread out over a period of years. I do not know whether it is because of a lack of confidence in their own operations or what it is, but that money is available for 5 years and some of it is available for 6 years. Further, there is no annual review of what they are doing. There is no control over it in any way anywhere. As a result of the operation of this bill, the Congress of the United States will be abdicating its rights and its functions and its duties. It will be turning over en masse to the Executive the entire operations of the job of handling Government money over a long period of years with no control whatever. There is bound to be trouble and waste and all that sort of thing. The only way the Executive can be kept in line is by careful and continuous review by the Congress. This bill does not provide that review and control. It has no safeguards. It just turns things loose. There is no way of getting anywhere or doing anything to keep the spending of this money in line or to keep the spending under control. It is about time that we stopped doing things that way. The Herlong amendment will provide all that is needed and all that can be used of funds to guarantee mortgages up to $6 billion. It will provide all that is needed in a great many other ways for the operation of any legitimate Federal aid to housing.

I hope the amendment can be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT] is recognized.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, I think it is apparent that the key issue in our discussion of pending housing legislation revolves around the matter of public housing. While I am aware that we shall not have unanimity on other aspects of a housing program, I do believe that where we need a reasonable amount of discussion—for clarification—is in the area of public housing.

First, let me make known my position. I support the public housing provisions contained in the bill reported by the House Committee on Banking and Currency, S. 57. I support these provisions because the public housing program is still needed, and further, any action we take in support of public housing would merely restore a previous authorization.

The public housing authorization contained in S. 57 is not excessive nor a pie-in-the-sky approach. It is a minimum authorization.

Opponents of public housing may pose this question: "Why authorize additional public housing units when not all of the previous public housing authorization

has been used?" I would like to address myself to this self-imposed question.

First, it should be stressed that S. 57 restores the original authorization for public housing enacted in the Housing Act of 1949. S. 57 calls for the construction of approximately 140,000 public housing units, remaining under the authorization made 9 years ago. This would be at a rate of 35,000 units per year, over a 4-year period.

Now it is thus obvious that some public housing units have not been constructed in some communities. Yet this should not be used as evidence to detract from the ever-present need for public housing. Just because some communities have not chosen to undertake a public housing program should not mislead us into preventing other communities from so doing, communities that have demonstrated need and the desire to proceed with a public housing program.

All that S. 57 does is to authorize public housing; hence, public housing construction will only take place where there is an evident need and desire to pursue the program. If no need is demonstrated, no units will be built. But where the need has been and will be shown certainly we should not hamstring community programs by disallowing congressional authorization.

If one checks the cost factor, it will be noted that the aggregate of new expenditures during fiscal 1960 which would result from enactment into law of S. 57 would be less than $100 million. This would represent only thirteen-hundredths of 1 percent of the administration's proposed Federal budget.

While on the subject of Government expenditures, I am impelled to refer to the eloquent plea in behalf of sound Government credit, a plea made yesterday during discussion of the rule by one of the most effective as well as respected—and deservedly so—Members of the House, the Honorable HOWARD SMITH.

In his able presentation he stressed the need not to endanger the credit of the U.S. Government, and he expressed a concern, felt by many of us, about the falling price of Government bonds while the interest rate or cost continues to rise.

The comments offered by my distinguished colleague have, very frankly, greatly disturbed me, because in essence what he intimates is that unless the Federal Government dutifully submits to the terms and conditions laid down by the moneychangers—and, let us face it, the Government borrows money from moneychangers—then the price of Government bonds will reach a new low, while the interest rate will reach a new high.

First, I want to point out that to give in to this type of pressure at a time when the people, the average taxpayers of the country, are forced to pay an exorbitant 4 percent would be an abdication in behalf of the benefit of a very select, a very small but admittedly powerful group, the moneychangers. I further want to point out and to remind my colleagues that it was in 1933 that the affairs of our country had reached such a sorry mess, largely due to our listening to moneylenders to such a degree that they were in control of the financial operation of our Government—the people's Government—and thus indirectly in control of the whole economy. We had a condition of human suffering and misery that I know none of us ever wants to see again.

I am not at all ashamed to quote from the inaugural address of the newly elected President when he said in the year of 1933:

> The moneychangers have fled from their high seats in the temple of our civilization. We may now restore that temple to the ancient truths. The measure of the restoration lies in the extent to which we apply social values more noble than mere monetary profit.

Therefore, the issue before us is simply this: Will this Congress willingly and knowingly bow to the moneychangers on every piece of legislation that comes before it? Will we allow this self-centered, self-contained group, by unreasonable, unjustified and irresponsible demands, to do away with public housing and urban renewal affecting millions of our citizens? If we submit now, forgetting the merits of the subject at hand, will it follow that a pattern of submission will be our mark on other legislation which will be before us?

I fervently hope the answer will be an unmistakable "No." I have no fear that our country will collapse if we do not follow the dictates of the profit moguls.

We will find a way out, as we did in 1933, but while we are finding that way, we cannot continue to overlook the crying needs of several millions today nor can we afford to add to their number, countless more millions.

I join with my able colleague, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN], when he said we can take care of the Government bond situation in different ways, and I hope this will be done soon and in an effective manner.

Mr. Chairman, may I conclude by stating categorically that I for one am not going to have any part of such a disgraceful surrender, at this or any other time; I hope with all my heart that my colleagues, on both sides of the aisle, with the lesson of history before them, will turn down the Herlong amendment and vote for the committee bill, S. 57—a bill for the people of our country, not the moneylenders. Let us not allow the measure of our internal strength to be destroyed by allowing mere monetary profit to lessen the nobleness of our social, yes our human, values.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CEDERBERG] is recognized for 4 minutes.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the substitute offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HERLONG]. I might say that even that with me is a compromise. This business of public housing is something I believe should be stopped right now and a thorough investigation should be made to determine the abuses that exist in this area of housing.

An editorial appeared in the Boston Herald on Monday, April 13, 1959, entitled "The New Elite." It read in part like this:

> Last fall, in a referendum subverting Mayor Hynes' right to determine appropriate municipal pay scales, Boston firemen won pay raises ranging from $790 to $1,050.

These raises were also given to the police department. As a result, many of these no longer qualify for occupancy in low rent public housing.

The editorial continues:

> Now, the Boston Housing Authority is seeking to raise the income ceiling for continued occupancy in State-aided housing projects so that 353 families of Boston police and firemen will not be evicted because of the increased income gained through the referendum.

The editorial states further:

> A better instance of having one's cake and eating it, too, could hardly be imagined.

It goes on further:

> Will the Boston Housing Authority state how many low-income families must stay in shabby tenements so that the fire and police families may remain in public housing?
>
> May we not legitimately ask whether we are on the way, here in Boston, to the establishment of a new elite—a special class of drones for whom those without influence labor unremittingly?

Mr. Chairman, I say that until these things are corrected in the areas of public housing, it should be stopped, because all over the country there are people taking advantage of this low income housing who should not be there, thereby denying those who are eligible to have occupancy in these housing projects.

I had the privilege of serving as mayor of my home city, a city of 55,000 people. The bureaucrats from Washington wanted to put in 485 low rent public housing units in my city. I vetoed the action of the council which would have permitted it and said that "As far as I am concerned we did not need low rent housing." As a result, the very area in which low rent housing was going to go presently is a fine subdivision that is on the tax rolls and is a real asset to the community. All of the citizens in my home town, I believe, are taken care of adequately with housing, maybe some not as good as they ought to be, but they are standing on their own feet.

The more we get into this Government housing and Government assistance, the less reliance we are going to have, the less initiative we are going to have from the individual people.

I have no quarrel with some of the developments in certain of the real large cities. We already have some 587,000 throughout the country. I say we ought to stop it until we investigate what is going on in this area at the present time.

Why, Mr. Chairman, we are even advertising for people to come into these low rent housing units. I think that is an unforgivable thing. We ought to look into this matter before we go any further with these projects.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL].

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. POWELL to the amendment offered by Mr. HERLONG: Add a new title as follows:

"TITLE VIII—NONDISCRIMINATION

"SEC. 1007. No insurance, grant, loan, contribution or guarantee or commitment to insure, grant, loan, contribute or guarantee or other assistance authorized under any title of this Act shall be given or made by the Commissioner, Administrator or other governmental official or agency administering the program under which the insurance, grant, loan, contribution, guarantee or commitment or other assistance is to be given or made unless the recipient and beneficiary of such insurance, grant, loan, contribution, guarantee or commitment or other assistance gives assurance in writing that the property for which the insurance, grant, loan, contribution, guarantee or commitment is to be given or made shall be available for sale, lease or occupancy without regard to the race, creed, or color of the purchaser, lessee or occupant.

"In the event that the recipient, beneficiary or any successor in title fails to conform to such written assurance, the Commissioner, Administrator or other governmental official or agency administering the program under which the insurance, grant, loan, contribution, guarantee or commitment or other assistance has been or is to be given or made shall have the authority to deny, withhold, suspend or terminate the insurance, grant, loan, contribution, guarantee or commitment or other assistance."

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman, I raise the point of order that the amendment is not germane because it is too general in its nature, it is not specific in applying to any particular provision.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. WALTER). The Chair is ready to rule.

The amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL] is restricted to any title of this act and is specific, in the opinion of the Chair.

Therefore the point of order is overruled.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, this amendment, in brief, is an amendment which carries out the purposes of the Housing Act of 1949 already on our books, 63 Stat. 413, section 2. The exact language is "to provide a decent home for every American family. It does not say for American families that are Protestant or for American families that are white. It says for 170 million Americans.

Now, we have evidence, which I will introduce in the RECORD later, to show that there is discrimination being practiced in public housing, not against Negroes alone but against Jews, Catholics, Orientals, and Puerto Ricans. There are about 40 million Catholics in this country, about 8 million Jews, about 20 million Negroes, about 3.5 million Puerto Ricans, and about 3 million Mexicans. All together they represent one-half of this Nation, 75 million.

May I refer to Hawaii, for instance, which we recently brought into the Union. We brought Hawaii into the Union because it answered some of the questions of Southeast Asia as regards our democracy. Are we going to refuse housing to the new Hawaiians because many of them are of Oriental descent? Take the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, one of our showcases in Latin America—Are we going to refuse housing to the Puerto Ricans and disgrace ourselves further in Latin America? Are we going to refuse housing to the Negroes and cause disturbance in our foreign relationships with Africa? We are not only discriminating against one-half of our population, but we are endangering our relationships with a billion five hundred million of these people of Asia, Latin America and Africa. This is the time for simple justice to be effected by this Congress, and this amendment does that. It calls for no discrimination because of race, creed, or color.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POWELL. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. WIDNALL. On yesterday in the gentleman's statement he said, "I am going to do everything I can to support that bill," referring to the Rains bill, "and also to defeat the Herlong substitute."

Mr. POWELL. Correct.

Mr. WIDNALL. My question is this: If the Herlong substitute should not prevail, does the gentleman intend to offer this as an amendment to the Rains bill?

Mr. POWELL. Absolutely.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. POWELL) there were—ayes 48, noes 138.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL].

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, I do not think we can laugh off the financial impact of this bill as some wanted to yesterday after the fine talk made by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH]. The security and the welfare of our country largely depends upon the stability of the dollar. Many of the problems today, many of the welfare cases we have today, many of the problems that cause people to write us every day asking to have social security payments enlarged, come because of inflation and rising prices. Any dollar that goes beyond the budget as planned helps to unbalance the budget and helps to create further inflation. I cannot quite understand, as a member of the Subcommittee on Housing over a period of years, with the very eminent and distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. RAINS], how in 1 year, when we are having better times, fuller employment, the demands for public housing should go up from nothing in his bill last year to 140,000 units in his bill this year, or 190,000 units, as we contend, or how the demands for urban renewal have in 1 year gone up from $350 million to $500 million each year for 3 years. There has not been that much additional blight added. Is this in the bill for bargaining purposes, or is it what is truly wanted by the committee? I am sure that we can come out of a conference with the Senate with a sound bill that will be agreed upon by both Houses, one that will enable the President to sign it so that we can make progress in the housing program for America. We cannot do it if we go to conference with the Rains bill. It is impossible to do it on that basis. And I feel very sure the President would veto such legislation.

Now, what do we want? Do we want to make progress in these fields? Do we want to continue our college dormitory program? Do we want to continue urban renewal on a sound basis, or do we want to reach for the moon and get nothing?

Mr. Chairman, I would like to call your attention to this, that in the college dormitory section, the appropriations under the Herlong substitute would be $200 million. The last authorization we had was $175 million. That is a $25 million increase over the previous authorization. It seems unrealistic to me today to say that you have to have a $400 million figure.

With respect to urban renewal, I know how well certain people who are interested in urban renewal and selling urban renewal have done the job; they have gone around the United States telling towns that they ought to get on the gravy train, they ought to file their requests. I have seen it happen in my own district. The demands are endless in that field, if you are going to assert that you can get every dollar you want down in Washington.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me this is a reasonable approach. The best has been taken out of the committee bill and is included in the Herlong substitute. It does not stifle housing. It encourages housing. We will get more housing and a better program, a sounder program and a more stable dollar. The people of the United States will like that bill when it is passed.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CURTIN].

Mr. CURTIN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the substitute.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CURTIN to the amendment offered by Mr. HERLONG: Page 43, following line 24, insert a new section as follows:

"SEC. 602. Title II of the National Housing Act is further amended by adding after section 231 (as added by sec. 802 of this Act) the following new section:

"'MORATORIUM FOR UNEMPLOYED MORTGAGORS IN ECONOMICALLY DEPRESSED AREAS

"'SEC. 232. (a) For purposes of this section—

"'(1) the term "unemployed mortgagor" means any individual who is a mortgagor under a mortgage insured under this Act, if the Commissioner determines that the loan secured by such mortgage is (or is likely to be) in default because such individual, although willing and able to work, is unemployed through no fault of his own; and

"'(2) the term "economically depressed area" on any given date means an industrial area within the United States in which there has existed unemployment of not less than—

"'(A) 15 per centum of the labor force during the six-month period immediately preceding such date, if the principal causes

of such unemployment are determined not to be temporary in nature, or

"'(B) 12 per centum of the labor force during the twelve-month period immediately preceding such date, or

"'(C) 9 per centum of the labor force during at least fifteen months of the eighteen-month period immediately preceding such date, or

"'(D) 6 per centum of the labor force during at least eighteen months of the twenty-four-month period immediately preceding such date.

The determinations of the duration and amount of unemployment in a given industrial area, and any other determinations which may be required for purposes of this paragraph, shall be made by the Secretary of Labor and certified to the Commissioner not less often than quarterly; and the Secretary of Labor may also certify to the Commissioner, as an economically depressed area for purposes of this paragraph, any industrial area within the United States (even though it does not meet the requirements of subparagraph (A), (B), (C), or (D)) which is determined by him to be an area in which there has existed substantial and persistent unemployment for an extended period of time.

"'(b) Upon application by an unemployed mortgagor residing in an economically depressed area and for the purpose of avoiding foreclosure of his mortgage, the Commissioner, subject to the requirements and conditions contained in this Act, shall assume the mortgagor's obligation to make payments of principal and interest under such mortgage; and while such payments are being made by the Commissioner pursuant to the assumption of such obligation no payment of principal or interest with respect to such mortgage shall be required of such mortgagor.

"'(c)(1) The Commissioner shall assume any mortgagor's obligation under subsection (b) only if—

"'(A) the mortgagor is not in default with respect to any condition or covenant of the mortgage other than that requiring the payment of installments of principal and interest under the mortgage in specified amounts and at stated times; and

"'(B) the mortgagor executes a satisfactory agreement in writing as provided in subsection (d).

"'(2) The assumption or suspension by the Commissioner of a mortgagor's obligation under subsection (b) shall terminate, and the mortgagor shall again be liable for the payment of all amounts due under the mortgage in accordance with its terms, on whichever of the following is the earliest:

"'(A) one year from the date on which such obligation is assumed;

"'(B) the date on which the mortgagor ceases to be an unemployed mortgagor as defined in subsection (a)(1); or

"'(C) the date on which the mortgagor becomes in default with respect to a condition or covenant of the mortgage other than that requiring the payment of installments of principal and interest under the mortgage in specified amounts and at stated times.

"'(d)(1) Prior to the assumption by the Commissioner of any mortgagor's obligation under subsection (b) he shall require the mortgagor to agree in writing to repay to him, after the maturity date of the mortgage but in the same manner and amounts and at the same periodic intervals as were applicable under the mortgage to the period during which such obligation was assumed, the aggregate amount of the payments of principal and interest required under the mortgage during such period.

"'(2) In addition to requiring the mortgagor to execute the agreement described in paragraph (1), the Commissioner shall, prior to the assumption of his obligation under subsection (b), take such action, and require the mortgagor to take such action, as may be necessary or appropriate to insure that the rights and interests of the mortgagee will be adequately safeguarded during and after the period in which such obligation is so assumed.

"'(e) Nothing in this section shall be construed as requiring the mortgagor, at any time during or after the period during which his obligation is assumed by the Commissioner under subsection (b), to make any payments under the mortgage in amounts or at times other than those which are regularly provided in the mortgage and those which are required after the maturity of the mortgage under the agreement executed pursuant to paragraph (1).

"'(f) After the obligation of any individual to make payments of principal and interest under a mortgage has been assumed by the Commissioner under this section, shall not again assume the obligation of such individual to make such payments under that mortgage or assume the obligation of such individual to make such payments under any other mortgage.

"'(g) The Commissioner is authorized and directed to issue such regulations as may be necessary to carry out this section.'"

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CURTIN] is recognized.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment, but I will reserve the point of order so that the gentleman from Pennsylvania may explain his amendment.

Mr. CURTIN. Mr. Chairman, both the committee bill and the Herlong substitute bill make relatively easy the purchase of homes. However, it seems to me that both of these bills leave out a very important factor. They do not adequately cover the retaining of such home after the homeowner has acquired it. In many sections of the country, during the last few years, we have had situations of conscientious and industrious persons losing their FHA insured homes due to the fact that they live in a distressed area and also because they were temporarily out of employment through no fault of their own. The substitute bill, as well as S. 57, seeks to bring the law regarding FHA foreclosures in line with the existing law regarding VA mortgage foreclosures. In other words, the substitute, as does S. 57, provides that if the mortgagor, or homeowner, is in default on his mortgage payments, the Commissioner can, at any time he so desires and, in fact, after a certain time, must, foreclose on the defaulted mortgage, although the Commissioner does have the power to make regulations to ease the conditions of default for a certain period of time. However, the homeowner is still in default and, therefore, there must be a foreclosure unless some payments are made during this period. My amendment would provide that in the event that such homeowner is unemployed, through no fault of his own, and living in such a distressed area, he can secure a moratorium for the length of time that he is unemployed up to, but not to exceed, 1 year, upon the signing of an agreement extending the term of his mortgage for the appropriate period of unemployment. At the conclusion of that period, of course, the payments will resume. This amendment further provides that such mortgagor is not forgiven these 12 payments, or part of the 12 payments if he is not out of work for 1 year, but that such time is tacked on the end of the mortgage term and he must then pay. I submit that this will cost the Government only a relatively small amount of money, because the Government still has the security in the property on which the original commitment was made. The mortgagee already has certain payments that this homeowner has previously made on the mortgage prior to the time of such unemployment. Therefore, at the very most, and I repeat—at the very most, that could happen is the Government would get some deferred payments on an investment which we must assume to be a good one. Therefore, I submit that this is a very necessary addition to this legislation now before us.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. WALTER). Does the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] insist on the point of order?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Yes, Mr. Chairman; I insist on the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule. The Chair calls attention to the fact that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania is to section 601 which is under title VI of the amendment under consideration. This particular section deals with the avoidance of foreclosure and states the procedures and circumstances under which a foreclosure may be avoided. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania very definitely applies to that section because it states the term "unemployed mortgagor" means any individual who is a mortgagor under a mortgage insured under this act.

The Chair rules that the amendment is germane. The point of order is overruled.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CURTIN].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. CURTIN) there were—ayes 31, noes 118.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOW] is recognized.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I had not intended to take part in this debate. The question has been raised as to the intentions of some who are supporting the Herlong amendment. I may say to my colleagues that I am supporting the Herlong amendment because I believe it brings us some form of fiscal responsibility.

My good friend, the gentleman from California, a few moments ago cited language from the inaugural address of 1933. I remember it well; I heard it. It was a good phrase. But I remember that the President who was giving that inaugural address had just won a campaign for the Presidency, based upon economy in government and against the wasteful spending of the administration then in power. He said he would reduce the cost of government by 25 percent. We all know what happened. I say to my friends that if we are going to take those

words of the inaugural speech let us go back to the words of his campaign on fiscal responsibility and the reduction of the high cost of the Federal Government.

In my State of Ohio, and I heard several of my colleagues from Ohio speaking in behalf of S. 57 on the basis that we need it in Ohio. Let me say if we continue to cause this debt to mount, taxes to go up, the Federal Government taking more and more from the people of our States, we are not going to be able to permit the people in Ohio to do these things for themselves.

Let us reduce the cost of Federal Government so we can return to the States these tax dollars and have the things done where they can be done best, and that is in the States.

Let me say further, because some of the Members from Ohio have spoken on this bill, that I do not believe that the people of the 16th Congressional District of Ohio are interested in the continuation of the increasing of the debt and putting us further and further away from the day when we shall be able to do these things for ourselves in the State of Ohio.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] is recognized.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, there has been a lot of talk about committees here and the arbitrary conduct of committees. In fact, I think the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD] who attacked the Rules Committee is of the philosophy that all committees except his committee ought to be abolished.

The Rules Committee in this matter did not desire to be arbitrary. There was not much pressure, except from a few people, about bringing out any rule on this bill, and you know it. Very few spoke to me about it. But what we tried to do, knowing there was a clear division and a very close division as to this kind of legislation, was to, if we could, get a bill before the House that the House could express its will on and perhaps enact a housing bill that was needed and one that would stand the test of a veto.

I did not like the committee bill. I know the members of the committee worked long and hard on it. I know it represents several months of work. I have great respect and affection for the members of that committee. Many of them are close friends of mine. But this is a complicated bill, and I do not think any member of the committee with his own hand ever wrote this bill. It is just as full of gimmicks as a dog is with fleas.

I am sorry that the leadership saw fit to cut off this debate because I think it is a subject we could afford to talk about for a long time. I am going to show you several things, and in doing so I am going to have to do a thing that is not very popular around here, and that is to mention the Constitution of the United States.

The Constitution of the United States provides that no money shall be taken out of the Treasury of the United States except by appropriation by the Congress. By the Congress, if you please.

If you have a copy of this bill, I think it would be interesting if you would turn to page 130 and look at the language beginning in line 18, which says:

> To obtain funds for advance and loan disbursements under this title, the Administrator may issue and have outstanding at any one time notes and obligations for purchase by the Secretary of the Treasury in an amount which shall not, unless authorized by the President, exceed $1 billion.

Mr. Chairman, look at that one, will you? Are you going to here vote for a bill that completely abdicates the functions of Congress and the Constitution of the United States and says that the President can authorize expenditures in an unlimited amount by simply going to the Secretary of the Treasury and handing him a note? That is what the bill says. I know that these gentlemen did not mean to do that.

What is the explanation? It specifically authorizes the President to authorize the expenditure of an unlimited sum of money; a function that under express language of the Constitution can only be exercised by the Congress.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. GARY. I understand that under that provision there is nothing to prevent them from borrowing $50 billion from the Treasury if the President authorizes it?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. That is true, and if some of the folks I have seen advertised in the newspaper as the probable next President of the United States are elected, I think that is just what would happen.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA].

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, as I listened to the attacks on public housing coming from the Republican side, I strained my ears to catch any accompanying music that might be coming from the chimes on Bob Taft's Monument. But the chimes were silent.

Public housing is a monument to the lifework of Bob Taft, and today those who with pride and affection had acclaimed him Mr. Republican and had hallowed him to the threshold of the White House, were joined together in verbally ripping to bits the edifice of his erection. No wonder the chimes on the monument of granite built here in Washington to Bob Taft's memory did not ring out. The chimes at least were loyal.

I was very happy in the 81st Congress to follow his leadership in planning a housing future for all our people, even the humblest.

Public housing stands today as the real monument to Bob Taft. How ironical that toward the end of the Eisenhower administration the party of Bob Taft should seek to destroy this monument. How ironical that to defeat this good housing bill which the committee has presented there is even hurled at us the threat of a Presidential veto.

I am not a Republican. I did not agree with Bob Taft on many things, but serious differences in other areas did not blind me to his dedication to decent housing for people, and I followed his leadership in public housing.

I am getting along and cannot expect to be here many years. I do not like to contemplate that men are so quickly forgotten that a decade after the passing of a leader his followers busy themselves in destroying what had been erected by the leader that in his life and power they had professed to admire, adore, and follow. I do not like to contemplate that before the Eisenhower administration is closed there should be any intimation that the man in the White House would veto a housing bill that did not carry the deathblow to the public housing program that forever will be associated with the name of Bob Taft. It would be unfair to put the President in this position.

I wish there could be greater understanding among us here. When I vote for the farmers—and I am from the city—I am trying to understand the other fellow's problems and help him in working them out, because this is our country and what is bad for any part of our country is bad for all of us. Down in Florida they had a problem with their oranges. The author of the substitute bill, my dear friend from Florida, who is not a housing authority, and I came here as freshmen together, and we are warm friends. I did not say to him: "Well, now, wait. I know nothing about growing oranges in Florida, but I will put in a substitute orange bill." I did not say that. I said, "The welfare of Florida means something to the welfare of Illinois," and I voted for that orange bill.

Why cannot you, who do not come from the cities of the North, who do not live with our problems, who have no familiarity with the magnitude of the tasks we face, with our cities bursting at their seams, ever threatened by engulfment in widening slums, ever demanding building and rebuilding to meet the challenge of progress, why cannot you give to us the same ear of understanding that day after day, Congress after Congress, we have bent to you and your problems?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BROYHILL].

Mr. BROYHILL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. BROYHILL to the amendment offered by Mr. HERLONG: Page 90, after line 12, insert the following: "(3) Section 203(b)(2) of such Act is further amended by inserting after 'unless the construction of the dwelling was completed more than 1 year prior to the application for mortgage insurance' the following: 'or the dwelling was approved for guaranty, insurance, or direct loan under chapter 37 of title 38, United States Code, prior to the beginning of construction'."

Mr. BROYHILL. Mr. Chairman, my amendment would incorporate in the regular FHA section 203 sales housing program a provision which I think the committee wisely included in its revision of the FHA 203(i) insurance program for low-cost housing in outlying areas. I refer to the provision which would allow the FHA maximum mortgage limitation to apply to an existing property

less than a year old if such property was subject to inspections during construction by either the Federal Housing Administration or the Veterans' Administration. The committee report succinctly explains the provision by stating:

Your committee believes that the inspection procedure and standards of the two agencies are essentially the same, and sees no reason why either agency should refuse to accept the inspection safeguards of the other.

The Veterans' Administration does accept FHA inspections but under existing law the FHA is not authorized to recognize VA inspections in such cases.

Let me illustrate the hardship of this deficiency in the existing FHA law. For a $13,500 house, FHA inspected, a mortgage of 97 percent of value is permitted resulting in a downpayment of 3 percent or $405. However, if that same house only had VA inspection but is sold FHA within a year, the FHA mortgage may not exceed 90 percent of value resulting in a required downpayment of 10 percent or $1,350. Under my amendment the buyer of this home would only be required to make the 3 percent or $405 downpayment for a FHA mortgage providing the house had been inspected by either FHA or VA during construction.

Since under existing law for the regular FHA sales housing program the 7 point penalty differential applies only to the first $13,500 of value, another bad effect of the provision is that relatively it works the greatest hardship on the buyer of the moderate-priced home. That should be corrected and my amendment will do so.

My amendment will give needed and desirable flexibility permitting builders and buyers to finance the eventual sale under either FHA or VA without penalty to the buyer. Relatively it will benefit most the buyers of moderate-priced homes. It will conform existing law to a good provision proposed in this bill. I hope my amendment will be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BROYHILL].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BROYHILL) there were—ayes 113, noes 10.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VANIK].

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the Herlong substitute. It substitutes a mere title for vital housing needs throughout the country. If we can spend money, as we do, throughout the world for housing and highways and defense, it certainly seems that we ought to be able to spend a little in our own country. After all, in the housing program we are adding to the capital plant of what constitutes America. If today we were to sell the public housing units that are already constructed, the return from such a sale would produce three times the original cost in most instances, which would result in no cost to the Government for their use during the past 20 years in which many of these units have been in existence.

I urge the defeat of the Herlong substitute.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS].

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, the fundamental issue before us today I think was very well presented by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] in his speech yesterday. It is a question of fiscal responsibility.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA] who preceded me by a few speakers, referred to Senator Taft. I would say this: There was one basic factor in Senator Taft's political and economic philosophy and that was fiscal responsibiilty. And in this regard I believe President Eisenhower joins. And I am very happy to observe that there are many people on the Democratic side who still think that fiscal responsibility is an important issue. And that is the issue before us now.

Mr. Chairman, I want to say this to those who talk about the little man. Fiscal irresponsibility does more damage to the little man than any single thing I can think of. As far as financiers are concerned—and I notice that the gentleman from California used the smear term "money changers"—as far as the financiers of this country are concerned, they can handle themselves pretty well under inflation. It is the little fellow who is hurt. And the issue here is exactly that.

We started our economic hearings this year and the one thing that seemed to disturb the Democrats on the Joint Economic Committee was the unemployment picture. It concerned us and it concerns all of us. But also there was concern over price stability and the need for price stability if we are going to have economic growth which produce the jobs that solve unemployment.

The gentleman from Virginia has pointed out the situation of our Federal bond market. I want to call attention to the fact of the position of the U.S. dollar abroad; that is, that it is so rapidly becoming soft currency. This is no fiction, gentlemen. This is a very, very serious matter and those of us on the Committee on Ways and Means know what is going to face us in the next few weeks when we are going to be asked again to raise the debt limit and might even be asked to raise taxes.

So it is a question of what can we afford at this time? That is an important factor.

The second fiscal aspect of this bill, it has been pointed out, is procedural and it has to do with how do we properly handle legislation and appropriations in the Congress. Bypassing the Appropriations Committee is the surest way to lead to fiscal irresponsibility. That is a basic issue.

I would call attention to a third issue that has not been mentioned and which also concerns the Committee on Ways and Means. On page 61 of the report it is pointed out that vast additional billions of dollars under the committee bill will be made available through tax-exempt bonds. If you want to talk about the rich people and helping the financiers, just create some more of these tax-exempt securities that they can put their money into. That is something that we on the Committee on Ways and Means have been concerned about for many, many years. What are we going to do about this great area that is opened up of tax-exempt securities? It is a very serious constitutional question but nonetheless it is a question that we are faced with here in the housing bill today.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. CLEM MILLER].

Mr. CLEM MILLER. Mr. Chairman, I rise for the purpose of making a correction of fact with regard to the introductory remarks of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HERLONG]. The correction is somewhat important because we may hear much more about this in subsequent debates. The gentleman from Florida said there were 100,000 units of public housing units available for next year. In other words, the idea or the argument is to defer any action on public housing because we have 100,000 units to play around with. It should be specifically understood, and I do not by any means intend to infer that the gentleman from Florida intended to make any error. He did not have the opportunity to appear before the Committee on Banking and Currency or before the subcommittee, but the 100,000 units of public housing have already been committed. There are no new units, there are no 100,000 units or any other units after June 30. When June 30 comes, those units expire and they will not be built unless they are under contract at that time.

Mr. HERLONG. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLEM MILLER. I yield to my colleague from Florida.

Mr. HERLONG. I thought I made it clear to the House, and if I did not, what I meant to say, and I hope I did say it, is that there were 110,000 units in the pipeline which are not under construction at this time.

Mr. CLEM MILLER. And if the contracts are not signed before that time, those units expire and may not be used at any subsequent time. I wanted to make that point clear for the record because great efforts are being made before the Committee to put across the idea that there would be new units after June 30. This is not the case.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLEM MILLER. I yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, the Committee of the Whole in a few minutes will have sharply presented to it two different philosophies. One, the philosophy of the dollar and the other the philosophy of human values. The committee bill is a comprehensive bill. It takes into consideration human values. It takes into consideration the fact that the backbone of our country are human beings—the American people. It takes into consideration the unfortunate. It takes into consideration those who are less fortunate than many

others in America. When this vote is taken, it will mark quite sharply and clearly the difference between the great majority of Republicans and the great majority of Democrats. The entire history of the Democratic Party is one of consideration for human values. When this vote is taken, it will be a straight vote on whether human values are going to be regarded or disregarded.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. McDONOUGH].

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, I just want to clear up a point that was referred to by my colleague, the gentleman from California, regarding the 110,000 public housing units that are not yet constructed. The construction of those 110,000 units do not depend on the passage of this bill. The money has been authorized and it is up to the Committee on Appropriations to appropriate the money to continue them. In addition to these 110,000 units, there are 30,000 public housing units under construction that are not yet occupied. In addition to that, there is an experience of a 25-percent vacancy each year of the number of units that are now occupied and 25 percent of those total units are being occupied, some 590,000, gives 147,000 units available for new occupants each year. If you add 110,000 to 147,000, you have 247,000 public housing units that will be available whether or not the 110,000 are completed.

Mr. CLEM MILLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McDONOUGH. I yield.

Mr. CLEM MILLER. I believe you will find at page 131 in the record of the hearings that we held that 85,000 units is a more correct figure than 110,000 and that 35,000 units are not under contract and, therefore, we cannot assume that this figure of 110,000 is correct.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Then we can say 85,000 are available. If you want to take your figures, we can say 85,000 units are available plus 25 percent of the total number of units that are now constructed and using those figures, it gives you 147,000 units plus the 85,000 units.

Mr. Chairman, I am sorry I cannot yield further to my colleague because I do not have the time.

Mr. Chairman, with reference to the question of housing for the elderly and this is a sensitive point in this bill, the Herlong bill provides for an FHA insured loan for an unlimited amount of money. The Rains bill provides for $100 million which is subject to the Committee on Appropriations as to how much will be allowed from year to year. If the total amount were allowed, we could build about 10,000 units.

Under the present housing program in the existing bill without any further amendments we have built 9,546. There are some 67 units in operation, and the program is doing very well.

The question as far as the abundance of homes for the elderly is concerned is this: The Herlong bill provides much more abundant units than would be provided in the committee bill. I think that point should be clarified.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana is recognized.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, I do not know how many votes I might gain for the Herlong substitute at this stage of the debate, but I do not want to lose any.

I rise in support of the Herlong amendment.

Harsh things have been said here by certain Members about some sort of coalition, as they called it. I have not had much to do with the drafting of the Herlong substitute. I am supporting it because I think it is a good bill. But as far as any coalition is concerned, let me simply say, and I suggest this in answer to what the Majority Leader just said, that in my opinion some people in the Congress through recent years have seen fit to stand for things that they believed were right, and I happen to believe that that saved the Republic.

There are those who have a different philosophy. They do not seem to be concerned with the danger that excessive Federal spending will bring about more inflation, with deeper inroads into the value of the dollar.

Let me point out that inflation hits hardest those least able to take care of themselves. Inflation eats away the savings and annuities of millions of elderly citizens in retirement who have no way to keep abreast of a rising cost of living.

The wealthy can take care of themselves; they know how to hedge against inflation.

But the breadwinner on a fixed income, the workingman, and the people living out their remaining years on modest pensions—these Americans have no possible way to hedge against a decline in the purchasing power of their money. They can only stand by and see their standard of living go down and down and down. So that is the challenge as far as I am concerned, and I stand by our great President, Dwight D. Eisenhower, on that proposition.

We have heard a great deal about public housing. One time a few years back I supported an extension of public housing to the great concern of some people, but at the moment I think we have all the public housing we need.

There is complaint that nobody knows what is in the substitute. However, I can offer assurances that from what I have seen of the bill that it is a very well-written bill. It stems from the committee bill. It has been suggested that if the substitute is defeated there will be a lot of amendments to the committee bill. We have had some amendmens to the Herlong substitute, some voted down, some voted into the bill. The gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL] says he will offer his amendment to the committee bill, and maybe that amendment would have some application to public housing; I do not know. There are other people who want to take certain things out of the bill. Actually I say we have written a good bill and it ought to be adopted as this substitute. It provides for FHA authorization.

It provides adequately for urban renewal.

It provides housing for the elderly.

It provides for college housing.

It does all of the things that need to be done.

Last year it was said that if we did not have a housing bill the building industry would go to the dogs. We did not have any housing bill, yet the record shows that we had more starts for housing in the first quarter of this year than we ever had before. It looks as if we did very well.

I want to refer again to the spending issue. Actually the substitute would seem to cost about $1.3 billion, the other bill $5.8 billion, and the committee bill probably a billion dollars more in the next year, or very substantial amounts more in the next year than the substitute.

The substitute bill is within the budgetary figures offered by the administration. True, there are provisions in there which have been referred to that are not exactly acceptable to the administration.

The gentleman from Illinois, whom I love and respect, says that the minority leader has been hurling threats of vetoes. I never hurled any threat of a veto, but I think I have a right to my personal opinion about what might happen in respect to proposed legislation.

I do not believe that the committee bill can ever become law in this country. I am convinced that the substitute bill can become law and can become law quickly, if we are not taken to the cleaners in the conference. That is the situation that confronts us: an adequate program carefully worked out, carefully considered here in the Committee of the Whole, amendments offered and debated, voted up or down. I say now is the time to settle this matter once and for all by adopting the substitute which is here presented.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. RAINS].

Mr. RAINS. Mr. Chairman, I was not sure I was within the rules until the gentleman from California had spoken in support of the amendment, and I assume that was all right.

In addition, there were two or three remarks made by the distinguished minority leader that I should like to make reference to.

One of them was that I predicted dire things for the housing industry if we did not get a housing bill last year. The distinguished minority leader has a short memory. As a matter of fact, when we were dragging our feet in—I will not call it a Republican depression, I will say a depression—in April of last year, everybody knows that in 30 minutes' time, without a dissenting vote we put a billon dollars into emergency housing legislation. So I say the gentleman must have forgotten. The home builders, the housing industry, people generally, tell me that today they are draining the bottom of the barrel of the billion-dollar emergency legislation. If you read the newspapers and the other financial journals of this country, you will

see that all of them predict hard money and no mortgage credit available immediately.

I am wondering if the minority leader thinks I am right in that statement.

Mr. Chairman, I get tired of hearing the intimated threat about so and so cannot become law. Let me tell you this. I say to you just as emphatically that the Herlong amendment cannot get out of the Congress, much less get to the President's desk.

So I repeat again, the minority leader is in error. Nobody can veto a bill until the Congress passes one, and in order to do that it takes both branches of the Congress. When they talk about so and so cannot become law and say there will be a veto, they are not considering the congressional processes. The truth is it is our duty in this Congress to write legislation, regardless of what any Chief Executive may think about it in advance.

The elected representatives of the American people on both sides of the aisle are not supposed to labor under the threat of a veto from any President, Democrat or Republican. You know, after all, every single individual here has his own responsibility, and I do not think the President of the United States ought to be concerned until it gets to his desk.

I am sure that is the way the legislative processes should work. I say, Mr. Chairman, let us write the best bill we can write and that will be what the American people want us to do.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE].

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I have a suggestion to make. We have laws to govern our procedure. They are respectable laws that have been seasoned by time and ripened by experience. Through the years they have proven to be wise laws and we have operated under them. The methods of procedure provided by those laws have been ignored in this consideration. A rule has been granted that has capped a padlock on the minds of the Members. We have been compelled to consider an amendment, a substitute bill, that has never been referred to any committee, that has never been considered by any committee, that has never been reported. There has been no statement made of the changes the substitute bill would make in existing law, as required by the parliamentary rules under which we are operating. If we adopt this amendment we will have done so without any regard to established legislative procedure. The suggestion I make is that you vote the Herlong amendment down and then resort to the regular parliamentary procedure. We will read the committee bill under the 5-minute rule. You will have an opportunity to consider it under established parliamentary practice. You will have the advantage of the knowledge that the subcommittee has obtained through long experience and long hearings on that bill. Let us see that we do respect the laws of the House and let us vote this amendment down and consider S. 57 as it should be considered.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the substitute offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HERLONG], as amended.

Mr. HERLONG. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the chairman appointed as tellers Mr. RAINS and Mr. HERLONG.

The Committee divided, and the tellers reported that there were—yeas 177, noes 203.

So the substitute amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE I—FHA INSURANCE PROGRAMS

Property improvement loans

SEC. 101. Section 2(a) of the National Housing Act is amended by striking out "September 30, 1959" and inserting in lieu thereof "October 1, 1960".

Section 203 residential housing insurance

SEC. 102. (a)(1) Section 203(b)(2) of the National Housing Act is amended by striking out "$20,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$25,000".

(2) Section 203(b)(2) of such Act is further amended—

(A) by striking out "85 per centum" and inserting in lieu thereof "90 per centum";

(B) by striking out "$16,000" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "$18,000"; and

(C) by striking out "70 per centum" and inserting in lieu thereof "75 per centum".

(b) Section 203(b)(3) of such Act is amended by striking out "thirty years" and inserting in lieu thereof "thirty-five years".

(c) Section 203(b)(8) of such Act is amended by striking out the period at the end thereof and inserting in lieu thereof a colon and the following: "*Provided*, That such 85 per centum limitation shall not be applicable if the mortgagor and mortgagee assume responsibility in a manner satisfactory to the Commissioner for the reduction of the mortgage by an amount not less than 15 per centum of the outstanding principal amount thereof in the event the mortgaged property is not, prior to the due date of the eighteenth amortization payment of the mortgage, sold to a purchaser acceptable to the Commissioner who is the occupant of the property and who assumes and agrees to pay the mortgage indebtedness."

(d) Section 203(c) of such Act is amended by striking out all that precedes the first colon and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(c) The Commissioner is authorized to fix a premium charge for the insurance of mortgages under this title but in the case of any mortgage such charge shall be not less than an amount equivalent to one-fourth of 1 per centum per annum nor more than an amount equivalent to 1 per centum per annum of the amount of the principal obligation of the mortgage outstanding at any time, without taking into account delinquent payments or prepayments".

Low-cost housing in outlying areas

SEC. 103. Section 203(i) of the National Housing Act is amended—

(1) by striking out "$8,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$9,000";

(2) by inserting after "97 per centum" the following: "(or, in any case where the dwelling is not approved for mortgage insurance prior to the beginning of construction, unless the construction of the dwelling was completed more than one year prior to the application for mortgage insurance or the dwelling was approved for guaranty, insurance, or direct loan under chapter 37 of title 38, United States Code, prior to the beginning of construction, 90 per centum)"; and

(3) by striking out ", and which is approved for mortgage insurance prior to the beginning of construction" and "the construction of".

Section 207 rental housing insurance

SEC. 104. (a) Section 207(c)(1) of the National Housing Act is amended by striking out $12,500,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$20,000,000".

(b)(1) Section 207(c)(2) of such Act is amended by striking out "90 per centum" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "95 per centum".

(c) Section 207(c)(3) of such Act is amended by striking out—

(1) "$2,250" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "$2,850";

(2) "$8,100" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "$9,000";

(3) "$2,700" and inserting in lieu thereof "$3,315";

(4) "$8,400" and inserting in lieu thereof "$9,500"; and

(5) "$1,000 per room" and inserting in lieu thereof "$1,250 per room";

(6) "$1,000 per space" and inserting in lieu thereof "$1,500 per space"; and

(7) "$300,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$400,000".

(d) The last paragraph of section 207(c) of such Act is amended by striking out "4½ per centum per annum" and inserting in lieu thereof "5 per centum per annum".

(e) Section 207 of such Act is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(r) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, the Commissioner is authorized to include in any mortgage insured under any title of this Act after the effective date of the Housing Act of 1959 a provision requiring the mortgagor to pay a service charge to the Commissioner in the event such mortgage is assigned to and held by the Commissioner. Such service charge shall not exceed the amount prescribed by the Commissioner for mortgage insurance premiums applicable to such mortgage."

Cooperative housing insurance

SEC. 105. (a) Section 213(b)(1) of the National Housing Act is amended by striking out "$12,500,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$20,000,000".

(b) Section 213(b)(2) of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"(2) not to exceed, for such part of the property or project as may be attributable to dwelling use, $2,910 per room (or $9,000 per family unit if the number of rooms in such property or project is less than four per family unit), and not to exceed 97 per centum of the amount which the Commissioner estimates will be the replacement cost of the property or project when the proposed physical improvements are completed: *Provided*, That if at least 50 per centum of the membership of the corporation or number of beneficiaries of the trust consists of veterans, the mortgage may involve a principal obligation not to exceed $2,970 per room (or $9,500 per family unit if the number of rooms in such property or project is less than four per family unit), and not to exceed the amount which the Commissioner estimates will be the replacement cost of the property or project when the proposed physical improvements are completed: *Provided further*, That as to projects which consist of elevator-type structures the Commissioner may, in his discretion, increase the dollar amount limitation of $2,910 per room to not to exceed $3,395, the dollar amount limitation of $2,970 per room to not to exceed $3,465, the dollar amount limitation of $9,000 per family unit to not to exceed $9,400, and the dollar amount limitation of $9,500 per family unit

to not to exceed $9,900, as the case may be, to compensate for the higher costs incident to the construction of elevator-type structures of sound standards of construction and design: *Provided further*, That the Commissioner may, by regulation, increase any of the foregoing dollar amount limitations by not to exceed $1,250 per room, without regard to the number of rooms being less than four, or four or more, in any geographical area where he finds that cost levels so require: *Provided further*, That in the case of a mortgagor of the character described in paragraph (3) of subsection (a) the mortgage shall involve a principal obligation in an amount not to exceed 90 per centum of the amount which the Commissioner estimates will be the replacement cost of the property or project when the proposed physical improvements are completed: *Provided further*, That upon the sale of a property or project by a mortgagor of the character described in paragraph (3) of subsection (a) to a nonprofit cooperative ownership housing corporation or trust within two years after the completion of such property or project the mortgage given to finance such sale shall involve a principal obligation in an amount not to exceed the maximum amount computed in accordance with this subsection without regard to the preceding proviso: *And provided further*, That for the purposes of this section the term 'veterans' shall mean persons who have served in the active military or naval service of the United States at any time on or after April 6, 1917, and prior to November 12, 1918, or on or after September 16, 1940, and prior to July 26, 1947, or on or after June 27, 1950, and prior to February 1, 1955."

(c) Section 213(d) of such Act is amended by adding at the end thereof a new sentence as follows: "Property held by a corporation or trust of the character described in paragraph numbered (2) of subsection (a) of this section which is covered by a mortgage insured under this section may include such community facilities, and property held by a mortgagor of the character described in paragraph numbered (3) of subsection (a) of this section which is covered by a mortgage insured under this section may include such commercial and community facilities, as the Commissioner deems adequate to serve the occupants."

(d) Section 213 of such Act is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(i) Nothing in this Act shall be construed to prevent the insurance of a mortgage executed by a mortgagor of the character described in paragraph (1) of subsection (a) of this section covering property upon which dwelling units and related facilities have been constructed prior to the filing of the application for mortgage insurance hereunder: *Provided*, That the Commissioner determines that the consumer interest is protected and that the mortgagor will be a consumer cooperative: *Provided further*, That in the case of properties other than new construction, the limitations in this section upon the amount of the mortgage shall be based upon the appraised value of the property for continued use as a cooperative rather than upon the Commissioner's estimate of the replacement cost: *And provided further*, That as to any project on which construction was commenced after the effective date of this subsection, the mortgage on such project shall be eligible for insurance under this section only in those cases where the construction was subject to inspection by the Commissioner and where there was compliance with the provisions of section 212 of this title. As to any project on which construction was commenced prior to the effective date of this subsection, such inspection, and compliance with the provisions of section 212 of this title, shall not be a prerequisite."

(e)(1) Section 213 of such Act is further amended by adding after subsection (i) (as added by subsection (d) of this section) the following new subsections:

"(j) There is hereby created a Cooperative Management Housing Insurance Fund (herein referred to as the 'Management Fund') which shall be used by the Commissioner as a revolving fund for carrying out the provisions of this title with respect to mortgages insured under subsection (a)(1) and subsection (a)(3) pursuant to commitments issued on or after the date of the enactment of the Housing Act of 1959 or mortgage insurance or commitments reissued under subsection (n). The Commissioner is directed to transfer to the Management Fund the sum of $2,000,000 from the Housing Insurance Fund established pursuant to section 207(f). General expenses of operation of the Federal Housing Administration relating to mortgages the mortgage insurance for which is the obligation of the Management Fund may be charged to the Management Fund.

"(k) The Commissioner shall establish, as of the enactment of the Housing Act of 1959, in the Management Fund, a General Surplus Account and a Participating Reserve Account. The aggregate net income thereafter received or any net loss thereafter sustained by the Management Fund in any semiannual period shall be credited or charged to the General Surplus Account and/or the Participating Reserve Account in such manner and amounts as the Commissioner may determine to be in accord with sound actuarial and accounting practice. Upon termination of the insurance obligation of the Management Fund by payment of any mortgage insured thereunder and/or at such time or times prior to such termination as the Commissioner may determine, the Commissioner is authorized to distribute to the mortgagor a share of the Participating Reserve Account in such manner and amount as the Commissioner shall determine to be equitable and in accordance with sound actuarial and accounting practice: *Provided*, That, in no event shall the amount of such distributive share exceed the aggregate scheduled annual premiums of the mortgagor to the year of payment of such share less the total amount of any share or shares previously distributed by the Commissioner to the mortgagor: And *provided further*, That in no event may any such distributive shares be distributed until any funds transferred to the Managment Fund pursuant to section 219 have been repaid in full to the transferring fund. No mortgagor or mortgagee shall have any vested right in a credit balance in any such account or be subject to any liability arising out of the mutuality of the Management Fund, and the determination of the Commissioner as to the amount to be paid by him to any mortgagor shall be final and conclusive.

"(l) There is hereby created a Cooperative Sales Housing Insurance Fund (herein referred to as the 'Sales Fund') which shall be used by the Commissioner as a revolving fund for carrying out the provisions of this title with respect to mortgages insured under subsection (a)(2) and individual mortgages insured under subsection (d) pursuant to commitments issued on or after the date of the enactment of the Housing Act of 1959 or mortgage insurance or commitments reissued under subsection (n). The Commissioner is directed to transfer to the Sales Fund the sum of $1,000,000 from the Housing Insurance Fund established pursuant to section 207(f). General expenses of the operation of the Federal Housing Administration relating to mortgages the mortgage insurance for which is the obligation of the Sales Fund may be charged to the Sales Fund.

"(m) The Commissioner shall establish, as of the enactment of the Housing Act of 1959, in the Sales Fund, a General Surplus Account and a Participating Reserve Account. The aggregate net income thereafter received or any net loss thereafter sustained by the Sales Fund in any semiannual period shall be credited or charged to the General Surplus Account and/or the Participating Reserve Account in such manner and amounts as the Commissioner may determine to be in accordance with sound actuarial and accounting practice. Upon termination of the insurance obligation of the Sales Fund by payment of any mortgage insured thereunder, the Commissioner is authorized to distribute to the mortgagor a share of the Participating Reserve Account in such manner and amount as the Commissioner shall determine to be equitable and in accordance with sound actuarial and accounting practice: *Provided*, That in no event shall any such distributive share exceed the aggregate scheduled annual premiums of the mortgagor to the year of termination of the insurance: *And provided further*, That in no event may any such distributive share be distributed until any funds transferred to the Sales Fund pursuant to section 219 have been repaid in full to the transferring fund. No mortgagor or mortgagee shall have any vested right in a credit balance in any such account, or be subject to any liability arising out of the mutuality of the Sales Fund, and the determination of the Commissioner as to the amount to be paid by him to any mortgagor shall be final and conclusive.

"(n) The Commissioner shall be empowered to reissue under the Management Fund or the Sales Fund, as the case may be, commitments or the mortgage insurance for any mortgage insured under this section pursuant to a commitment issued prior to the date of the enactment of the Housing Act of 1959, provided the consent of the mortgagees to such reissuance is obtained, or a request by the mortgagee for such reissuance is received, by the Commissioner within ninety days after the date of the enactment of the Housing Act of 1959; but the mortgage insurance for any such mortgage shall not be reissued under this subsection if on the date of the enactment of the Housing Act of 1959 the mortgage is in default and the mortgagee has notified the Commissioner in writing of its intention to file claim for debentures. Any insurance or commitment not so reissued shall not be affected by the enactment of the Housing Act of 1959."

(2) Section 207(f) of such Act is amended by striking out "and section 213" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "and (except with respect to mortgages the mortgage insurance for which is the obligation of the Cooperative Management Housing Insurance Fund or the Cooperative Sales Housing Insurance Fund) section 213".

(3) Section 213(a)(3) of such Act is amended by striking out the semicolon at the end thereof and inserting in lieu of such semicolon a colon and the following: "*Provided*, That as to mortgages the mortgage insurance for which is the obligation of the Management Fund such stock or interest shall be paid for out of the Management Fund;".

(4) Section 213(a) of such Act is further amended by striking out the period at the end thereof and inserting in lieu of such period a colon and the following: "*Provided*, That as applied to mortgages the mortgage insurance for which is the obligation of the Sales Fund, the reference to the Housing Fund in section 207(b)(2) shall refer to the Sales Fund: *Provided further*, That as applied to mortgages the mortgage insurance for which is the obligation of the Management Fund, the reference to the Housing

Fund in section 207(b)(2) shall refer to the Management Fund."

(5) Section 213(e) of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"(e) (1) The provisions of subsections (d), (e), (g), (h), (i), (j), (k), (l), (m), (n), and (p) of section 207 shall apply to mortgages insured under subsection (a)(1) and subsection (a)(3) of this section, except that as applied to mortgages the mortgage insurance for which is the obligation of the Management Fund pursuant to section 213(j), (A) all references to the Housing Insurance Fund or Housing Fund shall refer to the Management Fund, and (B) all references to section 207 or 210 shall refer to subsection (a)(1) and subsection (a)(3) of this section.

"(2) The provisions of subsections (d), (e), (g), (h), (i), (j), (k), (l), (m), (n), and (p) of section 207 shall apply to mortgages insured under subsection (a)(2) of this section, except that as applied to mortgages the mortgage insurance for which is the obligation of the Sales Fund pursuant to section 213(l), (A) all references to the Housing Insurance Fund or Housing Fund shall refer to the Sales Fund, and (B) all references to section 207 or 210 shall refer to subsection (a)(2) of this section.

"(3) The provisions of subsections (a), (c), (d), (e), (f), (g), (h), (j), and (k) of section 204 and subsection (p) of section 207 shall apply to individual mortgages insured under subsection (d) of this section, except that as applied to mortgages the mortgage insurance for which is the obligation of the Sales Fund pursuant to section 213(l), (A) all references to the Housing Insurance Fund or the Housing Fund in subsections (c), (d), and (f) of section 204 and subsection (p) of section 207 shall refer to the Sales Fund, and (B) all references to section 207 or 210 in subsections (c), (d), and (f) of section 204 and subsection (p) of section 207 shall refer to subsection (d) of this section."

(6) Section 219 of such Act is amended by striking out "or the Servicemen's Mortgage Insurance Fund" and inserting in lieu thereof "the Servicemen's Mortgage Insurance Fund, the Cooperative Management Housing Insurance Fund, or the Cooperative Sales Housing Insurance Fund."

Increased mortgage amounts in Alaska, Guam, and Hawaii

SEC. 106. The first sentence of section 214 of the National Housing Act is amended by inserting after "maximum or maxima otherwise applicable" the following: "(including increased mortgage amounts in geographical areas where cost levels so require)".

FHA mortgage insurance authorization

SEC. 107. (a) Section 217 of the National Housing Act is amended by striking out "$7,000,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$13,000,000,000".

(b) Section 217 of such Act is amended, effective July 1, 1959, by (1) striking out "July 1, 1956" and inserting in lieu thereof "July 1, 1959", and (2) striking out "$13,000,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$4,000,000,000".

Repeal of obsolete provision

SEC. 108. Section 218 of the National Housing Act is repealed.

Section 220 mortgage insurance

SEC. 109. (a)(1) Clause (i) of subsection (d)(3)(A) of section 220 of the National Housing Act is amended by striking out "$20,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$25,000".

(2) Subsection (d)(3)(A)(i) of section 220 of such Act is further amended—

(A) by striking out "85 per centum" and inserting in lieu thereof "90 per centum";

(B) by striking out "$16,000" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "$18,000"; and

(C) by striking out "70 per centum" and inserting in lieu thereof "75 per centum".

(3) Subsection (d)(3)(A)(ii) of section 220 of such Act is amended by inserting before the semicolon at the end thereof a colon and the following: *"Provided,* That such 85 per centum limitation shall not be applicable if the mortgagor and mortgagee assume responsibility in a manner satisfactory to the Commissioner for the reduction of the mortgage by an amount not less than 15 per centum of the outstanding principal amount thereof in the event the mortgaged property is not, prior to the due date of the eighteenth amortization payment of the mortgage, sold to a purchaser acceptable to the Commissioner who is the occupant of the property and who assumes and agrees to pay the mortgage indebtedness".

(b) Subsection (d)(3)(B)(i) of section 220 of such Act is amended by striking out "$12,500,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$20,000,000".

(c) Subsection (d)(3)(B)(iii) of section 220 of such Act is amended—

(1) by striking out "$2,250" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "$2,700";

(2) by striking out "$8,100" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "$9,000";

(3) by striking out "$2,700" and inserting in lieu thereof "$3,150";

(4) by striking out "$8,400" and inserting in lieu thereof "$9,500"; and

(5) by striking out "$1,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$1,250".

Section 221 Relocation Housing Mortgage Insurance

SEC. 110. (a) Section 221(d)(2) of the National Housing Act is amended by striking out "$9,000" and "$10,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$10,000" and "$12,000", respectively.

(b) Section 221(d) of such Act is further amended—

(1) by striking out "$9,000" and "$10,000" in paragraph (3) and inserting in lieu thereof "$10,000" and $12,000", respectively;

(2) by striking out "the Commissioner's estimate of the value of the property or project when constructed, or repaired and rehabilitated" in paragraph (3) and inserting in lieu thereof "the amount which the Commissioner estimates will be the replacement cost of the property or project when the proposed improvements are completed in the case of a property or project approved for mortgage insurance prior to the beginning of construction, or the Commissioner's estimate of the value of the property or project when the proposed repair and rehabilitation is completed if the proceeds of the mortgage are to be used for the repair and rehabilitation of the property or project";

(3) by striking out "and" at the end of paragraph (3) and inserting in lieu thereof "or"; and

(4) by redesignating paragraph (4) as paragraph (5) and inserting after paragraph (3) the following new paragraph:

"(4) if executed by a mortgagor which is not a nonprofit organization, and which is approved by the Commissioner—

"(i) not exceed $12,500,000;

"(ii) not exceed $10,000 per family unit for such part of such property or project as may be attributable to dwelling use, except that the Commissioner may by regulation increase this amount to not to exceed $12,000 in any geographical area where he finds that cost levels so require;

"(iii) not exceed (in the case of a property or project approved for mortgage insurance prior to the beginning of construction) 90 per centum of the amount which the Commissioner estimates will be the replacement cost of the property or project when the proposed improvements are completed (the replacement cost may include the land, the proposed physical improvements, utilities within the boundaries of the land, architect's fees, taxes, interest during construction, and other miscellaneous charges incident to construction and approved by the Commissioner, and shall include an allowance for builder's and sponsor's profit and risk of 10 per centum of all of the foregoing items except the land unless the Commissioner, after certification that such allowance is unreasonable, shall by regulation prescribe a lesser percentage); and

"(iv) not exceed 90 per centum of the Commissioner's estimate of the value of the property or project when the proposed repair and rehabilitation is completed if the proceeds of the mortgage are to be used for the repair and rehabilitation of a property or project:

Provided, That such property or project when constructed, or repaired and rehabilitated, shall be for use as rental accommodations for ten or more families eligible for occupancy as provided in this section: *And Provided further,* That the Commissioner may, in his discretion, require the mortgagor to be regulated or restricted as to rents or sales, charges, capital structure, rate of return and methods of operation, and for such purpose the Commissioner may make such contracts with and acquire for not to exceed $100 such stock or interest in any such mortgagor as the Commissioner may deem necessary to render effective such restrictions or regulations, with such stock or interest being paid for out of the Section 221 Housing Insurance Fund and being required to be redeemed by the mortgagor at par upon the termination of all obligations of the Commissioner under the insurance; and".

(c) Section 221(g)(2) of such Act is amended by striking out "paragraph (3)" and inserting in lieu thereof "paragraph (3) or (4)".

(d) Section 212(a) of such Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "The provisions of this section shall apply to the insurance under section 221 of any mortgage described in subsection (d)(4) thereof which covers property on which there is located a dwelling or dwellings designed principally for residential use for ten or more families."

Servicemen's housing mortgage insurance

SEC. 111. Section 222(b) of the National Housing Act is amended—

(1) by inserting "or 203(i)" after "203(b)" in paragraph (1); and

(2) by striking out "$17,100" in paragraph (2) and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "$20,000, except that in the case of a mortgage meeting the requirements of section 203(i) such principal obligation shall not exceed $9,000".

Builder's cost certification

SEC. 112. Section 227(a) of the National Housing Act is amended by striking out clause (iv) and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "(iv) under section 221 if the mortgagor meets the requirements of paragraph (3) or paragraph (4) of subsection (d) thereof,".

Mortgage insurance for nursing homes

SEC. 113. (a) Title II of the National Housing Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"Mortgage insurance for nursing homes

"SEC. 229. (a) The purpose of this section is to assist the provision of urgently needed nursing homes for the care and treatment of convalescents and other persons who are not acutely ill and do not need hospital care but who require skilled nursing care and related medical services.

"(b) For the purposes of this section—

"(1) the term 'nursing home' means a proprietary facility, licensed or regulated by

the State (or, if there is no State law providing for such licensing and regulation by the State, by the municipality or other political subdivision in which the facility is located), for the accommodation of convalescents or other persons who are not acutely ill and not in need of hospital care but who require skilled nursing care and related medical services, in which such nursing care and medical services are prescribed by, or are performed under the general direction of, persons licensed to provide such care or services in accordance with the laws of the State where the facility is located; and

"(2) the terms 'mortgage' and 'mortgagor' shall have the meanings respectively set forth in section 207(a) of this Act.

"(c) The Commissioner is authorized to insure any mortgage (including advances on such mortgage during construction) in accordance with the provisions of this section upon such terms and conditions as he may prescribe and to make commitments for insurance of such mortgage prior to the date of its execution or disbursement thereon.

"(d) In order to carry out the purpose of this section, the Commissioner is authorized to insure any mortgage which covers a new or rehabilitated nursing home, subject to the following conditions:

"(1) The mortgage shall be executed by a mortgagor approved by the Commissioner. The Commissioner may in his discretion require any such mortgagor to be regulated or restricted as to charges and methods of operation, and, in addition thereto, if the mortgagor is a corporate entity, as to capital structure and rate of return. As an aid to the regulation or restriction of any mortgagor with respect to any of the foregoing matters, the Commissioner may make such contracts with and acquire for not to exceed $100 such stock or interest in such mortgagor as he may deem necessary. Any stock or interest so purchased shall be paid for out of the Section 207 Housing Insurance Fund, and shall be redeemed by the mortgagor at par upon the termination of all obligations of the Commissioner under the insurance.

"(2) The mortgage shall involve a principal obligation in an amount not to exceed $1,000,000, and not to exceed 75 per centum of the estimated value of the property or project when the proposed improvements are completed.

"(3) The mortgage shall—

"(A) provide for complete amortization by periodic payments within such terms as the Commissioner shall prescribe; and

"(B) bear interest (exclusive of premium charges for insurance) at not to exceed 5 per centum per annum of the amount of the principal obligation outstanding at any time.

"(4) The Commissioner shall not insure any mortgage under this section unless he has received, from the State agency designated in accordance with section 612(a)(1) of the Public Health Service Act for the State in which is located the nursing home covered by the mortgage, a certification that there is a need for such nursing home.

"(e) The Commissioner may consent to the release of a part or parts of the mortgaged property or project from the lien of any mortgage insured under this section upon such terms and conditions as he may prescribe.

"(f) The provisions of subsections (d), (e), (f), (g), (h), (i), (j), (k), (l), (m), (n), and (p) of section 207 shall apply to morgtgages insured under this section and all references therein to section 207 shall refer to this section."

(b) Section 212(a) of such Act is amended by adding at the end thereof (after the sentence added by section 110(d)) the following new sentence: "The provisions of this section shall also apply to the insurance of any mortgage under section 229."

Technical amendments

SEC. 114. (a) Section 8(g) of the National Housing Act is amended by striking out "and (h) of section 204" and inserting in lieu thereof "(h), (j), and (k) of section 204".

(b) Sections 220(f)(1), 221(g)(1), 222(e), and 809(e) of such Act are each amended by striking out "and (j) of seciton 204" and inserting in lieu thereof "(j) and (k) of section 204".

Inclusion of conveyance costs in debentures

SEC. 115. Section 204(k) of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"(k) Notwithstanding any other provision of this section or of section 604 or 904 and with respect to any debentures issued in exchange for properties conveyed to and accepted by the Commissioner after the effective date of the Housing Act of 1959 in accordance with such sections, the Commissioner may: (1) include in debentures reasonable payments made by the mortgagee with the approval of the Commissioner for the purpose of protecting, operating, or preserving the property, and taxes imposed upon any deed or any other instrument by which the property was acquired by the mortgagee and transferred or conveyed to the Commissioner; (2) include in debentures as a portion of foreclosure costs (to the extent that foreclosure costs may be included in such debentures by any other provision of this Act) payments made by the mortgagee for the cost of acquiring the property and conveying and evidencing title to the property of the Commissioner; and (3) terminate the mortgagee's obligation to pay mortgage insurance premiums upon receipt of an application for debentures filed by the mortgagee, or in the event the contract of insurance is terminated pursuant to section 230."

Voluntary termination of insurance

SEC. 116. Title II of the National Housing Act is further amended by adding after section 229 (as added by section 113 of this Act) the following new section:

"Voluntary termination of insurance

"SEC. 230. Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act and with respect to any mortgage covering a one-, two-, three-, or four-family residence heretofore or hereafter insured under this Act, the Commissioner is authorized to terminate any mortgage insurance contract upon request by the mortgagor and mortgagee and upon payment of such termination charge as the Commissioner determines to be equitable, taking into consideration the necessity of protecting the various insurance funds. Upon such termination mortgagors and mortgagees shall be entitled to the rights, if any, to which they would be entitled under this Act if the insurance contract were terminated by payment in full of the insured mortgage."

Mr. RAINS (during the reading of the amendment). Mr. Chairman, since title I has already been voted upon, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of title I be dispensed with and that it be open for amendment at any point in said title I.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. RAINS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROYHILL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BROYHILL to the committee substitute amendment: Page 90, after line 12, insert the following:

"(3) Section 203(b)(2) of such Act is further amended by inserting after "unless the construction of the dwelling was completed more than one year prior to the application for mortgage insurance" the following: 'or the dwelling was approved for guaranty, insurance, or direct loan under chapter 37 of title 38, United States Code, prior to the beginning of construction'."

Mr. BROYHILL. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is identical to the amendment I offered to title I on the Herlong substitute when it was under consideration. It was approved by the committee rather substantially. As I stated at that time, it is noncontroversial. I have discussed it with several members of the committee, and I said at the time the chairman of the subcommittee raised no objection to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I ask for the approval of the amendment.

Mr. RAINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROYHILL. I yield.

Mr. RAINS. Mr. Chairman, as the gentleman from Virginia has said, this is more or less a technical amendment. While I have no authority to accept it on behalf of the committee, since it was adopted a little while ago and since, in my judgment, it would be a good amendment to the bill, I can see no objection to it.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BROYHILL].

The amendment to the committee substitute amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, earlier in the day I came in just as the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT], who is a member of the Committee on Education and Labor, was making a very appealing plea for homes for people who cannot themselves obtain one such as they desire.

But permit the giving of a few figures which are approximately correct and which come from the Public Housing Administration.

Prior to 1949, the Government had participated in the construction of 210,842 units.

Under the 1949 act, the program called for 236,400 units under management; 30,400 under construction; 85,700 under subsidy contract but not then being constructed, and it had under consideration plans to add, under subsidy contract, by July 1, 1959—that being the end of the fiscal year—31,416—or a total of 594,758, if we count the units prior to the 1949 Act.

That Administration also states that the annual turnover is about 25 percent, and that, by the end of the fiscal year, which, as we all know, is July 1, 1959, there will be on the program approximately 595,000 units. On the basis of a 25 percent annual turnover, more than 148,000 units would be available each year without this or any other new legislation.

As the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT] was talking, it occurred to me that he was a little too far ahead of the need for new Federal housing. A home is a very desirable possession, but unless the home owner has an in-

come or a job where he can get the money to buy something to eat, the furnishings he needs, a home is not much good to him.

The gentleman seems to have forgotten the need for labor legislation which will protect the homeowner. This time is taken because sooner or later——

Mr. Chairman, I cannot contend against the noise being made by the majority; hence I appeal to the Chair for order, and the appeal is made not because of any thought in my mind that the Members will listen or follow my advice or suggestions, but because I want it on the record.

The Congress in 1947 by the Taft-Hartley Act failed to make obviously needed corrections in labor legislation. I will not say the practice of extortion is a surprise because it is a customary thing; but the testimony—and you know we did have testimony which has been given to the House Committee on Education and Labor and you have the same thing from the McClellan committee—shows that it is an established fact that the group which defies law enforcement just refuses to permit anyone to transact his or her business in his own legal, lawful way.

The same evil, corrupt practice hamstrings even the largest corporations.

Recently, and this inexcusable—illegal business has been mentioned before—there have been before the Committee on Education and Labor witnesses—and there are thousands of similar cases which demonstrate that the unions now have the power and they are exercising that power to determine that no one, speaking comparatively, shall have a job and collect wages or do business unless he or she or it first pays tribute to the union. Whether the sums collected from some are the result of bribery or extortion is sometimes a question.

Just listen a minute. My friend from California and the other supporters of union racketeering—of course, they do not so intend——

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I hope the gentleman is not saying that I am a supporter of union racketeering.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Certainly not. Not knowingly. Of course not. No one in this House so far as I know is, but the result of the refusal to write legislation which will prevent or lessen bribery or extortion is to encourage both. The effect of our refusal is to encourage both. That is neither our purpose nor intention.

This fellow Hoffa—are we by our failure to act supporting him in his threat of a general strike if we legislate to prevent a monopoly by unions? No; of course, we do not so intend—not if we know about it.

If I use the word "you," I am not referring to any particular individual; I am referring to the group which goes along with the opposition to remedial legislation, refuses to enact legislation which will stop or at least minimize the power of union organizers who say, as was said to those three witnesses who appeared before our committee the other day: "You cannot operate this business"—and the largest number of employees employed by any one of them was three—"you cannot carry on this business unless you force your employees to join and pay dues to the union."'

Who has the answer to that practice? That is the fact, and this Congress lacks either the intent, the willingness, or the courage to enact legislation to protect the average citizen or employer.

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. In just a moment.

Read the testimony. Read the record. It is an established fact that today no one can do business unless he pays tribute to the union if the union in his locality does not want him to. In one case before our committee there were only two employees, and they told the woman who owned the business—who operated the grill—they did not go to the employees themselves, but they went to the boss; they never went to the employees; they never asked the employees if they wanted to join the union, but they went to her and finally put her out of business because she would not comply with their demands to force the employees to pay and join as a condition of further employment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Then I offer a preferential motion.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the preferential motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan moves that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the enacting clause be stricken.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his motion.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Yes; and in anticipation that a point of order may be made against my argument, let me say that the point is that there is no use of enacting legislation providing homes unless the homeowner has enough money or an opportunity to earn to get something to eat if and when he gets in the home. That is my argument, and that is the situation of many a worker who cannot either get or hold a job.

Just think a minute, not one Member of this House, if he were working for an industrialist or any business organization, could work if Hoffa, or for that matter, Reuther, said he could not unless he joined and paid dues to the union.

There are thousands of such cases. The organizer does not always go to the employee; he goes to the boss and he says: "You tell your employees that they cannot work unless they join the union."

When Judge Starr, a Democrat, now sitting as judge in the U.S. District Court in the Western District of Michigan Southern Division, was a justice of the Supreme Court of Michigan, he wrote a unanimous decision condemning the practice to which reference is now being made—*Silkworth et al.* v. *Local No. 575 of A. F. of L. et al.* (309 Mich. 746). Among other things the court said:

> In the present case we must determine whether or not defendants' picketing of plaintiffs' storage plant was for the purpose of obtaining a lawful labor objective. The motive for the picketing, that is, the result sought to be accomplished, was a question of fact. The testimony is convincing that defendants' real objective was to compel plaintiffs to put their drivers in defendant union by paying their initiation fees, regardless of whether or not the drivers wished to join. This was not a lawful labor objective. Defendants could not use the lawful means of peaceful picketing to accomplish such unlawful purpose.
>
> To hold with defendants' contention, under the facts and circumstances shown by the record, would provide a way whereby employers could be coercively compelled to pay union initiation fees for their employees, regardless of whether or not the employees wished to join the union. Such a course would not be in the furtherance of legitimate union aims and activities, nor would it be for the best interests of unions of employees.
>
> We confine our holding in the present case to the point that defendants could not use the lawful means of peaceful picketing to accomplish their unlawful objective. However, our decision should not be construed as in any way limiting or restraining peaceful picketing in the accomplishment of a lawful labor objective.

I do not believe there is anyone in this House who does not know that the present practices in some of the unions—that is, in those in which officials seek undue power—are to go to the boss and say: "You make your men join the union or we will picket you."

Talk about discrimination? How can you in good faith fail to enact legislation that will bar that practice which is extortion?

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Certainly.

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Michigan. May I say that I have introduced a new labor bill. All I want to do is to take Mr. HOFFMAN's time to request each and every Member of Congress to read it, and I will be satisfied.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. And I am requesting, and the only thing I am requesting is that each Member just stop for about 3 minutes, think over the present situation and practice, then vote on the labor legislation when it comes up as your conscience dictates. I know how Members will vote if they give thought to the present practice. We cannot help but oppose those who are now collecting this tribute from men and women who want to work. Who rules this country? Hoffa? He says he is going to tie up all transportation. If he does, and the Department of Justice does not have people with sufficient ability to convict, let us get one which can.

Give it the necessary funds and learn whether the crooked bosses or the Congress is writing legislation, whether the Justice Department is giving the people equal justice under law.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the preferential motion offered by the

gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

The motion was rejected.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

I would like to direct the attention of the chairman of the Housing Subcommitte to section 102(d) of S. 57. This is the section which amends section 203(c) of the National Housing Act by authorizing the Commissioner to fix a premium charge for insurance at not less than 1 percent and not more than one-quarter of 1 percent of the principal mortgage obligation outstanding at one time.

There is a point which I am uncertain about in this section and which I would like to clear up. My inquiry is one in respect to clarification. I do not intend to offer an amendment.

My question of clarification relates to the application of section 102(d) of the Housing Act of 1959.

The section includes cooperative housing mortgages executed pursuant to section 213 of the National Housing Act, and I am not certain whether the provisions of section 102(d) cover both 213 co-op mortgages executed after the date of enactment of the Housing Act of 1959 and section 213 mortgages executed prior to the date of enactment of the bill.

I feel that there are persuasive reasons for its application to existing co-op mortgages. Since their inclusion in the Housing Insurance Fund in 1950, 213 co-op mortgages have built up an exceedingly favorable insurance-loss experience, losses to the fund totaling only about $30,000 in the 9-year period. This is about one-third of 1 percent of the surplus which they have contributed to the fund.

In addition, since the rate of co-op insurance premium is not a matter of contract between the mortgagors and the mortgagees it can be changed by statute.

The outstanding experience of the existing 213's deserves to be rewarded by extending the proposed new insurance minimum to them. Cooperative housing—middle-income housing—is tremendously important to inhabitants of areas of high-cost housing. These are owner-occupied dwellings which receive the care devoted by owners of individual homes to their own residences. Equity and justice would indicate that owners of existing 213 co-ops receive the benefits of their own very favorable insurance-loss experience.

Mr. Chairman, in view of this record, which certainly justifies it, and in view of the uncertainty regarding the application of the provision, would it be your opinion that the minimum insurance rate provision of section 102(d) of the Housing Act of 1959 applies to 213 co-op mortgages executed prior to the passage of the act?

Mr. RAINS. The simple truth is that the section which the gentleman mentions has been mentioned to me by several members of the committee since we wrote the bill. The answer is "Yes, with certain qualifications," the qualifications being that it could not apply to that part of the mortgage where it would be retroactive and could not apply if the mortgage was in anywise in default and could only apply to the parties mentioned in this particular bill. So, the answer to the gentleman's question is "Yes."

Mr. HALPERN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I offer two amendments and ask unanimous consent that they be considered en bloc.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendments offered by Mr. POWELL: Page 19, after line 4, add the following new subsection:

"(d) Subsection (d)(4) of section 220 of such Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: 'Property covered by a mortgage coming within the provisions of paragraph (3)(B) of this subsection may include such commercial facilities as the Commissioner deems adequate to serve the occupants.'"

Page 51, insert "(a)" after "SEC. 408." in line 5 and insert after line 24 the following new subsection:

"(b) Section 110(c) of such Act is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"'Notwithstanding any other provision of this title, commercial establishments existing in an urban renewal area after its development or redevelopment with assistance extended under this title shall, insofar as practicable, be of the same average size (in terms of square feet of commercially utilized floor space) and type as those which existed in such area before the commencement of the project; and the owners and proprietors of the commercial establishments which existed in such area before the commencement of the project shall, under regulations prescribed by the Administrator, be afforded a priority of opportunity to purchase or rent the commercial establishments existing in such area after its development or redevelopment.'"

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, these are antidiscrimination amendments, but they are not based upon race, creed, or color. They are based upon discrimination against the small businessman. Those of us who come from the large cities find that when slum clearance takes place, large numbers of small businesses are dislocated, and under existing law, when we do build public housing, there is no provision to put stores in public housing. Area after area in my city covered by new housing projects has no local stores. The chain stores move in. How do they get in? They get in by the builder applying to a private lending corporation, such as a bank or insurance company, and they cannot get these loans from the banks or insurance companies unless they submit to the officials a list of the prospective tenants. And, these prospective tenants, as is indicated by a tour of any big city, are the large chains. These amendments do not discriminate against the entrance of the large chains, but they do guarantee that the small-business man, who is being discriminated against everywhere, shall have priority in going into the project. I feel that these are very justified amendments. I feel that this is a very good step; it takes a very good step toward the solution of our small business that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] and my colleague the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT] have been working on so assiduously.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POWELL. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. Does the amendment intend to restrict the sale of land under the urban renewal program to prior owners of commercial business in the area?

Mr. POWELL. No; it does not. It merely allows the public housing projects to now have stores in them. And those men and women who have been dislocated by virtue of slum clearance projects shall have priority in going into these stores.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. This is in public housing areas, not in urban redevelopment?

Mr. POWELL. That is right.

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POWELL. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Will the gentleman advise me whether his amendment has been submitted to the committee and considered by the committee?

Mr. POWELL. No. I was asked that by the gentleman from Texas just yesterday. I told him that I did not even think of this until over the weekend and I did not have it prepared until Monday. The idea did not even come to me until Friday, to be frank.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POWELL. I yield.

Mr. PATMAN. I believe there was a misstatement. This is in the urban renewal section, is it not?

Mr. POWELL. Yes; that is right.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. Then the gentleman's answer to my question should be the opposite of what he said.

Mr. POWELL. That is correct; I stand corrected.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. In such a case as this it would mean that before an urban renewal site could be resold, priority would go to people formerly located in the area, with the same amount of floorspace as they had before?

Mr. POWELL. Insofar as practical, under rules promulgated by the Commissioner.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. The gentleman's amendment would be entirely too restrictive for the proper redevelopment of a new area that is growing to serve the community.

Mr. POWELL. It does not limit it, however, to just the original proprietors and storekeepers. It opens it to others, but gives priority to the small businessman. It does not limit it except to small business.

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POWELL. I yield.

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the gentleman on his amendment. Coming from an adjoining district to the north, I have seen in these public housing projects and some of the

urban renewals cases of men who had developed goodwill for their stores, who had invested $50,000 to $100,000 in some of their stores, who were suddenly dislocated and thrown out, without getting any payment whatsoever from the city housing authority or any other condemnation group. All they could get out of it would be something for their fixtures. Then when the building comes back, those people do not have the opportunity to continue in their business. They must relocate elsewhere. They have lost their goodwill.

The gentleman's amendment would give these merchants who have developed in a community the opportunity to come back and continue to receive the benefits of the goodwill which they had before they were dislocated.

Mr. RAINS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendments. In the first place, these are extremely far-reaching amendments. They sound innocent, as though they might not do any harm. But this would mean that the city planners, those in charge, would be completely hamstrung in the development of any particular area. The simple truth of the business is that urban renewal is one area of housing that is extremely complicated. It needs to be studied. I am talking about the legislation that surrounds it. It needs to be studied carefully by the Housing Committee and we have decided that once this session is over we in the committee shall conduct a full study of all the urban renewal housing acts.

For that reason, Mr. Chairman, I sincerely trust that these two amendments, which are very far reaching, will not be adopted at least until we take the time to see what effect they actually would have on an overall city planning urban renewal program.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the amendments will be defeated.

SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am very much interested in the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL]. I think he has rendered a great public service in presenting the subject to the House.

I am personally not ready to vote for the amendments because I do not think sufficient committee consideration has been given them. There are so many problems involved. The phrase "insofar as practicable" makes it rather flexible, but I do not know whether it is flexible enough. There are several things in the amendment that I think need more consideration. For that reason I am not ready to vote for it. But I am for something along this line, for the principle.

Every Member of this House has received complaints from small businessmen to the effect that they were unable to get a lease in certain projects. There is usually one reason for that. The people who are building these huge projects are required to get a large amount of money in the market and they get it usually through some bank or financial institution. Many of the financial institutions today have branches, lots of them, and are in holding companies. They have interlocking directorates. They have so many interests that in nearly all these projects, when it comes to the time of submitting a plan, such as that which the gentleman from New York has suggested, if that plan does not have as lessees the national corporate chains—and they too have interlocking connections with these financial institutions—they demand it, and I do not know of any case where they fail. They have more power and they can do more. They have the advantage of the little man. I think it is a terrific problem. It involves small business all over the Nation.

Something should be done about it. We have these huge banking mergers like J. P. Morgan and Guaranty Trust. That is where each of them has dozens and dozens of interlocking connections with all kinds of different firms including chain stores and food firms and businesses like that. Whenever they can consolidate, they double their power and whenever they merge, they get bigger. So this is a problem that should recieve a great deal of careful consideration. I am grateful to the gentleman from New York for bringing it before the committee at this time although I am not ready to vote for it because I feel we should give it more consideration. I certainly think it should be given consideration and I am personally going to see that everything is done within my power in the Committee on Small Business and the Committee on Banking and Currency and any other committee where I have membership and any power, influence, jurisdiction, vote or voice because this is a big problem and it should be settled as quickly as possible.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. May I ask the chairman of the subcommittee [Mr. RAINS], if I understood him correctly, to say that it is his assurance to us that his investigation will specifically take up the problem presented by the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL]?

Mr. RAINS. The answer to that is yes because the problem is of paramount concern to small business. The problem of goodwill that was mentioned by the gentleman from New York is one that has given the committee a great deal of concern. Yet, it is not a problem that is easy to solve. You just cannot set a certain limitation on goodwill and make it fit in this place or that. So the Housing Subcommittee is not ready to present any definite answers because we do not have sufficient evidence and experience upon which to base the answers. But, I say to the gentleman from California and to the gentleman from New York, specifically, that we will look into it.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I think the question at issue here is not so much at the moment whether the Housing Subcommittee has given any thought to the problem. We have a principle at stake here. We are aware that we are told we should debate this housing bill in general and we are told, please, do not bring up this situation and let us not discuss it because it is much too complex for the ordinary man, but that the Housing Subcommittee with its genius will solve the problem. I am told that this happens year after year, and yet the genius of the members of the Housing Subcommittee still has not solved the housing problem of the country. The gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL] has offered an excellent amendment because it is based upon a sound principle. One of the things we have a knowledge of and which we have recognized and are well aware of, whether definitely or not, is in the urban renewal program is that in too many cases the poor unfortunate resident who is pointed at as being the person to be helped by urban renewal developments finds himself displaced and living in another slum and new people are brought in to live in the brandnew urban renewal development so that we are not helping the people who are supposedly to be helped by any program of this type. If we are to follow principles, then as good a point as any to start to follow principle is now. The basic principle being that the man who is to be evicted and forced to move from an area and who is being forced out, whether he be an individual resident or small businessman, should have a priority and protection so far as moving back into the area either as a resident or as a businessman. If we want to keep with principle, then this is the very point that we should start as a foundation.

Mr. RAINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DERWINSKI. I yield.

Mr. RAINS. The gentleman talks as though he believes the thing to do is to clear out the slums and then move the same slum situation back in the area.

Mr. DERWINSKI. No; I am referring to the people who are forced to move out and should be given priority to move back into the area.

Mr. RAINS. I do not profess to be a genius on the committee except I must say that when you are trying to investigate and look into a problem as big as this problem is, somebody ought to hear some testimony from someone as to what the situation actually is. Has the gentleman himself had any practical experience in the matter?

Mr. DERWINSKI. The point here is not whether we are going to cut off testimony. The point is that we should agree on a principle. We are concerned with the principle involved. I am not arguing over whether you may have to give 1 year or 10 years of serious study to this problem, but I am concerned with the acceptance of the principle involved—the principle being that if a man is a resident in a slum area or if a man is a small businessman in a slum area and if we feel we have to improve his standard of living, we should see to it that when we have finished this urban renewal project, this individual or this small business who was the original subject of our

concern has a better standard of living as a result of our action in spending the taxpayers' dollars.

Mr. RAINS. Of course, that is the end and aim that we have in mind, as the gentleman knows, so far as urban renewal is concerned, but if you are going to hamstring those who have to work out the program by setting aside specific spaces, as I see it, or to rebuild specific types of buildings in size and so forth, you would be inviting back the same kind of situation that you had to begin with. So the end and the aim being an overall urban renewal plan, do you not think that we should first of all consider whether it would fit into the plan to remove the blight conditions and so forth?

Mr. DERWINSKI. May I point out to the gentleman from Alabama that we are speaking or going in two different directions. All I would like to have noted for the RECORD is that the principle involved is the important thing. If the urban renewal program and if the principle involved in it is sound, I do not see how we can refuse to accept this principle if we are to help someone who is supposed to be the object of our original concern, and this amendment that we are now speaking about is as sound in principle as we could have, and I think it should be supported.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, in reference to this question of returning the people who are displaced in urban renewal projects, it occurred to me that the committee bill has a section reserved for public housing units which provides for replacing the same people in the area they were in before.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McDONOUGH. I yield.

Mr. POWELL. The gentleman is exactly correct. We do allow the tenants priority to return to public housing, and that is one of the things that inspired me to write this amendment that we ought to give the same priority to the men and women who had commercial establishments.

Mr. McDONOUGH. I suggest the thought to the Chairman of the committee that he at least indicate whether if we bring back the same people who were there before, we not create the same slums that were there previously? The question then is whether slums are people or whether it is the condition of the buildings in the area that creates the slums. You cannot say it is the people there; it is the condition of the buildings that creates the slums.

Mr. RAINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McDONOUGH. I yield.

Mr. RAINS. The bill has a section in it, does it not, providing they can go back into urban housing, public housing, that certain urban renewal land can be used for public housing space? I point out to the gentleman that the amount of public housing is small. The bill provides for only 35 units a year for 4 years in this country, and I am sure the gentleman thinks that is much too much. Where you take 166,000 people as families, as we are doing, you cannot put them all back in public housing.

Mr. McDONOUGH. I do not agree.

Mr. RAINS. I think the gentleman will agree with me that a subject as complex as this certainly needs more study.

Mr. McDONOUGH. We are displacing certain people in the development of these areas where they have built up their homes and built up their businesses. We are taking away from them the goodwill of the business that they operate when we take out of the area the people who patronize them and put in new people to occupy the same area.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McDONOUGH. I yield.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. But is it not a fact that at the same time you displace a commercial enterprise you are taking away the customers who made up his goodwill? So I do not see where the element of goodwill enters into it in such circumstances.

Mr. McDONOUGH. You would not be taking his customers away if you gave them an opportunity to return.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. But we do not give them the opportunity to return.

Mr. McDONOUGH. This amendment gives them this priority.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, without belaboring the Committee and taking too much time, I would like to rise in opposition to the amendment.

Before coming to the Congress I served as commissioner of public housing, served as president of the public housing officials in the State of Tennessee, and I happen to have some basic knowledge of the intricate problems involved in reselling a redevelopment area under this program. I know the financial difficulties involved as I foresee the deterioration of the property after it has been reclaimed and the reduction in the price that will be received on the reclaimed property under the urban renewal program.

As to the matter of replacing commercial business in an area that has been cleared out by the Government, while that has been the subject of study under the direction of the chairman of the subcommittee, we should spend more time in the study and development of this sort of problem before this committee decides on it.

I recommend that the amendment be voted down.

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I support this amendment and I would like to point out to the body that there is no study required because the people who administer the public housing program are putting in stores, but the stores they are putting into the projects are the big chainstores. What this amendment will accomplish will be a direction to the administrators that they are to take back the small business people who have been dislocated and who have been forced to move. They have lost their goodwill, they have lost their earning power when they are forced to go elsewhere. Sometimes they are unable to establish a new business. This amendment will be a direction to the Administrator that instead of preferring the chainstores, the large chainstores which have the money, they shall give priority to those storeowners who have suffered economic losses and their business by reason of being displaced.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SANTANGELO. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I call the attention of the gentleman and the Committee to the report made in 1958 by the House Small Business Committee under the chairmanship of the gentleman from Texas which spells out the interlocking directorates of these big stores and those financial institutions which organize these projects. The same people who are doing the financing control the giving of the franchises. I heartily concur in what the gentleman said and I hope he will read that committee report.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SANTANGELO. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. POWELL. I am happy that this amendment has caused this discussion. I would like to thank the gentlemen from Illinois, California, and New York for their support.

But with the promise of the chairman of the Small Business Committee, our colleague from Texas, and I am sure with the promise of our subcommittee chairman, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. RAINS], this question will be explored. I would like to ask unanimous consent to withdraw these amendments now and to insert them later, either this week or next, in the form of a bill.

Mr. SANTANGELO. Recognizing the sincerity of the chairman of the Housing Committee and also the gentleman from Texas, I have no objection to the withdrawal.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the amendments.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, in connection with the matter of stores, I would recommend very highly to the committee that inasmuch as I do not believe there is any provision in the public housing law for stores some provision be made to cover that situation because today when public housing is built it has been found necessary for those people who reside within the public housing areas very often to walk six or eight blocks in order to buy their necessities of life. So I would recommend that they consider very closely the question of making provision in the public housing law for the location of commercial establishments within public housing.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE II—HOUSING FOR ELDERLY PERSONS

SEC. 201. (a) The purpose of this title is to assist private nonprofit corporations to pro-

vide housing and related facilities for elderly families and elderly persons.

(b) In order to carry out the purpose of this title, the Administrator may make loans to any corporation (as defined in section 204(2)) for the provision of rental housing and related facilities for elderly families and elderly persons, except that (1) no such loan shall be made unless the corporation shows that it is unable to secure the necessary funds from other sources upon terms and conditions equally as favorable as the terms and conditions applicable to loans under this title, and (2) no such loans shall be made unless the Administrator finds that the construction will be undertaken in an economical manner, and that it will not be of elaborate or extravagant design or materials.

(c) A loan to a corporation under this title may be in an amount not exceeding 98 per centum of the total development cost (as defined in section 204(3)), as determined by the Administrator; shall be secured in such manner and be repaid within such period, not exceeding fifty years, as may be determined by him; and shall bear interest at a rate determined by him which shall be not more than 3½ per centum per annum.

(d) There is authorized to be appropriated not to exceed $100,000,000, which shall constitute a revolving fund to be used by the Administrator in carrying out this title. The amount outstanding from such fund at any one time for related facilities (as defined in section 204(8)) shall not exceed $10,000,000.

SEC. 202. In the performance of, and with respect to, the functions, powers, and duties vested in him by this title the Administrator shall (in addition to any authority otherwise vested in him) have the functions, powers, and duties set forth in section 402 (except subsection (c)(2)) of the Housing Act of 1950.

SEC. 203. (a) Housing constructed with a loan made under this title shall not be used for transient or hotel purposes while such loan is outstanding.

(b) As used in subsection (a), the term "transient or hotel purposes" shall have such meaning as may be prescribed by the Administrator, but rental for any period less than thirty days shall in any event constitute use for such purposes. The provisions of subsections (f) through (j) of section 513 of the National Housing Act (as added by section 132 of the Housing Act of 1954) shall apply in the case of violations of subsection (a) as though the housing described in such subsection were multifamily housing (as defined in section 513(e)(2) of the National Housing Act) with respect to which a mortgage is insured under such Act, except that for purposes of this section the Administrator shall perform the functions vested in the Commissioner by such section 513.

(c) The Administrator shall take such action as may be necessary to ensure that all laborers and mechanics employed by contractors and subcontractors in the construction of housing assisted under this title shall be paid wages at rates not less than those prevailing in the locality involved for the corresponding classes of laborers and mechanics employed on construction of a similar character, as determined by the Secretary of Labor in accordance with the Act of March 3, 1931, as amended (the Davis-Bacon Act); but the Administrator may waive the application of this subsection in cases or classes of cases where laborers or mechanics, not otherwise employed at any time in the construction of such housing, voluntarily donate their services without full compensation for the purpose of lowering the costs of construction and the Administrator determines that any amounts saved thereby are fully credited to the corporation undertaking the construction.

SEC. 204. As used in this title—

(1) The term "housing" means (A) new structures suitable for dwelling use by elderly families and new structures suitable for such use by one or more elderly persons, and (B) dwelling facilities provided by rehabilitation, alteration, conversion, or improvement of existing structures which are otherwise inadequate for proposed dwelling use by such families and persons.

(2) The term "corporation" means any incorporated private institution or foundation no part of the net earnings of which inures to the benefit of any private shareholder, contributor, or individual, if such institution or foundation is approved by the Administrator as to financial responsibility.

(3) The term "development cost" means costs of construction of housing and of other related facilities, and of the land on which it is located, including necessary site improvement.

(4) The term "elderly families" means families the head of which (or his spouse) is sixty-two years of age or over; and the term "elderly persons" means persons who are sixty-two years of age or over. The Administrator shall prescribe such regulations as may be necessary to prevent abuses in determining, under the definitions contained in this paragraph, the eligibility of families and persons for admission to and occupancy of housing constructed with assistance under this title.

(5) The term "State" includes the several States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and the Territories and possessions of the United States.

(6) The term "Administrator" means the Housing and Home Finance Administrator.

(7) The term "construction" means erection of new structures, or rehabilitation, alteration, conversion, or improvement of existing structures.

(8) The term "related facilities" means (A) new structure suitable for use as cafeterias or dining halls, community rooms or building, or infirmaries or other inpatient or outpatient health facilities, or for other essential service facilities, and (B) structures suitable for the above uses provided by rehabilitation, alteration, conversion, or improvement of existing structures which are otherwise inadequate for such uses.

Mr. RAINS (interrupting reading of the bill). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of title II be dispensed with and that it be open for amendment at any point.

Mr. HALLECK. Is that title II?

Mr. RAINS. Title II only.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE III—FEDERAL NATIONAL MORTGAGE ASSOCIATION

SEC. 301. Section 302(b) of the National Housing Act is amended by striking out "exceeds or exceeded $15,000 for each family residence or dwelling unit covered by the mortgage" and inserting in lieu thereof "exceeds or exceeded, for each family residence or dwelling unit covered by the mortgage, $18,000 in the case of a mortgage to be purchased under section 304 or $17,500 in the case of a mortgage to be purchased under section 305".

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment. I have several amendments to titles III, IV, V, and VI, and I ask unanimous consent that they be considered en bloc. I will send the amendments to the desk.

All they do is to change the method of financing, change it from what is commonly called the back door method to direct appropriations. When it comes to the dollar amounts of the authorizations, the authorization is not varied up or down 1 cent, it is just exactly like the committee wrote it. The only change that these amendments make in the four titles is in the method. The method is changed from Treasury authorization to direct appropriations.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS]?

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, does that mean, then, that the whole bill is open for amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. No. It only refers to these four amendments which will be considered together. The title that is being amended now is title III.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, these refer to titles III, IV, and V?

Mr. THOMAS. That is correct. It refers only to financing, I may say to the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendments offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS].

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendments offered by Mr. THOMAS: On page 123, strike out "by" in line 19 and all that follows down through the end of line 22, and insert in lieu thereof the following: "by such amounts, not exceeding $75 million, as may be specified from time to time in appropriation Acts."

On page 123, strike out "by" in line 25 and all that follows down through the end of line 2 on page 124, and insert in lieu thereof the following: "by such amounts, not exceeding $7,500,000, as may be specified from time to time in appropriation Acts."

On page 124, strike out lines 3 through 13 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(3) by striking out 'a consumer cooperative, and (2)' and inserting in lieu thereof the following: 'a consumer cooperative, which amount shall be increased by such amounts, not exceeding $37,500,000, as may be specified from time to time in appropriation Acts, (2) of the total amount of advance commitment contracts and purchase transactions authorized by this subsection, such amounts not exceeding $37,500,000 as may be specified from time to time in appropriation Acts shall be available solely for commitments or purchases of mortgages where the cooperative involved is a builder-sponsor cooperative, and (3); and".

On page 124, strike out lines 19 through 21 and insert in lieu thereof the following: "such amounts, not exceeding $7,500,000, as may be specified from time to time in appriation Acts."

On page 131, strike out lines 12 through 21 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(1) by inserting after the first sentence of subsection (b) the following new sentence: 'In addition to amounts otherwise authorized to be appropriated for such purpose, there are authorized to be appropriated for the purpose of making contracts, after appropriations therefor, for grants with respect to projects or programs assisted under this title, the sum of $1,000,000,000 for the period ending June 30, 1960, and the sum of $500,000,000 for the fiscal year 1961; and

any such sums so appropriated shall remain available until expended."

On page 147, strike out lines 21 through 25 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"SEC. 501. Section 401(d) of the Housing Act of 1950 is amended—

"(1) by inserting after '$925,000,000' the following: ', which limit shall be increased by such amounts, not exceeding $40,000,000, as may be specified from time to time in appropriation Acts';

"(2) by inserting after '$100,000,000' the following: ', which limit shall be increased by such amounts, not exceeding $40,000,000, as may be specified from time to time in appropriation Acts'; and

"(3) by inserting after '$25,000,000' the following: ', which limit shall be increased by such amounts, not exceeding $40,000,000, as may be specified from time to time in appropriation Acts'."

On page 152, after the period in line 14 insert the following new sentence: "Notwithstanding the authorization contained in the preceding sentence or in any other provision of this Act, no contract for annual contributions which binds the Government to pay out money for subsidized housing units shall be entered into after the date of the enactment of the Housing Act of 1959 unless at least the full amount of the contributions required for the first year of occupancy under such contract shall theretofore have been provided in appropriation Acts enacted after the date of the enactment of the Housing Act of 1959."

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, none of these amendments vary the bill upward or downward. It does not change the present bill by one penny. I want to make that clear. Incidentally, I told our able and genial chairman, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. RAINS], this morning that I would offer these amendments. As I stated a while ago, these amendments deal with four subjects: one, FNMA, that is, the Federal National Mortgage Association, to the tune of $75 million. The next one is $1.5 billion for urban renewal. The next one is $400 million for college housing, and the next one, in round figures again, is the tidy little sum of $2 billion for public housing.

So, my colleagues, you are considering here en bloc purely the method of financing these four programs to the tune of $4 billion. As the committee bill now stands, you, and you, and you, every Member of this Congress, has given away the rights of your people. You have absolutely given away the rights of your people to control the purse strings.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the gentleman's talk.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state the point of order.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Well, he says, "You; every one of us." Now, he cannot say that of me.

Mr. THOMAS. The gentleman is right. I hope he is going to vote with us. Well, you do not have to take that too literally.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I do not object, really.

Mr. THOMAS. I do not want to put anybody on the spot, but I mean the bill has given away the rights of the Members of Congress to control the purse strings to the tune of $4 billion.

Now, who is going to spend this money? Not a single person who has ever been voted upon by the people will spend this money. Do not say that the President is going to spend it, because the President has too much to think about. It is going to be someone appointed in the various bureaus.

I suggest to you that now is a good time to recoup the authority that the people back home who elected you think that we have, and who think that we are going to represent them.

Virtually what this bill does is this. It gives away control of the purse strings to the tune of $4 billion.

I do hope that these amendments are voted up. They are sound, they are sensible. And then on an annual basis this Congress, the membership of this body, as well as the body at the other end of the Capitol, can pass upon these funds.

Mr. Chairman, these are sensible amendments and it is high time that they be voted up.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS. I am delighted to yield to my distinguished friend from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. What the gentleman says is probably true.

Mr. THOMAS. Not "probably"; it is true, I will say to my distinguished friend. But please go ahead.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. The Congress has; but who has been in control of the Congress? The gentleman's party. The gentleman cannot charge that to the Republicans, he knows that.

Mr. THOMAS. Charge it to me, if the gentleman wishes. I am doing my best to rectify this situation and I hope the gentleman will help me.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. McDONOUGH. I understand the gentleman's amendment as it particularly applies to urban renewal, and in the bill there is a provision for $500 million for each year for the next 3 years.

Mr. THOMAS. That is the $1.5 billion that I referred to.

Mr. McDONOUGH. That is right. If the bureau downtown makes commitments to cities for urban renewal to the extent of the total amount for the next 14 months, the hands of the Appropriations Committee are tied, are they not?

Mr. THOMAS. The gentleman is right. In other words, the present authorization is not touched. We do not attempt to do that. That would not be right.

Mr. Chairman, I ask for a vote.

Mr. RAINS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

You know, Mr. Chairman, when I heard my distinguished friend—and I love AL THOMAS—say "I ask for a vote," and when he was referring to this as just a little, simple amendment, it reminded me of what happened in Alabama one time. I was out on a fishing bank fishing, and saw a little, teeny boy, and he had a fish about that long. That fish was just wiggling and wiggling and wiggling and the little boy said, "Hold still, little fish, I ain't going to do nothing to you except gut you."

What my good friend from Texas offers here would not do anything to housing, but just a minute, once you set the pattern, you have done something. It would not do anything to the housing programs except defeat them, that is all. Some people here may think that would be a good thing.

But I cannot help thinking—and I am looking squarely at my farm friends from the Deep South—and I am one of them, too—just how they would feel about the Commodity Credit Corporation; or just exactly how they would feel about REA; how would they feel about many, many programs—and that includes tobacco in North Carolina under the Commodity Credit Corporation—just how would they feel if we were to cut off the help that has been coming these many years through a public-debt transaction?

Mr. Chairman, I hope the gentleman from Texas does not leave. A friend of mine just handed me a speech that he made on May 18. You know, somebody once said that the best thing to do is never to write a book, and I found out that the best thing to do is never to make a speech, especially if they record it. Now this is what happened on May 18 when we had the space bill up. The gentleman from California [Mr. SISK] had the floor and he yielded to Mr. THOMAS. He said:

> I will ask my distinguished friend from California—

You must remember that he had offered a similar type legislation, not quite as hamstringing—

> if it is not a fact that the only purpose this language can have—it is brand new language—we do not have it in any other bill outside of this space bill and we have been spending $40 billion a year without it—is to hamstring the administrator?

And the distinguished gentleman from Texas continued:

> It is bound to slow him up, and if time is of the essence that is the way to slow him up 3 to 4 months out of each year.

You know if you are going to slow up missiles, and you will no matter what you tack this on, you are going to slow up the program and if it is not good for space, why we have to have houses before we can fly around the moon. We have to have houses before we can have space travel. So we come up here with an amendment aimed at housing and housing only.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAINS. I yield.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. I am sure that if this amendment is adopted, the next step will be a direct loan housing program for the veterans, and I certainly hope this amendment is defeated.

Mr. RAINS. The gentleman from Texas who is the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs knows that that is correct, and that it would be in the orderly process of things to fasten it on to every single bill. What I wish we could do would be to

once and for all to bring House Joint Resolution 161 out of the Committee on Rules and lay it on the floor of the House and let us get this bugbear over once and for all instead of just slipping it in and letting it go by and I am looking right in the eye of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules whom I love, but he did not hear me complain about that $4½ billion public debt transaction and how fast it went through the Committee on Rules. So I say to you that we are here at the meat in the coconut and we are picking out housing including the old folks, the poor folks, the college boys and girls and everybody in America, the slum people and we fasten it on that—and it is a bad idea, I will say to my distinguished friend.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for 2 additional minutes.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, I must object.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, what this amendment will do is to stop the backdoor approach to the Treasury of the United States. We are today giving various Government agencies authority to borrow billions of dollars through the Treasury of the United States and to spend those billions of dollars without adequate control by the Congress of the United States. I, for one, Mr. Chairman, certainly believe in human values, but I believe the human values in the United States are absolutely dependent upon a sound fiscal system. If you do not believe it, think back to 1929 when our economy collapsed and money values in this country took a tumble. We did not talk about houses then. Human beings were standing in breadlines holding out their hands for bread. Men and women were standing on street corners of our cities selling apples to try to get money to buy the necessities of life. I am not a prophet of doom because I do not believe there is any necessity for a situation of that kind ever to occur in this country again. But I do want to tell you this, that there are clouds on the horizon today that should cause us to stop, look, and listen. The Treasury is having difficulty today financing the bonds authorized by these backdoor bills. It is a matter of common knowledge that the interest rates have increased tremendously which is increasing the expenditures of our Government. Furthermore, even with the increased interest rates, recently the Treasury had trouble in financing one of its bond issues. If the people of the United States stop buying these bonds, then where are your human values going? They are going down the drain just as they did in 1929.

I remember very distinctly before the economic collapse of 1929, a very famous Virginian, the Honorable Carter Glass, on several occasions issued warnings. They laughed at him. His own people were talking about defeating him for the Senate because he had the courage to stand up and tell them what might happen. But it did happen just as he had predicted.

I certainly am not making any predictions today, but I am saying to you that we should take warning from the difficulties which the Treasury Department has experienced in its recent efforts to finance the Federal debt.

We as Members of the Congress should not surrender our right to control the expenditures for the various purposes for which we provide money. It has been said that this amendment will gut the program. I say emphatically it will not gut the program. We are proposing that this program be handled exactly like the $40 billion defense program. It has not gutted that. We are proposing that it be handled exactly as the $4 billion foreign aid program. It has not gutted that, why should it gut this housing program?

A proposal was made the other day—I have before me a copy of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD containing proposed amendments to be offered in the other body to the foreign aid bill. And what do they propose? They propose that we give the Development Loan Fund the right to borrow from the United States Treasury a billion and a half a year for 5 years to lend to other countries. If we keep that up who knows where this country will end.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the concern that the chairman of the Subcommittee on Housing expressed a moment ago. His concern is whether this is going to slow down the program on housing. But the new bill, the one that is now under consideration, provides authorization of $100 million for elderly housing. In other words, if he talks about slowing down the construction of housing in other respects, that has actually provided for the slowing down of the elderly housing feature in this bill. The substitute that we voted down a moment ago had no limitation and did not require authorization for elderly housing. That is a contradiction of his own statement.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield briefly?

Mr. McDONOUGH. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS. I am afraid our distinguished friend from Alabama is a little bit confused about the Space Agency. It has not the slightest connection with the subject under consideration. The point involved was that in providing funds for the Space Agency the legislation authorized all the details of how they should spend this money, every quarter, every penny that they spend. This program is being authorized now; it cannot slow it up in the slightest. All you are dealing with is the method of how they get money, whether they come up here to the Congress to get it or get it from the Treasury.

My friend the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE] is also confused a little bit. The program of lending to veterans has been going on for years and nobody has ever attempted to cut it, and certainly there is no intention of cutting it.

Mr. McDONOUGH. I think the committee ought to realize that any cut we authorize in the committee bill we have under consideration certainly applies to the elderly housing section. I wanted to bring that point out. I wanted to make the point when the gentleman was on the floor. If he feels that the amendment of the gentleman from Texas is proper he should then proceed to amend the section of his own bill to remove the authorization of $100 million for elderly housing.

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that if the committee is to have the power of life and death over legislation that would result if this amendment is adopted, because the power of the Appropriations Committee has not been greatly enhanced, at least such a committee should be pretty responsive to the electorate of this country; and I think it is worth pointing out that the Appropriations Committee is one of three on which the committee ratio did not change probably in the past election.

What we are being asked to do here, it seems to me, is to delegate the jurisdiction of the legislative committees that are responsive to a committee which is not quite so responsive because it is one of three on which the ratio was not changed.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ASHLEY. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. SISK. I simply want to call the Committee's attention to a rather long series of programs under the Veterans' Administration that would not have been possible and would not have gone into effect probably under the proposal offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS].

I further wish to reiterate that in his answer to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. RAINS] regarding the space program, there is an analogy here. I certainly have a very high regard for the gentlemen of the Appropriations Committee because we are all under the gun when we start criticizing this very powerful committee, but involved there was a controversy in which they felt that the legislative Committee on Science and Astronautics should not have the right to determine what the Space Agency might have in the way of funds and that the Appropriations Committee was the only one that should have anything to say about it. Of course, if we carry that to its ultimate conclusion, we might as well go home and turn the situation over to the Appropriations Committee. I say that with all the kindness in the world toward my good friends on the Appropriations Committee.

Here as some of the things that would not have been possible in connection with the veterans' program and in all probability would not have gone into effect under the amendments which the gentleman from Texas has proposed.

Grants for specially equipped automobiles for disabled veterans.

Compensation for service-connected disabilities for veterans of the Spanish American War, World War I, World War II, and the Korean conflict, and peacetime service.

Compensation for non-service-connected disabilities, World War I, World War II, and Korean conflict.

Hospitalization service for certain veterans of any war or peacetime service.

Domiciliary car service for certain veterans of any war or peacetime.

Outpatient medical treatment for veterans of any war or peacetime service.

Outpatient dental treatment.

Provide feeding or treatment in the use of prosthetics for veterans of any war or peacetime service.

Free medical examination in connection with applications of other Federal benefits.

Furnishing, repairing, or replacing certain aids for blind veterans entitled to service-connected benefits.

GI bill education and training benefits for veterans of World War II and Korea.

Vocational rehabilitation for disabled veterans.

War orphan education assistance program for children of certain disabled veterans.

GI loan program.

Direct loan program.

Grants of assistance for specially adapted wheel chair homes.

Unemployment compensation benefits furnished veterans of World War II and Korea, administered by Department of Labor.

Mustering out payment of World War II and Korean veterans—administered by the service department.

Guarantee of premiums of commercial life insurance for any person now on active duty.

GI life insurance for veterans.

Dependency and indemnity compensation for service-connected debts on or after January 1957.

Compensation for service-connected debts prior to January 1957.

Compensation for non-service-connected debts of wives and children of veterans.

Reimbursement of burial expenses not to exceed $150.

Furnishing burial flags to the veteran's survivors.

Six months death gratuity for survivors of veterans who died on active duty administered by service department.

Furnishing the headstone or grave marker—administered by Department of the Army.

Burial of veterans and immediate members of their families in national cemetery—administered by Department of Army and Interior.

Mr. Chairman, in conclusion may I say that if these amendments are adopted, as proposed by my good friend from Texas, it will represent a backward step in the legislative processes of this great body. I firmly believe it will set a precedent which will destroy many of the programs that are so vital and important to the American people. I fully agree with the statement made by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. RAINS] that this has to do with an issue which should be faced as a separate problem.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, perhaps an apology should be offered for bringing up this old, old question of the lack of necessity for private homes if the folks cannot use them. A page just brought down from the Press Gallery a release of the National Small Business Association which reads this way:

"Jimmy Hoffa's threat of a nationwide strike if big unions are placed under antitrust laws certainly emphasizes the imperative need for just such action by the Congress if the American people and their economy are to be protected."

So said Harry E. Brinkman, Cincinnati lithographer and president of the National Small Business Men's Association, today in proposing exactly what such legislation should accomplish.

"Essentially, Congress should return control of labor unions, including collective bargaining, to the local unions where it belongs," stated Mr. Brinkman.

He based his proposals on a study of union monopoly power and its needed legal curbs as featured in the National Small Business Men's Association's current issue of the "Small Business Bulletin." The study for the association was made by Washington attorney John Kilcullen, who represented the Commerce Department on the Attorney General's Committee To Study the Antitrust Laws.

Warning that today's monopoly control of the Nation's labor supply in the hands of a few professional managers poses a much greater threat to the Nation's economic welfare and national security than did the industrial trusts of 70 years ago, Mr. Brinkman suggests immediate legislation which would:

1. Prevent centralized control of bargaining policies by national or international unions and return these functions to the local union level. This would limit pattern bargaining directed by a few national union managers.

2. Prohibit strikes and other forms of coercive action carried out by two or more unions as part of a prearranged plan to impose concerted wage demands and other contract conditions on industries affecting interstate commerce and trade.

3. Prohibit union-imposed restrictions on the use of products and improved methods of work performance or price-fixing arrived at through agreement—either voluntary or coerced—with individual members or groups of employers.

4. Allow local unions to continue use of their traditional economic weapons in bargaining for wages and other employment conditions so long as their use is not part of a concerted plan or combination.

Under such legislation, Mr. Brinkman emphasized that unions' traditional economic weapons in support of legitimate union objectives would be fully preserved and protected while the big power combinations of unions would be broken up—just as the big corporate trusts of the 1890's were broken up under antitrust provisions in the Sherman Act.

"And," he added, "union members themselves would be liberated by such antitrust legislation from being treated as commodities to be bought and sold in the marketplace as a means of creating strangling economic power for such professionals as Jimmy Hoffa of the Teamsters Union."

Probably no single segment of the American community, other than the consumer, is more victimized or hard hit by the present labor monopoly than the Nation's 4.3 million small businessmen who watch wage patterns which they must meet—and over which they have no say—bargained out at the national conference tables, Mr. Brinkman emphasized.

"For this reason, and by an overwhelming 97.3 percent 'yes' vote in a grassroots poll of small businessmen just taken, our association is urging that Congress place unions under the jurisdiction of antitrust laws," Mr. Brinkman concluded.

That brings up again the question of who writes legislation. Is it the unions, is it Jimmy Hoffa? And talking about antitrust legislation applying to labor organizations, such legislation was introduced several years ago, and again this year, by me but no attention was paid to it. Perhaps the best thing we could have is just a little sample of the Jimmy Hoffa dictation. Let him call a nationwide transportation strike, do what he said he will do, cut off all transportation. He is the boss. And Jimmy Hoffa has stated he is going to run the country. What does the steel strike amount to compared to what Jimmy can do—'nothing'. And, bless your dear hearts, I cannot determine why the Justice Department does not put him in jail. If they do not get him in jail pretty soon, that is within a year or two he will clean up on Reuther, and that would not make me too unhappy—then we might give our undivided attention to Jimmy. But this transportation strike will hurt everyone. When Jimmy goes into action and cuts off transportation, including with Bridges' aid water transportation, of course, including the ships coming in from other countries, and he cuts off the lights and the water supply including that for drinking—when he cuts that off and refuses to transport food, what will we do about it? Is it not about time to do something definite. This is Hoffa's announcement that he is dictator.

Personally, I hope Hoffa starts in without delay because it will then convince this Congress he has some of the power he says he has. When we cannot get a drink of water, when we cannot turn the lights on, we cannot do anything we must do, when we cannot get the things we must have or do the things that must be done if we are to live, perhaps we will act. It was not too long ago that we had a transportation tie-up right here in Washington. Hoffa will bring about a situation where we cannot get to the office, the gasoline station cannot get gasoline so we can run our automobiles and we have to walk to Congress, our work, shop, office, or place of employment or business, then back home. Then it will be realized maybe that Jimmie is a menace to each of us as an individual as well as a group.

It is just possible that if we read what Kilcullen has to say about the need—as time and again since 1936 I have tried to tell the House—effective legislation will be written and enforced. But read

on. Here is what was written in the May issue of Small Business Bulletin:

WITH LOCAL AUTONOMY GONE AND BARGAINING DEMANDS NOW FORMULATED AT THE NATIONAL LEVEL, LABOR MONOPOLY POWER IN THE HANDS OF PROFESSIONAL MANAGERS TODAY WIELDS A UNIFIED FORCE WITH ALMOST UNLIMITED POWER OVER ALL INDUSTRIES—THAT'S WHY UNREGULATED AND UNCURBED LABOR MONOPOLY THREATENS OUR FREE ECONOMY SYSTEM

The problem of monopoly, which Congress sought to dispose of by enacting the Sherman Act 70 years ago, has reappeared in a form quite as threatening as that in which it appeared during the late stages of the 19th century.

Then it was the monopoly of the large corporations and the industrial trusts. Now it is labor monopoly. The effect is the same—monopoly prices. And the victim is the same—the consumer.

LABOR EVEN MORE THREATENING

In many respects labor monopoly is far more threatening than the business combinations of the last century. It is more extensive and more powerful. And, because labor is the most important element in costs, its effect upon consumer prices is greater.

Where industrial monopolies regulated the prices of only a few commodities, labor monopoly has its impact upon the price of all commodities. Where the business monopolies were limited to certain industries or areas, labor monopoly wields a unified nationwide force with almost unlimited power over all industries.

Most important of all, labor monopoly is gradually undermining the value of money, a process which—unless curbed—can eventually destroy not only economic welfare but national security as well.

Unfortunately, the labor monopoly subject, and what can or should be done about it has been clouded by emotional and irrelevant arguments. As a result, clear understanding of the subject has been lacking. Spokesmen for organized labor insist that the term "monopoly" can be used only in relation to business and commercial functions—that it has no valid applicability to unions or any of their activities.

LABOR CLAIMS IMMUNITY

By reason of this, they argue, it is unrealistic to consider any union activities or practices within the context of the antitrust laws. Let us proceed to examine whether this is true or not.

Monopoly power may be defined as the ability to set prices and outputs of particular commodities and services at levels which are significantly different from those that would be established by the interaction of the forces of supply and demand in a free market.

MONOPOLIST SEEKS SHELTER

In normal circumstances, monopoly power cannot be exercised unless the monopolist is in some way insulated or sheltered from competitive pressures and the checks and balances provided by natural economic forces.

In the case of business firms which manufacture or sell a product, such insulation is difficult to achieve. If they attempt to set or maintain the price of a particular commodity at an artificially high level the consumer will seek, and probably find, a suitable substitute.

Thus would-be monopolists find themselves in control of a product which has no market. To avoid this they must attempt to prevent the entry of rival products or rival businesses into the competitive market. But here they are stymied by the antitrust laws. Any efforts in this direction are prohibited and subject to severe penalties.

Labor unions, on the other hand, are effectively insulated from competitive pressures because those who require a supply of labor cannot find, except in rare instances, a suitable substitute. They have no alternative than to pay the price demanded by the union which supplies or controls the necessary labor.

Further, by virtue of their immunity from the antitrust laws, unions can protect their control over labor supply and labor prices by preventing the introduction of new and cheaper methods or products whose prices are forced up by increased union labor costs.

TEAMSTERS THREATEN TROUBLE

A case in point is the action taken by the Teamsters Union to prevent piggy-back transportation of truck trailers by rail. This method was developed in cooperation between truck lines and railroads to provide lower freight costs where long-haul shipments are involved.

The Teamsters viewed this cheaper method of transportation as a threat to their control of labor supply in the motor freight industry. Accordingly they notified trucking firms that any firm making use of piggy-back arrangements would face labor trouble with the Teamsters.

When a few trucking firms ignored this threat, the union directed its members to refrain from loading the trailers onto the railroad flat cars and engaged in picketing to prevent others from loading the trailers. Efforts to obtain legal relief from this high-handed interference with interstate commerce were rendered futile when the Supreme Court held that the Teamsters' boycott could not be enjoined.

If any business firm or firms in the transportation industry were to attempt to impose any such restraints upon the piggy-back arrangements they would unquestionably be prosecuted under the antitrust laws.

OTHER EXAMPLES CITED

Many examples of similar unions practices can be found in the building construction industry. There, unions have been successful in pushing wages of the bricklayers, plumbers, plasterers and other crafts to a higher point than almost any other group of industrial workers.

To protect these high wage levels the unions have used various devices to keep competitive products and methods of construction off the market. The Carpenters Union has, for example, outlawed the use of various types of prefabricated door and window sash, wall sections and modular units. These would greatly increase efficiency and cut costs in building construction.

The Plumbers Union has barred the use of plastic pipe, a new and improved product, which would more than cut in half the amount of plumbing labor involved in home construction and reduce costs of construction appreciably.

In some areas the unions closely regulate the entry of firms into a certain line of business, decide what projects a particular firm may be permitted to bid on, and set a minimum amount for any given bid.

In the printing industry the unions have prevented the use of automatic equipment which would permit cheaper and more efficient printing of books, magazines and newspapers.

All of these restrictions have, of course, the objective of preventing competition with the unions' established control over the available labor supply. Needless to say the cost to the consumer is enormous.

Organized labor's apologists willingly admit that unions utilize these various devices to prevent or neutralize competitive factors. But they argue that: (1) Workers are justified in taking these collective measures to obtain the highest possible wages and preserve their opportunities for employment; and (2) labor is not a commodity. Consequently the control of labor supply is not to be equated with the control of the supply or price of a commercial product or service.

The first part of this argument begs the question as to whether any segment of society is justified in taking self-help measures at the expense of all other segments. The producers of a commodity could, by the same token, argue that they have a right to make an adequate profit from their efforts. And, where necessary, they should be permitted to protect their product from price-cutting competition.

In a practical sense the businessman's argument is just as logical and morally justified as that of the union. But in each case, the result is the same—curtailment of competition and higher prices to the public.

IS LABOR A COMMODITY?

The argument that "the labor of a human being is not a commodity or article of commerce" originally found expression in section 6 of the Clayton Act amendments to the Sherman Act adopted by Congress in 1914. The implication was that any attempt to apply the antitrust laws to unions would amount to putting union members in the same category as so many sacks of flour or pairs of shoes or loaves of bread. To even suggest such a notion, the reasoning goes, demonstrates a disregard of human values.

Actually, this argument is more emotional than real. Admittedly, human labor should not be regarded as a commodity or article of commerce. But there is no rational relationship between this premise and the proposition that unions, as organizations, should or should not be subject to the antitrust laws. It is ridiculous to suggest that putting antitrust restraints upon the union would place its members in the category of commodities to be bought and sold in the marketplace.

In actual fact, it would be more accurate to say that just the opposite result would occur—that many of the present practices whereby unions exploit the workers and sell their services to those who can be induced or forced to buy them would be outlawed.

It is a right of workers, individually and collectively, to proffer or withhold their labor as they see fit. But in the vast majority of situations where union economic power is employed to bring about restraints of trade or to force unrealistic or uneconomic costs on production of commodities, the choice of the individual worker to proffer or withhold his labor is not involved. In most such situations the individual union members have little, if any, voice in determining the price to be charged for their labor, or in the determination as to whether their employer is to be permitted or restrained from handling a particular type of product or doing business with another employer.

UNIONS SELL LABOR

These decisions are, for the most part, the decisions of those who manage the union affairs. Consequently, these decisions and the actions which flow from them must be treated as actions of the union as an entity apart from the human beings whose labor is being proffered or withheld.

In this context it becomes apparent that the labor of human beings has become a commodity or article of commerce because the union itself is engaged in the business of trading and selling this commodity. And when the union engages in monopoly practices and restraints of trade, it is not necessarily acting for, or in the interests of, those whose labor is being bought and sold.

The idea of a labor union as an association spontaneously formed by individual employees to equalize their bargaining power and protect themselves from exploitation by a powerful employer is as obsolete as the horsecar.

LOCAL AUTONOMY LOST

This concept was true in years past when unions were local in character. That is, they were composed of workers in a particular area, or plant, or trade who had common interests and objectives.

In that setting the workers had a direct and immediate interest in their union, and the union had many of the aspects of a genuine fraternal self-help organization. The local union formulated its own collective bargaining demands, carried on the bargaining and, when agreement could not be reached, made the decision on whether or not to engage in a strike.

Although the local union was affiliated with a national or international union, this affiliation was a loose one. On policy matters the local union was autonomous and independent.

During the prodigious union growth of the past 25 or 30 years, local union autonomy has long since been thrown overboard. The center of gravity shifted to the headquarters of the national or international union.

There, the major decisions are made and carried out by a group of professional managers. They have taken over the functions of formulating bargaining demands—even conducting negotiations for the local unions.

In many industries the national union negotiates a pattern contract with a major company. The terms of this contract then become the obligatory terms for all local unions and employers throughout the industry. Decisions to strike are likewise made by the national managers with local members having no choice but to comply.

This transfer of the decisionmaking functions from the local members to the national officers has caused, quite naturally, a marked drop in interest of rank-and-file members in union affairs.

For the most part the union member no longer feels a close identification with the union. Studies of union loyalty attitudes have shown a high percentage of members having little, if any, interest in the union other than its periodic efforts to get higher wages, and a generally prevalent feeling of skepticism and lack of trust toward the union officers and their motives. This lack of rank-and-file interest is demonstrated most strikingly by low attendance at union meetings.

COMPULSORY MEMBERSHIP VITAL

In the face of this sharp decline in interest among rank-and-file members, gradual disintegration of many unions would have been inevitable if the union professionals had not had the foresight to demand and obtain compulsory membership provisions in their collective bargaining contracts with industry.

Under these so-called union security clauses the workers are obligated to become, and remain, dues-paying union members as a condition of retaining their jobs. Union managers argue, and have been able to convince the public, that such clauses are necessary to eliminate "free riding" by workers who share the benefits of union collective bargaining activities without paying the cost. But their actual purpose has been to prevent large-scale defections by workers who no longer have any sympathy for, or interest in, the union. This also explains why the professional unionists have thrown almost their total power and resources into the fight against the right-to-work laws.

In the process of change from local union autonomy to the centralized power of the national union, other changes have taken place in regard to union objectives.

The "bread and butter" union objectives of Samuel Gompers have quite clearly been displaced by a broad program of changes in the social and economic system.

The new union managers, almost to a man, maintain no strong sympathy for the competitive enterprise system. They strongly prefer a planned economy. Abundant evidence of this is available from the legislative proposals supported by the AFL-CIO. These include demands for heavier taxes on sources of investment capital, heavy Government spending in the fields of public power and public housing, Federal aid to education, rigid Federal farm subsidies and controls, Federal regulation of natural gas prices and many other programs which would expand the areas of governmental regulation and planning. The ultimate goal is complete Government control over industrial programs, production and prices.

The accomplishment of that ultimate goal has been slowed down to some extent because the American people still are too strongly committed to the competitive enterprise system. The most effective means of overcoming this public resistance and to hasten progress toward the planned economy is to break down the competitive enterprise system and destroy public confidence in it. The most effective tools for accomplishing this are the anticompetitive practices and uneconomic wage costs imposed upon industry by labor unions.

SOLUTION OFFERED

It is futile and unreasonable to expect that labor unions will ever voluntarily, in the public interest, forego their demands for higher and higher wages. Nor when these demands are thwarted by competing forces, will they forego the temptation to strike down the competition. Only when legal restraints are imposed and enforced by the Government will there be any adequate protection of the public interest.

Effective legislation in this field would have to do three things:

1. Prevent centralized control of collective bargaining policies by national or international unions, and return these functions to the local union level.

2. Prohibit strikes and other forms of coercive action carried out as part of a prearranged plan or combination between two or more unions to impose concerted wage demands and other contract conditions upon industries affecting interstate commerce and trade.

3. Prohibit union imposed restrictions upon the use of products and improved methods of work performance, limitations on production, price-fixing, and similar arrangements arrived at through agreement—either voluntary or coerced—with individual employers or group of employers.

Simultaneously, it should be made clear that where an individual union engages in any action in the form of strikes, picketing, or boycotts as a means of obtaining or enforcing a demand for wages or other conditions of employment—and such action is not a part of any concerted plan, combination, or arrangement with any other union—it would not come within the scope of any antitrust or antimonopoly restrictions even where it may result in an interruption of interstate trade or commerce.

Under such legislation the ability of local unions to use their traditional economic weapons in support of legitimate union objectives would be fully preserved and protected. But the big power combinations of unions would be broken up, just as the big corporation trusts of the 1890's were broken up by the Sherman Act.

It should be apparent to those who have a grasp of the economic force now building up within our country and throughout the world, that enactment of such legislation is our only hope of staving off ruinous inflation and the drabness of the welfare state economy that inevitably lies in store for the next generation.

Will somebody, a colleague, tell me why it is that the Congress will not cut off extortion and the apparently unlimited power that some of these union officials have and use? Somebody just write me a nice note. Do not sign it. Just send it to the office and give me the reason why we will not protect the individual—no—not even the union employee?

Tell me, please, and I will repeat it from the floor.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the method of obtaining funds for carrying out the provisions of this legislation has been for a long time provided by public debt transaction. The Home Owners Loan Act in 1933 was financed in that manner. The Commodity Credit Corporation is financed that way. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation was financed that way. The REA has gotten its funds in that manner. There are a host of other agencies of the Government that have obtained their funds by public debt transaction. It has been criticized that recently you voted for a bill that provided by public debt transaction for more than $4 billion of potential liability, most of which probably will never be called for, for the performance of the functions of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development and the International Monetary Fund. We made a tentative agreement through our representatives with 68 other nations that we would increase our holdings in those organizations. It was necessary to assure these nations that we could carry out our agreements and that the money would be forthcoming if these agreements were ratified by the Congress.

It would not be advisable under the circumstances now, without further hearings, to prevent the continuance of this method of obtaining funds. It seems to me it is changing the rules in the middle of the game. We followed the precedent for 30 years before this provision was put in the bill. If you do not want this method continued in the future, have a hearing on it, and pass general legislation. Let the people and the Congress, and the world know what our policies are. It certainly is unjust and inadvisable to pick out one bill that has followed the precedent of years, by which method the money has been obtained for this legislation, and say you cannot obtain these funds now or in the future by this method. The Committee on Appropriations is not bound to make appropriations that are authorized by law. They frequently use their own judgment as to what shall be necessary for the program. If you want to put your whole confidence and faith and hope and your power in the hands of two committees, you can do it. I think you ought to be free to legislate as you please. I do not think you ought to be circumscribed in your duties.

I hope you will vote this amendment down.

Mr. RAINS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 20 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MARSHALL].

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Chairman, I am one Member of this body who has supported all housing legislation since I have been a Member of this body. I am going to support this bill. I am going to support this bill whether the amendment offered by my good friend from Texas is adopted or not. I am going to support the amendment of my good friend from Texas. And I am going to support the amendment not because I am a member of the Committee on Appropriations but because I think it is necessary in the interest of the Congress of the United States to maintain control of the purse strings.

Time after time in my service on the Committee on Appropriations I have had Members come to me and ask me to intercede with departments of the executive branch of this Government. Time after time the work that we have done did not show on the record, because we have been able to impress upon the executive departments of the Government that they needed to make some accounting of some of the things that they did. There were numerous injustices done because of a lack of accounting.

It is a fine thing, for example, that the State Department comes before the committee of which my friend, the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY], is chairman, to justify their items in their appropriation bill. It is a fine thing that the Secretary of Agriculture comes before my committee to justify some of the requests which he has submitted in the bill; not from the standpoint of what it means to the Committee on Appropriations. We do not get any glory out of it. It is not in the record. It never shows in the record. But it maintains a responsibility and a respect, if you will, for the Congress of the United States.

We talk about this back-door approach and all of those things that go with it. How can you maintain respectable fiscal accounting in this country with a back-door approach? It is beyond my comprehension.

I repeat, Mr. Chairman, I am going to support this bill whether the amendment of the gentleman from Texas is approved or not. I think the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas will improve the bill and bring greater respect for the housing programs in the country. I think it is in the long-time benefit of the housing program, and I am going to support it on that basis. I think that we in the Congress of the United States have a responsibility in dealing with the executive department to maintain the fiscal responsibility of this Government and certainly the respect of some of the people who spend our money.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL].

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, I take this time to ask a question of the chairman of my subcommittee, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. RAINS].

On page 117 of the bill there is a new section, in which there is authorized to be appropriated $100 million in a new housing for the elderly program. My question is this—I ask this, after having heard vehement denunciations of the appropriations procedure, because it would destroy college housing, it would destroy urban renewal, and then later remarks that it would slow up the programs:

Why was $100 million appropriation required in this instance rather than the same procedures for urban renewal and college housing? Was it to slow it up? Was it to destroy the program?

Mr. RAINS. I will say to the gentleman that while I do not have many attributes as a legislator, I try to have the attribute of being practical. I know when I have difficulty and I realize what kind of difficulty I will have with a brandnew program not yet and never before authorized so far as moving it out of the Committee on Rules. For this reason, because it is a new and different program—and I am not talking about programs that have been a part of the legislative history of this Congress for many years—I have taken this position. In this particular instance, I bowed my head and said it is necessary, in my judgment, for the old people of this country to get this type of housing and in order to do it, I bow to the present situation of asking for an appropriation. The practical reality of the situation is why I insist that it be put in as an appropriation. It is a brandnew program, as the gentleman knows.

Mr. WIDNALL. I understand that thoroughly, but again I would like to ask the gentleman from Alabama if this does not destroy housing for the elderly program as proposed by you, if you have to go to the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. RAINS. I would hope it would not destroy it. I cannot even imagine the Committee on Appropriations saying to people who are on social security with less than $1,800 a year and no place to live and unable to pay rent on FHA houses, "We cannot give you a dollar." I realize that old folks' housing ought to have a little bit more, what shall I say, glamor and romance, but in the desire to get something done—that is why I put it in.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment and in defense of the Committee on Appropriations. From what the proponents of this amendment have said on this floor in the last 15 minutes, you would think the Committee on Appropriations appropriated money. As a matter of fact, the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency said just that—that the Committee on Appropriations might not appropriate money for this thing. You all know, and it is not necessary for me to repeat it to you, that the Committee on Appropriations cannot do one thing—they cannot appropriate money and they cannot prevent the appropriation of money unless that is the will of the majority of this House. You have an opportunity on every annual appropriation bill that comes up to express your will. We have had a Committee on Appropriations for a long time. This gimmick is comparatively new, but this Congress lived and this country lived and prospered and grew great for 150 years under the old constitutional method of appropriations through the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a suggestion?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. TABER. This amendment would cure the defect in the bill because it requires an annual review by the Committee on Appropriations of what is going to be spent and that is a good thing, too.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I called attention just a little while ago, when I spoke earlier today on this bill, to one provision in this bill, and I am going to do it again, if I have the time. Turn to page 130 and read where you are proposing—I might almost say the dictates of the Committee on Banking and Currency—as long as committees are being criticized—you are proposing to authorize the President of the United States to authorize appropriations in unlimited amounts. Did you know that? Some of you heard me say it a while ago. If you do not know it, look at page 130 and see how crazy we can get, where it says that this appropriation for urban renewal shall be limited to $1 billion—and here is the provision—unless authorized by the President. If you are going to pass this kind of legislation, let us all go on home and send a proxy to Washington and thus save the Government a lot of money.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD].

Mr. RAINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield.

Mr. RAINS. I would say, if I may, to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia that he did not read the section, but he just read the part he wanted to read, and what he did read came out of the administration bill. That is what we took out of the administration's bill. If he will look at it a little more and will check with his friends across the aisle, they might explain that to him a little better.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his contribution. I spoke once before on this bill today and I read 21 programs into the RECORD that have been authorized by the Congress and which involve debt transactions or guarantees of loans. Those programs include the Commodity Credit Corporation, the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation, the Federal National Mortgage Association, Rural Electrification Administration, the St. Lawrence Seaway, and I could go on with many others that this House has approved and has authorized the issuance of bonds.

In the main these bonds are repayable. I want to be fair with the House and say that there are provisions in all of these programs which say that if the bonds should default in the full amount that the Treasury would pick up the amount which is defaulted; and, of course, under

this bill there could be some expenditure, but in the main these programs have been self-financing, and in some instances they have actually made money for the Government.

There is another area covered in these 21 programs, and that is the right to authorize contract obligations. This was used in the Defense Department quite extensively. It is used in public and private housing; it is used in the guarantee of veterans' loans; it is used in the matter of loans for slum clearance, the use of the Government's credit to guarantee these bonds and debentures.

This type of amendment was not placed on the 21 programs which the Congress in its wisdom over the years authorized time and again, and there has been no evidence of abuse as a result of this kind of legislating. I say to you these are the things you must consider.

The gentlemen on the Appropriations Committee make a good plea. If I were on the Appropriations Committee I probably would want to get all the power I could; but this Congress has some power, too, in the matter of setting up policies and programs.

I ask you to defeat the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. THOMPSON] is recognized.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I oppose the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS] is recognized.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, let me talk briefly to my colleagues here and just try to talk a little bit of common horsesense. There is nothing to get excited about.

I love my good friend from Alabama. He says this is going to kill the program, and that is just not true. I voted for the gentleman's bill, I voted against the substitute, and, as I said to my friend from Minnesota, I am going to vote for the bill regardless of the outcome of this vote.

All that is involved here is how we handle appropriations. If you will forgive a personal reference, this will come before the gentleman from Illinois and the rest of us on independent offices, and I do not think any Member has said they have suffered too much at our hands.

My good friend from California read a list of veterans' items and said they might be in danger. My friend was confused, because the money for every item he read off, education, pensions, and compensation, and all that, is appropriated every year, and that is all we are asking you to do here, to have the money appropriated by the Congress and not let the agency go to the back door of the Treasury.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield.

Mr. SISK. I believe the statement of the gentleman from California was to the effect that these programs started as a public debt transaction and may have been adversely affected had they been forced to get their money through the appropriations process. Would the gentleman agree with that?

Mr. THOMAS. Has anybody in this House ever been unfriendly to the veterans' interests? Why, of course not.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield.

Mr. HAYS. I just wonder if the gentleman offered this same amendment to the Export-Import Bank bill, and if he did not, why he did not?

Mr. THOMAS. No, I did not. The gentleman is right. I cannot keep up with my good friends on the Banking and Currency Committee 100 percent; to do it would keep me going 24 hours a day. These brethren are able, and lovable, and quick on their feet, and quick witted, too.

Something was said about the Space Agency. Let us straighten that out. Do you know that every quarter the Space Agency has is appropriated? All you are doing in these amendments is to say that Congress should appropriate the money; that is all.

Mr. Chairman, let us retrieve back the appropriating power of the Congress and put it in Congress' hands. That is where your people want it. They voted for you to handle the purse strings; now, let us handle them.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, there is no more able or adroit debater in the Congress than my friend from Texas [Mr. THOMAS]. Unless you think objectively, he is liable to lull you to sleep and in your period of sleep convince you to do something that would be responsive to his wishes but would not be carrying out your own views.

There is nothing new in this question before the Committee at this time. We settled it in the airport bill. We had it up at that time. We had the same question in connection with direct loans to veterans. It is involved in the Commodity Credit Corporation where $14,500 million has been authorized by the Congress, where they can issue bonds with provisions for the Treasury, if necessary, to pay the bonds. That is a direct debt transaction.

We do not see any of our friends when legislation comes up relating to the Commodity Credit Corporation offering this sort of amendment, particularly those who come from farm areas. We from the cities appreciate the necessity of direct debt transactions in the case of the Commodity Credit Corporation so that we would not offer such an amendment and we would oppose such an amendment if offered.

There is the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation, the National Mortgage Association, the Housing and Home Finance Administration, the International Cooperation Administration, and there is the Rural Electrification.

The Congress can work its will. We are working the will of the Congress now. The committee has reported out a bill with certain provisions. The gentleman from Texas has offered an amendment. So we have the opportunity of working the will of the House now, whether we will follow the course in connection with these important activities as provided by the House bill or we will adopt the amendments offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS]. So the House is going to work its will.

Mr. Chairman, I respect the Committee on Appropriations. I realize the power of the Committee on Appropriations, I realize that money is power, and I have felt the impact of it. But I also believe that the standing committees of the House of Representatives should not be put in a subordinate position to the Committee on Appropriations.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendments offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS].

The question was taken, and on a division (demanded by Mr. THOMAS) there were—ayes 135, noes 145.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. THOMAS and Mr. RAINS.

The Committee again divided and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 149, noes 145.

So the amendments were agreed to.

Mr. RAINS. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. WALTER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (S. 57) to extend and amend laws relating to the provision and improvement of housing and the renewal of urban communities, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. COOLEY. 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 North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, the amendment to the agricultural appropriations bill submitted by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], and which has just been approved by the House, would utterly and completely destroy the farm program—if it becomes law and accomplishes what it proposes to do.

The injury and the hurt, the privations from loss of income, would fall heaviest upon the family farms of America.

Certainly I am not carrying the torch for large producers. We have more small farmers in my State of North Carolina than in any other State of America. We have more people living on the farm in North Carolina than in any other State. My primary interest is, of course, in little farmers, those who live upon and earn their living upon the family farms of our country. Most of all, I am interested in a successful and well-operated Federal farm program. I know and I understand the far-

reaching and devastating effect of the amendment offered by Mr. AVERY, of Kansas, which was included in Mr. TABER's motion to recommit.

I cannot believe that the author of this amendment intended to make the $50,000 limitation applicable to price-support loans to cooperatives, as well as to individual farmers, but he must admit that that is exactly what the amendment will do.

This is just another illustration and rather dramatic demonstration of the fact that we should never attempt to write legislation into an appropriations bill. I know that this amendment might be very well called a limitation rather than legislation but, after all, it makes a very definite and drastic change in the true intent and meaning of the legislation which has been approved by the Congress and is now a vital part of our farm program.

I am certain that many Members voted for this amendment, honestly and sincerely believing that they were doing the right thing. We are told that the road to hell is paved with good intentions. Regardless of good intention, the fact remains that if this amendment should finally be enacted into law, the farm program will abruptly end.

Moreover, the amendment represents a breach of faith with the farmers of this country. It would prevent the Department of Agriculture from carrying out its price-support obligations on 1959 crops—most of which are already planted.

Under the amendment, no Commodity Credit Corporation price-support loan could be processed which is in excess of $50,000. This would disrupt orderly marketing. It would force dumping of farm commodities upon the markets. It would weaken the price structure of agriculture.

The sponsors of this proposition indicate that their intention is to limit price supports to large farmers. But in doing so, as the Taber amendment has now been approved by the House, the greater hardships would be visited upon the family farmers, who now are hardly able to make ends meet.

Mr. Speaker, I know that many Members of this body who voted for this proposition were persuaded to believe that they were advancing the cause of the family farm system in agriculture, and they believed that farm programs should be drawn and designed primarily to perpetuate this system which in the early years of this Republic established the economic foundation of the free-enterprise system, and which down through the years has contributed so much to our spiritual, social, and political vitality.

Such is my own philosophy, and this is the dominant consideration in all my efforts to create national policies enabling the establishment of a sound and profitable agriculture.

But, Mr. Speaker, I repeat and I reemphasize that this amendment is not helpful—it is inimical, it is adverse—to the interest of the family structure in our agriculture.

The amendment will limit price-support operations not only for big farmers but also for hundreds of thousands of small farmers in every part of the country who receive their stabilization loans through cooperatives.

The amendment places a $50,000 maximum on any loan, including those made to cooperatives, even though the cooperative may represent, as some of them do, virtually all the farmers producing a commodity. It would thus virtually eliminate price-support operations for all those farmers who operate through cooperatives.

Mr. Speaker, even Mr. Benson, with whom I vigorously disagree on most matters relating to agriculture, recognizes the weakness of the proposition as it has been approved by the House.

When the amendment was presented I called upon Mr. Benson for a statement of his position upon it. I have a letter from the Secretary, just handed to me, in which he has this to say:

> Before the Congress finally enacts the appropriations bill, consideration will no doubt be given to amendments which would cover purchase agreements as well as loans, to make clear where support operations are carried out through farmer cooperatives that any limitation imposed would not apply to cooperatives, as such, and to other perfecting amendments.

I just have received, also, a telegram from Mr. Herschel D. Newsom, master of the National Grange, one of our greatest farm organizations, and I now read this message to the House:

> Even though there may seem to be superficial basis for Taber amendment, Grange vigorously urges its defeat. Such amendment fails to recognize real cause of difficulties and undesirable results of present program.
>
> Until more basic change can be made such amendment would increase rather than diminish the undesirable effects of present method of price support. Grange is determined to make basic changes and corrections in farm program as your committee well knows, but Taber amendment will neither constitute nor improve prospect of sound change.

Mr. Speaker, substantial changes in the farm program are now being drafted by the appropriate legislative committees, in an effort to adjust this program to the changing conditions in agriculture. Drastic changes in the program, if they are to be adopted, should be brought about by careful consideration of this legislation—not by hasty action in the Congress with absolutely no opportunity for debate or consideration.

A great part of agriculture is now in dire circumstances. Mr. Benson tells us that farmers must expect another income cut this year of 5 to 10 percent, at a time when all other elements of our national economy are experiencing unprecedented prosperity. Our farm families deserve better treatment at the hands of their Government. Their problems are entitled to the thorough and sympathetic consideration of the Congress.

The Avery amendment which was incorporated in the Taber motion to recommit was briefly debated and defeated in the Committee of the Whole. At the end of the day and at the end of the debate, the motion to recommit was offered and the previous question was ordered. The House then adjourned and no further debate was possible. I could not even be recognized for a 1-minute speech to explain the effect of the proposition, nor for the purpose of making a point of order. This was the parliamentary situation at the time the vote was taken. I am quite certain that the amendment in its present form, when well understood, will not be approved by the other body—which the Rules of the House will not permit me to mention.

NINETEEN HUNDRED AND FIFTY-SEVEN CROP LOANS

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include tables.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, each year for the past few years former Congressman Brownson, of Indiana, or I have placed in the RECORD a list of the producers receiving the largest amounts in crop loans. The 1957 list for corn, wheat, cotton, and rice was not available until after Congress adjourned and so was not placed in the RECORD last year.

The amount of crop loans has become the subject for the motion to recommit the agricultural appropriation bill; and, accordingly, I believe the RECORD should contain the 1957 list.

It follows:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE, COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

Producers with the largest quantity of corn placed under loan on the 1957 crop

Name of producer and address	Quantity	Amount
	Bushels	
ALABAMA		
T. J. Jones, Jr., Marion	10,168	$14,194.68
Jack S. Butler, Fayette	5,748	8,047.20
Guy L. Gannaway, Lincoln	5,541	7,757.40
Donald L. Pierce, Wetumpka	5,223	7,312.00
W. R. Lingerfelt, Fyffe	5,866	7,215.18
Estimated State average per corn loan		847.33
ARIZONA	*Bushels*	
Jim Veck, Willcox	9,492	14,142.63
Dunagan Bros., Willcox	8,287	12,099.21
Dale G. King, Willcox	7,900	11,770.55
Grant Anderson, Willcox	4,429	6,510.34
B. M. Jacob, Willcox	3,385	5,043.35
Estimated State average per corn loan		6,726.00
ARKANSAS		
C. R. West, Marianna	11,990	16,946.49
Nickey Bros., Memphis, Tenn.	7,434	10,407.60
Cedric Lee, Dumas	7,327	10,275.84
Earl Wells & Son, Helena	6,100	8,540.61
Frank T. Griffen	5,860	8,054.24
Estimated State average per corn loan		2,185.00
CALIFORNIA		
H. H. Peterson and Sons, Inc., Chico	29,637	42,514.28
W. H. Wright, Chico	28,757	40,927.27
George Stutz, Red Bluff	26,057	35,411.46
George M. Beke, Vina	25,833	30,250.98
George M. Stutz, Chico	18,846	27,034.58
Estimated State average per corn loan		27,789.00

Producers with the largest quantity of corn placed under loan on the 1957 crop—Con.

Name of producer and address	Quantity	Amount
COLORADO		
Leonard Feldhousen, Burlington	*Bushels* 26,107	$34,200.17
B. H. & R. K. McConnell, Fort Morgan	20,597	26,213.36
Orville Chapin, Burlington	18,445	24,162.95
Kenneth Hitchcock, Burlington	17,640	23,108.40
Rothe Bros., Greeley	14,617	19,148.27
Estimated State average per corn loan		2,300.00
DELAWARE		
Draper Foods Inc., Milford	5,832	9,039.60
Randall C. Willin, Seaford	3,666	5,682.30
Wilson E. Campbell, Dagsboro	1,850	2,867.50
William I. Handy, Seaford	1,828	2,833.40
W. H. Draper, Milford	1,333	2,066.15
Estimated State average per corn loan		3,575.00
FLORIDA		
B. F. Blanton, Lee	2,228	3,118.65
E. H. Finlayson, Greenville	1,019	1,426.60
R. C. Peacock & Sons, Campbellton	966	1,275.09
G. A. Armistead, Monticello	926	1,296.93
C. W. Whitener, Westville	889	1,137.69
Estimated State average per corn loan		998.00
GEORGIA		
Bateman Co., Inc., Macon	11,880	16,632.00
Logue Bros., Climax	7,616	9,934.48
Gus S. Moore, Resaca	8,115	11,361.00
Waldo Ewing, Fitzgerald	11,080	14,292.70
Wade Plantation, Sylvania	7,642	11,004.65
Estimated State average per corn loan		1,459.21
IDAHO		
R. Joseph Hawes, Grandview	16,779	23,826.18
Elmer C. Barlow, Marsing	12,245	17,387.90
Dale Gilbert, Grandview	10,148	14,410.16
Hipwell Bros., Grandview	9,860	14,001.20
D. O. Bybee, Nyssa, Oreg	6,656	9,451.52
Estimated State average per corn loan		1,418.00
ILLINOIS		
Cote Farms, Inc., St. Anne	64,448	90,871.68
A. T., Jessie, John, and Edward C. Summer, Jr., Milford	58,106	83,672.38
Scully Estate, Dwight	51,603	72,622.73
Martha W. Livingston and F. L. Livingston, Chatsworth	35,200	49,056.00
Rust Farm Co., Bloomington	43,401	48,609.12
Estimated State average per corn loan		2,363.00
INDIANA		
Emil Savich, Rensselaer	141,815	157,414.65
Richard Gumz, North Judson	114,417	161,329.67
Wm. Gehring, Inc., Rensselaer	99,974	140,963.34
Moses Fowler Chase, Estate, Oxford	45,581	64,269.21
Moore Bros., Rensselaer	38,647	42,898.17
Estimated State average per corn loan		2,307.00
IOWA		
Amana Society, Amana	76,919	82,277.09
W. P. Adams Land Trust, Odebolt	48,000	49,440.00
Mary M. Sargent, Lisbon	44,622	48,191.76
J. C. Hamilton, Hampton	35,445	45,697.65
J. R. Paul & Sons, Valley	30,820	42,470.00
Estimated State average per corn loan		1,703.76
KANSAS		
Lloyd Kontny and Wess Gerk, Kanorado	33,180	43,134.00
Oscar Lutz, Mayetta	12,961	18,103.02
Lloyd Kontny and Leon Silkman, Kanorado	12,033	15,642.90
KANSAS—continued		
Charles L. Silkman, Wakeeney	*Bushels* 9,607	$12,489.10
Thomas A. Ryan, Colby	9,771	12,086.55
Estimated State average per corn loan		1,249.00
KENTUCKY		
Anderson Bros., Morganfield	45,093	51,856.95
S. S. Wathen, Owensboro	29,345	39,104.45
J. H. Wathen, Morganfield	23,321	33,815.45
S. D. Broadbent, Jr., Cadiz	15,450	23,484.00
James C. Bower, Evansville, Ind	15,434	22,404.27
Estimated State average per corn loan		2,254.01
MARYLAND		
Roland H. Mullinix, Woodbine	6,516	10,099.80
Ebenspacker Bros., Vienna	5,151	6,438.75
Leslie Bradley, Vienna	2,832	4,389.60
Robert L. Kemp, Easton	2,693	3,366.25
William H. Emerson, Centreville	1,969	2,461,25
Estimated State average per corn loan		1,840.75
MICHIGAN		
Leslie, Robert, and Oliver Mueller, Britton	37,452	45,589.86
Haddix & Sons, Monroe	31,105	36,082.80
N. P. Beebe Farms, Niles	24,117	26,769.87
Upjohn Richland Farms, Richland	17,879	25,925.30
Gerald Wright, Vandalia	21,880	25,381.50
Estimated State average per corn loan		1,116.48
MINNESOTA		
Henry and Thane Bluhm, Mapleton	51,840	52,876.80
Martin Bustad, Austin	44,262	45,147.24
Leslie Boler, Winnebago	40,858	40,858.00
Edwin J., Stanley J., and Edwin J. Potter, Jr., Triumph	36,159	36,159.00
Carlyle Greibrok, Oakland	31,885	32,522.70
Estimated State average per corn loan		1,340.00
MISSISSIPPI		
C. E. Savery, Jr., Holly Bluff	10,159	14,222.60
James Hand III, Rolling Fork	10,131	14,183.40
J. H. Hogue, Yazoo City	8,346	11,683.80
T. E. Fouche, Benton	6,967	9,753.80
W. J. Waits, Goodman	3,821	4,980.71
Estimated State average per corn loan		1,516.00
MISSOURI		
Saline County Farms, Marshall	47,186	67,475.98
Nick and Emil Savich, Sturgeon	41,506	46,901.78
Green Top Farms, Inc., Richmond	22,000	29,040.00
C. O. Donah, Palmyra	23,232	25,787.52
Albert Painton Co., Inc., Painton	15,573	22,736.58
Estimated State average per corn loan		1,795.00
NEBRASKA		
Ernest Hundahl & Sons, Tekamah	106,421	142,331.89
Ned Tyson, Herman	65,420	71,743.70
Cornhusker Farms, Grand Island	60,464	61,528.63
H. F. Klosterman, David City	36,062	48,683.70
Ed Schliep & Sons, Fairfield	38,077	39,980.85
Estimated State average per corn loan		2,090.00
NEW JERSEY		
Edwin H. Brasch, Red Bank	12,852	16,322.04
Albert Bollmeyer, Freehold	3,145	3,994.15
Henry Muller, Freehold	2,400	3,768.00
NEW JERSEY—continued		
Fred Daum, Englishtown	*Bushels* 2,439	$3,097.53
Henry Bibus, Jr., Wrightstown	2,020	2,565.40
Estimated State average per corn loan		2,550.89
NEW MEXICO		
K. B. McCullough, Clovis	27,441	37,119.79
Clarence and W. T. Meeks, Farwell, Tex	3,954	5,615.08
Bill Meeks, Farwell, Tex	2,185	3,103.35
Wesley Engram, Texico	1,681	2,235.28
Ival Hesser, Texico	1,299	1,792.52
Estimated State average per corn loan		4,000.00
NEW YORK		
Edward DeGraff, Mount Morris	12,040	17,337.60
Anthony Christiano, Leicester	10,061	14,487.84
Julius Westheimer & Son, Middleburgh	7,514	10,820.80
M. Beach Stover, Trumansburg	6,042	8,700.48
George Mosher & Sons, Bouckville	6,015	8,661.60
Estimated State average per corn loan		1,325.35
NORTH CAROLINA		
Romaine Howard, Tarboro	10,099	15,451.47
McNair Evans, Laurinburg	6,033	7,420.59
Parrott Farms, La Grange	4,184	6,152.02
J. E. Eagles, Macclesfield	3,791	5,800.23
Zeno Ratcliff, Pantego	4,079	5,017.17
Estimated State average per corn loan		1,112.96
NORTH DAKOTA		
Groteluesche Bros., Ludden	14,157	15,982.21
Gerald C. Olson, Wahpeton	12,294	14,870.52
Anderson Bros., Hillsboro	10,945	12,586.75
Robert Nagel, Wyndmere	9,476	11,560.85
Charles O. Herman, Wyndmere	9,560	10,994.00
Estimated State average per corn loan		1,137.00
OHIO		
Hartman Farm, London	28,990	41,745.60
Chaswill Farm, Sabina	24,091	34,450.00
Dale Roe., Rudolph	21,742	31,308.00
Case & Co., Inc., Richwood	20,446	23,512.84
John H. Dunlap, Sr., Williamsport	15,519	22,348.75
Estimated State average per corn loan		1,201.00
OKLAHOMA		
Ralph Manwell, Choctaw	5,675	7,662.16
Homer Saunders, Henryetta	1,066	1,439.10
Albert Kohler, Boise City	1,136	1,432.13
Paul L. Kohler, Boise City	1,610	2,149.35
E. G. Bearden, Boise City	720	972.00
Estimated State average per corn loan		1,850.00
OREGON		
Jerry Cooper, Stanfield	6,631	9,910.33
Jack Zabransky, Stanfield	5,526	8,233.74
Harlan Crawford, Echo	5,259	7,730.73
Jim Gossler and Ted Peterson, Stanfield	4,390	6,585.00
Jim Clayton, Nyssa	4,347	6,390.09
Estimated State average per corn loan		1,807.04
PENNSYLVANIA		
G. W. Huntsberger, Lewisberry	5,573	6,996.25
Penrose Taylor, Glen Rock	2,802	4,343.10
P. V. Ahl, Carlisle	1,980	3,069.00
Carlin Bros., Coatesville	1,836	2,295.00
Zimmerman Bros., Norristown	1,203	1,864.25
Estimated State average per corn loan		1,195.00

Producers with the largest quantity of corn placed under loan on the 1957 crop—Con.

Name of producer and address	Quantity	Amount
SOUTH CAROLINA		
	Bushels	
J. C. Oswald, Allendale	20,749	$35,753.80
Hugh T. Lightsey, Brunson	13,389	18,744.60
N. B. Loadholt, Fairfax	11,036	14,327.76
C. E. Causey, Jr., Furman	10,330	14,462.00
G. C. Forrester, Allendale	7,770	10,191.46
Estimated State average per corn loan		1,269.00
SOUTH DAKOTA		
Clark Bros. & Jay Swisher, Putney	53,720	59,151.19
Connie Hanson, Columbia	43,246	49,671.12
Dean Nelson, Onida	38,531	44,767.57
Clarence Linden, Ipswich	38,328	44,125.51
W. M. Scott Livestock Co., Hecla	28,651	33,235.16
Estimated State average per corn loan		1,614.61
TENNESSEE		
F. E. Bryan, Guthrie, Ky	10,653	16,405.56
Harris & Teeter, Guthrie, Ky	4,336	6,591.42
G. C. Smith, Clarksville	3,104	4,745.96
Geo. A. Washington, Cedar Hill	2,844	4,294.44
J. Kenneth Stackpole, Guthrie Ky	2,412	3,642.12
Estimated State average per corn loan		1,800.00
TEXAS		
Eugene Boggess, Friona	16,519	22,466.33
John Machac, Hockley	11,990	12,868.36
Milburn Haydon, Hart	9,758	12,588.32
Myrle Jackson, Friona	9,375	12,498.76
D. R. Hopkins, Lubbock	9,120	11,764.80
Estimated State average per corn loan		1,939.00
UTAH[1]		
Joseph G. Simpson, Layton	961	1,422.28
Thomas A. Phillips, Layton	436	645.28
Estimated State average per corn loan		1,033.78
VIRGINIA		
A. T. Harwood, Charles City	4,563	7,036.96
G. C. Nicholas, Jr., Northwest	4,559	7,066.67
K. N. Whitehurst, Back Bay	1,972	3,096.04
Earl Hensley & I. Newton Miller, Port Republic	1,968	2,794.56
Mantua Farms, Inc., Heathville	1,974	2,802.94
Estimated State average per corn loan		2,883.05
WASHINGTON		
Sam Kobata, Stratford	18,750	25,312.51
Glen Rowe, Toppenish	16,244	23,554.42
Pete Kwak, Wapato	12,958	18,788.54
Jack Shattuck, Toppenish	12,128	17,586.30
Jno A. Newquist, Toppenish	11,922	17,287.07
Estimated State average per corn loan		3,890.00
WEST VIRGINIA		
Howard G. Buckley, Williamstown	3,469	4,925.98
D. H. Corbin & Norman Ingram, St. Marys	2,344	3,328.48
Oliveboy Stock Farm, Charlestown	1,764	2,734.20
James G. Coe, Parkersburg	1,707	2,423.94
W. H. Potts, Point Pleasant	1,653	2,347.58
Estimated State average per corn loan		2,272.66
WISCONSIN		
Charles Most, Prescott	17,632	19,042.56
Malvin Busse, DeForest	13,334	14,800.74
H. Evers Heilig, Prescott	13,169	14,739.12
Orin F. House, Prescott	10,444	14,412.72
Gaffner-Gumz, Whitewater	12,162	13,499.82
Estimated State average per corn loan		1,248.00

[1] Corn loans made to only 2 producers in Utah.

Producers with the largest quantity of corn placed under loan on the 1957 crop—Con.

Name of producer and address	Quantity	Amount
WYOMING		
	Bushels	
Art Damrow, Torrington	9,051	$11,947.32
Craven & Sons, Yoder	5,880	7,761.60
J. G. Webb, Torrington	5,415	7,147.80
F. B. & Boyd Reid, Torrington	3,616	4,773.12
Hughes & Son Dairy, Torrington	3,352	4,424.64
Estimated State average per corn loan		1,700.00

Producers with the largest quantity of cotton placed under loan on the 1957 crop

Name of producer and address	Quantity	Amount
ALABAMA		
	Bales	
J. B. Hain, Sardis	906	$156,778.95
W. C. Gray, Mathews	245	34,207.18
James Bros., Brent	186	31,534.21
Nolan Drake, Madison	191	25,386.28
W. A. Ganquet, Cuba	142	22,287.97
ARIZONA		
Morrison Bros., Higley	3,040	481,465.32
Charles Urrea & Son, Mesa	2,673	384,380.65
W. R. Neely, Chandler	2,274	362,214.45
Hooper & Rugg, Casa Grande	2,115	325,279.72
Phillips & Ellsworth, Mesa	1,707	302,924.10
ARKANSAS		
J. G. Adams & Son, Hughes	3,024	420,343.70
Miller Lumber Co., Marianna	1,615	223,319.26
Tillar & Co., Tillar	955	119,366.00
St. Francis Valley Farms, Market Tree	760	82,323.29
Lee Wilson & Co., Wilson	700	77,526.90
CALIFORNIA		
Westlake Farms, Inc., Stratford	5,611	854,450.67
W. J. Deal, Mendota	2,419	370,040.84
Frank & Jim Garona, Bakersfield	2,387	350,290.43
Wilco Produce Co., Blythe	2,123	323,164.70
Waldo W. Weeth, Coalings	1,898	282,895.20
FLORIDA		
J. E. Golden, Jay	87	11,433.98
C. O. & Wayne Godwin, Jay	48	6,944.43
W. J. Cooley, Brewton, Ala	33	4,417.73
W. C. Barrineau, Cantonment	27	4,156.71
H. T. Woodruff, Jay	28	4,004.21
GEORGIA		
J. H. Rowland, Midville	358	58,828.10
Quinton Rogers, Waynesboro	390	58,582.73
Singletary Farms, Blakely	322	51,578.95
W. H. Lovett, Dublin	268	42,439.33
R. C. Neely, Sr., Waynesboro	137	20,768.54
KENTUCKY		
Robert Sanger, Hickman	46	5,405.77
E. & H. Tyler, Hickman	36	4,019.91
Jack Lowrence, Tiptonville, Tenn	25	2,560.85
Worden Gray, Hickman	13	1,216.94
Harold Shaw, Hickman	8	842.32
LOUISIANA		
George B. Franklin & Son, Holly Ridge	817	128,118.87
Deltic Farm & Timber Co., Epps	1,003	125,443.04
Hollybrook Land Co., Inc., Lake Providence	611	86,056.75
Estate of M. P. Utz, Tallulah	549	71,107.49
Yerger Bros., Inc., Mound	500	70,753.76
MISSISSIPPI		
Delta & Pine Land Co., Scott	7,919	1,167,502.35
Dan Seligman, Shaw	1,291	173,631.68
Dockery Farms, Cleveland	1,216	171,116.27
Woolfolk Farms, Tunica	1,051	155,787.12
M. S. Knowlton Co., Perthshire	1,066	143,349.70

Producers with the largest quantity of cotton placed under loan on the 1957 crop—Con.

Name of producer and address	Quantity	Amount
MISSOURI		
	Bales	
O. H. Acom, Wardell	367	$37,874.02
Leo A. Fisher, Parma	332	35,360.33
E. P. Coleman, Jr., Sikeston	302	29,506.03
Joyce Emerson, Sikeston	184	19,870.61
Clyde Swiney & Son, Catron	186	19,554.47
NEW MEXICO		
J. F. Apodaca, La Mesa	645	130,391.38
Tony Salopek, Las Cruces	535	119,162.39
Richens Farms, Animas	630	95,344.01
L. G. Guaderrama, Las Cruces	543	93,772.99
E. N. Crossett, Anthony	530	90,661.75
NORTH CAROLINA		
John F. McNair, Inc., Laurinburg	673	87,043.86
Peoples Bank & Trust Co., Rocky Mount	310	45,705.63
Long Bros., Garysburg	210	32,998.49
W. S. Britt, Lumberton	231	32,523.36
T. B. Upchurch, Inc., Raeford	195	30,454.69
OKLAHOMA		
Wayne, Winsett, Altus	297	33,577.28
G. H. Thomas, Altus	184	19,776.62
E. R. Fowler, Roosevelt	179	18,756.53
Clark T. McWhorter, Blair	155	18,556.38
G. O. McDonald, Carter	133	16,799.73
SOUTH CAROLINA		
Coker's Pedigreed Seed Co., Hartsville	476	69,514.34
J. H. Chappell, Chester	373	55,905.67
W. R. Mayes, Mayesville	292	41,183.17
J. E. Mayes, Mayesville	149	22,241.25
J. A. McDonald, Bennetsville	176	18,742.59
TENNESSEE		
H. S. Mitchell, Millington	347	55,368.88
O. M. Carrington, Collierville	154	21,977.57
Jim S. Brock and H. A. Dewberry, Lawrenceburg	155	17,782.14
W. F. Yarbro, Burlison	127	17,179.81
G. H. Sing, Memphis	68	10,910.84
TEXAS		
Kesey Bros., Pecos	1,820	323,914.08
John J. Dorr, Pecos	1,393	253,368.70
Clark & Roberts, Pecos	1,315	237,328.84
Ralph's Farms, San Alizario	1,101	209,417.26
A. L. Cone, Lubbock	1,591	185,566.59
VIRGINIA		
W. H. Ligon, Emporia	51	8,489.30
T. T. Tudor, Garysburg, N.C	39	5,957.37
B. E. Moore, Emporia	33	5,561.54
B. B. Vincent, Skippers	27	4,437.89
B. A. Moore, Emporia	24	3,853.34

Producers with the largest quantity of rice placed under loan on the 1957 crop

Name of producer and address	Quantity	Amount
ARKANSAS		
	Hundredweight	
Producer's Rice Mill, Inc., Stuttgart	254,075	$1,460,902.11
George Smith & Tenants, DeWitt	55,498	316,362.50
Craighead Rice Milling Co., Jonesboro	34,306	184,894.16
W. B. Bynum Cooperage Co., Dermott	30,538	163,683.68
Alice Sidney Farms, Jerome	22,035	114,416.68
Estimated State average per rice loan		10,079.00
CALIFORNIA		
Heidrick Bros., Woodland	41,420	189,882.20
Robert Amarel, Yuba City	9,156	43,925.03
Thomas Mezger, Woodland	5,597	26,082.02
Archie Danisan and Jack Danison, Live Oak	4,838	21,555.24
Fratus Bros., Oroville	1,192	5,634.85
Estimated State average per rice loan		67,937.00

Producers with the largest quantity of rice placed under loan on the 1957 crop—Con.

Name of producer and address	Quantity	Amount
LOUISIANA	*Hundredweight*	
W. J. Gayle & Son, Gueydan	252,200	$149,977.23
J. A., J. E., and W. B. Layton, Sulphur	19,354	108,420.67
Hood and Hesie Denton, Sulphur	17,887	102,040.77
Brady Oswalt, Lake Providence	14,008	80,120.13
Paul C. Hoffpauir, Crowley	13,465	79,531.40
Estimated State average per rice loan		8,500.00
MISSISSIPPI		
James K. and Cecil E. Greer, Hollandale	29,169	142,057.02
Pee Dee Plantation, Greenwood	19,703	87,115.83
J. R. Dockery, Cleveland	12,96	67,675.82
Patterson Bros., Merigold	9,665	58,818.91
S. L. Reed, Belzoni	10,045	55,849.09
Estimated State average per rice loan		14,175.00
MISSOURI		
Dirl Bagby, Dexter	7,121	36,382.16
Sam G. Jones, East Prairie	1,311	6,290.83
Clyde Lynn & P. M. Vandivort, Benton	949	3,985.80
John L. Cook, Palmyra	1,077	3,781.37
Harold Johnston, Earl Gottman & Nelson & Yates, Palmyra	921	3,380.94
Estimated State average per rice loan		2,509.00
TEXAS		
South Texas Rice Farms, Rosharon	57,226	300,477.68
J. W. Adams & Son, J. H. Tigner, A. Farrer & E. W. Bailey, Jr., Angleton	29,565	161,373.81
Briscoe Production Co., Alvin	23,168	126,721.59
Lazy K Ranch, Garwood	20,489	115,594.75
George P. Nelson, Katy	20,107	100,594.16
Estimated State average per rice loan		11,977.00

Producers with the largest quantity of wheat placed under loan on the 1957 crop

Name of producer and address	Quantity	Amount
ALABAMA	*Bushels*	
Cooper Frazier, Tanner	7,337	$10,932.13
C. E. Moody & Son, Cherokee	4,194	6,471.61
W. L. Rice, Florence	3,778	5,565.69
Robert Winters, Florence	3,094	4,849.45
Leon Lindsay, Tanner	1,759	2,648.78
Estimated State average per wheat loan		1,804.62
ARIZONA [1]		
Allen Marlatt, Wellton	6,572	10,383.76
Floyd Pierport, Gila Bend	2,810	4,289.70
Estimated State average per wheat loan		7,336.73
ARKANSAS		
Wesson Farms, Victoria	22,442	44,811.24
H. T. Dillabunty, Hughes	12,972	26,041.24
Keiser Supply Co., Keiser	11,197	22,617.78
Noble Gill Farms, Victoria	8,361	18,057.87
Chiles Planting Co., Joiner	8,744	17,790.00
Estimated State average per wheat loan		2,962.00
CALIFORNIA		
Christensen Farm Co., Yuba City	11,371	22,685.15
Nic E. Lewis, Santa Margarita	10,115	20,467.70
Pinole Land & Cattle Co., Palo Alto	9,536	19,658.46
W. J. Duffey, Jr., Woodland	7,383	16,980.32
Botts Bros., Bradley	8,309	16,576.46
Estimated State average per wheat loan		14,416.00

See footnote at end of table.

Producers with the largest quantity of wheat placed under loan on the 1957 crop—Con.

Name of producer and address	Quantity	Amount
COLORADO	*Bushels*	
J. H.-N. M. Monaghan Farms Co., Derby	109,945	$214,872.34
Sprague Bros., Holyoke	59,104	112,301.81
Wood Land Co., Dailey	43,141	81,530.57
Tom Bradbury, Littleton	27,558	58,690.34
Moffitt Bros., Derby	31,232	57,695.78
Estimated State average per wheat loan		2,985.00
DELAWARE		
J. Clifford Rhoades, Middletown	1,576	3,316.73
Lilian McMullin, Middletown	1,065	2,224.23
Jas. T. Shallcross, Odessa	1,015	2,128.27
Corbit Collins, Middletown	1,015	2,128.27
S. G. Deats, Middletown	867	1,809.86
Estimated State average per wheat loan		1,240.00
GEORGIA		
F. H. Willie, Louisville	4,090	8,111.55
W. B. Hancock, Louisville	3,671	7,375.14
G. H. Shivers, Sr., Norwood	3,316	7,096.84
A. A. White & Son, Byron	2,779	5,946.46
R. F. Strickland Co., Concord	2,747	5,466.94
Estimated State average per wheat loan		819.84
IDAHO		
Shayne Linderman, Newdale	42,418	72,959.00
Meachan Land & Cattle Co., Culdesac	38,025	71,107.00
Ross & Marie Howard & Madeline Walter, Lewiston	36,162	63,745.00
Ira McIntosh, Lewiston	33,286	58,584.00
A. E. & DeMar Bott, Newdale	30,301	52,054.00
Estimated State average per wheat loan		3,288.00
ILLINOIS		
Richard L. & Albert Coultas, Winchester	9,836	20,065.44
Schaeffer & Losch, East Alton	8,193	17,246.08
Bartels Farms, Inc., St. Marys	8,382	17,165.30
Rapp Bros., Granite City	6,451	12,679.09
Marcella Muncy, Clarence Quintal, agent, Jacksonville	5,715	12,334.30
Estimated State average per wheat loan		999.61
INDIANA		
Graham Farms, Inc., Washington	9,198	18,351.78
A. G. Tebbe, Tipton	5,658	11,655.48
Charles Thompson, Jr., Decker	4,021	8,192.20
Luther Jones & James C. Bower, Vincennes	3,729	7,578.48
Maxwell Farms, Delphi	3,036	6,238.68
Estimated State average per wheat loan		1,321.00
IOWA		
Varro E. Tyler, trustee for Martha P. Cresap, Nebraska City, Nebr	20,325	44,613.36
M. M. Payne estate, M. M. Payne III, administrator, Hamburg	13,466	29,599.38
R. C. Good, Glenwood	5,673	12,480.14
Donald Guttau, Mondamin	5,274	11,628.97
Arthur Guttau, Mondamin	5,274	11,628.24
Estimated State average per wheat loan		1,187.49
KANSAS		
Stewart Farm account, by H. C. Altman, agent, Wellington	34,137	69,931.78
The Garden City Co., Garden City	35,553	68,883.21
Schneider Ranch, by A. G. Schneider, Jr., Stockton	23,250	48,268.96
Pessemier Co., St. Marys	21,830	47,824.28
Andrew E. Larson, Garden City	22,106	44,022.56
Estimated State average per wheat loan		1,499.27

Producers with the largest quantity of wheat placed under loan on the 1957 crop—Con.

Name of producer and address	Quantity	Amount
KENTUCKY	*Bushels*	
E. G. LaMotte, Hopkinsville	4,964	$9,776.90
J. W. Hancock & Son, Morganfield	3,851	8,432.96
Gorrell & Gregory, Guthrie	3,681	7,723.83
Anderson Brothers, Morganfield	3,738	7,662.90
H. R. Vinson, Cadiz	3,292	6,762.82
Estimated State average per wheat loan		990.82
LOUISIANA [1]		
Russel C. Fleeman, Lake Providence	16,921	24,816.94
Estimated State average per wheat loan		24,816.94
MARYLAND		
The B. F. Shriver Co., Westminister	7,930	17,148.24
Samuel B. Firebaugh, New Freedom, Pa	5,633	11,775.97
R. T. White, Gaithersburg	5,510	11,662.57
J. Herbert Carter, Queenstown	3,086	6,475.02
Woodland Farms, C. L. Minker, manager, Perryville	2,857	6,097.47
Estimated State average per wheat loan		1,116.04
MICHIGAN		
Walat Farms, St. Charles	8,682	19,342.18
Gerald Wright, Vandalia	5,889	12,072.45
Arthur Segerdahl, Schoolcraft	5,018	10,118.77
Claude L. Wood, Brown City	4,849	9,595.03
Glenn McNamara, White Pigeon	4,248	8,629.44
Estimated State average per wheat loan		1,268.30
MINNESOTA		
James & Joe Fanfulik, Angus	20,601	44,178.98
H. R. Peterson, Moorhead	15,298	30,674.90
Emil Rychart, East Grand Forks	10,668	22,365.97
Wm. Sczepanski, Stephen	10,720	21,197.12
Victor Younggren, Hallock	10,069	20,037.31
Estimated State average per wheat loan		1,733.00
MISSISSIPPI		
H. G. Girdley, Itta Bena	2,741	3,673.46
Leo W. Klarr, Hattiesburg	1,549	2,277.03
Ralph Lembo, Itta Bena	826	1,131.41
D. H. Shipp, Benton	799	1,070.35
S. C. Coleman, Yazoo City	770	1,031.33
Estimated State average per wheat loan		1,837.00
MISSOURI		
C. O. Donath, Palmyra	17,250	35,190.00
David M. Barton, Catron	16,263	33,991.40
James H. Pettijohn, Oregon	13,194	26,435.80
Dearmont Oliver, East Prairie	12,962	26,409.63
Parretta Bros., Kansas City	12,879	26,398.89
Estimated State average per wheat loan		805.00
MONTANA		
Campbell Farming Corp., Hardin	184,023	330,267.51
Floyd Warren, Inc., Hardin	48,412	86,626.19
Formanack & Barber, Lodge Grass	48,371	86,559.17
Tom McCracken, Ledger	37,344	66,480.48
Hunsaker Bros., Toston	37,532	66,468.62
Estimated State average per wheat loan		4,795.35
NEBRASKA		
Edward Jelinek, Alliance	48,784	95,162.33
Kjeldaard Bros., Big Springs	46,382	102,037.01
John Hippen, Lodgepole	38,338	73,951.34
Martha W. Jacobson, Alliance	35,672	95,162.33
Robert Elliott, Salvang, Calif	34,545	67,670.00
Estimated State average per wheat loan		2,175.00

See footnote at end of table.

Producers with the largest quantity of wheat placed under loan on the 1957 crop—Con.

Name of producer and address	Quantity	Amount
NEVADA [1]		
	Bushels	
Earnest Clinger, Lovelock	1,060	$1,537.00
Estimated State average per wheat loan		1,537.00
NEW JERSEY		
J. Ernest Snyder, Englishtown	5,811	12,547.39
Wm. D. Clayton, Freehold	5,500	12,100.00
Cross Bros., Holmdel	5,500	12,045.00
Roscoe Clayton, Freehold	3,048	6,707.80
John Probasco, Wrightstown	2,749	6,102.78
Estimated State average per wheat loan		3,118.40
NEW MEXICO		
Roy Williams & Sons, Clovis	24,065	45,722.86
Laura Moore & Sons, Clovis	15,456	29,057.05
Skarda Bros., Clovis	13,472	25,103.26
Lessie Pattison, Clovis	12,426	23,360.26
Roy & Leon Marks, Clovis	12,459	23,174.35
Estimated State average per wheat loan		4,000.00
NEW YORK		
Edward Leathersich, Caledonia	5,569	11,917.66
Everett LaWall, Gainesville	5,197	11,291.10
R. V. Call & Sons, Batavia	3,592	7,739.05
Louis Thomson, Avon	3,524	7,647.08
Gordon Wilson, Jr., Dansville	3,444	7,370.16
Estimated State average per wheat loan		1,813.38
NORTH CAROLINA		
S. P. Jackson, Kinston	3,029	6,131.44
L. P. Lindsley, Williamston	2,174	4,392.55
A. M. Waddell, Rockingham	2,173	4,727.00
Isaac Russell, Albermarle	2,111	4,158.67
J. H. Teague, Hickory	1,738	3,691.34
Estimated State average per wheat loan		828.23
NORTH DAKOTA		
Otto Engen, Minot	41,072	79,059.39
Witteman Co., Mohall	38,680	73,971.46
Ryan Farms, East Grand Forks, Minn	29,185	58,387.57
John D. Kirschman, Lemon, S. Dak	24,325	49,005.49
Peter A. Nygaard, Alexander	23,802	45,014.29
Estimated State average per wheat loan		2,035.00
OHIO		
The Orleton Farm, London	14,369	29,457.82
Agricultural Lands, Inc., London	10,152	19,491.84
Case & Co., Inc., Richwood	7,756	15,821.22
Alpha Realty Co., care of Robert Jackson, manager, Mount Sterling	5,922	11,251.80
Case Farms Co., Prospect	4,887	10,019.03
Estimated State average per wheat loan		1,040.00
OKLAHOMA		
Henry C. Hitch Ranch, Guymon	51,343	101,780.86
A. L. Jackson & Sons, Spearman, Tex	28,266	53,743.19
A. H. Huckaby, Selman	15,545	28,727.64
John W. Webb, Eva	13,344	25,437.74
Ed Tucker, Elkhart, Kans	13,192	25,196.09
Estimated State average per wheat loan		1,831.00
OREGON		
Amanda Duvall, Heppner	52,552	104,988.51
L. S. & Glen Thorne, Pendleton	50,582	92,674.62
Rew & Rew, Pendleton	38,322	72,869.39
Loyd E. Smith & Sons, Mayville	35,219	67,230.70
F. L. Watkins, J. Kenneth Kaseberg, and Helen Korn, Wasco	31,710	64,371.30
Estimated State average per wheat loan		5,981.56

See footnote at end of table.

Producers with the largest quantity of wheat placed under loan on the 1957 crop—Con.

Name of producer and address	Quantity	Amount
PENNSYLVANIA		
	Bushels	
Willow Brook Co., Catasauqua	3,400	$7,071.52
Sam B. Firebaugh, New Freedom	3,245	6,812.48
Maple Lawn Farms, Inc., New Park	3,144	6,602.46
John C. Trexler, Mertztown	2,717	5,652.05
Herman Handwerk, Schnecksville	2,691	5,623.62
Estimated State average per wheat loan		1,030.00
SOUTH CAROLINA		
Garrett Bros. & T. H. Copeland, Mountville	3,704	7,926.56
Carl Porth, Fort Motte	3,567	7,334.73
Hugh W. Perrow, Cameron	2,825	5,774.00
G. C. & N. H. Bull, Cameron	2,736	5,609.00
J. V. Spigener, Allendale	2,680	5,305.77
Estimated State average per wheat loan		1,077.39
SOUTH DAKOTA		
Donald Handcock, Longvalley	40,397	87,215.07
Dennis Anderson, Onida	34,792	69,308.68
Leslie Handcock, Longvalley	30,474	69,172.78
Myrten Jacoby, Batesland	28,727	60,472.74
Hansmier & Son, Bristol	28,500	58,555.00
Estimated State average per wheat loan		2,903.13
TENNESSEE		
Taylor & Teeter, Guthrie, Ky	5,491	10,770.35
C. S. Crockarell & Co., Clarksville	5,011	9,976.11
Holman & Winn Robertson, Springfield	4,222	8,649.84
Harris & Teeter, Guthrie, Ky	3,278	6,711.48
H. A. Dewberry & Jim S. Brock, Lawrenceburg	3,115	5,885.79
Estimated State average per wheat loan		750.00
TEXAS		
Jim Golding, Dimmitt	35,277	75,188.99
Nuckles & Gerald, Chillicothe	27,187	54,373.33
Elizabeth Herring Estate, Amarillo	21,615	45,157.99
A. L. Stovall, Panhandle	22,868	42,932.77
A. C. Witt, Perryton	21,725	39,327.11
Estimated State average per wheat loan		3,073.00
UTAH		
Ralph Bastian, Riverton	10,869	18,625.39
Orlando Allen, Tremonton	9,926	17,171.98
L. S. Capener, Riverside	9,096	14,736.05
Waldo Grant, Howell	8,329	14,409.17
Holmgren Bros. (LeRoy Dell and John), Bear River City	8,768	14,291.30
Estimated State average per wheat loan		3,065.00
VIRGINIA		
Adolph Hula, Charles City	6,707	14,557.28
Evelynton Plantation, Charles City	6,149	13,377.17
Brandon Farm, Spring Grove	4,533	9,347.52
Stanley Hula, Charles City	4,231	9,008.89
Upper Brandon Farm, Spring Grove	3,706	8,039.65
Estimated State average per wheat loan		999.89
WASHINGTON		
L. C. Staley, Pullman	55,613	103,573.72
Bi-County Farms & Horrigan Farms, Prosser	46,481	91,567.57
Don Damon, Cunningham	48,189	90,596.23
Wilbur Security Co., Wilbur	47,685	84,437.70
Edgar W. Smith & Sons, Lancaster	39,488	74,237.16
Estimated State average per wheat loan		6,790.00

Producers with the largest quantity of wheat placed under loan on the 1957 crop—Con.

Name of producer and address	Quantity	Amount
WEST VIRGINIA		
Oliveboy Stock Farm, Charles Town	1,370	$2,928.03
Paul D. Chapman, Rippon	1,012	2,196.76
Willard O. Lloyd, Charles Town	553	1,211.798
Alice J. Knott, Shepherdstown	418	852.72
J. Edgar Day, Shepherdstown	410	816.56
Estimated State average per wheat loan		1,391.35
WISCONSIN		
Kiehlbauch Bros., Sturtevant	3,416	7,310.24
Henry & Chas. Kuiper, Union Grove	1,854	3,967.56
Lester Hribar, Union Grove	1,270	3,717.80
Harry Kingsfield, Union Grove	827	1,769.78
Ronald Brummond, Mayville	814	1,693.12
Estimated State average per wheat loan		1,462.18
WYOMING		
Christy K. Smth, Newcastle	18,513	41,418.00
Conrad Kaufman, Hawk Springs	18,816	37,970.00
Joe Matje, Lagrange	18,751	36,176.00
Lon David, Haw Springs	16,816	36,138.00
Dale Hubbs, Haw Springs	15,724	32,429.00
Estimated State average per wheat loan		3,500.00

[1] Wheat loans made to only 2 producers in Arizona and 1 producer in Louisiana and Nevada.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION

Mr. THOMAS. 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 Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I voted against the authorization bill for the Space Agency for the reasons I have heretofore set forth in the RECORD on pages 8277 and 8291.

I repeat that I think the programs of the Space Agency should be carefully reviewed by the Congress, and this will be done now without section 4 of this bill. Section 4 will slow down the program 3 to 4 months every year.

We have spent in the neighborhood of $40 billion a year for national defense for several years without the requirements of section 4. At least $3 billion or $4 billion of the money goes for research and development in the same field as the Space Agency without the requirements of section 4.

I make these remarks as it is the only way of registering my disapproval to section 4 under the procedure where the bill was brought up under suspension of the rules and could not be amended.

NUCLEAR TEST BAN PITFALLS

Mr. HOSMER. 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. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, under date of May 8, 1959, a document of exceptional importance was submitted to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy via its chairman, the Honorable CLINTON P. ANDERSON. The document was written by the Honorable Thomas E. Murray, formerly an Atomic Energy Commissioner and at present a valued consultant to the Joint Committee.

The Murray document deals realistically with the subject of bans on nuclear testing, the subject of much current talk at the Geneva Conference of foreign ministers and brings to light many facets of that vital issue which have for too long been ignored in public discussion.

Murray advises that U.S. acceptance in principle of a proposal for permanent cessation of U.S. nuclear testing represent "a step backward in the policy of retreat" which the United States has adopted in disarmament negotiations. He asserts his belief that from the standpoint of American military security and political advantage, the worst thing that can happen is Soviet acceptance of such a proposal.

Citing an "uninformed and frightened world opinion" as the chief weapon of the Soviet Union in the propaganda war, Murray holds that public ignorance in nuclear matters leave the American people unable to debate intelligently either the effects of nuclear testing, the shape of a sound foreign policy, the design of a rational military policy, or the nature of our moral responsibilities.

He cites prior incidents of contradictory positions by the United States on nuclear policy. For instance, as late as December 1957 President Eisenhower was reiterating our former policy that cessation of nuclear tests would endanger the national security. Yet in August 1958 the President unilaterallv ceased U.S. nuclear testing.

The U.S. ban was based on a scientific assumption that nuclear test explosions could be readily detected, and on a political assumption that the United States would score a propaganda victory. Both assumptions, contends Murray were wrong; "the scientific assumption proved completely invalid and the political assumption boomeranged," he says.

Mr. Murray properly points out that throughout the test ban negotiations the immense land area of Red China has been completely ignored, rendering any scientific and political agreement which might be concluded essentially meaningless.

He held that the President's judgment in December 1957 is the right one because American military security demands continued nuclear testing in order to develop weapons for "important defense uses," to develop lower yield weapons for use in limited wars, and in order to make the weapon "more a military weapon and less a weapon of mass destruction." The need for further tests for defense purposes was emphasized by the Argus and Johnston Island outer-space tests, Mr. Murray argues.

He expresses a belief shared by many that there is a moral responsibility, so long as nuclear weapons do exist, to develop them into controllable and discriminate military weapons rather than indiscriminate instruments of massacre. Murray's call is for clear thinking which will bring a return to first principles: moral, political, and military.

Although I do not agree with Mr. Murray in each detail of his statement, and will at later times expand upon my own views, there is "red meat" food for thought in what he says. For that reason and because press coverage of his statement was skimpy, I have asked that his full statement be set forth, as follows:

THE PRESENT UNITED STATES BAN ON NUCLEAR TESTING

(Memorandum to Hon. CLINTON P. ANDERSON, chairman, Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, from Thomas E. Murray, consultant)

In compliance with your request, I am submitting my comments on the present U.S. policy regarding the cessation of nuclear testing.

A new turn was given to the whole complicated issue of nuclear testing by President Eisenhower's most recent letter to Mr. Khrushchev, as reported in the press. The worst thing that can now happen is that Mr. Khrushchev will accept the first proposal made by the President in this latest letter.

The proposal bears on the crucial issue of inspection. It is substantially the proposal made by Prime Minister Macmillan to Mr. Khrushchev and accepted by the latter in principle. It suggests that an agreement be reached to carry out on an annual basis a predetermined number of inspections. These inspections would not be numerous, but should bear an appropriate relationship to scientific facts and detection capabilities. (It is not at all clear what this concept means and implies; at the present moment the scientific facts concerning the capabilities of detection systems, other than atmospheric, are matters of serious doubt. I shall return to this point later.)

From the standpoint of American military security and political advantage, the worst thing that can happen is, I say, that Mr. Khrushchev will accept the Macmillan-Eisenhower proposal. There are four major reasons, whose force is cumulative.

First, an agreement of this kind will put a permanent stop to all U.S. nuclear tests. This, as I shall say later, would be disastrous in the present state of our nuclear armament programs.

Second, this agreement would not necessarily put a stop to Soviet nuclear tests. The Soviet Union could very easily evade the extremely limited capabilities of the proposed system of occasional inspections.

Third, the agreement would therefore have only one effect on the current armament race, namely, it would guarantee that the United States, which may already be behind in the perfecting of needed weapons systems, will fall further behind.

Fourth, these disastrous effects on our military security would not be compensated by any political gains for the United States. On the contrary, the Soviet Union would have won the political victory. It would have driven the United States another long step backward along the lines of the policy of retreat that it has been following with most lamentable consistency.

For about 5 years the United States has been steadily retreating under Soviet pressures and under the pressures, largely generated by Soviet propaganda, of an uninformed and frightened world opinion. Now we are giving way to the ill-advised views of an ally, Great Britain, who presumed to project her views into the current negotiations without prior consultation with the United States. The President's yielding to Prime Minister Macmillan was unjustified and unnecessary. In consequence of it a situation which was already bad has become worse. It will not be difficult to show how bad the situation already was.

Ever since 1945 the Soviet Union has looked upon disarmament negotiations as a major arena in which to wage its cold war against the West. The war on this vital front has moved through several phases; the dominant issue has been nuclear armament. In none of the phases of the conflict has the U.S. Government scored any successes.

A serious failure has been registered at the Geneva conference of the three nuclear powers—the United States, the United Kingdom, and the Soviet Union—which opened on October 31, 1958, and has been dragging on ever since. Having been present in Geneva during the early part of the conference as consultant to Senator ALBERT GORE, one of the official observers for the U.S. Senate, I have followed the course of the negotiations with close attention.

The proceedings of the conference have been reported in the press; but there has been no public argument about the basic issues of American public policy that the conference raises. The public is almost entirely unaware of what these issues are. This is lamentable, since they concern vital aspects of our national security and our cold war strategy. There ought to be vigorous argument about them, as there has been about the missile lag and about other defense policies.

The immediate background of the Geneva conference was an international meeting of scientists, also held in Geneva, during the summer of 1958. The scientists reached an agreement on the design of an inspection system capable of detecting nuclear test explosions. But they had before them inadequate data; in fact, the magnitude of this problem is only now beginning to be understood. Surprisingly, instead of being cautious, they accepted conclusions that were far too optimistic and in several important respects erroneous. Moreover, it is worthwhile noting that politics was subtly present at this scientific meeting; it showed itself chiefly in a tacit agreement to avoid questions that would raise political issues. For instance, it was obvious that the inspection system on which they agreed could have no meaning since it failed to cover the immense land area of China. But this question was not even raised, for obvious political reasons. On all sides there was a determination to agree. I might interject here that the issue of including China in the scope of an inspection system has been consistently and resolutely avoided to this very day; yet the issue is absolutely crucial.

In sharing the determination to agree the Soviet scientists in Geneva were following political instructions, as Soviet scientists always do. They could afford to sign the scientific agreement because it was politically meaningless in view of the higher Soviet policy that the operation of all international system of control must be subject to the rights of national sovereignty and therefore to the veto power. This has been a Soviet policy since 1946 when it was first announced by Mr. Gromyko in the course of the discussions on the Baruch plan for international control of atomic energy. There has been no evidence that the Soviet Union is disposed to relinquish this policy. The political meaninglessness of the scientists' agreement was demonstrated when the political conference met. The Soviet Union quickly de-

manded the right of veto within the control commission that would operate the detection system. During the course of the negotiations it has held to this position, which renders sterile from the outset all political negotiations about international inspection of nuclear tests. I would note here that Mr. Khrushchev's seeming willingness to discuss the Macmillan proposal constitutes no evidence that the Soviet Union is willing to change its veto policy.

The scientific agreement was reached on August 21, 1958. On August 22 President Eisenhower declared a unilateral moratorium on all manner of nuclear tests, to begin on October 31 and to run for 1 year, subject to extension. The action was incredibly rapid. It was also drastic. No satisfactory public explanation of it has been offered by the administration. Yet an explanation was owed to the public because the action raised all sorts of serious issues. In particular, it represented a radical change in American nuclear armament policy, a significant step in the policy of retreat upon which the United States has embarked. In order fully to explain the shift it would be necessary to go into the whole history of armament and disarmament policy; but this is a lengthy and tortuous story. The essential issue will appear if we go back just 1 year.

On August 21, 1957, exactly a year before the test moratorium was announced, President Eisenhower notified the London conference on disarmament that the United States would continue to "conduct such nuclear testing as our security requires," until two conditions were met: first, that all nations agree to stop testing, and second, that serious discussions about international inspection be inaugurated. In the course of the London conference the United States had made substantive concessions to Soviet demands, without obtaining any Soviet concessions in return. For instance, the United States gave up its long-standing position that nuclear tests should not be the first item on the disarmament agenda. More important, it revoked its even more substantive position that the cessation of nuclear tests must be made dependent on the prior installation of an effective inspection system. But the United States still held fast to the absolutely fundamental principle that an agreement on any ban on nuclear tests must be kept subordinate to the demands of American military security. It also held to the position that America would not act unilaterally in the matter.

On October 4, 1957, the President put the American position firmly in a long letter to Prime Minister Kishi of Japan, who had pleaded for a cessation of tests. The President said that "for the time being and in the present circumstances the security of the United States and, I believe, that of the free world depends to a great degree upon what we learn from the testing of nuclear weapons. We are at a stage when testing is required for the development of important defensive uses of nuclear weapons, particularly against missiles, submarines, and aircraft as well as to reduce further the fallout yield from nuclear weapons. To stop these tests in the absence of effective limitations on nuclear weapons production and on other elements of armed strength and without opening up of all principal nations to a measure of inspection as a safeguard against surprise attack in which nuclear weapons could be used, is a sacrifice which would be dangerous to accept."

On December 15, 1957, in a letter to Prime Minister Nehru of India the President made the same argument. "The cessation of tests," he said, "cannot be an isolated step"; it must be accompanied by other measures. He added: "We are at a stage when testing is required particularly for the development of important defensive uses of these weapons." And he concluded: "To stop these tests at this time * * * is a sacrifice which we could not in prudence accept."

Here then the essential issue appears. As late as December 1957 the President argued that a test moratorium would be imprudent, dangerous to the security of the United States and the free world, an unwarranted sacrifice of defensive military strength. He also implied that the United States has laid out a test program with definite objectives whose achievement is essential to the national defense. A bare 8 months later, in August 1958, the President declared a unilateral test moratorium on all kinds of tests. The American test program was brought to a complete halt. The dismaying thing is that this stoppage promises to be permanent, unless a better understanding of the issues is quickly reached; and no efforts are being made to promote this understanding.

The vital questions come to mind immediately. What happened in those 8 months to obviate or lessen the imprudence and danger of stopping nuclear tests? Did the United States suddenly acquire all the requisite designs of nuclear weapons for all "important defense uses," in such wise that no further experimentation was needed? At a press conference on April 25, 1956, the President had said that "the United States is proceeding with tests in order to find out ways and means of limiting nuclear weapons * * * and in general making the weapons more a military weapon and less a weapon of mass destruction." This objective is of supreme importance, both from a military and also from a moral standpoint. Has it been completely achieved? Or has it been abandoned? Has the United States permanently given up its program designed to limit nuclear weapons and make them suitable for properly military uses? Has it completely committed itself to a policy of almost total reliance on the strategy of massive retaliation by multimegaton weapons, which are not military weapons at all but simply instruments of indiscriminate massacre, designed for the annihilation of whole populations? Or possibly, is the United States presently so sure of its superior strength in the field of limited nuclear weapons, suitable for tactical use, that it can afford to stop tests, while the Soviet Union continues its tests, many of which are experiments with weapons of limited yield? Is the United States really ahead of the Soviet Union in this field?

The administration has given no answer whatever to these questions. What is worse, the questions themselves have not been put strongly enough to the administration. It seems to me that the American public is presently in an intolerable position. All it knows it what the President has said and what the President has done. What the President has repeatedly said is that continued nuclear tests are necessary for the national security. What the President has done is to stop the tests that are necessary for the national security. This is a plain contradiction. If the President was right in considering it imprudent and dangerous to stop tests in December 1957, he cannot have been right in stopping tests in August 1958. And if in August the action of stopping tests was prudent and compatible with the national security, the declaration in December was false. What is the public to believe? Neither the administration nor the public can have it both ways.

This is the more true because nothing happened between December 1957 and August 1958 to alter substantially either the international political situation or the domestic armament situation. An agreement was reached on the practicability of an inspection system to police a ban on tests; but this agreement is scientifically invalid and politically meaningless. Moreover the elaborate series of small tests that was rushed through at the Nevada test site in September and October, in order to beat the deadline for the moratorium on October 31, was sufficient testimony to the fact that the technology of lower kiloton, and especially fractional kiloton, weapons is still very imperfect. Limited nuclear weapons have always been the stepchild in our armament program. Our program in this range has hardly begun to move beyond the development stage; and in this stage tests are absolutely necessary in order to improve existent designs and to validate the radically new designs that are still needed. When the moratorium went into effect, the imperative objectives of our test program, as defined by the President, had not been achieved.

There is another alarming aspect to the matter. It came to light when the disclosure of the Johnston Island and Argus series of tests was made. The purpose of these tests was to investigate the effects of nuclear explosions in outer space. This was a radically new and vastly important field of investigation. When the President announced the test moratorium he knew the results of the Johnston Island tests and he also knew that the Argus series was soon to take place. The results of these two series of tests have been sufficient to raise grave questions about the effect of nuclear explosions in outer space on the operation of American weapons systems, communications systems and early warning systems. We must assume that the Soviet Union has conducted similar experiments and may be in a position to exploit their effects to its own advantage in the event of war. Given the meagerness of our knowledge in this area, it is imperatively necessary that the United States should conduct further tests in outer space. Delay is dangerous. But the President's moratorium is denying to the United States the scientific information that is vital to the national defense.

No military man in possession of the facts would have recommended the test moratorium, or consented to it except under heavy pressure. The military judgment today must still be the judgment made by the President in December 1957 that a total shutdown on all tests, small as well as large, underground as well as overground, is imprudent, dangerous to the national security, an unwarranted sacrifice of defensive strength.

Given the plain and public contradiction between the statements and the actions of the administration, it is, I think, altogether necessary that your committee should give immediate attention to the following questions: Is the existent moratorium compatible with the security interests of the United States? This is the major issue raised by the President's statements, quoted above, and by the results of the Johnston Island and Argus tests. In particular, is our present situation and our current progress satisfactory in what concerns the defensive uses of nuclear weapons, uses that are properly military because they envisage military targets (submarines, aircraft, missiles, troops in the field, military installations, etc.). For these uses limited weapons are desirable and necessary. Is our stockpile of these weapons adequate? Are our development programs sufficiently varied? In particular, is satisfactory progress being made toward the President's essential objective of "making the weapon more a military weapon and less a weapon of mass destruction?"

This objective is not only a military necessity but also a moral imperative. It is a military necessity for the reason pointed to by the Rockefeller Bros. special studies panel on national security, lest we be frozen between "the alternatives of yielding to what will seem a marginal Soviet gain or precipitating a worldwide holocaust." It is a moral imperative for the reason that we must have in hand the means of making

the use of force a moral act, an act of justice against injustice. The norms of justice will not sanction a use of force that is not limited and discriminating. They demand that force be directed with fair precision against the opposing force that is the instrument of injustice. They forbid that force be launched wildly against total populations. The moral integrity as well as the military security of the American people are at stake in the field of nuclear armament. It is the prerogative and the duty of your committee to elicit the due measure of public information on both issues.

A great deal of publicity has been given to many other areas of national security. There is an equal public right to candor about the nuclear weapons program in all its aspects, military and moral. Nuclear secrecy is now for the most part an archaic survival from the presputnik era. It has outlived its major usefulness as a means of military security. And in considerable part it has become a menace to another value that is not less important, our moral integrity as a Nation.

For instance, there has been ample information about missiles that will hurtle from 2,000 to 6,000 miles. The people have been informed, altogether vaguely, that these missiles will carry thermonuclear warheads. They may well suppose that the present technological effort is to make these warheads as destructive as possible. But the fact that multimegaton warheads will kill tens of millions of men, women, and children, has not been impressed on the imagination or the moral conscience of the American people. Yet, if these missiles are delivered, it is the American people as a whole, and not merely a handful of officers in the Pentagon, and the President, who will be morally responsible for the death and devastation that ensues. It is high time that the American people were told openly and frankly just what they are to be held morally responsible for. The Department of Defense is committed to the defense of the people not only as a historical people but as a moral entity, a nation under God, whose power, gained from the atom, is to be dedicated to the service of justice.

Given the military imprudence of the American unilateral test moratorium, one must presume that consent to it was obtained within military circles by the classic argument, overriding political considerations. The moratorium and the ensuing Geneva Conference were, in fact, a political maneuver. But the value of a political maneuver is measured by one standard—success. And the sorry fact is that both the moratorium and the Geneva Conference have been a dismal political failure.

Practically the first thing that the Russians did on arrival in Geneva last October was to announce in effect: "You want us to agree to a moratorium on tests for 1 year? That's no good. What we want is an agreement to abolish tests forever. And to abolish all nuclear weapons and nuclear warfare, too." Our propaganda line, that was supposed to capture the approval of world opinion, was topped at the very outset. We were put on the defensive again.

Our political gains from the test moratorium and the Geneva Conference have been zero. Worse than that, our political losses have been considerable. The image of America that we have projected is such as to inspire confidence only in our enemies, not in our friends. Surely the Russians must realize that our test moratorium marked a victory for their 12 years of tough policy and skillful manipulation of world opinion. They have driven us into a policy of retreat. It will take a high degree of political courage to extricate ourselves from its toils, which grow tighter every day.

The initial muddle is in our own thinking. It can only be cleared up by a return to first principles—moral, political, and military.

The first military principle is the security of the United States and the free world. It requires a flexibility of strength through the whole nuclear spectrum. To achieve this the essential demand now is an intensive test program of lower kiloton and fractional kiloton weapons for essential military purposes. This was the President's judgment in December 1957. It is still the right judgment.

This test program can be conducted underground. Therefore it will entail no radioactive contamination of the atmosphere and no hazards to world health from fallout. We have already developed the techniques for controlling and containing dangerous radioactive products from underground explosions. The techniques can be further perfected. On the other hand, tests conducted within the earth's atmosphere, from which contamination and fallout result, are presently not an essential demand of military security. We can afford to forego this manner of testing.

Therefore we are in a position to satisfy the demands of the first political principle, which is a due regard for the legitimate demands of world opinion. The peoples of the world are right in demanding that their health and well-being be safeguarded against possible radioactive hazards that might be created by nuclear tests conducted within the earth's atmospheric envelope. We can and ought to heed this reasonable demand.

The proposal that the United States should make, as a "first step," toward international limitation of nuclear weapons, is already evident from these two premises. The proposal has two parts: first, an agreement to stop all tests that would cause atmospheric contamination and fallout hazards; second, an agreement to inaugurate immediately an international inspection system.

The system is already in existence. Its operation needs only to be internationalized. Over the years the United States has created a system capable of detecting and locating nuclear explosions in the atmosphere, with a high degree of efficiency. We can immediately offer our own detection system for international use, to be manned by scientists from the nuclear powers. We should also propose an expansion of the system to include additional stations around the world, to be likewise manned by international scientific personnel. This expansion would increase the efficiency of the system to the point where it could detect and locate atmospheric nuclear explosions in the low kiloton ranges. This proposal would not call for the "mobile teams" of inspectors to which the Russians have been strenuously objecting at the Geneva conference. The international control teams would not have to inspect the scene of any explosion, either from the ground or from the air. Their work would be done at fixed stations. Therefore this proposal would cut the ground from under the Russian propagandistic evasions of the issues of control.

There is little or no reason to expect that the Russians would agree to this proposal. But whether they did or not, the United States would have improved its own position in two ways. First, it would have declared its freedom to provide for its own security by going ahead with "small" underground tests and with tests of the Johnston Island and Argus type in outer space. Second, it would have cleared its test policy in any honest court of world opinion.

The proposals that I have here suggested seem to be in substantial agreement with those made by the President to Mr. Khrushchev in a letter dated April 13, 1959. At that time the administration finally reached a realistic position compatible with national security and capable of being made the subject of a self-enforcing agreement. Subsequently, Prime Minister Macmillan thrust his unfortunate and dangerous idea into the picture. In his recent letter the President embraced the Macmillan idea and put his own proposal of April 13 into second place, as a secondary alternative to be considered if the Soviet Union rejects the Macmillan idea. This was a mistake. The Macmillan idea can prove to be a snare. But the idea behind the President's April 13 proposals has the merit of realism.

Realism here means a recognition of the fact that at the moment the science and technology of detection systems are developed to the point where only atmospheric explosions are subject to efficient and adequate detection. Formidable technical difficulties remain to be overcome before we can begin to talk of detecting all manner of text explosions. Hence it makes sense to propose a ban on atmospheric tests; this ban can be adequately controlled. It does not make sense to put forward proposals going further than this, unless we are prepared to make a mockery of the principle of inspection, to which we still fortunately cling, despite our continuing policy of retreat. I fear that there is far too little realization of the fact which I am here emphasizing, namely, the technical limitations of methods of inspection. Progress, of course, will be made. The point is that it has not yet been made. And it will be bad business if we let our political maneuvers run ahead of our scientific capabilities, in an area where these latter are decisive. An illusion of inspection would be worse than no inspection at all.

In conclusion, I express the hope that the policy I have suggested on nuclear tests would be the beginning of a recurrence to first moral principles. The fact today is that a vacuum exists in the governmental and public mind with regard to the moral aspects of the uses of force in the service of justice. The use of force is either considered to be inherently evil or else it is regarded as a purely neutral problem in technology. This vacuum of moral understanding and hence of political purpose is our greatest danger today. The chief reason why the threat of all-out war looms over the world is that nuclear technology, operating in a political and moral vacuum, but with appalling efficiency, has developed the capacity to wage it. And the technology continues to develop at a terrifying pace.

Nuclear technology alone cannot solve the dilemma it has helped to create. But it can make one necessary contribution. It can reduce the destructiveness of nuclear weapons to limits that make military and political sense. In the current international crisis recourse to armed violence may become a necessity of last resort. But the use of force must not go to the point of political and moral absurdity. If America is to lay claim to any moral mission in history, it must take the lead in confining the wildly destructive energies of the atom within the bounds set by the canons of justice. A rational test program, safely conducted, would therefore be a means of moral education as well as of military security. It would illustrate a sound philosophy of the uses of nuclear force in the furtherance of the American purpose, which is the organization of the world on the principles of justice and freedom—the principles which God himself has established for the rule of human societies. This test program, if it were intelligently explained to the public, might therefore help to develop in the public mind the right concepts that are presently altogether lacking. It would at least dramatize to the world American recurrence to first principles.

TIMBER RESOURCE REVIEW

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentle-

man from South Dakota [Mr. McGOVERN] may extend his remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, the State of South Dakota is generally referred to as a "prairie" State with the possible implication that its people, concerned as they are with the agricultural problems of this rich grain and cattle land, have little interest in forest problems. It is significant, however, that 4.4 percent of the total land area of the State, some 2,169,000 acres, is in forest acreage. Harvesting and processing timber ranks third in importance among the three great natural resource industries of South Dakota—behind agriculture and mining. Over 4 billion board feet of live sawtimber now stands in the forests of South Dakota.

Almost 4 years ago Chief Forester Richard E. McArdle released the results of a mammoth study known as the Timber Resource Review which is the most complete evaluation of timber supply and demand ever made. It indicated that significant progress had been made in bringing timber growth and consumption into close equality.

Significant also was its conclusion that standing timber is declining in quality. It is estimated that by the year 2000, the demand will require a timber cut of 95 billion board feet of timber, two-thirds more than the present cut—that is, it will if wood is to occupy about the same place in the national economy that it does now.

Although planting rates have increased greatly in recent years there is a huge planting job ahead. Almost 50 million acres, or some 10 percent of all commercial forest land in the Nation, need planting if they are to become productive within a reasonable time. The Nation's Chief Forester has asked for 48 billion trees to be planted in the next 10 years if the wood requirements of an expanding population are to be met by the year 2000.

Cooperation between private, State, and Federal foresters is needed to meet this demand. Yet in recent years, the Federal Government has allowed its budget requests in this field to decline.

Concurrent resolutions have been introduced in both bodies declaring it national policy to provide a continuing program for the needed reforestation of Federal, State, and private land. The Secretaries of Agriculture and Interior would be asked to lay out a 10-year program beginning on July 1, 1960, which, by accelerating and supplementing existing reforestation programs, will plant 48 million idle and nonproductive acres to the trees we need.

Mr. Speaker, the longer action to build up our timber resources is delayed, the longer and more acute the period of short supply will be. Our goal should be permanent timber abundance. We can make trees and forests serve human welfare forever.

I am happy to join with my colleagues in sponsoring a similar resolution.

AIR MERCHANT MARINE

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. PORTER] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to urge the building up of an American air merchant marine capable of serving the needs of the country in both peace and war.

The country needs more airlift. During a trip abroad just before Easter, I saw in the Paris edition of the New York Herald Tribune, March 28, 1959, an excellent syndicated column by S. L. A. Marshall of the Detroit News—who is a brigadier general in the U.S. Army Reserve—pointing out that although we have developed STRAC, the Strategic Army Corps of four divisions, it would take some 17 days to airlift even the spearhead of one of these divisions, such as the 101st Airborne Division, to a trouble spot abroad such as the Middle East. The Department of Defense at my request commented on General Marshall's article that it would take less than 17 days, but they have not said how much less.

It is common sense that we cannot count on only one brush fire war breaking out in the world at any one time. Would we not be in a dangerous position if we only had enough airlift to fly troops to handle a crisis in the Middle East and if at the same time simultaneous brush fire wars broke out in Vietnam and in Korea? We must be able to deal simultaneously with crises on opposite sides of the globe. Sworn testimony before the Armed Services Special Subcommittee of the 84th Congress, 2d session—page 841—is very revealing:

> General GAVIN. The Army in my personal opinion has as a very minimum, the need for a capability to lift one division in each of our major theaters of interest.
>
> Senator SYMINGTON. Simultaneously?
>
> General GAVIN. Yes, sir.

GROSSLY INADEQUATE AIRLIFT

As General Wheeler pointed out later in his testimony, far from having airlift for three divisions for three major theaters of operations, we are presently unable to airlift even one.

In his authoritative book on "Nuclear Weapons and Foreign Policy," Henry A. Kissinger quoted Army General Weyland that it would take some 15 days to move such a spearhead to the Middle East by available airlift and 10 days to move even a regimental combat team to Laos.

This is too slow and it means that our aerial fire brigades are liable to arrive too late to put out the brush fires, and in strength too weak to be fully effective.

Dr. Kissinger has pointed out that most of the airlift would not be available for limited war anyway since it would be earmarked for the Strategic Air Command, and that therefore "it will be necessary to create additional airlift capacity"—page 137.

It is the creation of additional airlift by a tripling of the civil airlift that is the purpose of my speech.

On December 9, 1958, Democratic Advisory Council's state of the Union message declared:

> We must build, too, our air transport facilities for a maximum of three to four modernized divisions, to be quickly transported to where they may be needed.

INADEQUACY IS ON THE RECORD

It is a matter of record in testimony before the Appropriations Committee that there is less than enough airlift in combined civil and military hands to move even one division of troops along with their tanks, missiles and other equipment, let alone the three that are called for.

Therefore, obvious defense needs, emphasized by these Army generals and by our party's advisory policy, call for a threefold expansion of the national airlift.

How best can the national airlift be tripled?

It can best be done by a triple expansion of our civil airlift. This way is most in keeping with our free enterprise traditions, it is the cheapest, and it has a long history of success.

We have a sound and historic example in the civilian merchant marine which has been the backbone of sealift in every war in which this country has participated.

In World War II, General Eisenhower gave this salute:

> When final victory is ours, there is no organization that will share its credit more deservedly than the merchant marine.

The Navy has never felt it necessary to build up a merchant marine of its own to compete directly with the civilian merchant marine in time of peace so as to have its own merchant marine in war.

SUCCESS OF MERCHANT MARINE

The Navy has always trusted the civil merchant marine to respond to the most dangerous wartime assignment, and this trust has been fulfilled.

If we could count, as we have done, on the sailors and ships of the civilian merchant marine to make dangerous voyages as they did to Murmansk and the Philippines, why can we not count equally well on the crews and planes of our air merchant marine to make emergency flights to Frankfurt, the Middle East, Saigon, or anywhere else in the world?

Is there any reason to suppose that the civilian crews and managements of the U.S. commercial airlines are any bit less courageous or less patriotic than the civilian sailors and management of the U.S. merchant marine?

The Navy, through its Military Sea Transport Service, tries to build up the civilian merchant marine by booking Government cargoes and passengers on the civil vessels wherever possible, instead of building up an empire of their own.

For example, out of each dollar appropriated to the Military Sea Transport Service—MSTS—over 70 cents goes to the U.S. flag civilian merchant marine, whereas by contrast the Military Air Transport Service—MATS—proposes that out of each dollar that they would be given for next year, the fiscal year 1960, they would retain 81 cents for their

own use and award only 19 cents to U.S. flag civil airline industry.

MATS should be encouraging the buildup of the U.S. flag civil air transport industry, and not competing with it in the carriage of peacetime Government traffic, because such competition hinders the buildup of civil airlift. Why should not MATS imitate MSTS and book 70 percent of its traffic on civil carriers?

It is obvious to me that a transport plane, like an ocean vessel, and unlike a tank or a bomb or a gun, is something that has a regular use in peace as well as in war. Therefore, the more transport planes that can be built up by the civil industry, the fewer that will have to be purchased and operated entirely at the taxpayers' expense.

USE COMMERCIAL CARRIERS TO THE MAXIMUM

The bipartisan Hoover Commission unanimously recommended that:

> Only after commercial carriers have been utilized to the maximum practicable extent, should transportation on service carriers be authorized.

This is a sound principle and who can really argue against it?

The Department of Defense itself recognizes the validity of this principle in its Department of Defense Directive 4500.9 which clearly directs that the congressional policy statements in the Transportation Act of 1940 and the Civil Aeronautics Act to be followed, that the resources of the Department of Defense "will not be employed in such manner as will adversely affect the economic well-being of the commercial transportation industry" and directs that, instead of Government transportation, "commercial transportation service will be employed for the movements of personnel or things when such service is available or readily obtainable and satisfactorily capable of meeting military requirements."

This Department of Defense directive is sound. If the Defense Department applied it consistently there would be no problem of Government competition with private, taxpaying air transport enterprise.

But, illogically, the Defense Department has limited the application of its own Department of Defense directive to traffic "within the continental United States." Why should there be a different policy outside than inside the country?

For no good reason, outside the continental United States, Government-owned and Government-operated airlines, in the form of MATS and an equally large fleet of "administrative aircraft" fly parallel to the U.S. flag airlines, and compete daily with them in the carriage of peacetime Government traffic.

NEED FOR LONG-HAUL TRANSPORT PLANES

I say the same policy of noncompetition should govern in the international traffic especially because, first, our U.S. flag carriers abroad have enough to do to fight foreign-flag competition without also fighting a U.S. Goverment airline; second, we should be encouraging the growth of U.S. international civil airlift because the greatest defense need is for long-haul transport planes capable of spanning the oceans.

We can get more airlift at less cost by building up civil airlift than we can by building up Government airlines.

Instead of competing with our international airlines, and forcing them into destructive rate practices, the Defense Department should follow outside, as well as inside the continental United States, its own directive 4500.9 that its huge economic resources "will not be employed in such manner as will adversely affect the economic well-being of the commercial transportation industry."

Our own Appropriations Committee, in House Report No. 2104 of the 84th Congress, 2d session, by Mr. MAHON, stated:

> In this regard, President Eisenhower's Air Coordinating Committee 1954 report on air policy (p. 17) had this to say:
>
> "The Government should to the greatest extent practicable, adjust its use of air transportation so as to use existing unutilized capacity of the U.S. air carriers."
>
> The committee strongly endorses that statement.

How big is the "existing unutilized capacity of U.S. air carriers," to quote our own Appropriations Committee report?

I have taken a survey individually, of all U.S. civil airlines, large, small and medium ones, asking them to tell me how much unused space they expect to have during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, to transport additional military traffic.

AMPLE CIVIL AIRLIFT CAPACITY

A tabulation of the replies received indicates that these civil airlines expect to have over 1.3 billion ton-miles of capacity during fiscal year 1960 to carry extra military traffic.

The tabulation shows U.S. flag civil airlines have more than enough airlift to carry all the passengers and cargo now transported by the Military Air Transport Service.[1]

I am inserting this tabulation immediately following my speech. It is noteworthy how many of the airlines point out that they can do the peacetime air transport job cheaper than MATS can, and no one in the Defense Department has seriously challenged these assertions.

We can get more airlift at less cost by building up civil airlift than we can by building up Government airlines.

It impresses me that the more the U.S. civil air fleet can be enlarged the greater will be our national airlift capacity to cope with emergency or wartime requirements.

IMPROVE EFFICIENCY

For example, I am struck by the statement of a former Under Secretary of the Army that if all Army peacetime movements were made by air there would automatically be available for duty at any one time an entire additional division of troops.

Consequently, I feel that the Army, Navy, and Air Force could all, with resultant economies in time, manpower, materiel and money, make far greater use of civil airlift in peacetime than they are now doing.

I do not believe the Defense Department in its peacetime movement of traffic in choosing between surface and air transportation has followed the statement in Senate Report No. 543 of the 85th Congress which was repeated in Senate Report No. 1937 on the present year's appropriation for the Defense Department, namely that:

> In evaluating relative costs of transportation, the Department should recognize the specific monetary value of time saved as an important factor.

Nor has there been sufficient implementation of Army Regulation No. 59-5 specifying the use of air transport as a normal mode of transportation to develop a wartime airlift capability and to save the time of soldiers and officers, and in the case of cargo to reduce the procurement in the amount of cargo and pipeline and stockpile. That this directive is not being implemented fully at the present time is shown by the fact that the services are moving some half million passengers by sea across the Pacific compared to only about 90,000 by air.

I believe the increase in airlift capacity called for by the Army generals and by our party's advisory council statement quoted above can be achieved by a rerouting of peacetime military traffic so as to use civil airlift rather than surface means.

BUILD CAPACITY IN PEACETIME

It is difficult to see how the airlift capacity needed for an emergency will be available if it is not built up in moving peacetime traffic.

If it is desired by the Department of Defense to have on hand for emergency use additional transport planes over and above those which exist or which would be added to the civil fleet if the Defense Department tripled its peacetime use of the civil fleet, then those planes should be considered additional and should not be allowed to take traffic away from the civil carriers.

It is obvious that a Government-owned and Government-operated transport plane will still be available in the event of war whether or not it carries peacetime loads, but one that is employed in commerce has to receive suf-

---

[1] MATS lift on MATS (Government-owned and Government-operated) planes for next year—fiscal year ending June 30, 1960—is estimated at—

	Ton-miles per year
Passenger ton-miles	252,998,000
Cargo ton-miles	873,025,000
Total	1,126,023,000

(House Defense Appropriations hearings for fiscal 1960, pt. 4, p. 922.)

The total estimate of the civil airlines replying to my questionnaire as to the ton-miles of unused space available to fly additional military traffic for the same period (fiscal year ending June 30, 1960) show: 1,300,000,000 ton-miles or more than enough unused space to carry all the traffic which MATS is planning to fly.

Based on a similar survey in the House Defense Appropriations hearings for fiscal 1958, pt. 2, pp. 1711–1718, inclusion of those civil airlines which have not yet replied to my questionnaire would double the above estimate of unused civil airlift.

Consequently, it can reasonably be concluded that the whole U.S. civil air transport industry has more than twice enough unused space to fly all the passengers and cargo which MATS will move.

ficient revenues to continue to be operated and failing to receive such revenues these planes are liable, as has been too often the case in the last 2 years, to be sold to foreign companies or foreign countries and so they are lost to the U.S. civil reserve air fleet.

A year ago—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 104, part 3, pages 3490–3491—I pointed out that MATS competition was forcing certain commercial operators to sell their planes to foreign countries where they would be lost forever to the U.S. Civil Reserve Air Fleet, and subsequently I asked the Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board how much it would cost the Government to replace these planes and he wrote me:

> Between $9 and $10 million.

One joint civil-military goal should be the development of a large fleet of cargo planes—of types that are economical in peace and effective in war. Of course the planes should be readily adaptable to military use. If there is no war this fleet will add to peace and understanding through greater and faster world trade, and if there is a war this fleet will deliver our troops to the trouble spot overnight instead of some 17 or 15 days later.

MATS has been far too prone to indulge in luxury passenger planes that could not possibly carry Army tanks or missiles and are difficult to land and take off from small, unprepared areas. What is neded is for the Government to bring about a partnership between the military and civil industry in the development of a large fleet of cargo planes to serve both purposes.

If the Federal Government were to move its traffic on civil airlines, then these lines could buy more planes, and the military would have the use of them in emergencies.

NEED FOR GREATER COORDINATION

What is needed is greater coordination between the Department of Defense on the one hand, and, on the other hand, the civil aviation agencies of the Government and the civil air industry.

A year ago I prompted the Defense Department and CAB into activating this joint working group on military use of civil airlift, but it is apparent that the results have been negligible and that no real cooperation exists.

The Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board, which is charged by law with encouraging the development of the civil air transport industry to meet the needs of national defense, has written me that the CAB's suggestions to encourage procurement of needed commercial air cargo airlift were apparently not favorably received by the Air Force.

Since the Defense Department has admitted that the greatest shortage is in overseas cargo planes, you would think that the Defense Department would offer as much of its peacetime cargo to civil operators as possible in order to encourage the development of a large oversea air cargo industry. But that is not being done and the Air Force has admitted that they carry 90 percent of the peacetime Government cargo themselves in their own Government-owned and Government-operated airplanes.

The Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board went on in his letter to me saying:

> It is apparent that the Board's effectiveness in obtaining a greater share of military traffic for civil air carriers is quite limited.

Then finally, the Chairman of the CAB, Mr. James R. Durfee, wrote me:

> In the last analysis, this matter is one which has to be resolved by the Department of Defense and the Congress.

It is embarrassing, Mr. Speaker, when one agency of the Government finds itself unable to cooperate with another agency of the Government in what should be a goal of mutual interest.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE AGAINST CAB

It develops that the Department of Defense not only has not been responsive to the suggestions of the Civil Aeronautics Board for increasing the amount of Government traffic to be offered to civil air carriers, but also the Department of Defense has even officially proposed to our House Appropriations Committee a one-third decrease in the use of civil airlift, while at the same time asking for huge increases to be spent on their own fleet of Government-owned transport planes. The Defense Department opposes any language in its appropriation bill that would assure a stable and reasonable share of the peacetime traffic to civil airlines.

At the very least the Congress should in the appropriation bill which will be coming before us early next month legislate against any cutback in the use of civil air, provide that $80 million of MATS funds, as was done in section 634 of Public Law 85–724, be earmarked for civil airlift only so that MATS cannot spend the money on themselves, and, further, to provide that other Defense Department uses of civil air transportation be set at no less than $300 million per year.

Having forestalled any backward steps in the use of civil airlift we should then point for a tripling in the use of civil airlift to carry out the policy already laid down by the Congress and to carry out the very evident need for additional airlift for national defense.

THE PROGRAM

In summary, building up an effective Air merchant marine requires:

First. The Defense Department should follow the policy already laid down by the last three Congresses that the Government should use the unutilized space on commercial airlines before authorizing use of Government-owned airlines.

Second. This policy could be carried out if the Defense Department broadened DOD Directive 4500.9 against Government competition to include all transportation anywhere. MATS should then follow the lead of its sister service MSTS and book over 70 percent of its traffic on civil carriers. If action along these lines is not done, Congress may have to enact permanent law giving preference to private enterprise.

Third. Certainly Army, Navy, and Air Force should make far more use of airlift for normal movements of passengers, cargo and mail. Time is value. Saving time means saving money.

Fourth. The Defense Department should cooperate wholeheartedly with the civil air agencies of the Government and the civil air industry to develop a fleet of cargo planes to meet both civil and military purposes.

Mr. Speaker, I made a statement before the House Defense Appropriations Subcommittee on the importance of increasing, instead of decreasing, funds for use of civil airlift and I want to praise the committee for having, 3 years ago, started the first thorough congressional hearings of MATS administrative aircraft owned by the Government and civil airlift and for having—each subsequent year—stuck to the principle that private enterprise should be used in preference to Government transportation for the movement of peacetime Government traffic.

Particularly I have been impressed, Mr. Speaker, by the searching interrogation made annually by the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] and by the adherence to sound principles expressed by Messrs. SIKES, WHITTEN, TABER, LIPSCOMB, and others and by the clear-cut policy statements made on behalf of the subcommittee by its very able and respected chairman, Mr. MAHON, in House Report No. 2104 of the 84th Congress, 2d session, by the chairman's reaffirmation of the language adopted the year before in CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 103, part 6, page 7735, in House Report No. 841 of the 85th Congress, and by the conference report which adopted the defense appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1959.

CONGRESS DESERVES CREDIT

The gains which have been made in reducing Government competition with private enterprise have been made by the Congress, rather than by the executive branch, and by the Committees on Appropriations in particular.

I hope further gains may be made in the fiscal year 1960.

Mr. Speaker, I believe it will be necessary to enact permanent legislation to provide that all passenger, cargo, and mail requirements of the Government of the United States for air transportation shall be procured from U.S. air carriers to the extent the required service is available, is authorized, is adequate, and the rates for such service are reasonable.

I believe that before the Comptroller General of the United States allows credit for expenditures for transportation on Government-owned and Government-operated transport planes, satisfactory proof of the necessity therefor should be furnished by the official authorizing the use of Government air. Of course, I do believe that the applicability of such legislation to a particular department may be temporarily waived whenever the Congress, or the President, declares an emergency exists justifying such temporary waiver.

Throughout our country's history, our Government has built up our civilian merchant marine and relied on it to answer to the most heroic calls of duty in all our wars.

The same treatment which has proved so successful throughout our history should now be accorded to our air merchant marine.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I am having the following materials printed following these remarks:

First. Summary tabulation of replies which I have received from U.S. flag civil airlines as to the amount of unutilized space which they expect to have available during fiscal year 1960 for flying additional military traffic.

Second. Copy letter to me from Deputy Director of Legislative Liaison, Air Force, showing they have already obligated approximately $71 million for commercial airlift out of the $80 million set aside in section 634 of the Defense Appropriation Act for fiscal 1959.

Third. Syndicated column by S. L. A. Marshall of the Detroit News as it appeared in the Paris edition of the New York Herald Tribune, March 28, 1959.

Fourth. My exchange of correspondence with the Department of Defense and with S. L. A. Marshall—who is a brigadier general, USAR—on above column.

Fifth. Three articles from the Taxpayer, published by the Citizens Public Expenditure Survey.

Summary of replies to Congressman Charles O. Porter's questionnaire on the unused space available on U.S.-flag civil airlines for moving additional military traffic for the year ending June 30, 1960

Company (alphabetical order)	Space available for military traffic for year ending June 30, 1960			Industry comments (extracts from airline telegrams or letters)
	Ton-miles	Dollars	Passengers or cargo and routes	
AAXICO (Florida)	27,000,000 21,000,000		Domestic cargo Overseas passenger or cargo, either Atlantic or Pacific.	MATS should concentrate on the movement of heavy or bulky cargo not suitable for transportation by commercial carriers; on the movement of military personnel and cargo in support of SAC missions; on the movement of secret military cargo and services to remote or secret military installations and on the maintenance of air communications services, rescue services, weather services, photographic and charting services and the like. On the other hand, the civil air carriers should supply the airlift requirements for the movement of dependents, civil service personnel, military personnel for routine replacement, refugees and ordinary air cargo * * * Congress should enact legislation during this session which would require the Department of Defense to utilize civil air carriers for at least 50 percent of their transportation requirements.
Alaska Airlines (Washington).	4,366,624	$2,314,431	75 percent passengers and balance cargo.	The Government's policy of not competing with private business should be extended to the airline industry. In event it is necessary that military operate certain transport aircraft these operations should be confined to noncompetitive routes rather than competitive situation as now exists between Seattle and Fairbanks where MATS carrying 52 percent of all available passenger traffic.
Alaska Coastal Airlines (Alaska).				MATS does not operate in this section of Alaska.
Allegheny Airlines (District of Columbia).	5,500,000	6,000,000		
Aloha Airlines (Hawaii)	2,276,475	2,502,216	Passengers between Honolulu and Hilo, Kona, Maui, and Kauai.	MATS currently carries Armed Forces personnel to rest camp in Hilo * * * Suggest policy that would place civil carriers in better position maintain pool of aircraft and trained personnel.
American Airlines (New York).	333,000,000 175,000,000		Passengers Cargo	Estimates are necessarily theoretical because we need more information on origin and destination of military traffic and cannot predict practical load factors. Policy should be (1) Air Force to determine how much emergency airlift is needed, (2) subtract capacity that can be supplied by civil air carriers, (3) deficit to be met from military sources or "noncarrier" organizations, (4) Air Force should be permitted to fly passengers and cargo as long as "the total daily or monthly flying operation would not exceed the flying hours required for military training and readiness.
Bonanza Air Lines (Nevada)	5,300,000			No significant amount of service by MATS or OTMD LBDFFT is being performed over our routes.
Braniff Airways (Texas)		1,049,000	International passengers and cargo, and mail.	It is obviously to advantage of Government to use existing civil air transport capacity to help assure sound international U.S.-flag operation and avoid possible duplication of cost of both Government operation and civil subsidy.
California Eastern Aviation (District of Columbia).				Company does not have available at the present time any aircraft for transport activities
Central Airlines (Texas)				The conditional proposal of the Defense Department of reduction in civil airlift and greater use of MATS and other Government aircraft could result in a terrific loss of Central's revenue through the following channels: (a) The frequent military traffic to and from over 55 military installations that are located in Central's area. (b) The daily (Monday through Friday) military recruit traffic in conjunction with other airlines coming from Houston, San Antonio, El Paso, and Amarillo to Fort Smith (Fort Chaffee); and from Oklahoma City to San Antonio (Lackland Air Force Base). (c) The seasonal Reserve movements (May 30 to 1st week of September) for the 4th Army area by extra sections and charter movements. (d) The 6 months Reserve traffic (on Sunday only) coming from various points to Fort Chaffee, Fort Sill, Fort Riley, and Fort Carson—all served by Central Airlines. We estimate we can carry as much as 50 percent more military traffic. * * * The military can fly cheaper on Central than on military aircraft.
Central Air Transport (California).	12,300,000	2,500,000	Passengers and cargo, transatlantic (or Pacific).	We suggest that contracts on a 12-month basis be negotiated between the Government and the small cargo carriers.
Chicago Helicopter Airways (Illinois).	364,077	1,227,896	Passengers and cargo, within 60-mile radius Chicago.	We feel Government should not compete with private business in air transport field.
Continental Airlines (Colorado).	135,000,000 50,000,000	40,000,000 12,500,000	Passengers Cargo	Strongly opposed Government competition in air transport field as transport carriers should be strengthened and with CRAF provisions could immediately convert to defense use in the event it was necessary.
Delta (Georgia)	12,325,000		Delta's domestic and internationa. routes.	
Hawaiian Airlines (Hawaii)	10,200,000	2,835,000		Unless there occurs through adoption of the Board's [CAB] new policy by the Department of Defense long-term stability in MATS business at a reasonable price, we will be forced to seriously consider the abandonment of our project.
Hempel Helicopter & Air Taxi (Missouri).				We are saving the Government money and time by operating an air taxi service to and from Scott Air Force Base, Ill. This base is headquarters of the worldwide Military Air Transport Service. At the present time for a 1-way trip we are charging $12 per passenger. I understand that this same trip by staff car had been costing the Government $44 per passenger, and also took 3 and 4 times longer for the passenger to reach his destination. It would seem to me that any business that can be alloted to the civil carriers, whether small operators like ourselves, or larger airlines, would be able to save the Government money as well as keep a constant reserve of trained pilots and equipment that could be converted for use in case of a national emergency.
Mohawk Airlines (New York).				We do believe the greatest possible use of scheduled airlines by the military is essential.
National Airlines (District of Columbia).	152,900,000	81,650,000		Acceptance of these recommendations [ATA letter to Defense Department Nov. 20, 1958] would provide the Nation with an improved emergency airlift capability, efficient utilization of both civil and military air transport resources and a solution to the problem of MATS competition.

Summary of replies to Congressman Charles O. Porter's questionnaire on the unused space available on U.S.-flag civil airlines for moving additional military traffic for the year ending June 30, 1960—Continued

Company (alphabetical order)	Space available for military traffic for year ending June 30, 1960			Industry comments (extracts from airline telegrams or letters)
	Ton-miles	Dollars	Passengers or cargo and routes	
North Central Air Lines (Minnesota).	19,000,000	15,000,000	Passengers and cargo over our entire system.	
Northeast Airlines (Massachusetts).	23,605,000	10,481,000	Cargo	It would be much more economical for the U.S. Government to continue using the services of the scheduled airlines to the maximum extent of available payload to MATS and other Government aircraft. It is our firm belief that if commercial aircraft is used to the maximum extent possible it would help to strengthen the position of the commercial airline industry in the United States and therefore would be in the best interest of the Nation's defense and economy.
	46,418,000	27,387,000	Passenger	
Northwest Airlines (Minnesota).	32,520,000	19,382,000	International and overseas routes. Does not include continental domestic operations. Trans-Pacific; States-Alaska; Seattle/Portland-Hawaii.	In view of the size of our unused capacity figures, we are concerned by the indication in your wire that the Defense Department proposes sizable reduction in civil airlift and greater use of MATS and other Government aircraft. This brings up the traditional MATS argument that carriage by MATS itself is more economical than use of the certificated airline services. The inherent fallacy of this argument is the fact that MATS' operating costs have never been fully analyzed on a basis which would reveal a proper comparison with commercial airline costs. If full MATS' operating costs, including depreciation and total personnel costs, were ascertained, we are certain they would exceed comparable commercial airline costs. * * * we feel strongly that such [MATS] competition has hindered development of a strong civil air transportation system, particularly in the Pacific area where Northwest conducts its international service. We have frequently had occasion to review the published timetables of MATS and find that the frequencies of service and total lift capacity far exceeds that of the 2 certificated flag carriers combined. As noted above, development of certificated air transportation in the Pacific has undergone a much slower growth than in the Atlantic due to the different economic and cultural conditions existing in the Orient. The great stake which the United States has in improvement of economic and social ties with the Orient requires the maximum development of a strong commercial air service in this area. To the extent that development of traffic flow by an extensive military air service, such commercial and economic progress is definitely hindered. Further, to the extent that military air transport services are conducted on a parallel basis with certificated commercial services operating with unused capacity, there is wasteful duplication of expense and, consequently, of the taxpayers' money.
Overseas National Airways, (District of Columbia).	48,000,000	12,000,000	Passengers and cargo, Atlantic or Pacific.	This [increased use of airlift] obviously means that the present [military] force can be more effective, or a smaller force with a smaller payroll can be equally effective.
Pacific Northern Airlines (Washington).	6,361,414	3,367,111	Passengers	
	6,220,500	1,458,707	Cargo	
			On Seattle Anchorage route parallel to McChord AFB, Wash.; to Elmendorf AFB, Anchorage, route of MATS.	
Panagra (New York)	14,741,000	11,358,000	Passenger	Transportation of nonstrategic cargo and personnel can be provided less expensively by commercial carriers than by Government.
	3,159,000	1,658,000	Cargo	
			Mainline route from Balboa, Panama Canal Zone, to Buenos Aires, Argentina, and for its domestic routes in Ecuador and Bolivia.	
Riddle Airlines (Florida)	32,000,000		Cargo, domestic (if MTMA, logair not renewed).	Riddle Airlines negotiating procurement of additional new jet-powered equipment for common carriage operations which would make available in late 1960 an additional 16,000,000 ton-miles capacity through utilization of replaced aircraft.
	9,000,000		Cargo, domestic scheduled routes	
Southern Airways (Georgia)	6,438,900	4,380,000	Passengers and cargo	We appreciate your efforts.
Trans-Texas Airways (Texas)				We are opposed to competition by the Government with private business in the air transportation field.
Trans World Airlines (New York).	31,900,000	18,500,000	Passengers—New York, London, Frankfurt; New York, Paris (both directions).	TWA urges the adoption of a congressional policy directing the military use of civil air transport for not less than 50 percent of military air traffic movement to reduce the serious competitive impact of the MATS operation.
	44,500,000	17,800,000	Cargo—New York, London, Frankfurt; New York, Paris (both directions).	Precedent for such action already exists. Such a split of military traffic surface movement between MSTS and private U.S. ships is in effect. The extension of that sound policy to air movement and the resulting increased use by the military of civil air carriers for peacetime traffic will insure an expanded civil air fleet to serve the national defense in any emergency.
Twentieth Century Airlines (California).	50,544,000	10,108,800	Passengers or cargo. Could cover most any portions of the MATS routes.	MATS should use the civil carriers for the bulk of the normal lift required month in and month out and MATS should then supplement the civil carriers during peak periods.
West Coast Airlines (Washington).				We would object vigorously to an expansion of MATS operations in the event there were plans to install additional operation bases within Idaho, Oregon, or Washington which would have the effect of reducing present military traffic moving via West Coast. It would be unwise for the Government to build a bigger and more costly operation for MATS which would be competitive to present airline operations and retard the expansion of this important industry which is not only valuable in peacetime but valuable in time of war.
Wien-Alaska Airlines (Alaska).	1,648,213	1,742,161	Fairbanks to Fort Yukon, Barrow, Galena, Nome, Kotzebue and such beyond points as Cape Lisburne Wales, Northeast Cape.	
World Airways (Washington).	6,000,000		Passengers or cargo	We have been forced to severely curtail our transportation activities during the past year principally because of lack of military contract business * * * We recommend that legislation be enacted which would require DOD to set aside at least 50 percent of its total airlift business for civil air carriers * * * Civil air carriers can serve normal airlift requirements of Army, Navy, and Air Force better than MATS because MATS may abandon normal airlift services in times of crisis.
Zantop Air Transport (Michigan).	7,008,010	1,261,440	Cargo	Through an expanded program of utilizing and building a larger civil aircraft fleet, a network of air logistics could be set up for the combined needs of the Department of Defense and the American public; in so doing mobilization in an emergency would already be in effect offering the ultimate at a critical time when the citizens of this great country are for the 1st time in history digging out of the rubble and havoc brought by enemy destruction.
Total for all airlines replying to questionnaire.	[1] 1,335,596,213	308,462,762		

[1] Ton-miles per year.

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, April 22, 1959.

Hon. CHARLES PORTER,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. PORTER: I refer to your letter of 16 April 1959 in which you requested information on the latest MATS call contract awards for commercial augmentation as announced in "Aviation Daily" of March 26 and April 15, 1959. In addition you asked how much of the $80 million as set aside in section 634 of the Defense Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 1959 for purchase of commercial airlift has now been obligated.

I am pleased to forward herewith a copy of the Summary of Abstract of Negotiated Call Contract Awards made by MATS for the period April, May and June 1959. You will note that awards made on 23 March 1959 totaled $5.7 million and the awards made on 1 April 1959 totaled $2.2 million. MATS has obligated a total of $70.7 million on commercial augmentation contracts as of 3 April 1959. Attached for your information is a summary and breakout of the fixed, call and common carriage contracts awarded during Fiscal Year 1959.

I trust this information will be helpful to you and if I can be of any further assistance to you, please do not hesitate to call on me.

Sincerely yours,

W. P. FISHER,
Major General, USAF,
Director, Legislative Liaison.

[From the New York Herald-Tribune, Paris edition, Mar. 28, 1959]

THE SCREAMING EAGLES

(By S. L. A. Marshall)

NEW YORK.—There's more to U.S. military policy than meets the eye and less substance in the U.S. military position than might be surmised from poking a finger gently into one of its tougher ribs.

As a showcase for STRAC, the 101st Airborne Division, stationed at Fort Campbell, Ky., reflects the strength of the Army at its present-day best as well as the operational weakness which comes of grudging support from the outside. The President, in his talk about Berlin, boasted that "STRAC is ready and able" to strike promptly.

STRAC is the Strategic Army Corps, the body of four divisions kept within the United States which was formed around the idea of being ready to go anywhere on the globe in a hurry and hit hard.

It was to be the Army's thunderbolt in this atomic age when swift smothering of a small fire could be as important as the power to expand a large one until continents are fried to a crisp.

The Army has labored hard to ripen fully STRAC's early promise. The corps is not shriveling for lack of manpower. In inventory of training facilities and fighting equipment it has been more favored than other Army tactical forces based on the United States.

Even so, of the four divisions, only the 101st today could be honestly labeled: "Relatively Ready for Immediate Use." The 82d Airborne is shaking down, after rotating battle groups to and from Europe. The 1st Division is training packets of men for overseas replacement. Though fleshed out, the 4th Division is not by design a highly mobile, fire-brigade type of instrument.

Without disparaging the others, one may fairly say that as of this hour the Screaming Eagles are as well primed and as ready to go as anything in the Army. The division trains hard; its people look strong and confident. Measured by soldierly appearance, the unctilious salute, the A.W.O.L. rate, and the other customary criteria, the 101st has that polish which spells military fitness.

In fact, one statistic suggests that the Eagles are too ready to die to be content with drillyard routine. In the past year 42 of them have spent their young lives in highway accidents.

In the operations room is a chart showing that the 101st could pack up, become airlifted and, as a body, go on the way to war within less than 24 hours after the gong rings. It is no idle boast. The division could do just that; it has readiness in a degree never before possible in the Army.

But as to what that signifies finally in terms of greater security to the Nation, we had best forget it for it doesn't mean a thing. On the same chart there is another planning figure showing over what period an airlift might be available to pick up and ferry this one spearhead outfit.

The figure is 17 days. Unlike the estimate of division readiness, this is not a real but a synthetic figure, expressing an optimum hope. The fact is that nobody knows the factors in this problem, either at Fort Campbell or among the Joint Chiefs or in Secretary McElroy's office, though from the latter source has come the comforting assurance that the U.S. airlift capacity is adequate.

The Air Force, the Navy, the commercial airlines, the Army itself, all have a part of the cargo-carrying capacity which might be pressed into airlift come a sudden emergency overseas which called for the most as fast as possible. But it is not systematically studied, much less inventoried, regulated and periodically recapitulated so that the commanders and logisticians may know how things stand. Why it is not done remains a mystery, and so long as the mystery lasts the long-range mobility of U.S. combined forces is "X".

But the 17-day figure is worth pondering. In that length of time a division could go by train to a port, board a liner and cross either ocean. So a cynic might comment that, in the realistic terms of movement, the United States, though heavily blessed with flight power in this air age, still lacks a military airlift.

In view of its current role as the vanguard of Army strike power, and in light of the rising threat in Germany, the 101st Division reflects in yet other ways the backing-and-filling in higher policy which creates instability.

It is bad enough that the Army is being cut back as a whole to an extent which will make STRAC anemic; the Congress voices its alarm at the prospect. The little noted, but possibly more ironic fact is that the Screaming Eagle Division—the one sharp Army instrument for immediate use—is replacing trained men which it need not lose with green recruits at the rate of 500 a month.

The imposed policy is perhaps designed to keep the fire brigade administratively flexible; its essence is that if an enlisted member of the division has less than 90 days to serve he can apply for and get immediate discharge.

Because young Americans like any deal where they seem to get something for nothing, the effect of that offer is to prompt an exodus of eligibles who otherwise might do their last 3 months, then try a second hitch. In consequence the reenlistment rate of the division has dropped from 64 to 16 percent. Besides being wasteful of dollars, it superinduces a measure of immaturity in the units which otherwise wouldn't be there.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., March 31, 1959.

The Honorable NEIL MCELROY,
The Secretary of Defense,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: On my recent trip overseas I noticed the attached article from the Paris edition of the New York Herald-Tribune on March 28 by S. L. A. Marshall.

Is it correct that it would take some 17 days to airlift the 101st Airborne Division, with its equipment, overseas in event of a brush fire war?

In addition to answering this question, I would appreciate your comments on this column together with any indication of what is being done or planned to increase the national airlift.

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES O. PORTER,
Member of Congress.

OFFICE OF SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, D.C., April 7, 1959.

Hon. CHARLES O. PORTER,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. PORTER: This is in reply to your letter of March 31 to the Secretary of Defense in which you requested verification of a statement appearing in a recent newspaper article asserting that 17 days would be required to airlift the 101st Airborne Division overseas in case of an emergency.

In the column referred to in your letter, the writer has, of course, expressed his own opinions in general terms relative to the matter of airlift. I have obtained the following information from within the Office of the Secretary of Defense.

During the past year, the Secretary of Defense, the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and the three services—Army, Navy, and Air Force—have devoted considerable time and attention to our airlift capabilities and requirements.

In fact, 18 different studies were prepared by the strategic planners of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, working with the strategic planners of the three services, and presented to the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and through them to the Secretary of Defense. These studies were related to various contingencies which might be expected to develop throughout the world and were based upon approved contingency plans for movements of troops to various world areas of possible conflict.

Even though a great deal of progress has been made during calendar year 1958, we are continuing to study our airlift requirements and capabilities, and are working with other agencies of the Government to refine our requirements and improve our capabilities.

Accordingly, it is indeed a misstatement of fact when Mr. Marshall writes in his column, "The fact is that nobody knows the factors in this problem, either at Fort Campbell or among the Joint Chiefs or in Secretary McElroy's office."

In discussing the figure of 17 days in his column, Mr. Marshall states that this is the period over which an airlift might be available to pick up and ferry the 101st Airborne Division. Our contingency plans indicate that we have the capability to lift this division, and other high priority essentials of a classified nature, to selected trouble spots in less than 17 days. Therefore, it is not correct to state that it would take some 17 days to airlift the 101st Airborne Division, with its equipment, overseas in the event of a brush fire war.

Sincerely yours,

CARLTON R. ADAMS,
Captain, USN, Director,
Office of Legislative Liaison.

THE DETROIT NEWS,
Detroit, Mich., April 18, 1959.

Hon. CHARLES O. PORTER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PORTER: I am grateful for the interest you are taking in this matter. It will take the efforts of many people working in one concerted direction to achieve the essential object.

This is to say that if you are satisfied with the D/D reply, indeed I am not. I have seen too many "bedbug" letters sent off by staff officers in my time; further, I have too many times been on the anxious seat, where

we knew our problem was not solved, but where we were also required to say in response to a restive inquirer that all things were being done adequately and in order.

I would still stand on the figure I gave, because that is the working figure of the logisticians who deal with this problem. My feeling is, however, that it is probably on the optimistic side. But who really knows? At the time of the Lebanon crisis and in the weeks that followed, the commanders who were most vitally concerned in the operation still did not know that what airlift would be available to them if their needs suddenly expanded. They merely knew what they had in hand for the going operation.

From Gen. Maxwell Taylor on down, I do not know one Army officer who feels either that airlift is adequate or that its exact availability in terms of national potential is defined, though it is probably definable. That is plainly implied in General Taylor's speech made at Pasadena in December; yet he is a member of the JCS.

I am not unfamiliar with such problems—meaning those related to large-scale logistical requirements. During World War II, I was Chief Historian, European theater, and again in Korea, some of my responsibilities were in this field. It is never easy to take issue with the establishment. I don't do it to be a gadfly but because I feel that certain of our military shortages are parlous to all we hold dear.

Sincerely yours,

S. H. A. MARSHALL,
Brigadier General, USAR.

OFFICE OF SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, D. C., May 4, 1959.

Hon. CHARLES O. PORTER,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. PORTER: This letter is in reply to your letter of April 28, 1959, in which you request that we investigate the statements contained in Mr. S. H. A. Marshall's letter of April 18, 1959.

It is regretted that Mr. Marshall is not satisfied with the Department of Defense answer of April 7, 1959. However, the Department of Defense has reviewed our original letter and it is believed that this letter adequately answers Mr. Marshall's request for information.

Most sincerely,

GEORGE W. VAUGHAN,
Assistant to the Secretary (Legislative Affairs).

[From the New York State Taxpayer, June 1958]

INDUSTRIAL FUND PLAN ENDS FREE RIDES ON MATS PLANES

The Military Air Transport Service is finally being placed on an industrial fund operating basis which means, according to Representative DANIEL J. FLOOD of Pennsylvania "there will be no more free rides on MATS. They will have to be paid for by those who are riding on them for official business."

MATS competition with commercial airlines has long been a sore spot with taxpayers. Although it has been repeatedly demonstrated that commercial airlines can carry goods and passengers more efficiently and at less cost to the taxpayers, MATS in recent years has ignored congressional directives and recommendations of the Hoover Commission that it should use "to the greatest extent practicable" the unutilized capacity of the commercial air carriers.

FORCED OUT OF BUSINESS

The effect of this increased Government competition with commercial lines was brought into sharp focus recently by Representative CHARLES O. PORTER of Oregon who declared: "By allowing MATS to take away traffic that should be carried by commercial airlines, the Administration has put several commercial airlines out of business and threatens to cut down several more."

In a House debate on defense appropriations earlier this month, Congressman FLOOD said that he has finally been assured by Assistant Air Force Secretary Dudley C. Sharp that the Defense Department would increase its "purchase of civil airlift on international and overseas routes" by about 20 percent in the next fiscal year.

"WORK IS NOT OVER"

Mr. FLOOD warned Congress, however, that "our work is not over." He noted that the Defense Department "has more transport planes outside MATS than have been coordinated into MATS. So, free rides will, presumably, continue on the other half of the Department of Defense fleet."

He explained that the Air Force has admitted operating some 573 "administrative, executive or special mission" transport planes. "We have ground rules on who can have limousines and chauffeurs at the public expense," Congressman FLOOD declared, "but it looks as if the sky's the limit with these million-dollar aerial limousines.

"AN AWFUL BOONDOGGLE

"Think of it. Why, if you gave two private planes to the President and one to each member of the Cabinet that would only add up to 11 planes. What is the justification for the other 561 executive planes? Who else gets to have one of these plush jobs? This looks like an awful boondoggle.

"They may be fine for taking Assistant Secretaries or high brass in comfort—and at no expense and with no accounting—up to hunting lodges in Alaska or things like that, but I do not think a fleet of this size can be justified.

"WHY A WHOLE PLANE?

"If some general has some genuine official business to be done somewhere, I am sure the Government can buy him a ticket on an airline. The taxpayers don't have to provide him with a whole plane.

"The Hoover Commission stated: 'The number of administrative aircraft should be drastically reduced.'

"The Pentagon disagreed, said they were needed to fly people 'to isolated areas' and 'to move traffic which for security reasons must be transported in these administrative aircraft.'

"HOW MANY SECRET MISSIONS?

"Well, I am sure there are a number of secret missions by Government officials, but not that many.

"And speaking of security, do they not trust the commercial airlines? Do they not trust MATS? Do they mean we have to pay for another fleet of transports in addition to MATS because riding on MATS is not sufficiently confidential?

"I am looking into this whole question. I want the Defense Department to know that.

"WE ARE NOT THROUGH

"The chances are that the Congress will have a lot more work to do in this field. We are not through by any means.

"This type of luxury living does not increase our war potential. It just wastes our money."

[From the New York State Taxpayer, May 1958]

MATS PUTS 'EM OUT OF BUSINESS

Competition by the plush Government-owned and Government-operated airline, the Military Air Transport Service (MATS), is reducing the vital civil reserve air fleet by 14 four-engine planes, Representative CHARLES O. PORTER, of Oregon, declared last month. "By allowing * * * MATS to take away traffic that should be carried by commercial airlines," he stated, "the administration has put several commercial airlines out of business and threatens to cut down several more." If the Government had to replace these planes that are being sold off, mostly to foreign countries, it would cost the Nation's taxpayers between $9 and $10 million.

[From the New York State Taxpayer, June 1957]

UNITED STATES OPERATES LUXURY AIR FLEET

If you were a farmer and gave your daughter $5,000 to go out and buy the best kind of truck to haul farm machinery about in, you would probably rest assured that she would bring home the proper truck and not a plush Jaguar convertible. But, Congressman DANIEL J. FLOOD, of Pennsylvania, pointed out recently that some of the boys in the Pentagon would probably not be equal to such a task.

It seems that the Air Force was given $110 million during the first year of the Eisenhower administration to buy a fleet of planes capable of carrying Army tanks. Well they didn't buy Jaguars, but in a sense purchased their air equivalent, 6 dozen plushed up DC-6 passenger planes instead of the tank-carrying cargo planes. They called it reprograming. Congressman FLOOD labeled the act "misappropriation."

Congressman FLOOD in noting this added that if "our hypothetical farmer's daughter made the mistake of blowing the $5,000 with which she was supposed to buy a farm truck she probably would have a feeling of guilt about it to make amends."

"Not so with the Air Force," the Pennsylvania lawmaker notes.

"They display no sense of shame whatsoever about this boondoggle," he lamented. "When confronted with the recommendations of the Hoover Commission, the directives of our congressional committee inveighing against competition with the private enterprise and general wastefulness of the taxpayers' funds, these gentlemen in the Air Force say. 'Well, we have got them now, and we are stuck with them so we had best fill them up a little bit by taking business away from commercial airlines'."

This is only one example of how the Military Air Transport Service, known affectionately as MATS, has mushroomed in size so that it now operates approximately 1,500 airplanes. This outstrips all of the U.S. domestic commercial airlines with their combined total of 1,212 planes in operation.

The really sad feature of this extravagance is that it costs the taxpayers an estimated $1 billion a year to operate the Government-owned airlines while defense hearings for fiscal 1958 indicated that commercial airlines would have more than $900 million in unused space available for military use for this same period of time.

It has been pointed out that while it cost the Government $795 per hour to operate the military equivalent of the DC-6 the taxpaying civilian airline cost for operating the same plane is $650 per hour. Use of commercial lines, where possible, would not only reduce the size and cost of this mammoth air fleet but also reduce the amount of subsidies required to maintain the private airlines.

The Government operated airline, with total assets over $1.4 billion provides service to practically every corner of the world regardless of the existing parallel routes of commercial airlines.

The Hoover Commission disclosed that an Air Force band was flown once a month from Westover, Mass., to Bermuda. The Air Force justified the flights for morale purposes, noting that there was no band in Bermuda.

Placing the morale issue aside, the Commission noted that two commercial airlines

operated flights that could have carried the same band over the same route at less cost to the taxpayers.

The Hoover Commission has further noted, that the $42.9 million airline subsidy for fiscal 1954 could have been reduced by 88 percent if the airlines had flown only 25 percent of the passengers and 50 percent of the mail moved by MATS over this same period.

The intent of Congress for fiscal 1958 that the Government should, to the greatest extent practicable, adjust its use of air transportation so as to use the existing, unutilized capacity of United States air carriers has been established. It remains now to be seen how the operators of military transportation will try to adhere to this established intent and refrain from trying to build up the plush operations of the military air fleet.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 46 I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea." I ask unanimous consent that the RECORD so indicate.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

LIMITATION OF $50,000 ON CCC LOANS

Mr. MICHEL. 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 Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted with the earlier vote today recommiting the agricultural appropriation bill with instructions to write into the bill, in effect, a denial of any funds to process CCC loans in excess of $50,000.

On short notice, it is difficult to get from the Department of Agriculture the figures which could shed some light on precisely what the effect of this limitation would be, but so far as I can determine for only those commodities and States serviced by the Kansas City Data Processing Center 222 loans would be involved, exclusive of cotton and tobacco. These 222 loans total $30,732,000. By simple arithmetic, if we subtract the first $50,000 of each of these 222 loans from the total figure, we have a net figure of $19,632,000 affected by the limitation. The Agriculture Department estimates there is at least this much more involved in those commodities for which exact figures were not readily available. This gives in the overall, then, a dollar figure approximating $40 million.

Mr. Speaker, while this language change is not perfect and will undoubtedly be refined in the other body to exempt farmer cooperatives the intent and purpose of this limitation is good and certainly puts us in the position of taking a step in the right direction. As a matter of fact I am reminded of a message from the President relative to agriculture dated January 9, 1956, which reads as follows:

The average size of farms in American agriculture, as measured by capital or by acres, has rapidly increased. To the degree that this trend is associated with the development of more economic and more efficient farm units it is in the interest of farm families and of the Nation. To the degree, however, that it has resulted in the removal of risk for large farm businesses by reason of price supports, it is much less wholesome and constitutes a threat to the traditional family farm.

Under the price support machinery as it has been functioning, price support loans of tremendous size have occasionally occurred. It is not sound Government policy to underwrite at public expense such formidable competition wtih family operated farms, which are the bulkwark of our agriculture.

I ask the Congress to consider placing a dollar limit on the size of price support loans to any one individual or farming unit. The limit should be sufficiently high to give full protection to efficiently operated family farms.

The language in the motion to recommit was manifestly an effort to carry out such an objective.

PREVENTING ENCROACHMENT OF HOLDING COMPANIES IN SAVINGS AND LOAN FIELD

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I introduced H.R. 7244 to prevent the encroachment of holding companies into the savings and loan field. This measure is identical with H.R. 4135, which passed the House unanimously 2 years ago, after having the unanimous approval of the Banking and Currency Committee. That bill, instead of receiving individual treatment on the Senate side, was included in the omnibus Financial Institutions Act of 1957, which passed the Senate but died in committee on the House side. In light of that history, the measure I have introduced has, in truth, had the approval of both Houses of Congress, but has failed to become law and must be started anew on its legislative course. Then, as now, it had the support of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board and of the two leagues representing the savings and loan business, although I anticipate that these groups may have some recommendations for refinements to the measure.

I am convinced of the urgency behind this bill, and seek the support of all segments in helping me to speed it on its way to become law. Two years ago I called attention to the imminency of developments in the savings and loan field which would militate against the essentially local character of that business. The acquisition of stockownership in the nonmutual associations which are included in the business has posed the threat that groups of such associations would come under central control of financial interests whose primary concern would be the promotion of stock prices rather than the proper development of the capacity of these institutions to properly serve the needs of their respective communities.

The holding company has no place in the savings and loan field. The strength of savings and loan associations, and the high regard they have acquired, is derived from their local management, local responsibility and local operation. The men who manage these institutions must be familiar with their community needs and maintain a civic responsibility. They must continue to think about what is good for the community and for the home owning families, rather than think merely of possible profit involved. We can hardly expect a holding company owned by people thousands of miles from a community to concern itself with the social and economic objectives of the community.

When I first introduced this bill, holding company operation was in its very infancy. In recent months, though, there has been a wave of new activity of holding companies in acquiring and proposing to acquire savings and loan associations. I understand that six holding companies have been formed in California alone within the past 6 months. When we held our hearings 2 years ago there were but two companies. I am further informed that holding companies have now spread their operations from California to Colorado and Texas.

I have heard another estimate that there are now as many as 20 or 30 holding companies either in operation or in the process of formation.

If we are to retain the savings and loan business as we know it and as it has so effectively served the Nation's homeowners, we must act with great speed. We all recall that the passage of legislation to regulate bank holding companies was made infinitely more difficult because the Congress delayed so long that the holding companies were large, powerful, and well entrenched.

My bill is not a complicated one. It would simply prohibit a holding company from acquiring control of more than one insured savings and loan association. It does not contain the complicated regulatory and tax features of the bank holding company bill. It does not affect holding companies in operation at the time of enactment, although it would, of course, prevent them from acquiring further institutions.

I hope that the Congress will act expeditiously on the matter so that the bill can become law this year.

AFRICA FREEDOM DAY

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, on April 15 one of the most stirring celebrations of Africa Freedom Day took place at Carnegie Hall, New York. The event in New York was one of like observance held around the world further focusing attention upon the dramatic and phenomenal drive for African nationalism now taking place on that continent. Other sites of similar gatherings were in our Nation's Capital, in London, in Paris,

capitals of independent African States, and elsewhere.

Peoples of all colors, creeds, nationalities and status filled Carnegie Hall to capacity, paying upward of $25 for a seat, and lines of persons were turned away. The Africa Freedom Day celebration in New York represented part of the response to a call for such an observance which emanated from the Conference of Independent African States held at Accra, Ghana, in April 1958. Confirmed at the unprecedented assembly of representatives from 28 African countries at the All-African Peoples Conference which I attended in Accra last December, the call designated that:

April 15 should be set aside and called Africa Freedom Day, which all African countries and all friends of Africa throughout the world shall observe as a rallying point for the forces of freedom.

Tom Mboya, described by Life magazine as "the most powerful political personality in Kenya, and among the most important in all Africa," member of Kenya's Legislative Council and secretary-general of the Kenya Federation of Labor, was the principal speaker for the occasion. As a contribution to the African Freedom Fund, a check for $10,000, partly raised through this effort, was presented Mr. Mboya by the American Committee on Africa, sponsor of the New York celebration.

I should like to call to the attention of my colleagues the speech made by Mr. Mboya and the speech made by Gov. G. Mennen Williams, of Michigan, on this occasion. Both put the African situation and African-American relations in proper context. I urgently commend these speeches to the reading of all citizens that we might come to a full appreciation of our national stake in this African cause:

AFRICAN FREEDOM DAY

(Address by Hon. Tom Mboya, chairman, All African Peoples' Conference, April 15, 1959)

Mr. Chairman, your Excellencies, ladies and gentlemen, I am glad to be in New York to launch today the worldwide celebration of African Freedom Day. April 15 was decided upon as African Freedom Day at the first Conference of the Independent African States held in Accra in April 1958, and was later endorsed by the first All-African Peoples' Conference, also held at Accra in December of last year. These conferences marked the discovery of Africa by Africans. This is in complete contrast to the discovery of Africa by Europeans in the 19th century.

What is this Africa and what do we mean by the word "freedom"? This is what many of us are thinking and talking about today throughout the world. Africa is still associated in the minds of many people in the United States and some European countries with the 19th century. They think of the dark continent, the jungles, the wild beasts, the Africa as presented to them by Hollywood—the fierce, ignorant, or merrily and furiously dancing tribesmen. Little is it realized that Africa, too, shares in what we call the 20th century: modern cities, schools, roads, airfields, houses, cars, and so on. As we celebrate this day, therefore, we might usefully stop and ponder these questions.

Africa desires to be understood and to be recognized from the viewpoint and perspective of her own people. Africa is no longer willing to be referred to as British, French, Belgian, or Portuguese Africa. Africa must create and assert her own personality and speak for herself. She cannot be a projection of Europe nor any longer permit herself to be interpreted or spoken for by self-appointed interpreters.

It was this conviction that moved African statesmen and political and trade union leaders to hold the two conferences at Accra that will no doubt mark out 1958 as Africa's year.

AFRICA EMERGENT

The Conference of Independent African States marked the birth of the African personality. The representatives of the African states at Accra unanimously agreed on the need for Africa to rise and be heard at all the councils of world affairs; and to effectuate this objective they created the Organization of African States, which now consults on all questions affecting Africa before the U.N., and which represents the united will of all Africans on such issues. Equally important was their decision that Africa's total liberation was the task for all Africans.

To implement the latter decision nongovernmental representatives of African people from the entire continent met at the All-African Peoples' Conference in Ghana last December. That conference gave birth to the African community. By unanimous vote all 500 delegates from political parties, nationalist organizations, trade unions, and similar groups from every part of Africa—agreed to work together in full cooperation for the total liberation of all Africa.

Thus both conferences were characterized by a spirit of unity based upon same, predominant concepts and ideals—above all, those expressed in the common purpose: independence for all Africa. There was agreement that the independence of one territory is incomplete and meaningless unless it is accompanied by total independence for all territories. This, indeed, was but the practical application of the moral principle expressed earlier and more elegantly that "no man is an island," and less elegantly but in language every American recognizes that "we must all hang together lest we hang separately."

The year, 1958, also saw the inauguration of the United Nations Economic Commission for Africa at Addis Ababa in Ethiopia. This marked, in fact, the U.N.'s functional recognition of Africa's legitimate place and role in the world's economic and social community and was another useful addition to the 20th century discovery of Africa. It provided a long delayed vehicle for Pan-African economic planning and coordination.

There are those who complain that the discovery of Africa and the African personality and community by Africans is taking place at too fast a pace. Such people should be reminded that Africa is many years behind the rest of the world and that, in these circumstances, we cannot afford the luxury of wasting time. They might well remember the old but true adage that "he who is behind must run faster than he who is in front." In the case of Africa we do not only have to run faster but we have, at the same time, to try to avoid the mistakes and pitfalls of those who "run before us," a considerable addition to our task. Lest any believe we are really running too fast, let me recall to them that colonialism has existed in Africa for over four centuries.

Most people seem to agree that colonialism is on its way out. It is, therefore, doubly difficult to understand why nations which are signatories to the United Nations Charter and which have committed themselves to the Declaration of Human Rights have not found it possible to give effective support to the African's struggle for freedom. Most of them have been noted for their compromising attitude and their desire to please the colonial powers or each other at the expense of democracy and human rights. How can anyone honestly believe that a compromise is possible where human rights, democracy and Christian ideals are concerned and still expect the African to have confidence and faith in him?

Of 220 million Africans only 70 million live in independent states free of white minority domination. The rest have yet to be liberated from colonialism and European domination. Surveying the situation of the 50 million people still not free one will immediately see what the African talks about when he condemns colonialism and European settler domination.

THE KENYAN SITUATION

Take my own country, Kenya. Until the Mau Mau eruption, few people had heard of Kenya, and today few understand its basic problems—most of them created by British colonialism.

Politically speaking, the British Government has, through its colonial office, toadied to the European settlers and condoned if not encouraged their domination of every phase of life. Today 60,000 Europeans are, under the present constitution, represented by the same number of elected members (14) as are the country's 6 million Africans. Although the Europeans have since 1923 voted on the basis of universal suffrage, Africans are restricted to an entirely arbitrary, multiple vote franchise, which is unrelated not only to the standards for white and Asian voters, but also to those set for African voters in surrounding British territories. Thus the bewildered Kenya African may vote if he has an annual income of $336, and may cast no more than two additional votes if he meets certain other requirements, whereas in adjoining Uganda, literacy in the vernacular is enough to qualify an African to vote, but he is, however, never entitled to a multiple vote. On the other hand, the income requirements for African voters are $420 in Tanganyika and $2,100 in the Rhodesias. Such standards, arbitrary in the extreme, have served only to suggest to Africans in Kenya and elsewhere that they are being cheated and frustrated in their basic democratic right of franchise.

Economically, the Government has until recently, forbidden Africans to raise the profitable cash crops (coffee, tea, sisal, etc.), and even now it subjects them to discriminatory licensing, credit, and other restrictions, which are not applied to Europeans. Far more serious to the Africans, the Government has reserved the entire cool, fertile highlands for white settlers only—refusing to allow Africans to farm even unoccupied sections—while as many as 700–900 Africans are crowded per square mile onto the poor semidesert areas not wanted by the whites.

Socially, segregation still prevails in far too many areas, particularly in such presumably public facilities as schools and hospitals. Discrimination in education is singularly frustrating to Africans for they all realize that schools provide the keys to a better and happier life for their children.

Yet while Europeans have compulsory education, education for Africans is neither compulsory nor free. The Kenya government spends $89.60 per year for each European child's education; for each far more needy African child it spends only $14.

To add to other grievances, Kenya Africans are now living their sixth year under the state of emergency proclaimed during the Mau Mau uprising. Since its proclamation, thousands of Africans have been arrested and detained—and restrictions upon movement, assembly and the press are still arbitrarily exercised. Shortly before I left Kenya, the police invaded my house in the middle of the night and searched it, suppressed the newspaper printed by the Nairobi Peoples' Convention Party, and arrested scores of party members. About 2,000 political prisoners remain in detention camps, among them Jomo Kenyatta, despite recent

revelations that two principle Crown witnesses were paid $5,000 and that at least one of them admitted perjuring himself at the trial. To all our representations and appeals, the British Government has turned a deaf ear, and our people, naturally, are becoming more and more restive.

COLONIALISM IN OTHER PARTS OF AFRICA

Unfortunately, many other parts of Africa have even more grim and horrible reports to make on conditions under their colonial governments:

Thus the situation in the Central African Federation must disturb everyone who has faith in democracy. In 1953, a federal constitution was imposed on the three territories composing the Federation despite the unanimous objections of the Africans, who constitute a 20 to 1 majority in the area. Nyasaland and Northern Rhodesia, being protectorates, demanded self-government and rejected any union with the segregation-minded Southern Rhodesia Government, but all in vain. Developments since then have shown that the Federation is indeed moving further and further toward the apartheid policies of the Union of South Africa. Britain has lost control over the territories, and the African now must defend himself; witness the recent shootings of 50 or more unarmed Africans, the declaration of a state of emergency based on the pretext of a murder plot about which not one shred of evidence has been produced, and the arrogant deportation from Northern Rhodesia of a British Member of Parliament. Today all African organizations in Nyasaland and Southern Rhodesia are proscribed and the leaders detained without trial indefinitely, often in distant parts of the Federation.

In adjoining South Africa apartheid and tyranny as yet only suggested in the Federation have come to their full, evil flower, with 3 million white persons brutally suppressing 9 million Africans and nearly 2 million other unfortunate minority peoples. Despite the clear, unabashed history of South African racial discrimination, not one effective step has been taken by Western democratic governments to help the victims of apartheid, and more particularly the millions of south West Africans whose country has been annexed by the Union of South Africa in violation of its mandate agreement, the U.N. Charter, and the decision of the International Court.

In the silent colonies of Angola and Mozambique, a system of repression at least as severe as that in the Union of South Africa is concealed behind the convenient legal fiction that these territories are constitutionally self-governing, the same as Portuguese metropolitan provinces. In these colonies forced labor—slavery—still exists openly, and opposition is brutally suppressed by beating and by shipment of troublemakers to the death island of San Tome, from which they seldom return.

At the north end of Africa self-determination and autonomy are denied 9 million Algerians by the refusal of the 1 million white settlers to permit any political settlement which does not protect their unwarranted political and economic domination. Thousands of lives have been lost, homes have been destroyed, the countryside ravaged, and the whole Mahgreb has been kept from fruitful development by the French colons. Yet the Christian and democratic nations turn away their eyes and see no eveil. How does an African distinguish between oppression of Algerians by the Frenchmen and of Hungarians by the Russians?

Even in West Africa, where self-government is generally advancing with considerable success, colonialism has left its unfortunate heritage: unnatural political boundaries, unrelated to logical geographical divisions or ethnic groupings have seriously hampered the economic and political development of the emerging African states. Thus, for example, the post-World War I division of the German Kamerun colony (itself an artificial unit) between Great Britain and France lay at the heart of the Cameroons question before the U.N. this March, which resulted in such bitterness toward the West among African member states.

Indeed, despite its force as a stimulus to Africa's economic development, colonialism has been the biggest hindrance to the development of the indigenous people. Under colonial rule, little attention has been paid to the need to invest in education, health, technical training, and general community development for Africans. The African's potential as a local market for consumer goods has been ignored. Partition of Africa and the use of territories as sources of raw materials for metropolitan economies have not allowed the planning of continent- or region-wide development. Instead, colonial divisions have treated each territory in isolation from others.

INDEPENDENCE REQUIRED FOR PROGRESS

Africans are convinced that economic and social conditions cannot be considered apart from their political setting. Self-government and independence open great possibilities for economic and social development. Self-government permits people not only to embark on development programs serving purposefully the needs of their own country which they know best, but also enables them to establish relations with other countries on the basis of equality and to coordinate progressively the economy of their country with those of others. Full economic and social emancipation is not possible without political emancipation. Above all, it is through becoming masters of their own fate that the energies of the people are fully released for the arduous task of economic and social development.

The subjection of a people, in any form, including forced labor, apartheid, or colonialism under the guise of assimilation, is wholly inimical to economic and social development. This is our answer to those who argue that we must wait until we have a viable economy and have acquired enough experience before we have the right to demand our freedom.

This argument for delay, which smells of a passive betrayal of democracy, ignores the fact that, so far, experience has shown that it is only after independence that most of our countries have embarked on large-scale economic and educational projects, and that in all cases it is only after independence that the world has begun to be conscious of our economic and social problems. In fact, the foundations for stable government have been laid only after independence, which makes nonsense of the plea of colonial governments that they are training us for self-government. In every case, colonial powers have left their African territories only when the organized pressure of our people has made it impossible for them to govern without serious consequences.

OPPONENTS OF FREEDOM ANSWERED

In addition to crying "Caution," "Go slow," opponents of African freedom have raised other objections. While most of the opposition arises from those who fear that independence will cost them status, economic advantage, or other special privilege, I would like briefly to consider the questions that are posed to me time and again by non-Africans:

For example, I have repeatedly been asked about the use of violence to achieve freedom. To this I can only answer that we are totally committed to nonviolent positive action. Nevertheless, I must call attention to the wise words of the great English reformer, John Bright, who in 1866 declared:

"I have never said a word in favour of force. All I have said has been against it—but I am at liberty to warn those in authority that justice long delayed, or long continued injustice always provokes the employment of force to obtain redress. It is in the ordering of nature and therefore of the Supreme that this is so, and all preaching to the contrary is of no avail. If men build houses on the slopes of a Vesuvius, I may tell them of their folly and insecurity, but I am not in any way provoking, or responsible for, the eruption which sweeps them all away. I may say too that force, to prevent freedom and to deny rights, is not more moral than force to gain freedom and secure rights."

Secondly, there are those, perhaps affected by the guilty conscience which the general record of Western colonialism must unfortunately lead to, who fear that we Africans may yield to the not unsurprising temptation to victimize minorities—particularly the formerly dominant whites—when we gain independence. To them I can only repeat what we resolved at Accra in December: namely, that Africa will be developed toward a democracy where individual rights will be recognized and guaranteed, regardless of race or color. Our quarrel is only with colonialism and European domination. With these we shall never compromise.

Lastly, there are some who are only too ready to try to make capital out of some of our teething problems. They expect perfection from us and lie in wait to ridicule our demand for freedom every time they see—or fancy that they see—any error or misjudgment by an African. I am flattered by these people because whereas they have not yet attained perfection themselves, they believe we are better fitted to achieve it before them. We have nothing to apologize for; but while we will always welcome constructive criticism, we do not and cannot allow interference with the sovereignty of our independent states. Any problems we meet during our early stages of independence reflect on the utter failure of colonialism as a training ground. We have no reason to believe that if the colonial governments had another hundred years the situation would be better.

But is it really necessary for us to justify our demand for freedom or even to answer as to our readiness to shoulder the responsibility of self-government? If so, to whom are we accountable and by what and whose standards are we to be judged? What right has any other person to set himself up as our tutor and judge?

I submit that we have a right to self-determination. It is a birthright which we need not either justify or explain. We know and understand our desires and responsibilities to our people, countries and world peace. The other nations would do well to cooperate with us in our efforts instead of setting themselves up as our judges.

Too often we have heard of those who insist that African freedom involves a risk of communism. To them all I want to say is, that if they spent all their efforts in practicing democracy that they preach they would have nothing to fear from communism.

A POSITIVE PROGRAM PROPOSED

Let us, therefore, join together and match the internationalism of communism item by item, with the internationalism of democracy. Let us cooperate in the effort to eliminate disease, poverty and ignorance from the face of the earth, and we shall have dealt a death blow to the root causes of most of the "isms" that currently bedevil the world.

To those who count, instead, upon military bases, established in colonial areas without the consent of—or even notice to—the local inhabitants, for security against the false prophets of the world, I commend a thorough study of recent events. Military agreements negotiated with colonial powers will necessarily be, as they are today in Morocco, for example, subject to the will and the needs of the African people when they gain

their independence. I humbly submit that only Africans, whatever their color, background, or race, may rightfully decide matters which vitally affect the future of Africa. We African people seek the same peace, stability, security, and well-being that all decent people seek the world over, and we are unwilling to be used willy-nilly as pawns in a great power struggle. For this reason we adamantly oppose the use of any African territory, even the most desolate wastes of the Sahara, as testing ground by non-Africans of their new and ever more devilish instruments of destruction.

What specifically, therefore, is the task of Africans who seek to achieve that standard of well-being which is now recognized to be the decent and proper right of all peoples? It was clearly summarized by Dr. Kwame Nkrumah, Prime Minister of Ghana, when he called upon the African peoples to aim at four stages of advance:

1. The attainment of freedom and independence.

2. The consolidation of that freedom and independence.

3. The creation of unity and community among the Free African States.

4. The economic and social reconstruction of Africa.

To this great fourfold task we shall devote our full energies until a new, proud, free Africa is able to contribute constructively and equally to the great adventures before mankind.

THE UNITED STATES AND AFRICA

This, then, summarizes the situation in Africa today—a situation which the American people and their Government can no longer afford to ignore. Because of its history, its background, and its stand for democracy, the African people have come to expect greatness of the United States. We are therefore often surprised, puzzled, eventually frustrated and disillusioned when we see the United States acquiesce in the French Army's use of American arms, allegedly for NATO, against Algerians; or obstain from voting on the Algerian question in the U.N.; or lead the defense of the Portugese refusal to declare and make reports on her colonies in Africa; or avoid condemning Government brutality in Nyasaland; or refrain from taking any positive steps to bring about the international control of South-West Africa. These faults may appear small to Americans, but in the end they will determine how far Africa's confidence is to be won or retained. Whereas most African leaders support the condemnation of such suppression as occurred in Hungary and now in Tibet, they cannot accept the apparent contradiction in standards and values where Africa is concerned.

Individually and collectively the American people have a way of associating themselves with our cause. Here, tonight, we have a fine example of this association, and I want to take this opportunity, on behalf of our friends in south Africa, to express our sincere appreciation to the American Committee on Africa for its contribution to the treason trial defense fund. I hope that many people will join the committee in this and other future efforts, especially now that we have launched a freedom fund to help in such cases as the pending trials in central Africa and Kenya, and also in such other work as providing for the needy families and dependents of people now detained or in prison. This fund will be used entirely for the purpose of advancing the legitimate aims of the African peoples in the positive, nonviolent achievement of democratic rights.

My friends, our struggle is simple. It is for political freedom, economic opportunity, and human dignity for all Africans, goals which can be opposed only by those who oppose the very concepts of democracy and human rights. Our struggle for freedom will continue without compromise until the liberation of all Africa is achieved.

In this struggle we ask your help: Contribute as you can to the Africa freedom fund. When the permanent secretariat of the All-African People's Conference announces specific plans, join with us to exert the mighty economic and moral pressure of an aroused American public against the Union of South Africa, to compel a change in its abominable racial policies. And support and join those organizations, such as the American Committee on Africa, which are contributing so much to Africa.

You are the descendants of the tiny brave band of men who "fired the shot heard round the world." Its sound has been slow to reach Africa, but now the echoes rebound from every corner of the land. For the same freedom and right to a better life which your ancestors won with so much pain and suffering, we Africans now also strive. To this achievement for every African in every portion of the continent, we too pledge "our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor."

EXCERPTS FROM REMARKS BY GOV. G. MENNEN WILLIAMS OF MICHIGAN, AFRICA FREEDOM DAY MEETING, AMERICAN COMMITTEE ON AFRICA, CARNEGIE HALL, NEW YORK CITY, N.Y., APRIL 15, 1959

Good evening friends and fellow Americans, tonight I come to you certainly not as an expert on Africa but nevertheless as one who has visited both Egypt and Africa below the Sahara. Not as an expert but as one who has seen and felt the warmth, the promise, and the problems of a great continent.

As a result of my observations, I have the feeling that Africa is undergoing a great and new exciting experience. There is a promise of manifest destiny for her people alive in the air. There is a new day coming for Africa's people, and by and large, it is the people of Africa who will make it come.

Every day, with every move of life in Africa, the new spirit is imparted to more and more Africans, spreading deeper and deeper into the bush, until soon no African will be without this new spirit—this surge of contagious expectation and enthusiasm.

It is my sincere conviction that this new spirit is fed by three flames. The first is a burning desire on the part of Africans for freedom to control their own destinies. The second is fired by the revolution of rising expectations, and expressed in a determination to enjoy freedom from want—one of Franklin D. Roosevelt's four freedoms. The third is the overwhelming compulsion to achieve racial equality—a compulsion so strong in areas of severe repression that it sometimes understandably breaks out into its own expression of racism.

To be both realistic and helpful, the policies of the United States must be responsive to the deep desire of the people of Africa for self-government, for economic opportunity, and for the dignity of racial equality.

Fortunately, such policies are clearly in line with our fundamental American beliefs and traditions. Unfortunately, our record in African policies in the recent past has not always been completely consistent with what is basic and true in ourselves. But when we live up to our best beliefs and better selves, we are to that degree a better nation, and I have every hope that the United States can, and will, be helpful to the Africans in their development of their destinies.

It is not going to be easy to implement such effective policies for Africa, nor is it going to be easy to keep such policies in step with the great changes taking place in that continent.

As one would expect in a place as large as Africa, with the many diverse geographical and historical conditions which prevail there, the problems are by no means simple or all alike. But the fact that the challenge is immense is no excuse for not trying to meet it. The United States can do it when we make up our minds that we really want it done.

Fortunately, there have been, and are leaders, who recognize what has to be done and are doing something about it. A number of them are here. I want particularly to express my pride and confidence in the work of a personal friend and fellow citizen from Michigan, Congressman CHARLES DIGGS. Incidentally, he is the first Negro member of the powerful House Foreign Affairs Committee. In this important position he can, and is doing a lot to advance America's relations with Africa.

Turning then to the development of an American policy responsive to the realities of Africa, the first challenge is Africa's desire for freedom to control its own destinies.

In this day and age, there can be no question at all but that the people of Africa are entitled to self-government. On this point, the United States should have not the slightest doubt or hesitation.

From the time of our Declaration of Independence, we have recognized that all men are endowed with certain unalienable rights, that to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed. We should always stand forthright and firm on that solid foundation of fundamental principle.

Mindful of all this, I would propose that American policy have as its stated objective the recognition of the principle of African majority rule. I believe that in general, this is the underlying policy of most countries, including our allies. Where this principle is not recognized, or to the extent it is not recognized, we should urge the recognition of the principle of African majority rule by all countries, and we should seek the earliest reasonable implementation of this principle.

With respect to trusteeships where we have a special responsibility, the United States should bring it's influence to bear to assure more substantial progress toward self-government.

Wherever the United States can properly be of assistance economically, or otherwise, it should not hesitate to render such support as it can. Naturally the given circumstances will be a factor in determining what we can do and how we can do it.

This brings me to Africa's revolution of rising expectations and to the second challenge—Africa's desire for freedom from want. Here there is much that America can do to help Africa now and thereby help create a stable and peaceful world.

During the 10-year span between 1944 and 1955, our world foreign aid totaled more than $45 billion, but of this amount only 1.5 percent went to Africa, according to Congressman DIGGS.

In 1958, as a further example, of the $3.3 billion in foreign aid, the United States sent only $77 million to Africa, most of which went north of the Sahara. Obviously, this amount does not represent a serious recognition of the problems the Africans face, nor a comprehensive effort to help solve these problems.

Economic aid for Africa should be constantly increased in scale with Africa's ability to absorb it. I propose that economic aid for Africa be increased up to as much as $1.5 billion a year.

This sum has been estimated by experts to be the amount needed to provide a real growth in wealth equivalent to a net increase of 2 percent in output per head per year.

The combined investment in Africa from its own resources, and from public and private resources outside, figures to about $1.2

billion in 1957, not enough to keep up with the increase in population. An additional $1.5 billion over the $1.2 billion is needed and should be supplied as rapidly as Africa can utilize it.

Last week, I proposed in Toronto that the industrialized free nations of the world undertake a $5 billion a year foreign aid program through the United Nations. I proposed that the cost of this be shared in proportions of about $3 billion from the United States, and $2 billion from the other countries participating. This would provide Africa with the dimensions of economic aid it needs, economic aid up to the $1.5 billion in accordance with Africa's ability to absorb it usefully.

My proposal to utilize the instrumentality of the United Nations would convince the Africans that we want to guarantee the integrity of purpose of the programs and to avoid any suggestion of political exploitation or domination.

The self-interest of the United States and the participating nations is served by the creation of stable self-governing states with viable economies. Such states are less likely to be induced to league against us or to disturb world peace.

Africa's third desire is for human dignity and racial equality. For us of the Judeo-Christian tradition, this certainly presents no problem of principle. Both the Old and New Testaments enjoin upon us the commandment "to love our neighbor as ourself." In the Phillips translation of the Letter of James, it is put felicitously for our purpose here:

"If you obey," James said, "the royal law expressed by the Scripture 'Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself' all is well. But once you allow invidious distinctions to creep in, you are sinning, you have broken God's law."

Our Judeo-Christian heritage was incorporated in our American Declaration of Independence, in which our forefathers said for us:

"We hold these truths to be self-evident that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights."

If our forefathers did so, can we morally do any less?

It would therefore seem to me that the United States must assert leadership in the United Nations for the recognition of equal human rights in Africa.

We should vigorously oppose the policy of apartheid in the Union of South Africa, but we should not stop there. We should, acting in the United Nations, work to bring about a reversal of that policy by whatever means can sensibly be applied.

And in this regard, let us be mindful of our own shortcomings in this area, and be determined to continue to strive to set things right—North, South, East, and West—wherever the problem exists.

In summary then, I propose that the United States declare its full recognition of the principle of African majority rule; that the United States initiate through the United Nations an economic aid program of the size that Africa needs, as much as $1.5 billion yearly as Africa becomes able to absorb it usefully; and that the United States exert leadership against the policy of apartheid, or racism in any form.

America should help the people of Africa because they need our help, and they deserve to have it. Let's give them the kind of economic aid they need to help raise the material standard of their lives. Let's support them consistently and vigorously in the fulfillment of their rightful dignity as men and women.

We in the United States believe in freedom, we believe in self-government, we believe in working for the material and spiritual advancement of people everywhere. Let's practice our beliefs through our policies and programs for Africa.

Let's roll up our sleeves and go to work. Whatever we do for Africa, we do for the future of Western civilization.

THE HONORABLE CLARENCE J. McLEOD

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, it is with deep regret that I announce to the House the death on Friday in Detroit of the Honorable Clarence J. McLeod, a former Member of this House from the Thirteenth District of Michigan.

Congressman McLeod served eight terms as a Republican Member of this House, elected for seven successive terms from 1923 to 1937 and again elected for one term from 1939 to 1941.

During his service in Congress, Clarence McLeod was for a number of years chairman of the House District Committee. He was an articulate and vigorous foe of communism and in 1928 led the fight in the House for the Reapportionment Act, adoption of which gave Michigan four additional House seats.

McLeod was also a leader in advocating improvements for the Walter Reed Army Hospital, which, incidentally, this year is marking its golden anniversary.

He was an able and conscientious public servant.

Since his retirement from Congress, Mr. McLeod had practiced law in Detroit.

In behalf of his former colleagues still serving in the House and in behalf of the Michigan delegation, I extend sympathy to Mrs. McLeod and other members of his family.

THE 1959 YOUTH MARCH

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 20, 1959, beginning on page 6352 under the heading "Washington Window," there appear comments and several newspaper articles referring to the April 18, 1959, youth march on Washington for integrated schools. Inserted in the RECORD by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. FORRESTER], these materials are used in an attempt by implication to link the youth march with Communist Party movement. I should like to set the RECORD straight on this piece of slander.

The 1959 youth march was very fully and objectively covered by Washington and other daily newspapers around the country. It involved nearly 26,000 white and Negro students from all parts of the Nation and outstanding, substantial, national personalities, both white and Negro, from the fields of Government, labor, religion, entertainment, and other interests. It was definitely a large action and, in that respect, indication of the growing demand on behalf of school integration and the enforcement of all constitutionally guaranteed civil rights. A delegation of these youth from the march was received at the White House by Deputy Assistant to the President Gerald D. Morgan, and Presidential Aid E. Frederick Morrow.

By including, among the newspaper clippings in this April 20 discourse, an article published in the Communist Party's Sunday Worker on the subject of the youth march, an attempt is made to infer a connection between the two. Of course, the Communist press would comment upon this march. It, too, is the press and reports on events of national interest. Of course, the Communist Party, through its press, would imply sympathy toward a cause that is humanitarian or just, however feigned its sympathy as a means to its own end. This is the Communist Party tactic—the avowing of itself as the savior for mankind's every just cause. Why else, as a Nation, are we concerned about its attempts to identify with India's, Africa's, China's, the world's needs, its unrelenting efforts to win alinements through expressions of sympathy and profferings of economic, technological, and even military assistance to nations in need? Who denies that there is hunger and disease and slavery and economic oppression and deprivation of human rights in the world and that these are the causes for which communism, on the one hand, is saying, "I am the way to overcome them," and democracy, on the other hand, is saying, "No; I am the way"?

It is ironic that with those who have some vested interest in the continuation of segregation between the races and oppression of the rights of Negro citizens, anything having to do with the democratic ideals of justice, equality, liberty, and opportunity between and for all men must somehow be linked up with communism. It is more ironic that this inference and charge should come from such groups when the truth is it is this groups' very position on race relations and civil rights which is the boom to communism. During my 5 years in Congress, I have observed all kinds of positions on questions of race relations and civil rights. There are those of my colleagues who, while not in favor of integration, at least command respect for their human reasonableness in the level and character of their opposing fight. On the other hand, there is that small band of vitriolic and demagogic diehards whose approach to these issues is so completely divorced of reason and at such an animalistic level that while they defeat their own efforts to sell their blind hatred and bigotry to thinking people, they nevertheless make fodder for the Communist cause. The use of inference as a tactic for hurdling vitriolic unreasoned charges is not subtle and does not escape attention and the evaluation it deserves.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I include in the RECORD at this point

materials concerning the youth march for integrated schools, including a list of sponsors, a policy statement, a youth march statement, statements by such nationally known personalities as A. Philip Randolph, Roy Wilkins, the Reverend Martin Luther King, Senator Paul Douglas, George Meany, and Walter Reuther, a list of the presidential delegation, a summary of the presidential delegation statement, and news reports from the Washington Post and Times Herald and the Washington Star.

The materials referred to follow:

LIST OF SPONSORS, 1959 YOUTH MARCH FOR INTEGRATED SCHOOLS

Chairmen: Mrs. Daisy Bates, Harry Belafonte, Mrs. Ralph J. Bunche, Rev. Edwin T. Dahlberg, Judge Hubert T. Delany, Rev. Harry Emerson Fosdick, Rev. Martin Luther King, Jr., Father John LaFarge, S.J., Clarence Pickett, Sidney Poitier, Rabbi Joachim Prinz, A. Philip Randolph, Walter Reuther, Jackie Robinson, Rev. Gardner C. Taylor, Norman Thomas, Roy Wilkins, Charles S. Zimmerman.

Youth chairmen: Minniejean Brown, Little Rock, Ark.; Oscar-Mae Gilmore, Montgomery, Ala.; Reginald H. Green, vice president, U.S. National Student Association; Willard Johnson, vice president, U.S. National Student Association; Thomas Lavone Jones, NAACP; Harlon Joye, North American Student Co-op League; Robert R. Kiley, president, U.S. National Student Association; Stuart Langton, chairman, United Christian Youth Movement.

Vice chairmen: Rev. Ralph Abernathy, Juan Avilez, Israel Breslow, C. C. DeJoie, Jr., Hon. Charles C. Diggs, Jr., Eustice Gay, Max Greenberg, Dorothy Height, Oscar Hammerstein II, Jimmy Hicks, Rev. J. Oscar Lee, Dr. Benjamin E. Mays, Joseph Monserrat, Reinhold Neibuhr, Bishop James A. Pike, Jacob F. Potofsky, Hon. Adam Clayton Powell, Rev. Sandy Ray, Ruperto Ruiz, Juan Sanchez, Lillian Smith, Chuck Stone, Harry Van Arsdale, Jr., William O. Walker, Bishop W. J. Walls, Jerry Wurf, Arnold Zander.

POLICY STATEMENT

From its inception, the youth march for integrated schools has maintained a nonpartisan character. In carrying on our activities, we have consistently and publicly made clear that we neither solicit nor accept financial support or participation from any political group as such. Whenever such support or participation was offered, from whatever source, it has been categorically rejected by the committee.

In keeping with this policy, we have on this occasion urged all partisan political groups to refrain from distributing any material along the line of march, at this meeting, and in the armory.

Certain groups have not complied with our request. Thus they have made it necessary for us again to respectfully urge all individuals to comply strictly with this request and urge all persons who have responsibility with the march to make it clear that we dissociate the march from all such partisan political activity and literature. We disapprove of the distribution of such literature and regard it as a disservice to the march and a violation of its spirit.

WHY WE MARCH—YOUTH MARCH STATEMENT

On April 18, thousands of American young people will march in the Nation's Capital in the largest demonstration of youth in our history. They will come from all parts of the country, by bus, plane, train, and car, and will represent all faiths. In Washington, they will be joined together in a great union of protest and action—the youth march for integrated schools.

WE MARCH FOR REAL DEMOCRACY—NOW

For over a century, the American Negro has been brutally and undemocratically denied the rights guaranteed to all citizens by our Constitution. The traditional rights of free speech, of suffrage, of due process, of equal protection under the law have been withheld from millions of Americans. And today, a minority of southern racist leaders is endangering our free educational system. This minority is threatening to close public schools, leaving thousand of our young people stranded, barred from the benefits of sound education.

Is this the way of real democracy?

We march to protest the century-long mistreatment of Negro citizens. They have waited long enough. We march to demand real democracy—now.

WE MARCH IN DEFENSE OF THE SUPREME COURT

Because of its recent decisions in behalf of equal educational opportunities for the Negro, the Supreme Court has been subjected to a battery of vicious attacks. Dangerous attempts have been launched to curb the power of the judicial branch of Government, which has moved courageously to defend the rights of Negroes. We protest against these attacks and call upon the executive and legislative branches to back up the Supreme Court in its reflection of the will of the majority.

WE MARCH FOR CIVIL RIGHTS LEGISLATION

Once again, Congress is being presented with an alternative: either to strengthen American democracy or to retreat before the campaign of the Dixiecrats. The procivil rights majority in Congress, greatly reinforced by the November elections, will have the opportunity to pass the Douglas-Celler-Javits-Powell bill, which goes a long way in helping the Negro and other minorities to achieve equality in all areas of life.

But time and time again, Congress has compromised the will of the people. We march to protest minority rule in Congress, and to demand the passage in toto of the Douglas bill. We march to demand an immediate end to the spectacle of Congressional double-dealing that encourages resistance to the law and deforms the democratic process.

Civil rights legislation is long overdue. We march for just laws—now.

WE MARCH FOR EXECUTIVE ACTION

We march to confront the President directly with the conviction of young people that he must use all of his powers to bring about the speedy integration of the schools. Specifically, we call upon him to speak out morally for the Supreme Court decision of May 17, 1954, and to use his influence to destroy the disease of segregation.

WE MARCH AS PART OF OUR DEMOCRATIC DUTY

When the wheels of government are slow in expanding our democracy (less than 500 students have been integrated in the deep South), when they get bogged down in compromises and maneuvers, we have the moral obligation in a democratic society to register our protest—through action. The essence of democratic government is the participation of the people themselves. Our failure to move against undemocratic practices leaves the field open to forces hostile to democracy.

Throughout our history, dramatic action by deeply concerned people has served to awaken the whole nation to its sense of duty. The power of the democratic idea symbolized by a vast march of sincere, earnest, disciplined, and dedicated people will influence those who have not yet taken a clear stand. Such a demonstration presses forward the cause of democracy and social progress in the courts, legislature, and all areas of American life.

Thus, American young people march not only to demonstrate solidarity with their embattled fellow-students of the South, but for the deepening and reinforcing of our democracy. We demand for every American every single right guaranteed by the Constitution, political, civil, and social; and until we get these rights, we will never cease to protest and assail the ears of America. We will continue to march, to petition, to demonstrate, and to persuade. It is our responsibility to do so.

We march on April 18 for the total victory of equal rights for all. We can no longer endure compromises and delays. We want a program for speedy integration—and we won't take no for an answer.

Come to Washington on April 18.

YOUTH MARCH FOR INTEGRATED SCHOOLS.

STATEMENT OF A. PHILIP RANDOLPH AT YOUTH MARCH FOR INTEGRATED SCHOOLS, WASHINGTON, D.C., APRIL 18, 1959

In the name of the youth march committee for integrated schools, I want to welcome you upon the occasion of this historic demonstration for integrated schools and civil rights legislation in the Nation's Capital.

Let me also, in behalf of our committee, express appreciation for the support of the Negro press, Negro church, NAACP, and various student organizations in the colleges and universities throughout the country in making this demonstration the monumental success it is. Let me express gratitude to certain outstanding leaders for the cooperation they have given this great cause, such as Roy Wilkins, executive secretary, NAACP; George Meany, president, AFL–CIO; Walter Reuther, vice president, AFL–CIO; Jackie Robinson, business executive; Harry Bellafonte, great American artist; Judge Hubert Delany, leader at the bar; Norman Thomas; and others.

We have come again to Washington because the job of achieving integrated schools and civil rights legislation is not yet finished, although some progress has been made.

While the massive resistance movement of Virginia has collapsed, morally and legally, resistance in other areas of the South continues unabated. Thus, until the whole sinister structure of segregation in the United States has been torn down and thrown into the ashcan of history, youth, black and white, Jew and Gentile, Protestant and Catholic, and their allies, the church and labor, must make pilgrimage after pilgrimage to Washington to keep the issue of human dignity alive in America in particular and the world in general.

Youth and their allies have come back to Washington because, in this fleeting moment of history, the problem of integrated schools has become the conscience of the Nation. We have returned to our Nation's Capital today with a democratic participation in a great mass demonstration by youth and adults to indicate the uncompromising commitment of American youth to the principle of the God-given right of every child, regardless of race or color, to secure an education in the public schools free from the insult of discrimination or segregation.

Youth from all sections of the Nation have foregathered here today to register protest against the attacks of Southern States against the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, the recognized leader of the civil rights movement in America. Efforts are afoot in State after State in the South to outlaw this organization and make it a crime for a citizen to become a member of it. We are here to make it evident, clear, and plain to the Faubuses, Talmadges, Eastlands, and white citizens councils that their struggle to destroy the NAACP will be resisted with all the moral and legal forces of the Negro in

America and by those who believe in justice and freedom.

We have come again to the Nation's Capital to register our protest against a movement, under the banner of States' rights, to hamstring, undermine and ultimately destroy the place of the United States Supreme Court in our American constitutional system. We resist and condemn every bill which has been introduced in the Congress or which will be introduced in the Congress to curb and restrict the power of the United States Supreme Court to interpret the Constitution and the laws of the land.

We have come back to Washington because it is the heart not only of America but of the free world. It is the Capital to which rulers from all nations of the world come to discuss their problems and seek support and cooperation from the President of our country, the most powerful ruler in the world today.

We have come again to Washington because we want to demonstrate that the fight for civil rights and integrated schools is a part of the fight for human rights all over the world.

When Faubus of Little Rock is encouraged and supported in this flagrant attack upon little Negro children's right to attend integrated schools in Little Rock, aid, comfort, and support are being given to the horrors committed by the Russian Communists in Hungary against the people of Hungary and the tragedy visited upon the people of Tibet by Chinese Communist barbarianism.

Because liberty is indivisible, one cannot support colonialism in Africa and racism in the United States without strengthening the hands of communism in its march for worldwide conquest. Thus, the march of youth for integrated schools and civil rights is the march for the preservation of our democratic society and maintenance of our traditions and human values of justice, freedom and equality.

One of the best ways to halt the progress of communism in Africa and Asia and give reality and integrity to our profession of democracy is for the United States to give Negroes their civil rights today. Tomorrow may be too late.

Thus, in this hour of world crisis, the Youth March to Washington seeks to give hope and faith to the nine Little Rock Negro children who seek to enter Central High School, and to express denunciation of the policy of closing public schools to avoid integration.

In order that the Fascist and Communist enemies of democracy at home and abroad may know where we stand, let me state that the Youth March for Integrated Schools is definitely nonpartisan. It is also definitely anti-Communist, but is definitely not nonpolitical.

Finally, in this time of worldwide tension, youth, together with their allies, express unqualified support of President Eisenhower upon the eve of a conference between Communist Russia and the Western democracies to discuss the problem of peace and war, in relation to the Berlin crisis. The cause of democracy must triumph for there can be no civil rights except within the framework of a democratic society. We wish to express appreciation to the Eisenhower administration for the role it has played in advancing the cause of civil rights but urge it to do more.

Let us not be dismayed by the long, hard struggle ahead for we will win if we fight and faint not.

REMARKS OF ROY WILKINS, EXECUTIVE SECRETARY OF THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF COLORED PEOPLE, AT THE YOUTH MARCH FOR INTEGRATED SCHOOLS, LINCOLN MEMORIAL, WASHINGTON, D.C., APRIL 18, 1959

It is most fitting and proper that the youth of this Nation should make their feelings known in plain fashion on the issue of desegregation in the public schools.

Education has always been a matter of deep concern to young people and their parents and in the age in which the uses of machines have climbed to a new high level, when electronics, engineering, chemistry, and the atom have sent our world forward at unprecedented speed, education is more necessary than ever.

Literally, one must be trained in order to live. The day is long past when what you don't know won't hurt you. Ignorance and lack of skill not only will hurt, but may well destroy.

But the world's mechanical and scientific progress has made more necessary than ever before an adequate education in human relations. The whole world is instantly aware of the revolt in far-off Tibet, where once news from that country might have taken weeks to reach Washington. The Prime Minister of Great Britain can be in Moscow on Sunday and in Washington or Ottawa on Tuesday. An African leader is jailed in Nyasaland and a Japanese prince is married in Tokyo. The stories are in our newspapers and the pictures on our television screens within hours, often minutes. The story of the Montgomery bus protest is on the front pages of papers in Stockholm, Rome, and New Delhi as soon as it is printed in Chicago.

In this kind of a world, it is silly to talk about segregating people because of their color, because they wear robes or veils, because they speak French or Swahili, because they are Buddhists or Moslems, or Presbyterians, or because their spiritual leaders are called ministers or priests or rabbis.

Yet, here in the greatest country in the world, in the country which has grown great in the minds and hearts of mankind everywhere because it has been built on the guarantee of equality and individual liberty, we are engaged in degrading debate on whether American children, regardless of race, shall be educated together in our public schools.

Our highest court has held that they shall be so educated in accordance with the equal protection clause of the 14th amendment to our Constitution. It has said plainly that racial segregation in public schools is unconstitutional and denies to Negro children equality of opportunity in education.

But instead of complying with the Court's opinion and taking advantage of the leeway it had allowed local communities in planning to make beginnings in good faith, several of the States and many localities have refused to obey the ruling. They are defying the Court and tearing up the Constitution.

This resistance is the plan of adults, not of young people. Many of the leaders of the resistance have lived their lives, or are so far along that they cannot, or will not, change. Their world is behind them. They don't understand India any more than Kipling did. They don't know—and don't care—about the difference between Vietnam and Ghana, or between Ecuador and Ethiopia. What is Kenya and where is Leopoldville?

What kinds of people live in these places? What are their colors, their religions, their eating habits? Our segrationists cry, who cares—what do they have to do with the United States?

So, living in their world of yesterday, they fight the uprooting of segregation and inequality which they nurtured in the land of the free. Yesterday it did not matter much to the rest of the world what the Governor of Arkansas did to 9 Negro children, or to 9,000. Today it matters a great deal. When Alabama sentenced a Negro man to death for the robbery of $1.95 the mail flooded into U.S. embassies in every part of the world and mounted to such a volume as to cause the Secretary of State to communicate formally and officially, with the Governor of Alabama. The Jimmie Wilson case damaged the image of America in the eyes of the world—and the image of America in these delicate and dangerous days must be the concern of every citizen.

It is your concern because this is the world in which you will have to grow up and serve. This is the world in which you will choose a career, marry, rear children, govern and be governed. It is a world in which education will be a tool without which men cannot live and function or know happiness, satisfaction and peace.

For education will give us the knowledge of each other, the mutual respect and dedication to the ideal of liberty and equality which will keep us all free. It has been the fashion to talk in terms of the damage which segregation has done to Negro children, and to forget the corrosive injury it has done to white youngsters. No more revealing or tragic story has come out of the desegregation campaign than that from the small town of Clay, Ky., where a white girl of 14 declared: "I'd rather grow up to be an idiot than to go to a school with a nigger in it." The segregated system made this girl a useless citizen for the world of 1970 by the time she had barely reached her teens.

That is why it is not merely silly to talk about maintaining segregation in public education; it is well-nigh suicidal. It could lose us the struggle for the hearts of men, be it cold or hot.

So you are here to say by your presence and in your resolutions that you want integrated schools for all American children. You have every right to say this to your Government and to all among the citizenry who will listen. No one has a better right, for in so speaking, you are demanding only that the high pronouncements and glorious traditions of this beloved bastion of freedom be vindicated, and that we be about the business of building the kind of world in which your generation can preserve freedom.

STATEMENT OF MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR., AT YOUTH MARCH FOR INTEGRATED SCHOOLS, WASHINGTON, D.C., APRIL 18, 1959

As I stand here and look out upon the thousands of Negro faces, and the thousands of white faces, intermingled like the waters of a river, I see only one face—the face of the future.

Yes; as I gaze upon this great historic assembly, this unprecedented gathering of young people, I cannot help thinking—that a hundred years from now the historians will be calling this not the "beat" generation, but the generation of integration.

The fact that thousands of you came here to Washington and that thousands more signed your petition proves that this generation will not take "No" for an answer—will not take double talk for an answer—will not take gradualism for an answer. It proves that the only answer you will settle for is—total desegregation and total equality—now.

I know of no words eloquent enough to express the deep meaning, the great power, and the unconquerable spirit back of this inspiringly original, uniquely American march of young people. Nothing like it has ever happened in the history of our Nation. Nothing, that is, except the last youth march. What this march demonstrates to me, above all else, is that you young people, through your own experience, have somehow discovered the central fact of American life—that the extension of democracy for all Americans depends upon complete integration of Negro Americans.

By coming here you have shown yourselves to be highly alert, highly responsible young citizens. And very soon the area of your responsibility will increase, for you will begin to exercise your greatest privilege as an American—the right to vote. Of course, you will have no difficulty exercising this privilege—if you are white.

But I wonder if you can understand what it feels like to be a Negro, living in the South, where, by attempting to exercise this

right, you may be taking your life in your hands.

The denial of the vote not only deprives the Negro of his constitutional rights—but what is even worse—it degrades him as a human being. And yet, even this degradation, which is only one of many humiliations of everyday life, is losing its ability to degrade. For the southern Negro is learning to transform his degradation into resistance. Nonviolent resistance. And by so doing he is not only achieving his dignity as a human being, he is helping to advance democracy in the South. This is why my colleagues and I in the Southern Leadership Conference are giving our major attention to the campaign to increase the registration of Negro voters in the South to 3 million. Do you realize what would happen in this country if we were to gain 3 million southern Negro votes? We could change the composition of Congress. We could have a Congress far more responsive to the voters' will. We could have all schools integrated—north and south. A new era would open to all Americans. Thus, the Negro, in his struggle to secure his own rights is destined to enlarge democracy for all people, in both a political and a social sense.

Indeed in your great movement to organize a march for integrated schools you have actually accomplished much more. You have awakened on hundreds of campuses throughout the land a new spirit of social inquiry to the benefit of all Americans.

This is really a noble cause. As June approaches, with its graduation ceremonies and speeches, a thought suggests itself. You will hear much about careers, security, and prosperity. I will leave the discussion of such matters to your deans, your principals, and your valedictorians. But I do have a graduation thought to pass along to you. Whatever career you may choose for yourself—doctor, lawyer, teacher—let me propose an avocation to be pursued along with it. Become a dedicated fighter for civil rights. Make it a central part of your life.

It will make you a better doctor, a better lawyer, a better teacher. It will enrich your spirit as nothing else possibly can. It will give you that rare sense of nobility that can only spring from love and selflessly helping your fellow man. Make a career of humanity. Commit yourself to the noble struggle for equal rights. You will make a greater person of yourself, a greater Nation of your country, and a finer world to live in.

DOUGLAS TELEGRAM

APRIL 17, 1959.

A. PHILIP RANDOLPH,
1959 Petition Campaign and Youth March for Integrated Schools, New York, N.Y.

Your support and that of thousands of other sincere believers in equal justice for legislation that will back up the historic desegregation decisions of the Supreme Court is a great encouragement to those of us on the legislative firing line.

The bill, S. 810, which 17 Senators have sponsored will, we believe, give constructive, reasonable, and effective assistance to the efforts to secure compliance with the 14th amendment in America's public schools.

We need to move steadily toward equality of opportunity in education so that all our citizens may enjoy the premise of our basic law, so that the Nation may have the best talents of all its people, and so that the world will have greater confidence in our Nation's leadership for freedom and against Communist tyranny.

Your efforts to awaken the Nation more fully to these vital goals are deeply appreciated. God bless you and keep you.

PAUL H. DOUGLAS.

AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR AND CONGRESS OF INDUSTRIAL ORGANIZATIONS,
New York, N.Y., April 6, 1959.

Mr. A. PHILIP RANDOLPH,
President, Brotherhood of Sleeping Car Porters, New York, N.Y.

DEAR SIR AND BROTHER: This will acknowledge your letter of March 31, in reference to the youth assembly which will be held in Washington, April 18. I sincerely wish it could be possible for me to take part in the program which, I note, will begin at 2 p.m., but regret to advise that my standing commitments will make it necessary for me to be absent from the city on that day.

With all good wishes to you and those associated with you in this assembly, I am,

Sincerely and fraternally,

GEORGE MEANY,
President.

REUTHER TELEGRAM

APRIL 17, 1959.

A. PHILIP RANDOLPH,
Youth March for Integrated Schools, New York, N.Y.:

I regret that I cannot be with you personally on this memorable occasion to support your dramatic appeal to the American conscience and your call for more forthright action by Congress and the administration in keeping with the historic Supreme Court decisions in the matter of school integration. I should be more confident of our capacity to do right by freedom at the center of Europe if there were a greater show of concern for freedom here in the center of Washington.

There has been no real disposition at either end of Pennsylvania Avenue to deal with civil rights in education although the means for dealing with it lie at hand in the form of legislation introduced by Senators DOUGLAS and JAVITS and Congressman CELLER.

The Negro people have been very patient. They have been very reasonable and very orderly and very long-suffering. You might say they have waited since 1619, since 1863, since 1865, since 1896. They have waited much longer than 1954.

America is strong, yet we are not so strong, so indestructible, and so immune to the wear and tear of history that we need not practice here at home, in our everyday life, what we preach so readily to the rest of the world. We had better put our own house in order. We had better look to our credentials as leader of the free world and the prospective leader of the peoples of the world now struggling to be free.

It is imperative that the American people understand that the question of free access to American schools is a basic test of freedom in an area where our troubles are no fault of the Communists. The question of school integration is a national matter. A matter of honoring the Constitution of the United States, and the major responsibility for a solution lies at the Federal center with the men who are now looking the other way at both ends of Pennsylvania Avenue in the crisis of the schools.

Parents are imposing their prejudices on their children. Let the voice of the young people be heard. Let the children lead us. They are ahead of their elders. They are the innocent victims of past wrongs; their real solidarity is with the future. They are ready to start growing up now to the stature and the awareness that they and the Nation will need in order to meet tomorrow's challenge.

You are helping this youth to find its voice. Our great hope is that this voice will reach the conscience of the country.

WALTER P. REUTHER,
President, International Union, UAW.

PRESIDENTIAL DELEGATION

Reginald Green: Age 23, from Walla Walla, Wash., A.B., Whitman College, 1955, summa cum lude. Harvard Graduate School of Arts and Science, A.M. Vice president, National Student Association of America.

Josephine Green Boyd: Age 19, from Greensboro, N.C., the first Negro student to graduate from an integrated school in North Carolina. She is an honor student at Clark University, Worchester, Mass., and secretary of the NAACP.

Sallye Phillips: Miss Phillips is a senior, age 17, at Hartshorne High School, in Hartshorne, Okla. She has been elected as a straight A student, the first Negro valedictorian of her class that graduates in May.

Harlon Joye: Age 26, from Orangeburg, S.C. Now studying at the New School of Social Research, in New York City. Is a representative to the Young Adult Council for the National Student Cooperative League.

YOUTH MARCH FOR INTEGRATED SCHOOLS—SUMMARY OF PRESIDENTIAL DELEGATION STATEMENT

RECOMMENDATIONS

In the light of the considerations which we discuss below, we respectfully urge that you give consideration to the following proposals, which we feel would enable the Federal Government to place its weight behind the movement for the integration of the schools:

1. The Chief Executive should make an explicit moral as well as legal commitment of the full resources of the Federal Government to the objective of achieving orderly, effective, and speedy integration of the schools.

2. The Chief Executive should place his weight behind the passage of a truly effective civil rights bill in the present session of Congress. As far as school integration is concerned, we believe that the Douglas-Javits-Celler bill is by far the most comprehensive and effective piece of legislation before Congress. This bill is bipartisan in its sponsorship. It deserves, we feel, the full support of the administration.

The Douglas-Javits-Celler bill is an historic and statesmanlike proposal. It empowers the Federal Government to move into the center of the school picture and to undertake, on a nationwide basis, careful and constructive planning of the Nation's march toward integration. It provides the expert counseling, the financial aid, and the legal authority necessary to achieve this end.

The several admirable features of the bills introduced on behalf of the administration likewise merit vigorous support, especially those adding to the protection of the right to vote.

3. The Chief Executive should call a White House conference of youth and student leaders, chosen from national and regional organizations, both North and South, to discuss ways in which youth may participate in the implementation of the Supreme Court decision.

4. The Chief Executive should intervene in the case of Asbury Howard, Jr., the 18-year-old Negro youth from Bessemer, Ala., who has been sentenced to the chain gang for 1 year for coming to the defense of his father when the latter was attacked by a mob. Cases such as this must be brought to the attention of the Nation and of the State authorities if a wrong is to be redressed and justice done.

We make these recommendations in the light of the following urgent considerations:

1. Nearly 5 years have elapsed since the Supreme Court ruled that in the field of education "separate but equal" has no place. But today only some 800 of 2,890 biracial school districts in Southern and border States have begun desegregation even on a token basis. In five States, there has been no desegregation in public education. In

the past 2 years, the number of districts instituting new desegregation plans has shrunk to a mere handful.

2. This situation is not acceptable to the youth and the students of the United States. For us, the youth, the question of school integration is the central moral issue of our time. Not only are the rights of minorities at stake; American democracy itself, and the supremacy of our Government, the very survival of the Constitution, are at issue.

We must point out that American youth have made strong and repeated affirmation of their support for the Supreme Court decision and the integration of the schools. Among the most recent demonstrations of this are the following:

(a) In August 1957, when the delegates of over 300 student governments, representing over 1 million students, expressed their belief at the U.S. National Student Association's 10th National Student Congress, that—

Segregation in education by race is incompatible with human equality. It is now also unconstitutional. In the face of ethical concepts, legal requirements, and global ramifications, there can be no justification for delay in the implementation of the Supreme Court decision.

(b) At the National Student Conference of the YMCA and YWCA held last December at the University of Illinois;

(c) At the 1958 convention of the National Federation of Catholic College Students held in San Francisco;

(d) At the 11th National Student Congress last August when delegates from 50 southern campuses expressed their desire for the abolition of segregation;

(e) At the 1958 youth march in Washington, when 10,000 students expressed their moral support for integration.

The petition campaign and youth march for integrated schools, with its 20,000-member march, its quarter of a million signatures, and its nationwide support, has won more support among the young people than any other national campaign or issue in the past 15 years.

3. Concern over the integration of the U.S. schools is not limited to this country. The delegates from the 75 national unions of students outside the Communist bloc, meeting in Lima, Peru, at the International Student Conference this spring, condemned the continued practice of racial segregation in our country. Similar grave concern was expressed at the World Assembly of Youth held in New Delhi last summer.

4. As young Americans, we appreciate the difficulties confronting those who work to implement integration of the schools. We commend the efforts of the courts, the Civil Rights Commission, and members of the administration such as Attorney General Rogers and Secretary Flemming on behalf of integration. Yet, if massive resistance has been defeated in Virginia, it is very much alive in South Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana. The leaders of the Deep South do not seek time to accommodate to integration, but to block it altogether. They do not wish to discuss compliance with the law but ways to evade it.

5. The crisis that centers around the integration of the schools is a national question. It affects school systems and national minorities in all parts of our land. It must, we feel, have the fullest attention of the Federal Government if a solution is to be reached, if the Nation is to have the leadership for progress, for the creation of a truer, fuller democracy that it so deeply needs.

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald, Apr. 19, 1959]

INTEGRATION RALLY HERE ASSURED; IKE SEEKS END OF RACIAL BIAS

A student delegation calling for the administration to press for speedy desegregation of the Nation's public schools was assured by the White House yesterday that the President shares their desire to eliminate racial discrimination.

The students, representing more than 25,000 persons from throughout the Nation who met here yesterday to demonstrate public support for faster implementation of the Supreme Court's desegregation decision, received the assurance from Gerald D. Morgan, deputy assistant to the President.

After a 15-minute meeting with Morgan at the White House, they reported that he was friendly and showed interest in their list of proposals for getting the Government to place its weight behind the movement for the integration of the schools.

Morgan read the delegates a statement declaring:

"The President is just as anxious as you are to see an America where discrimination does not exist. * * * We have a long way to travel, but in the past 6 years we have also come a long way. * * * We will never be satisfied until the last vestige of discrimination has disappeared."

Following the White House meeting, a crowd estimated at 26,000 by Park Police paraded in a youth march for integrated schools from Seventh Street on the Mall to the Sylvan Theater on the Washington Monument grounds.

They were addressed by the Reverend Martin Luther King; Roy Wilkins, secretary of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, and Tom Mboya, chairman of the All Africa People's Conference.

A four-page newspaper entitled "Workers World" was distributed at the rally. A spokesman for the rally sponsors said they had not authorized distribution of any literature.

A delegation was scheduled to present a petition to an aid of Vice President RICHARD M. NIXON at the Capitol. The meeting was canceled, rally officials said, because they wanted to give the petitions to a Member of Congress who could place them in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

[From the Sunday Star, Washington, D.C., Apr. 19, 1959]

TWENTY-SIX THOUSAND CHILDREN MARCH TO BACK INTEGRATION

Nearly 26,000 school-age youngsters from all parts of the Nation marched along the Mall yesterday in a demonstration for speedy school integration. They gathered for a speechmaking program at the Washington Monument Grounds.

The police had expected the march to end about an hour after its start at Seventh Street and Madison Drive SW. at 2:15, but the last of the marchers finally reached the Sylvan Theater area at 4 o'clock.

Sponsored by the Youth March for Integrated Schools, some 300 busloads—half of them from New York—arrived before noon.

Special delegations appeared at the Capitol and at the White House with petitions containing nearly 250,000 signatures urging "an executive and legislative program to speed integration" throughout the Nation.

MET BY PRESIDENT'S AID

At the White House the group was met by Gerald D. Morgan, deputy assistant to the President, who spoke to them on behalf of Mr. Eisenhower, now vacationing in Georgia.

Mr. Morgan said: "The President is just as anxious as you are to see an America where discrimination does not exist. * * * To reach this goal we have a long way to travel, but in the past 6 years we have also come a long way."

Mr. Morgan added that the President is proud of the progress made—"much of it under his personal leadership"—but the administration will not be satisfied "until the last vestige of discrimination has disappeared."

NEGRO LEADERS SPEAK

The youngsters were addressed at the Monument Grounds by national Negro leaders, including A. Philip Randolph, president of the Brotherhood of Sleeping Car Porters; Roy Wilkins, executive secretary of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People; and Charles S. Zimmerman, chairman of the AFL-CIO National Civil Rights Committee.

Senator DOUGLAS, Democrat, of Illinois, in a telegram read to the assembly, said the youth march—a repeat of a similar mass integration demonstration here last October—was "great encouragement to those of us on the legislative firing line."

Labor Leader Walter Reuther telegraphed: "Let the children lead us. * * * They are the victims of past wrongs."

The African Negro labor leader, Tom Mboya, of Kenya, told the applauding crowd: "Many millions of people throughout the world in spirit are here with you today. * * * The struggle for human dignity is a universal struggle."

Citations were presented to Jackie Robinson and Mrs. Daisy Bates, NAACP leader in Little Rock, Ark., and the Reverend Martin Luther King, Jr., Montgomery, Ala., Negro leader.

YOUTH MARCH OF 1959

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks immediately following the remarks of Mr. DIGGS.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, where more than in America is free expression and interest in the orderly process of government considered a responsibility of the individual citizen? It is because of its example of this high purpose that I wish to commend the youth march of 1959. It is the democratic way for people to join together for their common good with the interest of the Nation at heart.

Thirty thousand young people of every creed and race from all parts of the United States gathered at the Washington Monument Saturday, April 18, to collectively sound their belief in the principle of equal education for all. Their appointed delegates were received at the White House on behalf of the President of the United States.

In proceedings characterized by orderliness and calm purpose, they recalled the U.S. Supreme Court decision of May 17, 1954, in which it was stated that "segregation in the public schools is unconstitutional and a negation of human rights in a democratic society."

In petitions to the President and the Congress of the United States they said, "Southern young people have suffered indignities, humiliation, and violence in seeking to appease their rights," and that "further efforts to maintain segregated schools threaten the destruction of our system of free public schools and the embarrassment of our professions of democracy around the world." They urged "an executive and legislative program which will insure the orderly and speedy integration of schools throughout the United States."

These petitions carried some 400,000 signatures including Mrs. Ralph J. Bunche, Rev. Harry Emerson Fosdick, Father John Farge, Walter Reuther, George Meany, A. Philip Randolph, Jackie Robinson, and other distinguished citizens from throughout our Nation.

Education of our youth is an important investment in the future of our country. Our hopes for the future of our free society are heartened by the knowledge that our young people care.

TRIBUTE TO JOHN FOSTER DULLES

Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SCHWENGEL] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, my decision to take the floor today to pay tribute to John Foster Dulles has been prompted by a resolution of appreciation passed by the First District Council of Iowa Republican Women, the district that I have the honor to represent. At the spring meeting of this group in Washington, Iowa, on April 29, the following resolution was unanimously adopted and sent to Mr. Dulles in letter form:

The Honorable JOHN FOSTER DULLES,
Walter Reed Hospital,
Washington, D.C.

SIR: The members of the First Congressional District Council of Iowa Republican Women at their spring meeting in Washington, Iowa, April 29, 1959, unanimously asked that the following message be sent to you:

"We hereby express our sincere and deep appreciation for your loyal and outstanding work as Secretary of State.

"We sincerely believe that no other individual has ever contributed so faithfully of time, energy, and judgment in the endeavor to preserve peace in our Nation and the world, and we earnestly extend our heartfelt wishes for your speedy recovery."

Respectfully yours,
FIRST DISTRICT COUNCIL OF IOWA REPUBLICAN WOMEN,
MRS. WILLA WELDON,
District President.

Mr. Speaker, just today, I received a copy of another resolution, this one from the National Federation of Republican Women. It was adopted by the board of directors at its meeting in Washington, D.C., April 10 and 11 of this year. That resolution reads as follows:

Whereas John Foster Dulles has served as Secretary of State with rare devotion for more than 6 years; and

Whereas Secretary Dulles has earned the enmity of the Communists and appeasers for his opposition to the international conspiracy which threatens to destroy our Republic; and

Whereas Secretary Dulles has been attacked by some for his so-called policy of "brinkmanship," yet this policy of firmness has been wholly successful in keeping America out of war, while the policies of his predecessors three times took us over the "brink" and into war;

Resolved, That the Board of Directors of the National Federation of Republican Women affirm their support of the anti-Communist foreign policy of Secretary Dulles; and that he will continue his firm policies in resisting Communist strategy and aggression.

Resolved further, That a copy of this resolution be sent to Secretary Dulles and President Dwight D. Eisenhower.

This was one of four resolutions adopted at this meeting, and to me it is one of the most important. The board of directors members who signed these resolutions were: Mrs. J. B. Parks, Colorado, chairman; Mrs. Beth Carmack, Arizona; Mrs. Newell S. Boardman, Illinois; Mrs. Esther D. Holt, Oklahoma; and Mrs. Frederick P. Becker, West Virginia.

To the members of both of these groups and all groups who have paused to do honor to this great American, I offer high praise and commendation. I agree that when a public servant has made a contribution to his country's welfare and at the same time has had such a tremendous influence upon the peace of the world, recognition should be spontaneous and immediate. I want John Foster Dulles to know the place of esteem he holds in the hearts of the people of the United States. He has earned the right to be revered and respected and to receive a pat on the back and a thunderous applause for a job well done.

Mr. Speaker, at this very moment in Geneva there are negotiations going on which promise to reduce the chances for war, while at the same time preserving American principles. The American team at the Geneva Conference is of course led by our new and very able Secretary of State, Mr. Herter, but if good results should come from this conference few people will deny that our former Secretary of State, John Foster Dulles, is the man to whom most of the credit should go.

It is a paradoxical twist of fate that this great man, now lying sick at Walter Reed Hospital, should not have been well enough to lead the American delegation himself, for it seems clear that it would have been the summit of his career as a diplomat and statesman. Here is a man who was veritably in training for the job of Secretary of State since he was a teenager—as far back as the Hague Conference of 1907. In the intervening years Foster Dulles, while gaining prominence as chief partner in the law firm of Sullivan & Cromwell, continued his interest in international affairs, until in 1944, he again became active in foreign policy.

As a leading churchman and Republican, he could not help but be concerned over the postwar role of the United States in the world, and thus, 15 years ago, he came to Washington to offer his counsel to some of the most prominent Members of the other body. This was a good apprenticeship for the job Dulles later took on when our President offered him the post of Secretary of State, for in those early postwar years the United States, no less than our party itself, was undergoing a period of transition regarding America's role in the world.

For it has generally been recognized that John Foster Dulles is the negotiator par excellence, and we know beyond a doubt that this skill helped him in bringing about a good working relationship between such leaders as Vandenberg and Taft and an administration with which they were not in sympathy. Indeed, his skills in this field were so great that Dulles was called upon to serve as a member of the American delegation at the Conference which set up the United Nations, even though he was well known as a leading Republican.

In the years that followed, and before his party won the executive branch, Mr. Dulles assumed other positions of special trust and responsibility. He was a constant consultant on Far Eastern affairs, and of course he is recognized as the architect of one of America's most significant postwar achievements: the peace treaty with Japan. It was also at this time that Mr. Dulles was instrumental in writing our unique alliance with Australia and New Zealand: the ANZUS Treaty.

But, of course, John Foster Dulles will best be remembered for these past 6 years. There are those who say that he will be regarded as the finest Secretary of State ever to hold that office. Certainly, he held office in the most trying of times, and as I have said, it was a time of transition, both for his party and his country during which he held office.

In my humble opinion, Mr. Dulles should go down as the finest, ablest, most effective of all modern Secretaries of State. It is my belief that he has best filled the four roles demanded by that position. He has had the President's supreme confidence in foreign affairs, second-guessed by nobody; he has managed to keep Congress and the people informed of his policies and to gain their support; he has had the very warm support of our leading allies—this became especially clear earlier this year even before his illness; and finally, by his careful but firm diplomacy, he has made America's position crystal clear to its potential enemies, and thus kept the peace.

This is almost too much to ask of any man, thus it is not surprising that Mr. Dulles has had his critics. Some have charged that he spoke out of both sides of his mouth; others said that he was reckless; and many have made the queer claim that Mr. Dulles was too moralistic. It is not my feeling that Mr. Dulles deserved any of these complaints; indeed, it seems to me that those who made those charges simply do not understand the job he had to do. Certainly, all of us would agree that the nations of West Europe, close to the Russian menace, and with perhaps some colonial territories, are bound to look upon the world with different eyes than do the newly independent nations of the world, located often far from the mainstream of events. Yet it was Mr. Dulles' job to help defend both kinds of nations from aggression, and to help such nations understand America's good will toward them. Is speaking to such nations in a language each will best understand to be classed as duplicity? I don't think so—but if it is, then I am all for it.

And then there are those who say that Mr. Dulles was reckless—that he took us "to the brink." But is it not better to have your enemy know pretty well where you stand these days? For these are times when the risks of an accidental war are great, and Mr. Dulles understood this. He did not wish the men of

the Kremlin to have any illusions of where we stand, and thus foolishly apply pressure in the expectation that America would tacitly give in. Instead, his position has been to state America's position with clarity and firmness—but at the same time to seek peace and avoid any unnecessary provocations.

And finally, how can it be claimed that an American Secretary of State was "too moralistic." Can it be denied that there are rights and wrongs in international affairs? Is Mr. Dulles to be chastised because he did not fear speaking of these openly, especially when he knew that our country has traditionally been recognized as the embodiment of men's ideals? No—I say that John Foster Dulles was quite right in spelling out again and again the evil deeds of the Soviet Union in Eastern Europe; of the tyranny that is imposed there, and of the immorality of those deeds. At the same time, I respect him for the restraint that he has shown in times of crisis—for he recognized—as at the time of the Hungarian rebellion, that no American action save nuclear war itself could have any effect on matters which so clearly affected the Russian heartland. He knew that to make war under such circumstances would not help men anywhere, least of all the proud men of Hungary.

As Mr. Dulles lies gravely ill, I join his many admirers all over the free world in hoping and praying that his health will be restored so that he will be able to bring the benefit of his great experience to the aid of his President. Mr. Eisenhower voiced my sentiments exactly when he announced that Mr. Dulles would be commissioned as a special consultant:

> I personally believe he has filled his office with greater distinction and greater ability than any other man our country has known, a man of tremendous character and courage, intelligence and wisdom. And, therefore, my determination to keep him close where he can be as useful, both in the State Department and to me,—and indeed, in considering everything that may affect our foreign relations, I think is a very wise and proper thing to do.

Under unanimous consent I include the following editorials:

[From the Richmond Times-Dispatch, Apr. 17, 1959]

HE HELD THE LINE

No man in postwar public life, outside the White House, has had as hard a row to hoe as John Foster Dulles.

Throughout his 6 years as Secretary of State, he devoted every ounce of energy to the service of his country, and of the free West.

After his 1956 operation for intestinal cancer at the age of 68, and after another, 2 years later, he carried on pursuing a strenuous schedule of work and travel that would have tested the endurance of a young man in good health.

He lived up to the code prescribed in Kipling "If":

> "If you can force your heart
> and nerve and sinew
> To serve your turn long
> after they are gone
> And so hold on, when there
> is nothing in you
> Except the Will, which says
> to them, 'hold on!' "

This was the stamina that enabled him to "hold the line" in the face of the duplicity and attrition of a Red imperialism equally determined to reduce each of the West's diplomatic moves toward peace into an exercise in futility.

The Secretary's resignation was expected; yet the sudden realization that his hand was no longer at the helm of foreign policy came as a shock, especially to the President who had leaned so often and so heavily, during his own attacks of illness, on the sturdy shoulders of his Secretary of State.

Mr. Dulles' policy maneuvers were not always understood, at home or abroad. Some European governments friendly to us looked upon him as "an edgy gambler." Not until the past year did the overall pattern of his strategy come into focus.

Dulles had consistently held, that diplomacy vis-a-vis Moscow must lead from strength in order to be effective. That is why some have called him "the only man on earth feared by the Kremlin."

His withdrawal of a United States offer to help finance Egypt's $1.3 billion Aswan Dam project was regarded as a blunder. Those close to Dulles say that he withdrew the offer because he saw the need of making neutral governments realize the folly of playing the United States against the Soviet Union, in the hope of receiving economic aid from both.

His refusal to condone the Israeli-British-French invasion of Suez caused a rift hard to heal—yet he put his country on record as opposed to military aggression for economic reasons.

The landing in Lebanon was condemned as a needless "show of force," but may have convinced the Near East that we would come to the aid of legally constituted governments asking protection against Soviet attrition.

In his preoccupation with the task of knitting the non-Communist West more closely together, Mr. Dulles may have overlooked the "clear and present danger" of Red infiltration in Latin America; yet anyone trying to keep track of the kaleidoscopic multiplicity of international problems will understand how difficult it must have been to keep them all "under his hat."

The national reaction to his resignation was well expressed by Senate Democratic Leader LYNDON B. JOHNSON:

"Secretary Dulles," said the Texan, "will remain in our hearts as a great American who faced up to difficult and trying tasks with fortitude and resolution."

Similar stock phrases are often used in saluting statesmen forced to retire because of illness or age—but seldom with as much genuine feeling.

[From the Des Moines Register, Apr. 16, 1959]

A DEDICATED STATESMAN

John Foster Dulles hated to resign as Secretary of State, and President Eisenhower hated to see him go. There were tears in the President's eyes when he announced the resignation. The latest medical findings made the resignation inevitable, and Dulles acted promptly.

A Nation's sympathy will go with Dulles in his battle with cancer, and a Nation's gratitude for 6 years of energetic and thoughtful service in an office which has carried the heavy burdens of cold war, the rocket and nuclear arms race, the frustrations of trying to make the United Nations and the tangle of U.S. alliance systems work.

Dulles has unquestionably been one of the hardest working and hardest thinking of American Secretaries of State. Naturally, not everyone has agreed with him—we have not always done so. But in spite of his constant travels and the huge daily press of business, Dulles made a real effort to think through the general principles and the long-term goals of U.S. foreign policy, and to keep on thinking.

In this he had a headstart by virtue of his longtime interest in the subject before his appointment, in the years when he headed the wartime Commission For a Just and Durable Peace of the old Federal Council of Churches, the years when he was foreign policy adviser to Thomas E. Dewey in Dewey's two tries for the Presidency, the years when he was a special negotiator for Democratic President Harry S. Truman.

Some of Dulles' famous phrases lent themselves to misinterpretation and attack: "liberation," "massive retaliation," "agonizing reappraisal," "deeds, not words," "stand firm," for instance.

But Dulles did not think in slogans. In context, these phrases did not mean what his severest critics thought they did, and Dulles explained them again and again, in speeches and press conferences.

He was a great believer in private talks with foreign negotiators, but he was almost always ready to explain in detail for the public what he was trying to do and how things were going.

A Secretary of State gets praised or blamed less for his own performance than for the results. The results are only to a small extent within his control. It is no secret that the U.S. position in the world is more dangerous today than it was 6 years ago, though it is far from hopeless.

People will be arguing for a long time to come whether things would have been better—or worse—if Dulles had taken a different line on the Middle East, the Far East, Berlin, the summit meeting, and so on. But no one can doubt his devotion and his effort. And surely Soviet weapons technology and the revolutionary changes in the underdeveloped countries are the major reasons for U.S. insecurity today.

[From the Charlotte Observer, Apr. 16, 1959]

A BRAVE MAN LEAVES A VOID THAT MUST BE FILLED QUICKLY

Friend and critic alike would find it easy to agree on one thing about John Foster Dulles: He never shirked difficult decisions.

Now he has made perhaps the most difficult one of his career. Wracked by cancer, he has resigned as Secretary of State.

With a remarkable display of courage and determination, Dulles carried on in one of the world's most difficult jobs despite his painful illness until he was clearly incapable of going any further. Many of us think he delayed an inevitable decision too long.

That's water over the dam now. All of us can salute the grit and dedication of a remarkable public servant and regret that his career has been halted at a crucial moment.

Not since the postwar years has the Western Alliance—in which Dulles has been the dominant figure for 6 years—faced greater problems than it does now. In less than a month, allied foreign ministers meet with the Russians in a pre-Summit Conference. Still to be welded together is a firm, coherent answer to the Communist demand that the Western Powers pull out of Berlin.

Because of Dulles' illness, the role of the natural leader of the alliance—the United States—has been sharply reduced. The result has been a leadership vacuum, which Prime Minister Macmillan of Great Britain has tried unsuccessfully to fill. With time running out, Britain and West Germany are wrangling publicly.

At this point, one thing seems imperative. President Eisenhower must name a new Secretary of State quickly, and work with him in offering vigorous, cohesive foreign policy direction in the critical weeks ahead.

The logical choice may well be Acting Secretary Christian Herter, who has been directing our preparation for the Geneva talks. But whether the choice is Herter or someone else, it should be made now.

In times like these, leaders of both parties—in and out of Congress—stand ready to demonstrate this country's essential unity in facing the Communist threat.

The loss of Dulles is a crippling blow, but it must not be a fatal one. If the White House will act quickly and wisely, we can meet this challenge as we have so many others.

[From the San Francisco Examiner, Apr. 17, 1959]

SECRETARY DULLES MAKES THE HARD DECISION

The resignation of Secretary Dulles came with shock and sorrow to the American people, the leaders of both political parties, and our allies. It had been expected, but no amount of anticipation could ease the poignant sadness of President Eisenhower in announcing it, nor the dismay here and abroad.

It is a major misfortune. Mr. Dulles, we are sure, would be the first to protest against calling it a tragedy, and the first to exhort us not to let it turn into one.

He himself made the decision and we can only guess at what cost of agonizing self-assessment. As the President correctly predicted a few days ago, Mr. Dulles could be relied upon—better than anyone else—to determine his ability to remain in office and to decide on the basis of the best interests of our country. Those who thought otherwise underestimated, as usual, his quiet and tremendous courage.

He has set all of us an example to face the coming weeks of crisis with something of his fortitude and intelligence.

In that uncertainty it is heartening that Mr. Dulles will continue as foreign policy consultant to the President and the administration.

[From the Chicago Daily Tribune, Apr. 17, 1959]

UNDEFEATED

Secretary of State John Foster Dulles has fought against the destroying disease of Communist imperialism and a wasting malady that attacked his own body. Against both he displayed a spirit of indomitable fortitude and resolution which could not fail to arouse the admiration of all his countrymen.

Now Mr. Dulles has himself concluded that he is unequal to carrying on the struggle in the world arena while living under what must be recognized as a sentence of death. The duties he discharged with such conspicuous courage and firmness must now pass to other hands, and we all must trust that they will be handled with a sure and unfaltering touch, for at this stage in world affairs irresolution could cause enormous damage.

The conference of foreign ministers to deal with Soviet blackmail demands over West Berlin and the status of Germany lies just ahead, and after that there is a strong likelihood that the spokesmen of the Western nations will be obliged to deal in personal negotiation with Premier Khrushchev. They will need all their wits and all their perseverance in standing off this peasant schemer.

This was a job which Secretary Dulles was admirably suited to discharge. Through years of direct experience, he had come to know the nature of the enemy. He did not scare easily. He was good at bucking up the weaker sisters in the Western coalition. He had no stomach for sell-outs or for compromises leading to surrender on the installment plan.

If our diplomacy is to succeed, it must be conducted with the character, the principle, and the courage that Mr. Dulles brought to the task. Of him it could be said without sentimentality that his strength was as the strength of 10 because he knew his cause was just.

We have often been at odds with Secretary Dulles on questions of policy as well as on his methods of operating. There is little doubt that he was so frequently on the go that our international relations sometimes assumed a frenetic character. He talked much and often, sometimes indiscreetly, as in his "brink of war" statement. Yet, at his best, he was deft, perceptive, and not without wit.

The moral qualities which made him a lay church leader added strength to his diplomacy, but they also detracted from it, for Mr. Dulles was sometimes moved to equate diplomatic problems with moral absolutes—a trait which could be a handicap in a profession which frequently requires devious approaches to attain advantageous ends.

Mr. Dulles' undiscriminating addiction to the prescription of unending foreign aid stemmed from the same impulse—that foreign affairs are hardly to be distinguished in some of their aspects from the do-gooding promptings of social work.

Yet, when all is said and done, Secretary Dulles stood off the Communists, yielded nothing to them, and left them with the sure understanding that the United States was willing to fight, if need be, to preserve a world in which decent people might live. His policy of firmness worked, if it is to be judged by the only possible criterion—that the Communists turned away from the challenge.

This man deserves well in the estimation of his countrymen. They wish him comfort and peace in the days ahead, and they may hope that the example he has provided will live on in the memories of those to whom he must now reluctantly pass the high responsibilities of a post in the front-line against the enemy.

[From the New York Herald Tribune, Apr. 16, 1959]

MR. DULLES RESIGNS

Even though it was clear since his return from Florida on Sunday that John Foster Dulles could not continue to carry the great burden of his office, his resignation is a sorrowful blow to this country. For six long and exhausting years, he has dominated the policies of the Western World, shaping them and prosecuting them in one of the most remarkable careers a Secretary of State has ever enjoyed. His will and his energy left their stamp on almost every government, including that of the Soviet Union. But even his great strength could not overcome a cruel disease. His resignation is the more poignant because it speaks all too clearly of his personal tragedy.

A great part of Mr. Dulles' power as an American statesman has come from his unflinching conviction of the probity of American purpose in the world. It is this quality which set him apart from the traditional image of the diplomat, and which sometimes caused him to be misunderstood, both at home and abroad. There were some things, in his view, that could not be subject to bargaining, and chief among these was moral principle. This position always won him respect, if not agreement. And when he returned from his last, courageous trip to Europe in December and went into the hospital, the prospect of his absence from the international scene filled our allies with dismay. Such is his eminence.

Few Secretaries of State have had such preparation for office. Mr. Dulles attended his first international conference at 19. Even before he joined the Cabinet in 1953, he was an important diplomatic figure. He had a hand in the United Nations Charter. He was the Republican adviser to three Democratic Secretaries of State. He drafted the peace treaty with Japan in 1951—one of his proudest achievements. From the time he took office in January 1953, he embarked on a series of journeys around the world, conducting negotiations with heads of governments in their own capitals. One day in Cairo, another in Saigon, another in Manila, another in Paris, he transformed his office into an instrument of dynamic leadership in international affairs. His presence was perhaps most felt when a turn in the cold war had caused discouragement or sapped initiative. Then, his brave dedication to freedom lifted spirits and sharpened determination. More than any other man, he is responsible for keeping the Communist empire in check.

For all his dedication, Mr. Dulles is a master of diplomacy, and his skill will be missed as much as his strength. Fortunately, his long and intimate relationship with President Eisenhower, and with the men in the State Department, assures us that his methods as well as his basic policies will continue to guide the conduct of our foreign affairs. And, of course, it is cheering to know that he will stay on as foreign policy consultant. In the coming negotiations with the Soviet Union, his advice will be invaluable.

President Eisenhower has led the Nation and the world in paying tribute to Mr. Dulles—his wisdom, his devotion, and his courage. He is, indeed, a great public figure, and nothing that has happened or will happen can alter his stature.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Apr. 16, 1959]

DULLES, THE DEFENDER

Americans of all shades of opinion will deeply regret the circumstances which have forced Secretary Dulles' resignation. Even those who have disagreed sharply with him on occasion will pay tribute to the devotion, energy, and intelligence with which he has served the Nation for 6 difficult years.

It must be gratifying to Mr. Dulles to note that both at home and abroad there is today wide appreciation of that service. At no point in the 6-year period could he have stepped down with more support for his basic position. This is not merely a new understanding and sympathy for the man; it is a renewed recognition that diplomatic defense of the free world must be resolute. Nikita Khrushchev's deliberate provoking of the Berlin crisis has again awakened millions in both hemispheres who had forgotten too much history.

It has not always been easy to grasp the Dulles day-to-day line. For a man trained as a lawyer in careful use of words the Secretary at times seemed strangely prone to create unnecessary difficulties with things he said. His handling of the Aswan Dam affair has been most widely criticized. And his Goa statement seemed remarkably insensitive to Indian feelings. But generally he has been widely acclaimed as a diplomatic technician. Most of the opposition to Mr. Dulles has arisen among those who felt his basic position vis-a-vis the Soviet was too rigid.

Discussions of foreign policy would get closer to realities if the words "appeasement" and "rigidity" were both eschewed. "Brinkmanship" also is open to misunderstanding. The diplomat taking a stiff bargaining position is not necessarily inflexible. Mr. Dulles showed he could "flex" on Quemoy. Also on free elections for German reunification. Our own chief objection has been that he seemed most of the time to be taking a defensive position, merely countering Soviet moves. But he had to work with allies, and concerting initiatives for an alliance is not easy.

The foreign policy of the United States is far bigger than any man. Much of what

Mr. Dulles has stood for was implicit in the "containment" course followed by Washington since 1947. The President's personal loyalty to Mr. Dulles may have obscured this fact. He will need to make plain now that whoever comes in as Secretary of State has his full confidence and is carrying on not a personal but an American policy.

The time may be ripe for some fresh and imaginative approaches in foreign policy. But it will be well for all to recognize that a basic and bipartisan continuity is essential. The essentials remain—to seek peace unremittingly; to maintain enough military power to deter aggression; to support by moral and economic means the ideals of freedom and justice everywhere.

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 16, 1959]

MR. DULLES AS SECRETARY

It is always sad when a valiant soldier must lay down his burden. The physical necessity for the resignation of John Foster Dulles as Secretary of State has been well understood, but the fact itself occasions a moment of extraordinary pathos. There were tears in President Eisenhower's eyes yesterday, and the sentiment undoubtedly was shared by many around the free world, not necessarily because they have agreed with Mr. Dulles, but because they have admired his courage and unswerving devotion to his principles.

Yet there must be great satisfaction to the outgoing Secretary that he leaves his office at a time when his reputation is at a pinnacle. The storms of previous years that blew around him have largely dissipated, and doubts and discord have been replaced with real affection—as much abroad as at home. No doubt much of this respect has been focused by Mr. Dulles' position on Berlin and the German problem. But much also has stemmed from recognition of his steadfast adherence to his convictions. Perhaps it took the Berlin crisis and Mr. Dulles' illness to demonstrate what a source of strength he has epitomized. He has been the towering figure, not merely in the Eisenhower Administration, but also in the Western Alliance.

It is unnecessary, in a current appraisal of Mr. Dulles' 6 years as Secretary of State, to gloss over the points of past criticism. Mr. Dulles himself would not appreciate that. Some of the disagreements loom small in restrospect. Others represent basic differences of approach. On many points his strategy has seemed better than his tactics.

There was, for example, the much-publicized philosophy of brinkmanship which Mr. Dulles himself must take responsibility for having advertised. Certainly it caused far more apprehension than public expression of the concept was worth, even as a tool for coping with the Kremlin's machinations. There was the doctrine of massive retaliation which, insofar as Mr. Dulles voiced it, has shown itself to be far from an adequate posture of defense. There was the flirtation with "liberation," a phony partisan slogan which disclosed a scarcely creditable side of Mr. Dulles.

There also were such excesses of speech as the Goa statement, Mr. Dulles' various pronouncements about neutralism and his occasionally effusive invocations of morality. There was the silly episode in which he refused to permit American reporters to go to Communist China. There were exercises in legalism and attempts to camouflage old policies with Madison Avenue veneer. There was the justified complaint that Mr. Dulles made too little use of staff and encouraged only negligible long-range planning.

But there also were moments of greatness, as when Mr. Dulles recommended the searingly difficult decision to oppose the British-French intervention at Suez. Having played a part in precipitating the crisis by the blunt manner of his withdrawal of help for the Aswan Dam, and having contributed to the estrangement of Britain and France, Mr. Dulles worked with enormous earnestness to heal the split and repair the damage. His course helped preserve the usefulness of the United Nations, and it may also have prevented world war.

After years of opposition to any acknowledgment of Communist China, last autumn Mr. Dulles did make a major change of policy by disavowing Chiang Kai-shek's ambitions on the mainland. The United States is not yet out of its dubious Quemoy involvement, but in the circumstances the Dulles stand seemed to deter Communist aggression. However unclear the purpose at the time, the American intervention in Lebanon brought a measure of stability in the Near East. Mr. Dulles also must receive applause for what in the net is a good record of economic responsibility in world affairs on the part of the Eisenhower administration.

Finally, of course, there is the issue of Germany. Mr. Dulles combined firmness on the military position with a willingness to discuss various possible approaches to larger agreement. In this he showed awareness of the importance of turning the onus on the Soviet Union. The recent squabbles among the Western Allies illustrate how much Mr. Dulles is missed.

At the same time it can fairly be said that there has been no marked advance in the Western position under Mr. Dulles' leadership. He has been an apostle, as it were, of containment. The various pacts he erected in Asia and the Middle East—pactomania, his policy was called—were aimed at preserving the status quo. There is wide agreement with his thesis that the Communists will make trouble wherever there is weakness, but he displayed little or no initiative to try to roll the Communists back or negotiate a stabilization.

In part Mr. Dulles' approach has appeared to derive from his conviction that because communism is evil the Communist society eventually will crack up. There is little disagreement that communism is evil, but there is little evidence, either, that the Soviet state is in fact cracking up. On the contrary, most of the evidence indicates that it poses an increasing challenge which is still too little appreciated in either economic or military terms.

There have been few settlements under Mr. Dulles, and in some places—notably in Indochina in 1954 and now in Iraq—the Western interest has been set back. Yet containment, or preservation of the status quo, is no mean achievement. Perhaps it is all that could have been achieved. Mr. Dulles' approach has been essentially conservative, but it is useless to argue whether more initiative would have produced happier results. No one can prove his course wrong.

Certainly the Secretary demonstrated the capacity to grow in his job. He fought many unsung battles within the administration, on nuclear tests and other issues, without a word of complaint when his hand was suddenly weakened. If he continued to keep policy too much to himself, to be too much the lawyer engaging in brilliant improvisation, he refined many of his techniques and learned to avoid many of his earlier errors.

He won strong supporters among both parties in Congress after his initial experience in making concessions to the Republican right-wing irreconcilables which he probably did not have to make. He seemed to enjoy his frequent meetings with the press and was more adept than any other Cabinet member at using the news conference as a forum. Although he occasionally sacrificed both issues and personalities, he did a great deal to advance the acceptance of internationalism as permanent American policy.

Mr. Dulles learned early that no effective Secretary of State can expect to be popular. He had a curious affinity on many fundamental points, although neither may like the comparison, with his predecessor, Dean Acheson. Above all, he made broad use of a first-rate mind. Whether or not one concurred with his decisions, it was a joy to witness the exercise of his wit and intellectual power.

It is far too close to Mr. Dulles' service to evaluate the significance of his contribution with any depth of perspective. It is clear, however, that his retirement after a diplomatic career that goes back intermittently 52 years to the Hague Peace Conference of 1907 leaves a vast hole that cannot readily be filled. As he marshals his strength for what everyone will hope can be continued service as an adviser, he can be sure that his conscientiousness, energy, and dedication have won him the profound gratitude of his countrymen.

[From U.S. News & World Report, Apr. 27, 1959]

THE MAN WHO HAS KEPT US OUT OF WAR

(By David Lawrence)

John Foster Dulles will be known in history as the man whose bravery kept his country out of war. For it takes no courage to appease, to retreat, to accept the promises of an unscrupulous enemy at a time when it is being urged that "concessions" and "compromises" are the way to avoid bloodshed.

It takes no courage to argue that, because the Communists are strong militarily and have already achieved a sort of "right of conquest" in Eastern Europe, we must therefore "accept the status quo."

It takes no courage to become so "flexible" as to desert moral principles in international life.

It takes no courage to yield to the temptations of domestic politics and to seek political advantage by claiming to be a crusader for "peace"—even if it's peace at any price.

But it does take courage to fight the insidious doctrines of those, inside and outside of our Congress and the parliaments of the West, who think that the easiest way to deal with your adversary is to appease him.

One reason why John Foster Dulles has been able to see through the deceptive tactics of the Communists is that he has had a long experience in diplomacy—covering perhaps the longest span of any living American.

The critics of the outgoing Secretary have been so preoccupied with one objective in the last 3 years—to force the resignation of Mr. Dulles—that they have discounted his consummate skill in dealing with the ever-changing wiles of the Communists.

Thus there has been no lack of conferences at high level with the Communists on almost every subject— from the question of suspending nuclear tests to the matter of "cultural" exchanges. Even the artificially stimulated campaign to secure the admission of American press correspondents to Red China resulted in Mr. Dulles making a concession only to find, as he had suspected, that the Communists were not sincere. For they immediately insisted on a diplomatic package involving, in effect, the right to send a host of espionage agents into the United States as the price of admitting American newsmen to the Chinese mainland.

The critics have made much of the "liberation" policy advocated by Secretary Dulles. He never implied that America would use force to liberate Eastern Europe, but his opponents mischievously distorted his words in trying to impute such a purpose to him. By upholding the cause of peaceful liberation as a goal, he has kept the fires of freedom burning in the hearts of the peoples of the captive states.

Among those who so often have assailed Mr. Dulles for the phrase "massive retaliation" are many of the unwitting appeasers. They shortsightedly took his words to be an empty threat. They shuddered at a policy of resoluteness. Yet this is the only way to warn a potential enemy not to miscalculate our strength or our purpose.

Today "massive retaliation" is the embodiment of the military power of the West, though there has lately been more frequent use of the phrase "deterrent power." Actually, peace rests today on the knowledge in Moscow that an atomic attack on any country now a member of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization will result in a massive blow from our bombers based both overseas and in this country.

To John Foster Dulles belongs the accolade for having effectively warned the men in the Kremlin of what America would do if they started any general attack. President Eisenhower deserves the greatest credit for his unswerving support of these policies.

The strength of our determination has been tested at Quemoy and in Lebanon and in Indochina and lately in the West Berlin crisis. At no time has there been any doubt that Mr. Dulles would recommend military action in our defense if he thought it necessary. He was chastised in the press for using the phrase "brink of war." This has often been sarcastically referred to as "brinkmanship." Yet it is this basic readiness to fight if necessary—to let your enemy know you are willing to risk war to avoid war—which is the essence of "brinkmanship."

It is to be regretted that in the 1930's we didn't let Hitler know that Britain and France and America would join in fighting him if he started a war. He was convinced that, with the Soviet Union as an ally on his eastern flank, he could quickly finish off the Western countries. It took a tremendous sacrifice of human beings to show the Nazis the error of their way. May no such demonstration of error ever be necessary again.

If a world war is averted in the next decade, it will be because in the United States, irrespective of whether a Republican or a Democratic administration is in power, the principles that have been applied by John Foster Dulles in shaping America's policies in world affairs have been faithfully followed by his successors.

[From Time magazine, Apr. 27, 1959]

JOHN FOSTER DULLES—"A RECORD CLEAR AND STRONG FOR ALL TO SEE"

Sharp at 9 a.m., January 22, 1953, John Foster Dulles showed up for work in his fifth-floor office at the State Department, a tall, austere-looking man, eyes wary, mouth turned down at the corners, shoulders hunched, necktie slightly off-center. He sat down behind a big desk across from a big grandfather clock, surveyed a couple of portraits that he had ordered hung—one of his sideburned grandfather John Watson Foster, U.S. Secretary of State 1892–93 (under President Benjamin Harrison), the other of his uncle Robert Lansing, U.S. Secretary of State 1915–20 (Woodrow Wilson). On a small table within reach of his swivel chair, he laid out three books that through decades of international law and diplomacy he had rarely been without. The books: Stalin's "Problems of Leninism," "The Federalist" papers, the "Bible."

"Soviet Communism," the new Secretary of State had written of Stalin's "Problems of Leninism," "starts with an atheistic, godless premise. Everything else flows from that premise. If there is no God, there is no moral or natural law. * * * Since there is no moral law, there is no such thing as abstract right or justice. Laws are the means, the decrees, by which the dictatorship of the proletariat enforces its will 'for suppressing the resistance of its class enemies.' * * * There is a duty to extend this system to all the world."

"Our founders," the new Secretary had said of the other two books, "represented many creeds, but most of them took a spiritual view of the nature of man. They believed that this Nation had a mission to help men everywhere to get the great opportunity to be and to do what God designed. * * * Freedom cannot be contained—it is all-prevailing. * * * It is the despots who should feel haunted. They, not we, should fear the future."

In the 6 years that followed, it was the contribution of John Foster Dulles to his countrymen and to freedom that he best defined and actively waged the cold war in those terms. "The arena is vast," he wrote in his book, "War or Peace." "It embraces the whole world, and all political, military, economic and spiritual forces within it." And as he handled the unending procession of Communist-made crises—Korea, Indo-China, Formosa Strait, Iran, Guatemala, Jordan, Lebanon, Quemoy, Berlin—he threw into the cold struggle all of freedom's political, military, economic, spiritual strength. Specifically, he:

Developed the NATO collective-defense system from a Europe-first position of strength into a world network of alliances, offered U.S. friends U.S. military and economic help against aggression and subversion if they wanted it, gave millions of freemen a new sureness, a new basis for hope;

Maneuvered U.S. land-sea-air power across thousands of miles, stopped the Communists at the pressure points, slowed down the rate of Communist military adventurers when he warned the Communists that the United States would not necessarily meet the enemy on the enemy's chosen battlefields, but would retaliate, instantly, by means and at places of our choosing;

Threw the whole weight and wealth of U.S. influence behind the big European surge toward private enterprise and middle-class prosperity that mocked the basic Communist doctrine of class struggle, worked continually to bring to Western Europe some form of political-economic unity;

Proclaimed a peaceful Western offensive in the doctrine of liberation—a doctrine, as he wrote in 1952, by which he did not envisage bloody uprisings but hoped to keep alive the nationalist hopes of captive peoples, to the point where the Russians would have to yield increasing amounts of independence to dampen restlessness (setbacks for the doctrine: The 1956 bloodletting in Hungary);

Attempted new approaches to the surging neutralist nations of Asia, Africa, Latin America, but failed—over the short run—to convince them that there could be no neutralism in a universal struggle, was less effective in handling crises in which communism was not directly involved, e.g., his blow-hot, blow-cold performance on U.S. help for Egypt's Aswan Dam.

As he followed his guidelines, Dulles was a superb tactician. Traveling an astonishing 559,988 miles in 6 years, he worked tirelessly to keep diverse peoples and leaders united in common purpose and also to educate himself; he negotiated skillfully at scores of world conferences. When he moved out ahead of public opinion, as he did in trying to push the European Defense Community and to save Quemoy and Matsu, he could yield with a lawyer's tactical skill, always returning to his theme when the times had caught up with him.

But above all, Dulles was the clear, stern conscience of freedom. Said Dulles: "Our Nation must stand as a solid rock in a storm-tossed world * * *. Rededication to the faith of our fathers is * * * what is needed to make apparent the futility of any world program based on the suppression of freedom."

BRINKS OF WAR

From this sure base Dulles faced up to his times with an unusual diplomatic consistency. His first battleground: the Far East. His first decision: the scores of struggles underway along Red China's borders and from Korea to Malaya should be rated and met as one. His first move: the United States ordered the Seventh Fleet, then under orders by President Truman to neutralize the Formosa Strait, to desist from protecting Red China against any Nationalist China attack. At once his critics derided President Eisenhower for unleashing Chiang, but Dulles had the argument of later events on his side. Red China shifted thousands of troops from the North China-Korea theater to the newly threatened coast.

Dulles moved on from there to settle the intolerable situation in Korea, in which the Kaesong-Panmunjom truce talks had dragged on for 18 months while U.S. and U.N. forces suffered thousands of casualties a week. He informed Red China, through India's neutralist Prime Minister Nehru, that it would have to conclude the Panmunjom talks or risk an all-out U.S. drive to win the war. Red China signed. Dulles was improvising, experimenting, learning as he went along. His next move: Indochina. First, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff Admiral Radford recommended U.S. naval airstrikes to help the beleaguered French, but Dulles was against it, and the President vetoed this plan; subsequently, the French handed over North Vietnam (population: 14 million) to communism. But after that, the United States haltingly, then decisively, threw U.S. support to a shaky new Nationalist government in South Vietnam, helped negotiate and set up a brand new Southeast Asia Treaty Organization ("Pactomania," said the critics) that has faced up to communism in Southeast Asia ever since.

When, in early 1955, the Communists launched concerted attacks against Chinese Nationalist positions up and down the Formosa Strait, Dulles took it as a crucial probe of U.S. intentions. His response was immediate and unmistakable. The President sought and got a congressional resolution of support for U.S. defense of Formosa and the Pescadores; the President followed that up with a personal letter to Nationalist China's Chiang promising support at islands Quemoy and Matsu. Result: the Communists backed off, and the whole Red China offensive, rolling ever since Mao Tse-tung came out of the Yenan caves, was bogged down.

SHOWDOWN 1956

In central Europe the cold war entered another phase. On communism's side of the Iron Curtain Stalin had died, plunging the Kremlin into years of medieval intrigue while Nikita Khrushchev emerged as new dictator. On the Allies' side, the phenomenon was the emergence of Western Europe, through the Marshall plan recovery and its own industry, as a hopeful, prospering showcase of what freemen could do. At Budapest, in October and November 1956, Hungarian freedom fighters, workers, students, soldiers proved the Communist puppet government to be a hollow sham, reveled in 5 days of freedom, looked to the United States and the U.N. for help. The United States had no plan of action, and the revolt was smashed, but with it were smashed Communist pretensions of benevolent big brotherhood and Moscow's hopes for reliance on satellite armies.

One complicating factor in Hungary—which doubtless made Moscow bold—was that simultaneously the West was involved in the tragic affair at Suez. The buildup to Suez: (1) Dulles angered Egypt's Dictator Nasser when he pulled back U.S. aid from the Aswan Dam in retaliation for Nasser's acceptance of Red arms; (2) Nasser seized the Suez Canal; (3) Dulles tried with U.S. allies, with the U.N., to work out a solution and

failed. But when Britain, France, and Israel launched a sudden attack against Egypt without notice to the United States, Dulles took the toughest stand for principle of his career. Said he, extemporaneously, in one of his finest speeches at the U.N.:

"If we were to agree that the existence of injustice in the world * * * means that the principle of renunciation of force is no longer respected, then we would have, I fear, torn the [U.N.] Charter into shreds, and the world would again be a world of anarchy. It is still possible for the united will of this organization * * * perhaps to make it apparent to the world * * * that there is here the beginning of a world of order."

Through 1957, while the United States was in an economic recession, while the U.S.S.R. fired the first ICBM and put up the first space satellite, Dulles was the free world's "unpopular man." "Damned Dulles," swore an Indian lawyer. "He is responsible for the tensions of the world. He is not allowing the Americans to come to terms with the Russians." "Theologian" cried a French Cabinet Minister. "Eisenhower is the mystic. Dulles is the theologian." His critics increasingly rallied behind a "new approach" to world communism based upon (1) recognition of Red China, and (2) disengagement in Germany to make what they called "a thaw in the cold war." Critics' choice: a "parley at the summit," presumably similar to the one in which the Russians had promised to work toward reunification of Germany by "free elections" back in July 1955.

But through 1958, as is history, the tough old Secretary, who in 1956 suffered his first bout with cancer, fought up from his low point, won a limited deterrent victory in Lebanon (Eisenhower doctrine), a strong deterrent victory at Quemoy. Even as Quemoy was being fought out, the Communists opened up a propaganda offensive in Berlin. Dulles' response: (1) The United States would stand fast in the city; (2) the United States would, because some of its allies wanted to, be willing to negotiate on an all-German settlement but would yield on no basic points; and (3) any agreement with the Communists must be self-enforcing.

"There is a lesson," said he. "We have an armistice agreement with the Communists in Korea. But * * * the Communist side violates every provision of that agreement except the one provision that we enforce; namely, that they shall not advance militarily." A thaw in the cold war? Said Foster Dulles, and Tibet and Iraq were proving him a sure prophet as usual: "Well, Mr. Khrushchev is in a much better position to judge than I am. He lives in the north country where the icy blasts come from."

ZEST FOR PEACE

When he stepped down last week, Secretary Dulles knew that his success, for all his efforts, had been limited. The limits: (1) The cold war's boundaries in 1959 were much as they had been in 1953—the rollback had been in men's minds, not real estate; (2) the Communists were still driving hard in the Middle East, threatened to make Iraq their first potential conquest since North Vietnam; (3) the Communists were showing by their scientific achievements that there were many more fronts to the cold war; (4) the West's resolution, amid all the talk about flexibility, disengagement, showed some signs of tiring. But these limits of success as Dulles saw them were only more arguments for more sacrifice, for more devotion to duty to meet a challenge that was sustained.

And as he thus imprinted his wisdom, determination, shrewdness, and dedication on freedom's cause, the Secretary left behind him his last word that successors would walk away from at their—and freedom's peril:

"To deny external successes to international communism is not merely a negative, defensive policy. It accelerates the evolution within the Sino-Soviet bloc of governmental policies which will increasingly seek the welfare of their own peoples rather than exploit these peoples in the interest of world conquest. Freedom must be a positive force that will penetrate. * * * Freedom is still a magnet that atracts. If the non-Communist nations hold fast * * * above all, if they demonstrate the good fruits of freedom, then we can know that freedom will prevail.

John Foster Dulles, great Secretary of State, once added a personal postscript: "This quest for peace can be an enthralling adventure. Everyone has a part to play. We have the opportunity to prevent the suicide of humanity."

It is my prayer and hope, as it is, I am sure, the prayer and hope of every thinking American that somehow this man's life may be spared so that his great talents and influence may continue to be useful to America and to the world.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I count it as one of the greater privileges of my service here in the Congress of the United States to have known John Foster Dulles as a friend.

I will say flatly that in my considered opinion, he has earned a place in the history books as one of America's truly outstanding Secretaries of State.

Few men have served in this capacity during more trying circumstances; none has met his responsibilities with more courage, more wisdom, more patience, or with greater dedication to the interests of our people.

Much has been said and written of his marathon travels in pursuit of understanding among the nations of the world.

It is probably safe to say that at this moment there is no man alive who has a wider personal acquaintance with the leaders of the nations of this earth than Foster Dulles.

He has been willing to go anywhere, and at anytime, to help bring closer to realization that which all men of good will seek—a just and honorable peace.

Of Foster Dulles it may also be justly said that he has given a last full measure of his energies to the cause he has served with such distinction through the years.

I am sure I voice the sentiments of a grateful nation when I say the loss of his experience and great capacities, through physical disability, is a tragic blow to the free world in these critical times.

And I am certain I speak for all of his fellow citizens when I say that we admire the monumental fortitude Foster Dulles is showing in his battle against a cruel illness.

He has set a memorable example of devotion to duty for those of us who must carry on, and we are all richer for the contributions he has made to mankind.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, I am grateful that our colleague from Iowa has taken this time to pay high tribute to one of the noblest men, one of the finest public servants and certainly one of the greatest civilian heroes our country or any country has ever had.

John Foster Dulles was brought up as the son of a Christian minister. As a boy he must have read that wistful story in the ancient Scriptures about one of the greatest leaders of all time who after bringing his people through unbelievable privations, difficulties, external enemies and internal storms, was not himself permitted to enter the Promised Land.

It must have been heartbreaking frustration for Moses to lead his people through years of trials and tribulations and not be able to go on with them to the final victory. But there is no record of sadness or resentment on his part. He knew he had made the final victory possible.

There is a similar element of pathos in the story of Mr. Dulles. And I know there is sadness and regret in the hearts of millions of Americans that he is being denied the opportunity to play through to final triumph the world drama in which he has been the single most prominent actor for more than 6 years.

Yet no one can ever feel sorry for John Foster Dulles when one considers the total contribution this man has made to history. What a record of achievement.

I have had the privilege of working rather closely with John Foster Dulles since September 1944. He had one of the finest intellects that I have ever known. He had an extraordinary capacity to grasp total situations and to present the issues involved lucidly, concisely, persuasively. Some people said his was a cold intellect. Yet, I have never heard more moving statements of the reasons why the United States had to stand for certain fundamental principles that were the very foundation stones of its greatness than I have heard from the lips of John Foster Dulles.

He had superb skill in dealing with people, both friends and adversaries. He was trained as an international lawyer and it was his business to prevail for the cause he represented. Some people called his ability to keep his own counsel on occasion, or to shift tactics, deviousness. Well, no quarterback is of much value to his team unless his approach to the opposing quarterback is devious. Mr. Dulles was a chess player; he was champion chess player when a student at Princeton. And, he was dealing with Russian leaders, notoriously champion chess players. No chess player ever explains all his moves to his opponent or to the kibitzers watching over his shoulder if he wants to win the game. He can be a successful quarterback or chess player only if he is devious in his plays. That is why the Communists sought so tirelessly to discredit him. He was as skillfull in working for freedom and justice as they are for the subversion of freedom.

He had indefatigable physical energy and endurance. I have never seen his

equal. He would get in at 10 o'clock in the morning from trips all over the world and be testifying before our committee at 2 o'clock in the afternoon, reporting and interpreting to us in his clear, comprehensive way the key experiences of the trip and the lessons to be learned from them. As the gentleman from Iowa has said, certainly the expenditure without stint of his own vital life force must have contributed to the speed with which his terrible affliction finally broke through his defenses after being apparently dormant for 3 years.

Perhaps the finest and most important quality of John Foster Dulles is his high sense of duty, his dedication to eternal moral values. Some have said that his policy as Secretary of State was rigid and sterile—I suppose because he was not always pursuing the Communists, trying to surrender to them, so to speak. But his policy was not sterile; on the contrary it has been extraordinarily productive. As a result of his steadfastness, it has been the Communists who have been pursuing him, to get us to go to the summit, trying to get us to yield here or there, especially wherever we are strongest. Steadfast adherence to the truth and to human freedom is not a weak reed to lean upon in any human relationship. Mr. Dulles, as much as anybody I have known, has demonstrated a steady, unwavering faith that if you do what is right, the universe is so constituted that the forces in it will be working on your side. You can deny that wood has a grain and you can plane against the grain, if you wish; but John Foster Dulles was certain that there is a grain and our job is to find out how that grain runs, what is the right thing to do, and then patiently and persistently and untiringly go that way.

Mr. Speaker, it is a good thing for us to pause today, not only to pay deserved tribute to Mr. Dulles, but to learn for ourselves some of the secrets of his strength and the reasons for the successes achieved.

Mr. Dulles, along with his faith, or as a result of it, had an unwavering will. Oftentimes people talk about our great power as a Nation; but actually there is no such thing as power without the will to use it, when necessary. Mr. Dulles had such a will, our enemies recognized it, and backed off from the dire things they threatened. His firmness brought his country peace.

Naturally the Communists tried by every means to get rid of him. It always amazed and disturbed me how some Americans took up for a time the Communist chant, "Mr. Dulles must go." When asked for their reason, it generally boiled down to a feeling that we must get as Secretary of State some one whom the Communists liked better—as if their choice would be based on what is good for the United States.

Mr. Dulles took plenty of criticism, even abuse; I am glad that he has lived long enough to know the great gratitude and appreciation that exist today in the hearts of all his countrymen. He has pointed the way which, if we continue in it, I am perfectly confident will lead to an end of this awful nightmare which we are enduring.

Mr. Speaker, I join in hoping that, even though we know it is a malignant disease with which he is afflicted, somehow or other a miracle may still take place and he be spared for his family and his country. Our hearts go out to this dear friend and devoted public servant.

I thank the gentleman from Iowa for yielding to me.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, on a number of occasions I have expressed the deep respect and the strong admiration that I have for John Foster Dulles. I have admired him for his fine moral outlook on life; his refreshing idealism as well as his grim determination and his courage. I think the finest compliment anyone could pay him was paid him by the leaders in the Kremlin in their various attacks upon him throughout the years, because the fact is that they feared him, because of his grimness and his determination, his courage and his great capacity.

One could talk for a long while about John Foster Dulles and on occasions in the past I have expressed myself more fully than I shall today. But I should like to add my voice to those of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SCHWENGEL] and the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD], and the minority leader, and to concur in what these gentlemen have said about this great American. In my opinion, as time passes and the historians of tomorrow evaluate and write the history of today outside of the influence of emotionalism, they will record John Foster Dulles as being one of the greatest Secretaries of State of our country.

I hope the present Secretary of State whom I know personally has carried with him to Geneva some of the determination and the grimness of John Foster Dulles. I hope that he knows the Communist mind as John Foster Dulles knew it. Unless one understands that the origin of the Communist mind is hate, he will misinterpret what they say and what they do.

John Foster Dulles knew the mind of the Communist, his origin and his thinking, and from the angle of our country he interpreted the meaning of the expressions of the Communist leaders as well as their actions. He knew that weakness was accepted by them as something to be exploited in their favor. He knew that one could negotiate, but had to negotiate from a position of firmness and not to retreat. John Foster Dulles knew the Communist mind. He knew that any uncertainty of leadership, any uncertainty of policy, was exploited by them. While he negotiated from time to time, he always did so from a position of firmness and he never retreated.

I hope that our representatives at Geneva now will keep that in mind. It is all right to negotiate, but be firm and never retreat; because I consider the meeting going on at Geneva now to be the most important one in this long period of the so-called cold war, and that out of it will come either strength for the free world or weakness for the free world. And weakness on the part of the free world would mean the road to appeasement.

John Foster Dulles knew the dangers of the road to appeasement. We miss him very much at this time. We wish him well, as my friend from Iowa has so beautifully said in his remarks. We sincerely hope that God will shower an abundance of His blessings upon him through the improvement of his health, and that he will be able to give to our country and to mankind the benefit of his genius through advice. His advice is still sorely needed. But more than that, what we need is the spirit of John Foster Dulles, not only in the minds of the officials of our country in the executive and in the legislative branches of the Government, but among our people, because the spirit of John Foster Dulles is nothing but the spirit of the crusaders of old.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts, the majority leader. I thank the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD], whom I consider to be one of the ablest men and one of the best authorities on foreign policy and especially as it relates to the Far East. I also thank the distinguished minority leader.

As these gentlemen were talking, I could not help recalling those lines in that great poem about Abraham Lincoln by Edwin Markham, where he said:

Here is a man to hold against the world,
A man to match the mountains and the sea.

I could not help thinking how well those words and those lines applied to this great American.

Mr. Speaker, there have been hundreds of editorials written about John Foster Dulles. I have taken the liberty to sort out some of them. I have seven editorials here that I think are typical and I should like to ask unanimous consent that they be placed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

THE POLES AT MONTE CASSINO

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BOLLING). Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. PHILBIN] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, on the 15th anniversary of the victorious battle at Monte Cassino which was waged by the 2nd Polish Corps then fighting in Italy with the British Eighth Army, it is most appropriate that we should pause to recognize and commemorate this great victory for liberty, since it contributed materially to the winning of one of our great World War II campaigns.

My distinguished friend, Monsignor Andrew Lekarczyk, Chairman of Our Lady of Czestochowa Foundation of Webster, Mass., has forwarded me an eloquent tract commemorating that notable battle. His remarks are so forceful, well documented and impressive that I proudly make them part of my commemorative speech.

The American people and the allies were deeply touched and very grateful at the time to the gallant Polish boys who fought so courageously and bravely without a thought of themselves in this historic campaign. Their brilliant, heroic performance in this battle has become the living symbol of the bold struggle for freedom waged by the Polish nation, and, particularly in these days, its resistance to Soviet brutality and tyranny.

It is pathetic, however, that the gratitude and admiration felt for our noble Polish wartime Allies should have been followed so soon by ill-fated, diplomatic concessions which turned over the God-fearing, freedom-loving Polish people to the heartless brainwashing and calloused subjugation of Soviet masters.

Time and time again I have protested against the unspeakably shortsighted, ill-timed and ill-advised policy which unceremoniously swept aside the historic guarantees of Polish freedom and self-determination, carved up the historic boundaries of that stricken nation and allowed the Soviet horde to establish a puppet regime ruthlessly suppressing cherished rights of free religion, free conscience, free speech and free press and every other treasured right of free men and women.

How can lasting peace in that country, or any other country, rest upon stark, ruthless oppression and tyranny?

How can the democratic nations professing their love for free institutions expect any self-respecting, liberty-loving nation like Poland ever to buckle under the mailed fist of merciless Red communism?

How can a great people like ourselves, and the other great free peoples associated with us, ever be resigned to the plight of our great comrades in arms suffering under the lash of Soviet ruthlessness and inhumanities to man?

How can we, as the leaders of the free world, remain unmoved and unconcerned about the shackles of slavery that cruelly bind so many noble souls, consigned in so many instances, to living conditions stripping them of every vestige of self-respect, honor, decency and liberty?

How can we, as a free nation, remain untouched by the pleas of these people for liberation from tyranny? The heart of America beats for freedom and I am convinced that it will never cease to beat for those who have been enslaved and enchained.

We must resolve again and again to help these great people, so valiantly struggling for freedom, to find the way to liberation, freedom and democracy and to the reestablishment under God and under principles of justice and right of their time-honored, democratic government for which so many of their noble people have given their lives to preserve.

Let all Americans and lovers of freedom be pledged again to the cause of Poland and other Communist enslaved satellites who are living in terror, dread, and slavery. Let us move to encourage, hearten and assist them in every way we can to regain their rights as free men and women and to ordain once again free governments of their choice.

Monsignor Lekarczyk's brilliant and admirable remarks have very deeply moved me because I know of my own personal knowledge his great, unselfish love for his native land and his adopted land, the depth of his sorrow for Poland's present plight and the strength of his prayerful resolution to continue to strive for her liberation. I am honored and proud to quote in full the stirring words of a great American.

I read as follows:

THE 15TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE BATTLE OF MONTE CASSINO, MAY 18, 1959

This date commemorates the 15th anniversary of the victorious battle at Monte Cassino. That battle was waged by the Second Polish Corps, an integral part of the British 8th Army, then fighting in Italy. The Allied armies' offensive, whose objective was the conquest of Rome, broke down at the Apennines peninsula's narrowest point, from Ortona to Minturna. The German resistance stronghold was situated at the summit of Monte Cassino. For nearly half a year, the combined strength of the Allied armies attempted to conquer the summit, the possession of which would open the road from southern Italy to Rome. The first blows in the Aurunci Mountain areas, as well as at Monte Cassino, were struck by the American Tenth and Second Corps from January 20 to 22, 1944. Despite heavy losses, the attack achieved no positive results. Suffice it to recall that the 36th U.S. Division suffered 1,002 dead and wounded during the assault on the Rapido River. On January 25 the Second U.S. Corps, supported by the French Corps, went into action. In order to soften up the fanatic German resistance, American forces landed simultaneously at Anzio, where they held out in unusually bloody fighting until help arrived in May, after the conquest of Monte Cassino. The Second U.S. Corps' offensive was as unsuccessful as were the subsequent third and fourth blows struck by the New Zealand Corps. After the repulse of these four attacks, the German radio informed the world that Monte Cassino was indomitable. Only at the fifth blow from the Allied forces, carried out by the Polish 2d Corps, was success attained. In this uniquely bloody battle, lasting from May 11 to 18, Poles, under the command of General Anders, broke through the Gustave line and raised the red and white flag over the ruins of the monastery. After the shattering of the Hitler line from the 18th to the 25th of May and the conquest of the fortress of Piedimonte, Road No. 6 leading to Rome was open. The Sixth U.S. Corps, harassed by the Fourth Germany Army near Anzio received its anxiously awaited help. How many American mothers owe thanks to the Second Polish Corps for the lives of their sons. During this heroic fighting, the Second Polish Corps gave the lie to Soviet propaganda which blackened the Poles, saying that they did not want to fight the Germans.

To bring this victory and the Poles' splendid bearing into full prominence, it should be remembered that most of the soldiers of the Second Corps had been confined in Soviet prisons or forced labor camps, or at best deported to Russia, from whence they emerged ill, ravaged by hunger, typhus, and vermin, and that 80 percent of these soldiers were from the Polish eastern territories which in accordance with the Teheran Agreement, were handed over into Soviet bondage. With bitter grief and pain over the treachery he had suffered at the hands of his allies, the Polish soldier went into battle with nazism in order to fight for the dignity of man and the honor of Poland. How justly he did so, was referred to by the commander of the Fifth U.S. Army, General Truscott, who wrote: "Through their love of freedom, Polish soldiers died for man's liberty," and "Monte Cassino has become a symbol to free people." How sad, and how eloquent is the fact, that a decided majority of these soldiers from the Second Corps and the Polish armed forces did not return to Poland as a sign of their protest at the abandonment of their homeland into Soviet slavery. Many of them are now in the United States. We salute these heroes of Monte Cassino.

PANAMA INVASION SIGNIFICANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, the recent invasion of Panama by some 89 Cuban mercenaries has caused many to ponder that sensationally reported incident of the Caribbean. The questions most frequently asked are: What was its significance and what did we learn?

Complete answers to these queries would be too complicated and voluminous to attempt in a brief statement. But underlying them was, and still is, the ultimate objective of driving the United States from its control of the Canal Zone and Panama Canal. In fact, one part of the plan apparently was to make a token occupation of the Canal Zone.

That the Panama crisis is not over is shown by mountain guerrilla operations since April in the northern part of the Republic, following the pattern of Fidel Castro in Orient Province of Cuba. Were a regime similar to the new Cuban Government set up in Panama, the United States, in view of the abrogation of its guaranty of Panamanian independence and certain other 1903 treaty powers and responsibilities would face a serious situation.

Not for an instant would I wish to criticize Panama or its people, many of whom I treasure as personal friends. But it would be less than candid not to stress that the extreme attitudes and exorbitant demands on the part of its radical leaders as regards the jurisdiction and management of the Panama Canal enterprise and the attempted extension of its maritime waters to surround the Canal Zone, transcend the realisms involved.

It is pertinent to emphasize again that the Republic of Panama grew out of the Panama Canal undertaking, that its independence until 1939 was guaranteed by the United States, and that the isthmus has long been a land of inherent political instability often subjected to the tragedies of revolution. Current press reports would indicate that, despite the efforts of its more thoughtful leaders, this instability still prevails.

Perhaps the most startling revelation of the recent invasion was the failure of Panama, which possesses a National Guard of some 3,000 men, to repel some 89 invaders. Instead, it appealed to the Organization of the American States and the United States to prevent the attempted overthrow of its constitutionally elected government.

One may well ask, if Panama was unable to meet a minor maritime inva-

sion from Cuba how could it repulse an organized attack from adjacent countries? The answer is obvious and emphasizes again the realistic considerations in the Panama situation, if our vital interests are to be adequately safeguarded and the necessity for reassertion of our historic isthmian policy as set forth in House Concurrent Resolution 33, 86th Congress. Our Government will be grossly derelict if it fails to serve notice on all concerned that it will deal summarily with any attempt by revolutionary forces or methods to invade the Canal Zone or any land or water area vital to the operation and protection of the canal.

Touching all these matters it must be borne in mind that there runs through them the distinct and ominous patterns of Communist policy and endeavor.

Fortunately, two U.S. foreign correspondents whose views are buttressed with vast knowledge, Ralph K. Skinner and Edward Tomlinson, have recently written in revealing manner some of the current aspects of the situation which, under leave to extend, I quote as part of these remarks:

[From the Christian Science Monitor, May 8, 1959]

OPPOSITION BUFFETS PANAMA'S REGIME

(By Ralph K. Skinner)

PANAMA CITY.—The thwarted invasion of this Nation by Cuban mercenaries directed by disloyal Panamanians is seen as another phase—but not the finale—of a crescendo of political opposition here to the incumbent government.

The opposition is of two kinds:

1. Personal antagonism to President de la Guardia himself by political leaders of various groups; and

2. Opposition toward the rule of a family oligarchy system from the middle and lower classes who seek political, social, and economic opportunities denied them by the "super" class ruling Panama.

With the national guard firmly backing President de la Guardia, any revolt would necessarily involve armed strife, but it is undeniable that there is a definite movement here to unseat the chief executive.

CHARGES HURLED

The administration recognizes this and has accused the opposition of using treachery, treason, and foreign mercenaries to accomplish selfish personal ambitions with a complete disregard for the good of the nation.

For their part, opposition groups indict the administration with charges of ineptitude, failure to comply with campaign promises, and failure to provide jobs for the people of Panama. It is claimed that the administration has maintained (sometimes with force) the privileged status of the oligarchy which has ruled Panama for 55 years and stifled the social and economic aspirations of the middle and lower classes. Election frauds, misuse of funds, and political manipulation are charged also.

Some opposition leaders may be mollified by legislation just pushed through the national assembly permitting the registration of political parties other than the two which have held a monopoly.

People here generally believe that the change in registration laws was the result of pressure of mountain rebel forces, invasion threats, bombings, and other disturbances. This sets the precedent for similar civic disturbances to achieve other objectives which the administration has refused.

The invasion placed Panama in a ludicrous position before the world. Panama has been calling on the United States and others to recognize its maturity, to give it increased stature among nations.

RUMORS CIRCULATED

The inability of the Republic of Panama to defend itself became apparent when 85 to 89 invaders without communications, transportation, or reinforcements gave the appearance of stymying the 3,000-man national guard force.

Landing of the invaders at a seashore hamlet caused such hysteria among the political leaders and upper class of Panama that the wildest of rumors were circulated. The ruling class saw themselves threatened with destruction.

The man in the street was excited and disturbed by the obvious anxiety and confusion of Government leaders. The people would have been more apprehensive had they known that some of the very top Government officials moved their wives and children into the Canal Zone for refuge.

Local observers have been aware of the weakness of the national guard as a military unit. Originally a police force of national scope, it was elevated to national guard status by ex-President Remon. As a military unit, it is considered a house of cards.

As an instrument of internal control, it has been effective because (1) the people have been cowed by it traditionally, and (2) the people have no arms with which to oppose it. The national guard is the only armed force in the country.

WEAKNESS EXPOSED

The invasion crisis exposed its weakness to other nations because of the spotlight of publicity on the Cuban invaders who never were challenged in open combat by the national guard.

Even before the Cuban invaders had landed, urgent pleas for assistance had been sent to the Organization of American States.

This organization called on the United States to furnish arms, ammunition, supplies, and the services of airplanes and naval craft. This was done. Some few other OAS nations furnished token aid.

Panama made no pretense of facing the invaders alone. It implored the OAS for aid immediately. Demands for U.S. military assistance in furnishing arms and equipment were urgent.

This is in contrast with Panama's usual fiery nationalism and demand that no other country "interfere" with its activities.

Nationalism in Panama should not be mistaken for patriotism. Patriotism appears lacking in the political turmoil here, which has been reduced to two simple equations; a battle between the "ins" and "outs," and another between the "haves" and "have nots."

The few citizens here who have been able to preserve an objective viewpoint are of the opinion that the "super" class, the ruling oligarchy, will be forced to surrender soon some its special privileges and rights and its immunity from normal treatment, or else be driven out.

MILITIA CALL STUDIED

Panama's working people and aspiring middle class will not tolerate longer a system which withholds any hope of economic or social advancement for them, observers opine. They have been educated beyond the stage of being slaves or servants for the so-called superclass. Observers here do not believe these people presently are competent of self-government but they certainly aspire for it.

The call to citizens to form a sort of unarmed militia here to supplement the national guard is seen as a device to distract public attention and occupy the attention of several thousand men who otherwise might be idle.

The most significant accomplishment of the invasion attempt here is the prompt action of the Organization of American States, almost without aid from the Panama Government. Taking decisive action, it served notice to Caribbean revolutionaries what might be expected in the nature of OAS opposition if they attempt an invasion of Haiti or the Dominican Republic. The cohesiveness of the OAS was demonstrated against what could have becomes a "dry run" of a bigger invasion elsewhere.

CASTRO NAME HEARD

Premier Fidel Castro's name was everywhere in mention of the invasion. The invaders included onetime members of his revolutionary forces; he sent army officers to intercede with the invaders; the invaders said they surrendered because of the request of Dr. Castro. Indeed, the invaders suggested that they would not have surrendered without the intervention of Premier Castro.

[From the Washington Daily News, May 11, 1959]

NEW PERILS BECKON OAS

(By Edward Tomlinson)

The Organization of American States, the peacekeeping body of the 21 American republics, once again has shown that it can be a potent force against political troublemakers in this hemisphere when it asserts its leadership.

Many of its friends felt it had been keeping its head in the sand for the past 6 months while professional revolutionaries in several Caribbean capitals, particularly Havana, threatened.

But it succeeded in acting just in time to prevent a bloody civil war in Panama, and it probably saved the Panama Canal from becoming the center of a nasty international incident.

Unfortunately, hostile forces from Cuba had already landed on the isthmus before the OAS representatives arrived on the scene to investigate. Thanks to quick action on the part of the chairman of the group, Dr. Fernando Lobo, ambassador representative of Brazil, shooting was postponed until the peace emissaries could talk to leaders on both sides.

Meantime, the Panamanian Government had been able to circumvent the movements of Senor Robert Arias, alleged ringleader of the entire movement and lately Panamanian Ambassador to London. Senor Arias may not have been alone in the plot to overthrow the regime of President Ernesto de la Guardia. But ever since the Suez incident he has been demanding the ousting of the United States from the Canal Zone and the internationalization, or nationalization by his country, of the vital waterway.

Some of the members of the ill-fated expedition from Cuba not only have said he masterminded the movement against the Panamanian Government but that it had been a part of the plan to make a token occupation of the Canal Zone.

The initiative and effectiveness of OAS actions, as demonstrated in the Panamanian incident, has had nationwide coverage, but this is not a time for them to rest on their laurels after their accomplishments in Panama. There are several other plots in the making, some of them in Havana, too. There have been open threats to overthrow President Francois Douvalier of Haiti, President Ramon Villeda Morales of Honduras, President Miguel Ydigoras Fuentes of Guatemala, and other duly elected heads of state, as well as the Trujillo regime in the Dominican Republic and the government of President Luis Somoza in Nicaragua.

All these plots are potentially dangerous to the peace of the Caribbean because thousands of revolutionary adventurers and soldiers of fortune in Cuba are now out of jobs

since the triumph of the Castro revolution in that country, and they are ready and anxious to join up with any individual or group if somebody promises to feed and pay them.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, May 14, 1959]

UNITED STATES-PANAMA LINKS FIRM

(By Ralph K. Skinner)

BALBOA HEIGHTS, C.Z.—The invasion of Panama by a small group of Cuban and other Caribbean mercenaries did little to affect Panama-United States relations so far as the Panama Canal or the Canal Zone was concerned.

The United States promptly delivered arms, ammunition, and supplies to Panama's National Guard and furnished aircraft and naval craft to patrol Panama's water approaches. These items added to the U.S. assistance which Panama has accepted as a matter of course during the past 55 years.

Furnishing the arms may have exposed the United States to future trouble. Panama students and opposition groups have accused the United States of furnishing arms and ammunition to help Panama's National Guard maintain an alleged dictatorship or police state in their country.

Within the past year there have been fatalities in clashes between armed national guardsmen and students and reported rebels. Opponents of the administration bitterly resent the supplying of arms and ammunition by the United States to the only armed force in Panama. They hint at a similarity between this and the furnishing of U.S. arms to Batista in Cuba for use against Fidel Castro's rebels.

EQUAL SHARE DEMANDED

The invasion turmoil halted momentarily, but is expected to have no long-term effect on, demands of Panamanian politicians for a 50–50 participation in the gross receipts of the Panama Canal enterprise. This is based on their unilateral assertion that Panama is an equal partner in the U.S.-owned, U.S.-built, and U.S.-operated waterway.

Similarly, the invasion and the various revolutionary outbreaks in Panama preceding it did not have any long-term effect on Panama's claim of territorial jurisdiction for a distance of 12 miles seaward from its shores. This claim has been rejected by the United States because it cuts off the approaches from both oceans to the Panama Canal. In effect, it would force ships transiting the maritime shortcut to pass through Panamanian jurisdiction with possible inspection, delays, and charging of fees for such passage.

OFFICIALS' ACTS WEIGHED

No exercise of rights in the area between 3 and 12 miles offshore has been attempted yet by Panama. Local observers expect that an incident may occur to furnish propaganda for Panama to bring the matter before some international court. An opportunity is eagerly sought by some Panamanian leaders to bring the whole question of Panamanian sovereignty over the Canal Zone and participation in Panama Canal revenues before some international tribunal. Thus far, there has been no success.

During the political upset here, attention was focused on the acts of some top officials of the Panama Government.

Newspapers reported that former Foreign Minister Aquilino Boyd, presidential aspirant and now a deputy to the national assembly, used his immunity as a deputy to outwit the national guard. He is said to have brought two leaders of an armed rebel group to the capital city through reinforced police lines. The fugitives were delivered to political asylum in the Chilean Embassy.

For months, Senor Boyd was the official mouthpiece of the Panama Government. As Foreign Minister he formulated national policy toward the United States. In 1957 he formally opened the Panama University roundtable conference which failed in its attempt to enlist representatives of foreign nations into declaring the United Staes unfair to Panama.

In the United States, the former Foreign Minister is best known as the instigator of the proposal, termed unrealistic by Panama's President de la Guardia, that Panama should receive a 50–50 share of the gross receipts of the Panama Canal enterprise.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. BURNS of Hawaii (at the request of Mr. MCCORMACK) for Wednesday, Thursday, and Friday, May 20, 21, and 22, on account of official business in Hawaii.

Mr. ROBERTS (at the request of Mr. ELLIOTT), on account of death in family.

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. SCHWENGEL, for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. FLOOD (at the request of Mr. KASTENMEIER), for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. PORTER (at the request of Mr. KASTENMEIER), for 30 minutes, on Thursday next.

Mr. PHILBIN, for 20 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. PELLY and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. FEIGHAN and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. SISK, his remarks in Committee of the Whole and to include a list organizations.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan, his remarks today and to include a letter, a release, and a newspaper article.

At the request of Mr. MICHEL:

Mr. REECE of Tennessee and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. KNOX and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. KEARNS.

Mr. DINGELL and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BECKER.

At the request of Mr. KASTENMEIER:

Mr. PORTER to include extraneous matter in his special order for today.

Mr. BOWLES and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MULTER and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. DADDARIO and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. PORTER and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. DULSKI.

Mr. ANFUSO in two instances.

Mr. DENT in two instances.

Mr. STAGGERS and include extraneous matter.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 72. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Navajo Indian irrigation project and the initial stage of the San Juan-Chama project as participating projects of the Colorado River storage project, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 44 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, May 22, 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:

1006. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on examination of the procurement of spare parts from Boeing Airplane Co., Seattle, Wash., under Department of the Air Force contracts AF 33(600)-22119 and AF 33(600)-28223; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1007. A letter from the Board of Directors, Board for Fundamental Education, transmitting the audit and annual report of the Board for Fundamental Education for the year 1958, pursuant to Public Law 507, 83d Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1008. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated January 21, 1959, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on Great Lakes harbors study—interim report on Cleveland Harbor, Ohio, requested by resolutions of the Committees on Public Works, U.S. Senate and House of Representatives, adopted May 18, 1956 and June 27, 1956 (H. Doc. No. 152); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with two illustrations.

1009. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated March 26, 1959, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on Great Lakes harbors study—interim report on Toledo Harbor, Ohio, requested by resolutions of the Committees on Public Works, U.S. Senate and House of Representatives, adopted May 18, 1956 and June 27, 1956 (H. Doc. No. 153); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with one illustration.

1010. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated December 22, 1958, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on Great Lakes harbors study—interim report on Marquette Harbor, Mich., requested by resolutions of the Committees on Public Works, U.S. Senate and House of Representatives, adopted May 18, 1956 and June 27, 1956 (H. Doc. No. 154); and ordered to be printed with an illustration to the Committee on Public Works.

1011. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the review of selected phases of the low-rent housing operations of the Detroit Housing Commission, Detroit, Mich.; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1012. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of State, transmitting the texts of ILO Convention (No. 111) and ILO recommendation (No. 111) concerning discrimination in the field of employment and occupation, adopted by the International Labor Conference at its 42d session, at Geneva, June 25, 1958, pursuant to article 19 of the Constitution of the International Labor Organization (H. Doc. No. 155); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed.

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. ASPINALL: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 6596. A bill to encourage and stimulate the production and conservation of coal in the United States through research and development by creating a Coal Research and Development Commission, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 370). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BENTLEY:

H.R. 7264. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to permit the withholding of income tax from salaries of certain farm foremen employed by State penal institutions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KEARNS:

H.R. 7265. A bill to strengthen the protection provided to employees in the exercise of their rights of full freedom of association, self-organization, and designation of representatives for the purpose of dealing collectively, and to assure performance of existing obligations in the field of labor-management relations; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BURKE of Kentucky:

H.R. 7266. A bill to provide annuities payable from the civil service retirement and disability fund in additional cases for certain widows and widowers by reducing the required period of marriage from 5 years to 2 years; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 7267. A bill to provide for the addition of certain property in Philadelphia, Pa., to Independence National Historical Park; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CELLER:

H.R. 7268. A bill to provide for the settlement of claims of military personnel and civilian employees of the Federal Government for damage to, or loss, destruction, capture, or abandonment of, personal property occurring incident to their service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DULSKI:

H.R. 7269. A bill to provide for the reclassification of certain distribution clerks at airport mail facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HEMPHILL:

H.R. 7270. A bill to amend section 610 of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 to prohibit the serving of alcoholic beverages to airline passengers and crews, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HOLTZMAN:

H.R. 7271. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to liberalize the standard for determining the earning capacity of disability annuitants and to permit the restoration of disability annuities in certain cases; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. PELLY:

H.R. 7272. A bill to extend the provisions of the so-called Davis-Bacon Act to certain contracts to provide services; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 7273. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide for the free importation of barrelheads made of softwood; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PILLION:

H.R. 7274. 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. RAY:

H.R. 7275. 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. STRATTON:

H.R. 7276. 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. THOMPSON of New Jersey:

H.R. 7277. A bill to prevent discrimination in any public or semipublic place or by any public or semipublic transportation against members of the Armed Forces because of race, color, or creed; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. UDALL:

H.R. 7278. A bill to amend the act of April 19, 1950 (64 Stat. 44, 25 U.S.C. 635, 636) to better promote the rehabilitation of the Navajo and Hopi Tribes of Indians; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 7279. A bill to authorize the establishment of the Hubbell Trading Post National Historic Site, in the State of Arizona, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. WILSON:

H.R. 7280. A bill to provide for the admission of certain minor aliens without regard to the exclusionary provisions of the Immigration and Nationality Act relating to certain mental and physical conditions; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BECKER:

H.R. 7281. 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. BENTLEY:

H.R. 7282. A bill to provide for the establishment of a Commission on Metropolitan Problems; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. HOLLAND:

H.R. 7283. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase benefits, to increase the earnings includible in computing benefits, to eliminate age requirements for spouse's benefits, to reduce retirement age (with full benefits for both men and women) to 60, to reduce the outside earnings permitted without deductions from benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JONES of Alabama:

H.R. 7284. A bill to amend title 23 of the United States Code in order to increase the amount authorized for bridges over Federal dams; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. KOWALSKI:

H.R. 7285. A bill to prohibit unjust discrimination in employment because of age; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ROGERS of Colorado:

H.R. 7286. A bill to provide for the free entry of a Siemens electron microscope for the use of the University of Colorado Medical Center, Denver, Colo.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SMITH of Mississippi:

H.R. 7287. A bill to amend title 23 of the United States Code in order to increase the amount authorized for bridges over Federal dams; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BECKER:

H.R. 7288. A bill to amend section 209 of the Highway Revenue Act of 1956 to provide for an apportionment of not less than $1,400 million annually for the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. GREEN of Oregon:

H.R. 7289. A bill to promote the welfare of the people by authorizing the appropriation of funds to assist the States and Territories in the further development of their programs of general university extension education; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado:

H.R. 7290. A bill to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 100th anniversary of the settlement of the State of Colorado and in commemoration of the establishment of the U.S. Air Force Academy; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. KASEM:

H.R. 7291. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, to provide coverage for employees of large enterprises engaged in retail trade or service and of other employers engaged in activities affecting commerce, to increase the minimum wage under the act to $1.25 an hour, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. PILLION:

H.R. 7292. A bill to amend section 209 of the Highway Revenue Act of 1956 to provide for an apportionment of not less than $1,400 million annually for the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RIEHLMAN:

H.R. 7293. A bill to amend section 209 of the Highway Revenue Act of 1956 to provide for an apportionment of not less than $1,400 million annually for the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 7294. 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. WALLHAUSER:

H.R. 7295. A bill to extend coverage under the Federal old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system to self-employed physicians; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DENT:

H. Con. Res. 176. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress in regard to United Nations Charter revision; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. Res. 268. Resolution to amend the Rules of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. LANE:

H. Res. 269. Resolution in opposition to any visit to United States by Russian Premier Nikita Khrushchev; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII,

The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to amend sections 501 through 504 of the 1958 Amendments to the Social Security Act (Public Law 85-840) to permit the Territory of Hawaii to again obtain the full benefits of the Social Security Act, which was referred to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BREWSTER:

H.R. 7296. A bill for the relief of Arthur K. Jefferson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DELANEY:

H.R. 7297. A bill for the relief of Cecelia Drucker; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FULTON:

H.R. 7298. A bill for the relief of Montgomery Hyun (Man Kyu Hyun); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLTZMAN:

H.R. 7299. A bill for the relief of Jacqueline Abitbol; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOSMER:

H.R. 7300. A bill for the relief of Jose Lauchengco, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H.R. 7301. A bill for the relief of Dr. Thomas Hwa Young Chun and Dr. Lucia Soondong Lee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LIPSCOMB:

H.R. 7302. A bill for the relief of Ming Sang Quon (Quon Ming Sang); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H.R. 7303. A bill for the relief of Compton Jones; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MONAGAN:

H.R. 7304. A bill for the relief of Antonio Joaquim da Silva Aresta; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7305. A bill for the relief of Teresina Ricca and Giuseppina Costanza Costantino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MULTER:

H.R. 7306. A bill for the relief of Corradino Francesco Vilardi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMAS:

H.R. 7307. A bill for the relief of Ernest L. Potts, Mildred Potts, and Eileen Potts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. UTT:

H.R. 7308. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey land to the Diocese of San Diego Education & Welfare Corp.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. WAINWRIGHT:

H.R. 7309. A bill for the relief of Antonina Salvo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILSON:

H.R. 7310. A bill for the relief of Pedro Bigornia Bandayrel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ZELENKO:

H.R. 7311. A bill for the relief of Wong Kam Yun; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7312. A bill for the relief of Dr. Ebrahim Mojdehi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

192. Mr. WESTLAND presented a petition of the president and members of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Ferndale, Wash., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to voicing approval and disapproval of proposed legislation relating to alcoholic beverages, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Needed: An Investment Attitude

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 20, 1959

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, we in the West know the true worth of the investment made to develop our natural resources, the return which this investment has brought, and the need for a continuation of this attitude and program now.

That is why the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] struck such a responsive chord when he addressed the Jefferson-Jackson Day dinner in Tacoma, Wash., May 2, 1959.

So that my colleagues may know Senator SYMINGTON's appraisal of problems besetting us today, I ask unanimous consent to have his Tacoma address set forth in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

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

ADDRESS OF SENATOR STUART SYMINGTON, DEMOCRAT OF MISSOURI, JEFFERSON-JACKSON DINNER, TACOMA, WASH., MAY 2, 1959

Thank you very much for asking me to be with you here in Tacoma.

It is a privilege to visit your busy and beautiful State, and to meet with so many people who have a hand in developing the rich resources of the Pacific Northwest.

Here in the State of Washington you not only have a rich store of wealth in your mountains, fields, rivers and valleys, but are very fortunate in your geographical position.

The location of the Seattle-Tacoma area on the great circle route between two hemispheres makes it a great gateway for the jet age.

With the forward-looking leadership characteristic of this area, there is no limit to what can be achieved in this wonderful country.

By your choice of Governor and Senators, you have insured yourselves the kind of leadership we need, not only in Washington and the Northwest, but in all America.

I want to pay tribute to your outstanding Governor, Albert Rosellini.

In these days of tightened sources of State income it is not easy to build the kind of record Al Rosellini has made; and this is especially true when you inherit a deficit from the previous administration.

But your Governor has had the vision to write a progressive program, the good sense to face the financial realities, and the courage to put the State on a pay-as-you-go basis.

When the Governor of New York put over his tax program, the newspapers started running him for President. They should look as well to the State of Washington.

May I also pay tribute to your senior Senator, WARREN MAGNUSON. He is the able and experienced chairman of a great committee, and one of the most respected elder statesmen of the Senate.

All of us benefit from his experience, wisdom, and advice.

You always know where MAGGY stands. Invariably it is on the side of progress; i.e., the side of the people.

As for your junior Senator, "SCOOP" JACKSON, I don't have to tell you what I think about him.

SCOOP and I have long been partners in the effort to keep this country strong so it can remain free.

There is no more reliable friend and ally; and I predict that SCOOP will have a great future as a leader of America.

It is a long way from the State of Washington to the city of Washington. But I can report, as a somewhat prejudiced observer, that the Republican Party in the Nation's Capitol is just as bad off there as it is here.

Before the last election, an official at the White House wrote a book, "A Republican Looks at His Party."

Now he is writing a sequel, "A Republican Looks for His Party."

As they look at the calendar, the Republicans become more and more worried.

Next year, they see, is a presidential election year. If they are going to win again, they know they are going to have to pull a very large rabbit out of the hat.

Let me tell you a story I understand actually happened. As you know, the Republicans have now appointed a nationwide committee to try to formulate the true principles of their party.

This committee held a meeting recently; and one member, a sort of newcomer to Republican politics, said he thought what the party needed, more than anything else, was to stop acting like the party of privilege, and start representing the interests of all the people.

But older and more experienced Republican heads intervened.

One of them said in all seriousness, "You are wrong. We are the party of privilege. This has been our role throughout our history, and we should not change."

There is nothing like honest confession—and this confession of philosophy helps explain the Republican policies of today.

A party of privilege is bound to tradition.

It looks backward.

It is opposed to growth and investment.

It perpetuates waste.

It approaches the most pressing problems of the country with timidity, washing them gently with solutions which are 10 years old.

This preoccupation with tradition results in strange inconsistencies in national policy.

As example, the administration is obsessed by the threat of inflation, even though, according to the consumer price index, the last 12 months witnessed no inflation whatsoever.

Yet efforts to eliminate unemployment are ignored, even though that current problem is so pressing.

In your own State it now constitutes 8 percent of the labor force. In some States as high as 15 percent.

The administration justifies its reductions in the budget by asserting it wants to save our children from the burden of interest payments on the national debt.

But what do these reductions actually cut?

They cut funds for better schools, which in the long run would give our greatest resource—these very children—an opportunity to add thousands of dollars to their incomes.

They cut funds for medical research, which would add many useful years to the lives of all citizens.

Because the Republicans have been so preoccupied with tradition and are afraid of modernization, they have failed in their pledge to keep waste out of Government.

From the 99 chauffeur-driven Cadillacs, to the jungle of committees in the Pentagon, to the six different air forces the taxpayer now supports, to the great and growing mess in the Department of Agriculture, there is now mountainous waste in our Government.

We pay for that waste in taxes.

We pay for it doubly, since all these billions of wasted money could be used for what we really need.

My friends, this preoccupation with looking backward, which lends so much to this duplication and waste, is nevertheless not the most serious flaw of this Republican administration.

The people are on to much of this, as the last election showed.

By far the most serious Republican policy—and it is slowly coming to light—is the way this administration has concealed from the people the steady deterioration of our position in the world.

This latter policy is very serious, because it goes to the heart of our democratic system—the people's right to know the facts, and thereupon to act upon them.

If they are lulled into complacency, how can they make the effort necessary to keep us both prosperous and free.

The people want the truth—and because of these misrepresentations, come next year, will turn these Republicans out.

In 1960, at local, State, and National levels, the people will give the Democratic Party the greatest victory in its history.

May I talk briefly tonight about two areas in which we have been misled: national security and economic growth.

First, as to our defenses:

The administration has been telling us that we had defenses we do not have.

As illustration: For a long time the administration withheld the facts about Russian development of intercontinental ballistic missiles.

The American people were led to believe we were in fine shape, maybe even ahead, in both the development and the production schedule of this weapon.

But last January the Secretary of Defense finally admitted that the Russians will soon have a 3-to-1 lead over us in this field.

What happened when we learned the truth about ICBM's?

The people were immediately informed that our weakness there was compensated by strength in other sectors. One of those listed was our intermediate range ballistic missiles, which, we were told, were operational on foreign bases.

But now we learn that none of these IRBM's are operational—and are told the Russians have many hundreds of medium range ballistic missiles that are operational.

And what was the other major part of our defense balance that justified our voluntarily handing over ICBM superiority to the Communists?

It is the Strategic Air Command, which the administration says comprises over 90 percent of our retaliatory capacity.

Under questioning, however, the administration admits that three-fourths of the present Strategic Air Force is obsolescent; and that its 3-year plan for replacement of these old bombers will replace only a very small percent of those now in operation.

In his television address to the Nation a month ago, the Presiednt showed a chart of 17 missiles he said were "now in use by our Armed Forces."

Only one of these missiles could travel farther than from San Francisco to Los Angeles. That one was not operational then, and isn't now.

This entire process reminds me of the used car salesman who wants his customer to look only at the new paint job, because if he examines the car more closely, he will discover it has no clutch, no brakes, and no motor.

Now, about our economy.

The challenge we face from the Sino-Soviet Empire is fully as much economic as it is military.

The Communists are out to outproduce us, dry up our markets, and show the world that they can offer material welfare equal to, and superior to, that of the United States.

They are still behind us in some areas—but they are gaining fast.

Since 1950, the Russians have gone from 34 percent of American steel production to 71 percent; from 46 percent of our coal production to 113 percent; and from 27 percent of our aluminum production to 39 percent.

But does this administration warn the American people of this Russian progress, or take the steps to meet it?

It does not.

In the last Democratic administration, our economy grew at the rate of about 5 percent per year.

In this administration, economic growth has been slowed to a little over 1 percent a year.

Is this the way to provide for a population which will reach 235 million by 1975?

Is this the way to provide for the growth of the West?

Or is it the way to stunt the growth of the West?

If we had been able to keep up the Democratic growth rate between 1953 and 1958, it would have meant: $2,800 more income for each family; $31 billion more for our farmers; 10 million more man-years of employment; and $39 billion more private investment.

Every segment of our economy, every section of our Nation, would have been more prosperous than it is today.

At least as much as most, you in the Pacific Northwest have tasted the bitter fruits of Republican economic contraction.

You have seen the resources wasted by the policy of no new starts on the Columbia River.

You have felt the credit pinch of tight money.

You have felt the drain of unemployment.

You have seen glowing opportunities for the development of this region snuffed out by the indifference of this administration.

What you need is more investment capital to develop the riches that lie at your feet.

This requires a willingness on the part of our Government to make long-term investments instead of continuing to be obsessed with budget balancing on a year-to-year basis.

It requires an administration which is not afraid of growth.

I believe there must be more willingness on the part of Government to conceive and carry out broad economic plans, instead of responding haphazardly and uneconomically to such crises as power shortages and floods.

As we all know, the difference between civilized man and the savage is planning. The difference between men and animals is that men look ahead.

Long-range planning of resource development therefore, on a multistate basis, would enable the West to know where it was going, and how fast.

So, my fellow Democrats, our work between now and the next election would seem cut out for us.

We must set the record straight.

We must tell the people the truth about the world situation—and also about the lost opportunities caused by the policies of these Republicans.

We must convince them, by our record in Congress and in the country, that the Democrats will improve that record.

If we do so we will win; and the Nation will be stronger for the effort we have made and will make in the years to come.

University of Connecticut and Georgetown University Scientific Programs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 20, 1959

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, in connection with this week's discussion of appropriations for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, I should like to call attention to a healthy development in the field of education. This is the move on the part of our academic world to concentrate the spotlight of research on some of the difficult problems that are unfolding in the space sciences.

Two noted universities, one a State university and the other privately endowed, have recently announced studies which underline the reinforced interest in science. One is intended to bring latest information on technology together; the other is to examine the more theoretical aspects of space law.

The University of Connecticut has concluded plans for its second annual institute on missile technology. It is sponsored by the Chief of Research and Development, U.S. Army. The course will run from July 26 through August 7, and will cover all important principles connected with the application of missile technology. It is designed for those seeking fundamental, practical working knowledge in areas related to the development, production, and operation of missiles and components. The course is comprehensive, to provide full coverage of new developments, and is coordinated to facilitate technical understanding and

improvement. A staff of military and civilian experts has been gathered from universities and industries engaged in missile research and development. The fields of study will include such current problems as guidance and ballistics, propulsion theory and design, reliability and astral problems.

Here in Washington, Georgetown University has announced a program at its law school to study both nuclear energy law and space law. An institute has been established to conduct intensive, continuing research into national and international legal problems arising out of the peaceful and military uses of nuclear energy and the exploration of outer space. Acknowledging the interrelation of political, economic, and technological factors, the university is calling on faculties of various universities and departments to combine in an interdisciplinary approach to legal problems of the nuclear-space age. The institute will be under the direction of the law faculty and will have the cooperation of an advisory committee of industrialists, scientists, and lawyers actively engaged in such matters.

Thus America's universities, and particularly these forward-looking institutions I have cited, are marshaling their resources to help study the tremendous potential of the space age. The country needs and welcomes the thoughtful, academic consideration and the broadening of the instruction base that these institutes offer.

Address by Representative Collier at Bataan Memorial Dedication

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

Hon. EVERETT McKINLEY DIRKSEN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 20, 1959

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the dedication speech by Representative HAROLD R. COLLIER on May 17, 1959, at the dedication of the Bataan Memorial.

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

Fellow Americans, there is so little one can say or so little that need be said that could possibly reach the deep feelings which prevail on this occasion.

Certainly it would take volumes of words to even approach the emotions, human suffering, deeds of heroism, and love of country which are fully embraced in the history of Company B of the 192d Tank Battalion.

It is, in a sense, a small measure of fulfillment that in solemn gratitude and pride of community and country we dedicate this plaque in honor of a heroic group of soldiers who wrote an indelible chapter in the epic of the Pacific theater in World War II.

We have all learned much of the Maywood Tank Company which was the last of the American forces to cross the bridge from Bataan on the fiery night of January 7, 1942, before it was blown to bits by enemy shells.

The 192d Tank Battalion entered combat early in December of 1941 to engage in the struggle for Clark Field and it continued its fighting for more than a month, moving on to Luzon before its withdrawal into the Bataan Peninsula.

Against great odds it contributed in large measure to the prolonged defense of the peninsula, under the command of Col. Theodore F. Wickford, of Maywood.

It was a member of this company that brought down the first enemy plane to the credit of the armored forces in World War II.

It was here on this site exactly 30 years ago that the 33d Division Tank Company was activated and it was this division that was redesignated as the famous fighting Company B of the 192d Tank Battalion in 1940 when most of the nations of the world were already engaged in conflict.

In November of that year, Company B was ordered to active duty at Fort Knox, Ky., less than 2 months before the sneak attack upon Pearl Harbor which drew the United States into conflict.

The suffering of those who survived the horrible death march of Bataan has been described in the bitter accounts of the early struggle in the Philippines as was the further suffering which came in the Japanese prison camps.

The vicious fighting, the death march, and the maltreatment in the prison camps took their toll and left but few survivors of the original company.

I can't help but recall on this solemn and proposeful occasion, words which Abraham Lincoln uttered at Philadelphia 95 years ago, because no one has ever been able to say in so few words the very thoughts in which we find the true meaning of this ceremony.

It was there he said, "We accepted this war and did not begin it.

"We accepted it for an object and when that object is accomplished, the war will end, and I hope to God that it will never end until that object is accomplished."

So it was with these war heroes of the Maywood Company, when they answered their call to make whatever sacrifice was necessary to remove from mankind the tyrants of that time.

And more significant, in the immortal address at Gettysburg, did Lincoln say those words which could be said in no better phrase or sentiments to fit this very occasion today:

"But in a larger sense," he solemnly declared, "we cannot dedicate, we cannot consecrate, we cannot hallow this ground.

"The brave men, living and dead, who struggled here, have consecrated it far above our poor power to add or detract.

"It is for us, the living, rather, to be dedicated here to the unfinished work they have so nobly carried on."

"It is rather for us to be here dedicated to the great task remaining before us, that from these honored dead we take increased devotion to the cause for which they gave their last full measure of devotion, that we here highly resolve that the dead shall not have died in vain."

And then, we ask, who shall not have died in vain.

In our lifetime it means the hero dead of the great conflicts since the turn of the century.

They died to keep freedom alive.

They gave their all that we might continue to enjoy life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness.

We can make their deaths in vain by ignobly surrendering to those things which do not represent the way of life that has been our God-given heritage.

The hero dead of the last great world conflict and those who were spared from the supreme sacrifice were American patriots, strong of body, strong of mind and spirit, and strong in their belief in God.

They did not hesitate to fight for the right as God gave them to see the right.

For if we but stop to appreciate the true values of our heritage we must, by the same token, concede that there can be no guarantee of life or liberty or the pursuit of happiness unless we know what it means to defend it with the same full measure as the men who fought on Bataan.

For those who died that we might be here today with the same traditions, ideals, and freedoms as the day they left these United States for the Pacific battlefields, the job is done.

And well done it was.

But our work and responsibility to do in our own way what must be done in preserving all of these things remains as a challenge.

For even as we are gathered here today, there are millions of human beings behind the Iron Curtain of communism enslaved as the tyrants of our time would spread its godlessness and suppression of democracy around the world.

May the eternal light which will burn here on this spot after the light of each day has passed, for time immemorial be a reminder to each of us that the light of freedom may flicker and die if we, as Americans, falter in our responsibility to God and country in the years before us.

For those few who gave so much for so many, we must never forget.

Pay Rates for Employees at Airport Mail Facilities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 20, 1959

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a bill to provide that employees at airport mail facilities who handle high priority airmail should receive the rate of pay which is justified by the complexity of their duties.

Buffalo is proud of its beautiful airport. As a Member of Congress from Buffalo, and as a member of the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, I am interested in air traffic at the Buffalo Airport, and also in the quality of postal service that airport is capable of rendering.

The airport mail facility at Buffalo is staffed by a group of devoutly loyal employees of the postal transportation service. Were they to receive double their present rate of pay, their devotion to duty could hardly be increased.

Nevertheless, since having come to Congress, I have learned of the way in which the Postal Classification Act of 1955 was intended to provide equal pay for equal work. By the standards of complexity of duties, by the tension of making sure that mail moves without interruption between the closely connecting air flights, and by the standards of more elaborate as well as more frequently changing scheme requirements, postal employees assigned to airport mail facilities such as that at Buffalo should be granted level-5 pay.

Most distribution clerks in the postal service are assigned to level 4, with a starting salary of $4,035 annually. The starting salary my bill proposes for airport mail facility clerks is $4,275 annually, or just $140 additional per year. This is just 55 cents per working day, or 7 cents per hour.

The Post Office Department has already authorized as high a rate of pay for some people who handle airmail in installations other than airport mail facilities. Under a job description titled "Mail Dispatch Expediter," which the Post Office Department has numbered 2-198, the Department has authorized one level-5 position when distribution is performed in accordance with authorized airmail schemes.

At airport mail facilities, not only is mail distributed in accordance with such schemes, but it also meets the more demanding test of close-coupled contact with airline personnel to insure that connections are accomplished and that the highest priority class of mail suffers no delay.

Because of considerations such as these, I hope that my bill may be given early attention, and that the existing injustices may be corrected.

Maritime Day, 1959

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK J. BECKER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 20, 1959

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, on Friday of this week, May 22, we will observe Maritime Day. It seems fitting that in saluting the occasion we pause to consider what this means.

The security and well-being of every citizen depends on a strong merchant marine—traditionally operated as a private enterprise with the aid and cooperation of the Federal Government.

Both in peace and war, a strong merchant marine is essential to the strength of our country. A strong merchant fleet is necessary for the prosperity and stability of America's peacetime commerce and it becomes America's fourth arm of defense in times of national emergency.

During war years, American merchant ships were equipped with antiaircraft and heavier guns and merchant crews shared the gun stations with U.S. Navy gun crews.

In M-day or mobilization day plans, if the need should ever arise, the Navy would be responsible for the utilization and routing of merchant vessels. These ships would become naval auxiliaries for the transport of troops, munitions, fuel, and supplies.

In the security plan of the Nation, the ships of the American merchant marine are of prime importance and trained and efficient personnel for these ships is a natural concern of the Government.

It has been said that a ship is only as good as the men that sail her; therefore, if America is to have good ships, she must have good men aboard these ships.

Congress recognized this some years ago and the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 was signed into law. This called for Federal training of merchant officers and the act has often been referred to as the Magna Charta of the merchant marine. Standards were raised and, consequently, the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy at Kings Point was dedicated in 1942.

THE CAMPUS OF THE SEVEN SEAS

The U.S. Merchant Marine Academy at Kings Point is located on the north shore of Long Island, near the confluence of Long Island Sound and the East River, in sight of the towering skyline of Manhattan.

Built and equipped at a cost of $8 million, Kings Point occupies approximately a 65-acre site on Long Island Sound, a campus of the seven seas.

I have watched Kings Point grow from its very first day, when I attended the opening ceremonies as Nassau County commander of the American Legion, later during my 8 years in the Assembly of New York State as chairman of the military law committee and during my years in Congress; several times, I have served on the congressional Board of Visitors to Kings Point and on each occasion of a visit to the Academy I have been impressed by this "Annapolis of the Merchant Marine," its officers, and the cadets.

Every citizen should visit Kings Point and see this fine institution. Pause in the library and see the records made by cadets during World War 2 and read the tales of heroism.

The Academy's fine gymnasium, O'Hara Hall, is named after Ed O'Hara, a cadet from California. During a battle with a German raider, O'Hara, seeing the Navy gunners downed by enemy fire, took over the gun and dispatched the enemy to the bottom of the sea, but O'Hara was mortally wounded in the courageous action.

President Eisenhower on February 20, 1956, signed the bill that gave Kings Point permanent status, thereby placing it alongside West Point, Annapolis, the Coast Guard, and Air Force Academies as one of Uncle Sam's five Federal Academies for officer training.

It was a happy day for all hands, my fellow colleagues, STEVE DEROUNIAN and STUYV WAINWRIGHT, and I had worked long and hard to insure the final passage of the bill for permanency. John Scherger, chief clerk of the supreme court in Mineola and a very good friend, was president of the Association of Parents and Friends of Kings Point. The association had aided considerably in the battle for recognition.

TOP ADMIRAL, TOP STAFF

The Academy, under the capable direction of Rear Adm. Gordon McLintock, has advanced far in the field of higher education. The faculty is often called on for aid and cooperation in highly technical matters. Presently, several Academy officers are assigned to the building of the *Savannah*, America's first atom-powered ship. Truly a remarkable testimonial to the knoweldge and competence of the Academy staff.

SPARKLING SPORTS STAFF

Kings Point has also advanced in the world of college sports. Under Comdr. James W. Liebertz the Academy presents an intercollegiate sports program unequaled by any school its size.

Commander Liebertz was aide to Capt. Gene Tunney, who was in charge of the Navy's physical fitness program during World War II. The Kings Point athletic director is one of the Nations' most popular men in college athletics and his coaching staff includes two former great athletes from schools here in the Nation's Capitol—Clem Stralka, of Georgetown, and later a great line star with the Washington Redskins, and Tim Stapleton, a three-letter man at George Washington. Harry Wright, All-American from Notre Dame, took over last year as head football coach and the football fortunes started to rise to new heights. Lt. Comdr. Tom Carmody supervises the physical training program that has every cadet participating in physical development.

I might add that in addition to the educational and physical development of the cadet, there are the Academy chaplains, representing the three faiths, to aid the Kings Pointers' spiritual development.

The cadets spend 3 11-month years in residence at the Academy, plus a year of study and work aboard American vessels at sea. Upon successful completion of the course, which almost equals 5 years of regular college study, the degree of bachelor of science is awarded. Kings Pointers also complete courses qualifying them for U.S. Naval Reserve commissions.

The U.S. Merchant Marine Academy in these short, yet action-packed years of existence has served the country well. We hope that Kings Point will continue to provide the young men who will be America's merchant marine officers and ambassadors of good will for many more peaceful maritime days.

Greetings to the Slovak League of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. DENT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 20, 1959

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, Slovaks in America have for many years been very active in many phases of our communal life. Through the medium of various organizations they have rendered valuable services. The Slovak League of America, as a leading civic and cultural organization, working primarily in Slovak-American communities, has been known for more than 50 years as the agency for ministering to the material and spiritual needs of these communities, and also

educating immigrant Slovaks in the American democratic way of life. In greeting the 36th Congress of the league, I wish its organizing leaders success in their worthy endeavors.

The Conservation Reserve Authorized by the Soil Bank Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 20, 1959

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the conservation reserve authorized by the Soil Bank Act is a Federal program, which was supported by members of both parties. The program has been in operation for 3 years and during that time, it has established a remarkable record of accomplishment.

The conservation record is particularly impressive. During the time the program has been in operation, a total of 23 million acres has been placed in the reserve. In 1957, a total of 6 million acres was placed under contract. In 1958, a total of 4 million acres was placed under contract. In 1959, a total of 13 million acres was placed under contract and an additional 7 million acres was offered by the Nation's farmers but could not be placed in the reserve because the Department of Agriculture did not have a sufficient authorization to enter into contracts on this land.

On the first 10 million acres placed in the reserve during 1957 and 1958, establishment of protective cover has largely been completed. On this land, nearly 9 million acres are now covered with flourishing stands of grass which protects the soil from wind and water erosion, conserves the plant nutrients for further generations of Americans, and also contributes to the wildlife populations on this and adjacent lands. A truly remarkable accomplishment in this regard is the fact that in excess of 3 million acres of this grass has been established in the southern Great Plains, usually known as the dust bowl, where wind erosion has been a problem for over 30 years.

Another million acres have been planted to trees—a major contribution to forestry, wise land use, and conservation of soil and water on these lands.

On the 13 million acres placed in the reserve in 1959, final figures are not as yet available. On the basis of a sample projected to the entire acreage, it is estimated that on this land, 3 million acres are already established with a satisfactory cover, 8,500,000 acres are to be planted to grass, 700,000 acres are to be planted to trees, 150,000 acres are to be developed as wildlife cover, and the balance to be established in temporary cover, water conservation measures, etc.

The impact of the program on conservation has equaled or exceeded the highest expectations of the various conservation groups who supported the original legislation.

Among the many favorable aspects of the conservation reserve, one of the most noteworthy is the wildlife phase. It is particularly noteworthy because the benefits of the program to wildlife extends to such a widespread segment of the general public. Both urban and rural people enjoy hunting and fishing. In fact, one of every five Americans over 12 years of age fished and/or hunted during recent years. This army of sportsmen supported the original legislation and has been enthusiastic over the increase in wildlife which has already taken place.

Sportsmen in such States as Ohio, Georgia, South Dakota, Oklahoma, Washington, and Michigan have reported greatly improved hunting on lands in and near conservation reserve acres. Game and fish department figures show almost a 100 percent increase in pheasant population during the past 2 years in North Dakota, South Dakota, Nebraska, Minnesota, and Iowa. Wildlife population increases have been reported in every State where substantial acreages have been placed in the conservation reserve.

Conservationists recognize and approve the wildlife improvements resulting from the program and credit the increase to the 10 million acres placed in the reserve through 1958. Similar benefits are anticipated from the 13 million acres added in 1959. They also expect comparable benefits if the program were carried forward to the ultimate goal of 60 million acres originally contemplated for placing in the conservation reserve.

These conservation interests and sportsmen are unable to understand why a program, so successful and of such widespread benefit, should now be crippled by two actions of the Appropriation Committee.

The limitation on the 1960 authorization to $325 million dollars will almost halt placing additional land in the program. The 2.3 million acres that can be added within this limit will hold the program to 25 million acres—far from the 60 million acre goal.

Even worse is the action of the committee in setting a $3,000 maximum contract limitation. This will in effect make it almost impossible to add any land to the reserve next year.

The conservation reserve program has demonstrated its ability to encourage farmers voluntarily to reduce production. It has made possible a substantial land use adjustment, which contributes to soil, water, forest and wildlife conservation. It deserves continued bipartisan support.

DAV Services in West Virginia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARLEY O. STAGGERS

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 20, 1959

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, an exceptional record of vital rehabilitation services freely extended to thousands of West Virginia citizens has recently been brought to my attention. Again, these splendid humanitarian services are not sufficiently appreciated by those who have benefited thereby, directly and indirectly.

Among the several congressional chartered veteran organizations, which have State departments and local chapters in West Virginia, is the Disabled American Veterans. The DAV is the only such organization composed exclusively of those Americans who have been either wounded, gassed, injured or disabled by reason of active service in the Armed Forces of the United States, or of some country allied with it, during time of war.

DAV SETUP

Formed in 1920, under the leadership of Judge Robert S. Marx, DAV legislative activities have very substantially benefited every compensated disabled veteran. Its present national commander is another judge, David B. Williams, of Concord, Mass. Its national adjutant is John E. Feighner, of Cincinnati, Ohio. Its national legislative director is Elmer M. Freudenberger; its national director of claims, Cicero F. Hogan; and its national director of employment relations, John W. Burris—all located at its national service headquarters, 1701 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

Inasmuch as less than 10 percent of our country's war veterans are receiving monthly disability compensation payments for service-connected disabilities—some 2 million—the DAV can never aspire to become the largest of the several veteran organizations. Nevertheless, since shortly after its formation in 1920, the DAV National Headquarters, located in Cincinnati, Ohio, has maintained the largest staff of any veterans' organization, of full-time trained national service officers, 138 of them, who are located in the 63 regional and 3 district offices of the U.S. Veterans' Administration, and in its Central Office in Washington, D.C.

They there have ready access to the official claim records of those claimants who have given them their powers of attorney. All of them being war-handicapped veterans themselves, these service officers are sympathetic and alert as to the problems of other less well-informed claimants.

SERVICE FACILITIES IN WEST VIRGINIA

The DAV maintains a full-time national service officer in West Virginia, Mr. Henry E. Smith, located in the VA regional office, 832 Fifth Avenue, in Huntington. The department commander is Mr. Paul M. Elliott, and the department adjutant is Mr. Gus Loiseau, of Parkersburg.

There are four VA hospitals in West Virginia, in each of which the DAV has a voluntary services representative, as follows: Mr. James B. Taylor, Jr., at Beckley, with 200 beds for general medical patients; Mr. Edward C. Wereley, at Clarksburg, with 184 beds for general medical patients; Mrs. Esther M. Darling, at Huntington, with 180 beds, general medical; and Mr. Earl T. Rosensteel, at

Martinsburg, with 1,400 beds at the VA center.

During the last fiscal year, the VA paid out $63,813,000 for its veteran program in West Virginia, including $17,738,910 disability compensation to its 20,083 service disabled veterans. These Federal expenditures in West Virginia furnish substantial purchasing power in all communities. Only about 8 percent, 1,558, are members of the 35 DAV chapters in West Virginia.

SERVICE ACCOMPLISHMENT BY DAV

This 8 percent is strange, in view of the very outstanding record of personalized service activities and accomplishments of the DAV national service officer in behalf of West Virginia veterans and dependents during the last 10 fiscal years, as revealed by the following statistics:

Claimants contacted (estimate)	42,816
Claims folders reviewed	35,680
Appearances before rating boards	13,276
Compensation increases obtained	1,815
Service connections obtained	786
Nonservice pensions	740
Death benefits obtained	59
Total monetary benefits obtained	$1,000,470.39

These figures do not include the accomplishments of other national service officers on duty in the Central Office of the Veterans' Administration, handling appeals and reviews, or in its three district offices, handling death and insurance cases. Over the last 10 years, they reported 83,611 claims handled in such district offices, resulting in monetary benefits of $20,850,335.32, and in the central office, they handled 58,282 reviews and appeals, resulting in monetary benefits of $5,337,389.05. Proportionate additional benefits were thereby obtained for West Virginia veterans their dependents and their survivors.

SERVICES BEYOND STATISTICS

These figures fail properly to paint the picture of the extent and value of the individual advice, counsel and assistance extended to all of the claimants who have contacted DAV national service officers in person, by telephone, and by letter.

Pertinent advice was furnished to all disabled veterans—only about 10 percent of whom were DAV members—their dependents, and others, in response to their varied claims for service connection, disability compensation, medical treatment, hospitalization, prosthetic appliances, vocational training, insurance, death compensation or pension, VA guaranty loans for homes, farms and businesses, and so forth. Helpful advice was also given as to counseling and placement into suitable useful employment—to utilize their remaining abilities—civil service examinations, appointments, retentions, retirement benefits, and multifarious other problems.

Every claim presents different problems. Too few Americans fully realize that governmental benefits are not automatically awarded to disabled veterans—not given on a silver platter. Frequently, because of lack of official records, death or disappearance of former buddies and associates, lapse of memory with the passage of time, lack of information and experience, proof of the legal service connection of a disability becomes extremely difficult—too many times impossible.

A VA claims and rating board can obviously not grant favorable action merely based on the opinions, impressions, or conclusions of persons who submit notarized affidavits. Specific detailed, pertinent facts are essential.

The VA, which acts as judge and jury, cannot properly prosecute claims against itself. As the defendant, in effect, the U.S. Veterans' Administration must award the benefits provided under the laws administered by it, only under certain conditions.

A DAV national service officer can and does advise a claimant precisely why his claim may previously have been denied and then specifies what additional evidence is essential. The claimant must necessarily bear the burden of obtaining such fact-giving affidavit evidence. The experienced national service officer will, of course, advise him as to its possible improvement, before presenting same to the adjudication agency, in the light of all of the circumstances and facts, and of the pertinent laws, precedents, regulations and schedule of disability ratings. No DAV national service officer, I feel certain, ever uses his skill, except in behalf of worthy claimants, with justifiable claims.

The VA has denied more claims than it has allowed, because most claims are not properly prepared. It is very significant, as pointed out by the DAV acting national director of claims, Chester A. Cash, that a much higher percentage of those claims, which have been prepared and presented with the aid of a DAV national service officer, are eventually favorably acted upon, than is the case as to those claimants who have not given their powers of attorney to any such special advocate.

LOSSES BY REVIEWS

Another fact not generally known is that, under the overall review of claims inaugurated by the VA some 4 years ago, the disability compensation payments of about 37,200 veterans have been discontinued, and reduced as to about 27,300 others at an aggregate loss to them of more than $28 million per year. About 1 percent of such discontinuances and reductions have probably occurred as to disabled veterans in West Virginia with a consequent loss of about $280,000 per year.

Most of these unfortunate claimants were not represented by the DAV or by any other veteran organization. Judging by the past, such unfavorable adjudications will occur as to an additional equal number or more during the next 3 years, before such review is completed. I urge every disabled veteran in West Virginia to give his power of attorney to the national service officer of the DAV, or of some other veteran organization, or of the American Red Cross, just as a protective measure.

The average claimant who receives helpful advice probably does not realize the background of training and experience of a competent expert national service officer.

COSTS OF DAV SERVICES

Measured by the DAV's overall costs of about $12,197,600 during a 10-year period, one would find that it has expended about $3.50 for each claim folder reviewed, or about $8.80 for each rating board appearance, or, again, about $22.70 for each favorable award obtained, or about $123 for each service connection obtained, or about $54 for each compensation increase obtained, and has obtained about $14.10 of direct monetary benefits for claimants for each dollar expended by the DAV for its national service officer setup. Moreover, such benefits will generally continue for many years.

METHODS OF PROVIDING SERVICES

Evidently, most claimants are not aware of the fact that the DAV receives no Government subsidy whatsoever. The DAV is enabled to maintain its nationwide staff of expert national service officers primarily because of income from membership dues collected by its local chapters and from the net income on its Idento-Tag (miniature automobile license tags) Project, owned by the DAV and operated by its employees, most of whom are disabled veterans, their wives, or their widows, or other handicapped Americans—a rehabilitation project in thus furnishing them with useful employment. Incidentally, without checking as to whether they had previously sent in a donation, more than 1 million owners of sets of lost keys have received them back from the DAV's Idento-Tag department, 2,992 of whom, during the last 8 years, were West Virginia residents.

Every eligible veteran, by becoming a DAV member, and by explaining these factors to fellow citizens, can help the DAV to procure such much-needed public support as will enable it to maintain its invaluable nationwide service setup on a more adequate basis. So much more could be accomplished for distressed disabled veterans, if the DAV could be enabled, financially, to maintain an expert service officer in every one of the 173 VA hospitals.

MEMORIAL HONOR ROLL

During the last 10 years, the DAV has also relied on appropriations from its separately incorporated trustee, the DAV Service Foundation, aggregating $3,300,000, exclusively for salaries to its national service officers. Its reserves having been thus nearly exhausted, the DAV Service Foundation is therefore very much in need of the generous support of all service claimants, DAV members and other social minded Americans—by direct donations, by designations in insurance policies, by bequests in wills, by assignments of stocks and bonds and by establishing special types of trust funds.

A special type of memorial trust fund originated about 3 years ago with concerned disabled veteran members of the DAV chapter in Butte, Mont., which established the first perpetual rehabilitation fund of $1,000 with the DAV Service Foundation. Recently it added another $100 thereto. Since then, every

DAV unit in that State has established such a special memorial trust fund, ranging from $100 to $1,100, equivalent to about $4 per DAV member.

As a DAV life member, I am pleased to enroll as one of the benefactors on the memorial honor roll of the DAV Service Foundation, with the realization that only the interest earnings therefrom will be available for appropriation to the DAV for its use in continuing to maintain its national service officer setup in my State of West Virginia.

Each claimant who has received any such rehabilitation service can help to make it possible for the DAV to continue such excellent rehabilitation services in West Virginia by sending in donations to the DAV Service Foundation, 631 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW., Washington 4, D.C. Every such serviced claimant who is eligible can and should also become a DAV member, preferably a life member, for which the total fee is $100—$50 to those born before January 1, 1902, or World War I veterans—payable in installments within 2 full fiscal year periods.

Every American can help to make our Government more representative by being a supporting member of at least one organization which reflects his interests and viewpoints—labor unions, trade associations and various religious, fraternal and civic associations. All of America's veterans ought to be members of one or more of the patriotic, service-giving veterans' organizations: The United Spanish War Veterans, the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, Amvets, Military Order of the Purple Heart, and the Disabled American Veterans. All of America's disabled defenders, who are receiving disability compensation, have greatly benefited by their own official voice, the DAV. I am proud to be a member of the DAV, as well as a member of the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, and Amvets.

Imports of Canadian Bread in the Detroit Market

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR A. KNOX

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 20, 1959

Mr. KNOX. Mr. Speaker, a recent Associated Press news item datelined Lansing, Mich., described a serious problem that has developed in the city of Detroit because of the free importation of Canadian bread. This dispatch quotes two State senators, Harold M. Ryan and Raymond C. Dzendzel, who have urged the Michigan Legislature to appeal to Congress to "rectify the inequity of free bread imports" from Windsor, Canada.

The two senators pointed out that while bread imported from Canada is duty free the Canadian Government levies a tariff on traffic in the other direction. Senator Ryan cited the fact that Canadian bakers work for 85 cents an hour less than the current scale in Detroit and that flour costs $1.25 less per hundredweight in Canada. These basic inequities have naturally created unfair competition for the Detroit bakers. The flood of imported bread has reached the staggering figure of 400,000 loaves every month and it has forced Detroit's bakeries to slash prices drastically in a futile attempt to remain competitive.

While this problem would be serious enough in any American city, it is particularly ominous in Detroit. As you all know, the State of Michigan is one of the leading centers of unemployment in this country with Detroit itself contributing vast numbers to the rolls of the relief-eligible. The unfair competition experienced by the baking industry in Detroit comes on top of an already bad situation in the automobile industry where, despite a favorable rate of auto sales so far this year, many skilled workers are without jobs.

It was not too long ago that one of our most highly esteemed colleagues, the late Honorable Daniel A. Reed, spoke out against the severe domestic problems that were being created by unregulated auto imports. On February 2, 1959, referring to a speech made by Mr. Ernest R. Breech of the Ford Motor Co., Mr. Reed said:

> The next time the free-trade advocates from Detroit express concern over unemployment in that area, they might well give some thought to the fact that the difference between the jobs displaced by imported autos and the jobs created by auto exports showed a net deficit of 28,900 jobs. That conservative estimate is no insubstantial number of unemployed American citizens, the vast majority of them in Michigan.

Our late colleague went on to compute the monetary loss to America caused by this unemployment to be in excess of $200 million for the 12-month period preceding his remarks. Just think of that—$200 million in wages lost because of imported automobiles—and then tell me that our so-called free trade is actually free.

The same lack of reciprocity that is crippling the baking industry in Detroit has been injuring our auto industry for years. In 1957, 2 years ago, the United States imported 95,510 automobiles from the United Kingdom and 100,083 automobiles from West Germany. And how many cars do you suppose we sold in those two countries in the same year? Britain allowed only 265 American autos to be imported and a scant 576 cars of our manufacture managed to hurdle the trade barriers of West Germany. And this is the phenomenon that some of us refer to as reciprocal trade.

Returning to the cross-border competition in the importation of bread my hometown of Sault Ste. Marie, Mich., felt the seriousness of the situation when Our Own Bakery was forced to cease operation and put 60 men out of work. This bakery was confronted with competing with Canadian bread imported from Sault Ste. Marie, Canada.

The 11th Congressional District of Michigan has also suffered because of the importation of hardwood plywood. For many years certain areas of my district have been dependent upon the plywood industry for the employment of its citizens. Up until the year 1951 the domestic industry was not too greatly affected by the imports of plywood, as the imports in 1951 consisted of 67 million square feet, and the domestic consumption at that time was 827 million square feet. But when we look at the statistics of imports we find that 4 years later in 1955 the imports had grown to 628 million square feet. The domestic consumption had increased about 100 percent to 1.5 billion square feet. The ratio of the imports was 10 times greater in the year 1955 over the year 1951. The foreign producers gain has been at the expense of the domestic industry with a consequent loss of jobs for our citizens. The towns of Escanaba, Gladstone, Newberry, and Munising, Mich., have drastically felt the impact of such imports, with some plants forced to close their doors, not temporarily, but permanently.

And remember that the problems presented by foreign imports faces all of us; it is not only the bakers, the unemployed woodworkers, the unemployed automobile workers, or the Treasury Department that must bear the expense of our free trade foreign policy. This policy steals money from the pockets of every single U.S. citizen, from every business concern, and from every American industry.

Something must be done before this wasteful, irresponsible doctrine has stolen our country right out from under us.

The Labor-Management Performance Act of 1959

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARROLL D. KEARNS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 20, 1959

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement:

THE LABOR-MANAGEMENT PERFORMANCE ACT OF 1959

Congressman CARROLL D. KEARNS, ranking Republican on the House Labor Committee, introduced a new labor reform measure in the House today. "Weeks of hearings in the House, together with the public reaction against the Kennedy bill as passed by the Senate, demonstrate the need for a new approach to labor reform," said Congressman KEARNS at a press conference this morning. "I think we've been on the wrong track thus far. We need a new look.

"The heart of the labor reform problem is the breakdown in performance under existing laws. Whether the failure is in the law or its enforcement is an open question. The result is that the fundamental rights of the working men and women of this country definitely are not being protected.

"The breakdown is most serious when it fails to provide lack of protection against internal union abuses and to oust the criminal elements from the union movement. Union members can sometimes obtain relief from internal union problems through use

of the courts but it is a long and expensive process. Few rank and file union members can afford the time or the money. In the criminal area the congressional hearings have clearly exposed an appalling failure of enforcement.

"Nevertheless, the Senate act relies on court enforcement of its watered down bill of rights and on criminal penalties for most of the rest of its provisions. Such legislation is no more than a repetition of the same old theme song: 'Let the house of labor take care of itself.'

"My new bill offers a fresh approach. It is based on the recognition that, if the corrupt element is to be eliminated from the labor movement, the major part of the responsibility rests on the membership of any union to do its own housecleaning. Personally, I think they will do it if they are given the necessary tools and real protection while the job is being done. This bill does exactly that.

"The bill contains a simple but comprehensive bill of rights which will go a long way toward insuring that control of the union will be in the hands of the members rather than the officials. Independently audited financial reports are required but the bill recognizes that regardless of where the reports are filed, only union members will be sufficiently well-informed to question them. Thus it provides that the reports must be given to union members only. By far the great majority of union leaders and employers are honest Americans; therefore, no reports are required of labor officials or employers. Such reports are aimed only at wrongdoers and it is ridiculous to think a criminal is going to write us a report of his crime.

"Enforcement procedure is of paramount importance. The bill contains a simple, well-tested method—the unfair labor practice procedure of the National Labor Relations Board. All the member need do is file a charge of violation of the bill of rights or the reporting provisions, and the NLRB takes over the investigation and prosecution of his case. He is protected from retaliation while the case is processed. The confidence which rank and file workmen have in the Board is amply demonstrated by the fact that last quarter they filed 62 percent of the Board's unfair labor practice cases. The bill also includes important changes in Board structure to speed up its case handling."

Congressman KEARNS stated further, "Any labor reform measure must include restrictions on organizational picketing and secondary boycotts. Emotions run high on these issues, but both unions and employers are inclined to forget the impact of such activities on the working men and women who suffer as a result. Their right to be free of such coercion must be preserved if the freedom of association guaranteed by the Wagner Act is to mean anything.

"My new bill prevents picketing after a union loses an NLRB election and, at the same time, markedly speeds up NLRB procedure for holding such elections. It also stops picketing where the labor organization involved cannot establish that 30 percent of the employes want the union to represent them.

"In the secondary boycott area, there are presently restrictions on inducement of secondary employees. They are retained and a ban on threats, restraint and coercion of any person added. Hot cargo contracts are also outlawed.

"Believe me, the time has come to assure a greater voice to the union member in calling strikes. It is obvious that union officials must compete with each other to get the maximum wage increase for their members. Too often the members lose money as a result, either from lost wages or inflation caused by the increase. Consequently, the bill provides for a secret ballot strike vote to be taken within 7 days prior to commencement of any strike.

"There are many other provisions in the bill, which it is impossible to explain in detail in this release. However, they likewise definitely provide practical methods of protecting the rights of individual workmen.

"The Performance Act of 1959 is the least restrictive on the activities of legitimate unions of any bill presently before the House. It provides far fewer opportunities for harrassment of honest unions. At the same time, in my opinion, it provides the union member with the only practical, realistic method of enforcing his rights that can be found in any of the bills introduced.

"As a Member of Congress for 13 years, serving on the distinguished House Labor Committee, I believe that this bill offers the greatest opportunity for harmonious labor-management relations, and protection to the public, of any approach yet conceived."

The Danger of Nasserism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 20, 1959

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article by the distinguished Senator from New Jersey, the Honorable HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, as it appeared in the April 1959 issue of B'nai Zion Voice:

THE DANGER OF NASSERISM

(By Senator HARRISON A. WILLIAMS)

The grave situation in the Middle East constitutes a most serious challenge to the free world today.

As I read the latest dispatches from the Middle East, I am especially mindful of many early warnings against Nasserism and its true character. Instead of facing the unpleasant facts, we helped to build up the Egyptian military adventurer. We fed his imperialistic ambitions in the naive belief that he would, in gratitude, identify himself with the West.

It should have been apparent to anyone who could read Nasser's own words as set down in his book, "The Philosophy of the Revolution," the "Mein Kampf" of pan-Arabism—that Nasser was motivated by violent hatred of the West and by dreams of empire at the very outset of his political career. But our State Department preferred to view the matter otherwise, and we all but begged to be blackmailed.

The inevitable results were the weakening of our prestige and influence throughout the whole area, the perpetuation of the Arab-Israel conflict as Nasser's best instrument for promoting the tensions on which his dictatorship feeds, and the entry of Soviet power on the Middle East scene through Nasser.

Nasser's forces are working overtime to convince the American people that Nasserism and Arab nationalism are synonymous and that we have no choice but to swallow our dislike of Nasser and come to terms with him. This devious argument, which some misrepresent as hardheaded realism, would be more persuasive if one did not know the history of the power struggle within the Arab world and the essential weakness of strong men like Nasser, whose sole strength has been his ability to play off East against West. He has no indigenous strength. Even with the military aid and political support of the Kremlin, he was ignominiously defeated by little Israel, and he is being increasingly resisted and challenged by Arab countries like Lebanon, Jordan, and Iraq.

Add to this the opposition of Turkey and Iran, the growing resentment against Nasserist aims in Libya and Sudan, and the forthright action of President Bourgiba of Tunisia in breaking off relations with Nasser. The picture is not one of an invincible man of destiny marching from conquest to conquest, but of a political mirage going the way of all such fantasies of the desert.

The task before the West is clear. Our previous policy of massive appeasement of Nasser must be permanently replaced by a policy of massive containment.

Let no one intimidate us into believing that by pursuing such a policy we will be standing in opposition to Arab nationalism. America has provided the greatest impetus to Arab nationalism. It was at our initiative and under our leadership that the old imperialism were withdrawn from the Middle East. We fostered the political independence of all the Arab States and have lavished assistance of all kinds on these countries.

We are today prepared to continue our help to the underdeveloped Arab countries and ill-used Arab peoples. But we should not be prepared to equate Nasserism with the legitimate national aspirations of the Arab peoples, which we support.

I have already urged that we set ourselves the goal of establishing a stable economy in the Middle East, on a regional basis. That is the first thing we must do if we are to get peace.

In urging that a program of economic assistance in the Middle East should be pursued, however, I wish to make it clear that I do not believe that such assistance, if applied through the United Nations, should be given to nations which fail to observe the United Nations Charter, which explicitly prohibits economic boycott and belligerency of the kind now being waged by the Arab States against Israel.

At the same time, I believe that countries like Israel, which are clearly and unmistakably linked with the United States, in the worldwide struggle for democracy and against communism, should receive expanded aid directly from the United States on the basis of bilateral agreements.

Where Israel is concerned, even those who had blindly opposed its establishment must now admit that it stands as the major bastion of Western strength in the Middle East.

The moral and material support we have rendered to Israel—and such support has been largely bipartisan in character—must be viewed not only as a matter of aiding justice, but also as an extraordinarily vital expression of enlightened self-interest.

For if—Heaven forbid—Israel should ever fall, the Middle East would be finally opened up to the domination first of Nasserism, and next to the domination of Communist imperialism centered in Moscow. Then the hopes of the free world in that part of the world would vanish—and with them our hopes for Africa, and large parts of Asia, and perhaps even of Europe.

Neither the people of Israel themselves, with their magnificent though small defenses, nor the public opinion of the whole Western World, would ever permit this.

In the light of the bonds by which history and fate have linked the destinies of the peoples of Israel and the United States, is it not time to give full and unqualified public expression to this relationship?

Our Government has shown friendship and support for Israel in many ways—but it has not yet publicly proclaimed our determination to maintain Israel's political independence and territorial integrity, come what may. It makes absolutely no sense to

argue that a declaration by our Government to this effect would tend to stir up resentment and latent hostility against America within the Arab world. Our past reserve on this subject has certainly not served to check the barrage of anti-American propaganda emanating from Cairo.

Indeed, the inhibition we have imposed upon ourselves in order to appease Arab extremists has had the very opposite effect; it has encouraged them to believe that we are not unequivocally committed to Israel's defense and that by hammering away at America for being friendly to Israel, they may induce us to withdraw our support from Israel altogether. I believe, therefore, that a categoric warning that an attack against Israel would be dealt with as a threat to the security of the free world is the best way of tranquilizing the astmosphere surrounding the Arab-Israel conflict.

This policy, forcefully stated and resolutely pursued and implemented by American leadership in the United Nations, would be the prelude to peace and mutual cooperation among the peoples of the area for the benefit of future generations and for the good of mankind.

George Washington Day Dinner, American Good Government Society

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. B. CARROLL REECE

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 20, 1959

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, each year the American Good Government Society calls to memory the enduring contributions of George Washington to good government in this country by holding a public George Washington Day dinner here in the Nation's Capital. On these occasions the society's annual George Washington Awards are presented to two people for their outstanding contributions to good government in our own times.

Among the previous recipients of the George Washington Awards are the late Robert A. Taft, Harry Flood Byrd, Herbert Hoover, Allan Shivers, Howard W. Smith, Robert E. Wood, the late Walter F. George, George M. Humphrey, Karl E. Mundt, William M. Colmer, Richard B. Russell, and William F. Knowland. This year the recipients of the George Washington Awards of the American Good Government Society were JOHN L. MCCLELLAN and Lewis L. Strauss.

The awards were presented at the 1959 George Washington Day dinner attended by more than 700 ladies and gentlemen on Thursday, April 30, the 170th anniversary of the inauguration of the first President of the United States.

On behalf of the trustees of the American Good Government Society, U.S. Senator HARRY FLOOD BYRD, of Virginia, made the presentation to Secretary Strauss and Representative CHARLES A. HALLECK, the minority leader of the House of Representatives, made the presentation to Senator MCCLELLAN.

I offer for the RECORD Representative HALLECK's remarks on making the presentation to Senator MCCLELLAN, the citation from the George Washington Award and Senator MCCLELLAN's response:

Mr. Chairman, all of you folks, I am happy and proud to be a part of this wonderful evening. I would like to say first of all that I note with approval that the purpose of the Good Government Society is to promote the education of the American public in the principles of the Constitution and of free competitive enterprise. Now certainly this is a worthy objective, and I would like to observe, in passing, that good government is government according to these principles.

Tonight it is my singular privilege to present the Society's George Washington Award to a man who has made a unique contribution to the preservation of these principles, the Honorable Senator JOHN L. MCCLELLAN, of Arkansas. If you will pardon a personal note, I have not only worked with him as a colleague in the Congress but I've been hunting and fishing a few times with JOHN, and I mean it when I say that he's a great guy any place you find him. [Applause.]

I think you will all agree that the primary purpose of government under our Constitution is the protection of personal liberty. The Constitution has given Congress the legislative power to provide this protection against both our enemies—those from without and those within our own society who would encroach upon our liberty.

The power to investigate is an essential component of the legislative process if the Congress is to perform its function intelligently and effectively. It is a power, however, which must be used with the utmost fairness and restraint.

As chairman of a select committee, Senator MCCLELLAN has labored long and well to bring to the attention of Congress and the American public the abuses that are today threatening the personal liberty of many hard-working Americans. JOHN MCCLELLAN has won the gratitude and respect of all right-thinking Americans for the fearless and fair manner in which he has carried on his investigations. [Applause.]

In these days when Congress is fair game for everybody, no Member of Congress has done more to enhance public esteem of Congress as a champion of the human rights guaranteed by the Constitution than has Senator MCCLELLAN. [Applause.] And no man has done more to improve the understanding of the investigative functions of the Congress of the United States.

JOHN MCCLELLAN has shown a deep devotion to the Constitution and the free-enterprise system, and so all of us who love him and respect him and admire him applaud him for the great job he has done.

JOHN, [applause] this says: "Resolution and Tribute and Honor.

"JOHN L. MCCLELLAN, lawyer, statesman, and patriot, has devoted a quarter-century to the service of the people of Arkansas and of the United States—as prosecuting attorney, as Representative in Congress, and, the last 17 years, in the U.S. Senate. At 17, having passed the examinations, he was admitted to the Arkansas bar by special act of legislature.

"Among his notable achievements have been the adoption by Congress of many recommendations of the Hoover Commissions—on both of which he served with distinction; the enactment of community property income tax law; and the exposure of corruption and tyranny in labor unions, which deny the constitutional rights of union members. For 20 years he has been an advocate of flood prevention, and the development of the Nation's water resources.

"Courage and integrity, wisdom and suasive power have indelibly marked Senator MCCLELLAN's work for efficient government and for liberty—the sum total of human rights. He is Arkansas' most illustrious son.

"For the board of trustees, American Good Government Society, Burks Summers, president, and J. Harvie Williams, secretary, April 30, 1959."

JOHN, good for you. [Applause.]

SENATOR M'CLELLAN'S RESPONSE

Thank you, CHARLIE. I only regret that you couldn't have started that speech in the Senate, where I could have yielded all the time you want. You have been very generous with your flattery, and I, like all human beings and particularly Irishmen, like it when it is favorable. I wish you might have continued.

Mr. Toastmaster, President Summers, Admiral Strauss, distinguished guests, my colleagues, members of the society, my friends, ladies, and gentlemen, it is not merely difficult—it is just about impossible—for me to express the extent and depth of my appreciation for the high honor which you have so graciously conferred upon me here this evening. To say that I am happily surprised is a gross understatement.

Indeed, I can hardly reconcile this happening with reality, for it had never even remotely occurred to me that I had ever done anything to be worthy of the George Washington Award of your splendid organization or to be deserving of the enviable recognition which you have accorded me tonight. To be so honored by your distinguished society overwhelms me, and I take great pride in it and have a greater appreciation for it when I contemplate what this society stands for, the kind of government that it supports and approves, as has been so ably referred to here and been so ably described in the wonderful address we have just heard by my distinguished colleague, Senator GOLDWATER. [Applause.] This is indeed a marvelous tribute, and it is one that I shall always cherish and treasure.

I accept this notable award with profound gratitude and humility, but I cannot—and I do not—accept it in my own right and for myself alone. But I accept it for and on behalf of my family—for Mrs. McClellan, my loving wife and devoted companion, and for my precious and wonderful children. [Applause.] For, if I have ever done anything to deserve this, if my labors and my feeble efforts have in any way, even in the smallest measure, contributed to good government, the national security, and the public welfare, I readily and proudly acknowledge that the larger share of the credit is due them. Their faith and their abiding trust have constantly inspired and sustained me. Without their confidence and encouragement many, many times I might well have faltered and failed.

Then, too, I should like to accept this award in the name of my native State, the great State of Arkansas, and her people, whom I have the honor to represent in the U.S. Senate. [Applause.] Except for their suffrage, their support, and the trust that they have reposed in me, I could never have had the high privilege of serving or the opportunity to serve in the National Congress; and to them I am eternally indebted and thankful.

And may I say to you fellows, Governor, and all of our friends in Arkansas, I am happy indeed that you have come here tonight. You indeed honor me greatly. [Applause.]

When I meditate upon the affairs of state and reflect upon what constitutes good government, there comes to my mind a story that illustrates to me a great truth and one that maybe we should all relearn, observe, and remember. It is said that on one occasion a minister of a tiny country church asked a celebrated actor, who happened to be present in his audience, to render for the congregation the 23d psalm. The great actor readily agreed. He rose and in a most eloquent manner dramatized the beautiful passages of the 23d psalm. His efforts were an

overwhelming example of forensic oratory. But when he sat down, the minister turned to a humble parishioner, a man of simple words, and asked him if he too would recite the same psalm. The poor parishioner stood up, fully conscious of his plain clothes, his face weather-beaten, and his lack of training in the art of public speaking. But he began reciting, "The Lord is my shepherd * * *" and, as he continued, the congregation listened with consecrated attention. When he ended, there were tears in the eyes of the church members. They had been stirred and moved to a state of reverence and devout worship.

After the services, the minister asked the great actor why it was that the parishioners were more impressed by the words of the simple workingman than they had been by his. The great actor hesitated a moment, and then he said, "Well, I knew the psalm, he knew the psalm, but he also knows the author."

So we hold that governments are instituted among men to secure and maintain certain basic and unalienable human rights. Among those fundamentals that we foster, cherish, and seek to preserve are equality, liberty, and justice for all, under the authority of law that is derived from the consent of the governed, and not by dictatorial powers arrogated by men unto themselves. [Applause.]

If we are to have good government, these words, "equality, liberty, and justice," must have their meaning and be a part of our being. They must live in our hearts as well as in our minds. In short, we must "know the author," for I believe the indestructible principles embodied in these words, "equality, liberty, and justice," have upon them the divine seal, and that "good government" as our highest political aims has the approbation of His divine will.

I have heard my friend speak here this evening. His remarks and his address reminded us of the conditions that prevail in the world today and conditions that unhappily prevail here in our own country. They point out to us the gravity of dangers that may threaten us and the crises that may be impending. Since this is the 170th anniversary of the occupancy of the Presidency of the United States, I think it might be well for us, therefore, to reconsecrate and rededicate ourselves and our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor, to the preservation of the land that we love. That is what I shall try to do. Thank you. [Applause.]

The Modern Crusade of the Innocents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 20, 1959

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, in the near future, Congress by its action in either accepting or rejecting legislation to provide Federal grants to the States for education may well establish a policy which will be far reaching. In fact, historians of the future will probably refer back to this session of Congress and our decision on Federal aid to education as having an important influence on generations to come in America and what is in store for this Nation.

Recently, two Members of the other body with conflicting views discussed the subject, "Is Federal Aid to Education Necessary?" on the "American Forum of the Air." I have a transcript of this debate.

The Senator who was opposed to the Murray-Metcalf bill said it would lead to the Federal Government controlling the schools and in turn it would lead to the Federal Government prescribing the curriculum of our schools.

This Senator said: "When it does that, you've a dictatorship. That is the way Hitler and Mussolini arose in their countries."

The other Senator did not agree. Then he added, and these are his actual words:

"But even if it were true, I would suggest the possibility that it would be the lesser of the evils of not giving our children a decent education."

Mr. Speaker, I found this statement shocking, but even more disturbing to me is the way certain educators themselves ignore history. For example, all my friends in education agree with me and oppose Federal strings and control. Yet they are blind to history and will not see that it is impossible to remove control from the financing of schools. Japan is a good example of this power of the purse and central thought control. There before the war, organizations like chambers of commerce and of course all municipal functions of government were dependent for funds to exist from the Central Government, and why educators, of all people, would naively believe it would be different in America is beyond me.

The latest evidence of a misguided educator came to me in the form of letters forwarded by a teacher.

Hereafter is one of these letters which is typical of them all. After it, is my reply and the accompanying comment to the teacher. I think all three letters form a composite picture which recalls the Children's Crusade in Old World Europe. I wonder if unwittingly this 20th century Pied Piper could not be leading her innocent boy and girl students into oblivion and modern slavery. For myself, I do not consider such a risk the lesser of two evils and in all conscience I shall continue to actively oppose Federal control of our educational system.

These are the letters to which I refer:

The Honorable THOMAS M. PELLY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PELLY: Lately I have heard so many good things about you because you are such an outstanding man. So I am telling you from the bottom of my heart to please vote for schools, because we need your help for the Murray-Metcalf bill.

Now would you like to hear something about myself. I have two hobbies, horses and dogs. I have a dog called Susie.

My father works at Peter Thomas Co. My mother doesn't work.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., May 18, 1959.

DEAR THIRD GRADE STUDENTS: Your letters have reached me. When I was your age and in the third grade I went to Summit School. The same building still stands. It is at Union Street and Summit Avenue. Since I am a grandfather, you can tell it is getting to be an old building indeed.

Seattle, just like other places in the United States, needs new school buildings particularly I think to replace portables which get quite stuffy in winter.

The necessary money to construct such new schools and get good teachers of course must come from the citizens who live in Seattle, regardless of whether the city, the county, the State of Washington, or the Federal Government taxes these people to pay for them.

The Constitution of the United States does not call for the National Government to finance education and building of such schools. The Constitution of the State of Washington, on the other hand, accepts responsibility and guarantees an education to you and each other child in Seattle.

The reason our forefathers left education to the individual States was for fear of a dictatorship and a President of a king such as George III of England gaining control of our schools and telling each teacher what to teach. Thus Federal control could come about if special requirements were attached to accepting Federal money.

Before Pearl Harbor the people of Japan were under "thought control" made possible by financing of Japanese schools by the Central Government of Japan.

I have urged the Congress of the United States to recognize the needs of our schools and pass a law so as to have the Secretary of the Treasury send back a part of the income tax paid by each State to that State to be used for schools in the way each State decides it wants to use the money.

Your teacher told you and each member of your class to write me to vote for a different kind of a law. She has told you to tell me to support the Murray-Metcalf bill which would provide Federal grants to the States for use not only in constructing new schools but also for paying her and other teachers higher salaries.

I am sure she deserves better pay and I am sure your parents and the school board members elected to manage the Seattle schools want to increase it. As a matter of fact, if all property was valued and taxed properly and fairly in our State the problem would be simplified.

Many well-intentioned people are now urging Federal aid to education as a solution. But other equally well-intentioned people believe if the Federal Government once starts in granting money for teachers' salaries, its role will be expanded and new Government-selected books and other school needs will be added to these federally financed items. That will in time pave the way, some of us believe, to central control and the way opened for regimentation of all schoolchildren into one pattern of thought. History could repeat itself. We could have a Hitler in America under such a system.

I want you to know that your school and the education of every child in America is very important to me.

As the Representative in Congress of the northern part of Seattle and King County, which has had and will continue to have a huge increase in school population, I intend to do all I can to meet this problem without endangering principles that are basic to our way of life, such as the freedom from any form of "thought control," the right to think and make our own decisions free from any influence, kindly or otherwise.

I have two granddaughters attending McGilvra Grammar School. One is in kindergarten and one in the first grade. In a couple of years they will be in the third grade just like you are and I hope they too will be able to express themselves as eloquently as you have in your letters to me. It goes without saying that I want only the best in life for them, just as I do for you,

and I know this can be accomplished without jeopardizing our intellectual freedom.

Thank you for writing to me as you have.

Sincerely,

THOMAS M. PELLY,
Representative in Congress.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., May 18, 1959.

DEAR MISS: I am enclosing a single reply to the various letters from your third-grade students which you forwarded to me. I am sorry that I cannot talk to your class personally. Instead I hope you will act as my representative in reading the enclosed letter to them.

Children should take an early interest in civics and matters of concern to our country. However, in this instance I believe that perhaps unwittingly you have acted unwisely in using your third-grade students in what amounts to spreading propaganda for legislation in which you have a personal interest and the real implication of which obviously is over their heads. My reaction to their letters would be the same regardless of whether your students were urging support of or opposition to the Murray-Metcalf bill. I am sure you realize that many of the parents of the children attending our public schools are strongly opposed to Federal aid to education. Furthermore, while I do not impugn your motives, to me it is not proper to use children in this way.

The National Education Association, the Washington State Education Association, and on down through the various State and local groups, interested in and dedicated to the improvement and advancement of our educational system, perform an essential service in providing information. I value their help and although I am not always in agreement with the position taken by these various organizations and their representatives, I nevertheless appreciate their objectives and respect their point of view.

That I oppose Federal strings to school dollars is a matter of record. However, I am also conscious of the critical financial need facing our school system. It was in this connection that I initiated H.R. 4079, which would return a percentage of the Federal income tax to the various States to be used in any way those States themselves deem advisable, in the field of education and with no Federal controls of any nature.

Any other type of bill, it is my belief, could result in the Government censoring textbooks, so to speak, and occupying a seat on each school board in America.

I hope you will accept my letter in the spirit in which it is intended. The right to petition is in the Constitution, but this does not include the right of a teacher-guardian to use children in spreading propaganda.

Kind personal regards.

Sincerely,

THOMAS M. PELLY,
Representative in Congress.

States Should Be Reimbursed for Building Modern Highways

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 20, 1959

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to insert the text of a statement I submitted to the House Committee on Public Works in connection with its current hearings on legislation to reimburse States for expenditures incurred in the construction of roads which were subsequently incorporated into the Interstate Highway System. Among these measures is also my bill H.R. 6409, which I introduced on April 15, 1959. The text of my statement is as follows:

STATEMENT BY HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO, OF NEW YORK, TO THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS, MAY 19, 1959, ON H.R. 6303 AND H.R. 6409

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I appreciate this opportunity to present my views in support of the bill, H.R. 6303, introduced by the distinguished chairman of this committee, my own bill H.R. 6409 which is similar in content, and related bills. The purpose of all these bills is to equitably reimburse the States for toll and free roads which were incorporated into Interstate and Defense Highways of the Nation.

Several years ago Congress had authorized the construction of an interstate system of roads and highways of 41,000 miles extending into all parts of the country, in order to meet present-day highway needs as well as defense needs. This should have been undertaken several years earlier because of the growing needs. Some of our States had the vision and foresight to realize the immensity of our traffic and highway problems and they could not wait until Congress made up its mind. They were confronted with the problems and the only logical solution was to begin construction of roads.

This they did, and they built them well. The upshot was that in numerous instances these roads were later incorporated into the Interstate System and in these past few years they have been carrying a heavy traffic load. Let us not overlook the fact that those States which were the largest contributors to the Interstate System have the heaviest traffic demands and largest use.

Statistics show that a total of 10,954 miles built and financed by States have thus been incorporated into the Interstate System, and the cost of construction of these roads is given as more than $6 billion. The bills under consideration would reimburse the States for this expenditure, but less the States' share of the cost and less Federal payments already made. Thus, the total net reimbursable amount for all States would come to $4,295,600,000, which is roughly about 70 percent of the entire outlay. These reimbursements, however, are not to be made at once, but over a 15-year period, beginning with the fiscal year 1962.

As for my own State of New York, it had been allocated a total of 1,227 miles of roads under the 1956 Federal Aid Highway Act. New York, however, was one of those States that had the foresight to start building modern highways several years before the 1956 measure was enacted. New York took the initiative in the construction of such highways as the New York State Thruway and other roads, but it did so in the expectation that some sort of reimbursement would be made at some future date. In this way, New York was a pioneering State, it had spent about a billion dollars on the thruway alone.

Of the 1,227 miles allocated to New York, 658.2 miles of roads are financed through Federal aid and 568.8 miles were financed by New York State at a cost of $1,036 million. If the Federal Government had contributed 90 percent of the cost, as it has done for all interstate highway construction under the 1956 act, New York would have been entitled to receive $932,600,000 from the Government. Actually, New York received only $133,500,000, which means that it has a legitimate claim for the reimbursement of $799 million.

It is for this very reason that I introduced my bill. I feel that New York is justly entitled to this refund. In fact, 3 years ago when we debated the 1956 Federal Aid Highway Act on this floor, I stated at that time New York was already entitled to a reimbursement of $650 million and that it should not be penalized because it had the initiative to go ahead with its road program and could not wait until the Federal Government determined its course of action.

Mr. Chairman, the New York State delegation in Congress has nearly always shown consistency in support of legislation which is not only beneficial to our State, but to the Nation as a whole. We have never acted in a provincial manner despite the fact that the people of New York contribute nearly one-fifth of the tax collections of the Government. I, therefore, urge you to approve this bill and to reimburse each State to the share to which it is entitled.

Come to Oregon's Party

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHARLES O. PORTER

OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 20, 1959

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, my friend and colleague, Senator RICHARD L. NEUBERGER, has written a fine article entitled "Oregon's Big Birthday Party" in the Eagle for June 1959. No one knows better than DICK NEUBERGER how to sing the praises of Oregon.

I hope many of our colleagues and readers of the RECORD will have an opportunity to come to air-conditioned Oregon to join in the celebration of its 100th birthday. Under a previous consent I include the text of Senator NEUBERGER'S article:

OREGON'S BIG BIRTHDAY PARTY

(By RICHARD L. NEUBERGER)

(The author: U.S. Senator from Oregon, and a veteran member of Portland Aerie, FOE)

In that distant year when Hawaii celebrates the first centennial of its statehood, its Pacific Coast sister State of Oregon will be 200 years old. This is another way of emphasizing that 1959 marks the 100th anniversary of Oregon's admission to the Union. While activities celebrating congressional passage of Hawaiian statehood are dying down in the colorful islands, Oregonians are just beginning a festive year full of activities commemorating their admission day, which occurred on the eve of the Civil War.

Vacations on this last great frontier are always exciting, but Oregon, in 1959, is putting forth a special effort to make the tourist season a memorable one. Portland will be the site of a huge exposition and international trade fair from June 10 to September 17 and all Eagle Aeries in the State are participating in the promotion of this event. More than 50 foreign nations will submit exhibits.

Furthermore, such traditional Oregon events as the Portland Rose Festival, Ashland Shakespearean Festival, and Pendleton Roundup will be far more elaborate and extensive in tribute to the fact that Oregon has achieved the ripe old age of 100. Many gala events fight for attention on the crowded centennial calendar.

The Eagle who brings his family to Portland, the State's largest city, in June for the opening of the exposition and trade fair will be caught up in the Mardi Gras-like excitement of the famed Rose Festival. The favorite flower of the city of roses will be the featured attraction—from the new Zoological Gardens, where a miniature streamlined train winds through wooded hills around one of the West's most elaborate garden areas, to the grand floral parade downtown.

On the nearby white slopes of Mount Hood, the flower will be saluted in the Golden Rose ski tournament. Headquarters for this extraordinary climax to a spring celebration is Timberline Lodge. The only inn of its type in the Nation's 153 national forests, Timberline Lodge offers a host of attractions for the winter sports fan or casual visitor, including many examples of native Northwest Indian art, a new steam-heated swimming pool, and, of course, the spectacular ski runs.

July brings a wealth of rodeos and pioneer celebrations as rich as Oregon's western heritage. A variation on the cowboy theme is spotlighted in the Independence Day weekend Albany Timber Carnival. Daring birlers, who compete to stay on twirling logs in a millpond, and high climbers vie for world titles in skills of the industry that has been the bulwark of the Oregon economy.

The world-famous Shakespearean Festival draws crowds to the pleasant southern Oregon community of Ashland through August and early September as renowned performers display the Bard's works in authentic costumes and settings. Amid the rich wheat and cattle country of the broad eastern part of the State, real live cowboys and Indians delight small fry and oldsters alike in mid-September with one of the greatest of Wild West events, the Pendleton Roundup.

The list of festivals and celebrations, many of them sponsored or actively promoted by Aeries, runs to great length. Most of the events share a common debt, however. They are made extraordinary by, or even based solely upon, some aspect of Oregon's natural beauty. No matter how long the list of man-made spectacles, the State's awesome scenery goes the planning committee one better every time.

Numerous regattas and fishing festivals glorify the contribution of the sea to Oregon's picturesque coastal towns. No single celebration, however, can fittingly honor the magnificent 300 miles that a veteran Life photographer once told me was the most beautiful and spectacular of all the world's great seacoasts that he had ever photographed. Fortunately for Oregonians and visitors, every beach on the coast was reserved for public use by the farsighted action of Gov. Oswald West back in 1909.

It was at the northern end of this coast, near Astoria where the great and powerful Columbia River greets the sea, that Lewis and Clark spent the winter of 1805–06 after becoming the first Americans to venture overland to Oregon. The National Park Service is reconstructing their campsite as part of Fort Clatsop National Monument.

Farther down this unparalleled coast lie the vast Oregon dunes, towering billows of sand sheltering tiny clear lakes. I have recently introduced in Congress legislation to have the dunes area further preserved and developed for the public by giving national seashore status to them, and to the famed nearby Sea Lion Caves, where as many as 2,500 of the slippery animals frolic in underground caverns.

Spectacular as the coastline is, it must share honors with the mountain ranges that dominate virtually every Oregon horizon. The Skyline Trail threads along the crest of the Cascade Mountains, which soar as a north-to-south centerpiece. In northeastern Oregon, the Wallowas climb ruggedly from a high plateau, forming America's own little Switzerland around alpine meadows and lakes.

Widely traveled Justice William O. Douglas of the U.S. Supreme Court insists that the Wallowas are more beautiful than European topography to which they are so often compared.

The timbered slopes of Oregon's awesome mountain ranges drink deeply of western slope rains. As a result, many foaming streams rush to the ocean, daring anglers to capture the wealth of steelhead and trout their waters shelter. On the lower stretches of one such stream, southwestern Oregon's beautiful Rogue River, the entire family will enjoy a pleasant day's diversion, traveling from Gold Beach upriver to the little town of Agness and back in the boat that delivers mail.

Father will want to return to cast a fly in the swift Rogue's white water or troll for the big fellows on the bar at the Pacific end of the stream. All along the coast, mothers and children join fathers in surf fishing, a popular year-round, license-free sport.

In every corner of Oregon's abundant scenery—besides the smooth sands of a Pacific Beach, near a high mountain lake or next to a rushing trout stream—the visitor will find room for tents, trailers, or picnics in one of 164 well-kept State parks, more than any other State. Pleasant tourist cabins and motels are set conveniently alongside the good roads and highways.

The challenges of the great outdoors have made Oregon one of the last frontiers of America. But the pioneer spirit of the settlers who brought their belongings painfully to the new country by Conestoga wagon or Cape Horn steamer was not limited only to carving new livelihoods out of verdent forests and rich rangeland. The State has been a cradle for murderous political reform movements and leaders.

The progressive ideas in government long advocated by the Fraternal Order of Eagles find a hospitable reception in Oregon. Our State has been a leader in government reform. Oregon was the first to introduce the initiative and referendum, by which petitions may be used to place any proposal on the ballot for a plebiscite by the people. This machinery has been used to assure Oregon a high standard of old-age welfare and an educational system which ranks high in the Nation. Oregon, for example, was the first State to enact legislation providing maximum hours and minimum wages for women and children in industry.

Furthermore, Oregon led all other States in bringing about the direct election of U.S. Senators. Until Oregon elected a Senator by popular vote, Members of the Senate were appointed by the State legislature. This often encouraged corrupt deals and supremacy of special interests. After Oregon had made the breakthrough, the 17th amendment to the Federal Constitution soon followed, making mandatory the election of all Senators at the ballot box. The famed Senator William E. Borah, of Idaho, said Oregon's people were entitled to the credit for this major reform.

In Oregon the Eagles have found a fertile soil for all their principal causes. The State maintains high standards of health, and Aeries have collected generously of funds for the Damon Runyon Memorial Institute for Cancer Research. Only recently the National Institutes of Health made one of the largest grants in many years—$1,297,000 to be matched by a similar sum from the State—for a medical research center at the University of Oregon Medical School.

Jobs After 40 is also a popular undertaking in Oregon. Because the State has been a mecca for many people nearing normal retirement age, Oregon has a population sympathetic to legislation which would protect people from discrimination in employment due to their later years. The Eagles have accumulated the signatures of thousands of Oregon citizens who support the Jobs After 40 program. As a Senator from Oregon and sponsor of this proposal, I feel that I enjoy the support of most of my constituents in advancing the undertaking.

Many improved highways, supplemented by the State's own fine network of roads, will make it easier for the visitor to travel in Oregon, but the majestic scenery, which dominates all else, will continue to make it difficult for him to leave the State. Eagles who visit Oregon in this centennial year will find that out, and some of the State's Aeries may find their membership rolls fattened with transfer member when the year is over. Eagles, like other visitors, are only human.

Senator Kennedy's Remarks at United States-India Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHESTER BOWLES

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 20, 1959

Mr. BOWLES. Mr. Speaker, earlier this month on May 4 and 5, the Committee for International Economic Growth sponsored a highly significant conference here in Washington on the subject of "India and the United States, 1959."

References have been made previously here in the Congress to the contributions made at the conference by a wide cross section of outstanding commentators on Indian-American relations.

Among the most eloquent and effective of the speeches delivered at the conference was one entitled "The Bases of U.S. Interest in India—Its New Dimensions" by the distinguished junior Senator from Massachusetts, the Honorable JOHN F. KENNEDY.

Senator KENNEDY's interest and concern for the future of free India has been enormously heartening to all of us who feel as he does, that India's success or failure will determine the future of freedom in Asia.

In his conference speech, Senator KENNEDY demonstrated again, as he has on many occasions in recent years, a succinct and imaginative grasp of the economic, political, and strategic role of India in Asia. I think that speech admirably reflects the kind of leadership which Senator KENNEDY is devoting to this subject, both in his legislative capacity in the U.S. Senate, and in his outside contribution to public awareness of this vital question.

Under leave to extend my remarks I include the text of his speech as follows:

THE BASIS OF U.S. INTEREST IN INDIA—ITS NEW DIMENSIONS

(Remarks by U.S. Senator JOHN F. KENNEDY, Democrat, Massachusetts, Conference on India and the United States, 1959, sponsored by the Committee for International Economic Growth, Washington, D.C., May 4 and 5, 1959)

No struggle in the world today deserves more of our time and attention than that which now grips the attention of all Asia. I am not referring to the unhappy tide of events in Tibet, where the world is being

shown once again that man's eternal desire to be free can never be suppressed. Nor am I referring to the intermittent hostilities that endanger the Formosan Strait, or the truce lines in Korea and Indochina. I am referring to another struggle equally fierce but less obvious—less in the headlines but far more significant in the long run.

And that is the struggle between India and China for leadership of the East, for the respect of all Asia, for the opportunity to demonstrate whose way of life is the better.

The battle may be more subtle than loud—it may not even be admitted by either side—but it is a very real battle nonetheless. For it is these two countries that have the greatest magnetic attraction to the uncommitted and underdeveloped world. It is these two countries which offer a potential route of transition from economic stagnation to economic growth. India follows a route in keeping with human dignity and individual freedom, with only haphazard assistance from this country. Red China represents the route of regimented controls and ruthless denial of human rights, with considerable aid from the U.S.S.R.

It should be obvious that the outcome of this competition will vitally affect the security and standing of this Nation. But do we fully realize how it is coming out? Both China and India began their development efforts at about the same time—1950. They started with similar economic structures, similar standards of living and similar problems of skilled labor and natural resources. Actually India had some advantages—in transportation and trained personnel, for example.

But the harsh facts of the matter are that in the last decade China has surged ahead of India in most sectors of its economy. Its gross national output has expanded about three times as fast. In terms of industrial capacity, investment, education, and even household consumption China has slowly pulled up and now moved ahead. Its food production has nearly doubled, while India's has increased by less than 50 percent. By the most authoritative estimates, at present levels of agricultural growth, India will have by 1965 a food production deficit of over 25 million tons, a gap which cannot be filled by any foreign aid or domestic rationing program.

In steel production, China has moved from a position of inferiority to marked superiority. In 1950 China produced as much steel as Great Britain did in 1880. By 1958 China has moved to a point of productive superiority in steel to modern Great Britain today—and is making equal growth in coal and other major ingredients of national strength. Chou En-lai declared at the party Congress this past month: "It took us only 6 years to achieve in steel production what took Britain more than 50 years."

Since 1952 China has tripled the number of engineers and technicians in its industries and added 4 million workers to its skilled labor force.

Last year, China's rate of economic growth was at least three times as high as India's. Perhaps her official figures which claim to have doubled both agricultural and steel production may be discounted—but the fact remains that they are based on a hard record of fact compared to the sagging performance in India—and this is the record which has great appeal to those nations uncertain of which route they should follow.

Within the last year the Chinese have produced their first automobile. Within the next year they may have launched their first earth satellite. Even more seriously, they may well begin to take their place among the select company of nuclear powers. And perhaps equally significant for the future is the fact that China has become a major trading nation, not only in southeast Asia, where she is gradually supplanting Japan, but also in the growing trade movements to Europe and Africa. Indian primary products such as manganese ore and oilseed, for example, now suffer heavily as a result of China's price competition. Red China is now able to repay its loans from the Communist bloc, while India is not only in need of considerable further assistance, but has been forced to drastically reduce its foreign exchange reserves to meet its investment gap.

For the first time in modern history a government appears to have found a way—however brutal its human defects—which appears to solve the problems of large peasant underemployment and labor surplus. The mobilization of the unemployed mass of Chinese rural workers through economic communes, cottage industry, small pig-iron schemes and all the rest is an achievement whose political and intellectual impact in less developed areas is bound to be immense.

For the ambitious goals and growth of both the Russians and the Chinese are major political influences throughout the newly awakened world. The sturdy confidence of the Red Chinese is measured against the uncertainties of the Indian Government. The Chinese leader, moreover, boasts that within the next year China will make still further leaps into the future. He promises that the total value of agricultural and industrial output will rise by as much as 40 percent in 1 year. He hopes, for example, to raise coal output by 110 million tons in 1959 alone.

Even if these hopes cannot be fulfilled, in India—by contrast—targets are wavering. Hopes are set upon maintaining a real rate of growth of only 2 to 3 percent. This year the Indian population will rise. Increased agricultural output may not even feed the nearly 8 million new mouths of India's exploding population this year. It is in this setting that we consider this challenge, not by playing down and depreciating the very real physical achievements of China, but rather by determining to match these achievements in India by a real record of performance consistent with our ideals and democratic methods.

For the struggle is not over, and the potentialities for gain in India are still great. In the Chinese language, the word "crisis" is composed of two characters, one representing danger, and one representing opportunity. The danger now is clear. But let us also make the most of our opportunities. For if they are lost now, they may never come again.

India's population represents 40 percent of the uncommitted world. It is larger than the total populations of the continents of Africa and South America combined. Unless India is able to demonstrate an ability at least equal to that of China to make the transition from economic stagnation to growth, so that it can get ahead of its exploding population, the entire free world will suffer a serious reverse. India herself will be gripped by frustration and political instability, its role as a counter to the Red Chinese will be lost, and communism would have won its greatest bloodless victory.

So let there be no mistake about the nature of the crisis—both the danger and the opportunity. And let there be no mistake about the urgency of our participation in this struggle. It is not enough that we participate on a crash basis, for temporary relief. We must be willing to join with other Western nations in a serious long-range program of long-term loans, backed up by technical and agricultural assistance, designed to enable India to overtake the challenge of Communist China. The tool for this program can well be the Development Loan Fund.

I have joined with Senator FULBRIGHT in proposing that the operations of the Development Loan Fund be stabilized and its scale increased by placing it on a 5-year basis with authority to loan up to $1.5 billion a year. If by next year we can build up the resources of the Development Loan Fund to this level with assurance of continuity, then the United States will be in a position to exercise real leverage on the economic growth of the less developed countries and to give international leadership in the common efforts of the free world. We should embark on these reforms not at some indeterminate date in the future, but this year when there are real opportunities to seize.

Our assistance thus far has been limited to emergency aid to meet immediate crises and existing shortages. We have not met the requirements essential for long-range economic growth—nor have we alleviated the harsh realities which India faced a year ago. Her population continues nearly to outplace her economic development, her shortage of foreign exchange continues to increase, and a general loss of hope and morale continues to spread.

This is the critical year for India. This is the year when the second 5-year plan will prove to be either fruitful or futile. This is also the year when the third plan beginning in 1961 will be designed. This is the year, in short, when India must appraise her future and her relations with the rest of the world.

I do not say that India could not tread water for a few more years before going under. But this is the year the Indians need confidence that they can plan major efforts for long-range progress with some assurance of substantial, long-term assistance from the Western World.

Our aid should, of course, be based upon sound criteria and productive investment. But let us remember economies need time to mature. Our own Nation, in the days of its youth, sold railroad bonds to the British and other Europeans—and these were long-term—40- or 50-year—debentures. With the growth of our productive capacity, we gradually became a creditor nation with the ability to repay these foreign investments. There is no question that the Indians, given proper assurance and assistance, could do the same.

Many of the other governments in Asia and the Middle East are now balanced precariously on the wall of indecision between the East and West. Of course, an adequate program of aid to India is no magic persuader—nor is it a panacea for all of India's difficulties. There is no such solution for these tough problems. The barriers are great. The political and ideological dilemmas are many.

But I am confident that we can recover the initiative, that we can give a doubting world the realization that we—and not Russia and China—can help them achieve real stability and growth.

In short, it is our job to prove that we can devote as much energy, intelligence, idealism, and sacrifice to the survival and triumph of the open society as the Russian despots can extort by compulsion in defense of their closed system of tyranny. We can give a convincing demonstration that we have not a propaganda or crisis interest but an enduring long-term interest in the productive economic growth of the less developed nations.

This year, all over the Western World—and practicularly in an impressive Washington ceremony last month—we commemorate a notable anniversary, the founding of NATO. Whatever its handicaps may be today, this unique and historic association of free nations in a community of effort demonstrated that alliances can prosper on positive, as well as negative, goals.

Let us bear that decision in mind today. For, just as in 1949 the historic front was in West Europe, so in 1959 the gateway to fresh achievement lies in Asia. As Russia cast her ominous shadow across the horizon of our hopes during the last decade, so in the next

decade we must take measure of a new power—China, whose mounting strength is the cardinal political development of this area.

How will we meet the challenge of the next 10 years, between now and 1969? Will we be reminded of a lost journey which ended with the fall of Prague in the spring of 1939, or the new vitality of the democratic alliance which was formed in the spring of 1949?

The answer lies in part in congressional action, along the lines I have indicated, on the Development Loan Fund, our best tool for aiding long-range capital development. But the job should not and cannot be done by the United States alone. We need—as we needed 10 years ago—another historic effort in international collaboration—among the capital exporting nations in the world and India herself.

That is why Senator COOPER and I have recommended the creation of an international joint mission to India to work out with the Indians an accurate appraisal of their needs over the life of the third plan, to weave together the various aid programs of the Western nations, and to give both assuarnce and incentive not only to the Indians but to democratic leaders throughout the underdeveloped world, to demonstrate to them, and to enable them to demonstrate to their political followers, that there is a democratic way of achieving economic development as an alternative to the forced mobilization of men and materials. Once again, the free world can unite on a positive program with positive goals—instead of hanging together only out of fear of evils which we all oppose.

Coalitions of free states impose strains and sometimes handicaps, particularly in a period of peace and apathy. The allies of the U.S.S.R. and China, on the other hand, are rarely critical or uncooperative. They are at the very least silently, if grudgingly, submissive. But in a time of crisis, a free alliance finds unity and strength, even in the free exchange of ideas—while the Red satellites in a time of crisis are sources of anxiety, uncertainty, and trouble.

The situation in India is today a crisis, and it is an opportunity to demonstrate Western unity and strength. The moment is ripe for giving new meaning to the Atlantic Community and relating its peaceful enterprises to the aspirations of the uncommitted world. If the President and Congress give new momentum to our foreign assistance program, then we can expect with reason that the nations of the Common Market and the Commonwealth will also give realization to a larger effort of their own. Both the Secretary-General of NATO, Mr. Spaak, and the world spokesman of the Common Market, Mr. Monnet, have underscored in recent months that the great issues facing the member nations lie outside Europe and preeminently in the underdeveloped areas.

The creditor states of Europe are deeply involved in India's future, as are Japan and other potential members of this common enterprise. Our task now is to harness all of the resources of these nations more effectively, and to work out with the Indian Government the most effective method in participating in their developmental plans.

If the aid which India has received from all sources should remain at its current level, the increase in national income would barely outstrip population growth, bring no significant decreases in unemployment, increase the alarming deficit of food grains, and require sharp curbs on private enterprise in that economy.

If, however, foreign investment in India from all sources can rise to a figure of about $1 billion a year, then we can foresee with some confidence a growth in Indian income in the range of 25 to 30 percent as against a 10 to 12 percent growth in population. Unemployment might be reduced. Provided India takes vigorous measures of agricultural reform, food supply might finally outpace the increase of population, and the private sector of the economy would again reflect the dynamism which it exhibited at the end of the first plan.

But it is not enough merely to provide sufficient money. Equally important is our attitude and our understanding. For if we undertake this effort in the wrong spirit, or for the wrong reasons, or in the wrong way, then any and all financial measures will be in vain.

I have spoken here today about India's race with Red China. We want India to win that race. We want India to be a free and thriving leader of a free and thriving Asia. But if our interest appears to be purely selfish, anti-Communist and part of the cold war, if it appears to the Indian people that our motives are purely political, then we shall play into the hands of Communist and neutralist propagandists, cruelly distort America's image abroad, and undo much of the psychological effect that we expect from our generosity.

We ought to return to the generous spirit in which the original point 4 program was conceived; stress our positive interest in, and moral responsibility for, relieving misery and poverty; and acknowledge to ourselves and the world that, communism or no communism, we cannot be an island unto ourselves. That alone would do justice to the innately decent motives from which most Americans do support foreign aid.

There is considerable talk these days in Washington about distinguishing between military and economic assistance, and emphasizing the latter. I join in that endeavor, and consider it of major importance to the success of this program. But there are other distinctions which must be made—distinctions which are important to public understanding of the issues—and important to the self-respect and sensitivity of recipient nations.

Let us distinguish between lending a helping hand to countries—such as India—which are carrying forward their own development and, on the other hand, underwriting the entire economies of such vital but shaky areas as South Korea, Formosa, and south Vietnam. In one case, we are providing the all-important missing link in a total development effort, but in the other, capital development is only an incidental part of overall budget support.

Secondly, let us distinguish between aid shipments that are geared to the needs of the recipient countries, and those which are more geared to our domestic needs to dispose of agricultural surpluses. Certainly food shipments for famined relief in India and Pakistan are worth while, but where foreign needs and domestic embarrassments do not happen to coincide so nicely, we should not subordinate needs of the recipient country to our domestic political conveniences.

Finally, let us distinguish between foreign aid needed to prop up a faltering friend and aid which is part of a comprehensive, long-range foreign economic policy.

Foreign aid is important to most underdeveloped countries; but for some of them the real life-and-death question is markets for their export commodities; compared to that foreign aid receipts are often desirable incidentals. Many underdeveloped countries, if they had to choose between foreign aid and stable markets, would choose the latter.

The one-commodity nations, such as Bolivia and Ghana, are particularly affected by our business conditions and market policies, but even nations such as India are concerned about the economic cycle in this Nation, about our plans for commodity stabilization, and about our hopes for reciprocal trade agreements with more predictable tariff procedures.

All of this, by way of attitude and action, can be done, and must be done.

The free world cannot shame Russia and China into freedom, but it can inspire democracy to enrich its own freedoms. Freedom's banner will be vindicated or lost not by the test of military strength alone, but by the purity and passion of our commitment to democracy, by our dedication to the advancing hopes of new nations, and by our determination to provide that freedom can lift the haggard burden of poverty from desolate lands. We have not yet conquered the frontiers of fear. But neither have we yet fully explored the horizons of hope.

Slogan and Slowdown

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 20, 1959

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, in mid-April the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] addressed a Jefferson-Jackson Day banquet in the tri-city area of Pasco, Kennewick, and Richland, Wash.

Favorable reaction is still reaching my office from the searching and penetrating analysis given regional, national, and international issues in his address.

I request unanimous consent that Senator HUMPHREY's address of April 20 be printed in the RECORD.

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

ENERGY FOR ABUNDANCE—REMARKS OF SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, DEMOCRATIC DINNER MEETING, TRI-CITY AREA, WASHINGTON, APRIL 20

Here in this tri-city area you not only stand at the confluence of two great rivers, the Snake and the Columbia, but also at the crossroads of two great historical achievements in man's quest for energy.

Here you receive the benefits of electric energy created by falling water from the multipurpose Grand Coulee Dam on the great Columbia River.

And here you are helping to bring about the most phenomenal of the long line of achievements in the power field—the development of electricity created by atomic power.

One of our greatest needs in America today is energy and more energy—energy to fulfill the infinite needs of man and his environment—energy for abundance.

Why do we need so much power?

We need an ever-increasing supply of power just to maintain our present standard of living. We need it to keep pace with a rapid increase in population—a population which will reach some 260 millions by 1980.

We need an ever-increasing supply of power to support our Defense Establishment.

We need power to remove poverty here at home and increase economic opportunity for all.

We need power to extend a helpful hand to less fortunate neighbors abroad.

We need power to serve as a living example of what free men can do with science and industry.

Whether ultimately we take the road of fission via hydrogen or fusion via nuclear fuels; whether we get our usable electricity

by utilizing heat and turbines for electricity; or whether we achieve direct conversion of heat into electricity without the expense and waste inherent in the use of steam, we still must achieve an abundance of energy which should, in time, make all men free from the gruelling toil of our ancestors, the malnutrition and famine of our contemporaries.

Power is our first line of defense in the cold war.

When I look at the amazing growth in Soviet generating capacity, my biggest concern is that we keep ahead in the kilowatt race—far ahead.

Between 1945—the last year of World War II—and 1958 the total generating capacity in the United States more than doubled. Our total output of electricity almost tripled. This is good, but not good enough.

The generating capacity of the U.S.S.R. jumped from 10.7 million kilowatts in 1945 to 48.3 million in 1957—more than a fourfold increase. Output there rose from 43.3 billion kilowatt-hours to 210 billion—almost fivefold. According to Allen Dulles of the CIA, their output by 1965 will rise to 460 billion kilowatt-hours—more than double in about 8 years—more than 10 times as much as 20 years earlier. In the cold war and the threatened competition in the economic field it is slight comfort to be assured that in 1965 our capacity will still be more than twice that of Russia—when we have quadrupled our capacity while they have multiplied theirs by 10.

I do not take the doctrinaire position that all the electrical energy we need should be public power, or private power. The problem is not that our sources of energy be in private or public hands, but that there be enough of it at economical rates.

I do not want to be misunderstood. In the drive for abundant supplies of low-cost energy there is—there must be—a place for Federal development, for the Federal yardstick in both hydro and atomic power. There is a place for State and local public power systems where the people want them. There is and should be a big place for private enterprise, regulated as a monopoly and stimulated by public competition.

I am not the imaginary "whole hog" strawman at which Mr. Eisenhower shoots somewhat more than imaginary darts in the form of scare words. But I have no doubts whatsoever as to the benefits which would be lost should private monopoly in the power industry be freed from competition by public and cooperative electric systems.

I have no reservations whatsoever about the continued desirability of construction of public generation and transmission facilities and the marketing of Federal power under the preference clause. I say to my friends in the private utility industry: In an economy of abundance, particularly here in the Northwest with your tremendous power potential, if Federal development went forward as rapidly as it should, there would be an abundance of low-cost power for all—from the smallest little cooperative to the largest private power company.

In this country, since 1953, we have been living under the influence of an administration hypnotized by its own sloganmakers. You are all familiar with the expensive slogans of recent years: "Get the Government out of the power business." "Unleash private enterprise to develop the Nation's rivers at no expense to the taxpayers." "Partnership." "Abolish the Federal monopoly on atomic energy and let American private enterprise do the job." "Reduce expenditures." "Reduce taxes." "Enlarge loopholes for the great corporations through accelerated depreciation." "Balance the budget at whatever cost."

Here in the Northwest you have seen the fruits of this policy of slogan and slowdown.

In spite of everything we could do, the Idaho Power Co. has acquired the great Hells Canyon site at an immense cost to the Northwest in terms of flood control, low-cost power, phosphate development, industrial growth, and all of the benefits which would have flowed from that great project.

You have witnessed years of inaction in the authorization of vitally needed projects.

You have witnessed the appointment to the International Boundary Commission of men like Doug McKay—men who speak the same language as the interests that have jeopardized the longstanding international cooperation between the United States and Canada on the full development of the Columbia.

You have been acutely aware of the way in which Federal budget recommendations for power and river development have dropped almost from sight.

The Pacific Northwest has 40 percent of the potential hydropower in the United States and only about a quarter of this has been developed. There is nothing more essential to the well-being of this Nation—yes, and to its security—than that we get on with the task of pushing this development to completion.

You, we, the entire Nation have already lost the equivalent of one Bonneville Dam at Hells Canyon. This is a luxury we can ill afford—even though the Congress was able to force the administration and the Idaho Power Co. to disgorge the $365 million subsidy which the administration had granted to that company after it had pledged it would develop the middle Snake without a cent of the taxpayers' money.

It is time that we got about the business of harnessing the hydropower of the Northwest, increasing the irrigated lands to meet the needs of our growing population, controlling the destructive floods which threaten our lands, industry, commerce, and people.

If the psychology and slogans of the Eisenhower administration had been official policy in the old days, the Lewis and Clark Expedition would have been grounded in St. Louis for lack of funds; the Oregon Trail would have been closed to balance the budget; and the settling of the Northwest would have been postponed indefinitely as a threat to a stable dollar.

In 1954 the administration launched an all-out drive to give away the richest discovery in the history of man. That was the atomic energy program for which the Congress up to that time had voted something like $13 billion.

In Congress, because of the great leadership of your own Senators WARREN MAGNUSON and HENRY JACKSON, we were able to water down the giveaway. We were able to assert a preference right for nonprofit systems; we were able to write in an amendment permitting the Atomic Energy Commission to force the cross-licensing of patents.

But under our form of government, with its division of powers, the Congress—even when the Democrats have a majority—cannot govern the country. And the results of the great battle over the atomic energy program have not been heartening.

Year after year the Democrats in Congress have fought to get the money and Executive support necessary to carry out a crash program on atomic energy. We have been met with a numbers game on what was being accomplished, or planned, or daydreamed, or hoped for, ad infinitum. So that today we are lagging behind England and the Soviet Union in the development of atomic energy.

Last year under the leadership of your Senator JACKSON and Senator MORSE of Oregon, we authorized a dual-purpose reactor for Hanford, to produce both plutonium and electricity—700,000 kilowatts of electricity—two Bonnevilles. But the pressures against this reactor never cease. All we have so far is an installation under construction which can be made dual purpose, but the fight for the power part of the installation is still ahead of us.

There is still another battle we must somehow win. Senator JACKSON and those of us who support him have insisted that power from the Hanford reactor be fed into the Bonneville power grid where it can be utilized to its maximum to supply all of the people with low-cost power. But the Republican administration cannot see this proposal. Their vision stops at private utility stock market quotations.

The Republican administration is blind to the benefits of a giant power grid, which can tie together the generating facilities of an entire region.

The productive power of a modern industrial society is closely related to the cost per kilowatt-hour of electricity. And the economical production and transmission of electricity is inextricably tied to a "giant power" grid, envisioned a generation ago by Gov. Gifford Pinchot. In the Northwest the Bonneville power grid has given you the closest thing in the Nation, with the possible exception of the TVA area, to giant power. But we must build a power grid for the whole Nation which will enable us to tie giant atomic reactors to hydro and steam facilities so that the entire Nation may have the benefits of an abundance of low-cost power, supplied by public and private sources alike.

Taken as a whole, our power system is too much like our highway system 40 years ago. Some of you can remember the days when our highway system was largely a county and city affair. Even the paved roads—and there weren't many of them—looked like something kids in the first grade had drawn for fun. They were a few feet wide; they climbed any hill a team and wagon could climb; they zig-zagged around each farm or other obstruction, real or political. Adequate for a team and wagon, they were a challenge to even the model T and a positive threat to the occasional foolhardy spirit who wanted to push a White Steamer down them at 20 miles per hour.

We just could not have gotten very far into the 20th century with that kind of a highway system. So we did something about it.

But today the Nation's power grid is planned about as scientifically and with just about as much regard for the Nation's requirements as the counties planned highways 40 years ago. Part of the trouble—then and now—was inability of the local units to finance anything better. Part of the trouble—then and now—was an inability to conceive of anything that couldn't be seen from the window of a courthouse.

Our technicians can build a real power grid, and we can afford that kind of a power grid. We ought to have it. And we ought to have it soon.

Five hundred thousand kilovolt transmission lines which are only in the talking stage here are already in operation in Russia. The Russians are planning million-kilovolt lines with direct current transmission over which they can transport power 1,000 miles with only limited loss of energy. These lines will enable them to link giant hydro to giant thermal generators with the latter (if coal fired) built near coal mines. The economies of "hauling coal by wire" will be of great significance in achieving low-cost power.

In this great land peopled by "strangers from a thousand shores," we have moved mankind far in three centuries, blessed by immense natural resources and the greatest individual freedom of any industrial people in the history of the world.

Have we grown weary? Or old? Or afraid?

Are we prepared to lay down our burdens and give up our hopes and fall prey to our fears and distrust of each other?

I say "no," and I believe the overwhelming majority of our people say "no." Let us go forward, contending as we may over our honest differences and over our various vested interests, but let us have an end to fears and the slogans of stagnation and sterility.

The highest wisdom, it has been said, is to dare. I believe this and I believe you do, too.

Judge Murtagh's Book on Drug Addiction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 20, 1959

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, the problem of drug addiction remains a constant menace for our youth. Parents, teachers, welfare workers, civic leaders, and certainly legislators, have given much thought to this problem and possible ways for its solution. In March of this year I introduced a bill, H.R. 5304, to establish a Customs Enforcement Division in the Bureau of Customs to provide stricter enforcement of the antismuggling laws and thus put a stop to the smuggling of narcotics into this country. This would be a great help toward a solution.

The problem of solving drug addiction in the country and the treatment of drug addicts is, of course, a matter which should be solved primarily by our welfare workers, the courts, the enforcement agencies, and others who come in direct contact with the addicts and are thoroughly familiar with their problem.

A very interesting book on the subject has just been published, and I should like to call it to the attention of my colleagues, as well as to members of the judiciary, welfare workers, and others interested in the subject. The name of the book is "Who Live in Shadow," and its authors are Judge John M. Murtagh and Sara Harris. Some time ago they also coauthored a book "Cast the First Stone," which was an exposé of prostitution and the police approach to the problem.

Judge Murtagh is chief magistrate of the New York City Magistrates' Court. I have had the privilege of serving with him before entering Congress when I was a city magistrate in Brooklyn. He is an eminent jurist and a man who does not hesitate to express his views frankly and openly. These views are based in large measure on cases that have come before him or that he encountered in the course of his work on the bench.

"Who Lives in Shadow" is an exposé of another festering sore in American social life, drug addiction. Characterized as an inside view of the phantasmal world of "Narcotics, USA," its victims, racketeers, and police officers, the book uses vivid case histories of users and pushers of all ages and walks of life; and authentic, shocking information on the pathetically futile attempts to hunt dope smugglers and cure the addict. It is an angry, compellingly readable work of no-holds-barred dramatic journalism.

Stiff fines and long jail sentences are not the answer, the authors claim. They only make the unfortunate addict feel more like a criminal. Instead, the authors suggest that clinics be set up to provide hopeless users with enough drugs to keep them from turning to crime and degradation. Take the profit out of dope, they argue, and smuggling will be cut down to almost nothing.

"A punitive, prohibitory approach to the drug problem," the authors say, "has been the official policy of the United States for 40 years. No other country in the world has been so sadistic in dealing with addicts. Still there are more addicts in the United States today than in all Western countries combined, and more juvenile users in New York City than in all Europe."

The authors maintain further that the prohibitory approach as utilized by the Federal Bureau of Narcotics is in direct conflict with the law as stated by the Supreme Court of the United States. "There is nothing in the Harrison Act under which addicts are prosecuted," they say, "which precludes doctors from treating for addiction." Yet the Federal Bureau of Narcotics has, over the years, engaged in a reign of terror among physicians so that they have become intimidated and stopped treating addicts. Lawyers may interpret to doctors, as many of them do, the illegality of the Narcotics Bureau's position. But doctors can hardly be expected to rely on such opinions and to challenge the Narcotics Bureau. They would place in jeopardy their licenses to practice medicine. They would expose themselves to the risk of temporary detention or even prolonged incarceration. And even though ultimately successful, they would meanwhile have incurred the cost and experienced the harassment, humiliation and embarrassment inherent in criminal litigation.

"And so, despite the pronouncements of the Supreme Court, the law of the land tends to be obscured by bureaucratic policy that is contrary to law, and the medical practitioner is effectively prevented from caring for addicts. Addicts must therefore seek their succor from the underworld instead of from legitimate society. And, of course, the price that the underworld exacts from them is so high that they are practically mandated to become criminals. How, except through criminal activity, can people with $30, $40, $50 a day habits and no particular wealth or talent raise the money they need? And when they do what they are driven to, we prosecute them for their illness."

"The fact is," the authors say, "that addicts and petty pushers are practically the only ones being prosecuted today." The big moguls of the trade, who control importation and distribution, are neither caught nor stopped. In a way they must be grateful for the Government's single-minded attitude toward addiction. Our drug laws are immoral in principle and ineffectual in operation.

Calling for the Government to unshackle the medical profession, the authors cite the success of this approach in England. There they state that "there are less than 400 known drug addicts. In England, however, the words criminal addict are never heard. And doctors are allowed to dispense drugs to users and to treat them either in their own offices or in clinics."

But the authors add that due to our policy we must now go beyond mere permissiveness toward the medical profession and evolve more aggressive methods for coping with this illness.

Narcotic hospital facilities under Federal auspicies should be established in all large cities. These would institutionalize addicts for a period of at least 2 months, during which time they would be withdrawn from narcotics and exposed to a rehabilitative program, including contact with doctors, psychiatrists, social workers, vocational and recreational guidance personnel, and so forth.

After their release from the hospital, addicts would become outpatients in the clinical attachment of their hospitals. Efforts at rehabilitation would be continued, with the addicts receiving medical, psychiatric and social service. Those whose hospital withdrawal were successful would be treated without drugs; those who reverted after leaving the hospital and were proved to be in need of drugs, would get at cost the amounts their doctors prescribed for them. Gradual withdrawal would be reattempted with them when their psychiatrists judged the supportive therapy to have taken sufficient hold so that they could rely on it instead of the drug. Those who were considered "incurable" by the clinic professionals would be released from therapy while still receiving indicated dosages of their drug.

Aid to Tito: Proof That We Have No Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 20, 1959

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave obtained, I insert in the RECORD my remarks on the subject of "Aid to Tito: Proof That We Have No Foreign Policy":

In our foreign aid program there are admittedly cases where it is not easy to determine whether or not it is in our best interest to give aid, and if aid is to be given, to what extent and under what conditions. But there are cases where it is absolutely beyond any doubt that the aid given is not benefiting the United States, but is being used against us. At the top of this list is the case of aid to the Yugoslav Communist dictator, Tito.

The plain and incontrovertible facts of the Tito case are these:

First. That he never was, nor did he ever pretend to be anything else but a Communist, dedicated to the victory

of Communist imperialism in the world.

Second. That, according to his own admission, his foreign policy has never changed, but remains the same before and after his break with Stalin—June 28, 1948.

Third. That before that so-called break, during the break and after the reconciliation with Moscow—June 1955—Communist Yugoslavia constantly and unchangeably voted in all questions of any substance with the Russian Communist bloc, against the United States.

Fourth. That the internal regime of Communist Yugoslavia has remained the same, and was not in the least affected in any democratic sense by the huge aid which Tito has received from the United States.

Fifth. That only recently Yugoslavia nationalized—i.e., confiscated—all real estate in Yugoslavia with the explanation that Communist Yugoslavia's road was clear and it clearly led to communism. Therefore, private property had to disappear.

Sixth. That Tito repeatedly declared that he was using all the aid from the capitalistic West to build socialism—communism—in Yugoslavia.

Seventh. That Tito time and again declared that there was not and could never be any democracy or freedom for the enemies of communism in Yugoslavia.

Beyond all this, Tito has played and is playing an exceptionally important part in the Communist conquest of Asia. In November 1957 Vice President NIXON called public attention to the decisive role which Asia will play in the final outcome of the contest between human freedom and communism in the world. He then said that if the Communists succeed in winning control over Asia and the Middle East, they will win. Unfortunately, we are not far from that critical point and the man who played the key role in the conquest of the minds of the Asian people for communism is Tito.

How is it possible, in view of this record, that there are still people to tell us that it is in the interests of the United States to help the ruthless tyrant of Yugoslavia and that such is still the foreign policy of the greatest democracy in the world? Let us briefly examine the arguments of the adherents of our aid-to-Tito policy. They can, briefly, be summarized as follows:

First. That Tito is a Communist, but different and independent from Moscow.

Second. That Tito is, moreover, waging political warfare against the Russian Communists and Red Chinese.

Third. That he will, in case of war, be neutral or may fight on our side and, finally,

Fourth. That the people in Yugoslavia have accepted the regime and have reconciled themselves to living under communism.

In reality, all these assertions of Tito's propaganda, skillfully served to gullible Westerners by Communist agents in the free world, have no basis whatsoever in facts.

The fairy tale of Tito's independence was concocted by Yugoslav Communist propaganda and further spread by those who wish to help Tito, not to help the United States. From the first opportunity—Danube Conference in August 1948—after the Stalin-Tito rift until the present, Communist Yugoslavia has adopted the same attitude as the U.S.S.R. on all issues with which world communism is vitally concerned. What kind of independence is it that implies no important differences, but complete identity and conformity with the Russian plan for world conquest? At the VII Congress of the Communist Party of Yugoslavia—April 1958—the Yugoslav Vice Premier, Edward Kardelj, summed up his explanations about Yugoslav foreign policy by saying that "it can be understood only if one bears in mind that Yugoslavia is a Communist country and that its fate depends on the fate of communism in the world."

As for the dissension and feuds between Tito and Moscow and Peiping, they are not completely faked, which means that they are not just staged for the sake of fooling the West. They differ on nonessentials but they all agree on the plan for communism to dominate the world. But, on the other hand, the importance and consequences of those battles of words are no mystery, since Tito and others have often spoken about them and precisely defined their nature. The most outspoken was Edward Kardelj, the chief theoretician of the Yugoslav Communist regime, who said, May 5, 1959, that the differences between Yugoslav Communists and other Communists were "only the expression of the contradictions which are proper to the whole socialist development, that is which do not represent any national specific trait of Yugoslavia." He also laid full emphasis on the fact that the differences were not due to any nationalism on the part of any Communist, nor on any difference of dogma. Finally, he stressed that the Yugoslav Communists were "consistent not only in the building of socialism—Communist—but in the defense of the principle of Socialist—Communist—solidity."

In the light of these facts and Tito's solemn statement in Stalingrad—June 1956—that Yugoslavia would march shoulder to shoulder with the Soviet Union in peace and in war, there is no need to refute the willful and vile contention of Yugoslavia's neutrality in case of a war. The full cooperation between the Yugoslav submarine base in Boka Kotorska and the Russian submarine base in Sasseno—Albania—as well as the Russian-Yugoslav identity of opinions on the creation of the Khrushchev-sponsored zone of peace in the Balkans and the Mediterranean must be explained out of existence before any responsible Western statesman would dare to hope that Yugoslavia would stand in our camp in case of war. Incidentally, there are recent reports that the Russians are building in Kocevje, in northwestern Yugoslavia, a long-range missile launching site. It would certainly pay to investigate this news before giving a single dollar to the Communist oppressor of 18 million human beings in Yugoslavia.

Finally, the claim of the pro-Tito clique among our American opinion makers, that Tito's communism is different and more democratic and thus made acceptable to the people of Yugoslavia, is shattered by the findings of the Zellerbach Commission on Refugees, which issued recently a comprehensive and carefully documented report on the problem of refugees in Europe. In this report the Zellerbach Commission stated that Yugoslavia is the main refugee producing country in Europe. In the last 2 years nearly 40,000 people have escaped from the democracy of Communist Tito.

In view of all these fundamental and irrefutable facts, the policy of aid to Tito is absolutely indefensible. There is not one reason for continuing that policy and there is every reason for immediately putting an end to it. Our present policy of aid to Communist Tito is a policy of national suicide. Khrushchev warned us a year ago in a public statement that the Communists would bury us. By helping Communist Yugoslavia we are hastening the process of our own destruction, helping the spread of communism in the world and thus digging the graves for ourselves, for our children, and for our children's children.

Foreign Trade and Aid: Profit or Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. DENT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 20, 1959

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, the May 11, 1959, issue of the report—American Investments Abroad—gave a few details on governmental policies which are undermining America's strength in the world, policies which are sold to the public as necessary to build our strength.

Policies of the Federal Government have saddled American industry and workers with so much redtape and expense that other nations have begun to equal us in productivity. Many American industries are closing their American operations and building plants overseas, thus creating employment and greater productivity abroad. Governmental policies are making Americans dependent on foreign factories for some goods which America once produced in greater quantity than all other nations combined. Foreign aid programs, taxing American industries to build rival industries abroad. Even the Soviets have begun to capture some of free-enterprise America's foreign markets.

Governmental programs which encourage or force American business to invest and build abroad instead of in America, coupled with foreign aid which reduces production costs in foreign nations while increasing them in America, have caused a dangerous flight of our gold reserves to foreign countries—and the depreciation of American currency throughout the world.

Yet, in 1959, the two programs which the administration exerts the most effort for are the two which will make matters worse: (1) Continuation of foreign aid and (2) special tax and other benefits for Americans who pull up stakes in America and invest abroad.

On May 3, 1959, the New York Times devoted an entire section to the World Trade Fair to be held at the Coliseum in New York, beginning May 8. The Times said:

Manufacturers and producers of raw materials in North and South America, Europe, Asia, and Africa will compete for a share of the world's wealthiest market, the United States.

The amount of (textile) goods coming into America from abroad seems to be increasing, chiefly because countries that previously did not ship here are stepping up their exports.

In 1958, total imports of cotton goods amounted to 143,290,000 square yards, an increase of 16 percent, compared with 1957. And this year there is a rising trend of imports from Hong Kong and Korea.

Both India and Pakistan have received orders from importers here for substantial quantities of sheetings and drills at prices somewhat below those quoted by American manufacturers.

Japan is still by far the largest exporter of cotton goods to the United States. In fabrics alone, the Japanese exports here in 1958 totaling 105,220,000 yards comprised 70 percent of all imports. In addition it is estimated that Japan shipped an additional 130 million yards of cottons in the form of shirts, dresses, and other apparel items.

This year, imports from Japan are expected to be even larger. Japan has negotiated successfully for an increase in its voluntary quota of cottons shipped to the United States.

The Japanese have contended that the previous 235 million yard quota in the form of fabrics and apparel is not "realistic" in the light of its growing industry and reciprocal purchases of raw materials.

Last week, it was announced that the quota had been increased, with the consent of the State Department, to about 247 million yards.

One reason for the remarkable growth of the Japanese textile industry is American foreign aid, building in Japan, at American taxpayers' expense, great plants with modern equipment, superior to what American manufacturers can afford, after paying taxes to help finance fine plants for their Japanese competitors. Another reason is the lower labor costs and taxes in Japan.

The phrase about Japan's "reciprocal purchases of raw materials" is a deception. It implies that, whereas Japan may be capturing our domestic market for finished goods, she is a good customer for our raw materials. What raw materials? Cotton. Japan is using American cotton, because our Government—under the agricultural surplus disposal program—is making American cotton available to Japanese manufacturers at prices lower than American manufacturers have to pay for the same cotton. In fact, our Government sells American cotton to Japan—for Japanese currency, which we spend in Japan to stimulate the Japanese economy—for less than what the cotton actually costs the American taxpayers who—under the Government's domestic farm programs—must buy the cotton from American farmers and put it in storage, or dispose of it abroad, in order to keep cotton prices high in America.

But the American State Department approves of an arrangement to import even more Japanese goods, because this arrangement is more "realistic" for Japan.

It seems quite impossible for American officialdom to consider, ever, what is realistic for America.

A U.S. Senate subcommittee which studied the problems of the American textile industry—under the chairmanship of Senator JOHN O. PASTORE—found that the textile industry is suffering from foreign competition, but said it does not want to change the Government's foreign trade policy.

The Senate subcommittee said:

We do not suggest that our foreign trade policy has been the only cause of the loss of textile jobs, but we do point out that an industry faced with declining job opportunities feels the impact of rising imports more than an industry which is expanding its output and employment.

Thus we recommend that in the administration of our foreign trade program, every effort be made to channel imports into those markets which can most easily absorb production from abroad.

As a guide to positive action, these remarks from PASTORE's committee are, obviously, meaningless. But the attitude they reflect is clear, and significant. What they say, in effect, is: "Let's try to switch some of the unfair foreign competition—unfair, because it is subsidized by American taxpayers—to other American industries, as a possible means of giving the American textile industry a breather, but leave us not change Government policies which are undermining the whole American economy."

This is the personal political weakness that has caused the present condition. New people in public life who are afraid of what someone calls public opinion.

The real public opinion is that of the displaced American worker, his family, his creditors, and soon his local merchants who will have shelves full of foreign goods and streets full of American unemployed.

There is information on other American industries which are in trouble too. The New York Times said:

American makers of transistor portable radio sets may import Japanese receivers for the first time this year, and sell them here under well-known domestic brand names.

The move would be an application of the old saw: "If you can't beat 'em, join 'em." Domestic producers have watched their share of the market dwindle alarmingly and * * * Japanese portables climb more than 200 percent in the last 2 years.

Another Japanese threat to American producers in the near future lies in truly portable television sets.

Although portable radios are the only imported products that are actually nosing American electronic home instrument producers out of their own market so far, the West Germans and Japanese are penetrating here with other devices.

Imports are cutting a wide swath in the U.S. market in home furnishings. Domestic carpet producers are becoming increasingly worried about the rising sales here of carpets from Belgium. American mills also are uneasy about the success of carpets made in Japan.

Dinnerware continues to be a thorn in the side of domestic producers, as Japanese, West German, French, and other foreign makers of dishes, cups, and saucers maintain or increase their already substantial share in the market.

On May 1, 1959, Henry J. Heinz II, U.S. delegate to the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe, meeting at Geneva, told the U.N. Commission that U.S. exports of goods and services to Western Europe totaled $6,800 million in 1958, a decline of $1,200 million from 1957; and that U.S. imports from Western Europe totaled $7,200 million in 1958, an increase of $300 million over 1957.

Mr. Heinz said:

American consumers are tending to spend an increasing portion of their income on those types of goods which European producers are especially well fitted to supply.

This overall trade development—declining production in America, increasing production in Europe—is, Mr. Heinz told the U.N. gathering, "warmly welcome" to the American Government.

What goods are European producers "especially well fitted to supply" the American market, and why are they well fitted?

A survey published in the June 1, 1959, issue of the U.S. News & World Report provides some answers. Here are excerpts from the survey:

The United States through purchases abroad, has made available $190 billion in postwar years. Add that sum to the $107.9 billion in gifts and loans and private investments, and the total becomes $297.9 billion.

What has the outside world done with its $297.9 billion? Those dollars have rebuilt industries and cities. They have been used to purchase the latest in American machinery and to acquire the highest skills with which to make industry abroad fully competitive with American industry. At the same time, nations receiving the billions have used $11 billion to add to their financial reserves in gold and dollars.

This country today finds itself challenged by those it helped.

The American dollar, once a proud currency—the strongest in the world—now is selling at a discount in terms of some foreign currencies. Rumors in the financial centers of Europe are that the dollar may have to be revalued—depreciated in relation to gold. The dollar scarcity that alarmed planners not many years ago has been turned by U.S. generosity into a superabundance of dollars in Europe.

Gold is flowing away from the United States as some countries turn their immense reserves of dollars into gold. Foreigners at this time hold claims to $12.7 billion of the 20.3 billions of gold in the U.S. stockpile. If these foreigners ever exercise those claims, this country could find itself in a severe financial squeeze applied by those who enjoyed so much U.S. generosity.

Goods from abroad are coming into the United States to capture more and more markets. The industry that United States spent billions to revive and that U.S. industry helped to teach efficient mass production is able now to undersell its teachers in a growing number of fields.

In 1958, the industry of West Europe, prostrate 10 years earlier, produced more steel than the United States produced. As many trucks are being produced in Europe as here. Europe's industry last year built 1.9 million new dwellings, or far more than United States. Japan today is producing at double the prewar rate, thanks in part to American aid.

The industry abroad, that American aid did so much to revive, often is able now to undersell the products of American industry both in this country and outside. Many

nations receiving aid from the United States are keeping up their barriers against American products.

So enticing is the prosperity of the world outside the United States that American investors are sending more than $3 billion of private capital abroad each year for investment. A growing number of American companies are entering the foreign field, often to produce goods not only for markets abroad but for sale back in the United States.

All of this is part of the story of success that has grown from American generosity in postwar years. That generosity, in fact, has been so great that it accounts, in part, for the inflation within United States that is making it more difficult for this country to hold its competitive position in the world.

In addition to supplying dollars of aid, the United States has undertaken the principal burden of defense for the non-Communist world. * * * Americans are assuming this burden with no apparent complaint. This country's allies—now strong industrially—are not assuming equal burdens in the defense of the free world.

This survey did not point out what every one with a grain of sense knows; namely, that all of the defense of the free world which we are ruining ourselves to pay for does not provide any defense. We have neglected the vital defenses of our homeland to provide rich loot abroad for the Communists to take over.

On May 25, 1959, a Wall Street Journal editorial said:

An important shift has taken place in the U.S. economic position in the world. * * * foreign subsidiary operation by U.S. firms * * * is multiplying at an accelerating rate. U.S. brand-name goods are now manufactured all over the world. The United States is gradually pricing itself out of the world markets.

Here is what faces many an American business: It cannot make its product here and compete in world markets with the Germans, the British, or the Japanese. The alternative is a drastic reduction in its business or the export of some of its capital resources to another country, the erection of a plant there and the development of its worldwide business from a foreign, not a U.S. base. * * * All around us our economic position in the world disintegrates.

In a remarkable series of public statements in the latter part of April 1959, President Eisenhower said:

First, that inflation is a dreadful threat to the American economy.

Second, that he is making an all-out fight for a balanced budget because a sound dollar is the foundation of America's defense.

Third, and that all American businessmen should work tirelessly to obtain public and congressional acceptance of the President's recommended $3.9 billion of new foreign-aid appropriations for this year.

Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY predicts that the Soviets will soon start pushing America out of world markets in agricultural goods. HUMPHREY's remedy is to enlarge the program which will make this possible. He wants bigger and more extravagant Federal farm programs, which build agricultural surpluses that are so high-priced they cannot be sold even on the domestic market, much less on the foreign market. HUMPHREY wants to increase our program of giving agricultural surpluses away abroad. Satisfy the world demand for agricultural goods by giving ours away, and we will eliminate those markets that the Soviets are going to take away from us.

On May 22, 1959, at a time when every literate person on earth knew that America is in grave danger because inflation, caused primarily by policies of Government, is driving American capital and American gold reserves abroad, causing a relentless shift of industrial and economic strength from America to other nations, Mr. Henry Kearns, Assistant Secretary of Commerce, made a speech in Dallas, to a gathering celebrating World Trade Week.

Mr. Kearns urged U.S. businessmen to invest their money abroad, and recommended legislation, pending in Congress, to give special tax treatment that will encourage American capital to flee overseas.

Will the end result be peace or chaos?

Your knowledge of the situation, fellow Members, is greater than mine since most of you have been here longer than I.

However, my guess is that we are breeding world discontent, fostering false and misleading hopes in our friendly allies and in the end the American people will end up disliked, distrusted, disillusioned, and at a tremendous disadvantage.

We will have to face up to a realistic revenue problem. Our basic tax is the income tax with the large part paid by individuals and limited corporate percentages. As we continue our foolish and dangerous course, we will have less and less personal and corporate income to tax. Will we then shift to consumer taxes completely?

SENATE

THURSDAY, MAY 21, 1959

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

Almighty God and Father of all mankind, whose paths are mercy and truth, we come with all our fallible judgments, that in Thy light the immediate might be set in the wide horizons of abiding verities.

We would test our thoughts and words and deeds, not against the faulty background of our fellows, but with our eyes upon the transparent glory of the crystal Christ.

In these dangerous and disturbing days sober us with a solemn sense of personal responsibility, and that Thy call to each one of us is to contribute to the world's good, our own life, strong, clean, honest, trustworthy, and serviceable.

As Thy servants and the people's in this temple of democracy, save us from any perversion of the power that has been entrusted to our hands.

"If, drunk with sight of power, we loose
Wild tongues that have not Thee in awe—
Such boasting as the Gentiles use
Or lesser breeds without the Law—
Lord God of Hosts, be with us yet,
Lest we forget—lest we forget!"

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, May 20, 1959, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

REPORT ON PARTICIPATION IN WORLD SCIENCE PAN-PACIFIC EXPOSITION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The VICE PRESIDENT 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:

Pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 85-880, providing for participation of the United States in the World Science Pan-Pacific Exposition to be held at Seattle, Wash., in 1961, I am transmitting herewith the report required under section 5(a) of that act.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *May 21, 1959.*

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

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

H.R. 7007. 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; and

H.R. 7175. An act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and Farm Credit Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills and they were signed by the Vice President:

H.R. 147. An act to suspend temporarily the tax on the processing of palm oil, palm-kernel oil, and fatty acids, salts, and combinations or mixtures thereof;

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

H.R. 4282. An act to supplement and modify the act of May 24, 1828 (6 Stat. 383, ch. CXII), insofar as it relates to the corporate powers of the Sisters of the Visitation of Georgetown, in the District of Columbia;

H.R. 4597. An act to provide for the training of postmasters under the Government Employees' Training Act;