EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Wisconsin "Tops" Soviet Union in Cheese Production

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, August 29, 1959

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, during these days when the Soviet Union is experiencing growing pains, in the economic, military, scientific, and other fields, we receive repeated reports of bragging about their program.

Among these claims, for example, is that they have made a 500 percent increase in production over pre-World War years of a product for which my home State is famous, that is, cheese.

At this time I want to set the record straight.

Now, it may well be true that they have increased cheese production 500 percent. However, the real facts in cheese production illustrate that my home State of Wisconsin—with only about 2 percent of the population of the Soviet Union, far out-produces the Soviet Union in cheese.

In 1958 the Badger State output amounted to 280,000 metric tons of cheese; by comparison, the production of the Soviet Union totalled only about 150,000 metric tons, approximately 23 percent of the cheese production in the United States.

For a further comparison of cheese production—in which Wisconsin "tops" the Soviet Union—I ask unanimous consent to have the text of a release issued today printed in the RECORD.

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

WILEY HAILS WISCONSIN CHEESE OUTPUT AS SYMBOL OF FREE ENTERPRISE TRIUMPH OVER COMMUNISM; WISCONSIN WITH POPULATION OF 3.8 MILLION PRODUCES ALMOST TWICE AS MUCH CHEESE AS SOVIET UNION, POPULATION 208 MILLION

Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, Republican, of Wisconsin, ranking Republican member on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, today hailed Wisconsin's record of out-producing Russia in cheese as a symbol of triumph of free enterprise over communism.

"Currently, the Communist leaders brag about the stepped up production of consumer goods under their system. The Soviets are advertising the fact that their cheese production is up 500 percent since the pre-World War years. The fact is, however, that the State of Wisconsin, alone, now producers almost twice as much cheese as the whole Soviet Union. In 1958, the Badger State output amounted to 280,000 metric tons of cheese; by comparison, the production of the Soviet Union totaled only about 150,000 metric tons—approximately 23 percent of the cheese production in the United States. For further comparison, Russian cheese production amounts to 1.6 pounds per person, while the United States production amounts to 8 pounds per person—according to statistics released earlier this month by the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization.

"Globally, the production of cheese between the years prior to the Second World War and 1958 increased about 70 percent. During this same period, American cheese production more than doubled and the United States tops the list of cheese producers. Next in importance are France, Italy, the Federal Republic of Germany, the Netherlands, the Soviet Union, Denmark, and Switzerland.

"Although the United States is the world's No. 1 cheese producer," the Wisconsin Senator pointed out, "statistics illustrate that the consumption of cheese in some countries far exceeds that in the United States. Here the per capita consumption is approximately 8.5 pounds. This compares poorly with higher consumption of 19.5 pounds in Norway and 18.7 pounds by the Swiss (who were the pre-world war champions but are now outperformed by the Norwegians).

"Consequently, the United States still represents a large untapped market for the cheese industry. If the challenge of increasing consumption can be met successfully and will result in a per capita increase, this should substantially brighten the outlook for the American cheese industry. This should be particularly important to Wisconsin since it produces about 44 percent of all American cheese.

"The cheese consumption figures for the United States illustrate that what may be considered a luxury in Russia is everyday diet in this country. In the United States, a pound of hard cheddar cheese sells for about 58 cents, which would mean that an average industrial worker would have to put in about 16 minutes of work to buy a pound of cheese. In Moscow, a pound of the cheapest hard cheese sells for 11 rubles, and comparatively, would require 2 hours and 34 minutes of work.

"In attempting to show that the lot of the Soviet workers is not inferior to that of the American working class, the Communist leaders have denied that the American automobiles, the American home, and the American goods exhibited in the Moscow fair can be afforded by the typical American workingman. As usual, the Soviets are unlikely to accept our superiority in production or our ability to better provide the people's needs. Therefore, although I am not in favor of an 'open arms' welcome for Khrushchev when he comes to this country, I would be happy to send him some samples of Wisconsin cheese, which any American can afford, to help him find out for himself what the advantages of free enterprise are, and what the life and diet of an average American are like," Senator WILEY concluded.

SENATE

MONDAY, AUGUST 31, 1959

Rev. W. Vaughan Moore, associate pastor, Mount Vernon Place Methodist Church, Washington, D.C., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, Father of us all, give us grace to approach Thee at this time with penitent and believing hearts.

Enlighten our understanding with knowledge of right, and govern our wills by Thy laws. Grant us calmness and control as we face uncertainty and anxiety; let our hearts stand fast, believing in the Lord. Give us the right judgment to discern between values visible and values spiritual.

May the sense of our relationship to Thee fill us with a saving self-respect.

May our country be great in righteousness, wisdom, and peace; may its strength be used honorably for the good of mankind.

And, now, Holy Father, bless each Member of this august body. Accept our eternal gratitude and thanks for watchful care over our loved ones here or there, and gather each on to Thy lap; keep them with us so close to Thee that we can feel the warmth of Thy presence and the coolness of Thine assurance.

Dear Lord and Father of mankind,
Forgive our foolish ways;
Reclothe us in our rightful mind,
In purer lives Thy service find,
In deeper reverence, praise.

Drop Thy still dews of quietness,
Till all our strivings cease;
Take from our souls the strain and stress,
And let our ordered lives confess
The beauty of Thy peace.

In the name of God, the Father; God the Son; and God, the Holy Spirit. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Saturday, August 29, 1959, was dispensed with.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, under the rule, there will be the usual morning hour; and I ask unanimous consent that statements in connection therewith be limited to 3 minutes.

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

POSITION ON YEA-AND-NAY VOTE

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, on the yea-and-nay vote taken on Friday, August 28, 1959, I was absent from the Senate on official business. I desire to state for the RECORD that on the call of the roll which appears on page 17337 having to do with the recess of the Senate, had I been present I would have voted "yea."

CALL OF THE ROLL

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

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

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Beall	Butler
Allott	Bennett	Byrd, Va.
Anderson	Bible	Byrd, W. Va.
Bartlett	Bush	Capehart

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

Carlson	Hennings	Moss
Carroll	Hickenlooper	Mundt
Case, N.J.	Hill	Murray
Chavez	Holland	Neuberger
Clark	Humphrey	Pastore
Cooper	Jackson	Prouty
Cotton	Johnson, Tex.	Proxmire
Curtis	Johnston, S.C.	Randolph
Dirksen	Jordan	Robertson
Douglas	Keating	Russell
Dworshak	Kennedy	Saltonstall
Eastland	Kerr	Schoeppel
Ellender	Kuchel	Scott
Engle	Langer	Smith
Ervin	Lausche	Sparkman
Fong	Long, La.	Stennis
Fulbright	McCarthy	Symington
Goldwater	McClellan	Talmadge
Gore	McNamara	Thurmond
Green	Magnuson	Wiley
Gruening	Mansfield	Williams, N.J.
Hart	Martin	Williams, Del.
Hartke	Morse	Yarborough
Hayden	Morton	Young, N. Dak.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I announce that the Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. MCGEE], the Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] are absent on official business attending the Interparliamentary Union Conference at Warsaw, Poland.

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] is absent on official business attending the Interparliamentary Union Conference at Warsaw, Poland.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] is absent on official business.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] and the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] are detained on official business.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. A quorum is present.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a joint resolution (H.J. Res. 510) amending a joint resolution making temporary appropriations for the fiscal year 1960, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

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 President pro tempore:

S. 2539. An act to extend and amend laws relating to the provision and improvement of housing and the renewal of urban communities, and for other purposes;

H.R. 968. An act to provide for the construction by the Secretary of the Interior of the Bully Creek Dam and other facilities, Vale Federal reclamation project, Oregon;

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

H.R. 2886. An act to suspend for 3 years the import duties on certain classifications of spun silk yarn;

H.R. 6000. An act to amend title 28 of the United States Code to increase the limit for administrative settlement of claims against the United States under the tort claims procedure of $3,000; and

H.R. 6118. An act to amend section 6 of the act of September 11, 1959.

TEMOPORARY APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE FISCAL YEAR 1960

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I ask that the Presiding Officer lay before the Senate a joint resolution just received from the House of Representatives.

The President pro tempore laid before the Senate the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 510) amending a joint resolution making temporary appropriations for the fiscal year 1960, and for other purposes, which was read twice by its title.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of House Joint Resolution 510.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DOUGLAS in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN].

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, the effect of the House joint resolution is to continue for the month of September the same provisions with respect to the payment of salaries and so forth, as was provided for the present month of August.

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

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I understand this is the customary resolution, in instances where we have failed to complete action on an appropriation bill, when personnel matters and other matters cannot be properly attended to, and the personnel cannot be paid in the absence of passage of the resolution.

Mr. HAYDEN. That is correct.

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

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. What effect does the continuing resolution have on civil works projects which have been carried over from the first of July, where the projects have been funded only to the first of July?

Mr. HAYDEN. The resolution says:

> The amounts appropriated by section 2 of Public Law 86-118 are hereby increased as follows: Mutual security programs from "$300,000,000" to "$430,000,000."

The original public law we passed provided for one-twelfth of the amount of money available in the previous fiscal year to be available each month. The departments will have one-twelfth of what they had last year, for expenditure in the month of September.

Mr. RUSSELL. There would be no question about carrying on the projects already authorized or commenced, but it would be impossible for a new project to be started?

Mr. HAYDEN. That is correct.

Mr. RUSSELL. All the appropriation bills have been passed, I believe, except those for military construction and for mutual security?

Mr. HAYDEN. That is correct.

Mr. RUSSELL. All the others have been properly funded?

Mr. HAYDEN. All other bills have been passed.

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

The joint resolution (H.J. Res. 510) was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CURTAILMENT OF RAILROAD PASSENGER SERVICE IN WISCONSIN—JOINT RESOLUTION OF WISCONSIN LEGISLATURE

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, my colleagues will recall that the last Congress enacted legislation, the Transportation Act of 1958, to ease some of the problems confronting the railroads of the Nation.

The legislation provided, among other things, an easing of the machinery by which railroads could discontinue service if it were felt such service could not be performed on an economically sound basis.

During the first year of operation under this law, there have been a substantial number of discontinuances of service by the railroads in Wisconsin and throughout the country. In fact, the scope of such actions now requires that Congress take a second look at this situation.

As you know, there is a bill, S. 1331, pending before the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. A subcommittee of the full committee is in the process of taking action on the measure. Hearings have already been held. The purpose of the bill is to provide for a somewhat more thorough airing of evidence in cases of proposed abandonment prior to discontinuance of service. Unfortunately, there have been several abandonments of service to communities in Wisconsin, thus causing serious problems in some instances for expanding communities. Since 1950, more than 70 passenger trains have been discontinued. In addition, there are now pending applications to suspend operations of 12 more passenger trains serving our Badger communities.

We recognize, of course, that it is necessary to weigh all factors in such cases, including the economic situation. However, it is also important to take into account the impact that discontinuance of such public service can have on communities.

Recently, I received from Senate Chief Clerk Lawrence R. Larson, Wisconsin Legislature, a copy of a joint resolution—No. 83—memorializing Congress to study the effects of severe curtailment of railway passenger service. To give my colleagues the benefit of this joint resolution, I request unanimous consent to have it printed in the RECORD, and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the joint resolution was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, as follows:

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 83

Joint resolution memorializing Congress to study the severe curtailment of railroad passenger service in Wisconsin

Whereas public transportation is vital to the social and political life of a nation and public welfare demands the utmost practical development of every form of transportation and the best possible service; and

Where World War II amply demonstrated that the transportation problem is one of deficiency and not of excess and that the development of transportation must keep pace with the expansion of the Nation's economy; and

Whereas modern transportation must reach all sections of our State and Nation, without discrimination, if our greatness is to be preserved; and

Whereas it is noted with grave concern by the members of the Wisconsin Legislature that while other forms of transportation are rapidly expanding and modernizing their facilities, the passenger service of the railroads operating in the State of Wisconsin and, to a great extent, across the Nation, has been steadily curtailed by the discontinuance of substantial numbers of trains, inadequate service by remaining passenger facilities, and a gradual withdrawing of related services to a point where this process critically affects the economic, social and political existence of our State and the Nation as a whole; and

Whereas since 1950 more than 70 passenger trains have been discontinued in the State of Wisconsin and there are pending applications to suspend operation of 12 more passenger trains serving Wisconsin communities which, if granted, will leave many more Wisconsin areas stranded without rail passenger service; and

Whereas if such trend continues unabated across the country, this Nation in time of national emergency will not be able to cope with sudden demands upon its transportation system: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the senate (the assembly concurring), That the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin respectfully memorializes Congress to recognize the gravity of this transportation crisis by instituting a comprehensive study and investigation of the lamentable state of conditions of railroad passenger service in Wisconsin with an eye to solution of this problem; and be it further

Resolved, That special attention should be paid to those areas wherein abandonment or pending abandonment of railroad passenger service jeopardizes the welfare of the people of our State; and, be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, to the presiding officers of the U.S. Senate and House of Representatives, to each Member of Congress from Wisconsin and to the Chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission.

PHILIP ASH,
President of the Senate.
LAWRENCE R. LARSEN,
Chief Clerk of the Senate.
GEORGE MOLINARO,
Speaker of the Assembly.
NORMAN C. ANDERSON,
Chief Clerk of the Assembly.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

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

S. 1502. A bill to provide for adjustments in the annuities under the Foreign Service retirement and disability system (Rept. No. 837).

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

S. 1822. A bill for the relief of Hirsh Marinski (Rept. No. 840);

S. 2129. A bill for the relief of Mileva Lovric (Rept. No. 841);

S. 2319. A bill for the relief of Sergiusz Rudczenko (Rept. No. 842);

S. 2347. A bill to amend section 7 of the act of July 28, 1950 (ch. 503, 64 Stat. 381; 5 U.S.C. 341f), to authorize the Attorney General to acquire land in the vicinity of any Federal penal or correctional institution when considered essential to the protection of the health or safety of the inmates of the institution (Rept. No. 843);

H.R. 1665. An act for the relief of Mrs. Vassiliki P. Theodorou (Rept. No. 846);

H.R. 2946. An act for the relief of Cecil E. Finley (Rept. No. 847);

H.R. 2978. An act to amend section 1870 of title 28, United States Code, to authorize the district courts to allow additional peremptory challenges in civil cases to multiple plaintiffs as well as multiple defendants (Rept. No. 848);

H.R. 3801. An act for the relief of Harry and Lily Stopnitsky (Rept. No. 849);

H.R. 3816. An act for the relief of Mukhtar Mohammed (Rept. No. 850);

H.R. 4134. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the District Court for the Territory of Alaska to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim, or claims, of Scotty James, of Sitka, Alaska (Rept. No. 851);

H.R. 5873. An act for the relief of Clara H. Hall (Rept. No. 852); and

H.R. 7745. An act for the relief of Mrs. Willie Soher (Rept. No. 853).

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

S. 1696. A bill for the relief of Wong Sue Chee (Rept. No. 839);

S. 2321. A bill for the relief of Bernardine Lovse (Nadica Lovse) (Rept. No. 844); and

H.R. 8277. An act for the relief of Harold William Abbott and others (Rept. No. 854).

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

S. 231. A bill for the relief of Richard Peter Gustav Bredee and George Edward Bredee (Rept. No. 845).

REPORTS ON DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, from the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the executive department, to which were referred for examination and recommendation two lists of records transmitted to the Senate by the Archivist of the United States that appeared to have no permanent value or historical interest, submitted reports thereon, pursuant to law.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

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

John A. McCone, of California, to be the representative to the third session of the General Conference of the International Atomic Energy Agency; and

Paul F. Foster, of Maryland, to be alternate representative to the third session of the General Conference of the International Atomic Energy Agency.

BILLS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. HICKENLOOPER:

S. 2619. A bill for the relief of Maria Critelli Ventura; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURRAY:

S. 2620. A bill for the relief of Leonard Mitchell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MUNDT:

S. 2621. A bill to provide for the establishment of a Commission on Problems of Small Towns; to the Committee on Government Operations.

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

By Mr. COOPER:

S. 2622. A bill for the relief of Gerda Bleisch and her minor child Billy Ray Arnett; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURRAY (for himself and Mr. MANSFIELD):

S. 2623. A bill relating to emergency relief, and amending sections 120 and 125 of title 23, United States Code; to the Committee on Public Works.

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

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

S. 2624. A bill to amend the act of October 19, 1949, entitled "An act to assist States in collecting sales and use taxes on cigarettes"; to the Committee on Finance.

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

By Mr. JACKSON:

S. 2625. A bill to amend the War Claims Act of 1948 to provide for the payment of benefits under such Act to certain citizens and permanent residents of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LAUSCHE:

S. 2626. A bill for the relief of Zlata Dumlijan and Djuro (George) Kasner; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

KRAEMER MILLS, INC.—REFERENCE OF BILL TO COURT OF CLAIMS

Mr. HART. Mr. President, from the Committee on the Judiciary, I report an original resolution referring S. 2496 to the Court of Claims, and I submit a report (No. 838) thereon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be received and the resolution will be placed on the calendar.

The resolution (S. Res. 182) was placed on the calendar, as follows:

Resolved, That the bill (S. 2496) entitled "A bill for the relief of Kraemer Mills, Incorporated", 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 amounts, if any, legally or equitably due from the United States to the claimant.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF PARTS 3 AND 4 OF SECOND INTERIM REPORT OF SELECT COMMITTEE ON IMPROPER ACTIVITIES IN LABOR OR MANAGEMENT FIELD

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I submit, for appropriate reference, the following resolutions:

Resolved, That there be printed for the use of the Select Committee on Improper Activities in the Labor or Management Field three thousand three hundred additional copies of part 3 of the Second Interim Report made by that committee pursuant to Senate Resolution 44.

And—

Resolved, That there be printed for the use of the Select Committee on Improper Activities in the Labor or Management Field three thousand three hundred additional copies of part 4 of the Second Interim Report made by that committee pursuant to Senate Resolution 44.

The Senate select committee is undertaking to wind up its business and make a final report next January. It has completed almost all of its hearings; but one of its final and most important duties is to write a report of its findings and conclusions.

The demands for the committee reports thus far published have been exceedingly heavy. Copies of the report have been requested by labor and management, both on an individual and organizational basis, as well as the public, the press, libraries, law-enforcement agencies, and State and local authorities.

Because of the widespread interest in the committee's work, I am, therefore, requesting that the Senate authorize the publication of 3,300 additional copies of part 3 and 3,300 copies of part 4 of the Second Interim Report of the committee.

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

The resolutions, submitted by Mr. McCLELLAN, were received and referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

SENATE RESOLUTION 183

Resolved, That there be printed for the use of the Select Committee on Improper Activities in the Labor or Management Field three thousand three hundred additional copies of part 3 of the Second Interim Report made by that committee pursuant to Senate Resolution 44.

SENATE RESOLUTION 184

Resolved, That there be printed for the use of the Select Committee on Improper Activities in the Labor or Management Field three thousand three hundred additional copies of part 4 of the Second Interim Report made by that committee pursuant to Senate Resolution 44.

COMMISSION ON PROBLEMS OF SMALL TOWNS

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference, a bill to provide for the establishment of a Hoover-type commission to study the problems of America's small towns.

Throughout history, Mr. President, the small towns of America—for the purposes of my bill I have arbitrarily designated as a small American town any community of 10,000 population or less—have contributed greatly to the growth progress and stability of our great country. Like all other segments of our economy, however—our urban centers, agriculture, labor, education, transportation, and the like—America's small towns have been confronted with new problems created by our changing times and the forward march of technical developments. Consequently, my bill proposes for the first time a nationwide down-to-earth study of what makes our small towns tick, and what is needed to insure the growth and stability of such communities.

The study and recommendations proposed by my bill, Mr. President, would help develop a clear pattern for all such communities in analyzing why some towns maintain a successful growth in today's circumstances while others tend to wither on the vine and die. This proposed commission can be helpful in developing recommendations which can be highly helpful in community planning for the future, and in exploring the impact and potentialities of governmental programs on the small towns of America, which form an important part of the lifeline of the economy not only in such States as South Dakota and other great commonwealths of the Midwest, but throughout America.

Mr. President, the self-contained, self-reliant, small towns of this country comprise a form of community living and economic opportunity almost unique in the world outside of English-speaking countries. Together they comprise great bastions to protect and perpetuate what we all acclaim and admire as our American way of life—economically, politically, and spiritually. Their problems deserve our attention and I express the hope my bill to deal with them will be approved.

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

The bill (S. 2621) to provide for the establishment of a Commission on Problems of Small Towns, introduced by Mr. MUNDT, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

AMENDMENT OF EMERGENCY FUND IN HIGHWAY ACT FOR DISASTERS

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, as the Members of the Senate know, Montana has been stricken by an earthquake which has done a tremendous amount of damage. Ever since that unfortunate event, the Montana congressional delegation has been exploring every possible way to bring real aid to our State. On August 22 and 23 a congressional delegation visited the area to see with their own eyes the damage done by this earthquake.

There has been major damage to highways in Montana and in Wyoming and most of these highways are of a type eligible for complete financing by the Federal Government. Montana 1, a forest highway, has had some $4 million worth of damage. Key roads in Yellowstone National Park from Canyon and Old Faithful to West Yellowstone have had about $1½ million worth of damage. Subsidiary forest development roads have had some $500,000 worth of damage done to them.

On Tuesday, August 25, I had a member of my staff consult with the Bureau of Public Roads to explore amending the emergency fund in the Highway Act to permit full restoration of roads, which are wholly a Federal responsibility, from the emergency disaster fund in the Highway Act. I am pleased to say that on Wednesday, August 26, the Bureau of Public Roads, supplied draft legislation along with a letter which I ask to have made a part of the RECORD at this point.

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

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE,
BUREAU OF PUBLIC ROADS,
Washington, D.C., August 26, 1959.

Hon. JAMES E. MURRAY,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MURRAY: In accordance with the request of August 25 by Mr. Wolf of your office, we are glad to furnish the following information relative to the availability of Federal highway funds for the rehabilitation of the section of Montana State Route 1 affected by the recent earthquake in that area.

Montana State Route 1 is included in the Federal aid primary highway system and is eligible for improvement on its existing or a new location if requested by the State and matched in an appropriate amount by funds under the State's control and if approved by the Bureau of Public Roads. The current unobligated balance of Federal aid primary funds apportioned to the State of Montana as of July 31 is $4,722,179 of which $2,811,392 has not been programed for specific improvements. The matching ratio of Federal aid primary funds with State funds for Federal aid highway improvements in Montana, which is a public lands State, is on a basis of 56.49 percent Federal funds and 43.51 percent funds under the State's control.

The section of this route extending through the Gallatin National Forest is also included on the forest highway system which establishes the eligibility of that section for improvement with forest highway funds. Projects to be included in the forest highway construction program are agreed upon jointly by the State highway department, the regional forester, and the division engineer of the Bureau of Public Roads, and are approved by the Federal Highway Administrator and Chief of Forest Service. The current balance of unobligated forest highway funds for the State of Montana is $3,032,922 of which $147,872 have not been programed for any specific projects.

Title 23, United States Code, section 125 provides for the conditions under which emergency funds authorized by the Congress may be expended for the repair or reconstruction of highways and bridges on the Federal aid highway systems which have suffered serious damage as a result of disaster over a wide area. Under the provisions of this section no funds may be expended with respect to any such catastrophe in any State unless an emergency has been declared by the Governor of such State and concurred in by the Secretary of Commerce. As provided under section 120(f) of this legislation, the Federal share payable on account of any repair or reconstruction with such funds shall not exceed 50 percent of the cost.

All of the regular Federal aid funds available to Montana for expenditure upon forest highways without State matching funds as provided in the last sentence of section 3(a) of the Federal Aid Act of 1958, have been obligated.

We appreciate the situation resulting from the recent earthquake and wish to assure you of the cooperation of this Bureau with the States affected in the reconstruction of the highways affected by this catastrophe to the extent feasible under the existing highway legislation.

Sincerely yours,

F. C. TURNER,
Deputy Commissioner.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, my colleague, the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] and I immediately consulted with the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] chairman of the Public Works Committee. He, in turn, offered his cooperation and I ask unanimous consent that his letter of August 27 be made a part of the RECORD at this point.

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

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS,
August 27, 1959.

Hon. JAMES E. MURRAY,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR JIM: I have gone over the draft of the amendment of the Highway Act to permit 100 percent financing of Federal roads destroyed by disasters, prepared at your request by the Bureau of Public Roads.

To answer your question on expediting legislation, it can be best taken up when the highway bill comes to the Senate. I would prefer at least waiting to call a hearing until after the meeting you plan with Mr. Tallamy on August 31 so that all of us will have the benefit of his thinking. In addition, a little more time would afford your Governor and other Governors a chance to express their views on the solution proposed by your delegation.

If it is agreeable with you and Senator MANSFIELD, we can take the problem up in committee with the highway bill. Should we not have a highway bill in committee, we can have a special meeting or you can bring the amendment up on the floor.

Personally, I am much impressed with your suggestion for amending the highway disaster emergency fund. I regret the earthquake tragedy that befell Montana and will cooperate in every possible way to help.

Sincerely,

DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Chairman.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, today the Montana delegation met with Federal Highway Administrator Bertram Tallamy and his Deputy Commissioner Francis Turner to discuss ways and means of helping restore the transportation network in southwestern Montana.

As matters now stand, the highway emergency disaster fund supplies 50 percent of the money required to restore Federal aid highways. It does not provide a means for restoring Federal roads in national parks, for forest highways which are wholly within national forests and constructed entirely with Federal funds or for roads on Indian reservations which are a Federal responsibility. The bill I am now introducing along with my colleague [Mr. MANSFIELD] will correct this oversight in the Highway Act.

I realize that there are many complex problems before us on the question of highway financing but it is my hope that in taking care of the large emergency we face in the highway program, the Congress will also be able to adopt the legislation proposed by the Montana delegation to meet the disaster which now exists in Montana. This bill is general and is not directed solely toward solving Montana's problem. We believe that the experience we have had serves as a clear example of the need to revise the law. I have had wonderful cooperation from the chairman of the Public Works Committee. I ask unanimous consent that a telegram which the senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] sent to the western Governors be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

AUGUST 31, 1959.

Hon. WILLIAM A. EGAN,
Governor, Juneau, Alaska:

Airmailing you draft of proposed amendment to Highway Act originated by Senators MURRAY and MANSFIELD and Congressmen METCALF and ANDERSON presented to me on August 27 to cope with highway emergency caused by earthquake in Montana.

Decisive to consider amending emergency fund sections 120 and 125 highway act when highway bill is before Senate. Act does not now cover wholly Federal roads in national parks, national forests, Indian reservations.

Would like your views as soon as possible keeping in mind whether this would be helpful to your State if a disaster destroyed sizable amount of Federal forest, park, or Indian roads.

DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Chairman, Senate Public Works Committee.

(Same wire to Hon. Paul Fannin, Governor, Phoenix, Ariz.; Hon. Orville L. Freeman, Governor, St. Paul, Minn.; Hon. John Burroughs, Governor, Santa Fe, N. Mex.; Hon. Edmund G. (Pat) Brown, Governor, Sacramento, Calif.; Hon. J. Hugh Aronson, Governor, Helena, Mont.; Hon. John E. Davis, Governor, Bismarck, N. Dak.; Hon. Stephen L. R. McNichols, Governor, Denver, Colo.; Hon. Grant Sawyer, Governor, Carson, City Nev.; Hon. J. Howard Edmondson, Governor, Oklahoma City, Okla.; Hon. Mark O. Hatfield, Governor, Salem, Oreg.; Hon. Albert D. Rosellini, Governor, Olympia, Wash.; Hon. Ralph Herseth, Governor, Pierce, S. Dak.; Hon. J. J. (Joe) Hickey, Governor, Cheyenne, Wyo.; Hon. George Dewey Clyde, Governor, Salt Lake City, Utah.)

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I send the bill to the desk, and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

The bill (S. 2623) relating to emergency relief, and amending sections 120 and 125 of title 23, United States Code, introduced by Mr. MURRAY (for himself and Mr. MANSFIELD), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Public Works, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 125 of title 23, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"§ 125. Emergency relief

"(a) An emergency fund is authorized for expenditure by the Secretary, subject to the provisions of this section and section 120, for the repair or reconstruction of highways, roads and trails which he shall find have suffered serious damage as the result of disaster over a wide area, such as by floods, hurricanes, tidal waves, earthquakes, severe storms, landslides, or other catastrophies in any part of the United States. The appropriation of such moneys, not to exceed $30 million, as may be necessary for the initial establishment of this fund and for its replenishment on an annual basis is authorized. Pending such appropriation or replenishment the Secretary may expend from any funds heretofore or hereafter appropriated for expenditure in accordance with the provisions of this title, including existing Federal-aid appropriations, such sums as may be necessary for the immediate prosecution of the work herein authorized, such appropriations to be reimbursed from the appropriations herein authorized when made.

"(b) The Secretary may expend funds from the emergency fund herein authorized for the repair or reconstruction of highways on the Federal-aid highway systems, including the Interstate System, in accordance with the provisions of this chapter. Except as to highways, roads and trails mentioned in subsection (c) of this section, no funds shall be so expended unless the Secretary has received an application therefor from the State highway department, and unless an emergency has been declared by the Governor of the State and concurred in by the Secretary.

"(c) The Secretary may expend funds from the emergency fund herein authorized, either independently or in cooperation with any other branch of the Government, State agency, organization or person, for the repair or reconstruction of forest highways, forest development roads and trails, park roads and trails, and Indian reservation roads, whether or not such highways, roads or trails are on any of the Federal-aid highway systems."

SEC. 2. Subsection (f) of section 120 of title 23, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(f) The Federal share payable on account of any repair or reconstruction provided for by funds made available under section 125 of this title shall not exceed 50 per centum of the cost thereof, except that the Federal share payable on account of any repair or reconstruction of forest highways, forest development roads and trails, park roads and trails, and Indian reservation roads, may amount to 100 per centum of the cost thereof, whether or not such highways, roads or trails are on any Federal-aid highway system."

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, it is with pleasure that I join with my distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], in the introduction of proposed legislation which will provide that road disaster funds can be applied on a 100-percent basis to forest, park, and Indian roads. The enactment of this proposed legislation we feel will expedite the improvement and repair of road and highway damage in southwestern Montana and Yellowstone National Park.

On the morning of August 18, I arose to learn the tragic news of the earthquake which raised such havoc in my State. I immediately made several telephone calls to the State, making in-

quiries as to the earthquake damage, and offered the assistance of the Montana delegation in any area we might have been of some help. As soon as the preliminary reports were received on the disaster, it was apparent that one of the major aftermaths of this upheaval would be the repair and reconstruction of roads and highways.

The Montana delegation immediately made contact with the Bureau of Public Roads here in Washington to see what could be done in the way of providing emergency funds for this necessary and immediate road construction.

We were informed that the Highway Act creates an emergency relief revolving fund of $30 million for reconstructing roads destroyed by catastrophes, including earthquakes. These emergency funds are restricted to Federal-aid roads, excluding park roads, forest roads, and trails.

This money is available on a 50–50 sharing basis. This program goes into operation when an emergency is declared by the State Governor, and the Secretary of Commerce agrees.

The unfortunate part about this is that this 50–50 emergency money applies to forest, park, and Indian roads which were originally constructed by 100-percent Federal funds. Highway No. 1 in Montana, and the other roads that are in need of extensive repair are all forest highways or park roads and trails. As I have just stated, they were all originally constructed with 100-percent Federal funds.

It appears to me that it is only reasonable that any repairs should be made on a 100-percent Federal basis. After all, the Federal Government is a self-insurer. I feel that perhaps this was an oversight when the original law was enacted.

The bill my colleague [Mr. MURRAY] and I, and our colleagues in the House, LEE METCALF and LEROY ANDERSON, seek to have enacted would rectify this inequity in the present law. The interested agencies will then be able to go into Montana and immediately undertake a reconstruction and repair of these necessary roads and highways out of this emergency funds. I do hope that the Senate can act on this matter expeditiously. It is vital to the restoration of normal operations in Montana and Yellowstone National Park.

TAXATION ON INTERSTATE SHIPMENTS OF CIGARS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON], and my colleague, the junior Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING], I introduce for appropriate reference a bill dealing with the extension of the Jenkins Act, a law which itself deals with the inhibition upon the interstate shipment of cigars, where such interstate shipment vitiates the State tax laws on cigarettes, extending them to cigars.

New York State now imposes a tax on cigars. It is trying to pay its way in times which are very difficult for all States.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks a list of States which are in the same situation. We are trying to extend the law which already applies to cigarettes so that it will include cigars, in order to protect the States in their taxing power. The bill will cost the Federal Government nothing; in fact, will help the Federal Government, because if the States can maintain their own services, there will be less of a call by them for Federal help.

Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that a statement explaining the purpose of the bill, together with the text of the bill itself, be printed in the RECORD.

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

The bill (S. 2624) to amend the act of October 19, 1949, entitled "An act to assist States in collecting sales and use taxes on cigarettes," introduced by Mr. JAVITS (for himself, Mr. COTTON, and Mr. KEATING), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

The list of States, statement, and bill are as follows:

LIST OF STATES IMPOSING CIGAR TAXES

Alabama, Arizona, Georgia, Louisiana, Minnesota, Mississippi, New Hampshire, New York, Oklahoma, South Carolina, Tennessee, Vermont, and Washington.

MEMORANDUM TO ACCOMPANY PROPOSED BILL TO EXTEND COVERAGE OF JENKINS ACT (15 U.S.C., SEC. 375 FF.) TO INTERSTATE SHIPMENTS OF CIGARS

During legislative sessions in 1959, New York and several other States imposed a tax on cigars for the first time. At the time the imposition of tax was under consideration the tobacco industry brought to the attention of authorities in New York the fact that there already existed a considerable interstate traffic in cigars. It was argued, with much force, that the imposition of a 15-percent tax by New York, when many other States either imposed no tax or imposed a lesser rate of tax, would result in an increase in the flow of cigars into New York from other jurisdictions.

The same situation existed, and continues to exist to some extent, with respect to cigarettes when cigarette taxes were first imposed by the States. The differential in tax per unit which exists from State to State led to a considerable mail-order business in cigarettes. Federal legislation, commonly known as the Jenkins Act, was passed to overcome problems created by this interstate traffic. The problems are identical with respect to cigars, and consequently this amendment is urged.

As in the case of cigarettes, the requirement of notification of the State fiscal authority in the State to which the product is shipped accomplishes two main purposes. First, a factor of unreal competition based on the tax differential is eliminated if the same tax must be paid on products shipped into the State as is paid on products passing to the consumer from a retail outlet located within the State. Secondly, the State imposing the tax minimizes its loss of revenue through the collection of tax on all products shipped into a State for ultimate consumption therein.

The ease and simplicity of evading the tax on cigars through mail order and other purchases from outlets located in sister States, must be self evident. Furthermore, the consumer has more economic incentive to order from a low-tax or no-tax area because of the relatively higher price per unit than in the case of cigarettes. For example, on a box of 50 25-cent cigars, a purchaser in New York could save roughly $1.87, less postage, by having cigars shipped to him from a no-tax State.

This measure will have no fiscal effect on the Federal Government. It merely seeks to protect State revenues and, at the same time, eliminate an artificial competitive disadvantage that may be suffered by the cigar industry in New York and other States imposing taxes on cigars.

An Act to amend the Act of October 19, 1949, entitled "An Act to assist States in collecting sales and use taxes on cigarettes"

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the title of the Act of October 19, 1949, entitled "An Act to assist States in collecting sales and use taxes on cigarettes", is hereby amended to read as follows: "An Act to assist States in collecting sales and use taxes on cigars and cigarettes".

SEC. 2. Such Act, as amended (15 U.S.C., secs. 375–377), is hereby amended to read as follows: "That for the purposes of this Act—

"(1) The term 'person' includes corporations, companies, associations, firms, partnerships, societies, and joint stock companies, as well as individuals.

"(2) The term 'cigar' means any roll for smoking, other than a cigarette, made in whole or in part of tobacco.

"(3) The term 'cigarette' means any roll for smoking made wholly or in part of tobacco, irrespective of size or shape and whether or not such tobacco is flavored, adulterated, or mixed with any other ingredient, the wrapper or cover of which is made of paper or any other substance or material except tobacco.

"(4) The term 'distributor licensed by or located in such State' means—

"(A) in the case of any State which by State statute or regulation authorizes the distribution of cigars or cigarettes at wholesale or retail, any person so authorized, or

"(B) in the case of any other State, any person located in such State who distributes cigars or cigarettes at wholesale or retail; but such term in no case includes a person who acquires cigars or cigarettes for purposes other than resale.

"(5) The term 'use', in addition to its ordinary meaning, means the consumption, storage, handling, or disposal of cigars or cigarettes.

"(6) The term 'tobacco tax administrator' means the State official duly authorized to administer the cigar or cigarette tax law of a State.

"(7) The term 'State' includes the District of Columbia, Hawaii, and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

"(8) The term 'transfers for profit' means any transfer for profit or other disposition for profit, including any transfer or disposition by an agent to his principal in connection with which the agent receives anything of value.

"SEC. 2. (a) Any person who sells or transfers for profit cigars or cigarettes in interstate commerce, whereby such cigars or cigarettes are shipped into a State taxing the sale or use of cigars or cigarettes, to other than a distributor licensed by or located in such State, or who advertises or offers cigars or cigarettes for such a sale or transfer and shipment, shall—

"(1) first file with the tobacco tax administrator of the State into which such shipment is made or in which such advertisement or offer is disseminated a statement

setting forth his name and trade name (if any), and the address of his principal place of business and of any other place of business; and

"(2) not later than the 10th day of each calendar month, file with the tobacco tax administrator of the State into which such shipment is made, a memorandum or a copy of the invoice covering each and every shipment of cigars or cigarettes made during the previous calendar month into such State; the memorandum or invoice in each case to include the name and address of the person to whom the shipment was made, the brand, and the quantity thereof.

"(b) The fact that any person ships or delivers for shipment any cigars or cigarettes shall, if such shipment is into a State in which such person has filed a statement with the tobacco tax administrator under subsection (a)(1) of this section, be presumptive evidence (1) that such cigars or cigarettes were sold, or transferred for profit, by such person, and (2) that such sale or transfer was to other than a distributor licensed by or located in such State.

"SEC. 3. Whoever violates any provision of this Act shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and shall be fined not more than $1,000, or imprisoned not more than 6 months, or both.

"SEC. 4. The United States district courts shall have jurisdiction to prevent and restrain violations of this Act."

DIVERSION OF WATER FROM LAKE MICHIGAN AT CHICAGO—AMENDMENTS

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I submit an amendment, in the nature of a substitute, intended to be proposed by me, to the bill (H.R. 1) to require a study to be conducted of the effect of increasing the diversion of water from Lake Michigan into the Illinois Waterway for navigation, and for other purposes, when the bill is again before the Senate.

In brief, H.R.1 would authorize the State of Illinois and the Metropolitan Sanitary District of Greater Chicago, to divert from Lake Michigan, for the purpose of a study of the effect of such an increased diversion and for other purposes, an additional 1,000 cubic feet per second over and above the 1,500 cubic feet per second now permitted by the 1930 decree of the Supreme Court for navigation and the 1,800 cubic feet per second now authorized for domestic usages.

I have no objection to any study of pollution, sewage disposal, efficient methods of sewage disposal and related subjects by any Federal or State agency anywhere, but we do not need an additional diversion of waters out of Lake Michigan for such a study. We have recently been so informed by the Public Health Service of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

So I submit an amendment, in the nature of a substitute, to H.R. 1, which, while it would authorize a study, would not authorize any additional diversion.

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

Mr. PROXMIRE submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to House bill 1, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

WITHDRAWAL OF RESERVATIONS FROM PUBLIC LANDS—ADDITIONAL TIME FOR BILL TO LIE ON THE DESK

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, on Monday, August 24, my colleague, the senior Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], on behalf of both of us introduced a bill (S. 2587), which would require approval by Congress of any public land withdrawals or reservations in excess of 5,000 acres, and so forth. The bill was ordered to lie on the table until the end of business on August 31, so that other Members who desired to do so might cosponsor this proposed legislation.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill continue to lie on the table until the close of business this Friday, September 4, 1959, and that the bill be printed in full in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the bill will lie on the desk, and be printed in the RECORD, as requested by the Senator from Alaska.

The bill (S. 2587) is 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 "Public Land Withdrawals Act Amendments of 1959."

SEC. 2. The first section of the Act entitled "An Act to provide that withdrawals, reservations, or restrictions of more than five thousand acres of public lands of the United States for certain purposes shall not become effective until approved by Act of Congress, and for other purposes", approved February 28, 1958 (72 Stat. 27), is amended by striking out "the Department of Defense for defense purposes" and inserting in lieu thereof "any department or agency of the Government".

SEC. 3. Section 2 of such Act of February 28, 1958, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 2. No public land, water, or land and water area shall, except by Act of Congress, hereafter be (1) withdrawn from settlement, location, sale, or entry for the use of any department or agency of the Government; (2) reserved for such use; or (3) restricted from operation of the mineral leasing provisions of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (67 Stat. 462), if such withdrawal, reservation, or restriction would result in the withdrawal, reservation, or restriction of more than five thousand acres in the aggregate for any one project or facility of such department or agency since—

"(a) the date of enactment of this Act with respect to any defense project or facility of the Department of Defense,

"(b) the date of enactment of the Public Land Withdrawals Act Amendments of 1959 with respect to any other project or facility, or

"(c) the last previous Act of Congress which withdrew, reserved, or restricted public land, water, or land and water area for such project or facility, whichever is later."

COMMENDATION OF NATIONAL JAYCEE COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF RESOLUTION

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the junior Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] may be added as an additional cosponsor of the resolution (S. Res. 173) commending the National Jaycee community development program, submitted by me on August 24, 1959.

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

PAN-PACIFIC EXPOSITION—ADDITIONAL SIGNER OF CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on Saturday the conference report on the bill (H.R. 8374) to amend Public Law 85-880, and for other purposes, was adopted by the Senate. At that time the name of the Representative from Pennsylvania, Mr. FULTON, was not on the report, though he had indicated he was in favor of it. It is my understanding that his name is now available, and I ask that his name be added.

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

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

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

By Mr. DOUGLAS:

Article entitled "Plan for Shore Line Parks," written by Senator RICHARD L. NEUBERGER and published in the New York Times of August 30, 1959.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF GIRARD E. KALBFLEISCH, TO BE U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE, NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Wednesday, September 9, 1959, at 2:30 p.m., in room 2228, New Senate Office Building, on the nomination of Girard E. Kalbfleisch, of Ohio, to be U.S. district judge, northern district of Ohio, vice Paul C. Weick, elevated.

At the indicated time and place all persons interested in the above nomination may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], and myself, as chairman.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATIONS OF CHARLES M. MERRILL, TO BE U.S. CIRCUIT JUDGE, NINTH CIRCUIT, AND JOHN O. HENDERSON, TO BE U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE, WESTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Tuesday, September 8, 1959, at 2:30 p.m., in room

2228, New Senate Office Building, on the following nominations:

Charles M. Merrill, of Nevada, to be U.S. circuit judge, ninth circuit, vice William Healy, retired.

John O. Henderson, of New York, to be U.S. district judge, western district of New York, vice Justin C. Morgan, deceased.

At the indicated time and place all persons interested in the above nominations may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], and myself, as chairman.

NEW YORK NEGROES SEND CHILDREN TO SCHOOL IN SOUTH

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, a very informative and enlightening article was published on the front page of the New York Times of Sunday, August 30, 1959, entitled "Some Negroes Here Send Their Children to School in South." The article states, in essence, that even the Negroes in New York City are becoming grossly dissatisfied with racial tensions, street crimes, and juvenile delinquency—all of which are being fostered by forced integration of the races—and that they prefer to send their children to school in the South, where orderly segregation is maintained by law, custom, and the overwhelming sentiment of the people. They realize that there is more to be gained by their children in a segregated school system where segregation is honest and aboveboard, where there are no racial tensions in the schools, and where crime and juvenile delinquency in the schools are at a bare minimum. Senators will recall, Mr. President, that it has been found necessary in schools of New York to call out police to patrol the corridors.

Mr. President, I commend these Negro parents for being concerned about the atmosphere in which their children are required to try to learn and obtain an education. The books are difficult enough themselves, Mr. President, without students having to fight racial tensions, school hall crimes, and juvenile delinquency.

I also commend the editors of the New York Times for presenting the facts to their readers. Only last week I brought to the attention of the Senate an outstanding editorial which the Times published on the necessity of getting the word to city hall to clean up the mess in New York City. That editorial had to do with racial tensions, crime, and juvenile delinquency in general. This article, however, has to do specifically with integration of the races in the public schools of New York City, and it pinpoints the heart of the whole trouble in New York—the attempt to force different racial groups together into an amalgamated society in every social endeavor in derogation of the wishes of the people. If the people of New York, with their relatively low ratio of Negro population to white population, find it so difficult to operate their schools and to maintain law and order, I cannot fathom how their political leaders can expect the people of the South to bow to their political demands that they accept an even more mammoth mess than their own people are willing to stomach.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to have printed in the body of the RECORD at this point in my remarks this article from the New York Times, together with another article, from the Washington Post and Times Herald of Monday, August 31, 1959, entitled "Two Slain as Youth Feuds Continue in Manhattan."

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

[From the New York Times, Aug 30, 1959]

SOME NEGROES HERE SEND THEIR CHILDREN TO SCHOOL IN SOUTH

Some Negro families in New York are sending their children to segregated schools in the South because of dissatisfaction with school conditions in the city.

Apparently a much larger number are sending their children to parochial and other private schools.

And still others are registering their children from false addresses in order to get them into better public schools in New York.

Negro leaders here disagree on how many children are leaving the city to attend southern schools. One estimate there are 2,000. Another says he would be astonished if there were 50. But dozens can be identified by name and address.

COMPLAIN OF OVERCROWDING

Most of the parents complain of overcrowding in what they say are neighborhood schools that are segregated in fact. They say these schools operate on split sessions and do not give full educational opportunities to their children.

They worry also over potential associations with delinquents that might affect their children.

Another reason for sending children south to school was given by the Reverend George E. Calvert, minister of the Church of the Son of Man, 227 East 104th Street.

He said these families found it "simpler to educate children in the old culture than to make the new, confusing city culture relevant to the lives of their children."

However, more often Negro parents are turning to parochial or private schools, which already teach 30 percent of the city's school children.

A Brooklyn official of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People says more than 25 parents who worked with her last year to improve public schools are shifting their children to parochial schools this year.

Campaigns by Negro leaders for changes within the public schools are being stepped up this fall. The New York branch of the NAACP plans to submit to the board of education the names of 1,100 pupils in Manhattan and 500 in the Bronx who should and want to be transferred from overcrowded schools to schools in other districts.

Another technique is the illicit one of registering children from false addresses in preferred districts.

Despite these shifts, Negro public school enrollment may hold its own or edge up as the Negro population increases. Last fall, the public schools had 184,985 nonwhites among their 967,865 pupils, or 19 percent, against 172,957 or 20 percent the year before.

MONEY A FACTOR

Economic circumstances compel the overwhelming bulk of the city's Negro children to keep attending public schools. There were 197,584 nonwhite children here 5 through 16 years old in the special census of April 1957.

The 172,957 nonwhites attending public schools here that fall were 87 percent of this total.

Nevertheless, there are cases like that of William Hicks, 12 years old, of 546 Macon Street, in the Bedford-Stuyvesant section of Brooklyn. For the second consecutive year, he has started off to school in Bedford, Va.

His father, Samuel Hicks, a taxi driver, and his mother, Bertha, a children's nurse, said William had been on split sessions during his first four grades at Public School 70. The old brick structure at Macon Street and Patchen Avenue dates from 1887.

The Hickses' protests to school authorities got William put on full time only after his first 2 months in the fifth grade. They said he had had five teachers in 1 year.

His father worried about William's friends. "Some children are easily persuaded," the father said. "The child was being persuaded too much for his own good by some children we didn't like for him to associate with."

BEATEN IN STREET

Then, there was another factor. William and his twin sister Juanita were walking home one Sunday night. Two boys—aged 14 and 11—stopped them, and wanted to know what school William went to. Then they beat him.

The Hickses came here from Virginia—the father in 1927, the mother in 1931—and still have relatives there. In 1952, when financially pressed, they sent their second oldest child, Maxine, now 19, to school for a year in Bedford. At the same time, the twins also stayed there with Mrs. Hicks' sister.

Last fall, the Hickses sent William to sixth grade in the elementary school in Bedford, even with the cost of boarding him with a teacher there and with the extra burden of buying $20 worth of books.

The Bedford schools are segregated, but Mr. Hicks said he was pleased by the progress that William had made in class and in conduct. The 5-foot, 112-pound youngster played quarterback on the football team there, but conceded he has found some of the going a bit hard in the segregated State.

RETURNING NEXT YEAR

Last Thursday, the Hickses sent William back to Bedford to junior high school. However, Mr. Hicks said that after this school year he planned to enroll William in the New York public schools again, where he considered the facilities better for vocational training. He hopes William will become a mechanic.

"We like New York," Mr. Hicks said. "I feel the teachers here are more highly qualified than some in the lower grade schools in Virginia. Here they have to be college trained. Even the old schools here have a decided advantage in buildings.

"But the Bedford school is a good school. It has a good playing area. The environment in a small town is more wholesome for a small child."

The Reverend J. Archie Hargraves of the Congregational Church of the Nazarene, 506 McDonough Street, Brooklyn, says 10 of the 475 families in his congregation are sending children out of town this fall—7 of them to Virginia and North Carolina.

He knows of 20 other families that are sending their children out of town, and he guesses that from the Bedford-Stuyvesant area alone, with 300,000 population, perhaps 1,000 children are being sent out of the city for their education.

SLOW PROGRESS SEEN

"Basically," Mr. Hargraves said, "this is because of dissatisfaction that the children are not progressing rapidly in the schools here. Then there is a fear that they may get into trouble because they are not doing well in school. The families have ties in the

South. Perhaps they remember basic education in the South."

L. Joseph Overton, president of the New York branch of the NAACP, said sending children to schools out of town had always occurred. This was primarily when both parents were working and had relatives elsewhere to care for the children, he added.

Mr. Overton guesses there might be perhaps 2,000 such cases—500 or fewer from the Bronx, 600 from Brooklyn, and 1,000 from Manhattan.

But Roy Wilkins, national executive secretary of the NAACP, said he would be astonished if as many as 50 Negro children from New York were sent back south.

"It's the other way," Mr. Wilkins said. "Hundreds of southern children are sent up here. They live catch-as-catch-can here with relatives, to enjoy better education here."

FOUR CASES NOTED

Mrs. Florence Lucas, president of the Jamaica, Queens, branch of the NAACP, whose son has gone to a private school for the last 5 years, said she knew of only one child now and three in the past who had been sent to southern elementary and secondary schools. Two were girls whose parents thought they would be morally or socially better off; another was a boy whose parents had separated.

Mrs. Lucas depreciated southern schools, and said children from such schools had been one of the greatest drawbacks to schools here.

Roman Catholic and Negro leaders agree that more Negro children are transferring to parochial schools here. While no figures are kept by race, Msgr. John Paul Haverty, superintendent of schools for the Archdiocese of New York, noted that Manhattan enrollments in parochial elementary schools had increased from 38,000 to 43,000 since 1950.

The borough's white population has decreased during the same period. Msgr. Haverty said Harlem parochial schools had more than 10,000 pupils.

City Councilman Earl Brown and Hubert T. Dalany, chairman of the intergroup committee on public schools, noted that the Roman Catholic Church had increased efforts to convert Negroes.

REPUTATION CARRIES WEIGHT

Mr. Wilkins said he knew non-Catholic Negro parents who had sent their children to parochial schools here because of their reputation for good education, discipline, and personal attention.

Enrollment of all races in private and parochial elementary and secondary schools in the five boroughs this fall will reach 421,000, according to the State department of education. The public schools expect to take 979,000 pupils.

Among private schools, the Junior Academy, 404 Herkimer Street, Brooklyn, has had a 50-percent increase in students, to 160, in the last 5 years. Ninety percent are Negroes.

Families that withdraw children from the public schools come largely from the higher social and economic groups. Many had been active in parent associations and committees for improving their neighborhoods. But in interviews they said they had not been strong enough to better the public schools, and did not want to risk their children's education.

"I don't like progressive education, especially in a split session," Mrs. Margaret Graves, of 424 Macon Street, Brooklyn, said. "I want my child to learn the three R's and to associate with nice children. That is why I put him into a private school."

Mrs. Ollie Dent of 385 Stuyvesant Avenue, Brooklyn, complained of overcrowding in the public schools. A non-Catholic, she sends her children to a Catholic school.

YOUTH SENT TO FLORIDA

One father whose son has just graduated from a Pensacola, Fla., high school, said he had sent the youth there because New York City had "just too much juvenile delinquency and racial tension." He asserted, "New York City is not a place to bring Negro kids up."

The father had graduated from the Pensacola school. The son stayed with a grandmother while in Florida. The father planned to send a 15-year-old daughter to finish her schooling in Florida. An 8-year-old son now attending a Manhattan public school is to go south when he is older.

The Urban League of Greater New York had 25 to 30 calls daily last fall from mid-September to the end of October from Negro parents asking how to transfer children from overcrowded schools, according to Dr. Ofelia Mendoza, education director.

Dr. Mendoza said there was "a growing anxiety among parents having children in segregated schools." Many parents, she said, declared they would "prefer to sacrifice themselves and send their children to private schools because of the psychological damage they receive in segregated schools, plus the fact that they don't get proper preparation to go ahead in life."

Of all last fall's inquirers, Dr. Mendoza said only two parents decided to send their children south—both to relatives. Mr. Overton said that when the New York branch of the NAACP submitted its list of 1,600 would-be transfers to Dr. John J. Theobald, superintendent of schools, it would stress that "the main thing we're interested in right now is in having these kids receive a full day's education."

None of the parents interviewed thought there was discrimination on the part of the board of education here.

But their feelings were summed up by Mr. Hargraves, who said: "It just turns out that overcrowded neighborhoods are usually your racial ghettoes."

Mrs. Claire Cumberbatch, chairman of the education committee for the Brooklyn branch of the NAACP, led a fight last fall for 81 fourth-graders in Crown Heights seeking a transfer to better schools.

When the board of education finally agreed, she said, "60 had vanished." She said she believed most had effected their own transfers by falsifying addresses.

[From the Washington Post, Aug. 31, 1959]

TWO SLAIN AS YOUTH FEUDS CONTINUE IN MANHATTAN

NEW YORK, August 30.—A group of boys who shouted "We don't allow gringos near the park" stabbed two youths to death and injured three others early today at a playground in the old Hell's Kitchen area.

One of the victims described the attackers as 6 to 10 Puerto Rican youths. "Gringo" is a word of contempt sometimes used by Spanish-speaking peoples to describe North Americans.

Police working on the case said three suspects were picked up tonight and four others were being sought. None was identified.

Five boys and a girl, all white, were sitting on benches in the unlighted playground shortly after midnight when the other teenagers appeared, armed with knives and bottles.

A few moments later two 16-year-old boys were dead. Witnesses told of seeing some youths flee from the park and jump into a taxicab following the attack.

One of the survivors, 16-year-old Harold Luken, whose sister, Sandy, 14, was present, said the gang of boys approached his group and asked him if he had seen "Frenchie," a youth who works in a gas station. Luken said "No."

"Then they walked away and started talking," Luken went on. "When I got up to leave they came back and told me I ain't leaving.

"Then they jumped on us. I got hit on the head with a bottle and ran home. They didn't hurt Sandy, they let her out."

Dead with stab wounds were Robert Young and Anthony Krzesinki, both 16. Ewald Riemer, 18, was taken to a hospital with a stab wound in the abdomen.

The deaths brought to four the number of teenagers slain by gang violence in the past 8 days. Last Sunday a 15-year-old Negro girl was shot to death and a 14-year-old boy was fatally stabbed.

SHEEP AND WOOL REFERENDUM VOTE

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I am very much distressed over the major crisis facing the sheep and wool industry as it votes in September on the market promotional section of the National Wool Act. The outcome of the vote has been thrown into the shadow of doubt by opposition of the American Farm Bureau, one of the Nation's leading farm organizations. The promotional program has the emphatic approval of all sheep grower organizations.

During September, the sheep and wool industry will vote in a national referendum whether to renew the agreement between the Secretary of Agriculture and the American Sheep Producers Council provided for in section 708 of the National Wool Act. This section provides for the deduction of 5 cents per head of lambs and 1 cent per pound on wool for the promotion, research, and educational program to encourage the use of wool and lamb. The vote is crucial because it requires the approval of every two out of three voters for success. The organized opposition of the American Farm Bureau places the outcome in doubt.

In a letter last week the presidents of the two major sheep and wool growers associations put Charles B. Shuman, president of the American Farm Bureau, on notice that that farm organization would be held responsible in the event of an unfavorable vote. Harold Josendal and Lester Stratton, presidents of the National Wool Grower Association and the National Lamb Feeders Association, said they would look to Shuman and his organization to provide the sheep producers with an alternative program.

If the AFBF cannot or will not provide an alternative, then it must be assumed that the AFBF desires to see synthetics and man-made fibers with their tremendous advertising resources take over the entire textile industry and subjugate wool and other natural fibers to a minor role in blends—

They said.

Last year the National Farm Bureau opposed my amendment to the Packers and Stockyards Act which I cosponsored and which would have allowed a meat promotional program for the cattle industry similar to this outstandingly successful plan in the sheep and wool industry. However, as the Sheep Industry Journal pointed out last week, the defeat of this program might well endanger the future of the other half of the National Wool Act—the incentive payments program. If the self-help provisions of the act are lost the future

of wool price support would be tremendously affected.

The American Farm Bureau Federation is a large and responsible farm organization which is highly respected. Its opposition to a successful sales-promotion program of the type which operated so constructively in the sheep and wool industry is disturbing and lamentable. To me, this program in reality exemplifies the concept of free-enterprise farming and self-help programs advocated generally by the bureau. Why should it oppose its extension at this time? Surely our sheepmen are entitled to some explanation and I dare to hope the AFBF may still revise its thinking on this measure and provide it with the support which it merits. Otherwise, what alternative does it recommend to this successful program?

Mr. President, I urge every eligible voter in the September referendum to register a resounding "yes," thereby insuring the broadening of the sheep and wool market, the improvement of distribution, the continued education of consumers toward lamb and the insurance of the future of the entire wool support program. I sincerely hope other groups and farm organizations will join in a campaign to get out a large affirmative vote. It means much to every sheep-producing State in America.

THE SITUATION IN THE MIDDLE EAST

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, 1 year ago the Middle East was in crisis. A revolution in Iraq had brought down a pro-Western government and had started alarm bells ringing in the Western capitals. It placed in power a man about whom nothing was known, although it was suspected that he would not be able to resist demands of extremists ranged around him.

The revolution seemed capable of spreading.

American troops were sent to Lebanon, whose half-Christian, half-Moslem population bristled with passions that in the past produced holy wars.

In Jordan, British paratroopers were helping to defend what seemed an indefensible situation—the continued rule of King Hussein, a leader whose enemies appeared far more numerous and resourceful than his friends.

Many qualified observers of Middle East affairs believed the Western Powers were reaping the whirlwind of past mistakes and misjudgments. There was a serious question whether shattered Western influence and prestige could ever be regained.

Fortunately, there has been a tenuous stability in the Middle East during the past year. Along with that, the trend of events in the area offers a certain amount of cautious encouragement.

In Iraq, there is evidence that the new government had the support of a majority of the population in its recent efforts to cope with and, so far, even put to rout, the extremists and unruly elements that have intrigued for power. This has been done while correct relations with other nations have been maintained and commercial obligations have been honored.

In Lebanon, elements in open conflict during a good part of 1958 have joined in a coalition cabinet that gives promise of a capacity for effective government.

In Jordan, King Hussein has not, as predicted, met the same fate as befell his cousin, King Feisal of Iraq. Instead, he has liberalized his government somewhat, and appears to be stronger as a result. Moreover, the recent agreement to resume diplomatic relations between Jordan and the United Arab Republic suggests a normalization of relations between these two States which should help to soften one of the deepest hostilities in the Middle East.

With respect to the United Arab Republic, I find encouragement in our mutually improved understanding of each other. I have never concealed my belief that our past equivocal attitude toward Egypt and its present leader has been the source of much of our trouble in the Middle East. In the past year, we seem to have matured somewhat in our understanding of the strong drives of Arab nationalism. We seem finally able to distinguish between Arab nationalism and communism. And as for the Egyptian leaders, I believe they are tempering their emotional anticolonialism with the realization that economically, politically, and spiritually they can develop an independence of outside controls and influence.

As a result, Egypt and the United States are cooperating again in a mutually advantageous technical assistance program. Public Law 480 agreements and Export-Import Bank loans are assisting our two countries in moving toward closer working relationships.

I have always hoped that U.S. policy in the Middle East would become something more than a series of ad hoc measures designed to cope with periodic crises. And I hope such a policy is being developed now, because many of the fundamental causes of unrest in the Middle East are all still there.

We could only devise such a policy by treating each of these sovereign States on an adult and realistic basis, rather than suggesting the presence of a political vacuum in the Arab world. We must take into account the full capabilities of the Arabs themselves. This we have failed to do in the past. President Nasser's decision to manage the Suez Canal independent of outside assistance, for example, was greeted with sentiment ranging from skepticism to open derision. However, the canal is being operated just as efficiently as before, the banks have not crumbled, the locks not failed, or ships collided. The only difference is that half of the pilots are now Egyptian nationals, and this is all good. Furthermore, as a result of normal economic growth the volume of goods moving through the canal is considerably higher than it was prior to nationalization. This is just one example of a misjudgment by the West of the capabilities of the Arab peoples.

Sending troops into Lebanon last summer was regarded by many informed people as another misreading of a serious situation. In this view, the United States exaggerated the external threat to Lebanon's security while failing to comprehend the complex internal pressures that had splintered Lebanon into assorted political factions. Furthermore, it was a case of sending troops into one country, Lebanon, as a result of events in another, Iraq.

In much the same way, a great many responsible Americans, Government officials and journalists alike, have apparently misjudged the ability of the present Government of Iraq to stabilize conditions within its borders. Yet General Kassem's government has indicated that by next year the political situation will be sufficiently calm and orderly to permit a resumption of normal political life, with even the possibility of elections—a most hopeful estimate.

In short, it seems to me that the peoples and governments of the Arab States may be in the process of establishing the stability and relative calm essential to the development of representative government and economic growth.

This is what we wish to see—not representative government necessarily in our pattern—not economic growth necessarily in the American pattern—but essentially we want to see men and women able to govern themselves and improve their standards of living.

There are, of course, many more steps that the Arab States could take that would promote developments of mutual advantage in the area. Moreover, as I have indicated, certain basic divisions between some Arab States still exist. But political stability and economic development cannot be attained overnight. It is a gradual process. And we, as a nation, must be prepared to meet these hopeful developments in the Arab world with a policy considerably more mature than that which we have followed in the past.

I submit that the time to formulate our long-range policy for the Middle East is in a period of relative calm. In the recent past, such periods have been all too rare. We seem to be in a period of calm now. I hope very much that the leaders of the Arab States and of the United States may move imaginatively and boldly toward a new, more mature, and realistic relationship.

PRESIDENTIAL APPROVAL OF VETERANS' PENSION BILL

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I desire to commend President Eisenhower for signing the veterans' pension bill recently passed by Congress. This was a realistic bill, which stiffened the test of need with respect to pensions, but also brought widows and orphans of World War II and Korea to a parity with the widows and orphans of World War I. The bill increased some costs, but it reduced others. It represented the middle ground, because its supporters in Congress had rejected far more expensive proposals which would have added a $29 billion program of new special pensions for veterans of World War I with nonservice-connected disabilities.

We all know that Mr. Eisenhower was under pressure from certain economy groups to veto this bill, because it did not take away various veterans' benefits which had been the law of the land for many years. From the other extreme, there were those who expressed dissatisfaction because the bill failed to add costly additional programs of benefits and pensions.

This middle-ground bill represented what I would describe as the moderate approach in the Senate and the House, and the President has acted wisely in making it law with his signature. There had been predictions he would veto the bill, but fortunately these predictions have now proved to be false.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article from the New York Times of August 30, which includes an accurate and comprehensive summary of what the new bill provides for veterans themselves, and for the widows and orphans of veterans.

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

PRESIDENT SIGNS VETERAN-AID BILL—WIDOWS HELPED—NET COST OF REVISED PENSION PLAN IS PUT AT 10 BILLION IN 40-YEAR PERIOD—TEST OF NEED STIFFER—TWELVE BILLION SAVING UNDER NEW RULES OFFSET BY 22 BILLION RISE IN SURVIVOR GRANTS

(By John D. Morris)

WASHINGTON, August 29.—President Eisenhower signed today a bill revising the system of pensions for war veterans with disabilities not connected with their war service.

The new law, which takes effect next July 1, will cost the Government about $10 billion in additional benefits over the next 40 years.

It makes the widows of veterans of World War II and of the Korean war eligible for pensions on the same basis as the widows of World War I veterans, at an estimated cost of $22 billion between now and the year 2000.

It sets up a new sliding-scale formula for benefits of all veterans and dependents going on the pension rolls in the future. This system, it is estimated, will save $12 billion in the next 40 years. Payments under the new plan are to be based on need to a greater extent than at present.

The White House announced that President Eisenhower signed the bill this morning at Chequers, the country home of Prime Minister Harold Macmillan of Britain, near London.

The action ended much speculation over the possibility of a veto. The administration had recommended a stricter needs formula for benefits and had opposed the broadening of widow's pensions.

WIDOWS' AID NOW EQUAL

The pension system, now costing about $1,100 million a year, is separate from the system of compensation for veterans disabled in military service.

Benefits are paid to veterans deemed totally disabled. Those over 65 years of age are presumed to be 90 percent disabled and consequently must show an additional disability of only 10 percent to qualify for pensions. Nearly all can do so.

While widows of World War I veterans get benefits under the present law, widows of veterans of World War II and the Korean war get help only if their husbands were disabled in service. The new law makes the widows of all three wars eligible regardless of whether their husbands' disability was incurred in service.

The new payment formula provides higher pensions for veterans with low incomes and lower pensions for those with higher incomes.

However, veterans already on the rolls can choose either the old or new formula. As a consequence, about three-fourths of those now on the rolls will get higher pensions starting July 1 since they are in the lower-income group and will presumably choose the new formula.

Prospects of long-range savings to the Government under the new formula are based on the assumption that the outside income of veterans will increase.

Flat-rate benefits are prescribed by the expiring system. The exemptions of outside income in determining need are more liberal than they will be under the new law.

The old and new scales are as follows:

VETERANS

Veterans are now eligible if their annual income does not exceed $1,400 if they have no dependents, or $2,700 if they have dependents. They receive $66.15 a month at the start. After 10 years on the rolls, or at 65 years of age, the rate is $78.75.

Under the new system, veterans without dependents will get $85 a month if their income is less than $600, $70 if it is $600 to $1,200, and $40 if it is $1,200 to $1,800.

Veterans with one dependent will get $90 if their income is less than $1,000, $75 if it is $1,000 to $2,000, and $45 if it is $2,000 to $3,000. Veterans with two dependents will get $95, $75, and $45 in the same income ranges. Those with three or more dependents will get $100, $75, and $45.

All rates will be $70 a month for helpless veterans who require regular attendants.

WIDOWS

Widows now are eligible for pensions if their annual income does not exceed $1,400 when they have no minor children, or $2,700 with a minor child or children.

Widows without children now get $50.40 a month. Those with one child get $63. For each additional child, the benefit is $7.56.

Under the new system, childless widows will get $60 a month if their income is less than $600 a year, $45 if the income is $600 to $1,200, and $25 if it is $1,200 to $1,800.

Widows with one child will get $75 a month if their income is below $1,000 a year, $60 if it ranges from $1,000 to $2,000, and $40 if it is $2,000 to $3,000.

In all cases $15 a month will be paid for each additional child.

ORPHANS

Orphans now are eligible for pensions if their outside income is below $1,400 a year.

Payments amount to $27.30 a month for one orphan, $40.95 for two, $54.60 for three and an extra $7.56 for each additional one.

Under the new system orphans will be eligible with outside income up to $1,800 a year, not counting their own earnings.

Payments will amount to $35 a month for one orphan and an extra $15 for each additional child.

In prescribing a stricter needs test for determining eligibility, the new law requires the Veterans' Administration to take into account a prospective beneficiary's net worth, specified types of retirement income and the income of a veterans' wife in excess of $1,200 a year.

About 805,000 veterans and 450,000 widows are now on the non-service-connected pension rolls. The new law, it is estimated, will bring in 206,000 more widows and 72,000 veterans.

The additional cost in the first year is estimated at $308 million.

THE AMERICAN PEOPLE ARE ENTITLED TO THE TRUTH

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, a book "Design for Survival," written by Gen. Thomas S. Power, commander of the Strategic Air Force, is now being withheld from the American people because the Department of Defense does not consider it appropriate for this general to publish this book.

In a democratic form of government the people have the right to all truth which does not help a possible enemy.

Now that Director Keith Glennan of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration has been frank about the conditions incident to our space picture, and we know our military operational capacity in long-range missiles is still well into the future, we know also that the greatest deterrent to aggression against the free world today remains the Strategic Air Force.

An officer who has attained the respect of the Congress because of his candor, his sincerity, and the logic of his experienced views, is General Power, commander of SAC.

Numerous persons who have heard General Power discuss various aspects of survival in the nuclear age, urged him to compile his thoughts and ideas on this subject in book form; and thus make them available to the general public.

Motivated by the conviction that the Nation's problems cannot be solved unless the American people understand these problems, General Power decided, early in 1958, to write the suggested book.

It is a comprehensive discussion concerning the nature of the threat to the Nation's survival, how to meet that threat, how to maintain peace on honorable terms, and how to survive if deterrence fails.

Before proceeding, General Power discussed this project with the Air Force and obtained full approval.

General Power prepared the manuscript entirely in his own time, and at his own expense, maintaining an accurate account of receipts and all expenses incurred. The private nature of the book was also emphasized by a note on the title page to the effect that the opinions expressed by the author did not necessarily reflect those of the U.S. Air Force or Department of Defense.

In accordance with established procedures, the completed manuscript was submitted for Defense Department clearance on April 2, 1959.

It was indicated clearance would take about 1 month, and the publisher, therefore, set his publication date for the latter part of September.

When month after month passed without a decision, General Power learned that there were certain problems in connection with the clearance, but it proved impossible to find out exactly who was holding up the clearance and why.

On the morning of August 21, General Power heard of a statement in the Army-Navy-Air Force Journal, indicating that his book had been banned by the Secretary of Defense. Because of persistent media inquiries, General Power phoned Mr. Murray Snyder, Assistant Secretary of Defense for Public Affairs, who stated approval of the

manuscript was being withheld because the Department of Defense did not consider it appropriate.

As General Power was under the impression that the financial aspect might be a major item of objection, he offered Mr. Snyder to turn over all potential profits to the U.S. Treasury, emphasizing that his only motive in writing this book was to help make the American public better informed; and General Power confirmed this offer in a subsequent letter to Mr. Snyder.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at this point in my remarks a partial list of some high-ranking officers in all three services who have published important books while on active duty.

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

The following senior military officers published books while on active duty:

1. Gen. Omar Bradley, U.S. Army, "A Soldiers Story" (Henry Holt, June 15, 1951). General Bradley was Chairman, JCS at time of publication.

2. Gen. Laurence Kuter, USAF, "Airman at Yalta" (Duell, Sloan & Pearce, 1955). General Kuter was commander, Air University at time of publication.

3. Maj. Gen. William A. Dean, U.S. Army, "The Great Soldier" (Viking Press, 1954). General Dean retired on October 31, 1955.

4. Gen. George Kenney, USAF, "General Kenney Reports" (Duell, Sloan & Pearce, 1949). General Kenney was commander, Air University at time of publication. His previous assignment was commander, SAC.

5. Adm. Hyman G. Rickover, U.S. Navy, "Education and Freedom" (Dutton, 1958). Vice Admiral Rickover is on active duty with the Navy and is connected with atomic submarine research and development.

6. Rear Adm. George J. Dufek, U.S. Navy, "Operation Deep Freeze" (Harcourt Brace, 1958); "Through the Frozen Frontier" (Harcourt Brace, 1959). Admiral Dufek is commander of Operation Deep Freeze I, II, III, IV.

7. Maj. Gen. John Russell Deane, U.S. Army, "Strange Alliance" (Viking Press, 1947). General Deane had just returned from an assignment in Russia.

8. Maj. Gen. James Gavin, U.S. Army, "Airborne Warfare" (Infantry Journal Press, 1947). General Gavin was commander, 82d Airborne Division, Fort Bragg, N.C., at time of publication.

9. Lt. Gen. Henry "Hap" Arnold, USAAF, and Brig. Gen. Ira Eaker, "USAAF Army Flyer" (Harper & Bros., 1942). General Arnold was Chief of the Air Corps and Chief of Staff for Air in the War Department at time of publication.

10. Maj. Gen. Henry "Hap" Arnold, U.S. Air Corps, and Lt. Col. Ira Eaker, "USAC This Flying Game" (Funk and Wagnalls, 1938). General Arnold was Chief of the Air Corps.

11. Adm. Alfred T. Mahan, U.S. Navy, "The Influence of Sea Power Upon History, 1660–1783" (Little, Brown, 1890). Admiral Mahan was a professor at Annapolis.

12. Rear Adm. Dan Gallery, U.S. Navy, "Clear the Decks" (Morrow, 1951); "Twenty Million Tons Under the Sea" (Regnery, 1956). Admiral Gallery published these while on active duty. He is still on active duty. Admiral Gallery has also published numerous highly controversial articles in major magazines such as Saturday Evening Post and the late Collier's. Several were strong indictments of the Air Force, especially the B-36 and long-range bombers.

13. Gen. Mark Clark, U.S. Army, "Calculated Risk" (Harper & Bros., 1950). This was a highly controversial book when it came out. General Clark was commander, 8th Army in Korea at time of publication.

14. Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower, U.S. Army, "Crusade in Europe" (Doubleday, 1948). General Eisenhower, at the time of publication, was officially on active duty drawing full pay and allowances. He retired from the service on May 31, 1952 and resigned his commission in July 1952. The book was written while he was Chief of Staff of the U.S. Army, November 19, 1945, to February 7, 1948.

15. Gen. Douglas MacArthur, U.S. Army, "MacArthur on War" (Duell, Sloan & Pearce, 1942). This is a collection of General MacArthur's writings and papers as Chief of Staff, U.S. Army, and reflects his thoughts on war and U.S. military situation. At time of publication General MacArthur was commanding general, U.S. Army Forces in the Far East.

Mr. SYMINGTON. If this country is to remain adequately strong, we must face up to the realities of this present era—and to do that the people must have the truth.

It now appears that the most able and experienced leaders of our Military Establishment are going to be denied the right to present that truth.

If this is to be future policy, how can the American people obtain the facts about the status of our national defense?

Not only are they entitled to know those facts, but they deserve to receive them from the best possible sources—and General Power is exactly that type of source.

NEEDED: CAUTION IN TRADE TALKS WITH KHRUSHCHEV

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the upcoming exchange of visits between President Eisenhower and Premier Khrushchev will, in all likelihood, involve discussions of a wide variety of topics.

During the visit, for example it is expected that the Soviet Premier will make a "pitch" for stepped-up United States-Soviet trade.

If and when such talks occur, I believe we must be extremely wary. The Premier is a good "horse trader"—although in this case, the stakes are much higher—that is, the security of the free world.

CONDITIONS TO MORE EAST-WEST TRADE

Earlier this year, Under Secretary of State Douglas Dillon set some very fundamental conditions which needed to be considered in any East-West trade talks. Among other things, these include: Settling the Russian lend-lease obligations—still amounting to millions of dollars—tearing down Communist barriers that prevent U.S. companies from access to producing and consuming industries that would be involved in trade; agreements to protect patent rights; and other actions to demonstrate good faith in trade policy.

TREAD CAUTIOUSLY IN ANY TRADE NEGOTIATIONS

The presentation of such factors in trade discussions—particularly the bad debts—would, in all likelihood, be unwelcome by the Soviet Premier.

Policywise, the Communists have a deceptive habit of wanting to handle such past debts, or other obligations, by sweeping them under the rug and forgetting about them. Thus, I believe we must tread cautiously in any negotiations for increased United States-Soviet trade.

Despite a thaw in the cold war that may be created by the agreed-upon exchange visits of President Eisenhower and Premier Khrushchev, we are still in a life-and-death struggle with communism. Until the Soviets show real signs of swerving from their oft-stated goal of world domination—including domination over the United States—we will need to be extremely careful not to engage in any negotiations—including trade—that would strengthen their ability to accomplish their objective.

I am aware, of course, that there are voices within this country which are urging increased trade with Communist countries, including Red China. Naturally, I can appreciate the interests of individuals, businesses—and yes, Members of Congress—in seeking to find outlets for commodities significant to the economies of their communities.

However, I would again warn that we cannot sacrifice our security for the almighty dollar. Rather, every possible precaution should be taken to insure that, in any instance, in which there might be increased trade between the East and the West—whether it is with the Soviet Union, Communist China, or any orbit country behind the Iron or Bamboo Curtains—every necessary effort be made to ascertain that such commodities will not ultimately threaten our own security.

TRIBUTE TO OSCAR L. CHAPMAN AND OTHER PIONEERS IN FIGHT FOR HAWAIIAN STATEHOOD

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, when the distinguished new Senators from the State of Hawaii [Mr. FONG and Mr. LONG] took their oaths of office last week, tribute was paid in the Senate to many who, over the years, had contributed to the fruition of Hawaiian statehood.

I desire to add a name which may have been overlooked—that of Oscar L. Chapman, who, as Secretary of the Interior, never flagged in his advocacy of statehood for both Hawaii and Alaska. An edifice rarely is built overnight. Those who toiled during the past were the ones who reared the foundation on which the present structure of statehood stands. Without the pioneering efforts of Secretary Chapman, I doubt if we would have States No. 49 and No. 50 today. A story appeared in the Washington Post and Times Herald of August 31, 1959, heralding the early interest of Oscar Chapman and his very attractive wife, Anne, in statehood for Hawaii, and I ask unanimous consent that the article appear in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

FOR FORMER SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR: HIS 20-YEAR DREAM CAME TRUE

(By Rosemary Donihi)

The Hawaiian congressional delegation had a busy weekend with parties in their honor both Saturday night and last night.

Saturday evening, the Oscar Chapmans entertained for the Hawaiian congressional delegation in their charming back garden with such luau-like additions to their cocktail table as roast suckling pig, toasted cocoanut, eggrolls, chicken balls, and "golden nuggets." Magnificent addition from Alaska was the giant king crab, flown in especially for the party.

Wandering through the garden, greeting friends, listening to the little band of Hawaiian musicians and generally enjoying themselves were the Philippine Ambassador and Mrs. Carlos P. Romulo; the Korean Ambassador and Mrs. You Chan Yang, and Guatemalan Ambassador and Mrs. Carlos S. Antillon-Hernandez. Guests from the Mexican Embassy included Minister Counselor Eugenio de Anzorena and Minister Juan P. Gallardo.

Hawaiian Senator OREN E. LONG, who last visited the former Secretary of the Interior and Mrs. Chapman a year ago as Governor of Hawaii, at a party celebrating Alaska's statehood, was greeted by fellow Senators JOHN SPARKMAN, Democrat, of Alabama, and PAUL H. DOUGLAS, Democrat, of Illinois, both of whom came alone. (Mrs. Douglas is in Tel Aviv at the bedside of her son-in-law who is seriously ill.)

Chatting with Hawaiian Democratic Representative DANIEL INOUYE and Mrs. Inouye were Senator and Mrs. CLINTON ANDERSON. Others from Capitol Hill included Senator and Mrs. WILLIAM E. PROXMIRE, Democrat, of Wisconsin, Senator CLAIR ENGLE, Democrat, of California, and his pretty wife and Senator RICHARD L. NEUBERGER, Democrat, of Oregon, who came alone. Mrs. Ralph Yarborough, wife of the Democratic Senator from Texas, was greeted by her many friends who were happy to see her looking completely recovered from her recent illness.

Perhaps happiest of all at the happy party were the Chapmans themselves, who see in statehood status for Alaska and Hawaii the fulfillment of one of his goals during his almost 20 years of service as Assistant Secretary and Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I also desire to refer to the early efforts made toward statehood for Hawaii by the man who was my opponent for the Senate in 1954, the Honorable Guy Cordon, of Oregon. While Senator Cordon and I disagreed on many issues, both in the national and international realm, we definitely saw eye to eye on statehood for Hawaii. As chairman of the Senate Interior Committee during the Republican 83d Congress, Senator Cordon was a persistent and effective proponent of Hawaiian statehood, and I believe his name should be recorded among those who have contributed substantially to this great event of adding a 50th star to the flag of the United States.

In addition, I desire to list an Oregon resident whose editorials and whose voice as a member of our State legislature always have been loud and clear in the cause of Hawaii. I refer to State Senator Monroe M. Sweetland, of Clackamas County. Senator Sweetland served in the Hawaiian Islands as an American Red Cross representative during World War II. There he made many stanch personal friends, and there he became convinced that the inclusion of Hawaii's melting pot of many races in the Union of States would be a contribution to democracy throughout the free world. His editorials in the Milwaukie, Oreg., Review, which he publishes, and his memorials in the Oregon State Senate, have been further factors in the series of historic events which reached their climax last week, when HIRAM FONG and OREN E. LONG took their oaths as Senators from the sovereign State of Hawaii.

THE SUEZ CANAL TRANSIT ISSUE

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I noted with great interest the statement of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations [Mr. FULBRIGHT].

All men of good will must agree with the Senator from Arkansas when he says:

> Fortunately there has been a tenuous stability in the Middle East during the past year. Along with that, the trend of events in the area offers a certain amount of cautious encouragement.

And the Government of the United States, along with the Senator from Arkansas, wants "to see men and women able to govern themselves and improve their standards of living."

This is a stated aim of the Eisenhower administration. I am sure we must agree that this administration's policies have contributed to both the stability in the Middle East and the encouragement felt in other parts of the world.

But I must take exception to an omission in the Senator's statement, when he said:

> President Nasser's decision to manage the Suez Canal independent of outside assistance, for example, was greeted with sentiment ranging from skepticism to open derision. However, the canal is being operated just as efficiently as before, the banks have not crumbled, the locks not failed, or ships collided. The only difference is that half of the pilots are now Egyptian nationals and this is all good.

The other difference is that the canal is not being operated legally.

President Nasser's government has refused passage to Israel ships or to other ships with Israeli cargoes.

For the past 100 days the Danish flag vessel *Inge Toft*, with an Israeli cargo, has been detained at Port Said. This action is in violation of international convention, United Nations decisions, the pledged word of the United Arab Republic, and the cause of peace in the Middle East.

The U.S. Government's position with respect to the unrestricted use of the canal is clear and unequivocal, and was restated as recently as last July.

I ask unanimous consent to include as part of my remarks a letter from the Department of State sent to me in answer to a telegram which was sent to President Eisenhower by 25 Senators, including myself; also an editorial entitled "The Canal and the Bank," published in the New York Times of August 29, 1959.

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

JULY 3, 1959.

DEAR SENATOR SCOTT: In connection with the joint telegram which 25 Senators, including yourself, sent to the President on June 24, 1959, expressing concern over the recent detention by the United Arab Republic of cargoes bound from Israel on Israeli chartered ships, I have been asked to furnish you with details regarding the Department's position with respect to the Suez Canal transit issue.

As your telegram to the President indicates, the U.S. Government's position with respect to the unrestricted use of the canal is clear and unequivocal. The United States joined with France and the United Kingdom to sponsor a resolution before the Security Council in September 1951, which called upon Egypt to terminate restrictions on the passage of international commercial shipping and goods through the canal. This position was reaffirmed by a majority of the Security Council in voting in favor of a draft resolution, subsequently vetoed by the Soviet Union, on March 27, 1954, which called upon Egypt to comply with the 1951 resolution. Further statements by U.S. officials, including one by Ambassador Lodge in the Security Council on April 26, 1957, have maintained the position that there should at all times be free and nondiscriminatory passage through the canal for all countries. The United Arab Republic and all other members of the United Nations are fully conversant with the U.S. position.

The recent seizures of several cargoes bound from Israel aboard non-Israeli ships, and the current detention of a Danish-flag vessel chartered on behalf of Israel interests, have again raised the issue of free transit through the canal after a period of apparently satisfactory transit of cargoes originating in Israel. The United Nations and the parties concerned are currently engaged in trying to resolve the problem which had been created by these recent difficulties. The Secretary General of the United Nations is now visiting Cairo where he will be discussing a number of questions including the *Inge Toft* case.

It is hoped that the transit problem may be resolved between the parties immediately concerned, and we are encouraging and supporting the continuing efforts on the part of Mr. Hammarskjold. The U.S. Government has already discussed the Suez transit question in various foreign capitals, including Cairo and Tel Aviv. While the efforts at settlement currently being undertaken by the United Nations, supported by the United States and other powers, would appear for the present to constitute the most effective means of seeking a satisfactory solution, you may be assured that we will continue to take every appropriate measure which may contribute to a resolution of this problem.

The U.S. Executive Director of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development is aware of developments in this matter and is also conversant with our longstanding policy in support of the principle of freedom of transit through the canal.

If I can be of any additional assistance to you with regard to this problem, please do not hesitate to communicate further with me.

Sincerely yours,
WILLIAM B. MACOMBER, Jr.,
Assistant Secretary of State.

[From the New York Times, Aug. 29, 1959]

THE CANAL AND THE BANK

The technical aspects of arranging a loan by the World Bank for the United Arab Republic to widen and deepen the Suez Canal seem to have been settled in Cairo. The political aspects have not. This appears to be the gist of the impasse that has now been reached.

Obviously, the canal should be improved to take more and larger ships. The whole world would gain if that were done, and sooner or later it must be done. However, the World Bank is not a completely free agent. In theory it acts on a strictly financial and economic basis; in practice there are

bound to be occasions where its decisions cut across political lines. This is one of them, as the letter of protest sent by 13 Members of our House of Representatives to Eugene Black, President of the Bank, demonstrates.

The canal is an international thoroughfare, but it now belongs to the United Arab Republic. President Nasser continues to refuse to allow Israeli ships or even cargo destined to Israel through the canal. As long ago as September 1, 1951, the Security Council of the United Nations adopted a resolution calling on Egypt "to terminate the restrictions on the passage of commercial shipping and goods through the Suez Canal wherever bound, and to cease all interference with such shipping beyond that essential to the safety of shipping in the canal itself."

If President Nasser can get his financing privately no one would have a right to complain, but Israel is a member of the World Bank, even if a modest one. There are also other members who would not want to see the Bank finance work on behalf of the Suez Canal so long as Colonel Nasser refuses to meet his international obligations. It should be made a condition of any loan that the Suez Canal be a truly international thoroughfare, without limitations or restrictions.

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

Mr. SCOTT. I shall be glad to yield in just a moment.

Mr. President, despite the improved political climate in the Middle East and despite a sincere desire by the people of that area for a lasting peace, I submit that such actions by President Nasser's government prevent better relations with the United States.

I wonder if the Senator from Arkansas knows of any development which would ease the situation with respect to the Suez Canal. I shall be glad to yield to him for any comment he cares to make.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, what I was hoping would come out of the present conditions was a lessening of the tension. I was suggesting that our Government should, in a time of relative quiet, undertake to find a way to solve the continuing differences between the United Arab Republic and Israel, or between all the Arab States and Israel. I would hope that we would not wait for another crisis and another outbreak before bestirring ourselves to do something.

I did not, as the Senator will agree, seek to make any political capital or to criticize the administration. However, inasmuch as the Senator has injected the administration's attitude, I must at least remind the Senator that at the time of the cancellation of the plan for financing the construction of the Aswan Dam I was very much in disagreement with the policy of this administration, then under the direction of Secretary Dulles. I am still of the same opinion. I still believe that was the source of much of the trouble. But in my own statement I did not make any reference to that, and I did not seek to make any partisan political implications. I do not know why the Senator insists on injecting partisan politics into this particular matter.

Mr. SCOTT. First of all, I agreed with the Senator when he was critical of the action taken with respect to the Aswan Dam, if by that position he means that when we undertook to build it we were wrong. I think we were. I am glad we decided not to build it, and I think that was right, but I wonder why the Senator feels that reference to the administration as having been correct in another instance is necessarily, or in itself the injection of politics or partisanship. I have referred to the statement by the Senator from Arkansas, who says that the canal is being operated legally.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I did not say legally. I said efficiently. It is being operated efficiently.

Mr. SCOTT. So was Hitler's government. I have said that the canal was being operated illegally. I do not think that is any more a political statement than the statement made by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. My view of how to proceed is to encourage those people. Obviously they have been performing better than many expected. An example, is the resumption of relations with Jordan. I did not say that everything was solved. I believe that the way to make progress is to encourage those people in their more moderate views, rather than to continue to criticize them. I deplore the interruption of legitimate traffic, but the way to get at the problem is not by continuing to carp about it, but to go forward with an affirmative program, in an effort to try to reconcile the Arab States to the continued existence of Israel—in other words, to compose the differences.

Much has been done, or I should say it is in the process of being done, to reconcile the differences which exist between India and Pakistan. What I specifically have in mind, I did not put in my statement, because it is not really my responsibility to try to draw a blueprint for the State Department and the administration. My idea is to bring into this picture the same agency that was brought into the trouble between Pakistan and India, to see if some solution can be reached which would compose the differences leading to such instances as the interruption of traffic in the canal. That is all I was trying to suggest.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. SCOTT. May I have unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute, to make further comment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator may proceed for 1 minute.

Mr. SCOTT. First of all, I suspect that the reason why India and Pakistan seem to be drawing together is that the catalyst is Red China rather than the United Nations or any action of our own. But as to the concord or solution of the differences in the Middle East, I entirely agree with the Senator from Arkansas. I am only trying to say that I do not think it should be onesided. I think that so long as Nasser continues to refuse to permit the ships of any nation to go through the Suez Canal, we should be as much concerned about that as if some other government refused permission for ships to go through some other strait or canal. I would not spend my time praising Nasser for bringing peace to the Middle East when he is the man who is causing the only blockade or only existent trouble at the moment, namely that between Israel and the Middle Eastern countries.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be allowed to proceed for one-half minute in order to comment on the statement of the Senator from Pennsylvania.

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

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not wish to let the statement stand that Red China is the main reason why the troubles between Pakistan and India are being solved. I deny that. I do not believe that really is the reason. The real accord is being achieved because of the imaginative statesmanship of Mr. Eugene R. Black and because of the money available for disposition by the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development.

If we do not understand how these things are brought about, we cannot make any progress in the future. This is not at all an incidental development because Red China is being aggressive, in my opinion. The adjustment of this matter was under way before Red China's aggression became so evident. Work had been done on the problem for a long time. What is happening with respect to India and Pakistan is the culmination of a very intelligent way of going about the solution of difficulties of this kind. I only hope the administration can institute something similar in the Middle East with respect to a settlement of the difficulties between the Arabs and the Jews.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Arkansas has expired.

---

40 AND 8 SOCIETY DEFEATS ATTEMPT TO FORCE RACIAL INTEGRATION

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, last Wednesday the American Legion National Convention defeated an attempt to force integration upon the 40 and 8 Society, a subsidiary of the American Legion. The vote was 1,650 to 1,388.

The amazing part of this vote was not the southern bloc vote which voted against forcing the 40 and 8 to integrate, but the surprise—which was a pleasant surprise—came from Legion representatives from areas where integration has been a widespread practice and the preaching of some of the political leadership for years.

Mr. President, for example, Canada voted 6 to 0 against integration. The District of Columbia voted 16 to 4 against integrating; Idaho, 13 to 4 against integrating.

Mr. President, I particularly call to the Senate's attention the vote of the State of the distinguished senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] who is now presiding, which was 211 against integrating and 8 for. Iowa is another example, where the delegates voted 104 to 0 against integrating; Kansas, 67 to 0 against integrating.

Mr. President, again I cite the vote of the delegates from Michigan, where they voted 44 against integrating to 33 for integrating.

I wish to bring to the attention of the distinguished Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], the chairman of the Constitutional Rights Subcommittee, who has announced his support of one of the strongest civil rights bills ever brought into the Congress, the vote of the delegates from his State to the American Legion National Convention. These Missourians voted 72 against integrating to 3 for integrating. In Montana the vote was 20 to 1 against integrating. Nevada voted 9 to 0 against integrating. Ohio voted 87 to 37 against integrating, and Oklahoma voted 52 to 0 against integrating. Oregon voted 25 to 5 against integrating, and the Panama Canal Zone voted 7 to 0 against integrating. The State of Washington voted 44 to 5 against integrating, and West Virginia voted 36 to 0 against integrating.

Mr. President, this recorded vote by American Legionnaires on the question of whether or not to force integration upon the 40 and 8 Society is a representative vote from across the entire United States and its possessions, and even including some foreign nations. This vote should be carefully analyzed by those who now wish to force more integration upon the country through civil rights laws such as the announced amendments and proposals by Senator KEATING of New York, and Senator HENNINGS of Missouri.

This vote certainly indicates that there is strong thinking among the people of the various States that forced integration is not necessary. In fact, Mr. President, I daresay that if the people across this land were given an opportunity to vote on whether or not to force integration on everybody, their answer would be "No," as it was at the American Legion National Convention.

However, so long as the question is left up to the Supreme Court, which is far removed from the squalor, prejudices, hatreds, and slums of New York and other large cities where integration has been forced on the people, then we shall never get the right answer. Similarly, I hope the Members of the Senate will not force civil rights legislation upon unwilling people until we find a solution to the horrifying problems that have already been created by the forced integrations of the past.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a table of votes from the American Legion National Convention, as published in the Minneapolis Tribune of Thursday, August 27, 1959.

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

Here's key vote on race report

Department	Yes	No	Number of votes
Alabama		42	42
Alaska	9		9
Arizona		21	21
Arkansas		33	33
California	126	24	150
Canada		6	6
Colorado	27	4	31
Connecticut	37		37
Delaware		10	10
District of Columbia	4	16	20
Florida		51	51
France	7	1	8
Georgia		60	60
Hawaii	9		9
Idaho	4	13	17
Illinois	8	211	219
Indiana	75	40	115
Iowa		104	104
Italy	(1)	(1)	9
Kansas		67	67
Kentucky	0	60	40
Louisiana	3	37	60
Maine		27	27
Maryland		41	41
Massachusetts	92		92
Mexico	5	2	7
Michigan	33	44	77
Minnesota	99		99
Mississippi	1	37	38
Missouri	3	72	75
Montana	1	20	21
Nebraska	36	22	58
Nevada		9	9
New Hampshire	24	1	25
New Jersey	77	1	78
New Mexico	19	1	20
New York	211	9	220
North Carolina		49	49
North Dakota	20	16	36
Ohio	37	87	124
Oklahoma		52	52
Oregon	5	25	30
Panama, C.Z.		7	7
Pennsylvania	248	10	258
Philippines	9		9
Puerto Rico	(1)	(1)	14
Rhode Island	18		18
South Carolina		28	28
South Dakota	34	2	36
Tennessee	1	59	60
Texas	2	83	85
Utah		13	13
Vermont	18		18
Virginia		37	37
Washington	5	44	49
West Virginia		36	[2] 37
Wisconsin	67	14	81
Wyoming	14	2	16
Total	1,388	1,650	3,062

[1] Passed.
[2] 1 passed.

CANADA'S INTEREST IN LAKE MICHIGAN DIVERSION

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, in view of its timeliness, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Affront to a Neighbor," published in the Washington Post and Times Herald of today, August 31, 1959. The editorial relates to the proposed diversion of the waters of Lake Michigan.

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

AFFRONT TO A NEIGHBOR

The argument usually heard in support of the bill to permit Chicago to divert 1,000 cubic feet of water a second from Lake Michigan is that it would lower the level of the lake by only one-quarter of an inch. This argument seems to us both dangerous and fallacious. In one sense, of course, one-quarter of an inch off the surface of Lake Michigan seems very little; but in another sense it is an immense amount of water.

Minnesota, Wisconsin, Indiana, Michigan, Ohio, Pennsylvania, New York, and our neighbor Canada have very direct interests in this water. With so large an area vitally concerned about the water of this great inland sea, it is difficult indeed to justify additional diversions to aid Chicago with its sewage problem. One must remember that Chicago already takes 3,300 cubic feet a second from the lake to flush its sewage through the Illinois Waterway.

This move in Congress to reduce the level of the Great Lakes by unilateral action is especially unfortunate because it is an affront to Canada. Sponsors of the bill argue vehemently that Lake Michigan is wholly within the United States, which is true. But this is only a quibble in view of the fact that it is linked with the other four Great Lakes, which are international waters. Control over these waters is made an international concern by a number of treaties; Canada has protested against the diversion bill; the State Department has frowned upon it; and it must be obvious to any Senator that it cannot be passed without worsening our relations with a close neighbor who is already nursing a number of grievances against this country.

Since any water diverted from the Great Lakes by way of the Illinois Waterway into the Mississippi and the Gulf of Mexico will obviously not be available for the great St. Lawrence Seaway project that the United States and Canada have jointly built, the proposed diversion might easily be regarded as an act of bad faith on the part of the United States. Senator PROXMIRE pointed out, moreover, that Canada could easily retaliate by taking 25 percent of the water of the Columbia River before it flows into the United States.

If Chicago can make a legitimate case for the diversion of more water from Lake Michigan to ease her sewage problem, at least the diversion should await full agreement with Canada.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I wish to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that the International Joint Commission has for some months been working on the proposed diversion of the headwaters of the Columbia River, several hundred miles above the U.S. boundary. This work of the International Joint Commission is in accord with the provisions of the treaty of 1909, which recognizes the right of either country to object to action by the other which will materially affect its water resources or the boundary waters which are mutual or common to both countries.

I trust that the U.S. Congress will show equal respect for the provisions of this treaty.

THE NATIONAL SYSTEM OF INTERSTATE AND DEFENSE HIGHWAYS AND THE GASOLINE TAX

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, with the passage of each day, the need for congressional action to avert a collapse of our program to build a National System of Interstate and Defense Highways becomes more acute. There is general agreement that action to insure continued construction must, and will, be taken. The question is whether we shall make continuation of this vital program conditional upon a further in-

crease in the Federal sales tax on gasoline.

Mr. President, the power to levy taxes belongs to Congress. This power should be used wisely and fairly. In determining what kind of a tax shall be imposed, consideration must be given, not only to the need for revenue, but also to the question of whether the proposal is fair and would result in an equitable sharing of the overall tax burden.

I have already pointed out to the Senate that highway users, in addition to paying all types of taxes levied upon taxpayers generally, are paying direct excise taxes in an amount substantially in excess of the cost of highway construction, a program of which they are one, but by no means the sole, beneficiary. Yet it is now proposed to impose upon them a still greater burden.

Gasoline is a necessity, an essential commodity. Almost everyone must use it in one way or another. Many use it regularly, in order to earn a livelihood. The burden of a Federal sales tax or gasoline tax falls equally upon all, with no regard whatever to ability to pay. It is a regressive tax in every sense of the word. The wage earner pays at the same rate as does the top corporation executive. A person who earns a livelihood by means of the use of gasoline pays the same as does one who uses gasoline for pleasure purposes. The tax on gasoline is already too high.

With all the loopholes and areas of tax favoritism which remain uncorrected, I can not believe that this Congress, after due deliberation, will determine that the highway users are the one class of taxpayers upon whom an additional levy may equitably and fairly be imposed.

Already gasoline is the most heavily taxed essential commodity. In many States, the Federal and State sales taxes combined are approximately equal to the cost of the fuel at the refinery. Where is there another essential commodity which bears a 100 percent tax? Indeed, there are few luxuries which bear a tax proportionately as heavy as does this essential commodity.

It is said that this additional levy is to be imposed only for a temporary period of 1 or 2 years, to meet an emergency. I would remind my colleagues that the history of taxation is replete with examples of "temporary" taxes which have become permanent fixtures. Just this year, the Congress once again extended the corporate and excise tax rates. The excise taxes imposed on transportation and communications as wartime measures during World War II are still partially with us.

Should this Congress increase the gasoline tax for a definitely prescribed period, the same arguments that now are made in support of its adoption would be made in the future, for its extension.

Some appear to contend, Mr. President, that we must increase the gasoline tax because there is no other fiscally responsible way to continue the highway program. The fact is, however, that there is another course of action which will permit the program to go forward without increasing overall appropriations from the general fund of the Treasury.

I have proposed that appropriations for the fiscal year 1960 be reduced by 1 percent, with the amounts derived from this rescission to be transferred to the highway trust fund, to provide funds to pay the States the money the Federal Government is obligated to pay them. I emphasize, Mr. President, that the maximum amount by which any program would be reduced would be 1 percent of the amount appropriated. In the instances in which the full amounts appropriated are required by law to be paid, the reduction would not apply; and the President would be given the discretion to make this determination in instances other than those enumerated in my bill, such as veterans' pensions. I do not believe it can reasonably be asserted that a reduction of 1 percent would be disastrous to any of the many programs for which we annually appropriate funds.

To those who believe that the Congress should act to reduce expenditures, my proposal should appear indeed modest. Yet the amount of the reduction would be adequate to eliminate the 1960 deficit in the highway trust fund.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time available to the Senator from Tennessee, under the 3-minute limitation, has expired.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for an additional minute.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I join in that request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered; and the Senator from Tennessee may proceed.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, in addition to the sums already earmarked for the highway trust fund, highway users will pay into the general fund this year $1.6 billion derived from direct taxes imposed upon them. In addition, Mr. President, as I have said, they contribute otherwise to the general fund, in the same proportion as do all other taxpayers generally. I see no valid reason why the highway program, which benefits the entire economy and is necessary for our national security, should be made a stepchild, with further progress to be contingent upon the levy of a penalty tax upon the highway user.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The additional time granted the Senator from Tennessee has expired.

THE IMPORTANCE OF INSURING UNFETTERED PASSAGE THROUGH THE SUEZ CANAL

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I desire to associate myself with the remarks made earlier today by the Senator from Pennsylvania in regard to the problem of the Suez Canal. It seems to me that the unconscionable action of President Nasser contravenes the spirit of international law, and is ample reason for the other nations of the world to unite in acting in concert.

Mr. President, it seems clear to me that no loan should be made by the World Bank to Egypt to improve the Suez Canal until President Nasser agrees to open the canal to trade by all nations of the world, no matter how efficient President Nasser may be claimed to be in his operations.

It had been my intention to ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the excellent editorial on this subject which was published on Saturday in the New York Times. However, my colleague from Pennsylvania has already received permission to have it printed in the RECORD. As is pointed out in the editorial:

> It should be made a condition of any loan (by the World Bank) that the Suez Canal be a truly international thoroughfare, without limitations or restrictions.

I agree entirely with that statement, Mr. President; and also with the statement, made by the Times, that Israel and other countries—including, I would hope, the United States—are unwilling to see World Bank funds advanced to Egypt, for canal work, "so long as Colonel Nasser refuses to meet his international obligations."

Mr. President, on June 24 of this year, I joined with 25 other Members of the Senate in urging President Eisenhower and the State Department to continue America's efforts to assure free transit of the Suez Canal. I have been reassured, by the response, that America will keep on playing its part in resolving this problem.

Specifically, on July 3, Assistant Secretary of State William B. Macomber, Jr., wrote that this country has continually stressed that "there should at all times be free and nondiscriminatory passage through the canal for all countries."

He further stated that although our Government at that time felt that negotiations under the auspices of the United Nations constituted "the most effective means of seeking a satisfactory solution, you may be assured that we will continue to take every appropriate measure which may contribute to a resolution of this problem."

In addition, Mr. Macomber wrote on July 3 that the World Bank was aware of the Suez Canal situation and "is also conversant with our long-standing policy in support of the principle of freedom of transit through the canal."

Mr. President, in this connection, I was delighted to note that a bipartisan group of 13 Members of the other body, under the leadership of the Honorable SEYMOUR HALPERN, of New York, recently wrote President Eugene R. Black of the World Bank urging that the Bank withhold the proposed loan to the United Arab Republic for canal work until freedom of transit through the canal was assured. I applaud heartily this action.

I have today signed a letter, in conjunction with my distinguished colleagues from New York [Mr. JAVITS] and from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT], along the same lines, addressed to the Secretary of State. I am extremely

hopeful our actions will help put pressure on Mr. Nasser to stop plugging up this important international artery and will permit the noble State of Israel to continue its fine progress through increased trade with the nations of the world.

I further hope that the U.S. Government will continue by all means at its disposal to do its part to insure freedom of transit through the Suez Canal.

Mr. President, I turn to another subject.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York.

BRANCH RICKEY'S GREATEST CHALLENGE

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, the task of Branch Rickey in getting the third major league on its feet and into operation may well be the greatest challenge of an illustrious career filled with challenges and successes. Mr. Rickey brings magnificent talents to this important cause and the good wishes of all baseball fans, including myself, go with him as he proceeds with his work.

A fine editorial in the Christian Science Monitor recently pointed out that "if anybody can make baseball's third major league a going institution, Rickey is the man." There is much truth in that statement, Mr. President, and that is why so many of us are delighted that Mr. Rickey has consented to take up the cudgels in behalf of the Continental League.

I ask unanimous consent to have this editorial printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Aug. 27, 1959]

BASEBALL'S ONE-MAN HALL OF FAME

For most men at the age of 77, success is something to look back upon, to dream about, to talk over on a quiet evening with old friends.

But to Branch Rickey, first president of baseball's Continental League, success has always been a springboard to something else. It may be that Mr. Rickey is the best thing the Continental people have going for them, since as yet they don't own any bats, balls, or players.

Briefly, Mr. Rickey has a long list of firsts to his credit, including the breaking of baseball's color line, establishment of the farm system, the numbering of players, and plastic helmets for batters.

Usually Rickey's talents come high, but he is a 100-cents-on-the-dollar man. He is scrupulously honest. Yet there are those who refused to make trades with him when he ran the Brooklyn Dodgers and St. Louis Cardinals because he invariably outfoxed them. For a club president who never went to a ball park on Sunday—because of a promise to his mother—he did extremely well.

To Rickey everything is a challenge. To the new league's most pressing question—where does it gets its players?—Rickey someday will answer in some four or five thousand well-chosen words. They will be over the heads of many of his listeners but that won't make any difference because Branch will come up with the players anyway.

Baseball writers who coined the term "Stengelese" for the vernacular of the New York Yankees' Casey Stengel have also come away from baseball dinners tremendously fired up from listening to Rickey. Yet, in most cases, few were able to discern the full import of what he had said. If anybody can make baseball's third major league a going institution, though, Rickey is the man.

THE ADMINISTRATION HAS LAGGED ON EDUCATION

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, education of the youth is one of the chief duties of the state in a democracy. If properly and efficiently done, it is the chief safeguard of liberty and freedom. If neglected, ignorance and misguided mob psychology will undermine free and rational institutions.

Educational opportunity for American youth generally is more available now than it was a generation ago. However, that opportunity has increased in this generation much more slowly than educational opportunity has increased in many other countries in this same generation.

America will remain the light and the hope of free men everywhere on this earth only if we keep ourselves enlightened and free.

Education is the first and foremost of the keys to personal, national, and international understanding. A trained mind is the sharpest weapon in the arsenal of democracy.

Mr. President, this administration has done lipservice to education, but little else. It professes to believe in education, but it has toned down the financial support available for college loans under the National Defense Education Act; it has opposed the college classrooms construction program in the Housing Act; it is opposing the GI educational bill for veterans of the cold war; it is opposing classroom construction in grade and high schools. In short, this administration is waging war on every front on our democratic efforts to improve American education.

In the Washington Post for Sunday, August 30, 1959, the fine and perceptive lead editorial entitled "Under the Rug" narrates some of the administration's methods of delaying progress in education. It tells how American schoolchildren, 10 million of them, are being swept under the rug with their lost educational opportunities. When they get under the rug, they may find the administration's bug which put them there. And when they do, they will find that bug labeled "administration which puts the welfare of big money above the welfare of the people."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Washington Post editorial be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

UNDER THE RUG

The administration is going through its customary ritual of calling attention to the desperate condition of the country's public school system without doing anything effectual to correct that condition. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare issued an unringing appeal on Wednesday for congressional action on an administration-sponsored installment plan of Federal aid for building classrooms. But no one seems to suppose seriously that it has any possibility of passage in this session of Congress. And no one can pretend that it proposes to do anything more than apply a poultice to a hemorrhage.

A fortnight ago Secretary Flemming told a news conference that when the public schools open next month for the 1959–60 school year there will be a shortage of about 140,000 classrooms throughout the United States. The shortage a year ago at the opening of school was 140,500 classrooms. "What does this continuing neglect by the Federal Government of this classroom shortage mean in terms of the actual loss of educational opportunity?" the Secretary asked the reporters rhetorically. He answered his own question as follows:

"When there aren't enough classrooms there are generally more pupils per teacher, educational facilities are crowded. Half-day and split sessions are imposed. There are fewer hours for children in school. Parents, teachers, children are subjected to constant frustration. A crowded classroom robs every child in that room—not just those who make up the statistical excess enrollment for the school."

The Commissioner of Education, Dr. Lawrence G. Derthick, has just announced that a total of 1,563,000 teachers will be needed in both public and nonpublic schools in the coming year, whereas the number presently qualified is 1,368,000. "The deficit of teachers will mean, in many communities, overlarge classes or the employment of teachers without adequate training, or both," Commissioner Derthick said. "In many instances, it will also mean curtailing the number of subjects offered."

The administration school-aid bill does not even pretend to do anything about the shortage of teachers. And it is by no means clear that it would do what it pretends to do about the shortage of classrooms. It would commit the Federal Government to pay, each year for 5 years, half the annual principal and interest on school bonds representing a capital outlay of $600 million to be allocated among the States on the basis of school population, per capita income, and school financing efforts. The Federal share of principal and interest would be $17 million in the first full year of operation, rising by the fifth year to a maximum level of $85 million which would be maintained until the bonds are paid off.

The virtue of this installment program is that it would not unduly swell the budget of an administration unwilling to recommend additional taxation to meet imperative human needs. It undoubtedly represents the most that Secretary Flemming, an educator who surely understands the problem, thinks he can induce the President to approve. Its vice is that it is niggardly and inadequate; it would mortgage the future without solving the problem; it would finance, at best, hardly half of the additional classrooms admittedly needed; and the terms of financing would be unacceptable or unattainable for school districts already at the limit of their financial resources. Worst of all, perhaps, it is a program presented with so little fervor, with so slight a sense of the urgency of school needs and with so conspicuous an absence of Presidential leadership or even support that it can evoke enthusiasm neither in Congress nor in the country.

Congress must bear, no doubt, a heavy burden of the blame for failure year after year to deal with the Nation's school needs. But a still heavier share of blame must be shouldered by the administration for its failure to give this problem the priority it deserves. Together, Congress and the administration can once more, as they have done so often in the past, brush this problem under the rug. But they will be brushing under the rug about 10 million American

children—the number doomed to overcrowded and obsolescent classrooms in the richest nation on earth.

PUBLIC AND PRIVATE POWER LEADERS IN PACIFIC NORTHWEST OPPOSE LAKE MICHIGAN DIVERSION

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, on the votes taken during the past few days with respect to the Lake Michigan diversion, I either have been opposed to this diversion or I have been paired against it with the distinguished majority leader of the Senate, the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], who was absent on official business.

My basic opposition to further Lake Michigan diversion is based on the fact that Canada does not approve this diversion. My own Pacific Northwest region has a great stake in friendly relations with Canada, because Canada controls the upper reaches of the mighty Columbia River, which is vital to hydroelectric power and flood control in our States.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to include in the RECORD at this point a telegram which I have just received from Robert H. Short, of the Portland General Electric Co., of Portland, Oreg., in which he expresses the view of his company that any additional diversion might establish the precedent for Canadian diversion of the Columbia River.

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

PORTLAND, OREG., *August 28, 1959.*

The Honorable RICHARD L. NEUBERGER,
U.S. Senate, Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.:

Based on a brief study of Lake Michigan diversion problem, we suggest that action be delayed at least until pending court cases are settled. In view of the Supreme Court decision of many years ago, which we understand limited the quantity of water available for diversion to the Chicago Sanitary System and also in view of the possibility that any additional diversion would establish precedent for Canadian diversion of Columbia, we feel this question must be approached with great care.

Serious consideration should be given to the thought that no diversion should be permitted unless or until reasonable agreements are worked out with the Canadian Government.

ROBERT H. SHORT,
Portland General Electric Co.

Mr. NEUBERGER. It is encouraging to me that the position taken by Mr. Short and the Portland General Electric Co. is strikingly similar to that taken on this same issue last year by Gus Norwood, secretary of the Northwest Public Power Association. At that time Mr. Norwood telegraphed me as follows:

Urge you oppose Lake Michigan diversion as proposed by H.R. 2 unless covered by new treaty with Canada. Otherwise such diversion might become bad precedent for Columbia River.

Thus, Mr. President, both the advocates of private power and public power in the Pacific Northwest are opposed to further diversion of Lake Michigan lest it establish the perilous precedent for Canadian diversion of our Columbia River.

Mr. Norwood has reaffirmed his position regarding the effects of the proposed Lake Michigan diversion in a letter dated August 28, 1959. I ask consent that the letter from the Northwest Public Power Association be included in the RECORD with my remarks.

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

NORTHWEST PUBLIC POWER ASSOCIATION, INC.,
Vancouver, Wash., August 28, 1959.

Hon. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR NEUBERGER: Thank you for telegram of August 28 relative to the Lake Michigan diversion bill.

On March 2, we sent the following telegram to Representative RUSSELL MACK, of the House Public Works Committee:

"MARCH 2, 1959.

"Hon. RUSSELL MACK,
"*House Office Building, Washington,* D.C.

"Please file this as our testimony in opposition to the Michigan diversion bill, which Canada opposes. Even if Canada favored the bill we would oppose any unilateral diversion policy which might be a precedent against us in the Pacific Northwest.

"GUS NORWOOD,
"Northwest Public Power Association."

As we read articles III, IV, and V of the 1909 Boundary Waters Treaty, neither country must divert water without the approval of the other country. If our reading of the treaty is correct, then at least we would urge the Senate Public Works Committee to request a legal opinion from the Attorney General or the State Department.

May we also call attention to our testimony before the Senate Interior Committee on May 7, 1958, in the hearings on upper Columbia River development, particularly pages 327–328, wherein we discussed the principle of integration versus the principle of sovereignty. This testimony lists the relevant documents which were presented at the Fifth World Power Conference at Vienna, 1956.

We also pointed out in the testimony that it is not only the Columbia River which is endangered but also the Yukon River.

We oppose unilateral diversion of either river by either nation.

As a very minimum position, we would urge that the Senate Public Works Committee postpone action on H.R. 1 until the second session of the Congress.

Our reason is that the present negotiations with respect to the upper Columbia River development are now making very good progress and may result in agreement before the end of this calendar year.

It is appreciated that the economic issue in H.R. 1 is infinitesimal since the main loss to Canada would be from reduced power in the St. Lawrence watershed.

This is primarily a matter of testing the principle or violation of principle. We think the country now operates under the principle that unilateral diversion is generally illegal.

We furthermore appreciate that the State Department's legal brief, pages 72 to 89 of the "Upper Columbia River Development" hearings, rests more strongly on principles of international law than it does on the 1909 treaty. Thus, even if the 1909 treaty can be read or interpreted to permit unilateral diversion, it is our understanding that international law would be persuasive against such diversion.

These points aside, it seems to us that the United States, as the more powerful nation, and because of our great concern for creating an international impression of fairness, should avoid antagonizing Canada.

While the Northwest Public Power Association has no resolution on the subject of this bill, we think that our general resolution favoring comprehensive, unified development of the Columbia River, as well as our specific resolution opposing Columbia River diversion, requires that we be recorded in opposition to H.R. 1.

Best personal regards.

Sincerely,

GUS NORWOOD,
Executive Secretary.

NEGRO FAMILIES SENDING CHILDREN TO SEGREGATED SCHOOLS IN THE SOUTH

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I send to the desk an Associated Press dispatch from New York City which appeared in the Columbia, S.C., morning daily newspaper, the State, of August 30, 1959, entitled "New York Negroes Sending Children South to Segregated Schools."

Mr. President, this is one of the most extremely ironical situations that I have ever seen develop on the sociological or political front in the segregation versus integration controversy.

I sympathize with the Negro parents who are undertaking the expense of sending their children to segregated schools in the South, for I know they want their children to be well educated, and that they know the best education can be obtained for their children at the many fine segregated schools in the South. It is tragic that the leadership in New York and other similar cities across the Nation has undertaken to force integration in public schools by various means, and to force integration upon people in every social way.

This newspaper article quotes a Negro father who had sent his son to high school in Florida as stating he had sent his son there because "New York has just too much juvenile delinquency and racial tension. New York City is not a place to bring Negro kids up."

Mr. President, apparently some of the Negroes who live in New York at least remember that the South is a good place in which to bring up Negro children, for they are, according to the Associated Press reports, estimated to be sending back to the South every year 2,000 children to be educated in southern schools. Obviously, integrated schools are not providing the so-called better education for Negro children, as was alleged in the 1954 Supreme Court ruling which declared segregated education to be inferior to integrated education, and therefore unconstitutional in the eyes of that court.

Mr. President, I seriously believe that if the Supreme Court paused for a second look at the situation across the country today, it would not rule that integrated schools are superior to segregated schools, and I believe it would happily go back to the amicable conditions that existed prior to forced integration in large cities such as New York and elsewhere.

It is appalling what forced integration has done to millions of people in our land.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD this article from the State dated August 30, 1959, entitled "New York

Negroes Sending Children South to Segregated Schools."

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

NEW YORK NEGROES SENDING CHILDREN SOUTH TO SEGREGATED SCHOOLS

NEW YORK.—Some New York Negro families, protesting the spread of juvenile delinquency and racial tension in the Nation's largest city, are choosing to send their children to segregated schools in the South, the New York Times reported Saturday.

Overcrowded conditions in public schools as well as overcrowded neighborhoods, where youngsters are subjected to undesirable living and recreational conditions, are other factors influencing parents to send their children out of the State, the newspaper said.

Wide disagreement was reported, however, among Negro leaders on the number of children leaving the city to attend Southern schools.

One Negro leader placed the number at 2,000.

Another Negro leader estimated the number at 50 and added that the trend actually was in the opposite direction—that more southern children are being sent here to school away from segregated institutions in the South.

The newspaper's report was based on interviews with parents and school and church leaders. Those quoted included the following:

The Reverend J. Archie Hargraves of the Congregational Church of the Nazarene in Brooklyn. He said 10 of the 475 families in his congregation are sending children out of town this fall, 7 of them to Virginia and North Carolina. He said he knew of 20 other families taking similar action and he estimated the total number of children involved at 1,000.

"Basically," Reverend Hargraves said, "this is because of dissatisfaction that the children are not progressing rapidly in the schools here. Then there is a fear that they may get into trouble because they are not doing well in school. The families have ties in the South. Perhaps they remember basic education in the South."

Reverend Hargraves added: "It just turns out that overcrowded neighborhoods are usually your racial ghettoes."

The Rev. George E. Calvert, minister of the Church of the Son of Man, in Manhattan, said families sending their children to southern schools found it "simpler to educate children in the old culture than to make the new, confusing city culture relevant to the lives of their children."

Roy Wilkins, national executive secretary of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, disagreed with the large numbers estimated by some and said he "would be astonished if as many as 50 Negro children from New York were sent back South."

"It's the other way," Wilkins added. "Hundreds of southern children are sent up here. They live catch-as-catch-can here with relatives, to enjoy better education here."

One Negro father, unidentified by name, has a son who has just been graduated from a high school in Pensacola, Fla. The father said he sent his son to school there because New York has "just too much juvenile delinquency and racial tension."

"New York City is not a place to bring Negro kids up," the father added.

A different point was made by Dr. Ofelia Mendoza, education director of the Urban League of Greater New York. She said the league had received from 25 to 30 calls daily last fall from Negro parents asking how to transfer children from overcrowded schools.

Of all the inquiries, Dr. Mendoza said, only two parents decided to send their children to schools in the South. She said there was "a growing anxiety among parents who have children in segregated schools" and added:

"Many parents prefer to sacrifice themselves and send their children to private schools because of the psychological damage they receive in segregated schools, plus the fact that they don't get proper preparation to go ahead in life."

A CRITICAL ANALYSIS OF CIVIL DEFENSE

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I have an address this morning which I should like to make on the subject of civil defense, and I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to speak an additional 5 minutes in the morning hour.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the Nation's state of preparedness, or rather the frightening lack of it, to survive the devastation which a nuclear attack could wreak upon this country, is a matter of our gravest concern.

I notice the morning's press carries a report of the recommendations of the subcommittee of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, relating to the recent hearings which were held as to the Nation's ability to withstand a massive nuclear attack and possible Soviet nuclear blackmail. A key recommendation is for a broad and extensive U.S. shelter program, for shelter not from bombs but from the effects of radioactive fallout, a matter to which I will direct my attention today.

I am not an alarmist, Mr. President, but estimates of civil defense officials at hearings conducted by the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy recently that a limited to medium range attack on the United States would result in the deaths of 50 million Americans illustrates the appalling nakedness of America's defenses against nuclear weapons.

Such a harrowing projection makes clear the urgent need for a fresh, critical appraisal of the Federal Government's civil defense program.

If, after almost 10 years of civil defense planning, the Government's capability to protect the population of the United States is as ineffective as these officials indicate, it is high time we face the problem of survival in the thermonuclear age squarely—and do something about it.

I am gratified that the President of the United States on August 25, 1959, directed to the Congress, relating to the supplemental appropriation bill, a request for additional funds for the civil defense program. His statement, which I shall include subsequently in my remarks, points up the urgent need for action—particularly on the $12 million requested for the matching of State funds for administrative purposes, which is the very heart of the program.

Mr. President, a great amount of public attention has been focused on civil defense, radiation fallout, and the hazards of nuclear warfare in recent years. Extensive congressional hearings have been held, the administration has developed an elaborate long-range civil defense plan, nationwide civil defense "exercises" have been conducted under hypothetical attacks, exhaustive research has been conducted on fallout shelters, mass evacuation, radiation detection, and other programs, and hundreds of millions of pamphlets have been distributed throughout the country advising citizens of action to take before, during and after nuclear attack.

However, Mr. President, despite these actions, our actual defenses against massive nuclear attack today are largely in the "blueprint" stage. Incredible as it is, after 10 years of planning and study, there are still not even the beginnings of a shelter program which could protect millions of Americans beyond the blast area from a nuclear explosion, and which could assure that the Nation would be able to pick itself off its feet and restore at least vital services within a reasonably short time.

A broad national program has been drafted, command centers for emergency operation of the Government have been established, detailed "survival projects" have been developed and responsibilities for conduct of the Nation's civil defense have been assigned.

But the civilian survival program exists today only on the drafting boards. The basic foundations of such a program—protection from radiation, rehabilitation of vital communications and emergency maintenance of the economy—simply do not exist. As anyone who has inspected the Nation's civil defenses knows, not a major city in America could evacuate or shelter 10 percent of its population in the event of a nuclear strike, except in totally inadequate makeshift shelter areas, nor does adequate fallout shelter exist in communities or elsewhere throughout the country to protect the remainder of the population from the deadly effects of widespread radiation which would follow in the wake of an atomic or hydrogen attack. Even if major cities could evacuate their populations in advance of an attack, as a few have on a token basis in carefuly prearranged hypothetical exercises, neither rehabilitation or reception centers exist to protect them from fallout which in heavy concentrations is as lethal as the direct impact of a hydrogen bomb.

I do not point out these facts in criticism of the OCDM, nor of civil defense officials or workers at any level. Nor do I have but the highest admiration for the hundreds of thousands of volunteer civil defense workers throughout the country who have contributed so much to the Nation's civil defense program since its inception in 1950. They have in the main given their best to building a strong civil defense, frequently, I might add, despite not only public apathy, but official apathy in high places.

Nor do I overlook the fine efforts of the many mayors, Governors, State civil defense directors, and local civil defense officials who have created active civil defense programs to augment the national program. In my State of Minnesota, for

example, Governor Freeman, State Civil Defense Director Hubert A. Schon, Walter P. Halstead, director of Minneapolis civil defense, and their coworkers have done a splendid job—but, Mr. President, neither they nor any other State or local officials can be expected to build adequate defenses against nuclear weapons on the limited resources available to them locally or on the basis of the token assistance the Federal Government provides under its present policy.

The default in civil defense, Mr. President, lies at much higher levels—in the Congress, at the White House, and in the Government's highest strategy councils.

To meet the dangers of nuclear warfare, we have staked everything on our ability to retaliate, coupled with an active defense system against bombers admittedly useless against missile attack.

We cannot afford to continue to differentiate between "national" defense and "civilian" defense. Indeed, the very fact that we possessed an effective fallout shelter program would be an added deterrent to a nuclear attack—an important consideration in further discouraging any would-be attackers.

But while we may find it possible to deter a rational, logical enemy, we must also consider the grave dangers which will rise as more nations join the "nuclear club," and the serious possibility of a completely irresponsible attack. Furthermore, there is always the possibility of a disaster through which a nuclear weapon would be launched by some horrible mistake.

Mr. President, while I zealously guard the spending of every tax dollar, for national security, or otherwise the appropriation of $45 million to $50 million—less than a tenth of 1 percent of our total military budget—for the civil defense of America is nothing more than a gesture.

Nuclear experts, civil defense authorities, and scientists who have conducted exhaustive research into nuclear weapons state that even under massive nuclear attack the Nation could sustain itself, the Government could continue to function and the great majority of the population could be saved if adequate measures to protect the United States are taken in advance.

These measures would include protection from radiation, rehabilitation of communities, restoration of the national economy, and maintenance of governmental functions.

There is little or no realistic defense against the direct impact of a multimegaton weapon. But the gravest danger to the United States from a nuclear attack, according to our foremost authorities on nuclear weapons, would not be from the blast effects of hydrogen explosions over targets, but from massive radiation which would blanket much of the country, would kill or incapacitate the majority of the people exposed to it, and which could seriously cripple our national capacity to recover.

It is important to distinguish between a fallout shelter program and the enormously more expensive program to provide not only protection against radioactive fallout, but also against heat and blast. While even the fallout shelter program would require a major investment, the return from such an investment would be so fantastically large—perhaps 25 million American lives saved in the case of a medium-sized nuclear attack—that it must be given the most serious consideration.

After all, our military leaders have given tacit recognition to the value of a shelter program, through the construction of underground command centers and hidden administrative and communication complexes. But what about the people our military leaders are trying to defend? It would be a hollow victory indeed if the leaders should survive and the people perish—simply because of a reluctance to develop a prudent and simple fallout shelter program.

I maintain, therefore, Mr. President, that if the United States is to survive a potential nuclear attack, it is imperative that the Federal Government develop an aggressive, commonsense approach to radiation protection, either through direct Federal financing or matching financing with the States, which would provide maximum protection for the population, assure that the national economy would continue to function, and enable the Nation to swiftly recover from initial attack.

The Federal Government will abdicate its responsibilities if it is content with a voluntary, "do it yourself" shelter-building program. As appealing as a voluntary home-shelter program is—and of course the more Americans who become interested in building home shelters the better—we are never going to have a realistic program of civilian survival in the case of nuclear attack without vigorous and aggressive governmental leadership from the White House on down.

While there is a great deal the average American householder in the fallout zone can do to protect his family, even if he begins during the first 30 minutes after a nuclear explosion, it is sheer folly to further delay the bringing to bear of all the resources of the community, State and Federal levels of government in a comprehensive fallout shelter program, sparked and maintained by Federal example and Federal leadership.

I invite to the Senate's attention that the 51st Annual Conference of Governors, which met in San Juan, P.R., early this month advocated immediate action on a nationwide fallout shelter program. The Governors' program is based upon the so-called New York State plan, which proposes the mandatory building of shelters by citizens, the modification of existing structures to provide protection against fallout, and the stockpiling of emergency supplies by individual citizens to enable them to exist during attack. The New York State plan, in effect, would make mandatory the administration's volunteer shelter program. But again, Mr. President, it overlooks completely the very fundamentals of civil defense of which I have spoken—that the full resources of the Government must be marshaled to provide maximum protection against radioactive fallout throughout the Nation and that neither volunteer nor mandatory shelter building by citizens alone will provide adequate protection against the nuclear bomb. All appropriate resources at Federal, State, and community levels must be brought to bear if we are to withstand the widespread devastation of a massive attack, and recover from it.

We must have an active Federal program of direct or matching financial assistance to the States and local communities for the building of realistic protection against radioactive fallout, as well as a thoroughgoing program of fallout protection training.

Certainly the average American can hardly be expected to take a voluntary shelter program seriously when the Federal Government does not itself require that its own new public buildings or federally assisted construction be equipped with shelters. Yet, with proper leadership, our people would come to realize that literally tens of millions of Americans could be saved from death by radioactive fallout by an adequate fallout shelter program.

I am aware, Mr. President, of the advances civil defense authorities have made in communications, shelter research, radiological monitoring, maintenance of government in emergency, stockpiling, and many other areas. OCDM can today flash a nationwide warning of enemy attack in a matter of seconds, it has established 500 Federal radiological monitoring stations across the Nation to measure the intensity of fallout, stockpiled $200 million worth of medical, radiological and engineering supplies at strategic locations throughout the country, and trained thousands of civil defense workers in every State in the fundamentals of survival under attack.

But, Mr. President, the ability to flash a warning in 30 seconds throughout the country or to report the amount of radiation existing or anticipated in a given locality when protection from fallout does not exist for either the victims of an attack or for civil defense workers, affords scant protection against the deadly effects of a nuclear missile. Likewise, air raid tests, civil defense exercises and extensive public information programs on the hazards of nuclear warfare, as important as they may be, will not protect the American people from the effects of a 20-megaton hydrogen bomb nor radiation fallout—unless adequate facilities to shelter people, rehabilitate communities, and restore the economy exist.

In other words, Mr. President, the finest of long-range plans, survival projects and blueprints for civil defense without the resources, operational capability, and facilities to implement them on a moment's notice provide no more than a paper defense against the catastrophic dangers of nuclear warfare. I repeat, realistic protection from radiation, rehabilitation of communities, restoration of the economy—these are the indispensible fundamentals of defense against nuclear weapons.

While I agree with the basic concept that civil defense is the joint responsibility of the Federal Government, State governments, and local communities, and that the full potential of all three levels of government must be mobilized to withstand the widespread destruction of nuclear weapons, nevertheless, the Federal Government must bear the primary responsibility for our nonmilitary defense, and demonstrate that it is prepared to discharge it.

What is required, Mr. President, and urgently required, is a complete recasting of Federal policy, a cold, calculating reassessment of the inadequacies of our present defenses against nuclear weapons and establishment of a Federal program which will provide realistic defenses against them.

The cost may be great compared to present expenditures, but the cost of continued default by the Federal Government in this vital area of national security, could, by comparison, be of incalculable consequence should a nuclear strike against this country ever be made.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the report and resolution on civil defense adopted by the Governors' conference, and an article from the Washington Post and Times Herald of August 5, 1959, on this report, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

REPORT OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON CIVIL DEFENSE OF THE GOVERNORS' CONFERENCE

For the past 3 years, the Governors' Conference Special Committee on Civil Defense has recommended a greater assumption of responsibility for civil defense by the Federal Government. On each such occasion, the Governors' Conference adopted the committee's reports.

Last year, subsequent to the Governors' Conference the Congress enacted legislation which defined responsibility for the vital task of affording protection to our citizens and institutions in the face of nuclear war. It is now national policy, declared by the Congress, that the responsibility for civil defense be vested jointly in the Federal Government and the several States and their political subdivisions.

In accordance with this recent declaration by the Congress, the President of the United States has promulgated within the past year the national plan for civil defense and defense mobilization—a plan developed under the wise leadership of our former colleague, Governor Hoegh.

This national plan brings sharp, new emphasis to the responsibility of every individual to survive, on his own resources, for at least 2 weeks following a nuclear attack. It is now clear for the first time that every individual citizen must be prepared to survive an attack on our country without outside help in the initial weeks.

This new responsibility is formidable and challenging. Formidable because there is so much to be done; challenging because so much can be done.

As our knowledge has grown about the dangers of radioactive fallout and the lethal destructiveness it may carry many hundreds of miles downwind from a bomb burst, it has become clear that it is not only the safety of the target area that is at stake, but the survival of every city and hamlet in the Nation. For no one can predict where the bombs will land—or even with certainty the targets to which they will be dispatched—or the vagaries of wind and weather bearing their deadly cargo of radiation.

In the event of nuclear attack, many more millions of people will be threatened by radioactive fallout than would be killed by the blast and heat of the bursting bombs. Indeed, in the last series of exercises in which nuclear bombs were assumed to have hit targets in the United States, it was estimated that 3,800,000 people would have died in the State of New York alone as a result of radioactive fallout as compared with 1,200,000 deaths in New York caused by the bomb bursts themselves. Another 4 million people would have been disabled by radiation sickness in the State of New York alone. The greater number of deaths by far are attributable to fallout even though the assumed bomb bursts were limited to [concentrated] urban areas.

Fortunately, studies indicate that the deaths and illness from fallout are avoidable. Protection against fallout can be achieved and the cost need not be prohibitive. But, if the American people are to have protection against fallout, realistic and cooperative action must be taken now by State and local governments and, most important, by the individual citizen himself.

Under the national plan for civil defense and defense mobilization, individuals and families who survive the blast and heat of the initial bomb bursts must be prepared to exist in fallout shelter areas, without any outside help, for a minimum of 2 weeks following an attack. To do this, they must have prestored stocks of food, water, fuel, medicine, and other survival items. Few families in any State are so prepared today.

Notwithstanding the present lack of preparation, however, there is reason for optimism. While every effort must be made to maintain peace with dignity for our Nation, and while we recoil from the catastrophe of a nuclear war, we, as Governors of our States, have a heavy personal and official responsibility for the safety and health of our citizens. The tragedy of a nuclear attack on our country, if it comes, cannot excuse any failure on our part to act now so as to save the lives and protect the health of the millions of people whose lives and health it is within our capacity to secure.

We are satisfied that it is not necessary for anyone to die from radioactive fallout in a nuclear war if relatively inexpensive preparation is made in advance, if the public is educated to understand the hazard, and if, in the event of attack, the simple rules for protection are observed. It is clear that, by taking steps which are within our reach as individuals and as States, our people can survive the fallout from even the most severe nuclear attack that might be made upon our country.

The committee believes that State governments, in cooperation with the Federal Government, can, by leadership and example, bring into existence the necessary protective preparation to assure such survival. The very existence of this capacity to survive the hazard of fallout will be as potent a force for peace as any we can yet devise. It will permit the people of our States to face with realism and confidence the threat of nuclear attack.

If we take the precautionary steps which are required for survival, we will have made a major contribution to peace. Confidence in our ability to survive will strengthen our national will; it will prevent nuclear blackmail; it will bolster the position of our national leaders in foreign policy negotiations; it will materially lessen the temptation to an aggressor to launch an attack; and it will provide assurance that our Nation will not only survive nuclear war, but will survive with dignity and without panic for final victory over any enemies who attack us.

The national plan, as promulgated by the President, makes it basic to all civil defense that individuals and families be able to survive on their own resources for as long as 2 weeks following attack. The success of other aspects of civil defense directly depends on how effectively individuals and families are prepared to meet this test. They are not so prepared today. The whole national defense effort, as a result, could be meaningless unless steps to protect against fallout are taken and taken promptly.

So crucial is the problem of fallout protection that the committee recommends it receive urgent and immediate action by all levels of government, Federal, State, and local.

Specifically, the committee recommends the following action:

1. That each State initiate a vigorous and continuing campaign of education as to the nature of fallout, the extent of the danger, the fact that protection is possible and the ways in which such protection can be achieved.

2. That the responsible government officials—Federal, State, and local—take immediate steps to assist and encourage the people of this country to prepare themselves successfully to survive radioactive fallout in the wake of an enemy nuclear attack on the United States. Among the steps which should be considered as part of an effective program for the safety and survival of our people are:

(a) Provision by State law both of incentives—for example, through loans, tax exemptions, and credits—and of requirements—by means of building codes, school and factory construction standards, and health and safety specifications—for the inclusion in all new construction and existing buildings of fallout protection meeting a specified minimum standard.

(b) The development and distribution of a kit of items essential to a 2-week survival, without outside help—items such as food, water, and radiation monitoring devices.

3. That each State initiate a survey of all State owned or operated facilities to determine both their adequacy as fallout shelters and what steps are needed to provide fallout protection for their users, both regular and transient.

4. That each State, in cooperation with Federal and local government, develop (promulgate) and consider (secure) the adoption of standards for construction which will provide adequate fallout protection in all types of buildings.

5. That each State develop a protected seat of State government which will assure the continuance of State government leadership and function during and after a nuclear attack.

RESOLUTION ON CIVIL DEFENSE UNANIMOUSLY ADOPTED AT THE 51ST ANNUAL GOVERNORS' CONFERENCE AT SAN JUAN, P.R., AUGUST 5, 1959

Peace, with dignity, is the paramount concern of our Nation. But the maintenance of peace requires national strength. An essential element of this strength is the ability of our Nation to survive a nuclear attack.

Unfortunately, today, our people are not prepared to survive the fallout from a nuclear attack on our country. Yet, it is the fallout from nuclear weapons which will threaten every hamlet, city, and farm in our Nation. It is fallout which will cause up to three times as many deaths as would result from the bursting of nuclear bombs on targets in our country. Deaths and sickness from fallout could make casualties of half the population of our country.

Protection against fallout, however, can be achieved and achieved by means which are within our reach as individuals and as States.

Without protection against fallout we are vulnerable to nuclear blackmail. But, if

our citizens, as individuals, take protective action against the threat of fallout it will be abundant notice to any potential enemy that we, as a people, are determined to survive and that we will not be forced by nuclear blackmail either to abandon our friends or to forsake our national interests at home or abroad.

As Governors we have a heavy personal and official responsibility for the safety and health of our citizens. So crucial is the problem of fallout to the maintenance of peace and the health of our people that we do hereby resolve that:

1. Each State initiate a vigorous and continuing campaign of education as to the nature of fallout, the extent of the danger, the fact that protection can be achieved, and the crucial importance of affirmative action by individual citizens as a protection against nuclear blackmail and to increase the prospects for peace.

2. That the responsible government officials—Federal, State, and local—take immediate steps to assist and encourage the people of this country to prepare themselves successfully to survive radioactive fallout and other aspects of an enemy nuclear attack on the United States, including such matters as adequate warning, shelters, radiation detectors and survival kits; and to that end, that an early meeting of the Governors Conference Committee on Civil Defense be held with the President of the United States, the national military leaders, and other official representatives of the executive and legislative branches of the Federal Government for an intensive review of the nature of the nuclear hazard and the cooperative steps which are available to government—Federal, State, and local—for the nuclear protection of our people.

3. That each State initiate a survey of all State owned or operated facilities to determine both their adequacy as fallout shelters and what steps are needed to provide fallout protection for their users, both regular and transient.

4. That each State develop a protected seat of State government which will assure the continuance of State government leadership and function during and after a nuclear attack.

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald, Aug. 5, 1959]

BOMB SHELTER WORK URGED BY GOVERNORS—CONFERENCE SEES IT AS DEFENSE AGAINST ATTACK OR BLACKMAIL

(By Robert C. Albright)

SAN JUAN, P.R., August 4.—The 51st annual conference of Governors went on record here today in favor of immediate steps to encourage a massive civil defense program aimed at a bomb shelter in every home as the best insurance against either nuclear attack or nuclear blackmail.

The Governors overwhelmingly adopted the report of New York Gov. Nelson A. Rockefeller's special committee on civil defense recommending such a program. Then they did an unusual thing—they adopted a resolution committing their resolutions committee in advance to support of the project.

It was a skillfully handled victory for the freshman Rockefeller and his heretofore highly controversial proposals for taking the civil defense problems to the people.

A closed session briefing by Allen W. Dulles, director of the Central Intelligence Agency, provided the backdrop for the action of the conference in resolving: "That the report and recommendations of the special committee on civil defense be accepted and approved and that the resolutions committee be requested to bring before the conference a resolution embodying the recommendations of the report."

The report among other things, called for an early meeting of the Governors' civil defense committee with President Eisenhower, the Nation's military leaders, and congressional leaders to review "the nature of the nuclear hazard and the cooperative steps which are available to Government."

"The evidence is overwhelming that the Soviets intend to use nuclear blackmail as a major weapon to promote their objectives—namely to spread communism throughout the world," Allen Dulles told the Governors at the closed meeting preceding Rockefeller's report.

"They showed this intent at the time of the Suez crisis about a year ago.

"They will use the same threat against this country."

The Nation's chief intelligence officer said he did not come to the conference to support any specific project, but he went on to say:

"If due either to any weakening of our defenses—and all forms of protection against nuclear attack are important elements of our defense—or due to any failure to maintain our retaliatory striking power, we render ourselves susceptible to such nuclear blackmail, the security of this country and of the free world would be gravely compromised.

"I have no reason to feel that we will fail to meet this challenge."

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the President's massage to the Senate of August 25, 1959, again emphasizing the importance of certain civil defense activities, and the article entitled "$20 Billion U.S. Shelter Plan Urged," published in this morning's Washington Post and Times Herald. The latter relates to the recommendations of the subcommittee of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

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

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, August 25, 1959.

The PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE

SIR: I transmit herewith to the Congress a supplemenetal appropriation request of $9 million for the fiscal year 1960 for the "Salaries and expenses" appropriation of the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization. These funds are necessary to finance the civil defense and defense mobilization activities assigned to several Federal departments and agencies pursuant to law and the national plan for civil and defense mobilization.

I cannot emphasize too strongly the urgent need for the Congress to appropriate such funds before adjournment.

Along with our military defense and retaliatory forces, civil defense and defense mobilization are vital parts of the Nation's total defense—together they stand as a strong deterrent to war.

For this reason I am asking the Congress to reconsider my earlier request for funds to assure that Federal agencies, which have vital responsibilities for nonmilitary defense, will be enabled to discharge these crucial functions.

The nature of nuclear war places upon the American people the responsibility for considerable action and sacrifice to insure their own security. This is clearly spelled out in the national plan for civil defense and defense mobilization and the national shelter policy.

But the American people have the right to expect of their Government intelligent and aggressive preparation to carry out its essential defense role and to do those things which are beyond the capability of individuals.

I believe the American people will demand this. As an indication of the growing public desire for a strong civil defense, I call your attention to the unanimous vote by which the Governors' conference at San Juan passed a resolution supporting the national fallout shelter program. I was pleased by this action.

There persists in many minds the image of civil defense as something apart from regular government, something which would spring into being to bear the vast responsibilities of home defense and recovery in case of attack. This is a false image.

The responsibilities for civil defense in this Nation rests squarely on regularly constituted government at local, State, and Federal levels, and upon people.

There is before the conferees on the present independent offices appropriation bill my request for $12 million to match funds spent by State and local governments for personnel and administrative costs of civil defense. It is most urgent that this item be approved.

Matching funds are required to strengthen civil defense at the State and local levels, the very heart of civil defense, and to give tangible evidence of Federal leadership in encouraging State and local governments to prepare the defense for the people. These funds will implement Public Law 85-606.

Civil defense, the defense of our people in the missile age, is the joint responsibility of the Federal, State, and local governments; no one level of government can do the whole job. The partnership among the Federal, State, and local governments never was more intimate or more necessary.

The Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization and State and local civil defense offices serve a staff function to help elected officials perform their vital home defense roles by using all the built-in capability of existing government structure.

Within the Federal Government there are departments and agencies peculiarly competent to cope with many of the diverse problems that would come with nuclear war.

The request I am resubmitting today is for funds needed to permit these specially competent agencies to contribute their experience, knowledge, and resources to the total effort required.

The request is modest. But these modest funds will enable the Federal Government to take a long stride toward mobilizing its total resources to meet this problem.

The history of appropriations for Federal agency preparedness is most unfortunate. In fiscal year 1959, departments and agencies were asked to include funds necessary to finance all their civil defense and defense mobilization functions as a part of their regular budget estimates. The Congress eliminated these defense funds and directed that these departmental requests be consolidated in the budget for the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization.

For fiscal year 1960, my budget for the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization included $12 million to be allocated among nine departments and agencies needed to finance civil defense and defense mobilization programs. The $3 million provided does not enable the Federal Government to carry out the responsibilities contained in the National Security Act, the Defense Production Act, and the Federal Civil Defense Act.

It would be unwise to neglect our civil defense mission because our total defense is incomplete and meaningless without reliable and responsible home defense. Survival cannot be guaranteed merely with a capacity for reprisal. Equally important is our ability to recover. This means staying power and endurance beyond that ever before required of this Nation or any nation.

I recommend that the Congress appropriate the funds outlined above to carry out these programs which are so vital to the national security. The details of this proposed appropriation are set forth in the attached letter from the Director of the Bureau of the Budget.

Respectfully yours,

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald, Aug. 31, 1959]

TWENTY-BILLION-DOLLAR U.S. SHELTER PLAN URGED—PROJECT COULD SAVE 46 MILLION LIVES, REPORT DECLARES

(By Joseph L. Myler)

A congressional subcommittee said yesterday that the "total unreadiness" of the American people to survive an atomic war threatens to undermine the Nation's ability to resist "possible Soviet 'nuclear blackmail.'"

The subcommittee made the statement in publishing expert testimony that a shelter system costing no more than $20 billion could save some 46 million American lives if nuclear war should come.

The testimony also challenged the notion that the radiation effects of nuclear war would "extinguish all human and animal life."

HEARINGS HELD IN JUNE

The report summed up hearings on the effects of nuclear war conducted June 22–26 by a Special Atomic Energy Subcommittee headed by Representative CHET HOLIFIELD, Democrat, of California. The committee is an arm of the Joint Senate-House Atomic Energy Committee.

Witnesses repeatedly stressed that this country would be in a far better position to deter Russia from atomic attack, and in better position to recover from an attack if it occurred, if it proved through a national shelter program its determination to resist nuclear blackmail.

The subcommittee did not pass judgment on responsibility for planning and financing "an effective national defense program." It said "the decision as to whether the Federal Government, the State, or the individual pay the bill remains and demands solution."

ATTACK POWER ASSUMED

For the purpose of the hearing the subcommittee assumed that 224 U.S. targets were hit with 263 nuclear weapons having the destructive power of 1,446 million tons of TNT. It also assumed that an additional 2½ billion tons were dropped on targets in the attacking country and Western Europe.

In stressing that man and nature would ultimately recover, the witnesses did not minimize the horrors of such a war. Assuming no effective civil defense, they said it would cost lives of about 50 million Americans, with 20 million others suffering serious injury.

THE SUPREME COURT SEGREGATION DECISION

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, few decisions of the U.S. Supreme Court have provoked as much deserved criticism as the 1954 ruling undertaking to strike down the long-established right of the States to maintain separate but equal schools for the races.

The critics of that decision have by no means been limited to those in public life. They have included responsible citizens in all walks of life, distinguished attorneys and men as learned in the law as a former Justice of the Supreme Court.

The list of persons who have felt compelled to speak out against the flagrant abuse of the Constitution by the Court in the school cases has now been joined by one of the most respected figures in American academic circles.

Dr. E. Merton Coulter, for many years head of the department of history of the University of Georgia, delivered one of the most forceful and articulate criticisms of the decision that I have yet read in a graduation address at the University of Georgia summer school.

Dr. Coulter needs no introduction to those familiar with contemporary historical scholars. He is universally regarded as one of the leading authorities on southern history. Dr. Coulter has written many books and countless articles on southern history and is coeditor of the monumental 10-volume "History of the South," now under publication by Louisiana State University.

In addition to coediting this comprehensive work, Dr. Coulter contributed the two volumes dealing with the Civil War and Reconstruction periods.

In his address to the summer quarter graduates of the university, Dr. Coulter states that the 1954 school decision "called for a more fundamental change than was worked by any one of the last seven amendments to the Constitution." He also charged that in making this decision, the Chief Justice and his "assistants" exercised more power than could have been exercised by a President of the United States. He might well have added, Mr. President, that the Court undertook a power that is beyond the reach of the Chief Executive and Congress combined in its attempt to amend the Constitution.

Dr. Coulter also effectively answered those who naively contend that it is somehow wrong to criticize a decision of the Court and who contend that the Court cannot violate the Constitution.

This, Dr. Coulter says, "is equivalent to saying that the Court could put any interpretation that it pleased on any part of the Constitution, and that the interpretation would be the Constitution and the law of the land."

Mr. President, I commend Dr. Coulter's excellent and scholarly address as "must" reading by every Member of this body. I ask unanimous consent that it be inserted in the body of the RECORD.

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

WHAT IS HISTORY AND WHAT IS IT GOOD FOR?

(By E. Merton Coulter)

There is an old axiom which runs: "Shoemaker, stick to your last." Being applied to me, it might suggest that I stick somewhat closely to history, its implications and its applications to a world in which we live. In other words, my subject might be called something like this: "What is history and what is it good for?"

I think the first application of that formula or principle should be to our own university here. We often forget or have never known that we have a unique document which brought this university into being, and that it should be put in the same class with two other famous documents, the Declaration of American Independence and the Constitution of the United States, about which I wish to say something later on. It is the charter of this university, written and adopted in 1785, only 2 years after the Revolutionary War ended and 4 years before the Constitution of the United States came into force.

This was the first charter adopted by any of the American States for setting up and controlling an institution of higher learning. By an amazing good fortune this document has survived three removals of the State capital, where it was kept in the official archives, the torch of Sherman's army, and also the torch of a janitor who was about to light a fire with it in the furnace of the State capitol in Atlanta. It is now in our university library and may be seen there.

But I am not here to tell you about the history of the university. Rather, first, let us see what history is—that is, what people have said that it is. There is the famous definition of the English historian, Edward A. Freeman, who said that history was past politics and that politics was present history. This is certainly a very restricted definition and nobody today accepts it.

Then, Thomas Carlyle said that history was the lives of great men and he proceeded to write his book, "Heroes and Hero Worship," which I had to read to get into college.

Voltaire, in one of his sarcastic moments, said that history was a pack of tricks which people play on the dead—the dead, who cannot rise to defend themselves. And either he or someone else said that history was a story agreed upon. These definitions do not place history on a very high pedestal.

Benedette Croce, the Italian philosopher and historian, said that history was "contemporary thought about the past." This certainly sounds reasonable but hardly goes far enough to explain much.

Then Henry Ford, who got mixed up once on some historical characters, confusing, it seems, Benedict Arnold with Matthew Arnold, got out of his predicament by saying that history was the bunk.

James Harvey Robinson, an eminent American historian, now dead, gave the most inclusive of all definitions. History, according to him, is "all we know about everything man has ever done, or thought, or hoped, or felt." This definition included everything that can be related to mankind throughout all past generations—everything that we have any knowledge of. This includes only the human aspects of the past—not everything that happened, such as the progression of geological ages, glaciers, storms, earthquakes, the tides, the seven seas. These are the physical aspects of nature—not human.

Of course, present-day historians do not attempt to cover all the ground included in James Harvey Robinson's definition. Every important discipline, division, school, or college in universities today has taken that slice of history which relates to itself and has appropriated it to its own uses: Political scientists, economists, schools of journalism, of education, of fine arts, of geography, of classics, and so on. If present departments of history are not more careful and watchful, the only thing they soon will have left which they can truly call their own will be the history of history and of historians.

But whether we are satisfied with these definitions of what history is or is not, I must get along and try to find out what I think history is good for, if anything.

It used to be said that history was good to teach mental discipline. What a wearisome thing history became under that regime—dates, and names, and battles, and statistics. No wonder history came to be called as dry as dust, and this definition of history emerged: "If it is interesting, it is not history."

Then there came along this use which history was said to serve, and it has not been entirely given up yet: history is to teach patriotism. And a more dangerous assault on truth could not be devised that this use makes possible. If history is to teach patriotism, then all parts of it that do not teach patriotism must be suppressed. What a perverted history that would be. This is not to say that history may not teach patriotism (certainly much of it does) for there are many glorious chapters of American history that cannot help but make us proud of our country. And other countries and

peoples can likewise profit from their annals.

But there are other chapters of our history which should make us ashamed, and make us resolve not to be guilty of such like again. The recent past in Europe has given us some melancholy examples of how history has been perverted to teach patriotism, and how it has helped to get the world into the two greatest wars of all times. An overzealous patriotism makes for the master race or master nation or master doctrine movements (as communism today, and nazism and fascism yesterday), and they lead inevitably to disaster.

History has been put to some other dishonorable uses, largely for pecuniary gains, which are not likely to rock the world, but nevertheless gnaw away at truth and integrity. Take for instance historical fakes, frauds, and hoaxes. One of those nearest home was the attempt a decade or two ago to label the old ruins on the coast of Georgia as being the remnants of old Spanish missions, antedating those in California and Texas by a century or more. With that knowledge, all the tourists going to Florida would be attracted to these old ruins and by paying an entrance fee to see a fake, enrich the owners. There is no doubt that these interesting old ruins were once sugar houses where Georgia sugarcane a century and more ago was made into molasses, sugar, and rum.

But is it not possible to use history to foretell the future? Certain conditions in the past produced certain results; so when we have the same conditions recurring we will get the same results. But the trouble with this theory is that we never have the same conditions recurring. There is always a difference. The same thing never happens twice in human affairs. It is said that historians may, and often do, repeat themselves, but history never repeats itself. In a chemical laboratory we can make the same thing happen twice. We can put certain chemicals together and make the same thing happen again every time. We can make the same thing happen again and again in the other exact sciences; but the same thing never happens twice in human relations. The social picture is never the same from one minute to another; neither is the individual the same from day to day. One of the great pillars of wisdom with the Greeks was: "Know thyself." But no one has ever quite reached that state of perfection.

We speak of a social science. If it is a science, it is one without laws; for there are no laws of history, so exact that they can be formulated and codified. One person has said that "the past is a guess, and the future a gamble." The historian H. A. L. Fisher has said, "men wiser and more learned than I have discovered in history, a plot, a rhythm, a predetermined pattern. These harmonies are concealed from me. I can see only one emergency following upon another as wave follows upon wave; only one great fact with respect to which, since it is unique, there can be no generalizations; only one safe rule for the historian; that he should recognize in the development of human destinies the play of the contingent and the unforseen. This is not a doctrine of cynicism and despair. The fact of progress is written plain and large on the page of history, but progress is not a law of nature. The ground gained by one generation may be lost by the next. The thoughts of men may flow into the channels which lead to disaster and barbarism."

And how conscious we are of that today.

And another historian, James Westfall Thompson, said 10 years ago: "Neither a grain of sand nor history can be understood by the human mind. The stream of time has come down out of remote ages and passed headland and headland. It has brought down the debris of broken empires. The historian is but a fisherman on the shore, pulling out of the flood a fragment here, a broken statue there, vestiges of the dead past."

To what terrible fate, then, has mankind been sentenced, in the shadow of which it has been living from time out of mind? Must everything that takes place happen only by accident? Is mankind buffeted around by the whims and prejudices of one man or by chance or random? If Cleopatra had had a pug nose, think how the lives of Caesar and Mark Anthony would have been changed and how it would have affected the Roman Empire and Egypt. Had the winds blown in another direction or had there been no storm when the Spanish Armada descended on England and England had come under the dominion of Spain, then what about America? Would the United States be a Spanish-speaking and Roman Catholic country today? Had Columbus not followed a flock of birds flying to the southwest as he approached the North American shore, he probably would have landed somewhere on the coast of what is now Georgia. Did the flight of a flock of birds prevent North America from having been settled by the Spaniards, instead of the West Indies, Mexico, and South America? If George Washington had gone to sea and become a sailor, against the advice of his mother, would the American Revolution have been unsuccessful and would we today have Elizabeth II as our Queen? Or if George Washington had slipped on a cake of ice and been drowned when he was crossing a river on his return from delivering a message to the French commander on Lake Erie, would we be today a British commonwealth? Or to come down to the present, if there had been no Hitler, how different the world would be today. Or if Batista when he had Castro in his hands had shot him instead of pardoning him, how different Cuba would be today.

As fundamental and cataclysmic as these developments have been, they ultimately were not based entirely on accidents or the life of one man. They would not have happened just like they did or when they did, but they would have come after all. The American Revolution would have succeeded whether there had been a George Washington or not. Even if England had been conquered by the Spaniards, it is safe to say that the Spaniards later would have been expelled; and if Columbus had not followed the flock of birds and had landed on the coast of Georgia, the English would later have driven them out, as they did when the Spaniards one time held Florida. And if there had been no Hitler, the forces in Germany which made him possible would have found another leader, though hardly such a monster as Hitler; and if Castro had not happened along, Batista would have been pitched out of Cuba by a less radical leadership, and a more considered reform would have come about.

What I have just now said would indicate that I believe that there are some great fundamental forces or deep currents in the affairs of mankind, not always good, that push along as inexorably as a mighty glacier. And that leads me to say that some people assert that there is a law of continuity, which sounds very sensible and is in fact capable of proof to a certain extent. It seems safe to say that the "future is a variable consequence of the past"; and the law of continuity has been defined in these words: "All events, conditions, institutions, personalities, come from immediate preceding events, conditions, institutions, personalities."

Historical perspective acts almost like a crystal ball into which we gaze and see present-day happenings more closely and with greater understanding. For example, there is nothing new in the sectional attitudes of various people and newspapers in the North toward the South. That has been going on for more than a hundred years.

It has been an age-old habit with certain people to make the South a whipping boy. This attitude was basically the cause of the development of that bitterness and misunderstanding between North and South that brought on the Civil War. With that war over and the South forced back into the Union, there was still no letup; for the war was followed by a reconstruction that was pursued as ruthlessly as had been the war itself. And though the political aspects of the reconstruction have largely disappeared the old spirit of remaking the South socially, educationally, and intellectually is as strong and vibrant as ever. Hodding Carter recently wrote a book called the "Angry Scar," dealing with the reconstruction. The wounds of reconstruction have hardly yet healed into a scar; they are still angry and festering, made so by radical reformers to the northward, who have problems of their own as angry and festering as those in the South, which they conveniently ignore as far as possible.

For instance, the barbarous crime recently happening in Tallahassee, Fla., was played up on the front pages of the New York newspapers; a like crime with exactly the same racial components happened a few days afterward in New York City. One of the outstanding New York papers gave the news of this crime most inconspicuously, on page 11, column 3, at the bottom of the page, in 19 lines. "All the news that's fit to print," but the farther south these racial crimes, the fitter it is to print. And so the law of the continuity in history is exemplified in the existence of a sectionalism of North against South in our own country.

One of the greatest present-day heresies is the assumption that the U.S. Supreme Court has somehow been endowed with a sanctity which if questioned constitutes sacrilege; that in fact it is absolutely infallible. It has been said that it was an impossibility for the Court to violate the Constitution—a statement which surpasseth all understanding. It is equivalent to saying that the Court could put any interpretation that it pleased on any part of the Constitution, and that would be the Constitution and the law of the land.

If the Court should take it into its collective head to say that the part of the Constitution which awards to every State two Senators, irrespective of population, no longer comports with the present concepts of justice and is against the spirit of the 14th amendment and the pronouncements of Gunnar Myrdal on social progress, and that, therefore, hereafter Nevada shall have one Senator and New York, 100—then that would be part of the Constitution according to the doctine of the infallibility of the U.S. Supreme Court. This is not as fantastic an improbability as it might seem, for it might be argued that the 14th amendment having been later added to the Constitution nullified any previous part out of harmony with the Court's interpretation of that amendment.

It is a fact which anyone may decide for himself that the 1954 decision of the Supreme Court called for a fundamental social change and an upset of a way of life not only as old as the Republic, but antedating the Republic to the beginning of the colonization of America. It called for a more fundamental change than was worked by any one of the last seven amendments to the Constitution. Read them and see if you don't think so. And yet the Supreme Court took it upon itself to amend the Constitution. The Chief Justice with his assistants assumed vastly more power than he could have exercised if he had been elected President of the United States, a position which he tried several times to attain. Assuming that the decision was to carry into effect the 14th amendment, the Court usurped that

power, for the amendment reads: "The Congress shall have power to enforce, by appropriate legislation, the provisions of this article." Even if an amendment to the Constitution were not required, to enact into the law of the land the decision of the Court would require a majority of the House and of the Senate and the signature of the President of the United States. There are four ways by which the Constitution may be amended, but a decision of the U.S. Supreme Court is not included in these four ways. Not only does the Court not have the right to amend the Constitution, but also it was never intended by the makers of the Constitution or by the American people thereafter that the Court should have the right to legislate or establish policies. Otherwise, why was a Congress and a President provided?

One is reminded of what Robert Toombs is supposed to have said a hundred years ago. As the sectional struggle was about to develop into a breakup of the Union by the secession of the South, when it was felt that there was no longer any protection in the Constitution, Toombs said that the greatest danger was that the Union might outlast the Constitution. No one today has any feeling that the Union is about to be broken up, but there is grave concern in Congress and out that our Constitution is coming to mean whatever the social and political prejudices, whims, and foibles of a Supreme Court want it to mean—that, in the fears of Tombs, the Union is outlasting the Constitution.

We had long prided ourselves that in a written document we had the safety and protection as surely as words in the English language had meaning—that fortunately we were not like Great Britain, which had only an unwritten constitution based on precedent which a Parliament might overturn if it liked. But it now turns out that the British people have the protection of a Parliament elected by the people, whereas the Americans with all their written Constitution have the protection of only nine men, not elected by the people at all, but appointed for life.

A slight application of history to the origin and progress of the Supreme Court ought to be an excellent tonic for the present generation. Criticism of the Court is as old as the Court itself. Although all of us like to call ourselves good Jeffersonians, some of us do not realize that Jefferson's greatest fear was that any subversion of the American system of government would come through the Federal courts. He had scarcely assumed the office of the Presidency before he was seeking the impeachment of Federal judges and considering action against the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court.

It is generally conceded that our next President in the order of greatness was Andrew Jackson. He likewise had a tilt with the United States Supreme Court in connection with a decision relating to the removal of the Cherokee Indians from Georgia. Georgia considered the decision unacceptable and refused to abide by it and never ceased to ignore it—even down to the present moment if that were necessary.

And President Jackson has been credited with this famous statement: "John Marshall has made his decision; now let him enforce it." And this was not the only Supreme Court decision which was never enforced by a President.

It might have been well had the present President of the United States known of the Cherokee Indian decision and how it was never enforced and how in spite of it, the United States Government did not collapse in 1832. Had he applied a little American history to his thinking, he might not have taken the advice of some of his advisors, and not sent troops to Little Rock under the mistaken notion that if the decision of a Federal judge was not enforced, the U.S. Government would have to go out of business.

Following Andrew Jackson, the next President in order of greatness was, by common consent, Abraham Lincoln. President Lincoln was greatly disturbed by the decision of the United States Supreme Court in the Dred Scott case, which declared the Missoury Compromise law unconstitutional, a compromise which had restricted slavery to the territories south of the southern border of Missouri, Lincoln was not as forthright in his language as some of his supporters, who averred that the Dred Scott decision should be awarded no more dignity or respect than a like decision by a bunch of habitues of a bar room.

Concerning the Supreme Court, Lincoln did say in his Inaugural Address in 1861, that generally the Supreme Court should be upheld, but at "the same time, the candid citizen must confess that if the policy of the Government upon vital questions affecting the whole people is to be irrevocably fixed by decisions of the Supreme Court, the instant they are made in ordinary litigation between parties in personal actions, the people will have ceased to be their rulers, having to that extent practically resigned their Government into the hands of that eminent tribunal." And so, with the criticisms of some of the rather amazing decisions of the U.S. Supreme Court today, we have another example of the law of continuity of history.

Our great danger today is that little by little we may allow the whole processes of American Government to be warped and changed by a Federal judiciary, appointed for life and never subject to the will of the people, until American democracy is anything but a democracy, becoming a far cry from what was intended by the makers of the U.S. Constitution, who provided four ways for amending the document they had made, but none of those ways by decisions of the U.S. Supreme Court.

Another one of the dangers we undergo today is the subordination of the ancient rights of the individual, our customs, folkways, mores, to expediency, and allow them to be whittled down and bartered away as pawns in our international diplomacy. It is argued that we must give way in this or that because in our present situation we may not please those who profess to speak for the rising nations in Asia and Africa, who may not be satisfied with the millions of dollars of aid we are giving them, but perforce we must give up important aspects of our way of life also. And when all this is done, we may still be without their gratitude and respect. And to please the Communists and hope to take the thunder out of their propaganda against us, there is no limit to what we must give up if we are to let them call the plays—every ancient right individual or social together with our so-called capitalistic system, which in reality is a mild form of socalism. We would have to enter the Communist orbit as a satellite—a captive nation. Nothing less would satisfy them.

And in playing this game, we will always find groups among us taking advantage of this foreign propaganda, demanding for themselves so-called rights which deprive other groups of their rights—individual associations and the right to choose their companions.

And in closing, let me say that we must all realize that we do live in a changing world and that there are wise changes that must come or we will be run over; but also at the same time there are certain fixed rights and principles which should be maintained at all hazards. Rome was not built in a day, and Rome should not be destroyed in a day.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. RUSSELL. Is the Presiding Officer prepared to declare the morning business closed?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. I am informed that the Presiding Officer does not close morning business until 2 o'clock, but that if no Senator has any further business, resolutions 180 and 181 have precedence.

RESCUE THE WORLD COURT

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I should like to call to the attention of this body an excellent editorial which appeared on August 24 in the Washington Post and Times Herald under the title, "Rescue the World Court." This editorial points out that the Connally amendment limits the usefulness of the World Court to the United States, and urges its repeal. It notes that the President, the Vice President, and the State Department have, in principle, endorsed an effort to eliminate "this court-crippling device."

The editorial supports Senate Resolution 94, which I introduced to accomplish this purpose, and urges the President to give this resolution his unqualified support: "Why doesn't he send up a rousing message asking for immediate passage of the Humphrey resolution as a means of striking a blow for world law."

I was pleased to read that Attorney General Rogers, speaking before the American Bar Association in Miami Beach, Fla., this past week, urged that the Connally amendment be repealed. This is encouraging. The Attorney General's plea is the strongest to date by an official of the administration, and I am hopeful that it will help in our efforts for adoption of my resolution.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial to which I have referred, from the Washington Post of August 24, along with articles on Attorney General Rogers' speech from the Washington Post and the New York Times of August 27, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

[From the Washington Post, Aug. 24, 1959]

RESCUE THE WORLD COURT

What has happened to the movement to rescue the World Court? A few months ago a considerable head of steam was built up behind the demand for repeal of the Connally amendment, which has gravely limited the usefulness of the Court. President Eisenhower had said in his state of the Union message that U.S. relations with the World Court should be reexamined "to the end that the rule of law may replace the rule of force in the affairs of nations." Vice President NIXON, Charles S. Rhyne, past president of the American Bar Association, and others stirred up a great deal of interest in the subject. Senator HUMPHREY introduced a resolution to repeal the Connally amendment. The State Department endorsed the resolution in a letter to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee in April, and since then the proposal has not moved off dead center.

This is especially unfortunate because it leaves the United States in the position of

holding back in the drive for substitution of judicial processes for force in the settlement of international disputes. This country can and does suggest that many international controversies be decided by the World Court, but it is an empty gesture. Through the Connally amendment the Senate asserted the right for this country to decide for itself in each case whether any dispute laid before the World Court is within its domestic jurisdiction. That gives every other country against which the United States may bring a case in the World Court a similar right to escape a judicial determination by asserting that the case is domestic regardless of what may be involved.

Every reason of justice and self-interest cries for removal of this court-crippling device. It would be especially salutary if President Eisenhower could inform our allies on his forthcoming visit and Premier Khrushchev on his September tour that the United States is accepting the compulsory jurisdiction of the World Court, without any strings attached.

Responsibility for the present inaction seems to be shared about equally by the administration and the Foreign Relations Committee (which reportedly is reluctant to move because of opposition mail). In any event, the President is in the best position to break the deadlock. Why doesn't he send up a rousing message asking for immediate passage of the Humphrey resolution as a means of striking a blow for world law?

[From the New York Times, Aug. 27, 1959]

WIDE ROLE ASKED FOR WORLD COURT—ROGERS BIDS BAR AID FIGHT TO END U.S. RESERVATION ON PANEL'S JURISDICTION

(By Anthony Lewis)

MIAMI BEACH, August 26.—The Attorney General, William P. Rogers, today urged early Senate action to remove U.S. reservations to the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice.

Speaking to the annual meeting of the American Bar Association at the Americana Hotel here, Mr. Rogers urged lawyers to work for the elimination of the right this country retains to keep any dispute out of the World Court on the ground that it involved domestic issues.

Mr. Rogers' statement was the most direct call to date by any high administration figure for repeal of the reservation. He told the audience that if the United States fails to repeal it, "other nations will not believe we are sincere in our support for the rule of law."

The World Court is bound by its own charter not to consider matters within domestic jurisdiction.

Except for the reservations by a few nations, the court would itself decide—as other courts do—whether a case was within its jurisdiction.

NOTES FRENCH ACTION

Mr. Rogers noted that France last month had withdrawn a reservation similar to that of the United States. He said France was "surely as sensitive as we are in matters of sovereignty."

Of the 10 members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, Mr. Rogers said, "the United States is the only one which denies to the court the right to determine its own jurisdiction."

He pointed out that under principles of reciprocity, any country involved in a dispute with the United States could invoke a U.S. reservation of jurisdiction and keep this action out of the court.

He said no court could function effectively under such conditions.

CONNALLY AMENDMENT

The basis of the U.S. reservation is the so-called Connally amendment.

This was sponsored by Senator Tom Connally, Democrat of Texas, and chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, when the Senate in 1946 ratified this country's acceptance of the court's jurisdiction.

The Attorney General also renewed a proposal first made in a speech last spring by Vice President RICHARD M. NIXON—that the United States try to write into future international agreements a clause providing for World Court resolution of any disputes over interpretation of the agreements.

"The fact that we may not be successful in securing agreement in such a clause in all cases does not mean that we should fail to try," he said.

He mentioned, for example, the possibility that the Soviet Union would refuse to go along with the provision in agreements.

"The more often the Soviets oppose reasonable methods to solve world tensions," he said, "the more the nations of the world will come to recognize the significance of the Soviet policy of world domination."

Mr. Rogers saw hope that Soviet leaders today may be willing to permit a freer flow of ideas between our two countries than they have in the past."

In this connection he urged exchanges of lawyers and judges so that Soviet legal figures may study our constitutional system and the operation of our courts and we theirs.

The bar association announced today that its 1961 annual meeting would be held in St. Louis. Next year's will be in Washington. The meeting here will close Friday.

[From the Washington Post, Aug. 27, 1959]

ROGERS ASKS GREATER ROLE FOR WORLD COURT

MIAMI BEACH, FLA., August 26.—U.S. Attorney General William P. Rogers called today for repeal of the so-called Connally amendment under which the United States decides for itself what disputes it will put before the International Court of Justice.

He said this amendment is partly to blame for the minor role of the court in settling international disputes. In its 13 years of operation, it has decided only 17 major cases.

Lawyers hearing the talk, delivered at the American Bar Association convention, called it the strongest pleas to date by any top official of the Eisenhower administration for repeal of Connally amendment.

The Connally amendment takes its name from former Senator Tom Connally, Democrat, of Texas.

When it came to accepting the idea of America joining the World Court, back in 1946, there were several exceptions laid down as to its jurisdiction. One was that the United States would not accept Court jurisdiction over disputes which deal with matters essentially in the domestic jurisdiction of the United States.

Connally proposed a further amendment of six words: "As determined by the United States." The Senate adopted this, 51 to 12.

Rogers said France recently withdrew a similar provision and that the United States now is alone among 10 NATO nations accepting the court's jurisdiction to make such a reservation.

In the eyes of other nations, the United States provision "adds up to a vote of no confidence that the Court will limit the cases it hears to those within its jurisdiction," Rogers said.

"It is argued that our sovereignty might thus be impaired," he said. "As a practical matter, the argument as to possible loss of sovereignty is not persuasive."

He said the Court's own charter limits it to international disputes and it has stayed closely within its jurisdiction.

Members of the 15-man Court are selected by the United Nations, which established the tribunal.

Rogers said establishment of an effective tribunal to decide controversies between nations is long overdue.

He called on the lawyers to urge the U.S. Senate to act quickly on the International Court's jurisdiction.

"If we fail to do so, it will make the other nations of the world believe we are not sincere," he declared.

Rogers also proposed an exchange of visits between American and Russian lawyers that would, he said, dramatize the contrast between a free system of government and a regimented Communist system.

"It is my opinion," Rogers said, "that the legal profession should give its support to a carefully planned exchange program of lawyers and judges in order that the Soviets may study our constitutional system and the operation of our courts, and that we be given an opportunity to study the system in effect in the Soviet Union."

The Bar Association will hold its 1961 national convention in St. Louis, the Board of Governors decided today. The dates will be announced later.

The ABA meets next year in Washington, D.C., from August 27 to September 2.

TOM DOOLEY, "HEALTH FOR PEACE," AND PARALLEL WORK BY THE INTERNATIONAL HEALTH SUBCOMMITTEE

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I know that a great number of my colleagues have read with deep interest and concern the news reports concerning the return of the famed physician, Tom Dooley, from far-off Laos for cancer surgery. It is our earnest hope that the report that the cancer has been successfully removed will be fully borne out by future developments, as presently appears to be the case.

It is appropriate that Tom Dooley, who has personally contributed so much to medical science, should now be a beneficiary of the genius of modern medical science. Tom Dooley has become the symbol of the noblest motivation in the medical profession—to heal suffering human beings everywhere, regardless of race, creed, color, or national origin.

A SOUND APPEAL FOR SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 41

It was characteristic, therefore, of Tom Dooley to appeal from his hospital bed for action on health for peace legislation, Senate Joint Resolution 41. This is the bill introduced by the distinguished senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] and cosponsored by well over half the Members of the Senate, including myself.

The ample case for that bill, as approved by the Senate 63 to 17, has been made by a great many medical experts who testified before the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare and before a subcommittee of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The able chairman of the House subcommittee, Hon. KENNETH ROBERTS, has devoted intensive consideration to the proposed legislation, as have his colleagues. Regrettably, for other reasons, it does not appear, on the basis of present circumstances, that the bill will be approved this year by the House of Representatives. Thus, action cannot be commenced in 1959 under the proposed

new National Institute for International Medical Research.

This apparent delay well into 1960 is a source of sadness to all those who appreciate that time is of the essence in mankind's battle against disease. No one has proved that fact more eloquently than my colleague from Alabama [Mr. HILL].

Meanwhile, however, medical science does not wait.

DR. RUSK'S TRIBUTE TO TOM DOOLEY

Tom Dooley continues to symoblize medical valor and dedication. The inspiration of that symbol has been well described by the man who is universally renowned, not only for his personal contributions in physical medicine and rehabilitation but for his ability as a medical journalist, Dr. Howard A. Rusk, associate editor of the New York Times.

ANOTHER LEADER: THE LATE C. P. RHOADS

Let me mention now, however, that it is symbolic, as well, that the great surgery which was performed on Tom Dooley occurred in an institution which is famed throughout the world for its outsanding contributions to cancer research and therapy—the Memorial Center for Cancer and Allied Diseases.

Just recently a man whose name was rightly and closely identified with that great center and with the allied Sloan Kettering Institute for Cancer Research, Dr. C. P. Rhoads, unfortunately and prematurely succumbed to a heart attack.

No man can estimate the loss to humanity from the death of a great cancer fighter like Dr. Rhoads.

The best type of tribute that we can pay to the departed C. P. Rhoads is to enact legislation for which he himself so earnestly hoped and strove. It is the same legislation for which Tom Dooley from his sickbed appealed; namely, Senate Joint Resolution 41.

SEND CONTRIBUTIONS TO MEDICO

So, too, one of the ways by which we can say "get well" to Tom Dooley, is in a manner and way which he will best appreciate; namely, by sending contributions to the splendid organization which has made possible, not only his work in Laos, but the work of many other dedicated physicians in other emerging countries of the world. I refer to Medico, the private nonprofit organization whose work is an inspiration to the American medical profession and to physicians elsewhere throughout the world.

Endorsements of Medico, like endorsements of Senate Joint Resolution 41 have poured in, unsolicited, to the Senate Government Operations Subcommittee, of which I am chairman. As part of our international health study, there has come to us from all over the United States and the world, an almost unanimous volume of suggestions for enactment of this sound legislation and for encouragement of this type of dedicated private organization.

SENATE SUBCOMMITTEE'S PUBLICATIONS POINT UP THIS WORK

Meanwhile, I am glad to report that our Senate subcommittee's work is proceeding on a great many of the fronts which Tom Dooley's worthy career symbolizes.

Early next month, the International Health Subcommittee will release another of its committee prints, entitled "Patterns of Incidence of Certain Major Diseases Throughout the World." It will show various opportunities for expanded research, based on the fact that certain major diseases strike particular types of populations.

Shortly thereafter we will publish a report on "The American Pharmaceutical Industry and International Health." Here, let me note that pharmaceutical companies have generously donated drugs to Tom Dooley and to other nonprofit hospitals.

Thereafter, the subcommittee will publish the first part of a report on "American Voluntarism and International Health."

I hope that in this and other ways, we can make our own contributions to the great job which has been performed and which we hope can be resumed in the not too distant future by Dr. Dooley.

I send to the desk now the stimulating article in Sunday's New York Times by Dr. Rusk, and an editorial in this morning's Times, entitled "Tom Dooley's Message."

I ask unanimous consent that they both be printed in the body of the RECORD at this point.

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

[From the New York Times, Aug. 30, 1959]

FOR DOOLEY AND LAOS—JUNGLE DOCTOR GAINS IN CANCER FIGHT AS DRIVE IS BEGUN FOR HEALTH AGENCY

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

In a 3-hour operation here on Thursday, Dr. Tom Dooley had the cancer on his chest wall successfully removed at the Memorial Center for Cancer and Allied Diseases.

On Friday, thousands of his friends, admirers, and professional colleagues in the United States and 10 times their number of natives in the jungles of Laos were deeply relieved to hear he was convalescing normally after this major surgery.

The first hurdle has been cleared. Only time will bring the final answer.

It was typical of this dedicated international physician that the day before he went to the operating room he sent the following telegram to more than 50 leaders in Congress:

"I returned last week from Laos where for the past 2 years I have been operating a hospital near the border of Communist China, under the auspices of Medico, with voluntary funds raised from the public.

"During this period I have seen a complete change in the attitude of the Laos people whom I have served. The people now understand communism and want none of this way of life.

"I am being operated on tomorrow for cancer. As soon as I recover, I intend to go back to Laos to continue this fight against communism with the tools of health.

"I want to thank you and your colleagues in Congress for the support you have given to medical research. I know Tulane Medical College has recently developed a new technique for treating the type of cancer I have, that may save my life.

"I am deeply distressed that the Health for Peace Resolution No. 41 now in the Subcommittee on Health and Safety of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce may not be acted on before Congress adjourns. I feel that this would be a tragic waste of irretrievable time. Unless you have lived and worked in the primitive jungle as I have, you cannot realize what this means. Please do everything possible to get action on this vital bill before adjournment."

The research to which he referred as a possible help to him was developed under grants from the National Cancer Institute and the American Cancer Society by Dr. Oscar Creech, Jr., Dr. E. T. Krements, Dr. R. F. Ryan, Dr. Keith Reemstsma, Dr. J. N. Winblad, Dr. James L. Elliott, the Tulane University School of Medicine, Charity Hospital, Touro Infirmary, and the U.S. Public Health Hospital, New Orleans.

The technique is known as perfusion and consists of placing a tourniquet around the affected area and forcing phenylalanine mustard through the circulation in the area, but not through the entire body. This new procedure for the first time permits the concentration of cancerocidal drugs with minimum toxic effects. It represents a great advance in cancer therapy.

Tom Dooley has also been anxious this week about the fate of his two colleagues, Dwight Davis and Earl Rhine, whom he left behind to continue his work when he was ordered back to the United States for treatment.

With Communist troops within 50 miles of the capital of Laos, and with guerrilla fighting all through the country, especially in the area of his hospital at Muong-Sing, Dr. Dooley's apprehension is well founded.

Laos is a country the size of Utah, bounded on the east by Vietnam, on the south by Cambodia, on the west by Thailand, and on the north by Communist China. The current fighting is in the north near the 600 miles of border with Communist China and Communist North Vietnam. The Communists who have been captured or killed in the recent deep-jungle fighting in the monsoon season have been well armed with new guns stamped "Made in Czechoslovakia."

Tom Dooley has much to give when he recovers to the point that he can return to his station. He wants to establish two more hospitals in this wild area of Laos. If he can obtain a small airplane, it will enable him to fly the circuit as a modern "horse-and-buggy" doctor.

Tom Dooley has awakened anew our realization that healing is a priceless tool in the winning of men's minds for freedom. He has been not only a great emissary for healing, but for peace.

Hundreds of letters addressed to Dr. Tom Dooley came last week to the offices of Medico at 251 Fourth Avenue. All were expressions of gratitude from those who sat in comfort at home for the sacrifices he has made and for his jungle battle for democracy.

Many contained contributions for Medico, a tax-exempt, nonprofit organization that facilitates scientific communication and provides health services in the underprivileged parts of the world. Dr. Peter Comanduras, a dedicated Washington physician, is Medico's director general.

Dr. Dooley's professional colleagues are starting a campaign for funds among the physicians of America to support Medico, because Tom Dooley epitomizes Medico, which he helped to found. Its life and future are more important to him than his own.

Millions of Americans who never knew Tom Dooley or read his books have prayed this week that he may win his victory over cancer and rise again to walk among the sick and to serve his fellow men.

[From the New York Times, Aug. 31, 1959]

DR. DOOLEY'S MESSAGE

Dr. Thomas Dooley has been in this city during the last week or so when his services were badly needed at the hospital he has been operating in Laos, near the border of Communist China. He came here because that was the only way he could hope to be cured of a cancer which was operated on last Thursday.

Tom Dooley seems to have thought of himself during this ordeal only in terms of the work he could do and hopes to keep on doing for other people. Before his operation, when his personal fate was still uncertain, he sent a message to 50 Members of Congress in which he urged the passage of the beautifully named "health for peace" bill. This measure, which has now unhappily been postponed, would set up an international medical research institute. The opposition to it has been hard to understand.

Tom Dooley's case, his message and his work were described in an article by Dr. Howard A. Rusk in yesterday's issue of the Times. Tom Dooley has done his almost miraculous work on private funds contributed through a tax-exempt nonprofit organization called Medico, which has its headquarters in New York City at 251 Fourth Avenue. Much more could be done, however, if these contributions were supplemented by the kind of organization that would be set up under the "health for peace" bill. It is tragic that Dr. Dooley's example did not bring the bill out of the House committee where it is now locked up. The mistake could still be remedied if the need and the opportunity were keenly realized.

DIVERSION OF WATER FROM LAKE MICHIGAN, AT CHICAGO

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, as I understand it, we are operating under the 3-minute rule.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. WILEY. But I have noticed that Senators have been using from 6 to 10 minutes, and no one objects.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair should inform the Senator from Wisconsin that in the case of the Senator from Minnesota, he requested 5 extra minutes, which were granted to him.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, one of the priceless privileges and pleasures that I have experienced in being a Senator is to know Senators who have been men of great understanding. During my 20 years in the Senate, I have literally sat at the feet of men who had learned much on life's highway. I remember among them Senator Vandenburg. I remember when he rose to speak he always said, as a distinguished Senator the other day did, "Mr. President, I desire to be uninterrupted until I have finished what I have to say." Then he delivered his talk, which would be relatively short, and would provide an opportunity to be questioned. Today I make the same request.

Before I get into the subject at hand, may I say that in the debate so far, I have had a number of surprises, and over the Sabbath I thought about one of them. I am going to lay it before the Senate.

You know, Mr. President, I never question the integrity or the judgment of a fellow Senator. When a Senator tells me, for instance, as several of them have, that he had pledged Mr. O'BRIEN that he would support his bill, and this occurred when they were in the House, who am I to question such an understanding? Yet, let me say that another bit of—let us call it wisdom or knowledge—comes to my mind.

A very distinguished Senator, when I first came to the Senate—and one of whom I became very fond—in speaking of his experiences said, "Senator, you know, I never give a firm committal to any individual or about any bill. If people want to talk to me, I am glad to give them my present conception on any subject. But I have found so many times that Senators have found themselves in a tight box because they had given their word they would vote for a certain measure. Then when the measure came up, it was the same bill, but it wouldn't contain the basic ideas it had in the beginning." As a result he would, he said, have to give a lot of explanations why he voted against it.

I was called out just now and asked to make a committal. I simply said, "No. I do not know what the report is going to be when it comes out of the labor conference, but I assure you it will have my honest judgment when I do vote."

How is that pertinent to the matter I am discussing? Just this: Representative O'BRIEN, apparently, got a blanket agreement which, of course, referred to a bill then under consideration. The present bill is entirely different from any previous bill. For instance, I hold in my hand the 1957 bill, on which we voted in 1958; the pending bill, as introduced; and the pending bill, as proposed to be amended. I ask that they be placed in the RECORD at this time.

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

H.R. 2

[85th Cong., 1st sess., in the House of Representatives, January 3, 1957—Mr. O'BRIEN of Illinois introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on Public Works, April 17, 1957—Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed]

A bill to authorize the State of Illinois and the Metropolitan Sanitary District of Greater Chicago, under the direction of the Secretary of the Army, to test, on a three-year basis, the effect of increasing the diversion of water from Lake Michigan into the Illinois Waterway, 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 provide a basis for a study of the effect of increased diversion of water from Lake Michigan upon the Illinois Waterway and the degree of improvement in such waterway caused thereby, the effect of such increased diversion upon commerce among the several States and navigation on the Great Lakes and the Illinois Waterway, and the extent to which such increased diversion may affect the level of Lake Michigan, authority is hereby granted to the State of Illinois and the Metropolitan Sanitary District of Greater Chicago, under the supervision and direction of the Secretary of the Army, to withdraw water from Lake Michigan, in addition to all domestic pumpage, at a rate providing a total annual average of not more than two thousand five hundred cubic feet of water per second, to flow into the Illinois Waterway during the three-year period which begins on the date of enactment of this Act, subject to the following limitations:

(1) The maximum direct diversion from Lake Michigan shall not at any time exceed a flow of five thousand cubic feet per second;

(2) The Secretary of the Army shall at all times have direct control and supervision of the amounts of water directly diverted from Lake Michigan; and

(3) The Secretary of the Army shall not allow any water to be directly diverted from Lake Michigan to flow into the Illinois Waterway during times of flood in the Illinois, Des Plaines, Chicago, or Calumet Rivers.

SEC. 2. As soon after the date of enactment of this Act as is possible, the Secretary of the Army shall cause a study to be made of the effect on Lake Michigan and on the Illinois Waterway of the increased diversion authorized by the first section of this Act, and the improvement in conditions along the Illinois Waterway which may result from such increased diversion. The Secretary of the Army shall report to the Congress on or before January 31, 1961, the results of such study. Such report shall contain recommendations with respect to continuing the authority to divert water from Lake Michigan into the Illinois Waterway in the amounts authorized by this Act, or increasing or decreasing such amounts.

PRESENT BILL

[86th Cong., 1st sess., in the House of Representatives, January 7, 1959—Mr. O'BRIEN of Illinois introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on Public Works]

H.R. 1

A bill to require a study to be conducted of the effect of increasing the diversion of water from Lake Michigan into the Illinois Waterway for navigation, and 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 provide the basis for the study, authorized by section 2 of this Act, of the effect of increased diversion of water from Lake Michigan, in addition to the one thousand five hundred cubic feet of water per second presently provided by the 1930 decree of the Supreme Court of the United States (281 U.S. 181–202) and subsequently authorized by the Rivers and Harbors Act of 1930 (46 Stat. 918, 929), upon the Illinois Waterway and the degree of improvement in such waterway caused thereby, and the effect of such increased diversion upon commerce among the several States and navigation on the Great Lakes and the Illinois Waterway, authority is hereby granted to the State of Illinois and the Metropolitan Sanitary District of Greater Chicago, under the supervision and direction of the Secretary of the Army, to withdraw water from Lake Michigan for the one-year period specified in paragraph (3) of subsection (b) of section 2 of this Act, in addition to all domestic pumpage, at a rate providing a total annual average of not more than two thousand five hundred cubic feet of water per second, to flow into the Illinois Waterway during such one-year period, subject to the following limitations:

(1) The Secretary of the Army shall at all times have direct control and supervision of the amounts of water directly diverted from Lake Michigan.

(2) The Secretary of the Army shall not allow any water to be directly diverted from

Lake Michigan to flow into the Illinois Waterway during times of flood in the Illinois, Des Plaines, Chicago, or Calumet Rivers.

SEC. 2. (a) During the three-year period beginning on the date of enactment of this Act the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, in cooperation with the Secretary of the Army (acting through the Chief of Engineers), shall cause a study to be made of the effect on Lake Michigan and on the Illinois Waterway of the increased annual diversion of one thousand cubic feet of water per second for the one-year period authorized by this Act, and the improvement in navigation conditions and other improvements along the Illinois Waterway which may result from such increased diversion.

(b) The study authorized to be made by subsection (a) of this section shall be divided into the following phases:

(1) The first period of six months shall begin on the date of enactment of this Act and shall be used to develop plans for the tests and range of studies of the Illinois Waterway, with no increase in the authorized diversion from Lake Michigan during such period.

(2) The twelve-month period immediately following the period specified in paragraph (1) shall be devoted to a stream survey of the Illinois Waterway under existing conditions, with no increase in the authorized diversion from Lake Michigan during such period.

(3) The twelve-month period immediately following the period specified in paragraph (2) shall be used to study the conditions in the Illinois Waterway with a total annual average diversion of two thousand five hundred cubic feet of water per second (comprising the authorized diversion of one thousand five hundred cubic feet of water per second and the additional one thousand cubic feet of water per second authorized by the first section of this Act) in addition to all domestic pumpage.

(4) The six-month period immediately following the period specified in paragraph (3) shall be used to prepare the final report required by subsection (c) of this section.

(c) Upon completion of the study authorized by subsection (a) of this section, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Secretary of the Army shall correlate the results of such study. Thereafter the Secretary of the Army shall report such results to Congress on or before June 1, 1962. The report on such results shall contain recommendations with respect to continuing the authority to divert water from Lake Michigan into the Illinois Waterway in the amount authorized by the first section of this Act, or increasing or decreasing such amount.

[86th Cong., 1st sess., in the Senate of the United States; March 16, 1959, read twice and ordered to lie on the table; March 18, 1959, referred to the Committee on Public Works; August 25, 1959, reported by Mr. CHAVEZ, with amendments]

[Insert the part printed in italic]

H.R. 1

An Act to require a study to be conducted of the effect of increasing the diversion of water from Lake Michigan into the Illinois Waterway for navigation, and 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 provide the basis for the study, authorized by section 2 of this Act, of the effect of increased diversion of water from Lake Michigan, in addition to the one thousand five hundred cubic feet of water per second presently provided by the 1930 decree of the Supreme Court of the United States (281 U.S. 181–202) and subsequently authorized by the Rivers and Harbors Act of 1930 (46 Stat. 918, 929), upon the Illinois Waterway and the degree of improvement in such waterway caused thereby, and the effect of such increased diversion upon commerce among the several States and navigation on the Great Lakes and their connecting waterways, and the Illinois Waterway, authority is hereby granted to the State of Illinois and the Metropolitan Sanitary District of Greater Chicago, under the supervision and direction of the Secretary of the Army, to withdraw water from Lake Michigan for the one-year period specified in paragraph (3) of subsection (b) of section 2 of this Act, in addition to all domestic pumpage, at a rate providing a total annual average of not more than two thousand five hundred cubic feet of water per second, to flow into the Illinois Waterway during such one-year period, subject to the following limitations:

(1) The Secretary of the Army shall at all times have direct control and supervision of the amounts of water directly diverted from Lake Michigan.

(2) The Secretary of the Army shall not allow any water to be directly diverted from Lake Michigan to flow into the Illinois Waterway during times of flood in the Illinois, Des Plaines, Chicago, or Calumet Rivers.

(3) With respect to the regulation of flows along the Illinois River, particularly at Pekin, Illinois, the diversion authorized by this Act in accordance with this section will be regulated with the objective of maintaining a uniform flow at Pekin of eight thousand cubic feet per second when such uniformity of flow is feasible, as determined by the Chief of Engineers and the Secretary of the Army, and when maintenance of this uniformity will not conflict with or interfere with the preceding provisions of this section.

SEC. 2. (a) During the three-year period beginning on the date funds are first made available for the study the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, in cooperation with the Secretary of the Army (acting through the Chief of Engineers), shall cause a study to be made of the effect on the Great Lakes and their connecting waterways and on the Illinois Waterway of the increased annual diversion of one thousand cubic feet of water per second for the one-year period authorized by this Act, and the improvement in navigation conditions and other improvements along the Illinois Waterway which may result from such increased diversion. *The studies described above shall include, but not be limited to, the effect of the diversion of an additional one thousand cubic feet per second on the levels of the Great Lakes, and shall also include a study of the effect of currents and flows of water throughout the south one hundred and seventy-five miles of Lake Michigan, the effect of aeration, chlorination, sources of pollution, studies of the quality of water in the Illinois Waterway and tributary streams, the possibility of the separation of storm and sanitary sewage, and a study of the treatment of industrial wastes.*

(b) The study authorized to be made by subsection (a) of this section shall be divided into the following phases:

(1) The first period of six months shall begin on the date funds are first made available for the study and shall be used to develop plans for the tests and range of studies of the Illinois Waterway, and the Great Lakes and their connecting waterways, with no increase in the authorized diversion from Lake Michigan during such period.

(2) The twelve-month period immediately following the period specified in paragraph (1) shall be devoted to a stream survey of the Illinois Waterway, and the Great Lakes and their connecting waterways, under existing conditions, with no increase in the authorized diversion from Lake Michigan during such period.

(3) The twelve-month period immediately following the period specified in paragraph (2) shall be used to study the conditions in the Illinois Waterway, and the Great Lakes and their connecting waterways, with a total annual average diversion of two thousand five hundred cubic feet of water per second (comprising the authorized diversion of one thousand five hundred cubic feet of water per second and the additional one thousand cubic feet of water per second authorized by the first section of this Act) in addition to all domestic pumpage.

(4) The six-month period immediately following the period specified in paragraph (3) shall be used to prepare the final report required by subsection (c) of this section.

(c) Upon completion of the study authorized by subsection (a) of this section, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Secretary of the Army shall correlate the results of such study, and shall report such results to Congress. The report on such results shall contain recommendations with respect to continuing the authority to divert water from Lake Michigan into the Illinois Waterway in the amount authorized by the first section of this Act, or increasing or decreasing such amount: *Provided, That nothing in this Act shall be construed to indicate any approval or authorization of a permanent increase in diversion in the amount of one thousand cubic feet per second, or any other amount if hereafter recommended. Prior to any authorization of other or additional diversion, consultation shall be had between the Governments of the United States and Canada. But nothing herein contained shall ever be construed to effect in any way, any and all rights now or heretofore existing in the United States in and to the exclusive control, use, and management of the waters of Lake Michigan.*

Mr. WILEY. Then, as my friend said, "You know, facts—a change of facts—changes the picture."

It wasn't until about a month after the pending bill was referred to the Public Works Committee that the Canadian Government sent its note to the Secretary of State, which note I ask to have printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

CANADIAN NOTE

Hon. CHRISTIAN A. HERTER,
Acting Secretary of State,
Department of State, Washington, D.C.:

I have the honor on instructions from my Government to refer to proposals for legislation in the United States concerning an increase in the diversion of water from Lake Michigan through the Chicago drainage canal. It is noted that one proposal to this effect has been approved by the House of Representatives and will shortly be considered by the Senate.

During a period of many years there have been numerous occasions on which the Government of Canada has made representations to the Government of the United States of America with respect to proposals concerning the diversion of water from Lake Michigan out of the Great Lakes watershed at Chicago.

Many of these representations have been directed toward particular proposals then under discussion by U.S. authorities. Because of the importance of the question, the Government of Canada believes it timely to reexamine the considerations which it regards as most important concerning any proposals for additional diversion of water from the Great Lakes watershed. Accordingly, in order that there may be no misunderstanding as to the views of the Gov-

ernment of Canada, I have been instructed to bring the following considerations to your attention.

Every diversion of water from the Great Lakes watershed at Chicago inevitably decreases the volume of water remaining in the basin for all purposes. The Government of Canada is opposed to any action which will have the effect of reducing the volume of water in the Great Lakes Basin. Careful inquiry has failed to reveal any sources of water in Canada which could be added to the present supplies of the basin to compensate for further withdrawals in the United States.

The Government of Canada considers that many agreements and understandings between the United States and Canada would be broken if unilateral action were taken to divert additional water from the Great Lakes watershed at Chicago and directs attention to provisions of two treaties in particular:

(a) The Boundary Waters Treaty of 1909: The applicability of either article II, paragraph 2, or article III of this treaty depends upon the interpretation of physical facts.

If Lake Michigan physically flows into the boundary water Lake Huron, article II preserves to Canada the right to object to such a diversion which would be productive of material injury to the navigation interests in Canadian waters.

If, as has been asserted by eminent U.S. jurists, article III of the treaty applies, no further diversion shall be made except with the approval of the International Joint Commission.

(b) Niagara Treaty of 1950: This treaty allocates water for scenic and power purposes. The amount of water which shall be available for these purposes is the total outflow from Lake Erie. The specific inclusion of certain added waters in article III of the treaty emphasizes the underlying assumption that existing supplies will continue unabated.

In addition to these treaty provisions, there is a further agreement of far-reaching importance. Power development in the Provinces of Ontario and Quebec is predicated upon agreed criteria for regulation of the flows of the St. Lawrence River. The order of approval of the International Joint Commission of October 29, 1952, as supplemented on July 2, 1956, and accepted by both our Governments, forms the basis for the construction and operation of the hydroelectric power installations in the international section of the St. Lawrence River. Criterion (a) of this order of approval assumes a continuous diversion out of the Great Lakes Basin limited to the present 3,100 cubic feet per second at Chicago.

Navigation and commercial interests depend upon the maintenance of the basis upon which channel enlargements have been designed in order that vessels of deep draft may proceed with full load to and from ports of the upper Great Lakes. In this connection, I would refer to the following matters:

(a) The construction of the St. Lawrence Seaway: Legislation in the two countries and the several exchanges of notes concerning the construction and operation of the Seaway now just completed are based on the assumption and understanding that there will not be unilateral action repugnant to the purposes of the legislation. Withdrawal of water from the Great Lakes Basin would materially affect the operation of the St. Lawrence Seaway.

(b) Dredging: By agreement contained in the various exchanges of notes between the two countries, profiles have been prepared for the excavation which has taken place or is about to take place in the International Rapids Section of the river, in the Amherstburg Channel, and in the St. Clair River. These agreements are based on the implied understanding that material changes would not be made in the volume of water available for navigation.

(c) New channel: In an exchange of notes dated February 28, 1959, it has been agreed that a new channel should be constructed to eliminate the so-called Southeast Bend of the St. Clair River. The agreement by the Government of Canada to this proposal was based on the understanding that there would be no artificial interference with the present supplies of water.

Because of the importance attached by the United States and Canada to the honoring of international undertakings in letter and in spirit, the Government of Canada views with serious concern any possible impairment of agreements and undertakings relating to the Great Lakes Basin. Furthermore, the alarms created by repeated proposals for diversion which inevitably disturb the people and industry of Canada are a source of profound irritation to the relations between our two countries which we can ill afford.

I am instructed, therefore, to express the hope of the Government of Canada that the United States will view this matter with equal concern and will be able to give satisfactory assurances that unilateral action will not be taken which would imperil the present regime of the waters in the Great Lakes Basin and the status of the agreements and understandings to which I have referred.

Please accept, sir, the renewed assurances of my highest consideration.

A. D. P. HEENEY.

WASHINGTON, D.C., *April 9, 1959.*

Mr. WILEY. Thereafter, hearings were held before the Public Works Committee, and the bill was reported—8 to 6—with two of the eight stating that the bill should be referred to the Foreign Relations Committee. None of the others made any expression on that subject. As Senator CASE said, they simply went into the facts of the diversion.

Another fact—after the bill had been reported 8 to 6—the Canadian Government sent its second note, which I ask to have printed in the RECORD at this point. The point I am making there is that these two notes from the Canadian Government have changed the picture entirely. They certainly could not have been considered at the time Mr. O'BRIEN exacted the promise of support.

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

INFORMATION OFFICE,
CANADIAN EMBASSY,
Washington, D.C.

I have the honor to refer to my note 184 of April 9, 1959, concerning legislative proposals to increase the diversion of water from Lake Michigan at Chicago.

I am instructed to inform you that the Government of Canada has taken note of the recent legislative developments in the United States concerning this matter. In this connection, I am to advise you that the Government of Canada explicity reaffirms the position set forth at length in the above-mentioned note. In the view of my Government any additional diversion of water out of the Great Lakes watershed would be inconsistent with existing agreements and arrangements which together constitute an agreed regime with respect to these waters. The proposed unilateral derogation from the existing regime therefore occasions serious concern in Canada.

Please accept, sir, the renewed assurances of my highest consideration.

A. D. P. HEENEY,
Ambassador.

AUGUST 20, 1959.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask to be allowed to continue for 2 additional minutes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Wisconsin be allowed to proceed for 3 additional minutes.

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

Mr. WILEY. I hope my bit of philosophy, if it has no other effect, will cause all of us to do some thinking. We who represent this Government in the legislative branch should do some thinking before someone has a rope around our necks on a given measure which is not yet in existence.

I remember so well when I decided to run for the Senate that groups came to me and wanted me to give my promise that I would vote for such and such a measure when it was introduced. I had had 30 years of experience in the law business which had taught me not to make any such promises, and I have been grateful ever since. A prominent labor leader, in my presence and in the presence of others, said, "I have not always agreed with the Senator, but I know that nobody or group has a rope around his neck." And in the last election, the best compliment I got was from one of the "kingmakers," who said, when asked why he was not supporting me, "The old s.o.b. does not take orders."

Much I have said is more in the nature of advice to the young Senators who have a great responsibility in representing their Commonwealth and their country. One can sleep well nights if he feels that God is his only Master.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the call of the roll be rescinded, and that the unfinished business be laid before the Senate for its consideration.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I must object to that request. I believe we must have a quorum present.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BARTLETT in the chair). The clerk will continue with the quorum call.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I renew my objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. To what does the Senator from Wisconsin object?

Mr. WILEY. I object to the request that the order for the call of the roll be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard; and the clerk will continue with the call of the roll.

The Chief Clerk resumed and concluded the call of the roll; and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Byrd, W. Va.	Dirksen
Allott	Capehart	Douglas
Anderson	Carlson	Dworshak
Bartlett	Carroll	Eastland
Beall	Case, N.J.	Ellender
Bennett	Chavez	Engle
Bible	Clark	Ervin
Bush	Cooper	Fong
Butler	Cotton	Fulbright
Byrd, Va.	Curtis	Goldwater

Gore	Kuchel	Proxmire
Green	Langer	Randolph
Gruening	Lausche	Robertson
Hart	Long, La.	Russell
Hartke	McCarthy	Saltonstall
Hayden	McClellan	Schoeppel
Hennings	McNamara	Scott
Hickenlooper	Magnuson	Smith
Hill	Mansfield	Sparkman
Holland	Martin	Stennis
Humphrey	Morse	Symington
Jackson	Morton	Talmadge
Johnson, Tex.	Moss	Thurmond
Johnston, S.C.	Mundt	Wiley
Jordan	Murray	Williams, N.J.
Keating	Neuberger	Williams, Del.
Kennedy	Pastore	Yarborough
Kerr	Prouty	Young, N. Dak.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

DIVERSION OF WATER FROM LAKE MICHIGAN, AT CHICAGO

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The morning hour has expired; and the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 1) to require a study to be conducted of the effect of increasing the diversion of water from Lake Michigan into the Illinois Waterway for navigation, and for other purposes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, what is the pending business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending business is House bill 1, to require a study to be conducted of the effect of increasing the diversion of water from Lake Michigan into the Illinois Waterway for navigation, and for other purposes.

The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] to lay on the table the motion of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] to refer the bill to the Committee on Foreign Relations, with instructions to report it back not later than January 15, 1960.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, is the pending motion debatable?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending motion is not debatable.

On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered; and the clerk will call the roll.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio will state it.

Mr. LAUSCHE. If the pending motion is rejected, will the Senate then vote on the motion to refer the bill to the Foreign Relations Committee?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That motion would then be the pending question. Whether or not a yea-and-nay vote would be taken on it at that time would depend upon the subsequent developments.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut will state it.

Mr. BUSH. On what question is the yea-and-nay vote about to be taken?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On the motion of the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] to lay on the table the motion of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] to refer the bill to the Committee on Foreign Relations, with instructions to report it back not later than January 15, 1960.

On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered; and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the junior Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "yea." If I were permitted to vote, I would vote "nay." Therefore, I withhold my vote.

Mr. MANSFIELD (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE]. Were he present and voting, he would vote "nay." Were I permitted to vote, I would vote "yea." Therefore, I withhold my vote.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "nay." If I were permitted to vote, I would vote "yea." Accordingly, I withhold my vote.

The rollcall was concluded.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I have a pair with the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "yea." If I were permitted to vote, I would vote "nay." Therefore, I withhold my vote.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I announce that the Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. MCGEE], the Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] are absent on official business attending the Interparliamentary Union Conference at Warsaw, Poland.

On the vote the Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON] is paired with the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY]. If present and voting, the Senator from Nevada would vote "nay," and the Senator from Oklahoma would vote "yea."

The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] is paired with the Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE]. If present and voting the Senator from Tennessee would vote "yea," and the Senator from Maine would vote "nay."

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD] is paired with the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS]. If present and voting, the Senator from Connecticut would vote "yea," and the Senator from Florida would vote "nay."

I further announce that if present and voting, the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. LONG] and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. MCGEE] would each vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] is absent on official business attending the Interparliamentary Union Conference at Warsaw, Poland, and his pair has been previously announced.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] is absent on official business.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] and the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] are detained on official business.

On this vote, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] is paired with the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS]. If present and voting, the Senator from Nebraska would vote "yea," and the Senator from New York would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 38, nays 42, as follows:

YEAS—38

Allott	Fong	Kennedy
Bartlett	Goldwater	Kerr
Bennett	Gore	McCarthy
Byrd, W. Va.	Gruening	Morse
Carroll	Hartke	Morton
Chavez	Hayden	Moss
Cotton	Hickenlooper	Murray
Curtis	Hill	Pastore
Dirksen	Holland	Randolph
Douglas	Jackson	Saltonstall
Eastland	Johnson, Tex.	Schoeppel
Ellender	Johnston, S.C.	Yarborough
Engle	Jordan	

NAYS—42

Aiken	Fulbright	Prouty
Anderson	Green	Proxmire
Beall	Hart	Robertson
Bible	Hennings	Russell
Bush	Keating	Scott
Butler	Kuchel	Smith
Byrd, Va.	Langer	Sparkman
Capehart	Lausche	Stennis
Carlson	McClellan	Symington
Case, N.J.	McNamara	Talmadge
Clark	Magnuson	Thurmond
Cooper	Martin	Wiley
Dworshak	Mundt	Williams, Del.
Ervin	Neuberger	Young, N. Dak.

NOT VOTING—20

Bridges	Humphrey	Monroney
Cannon	Javits	Muskie
Case, S. Dak.	Kefauver	O'Mahoney
Church	Long, Hawaii	Smathers
Dodd	Long, La.	Williams, N.J.
Frear	McGee	Young, Ohio
Hruska	Mansfield	

So the motion to lay on the table was rejected.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the motion to lay on the table was rejected.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now recurs on the motion of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] to refer the bill to the Committee on Foreign Relations with instructions to report back not later than January 15, 1960.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas will state it.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Is the motion subject to amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The instructions are subject to amendment.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I move to strike "January 15, 1960," and to insert in lieu thereof "April 1, 1960."

If the bill is to be referred to my committee, I do not think the committee should have such a short period of time to consider it. I do not think we could

possibly give the bill due consideration in 15 days at the first of a session. I therefore move to amend the motion by striking out "January 15, 1960" and inserting in lieu thereof "April 1, 1960."

The PRESIDING OFFICER The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Arkansas.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Have the yeas and nays been ordered on the motion by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE]?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. They have not.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], as amended. On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD (when his name was called). Mr. President, on this vote I have a pair with the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE]. Were he present and voting, he would vote "yea." Were I at liberty to vote, I would vote "nay." I therefore withhold my vote.

Mr. SPARKMAN (when his name was called). Mr. President, on this vote I have a pair with the junior Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "nay." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "yea." I therefore withhold my vote.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey (when his name was called). Mr. President, on this vote I have a pair with the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "yea." If I were at liberty to vote I would vote "nay." Accordingly I withhold my vote.

The rollcall was concluded.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I announce that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] are absent on official business attending the Interparliamentary Union Conference at Warsaw, Poland.

On this vote the Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE] is paired with the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA]. If present and voting, the Senator from Maine would vote "yea," and the Senator from Nebraska would vote "nay."

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] is paired with the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS]. If present and voting, the Senator from Oklahoma would vote "nay," and the Senator from Florida would vote "yea."

I further announce that if present and voting, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] would vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] is absent on official business attending the Interparliamentary Union Conference at Warsaw, Poland.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] is absent on official business, and on this vote, is paired with the Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE]. If present and voting, the Senator from Nebraska would vote "nay," and the Senator from Maine would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 41, nays 46, as follows:

YEAS—41

Aiken	Green	Neuberger
Anderson	Hart	Prouty
Bible	Hayden	Proxmire
Bush	Hennings	Robertson
Butler	Humphrey	Russell
Byrd, Va.	Javits	Scott
Cannon	Keating	Smith
Capehart	Kuchel	Stennis
Case, N.J.	Langer	Symington
Clark	Lausche	Talmadge
Cooper	McNamara	Thurmond
Dworshak	Magnuson	Wiley
Ervin	Martin	Williams, Del.
Fulbright	Mundt	

NAYS—46

Allott	Engle	Long, La.
Bartlett	Fong	McCarthy
Beall	Goldwater	McClellan
Bennett	Gore	McGee
Bridges	Gruening	Morse
Byrd, W. Va.	Hartke	Morton
Carlson	Hickenlooper	Moss
Carroll	Hill	Murray
Chavez	Holland	Pastore
Cotton	Jackson	Randolph
Curtis	Johnson, Tex.	Saltonstall
Dirksen	Johnston, S.C.	Schoeppel
Dodd	Jordan	Yarborough
Douglas	Kennedy	Young, N. Dak.
Eastland	Kerr	
Ellender	Long, Hawaii	

NOT VOTING—13

Case, S. Dak.	Mansfield	Sparkman
Church	Monroney	Williams, N.J.
Frear	Muskie	Young, Ohio
Hruska	O'Mahoney	
Kefauver	Smathers	

So the motion of Mr. CASE of South Dakota was rejected.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the motion was rejected.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the first committee amendment.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I oppose the passage of the pending bill for many reasons. H.R. 1, if it becomes law, will constitute, in my opinion, a wholly unwarranted taking of waters belonging to all the Great Lakes States solely to assist the city of Chicago, Ill., in solving its sewage problem, a problem, incidentally, which it has failed to solve in the past 70 years because of inexcusable procrastination, inaction, and delay on the part of the city of Chicago.

H.R. 1 is not a new legislative proposal by any means. It differs but slightly from H.R. 2, introduced in the last session; H.R. 3210 passed in the 83d Congress, and vetoed by President Eisenhower; and H.R. 3300, passed in the 84th Congress, which was also vetoed by the President. All four would authorize the State of Illinois and the Metropolitan Sanitary District of Greater Chicago to withdraw water from Lake Michigan at a rate of not more than 2,500 cubic feet a second, in addition to all domestic pumpage. H.R. 1 differs from previous measures only in that the proposed diversion is for 1 year instead of 3.

There is nothing new about the question of diversion of waters of Lake Michigan. This question has been before our courts for many years. In fact four cases are now pending in our Supreme Court on this same issue.

Diversion of the waters from Lake Michigan by the city of Chicago goes back to the beginning of this century, when Chicago conceived a plan to dispose of its raw sewage by cutting a canal from the upper end of the Chicago River, which up until that time flowed into Lake Michigan, through a hilly area south of Chicago. This hilly area constituted a natural boundary between the Great Lakes basin and the Mississippi River basin. The canal, a narrow body of water about 36 miles long, reversed the flow of the Chicago River so that instead of flowing into Lake Michigan, it flowed southwesterly through the canal, thence into the Des Plaines River, thence into the Illinois River, and thence into the Mississippi River.

H.R. 1 would authorize a diverson of 2,500 cubic feet a second from Lake Michigan into the Illinois Waterway for a 1-year period, in addition to 1,800 cubic feet a second for domestic pumpage. This does not sound like very much water to the average person as it is measured in cubic feet per second.

So I computed the number of gallons involved in this proposed diversion. Pursuant to the Supreme Court decree of 1930, Chicago is now taking 1,500 cubic feet a second for navigation in addition to approximately 1,800 cubic feet a second for domestic purposes, or a total of 3,300 cubic feet a second. The bill would authorize an additional 1,000 cubic feet a second.

The 1,500 cubic feet a second amounts to 972 million gallons every 24 hours, and the 1,800 cubic feet for domestic purposes amounts to 1,166,400,000 gallons every 24 hours. Add these figures together and we find that Chicago is already taking more than 2 billion—to be exact 2,138,400,000 gallons—a day.

The additional 1,000 cubic feet a second amounts to 648 million gallons every 24 hours. Hence, if the bill becomes law, Chicago will be taking 2,786,400,000 gallons of water out of Lake Michigan every 24 hours, not a drop of which is ever returned to the lake.

Mr. President, my concern is primarily because of the adverse effect the bill would have on all of the people of my State of Michigan. They are strongly opposed to this proposed diversion. We in the Great Lakes States fear this foot-in-the-door approach. To us it is simply another version of the camel's nose and the Arab's tent. If a 2,500 cubic foot diversion is now enacted, then another 5,000 cubic feet will probably be sought in another few years, and so on.

It is undisputed that this diversion will lower the levels of all of the Great Lakes except Lake Superior. A hydrograph prepared by the Corps of Engineers conclusively shows that the lake levels in Lake Superior, Lake Michigan, Lake Huron, and Lake St. Clair have been steadily dropping since 1952. Senate hearings in 1956 brought out that the level of Lake Michigan had dropped 2½ feet from the 1952 level, in the 4½-year period from 1952 to July 1956.

This drop has already increased considerably the cost of the dredging the connecting channels of the Great Lakes and the St. Lawrence Seaway. These connecting channels are being dredged to a 27-foot depth, and in many cases the dredging is being carried on through almost solid rock at a tremendous expense to the U.S. Government.

It would seem foolhardy, on one hand, to continue with this costly dredging of these connecting channels on the Great Lakes Waterway and the St. Lawrence Seaway, and at the same time to lower the levels of the Great Lakes, thereby necessitating even more and costly dredging of the connecting channels between the Lakes.

Mr. President, we were told in the Committee on Public Works, last year, that we should pass H.R. 2 providing for a 2,500-cubic-foot diversion for a 3-year period, but that we did not really mean it. What we really meant was a 1-year period, because the Sanitary District of Chicago would take the water for only 1 year.

We were told that the sanitary district had made this commitment in the form of a letter to the Public Works Committee, and this commitment was in our committee report. To me, this was a new high in legislative achievement, so I proposed an amendment to H.R. 2 to make the bill read as the Committee on Public Works said it should read.

It was also stated that notwithstanding my submitting this amendment, I was not in favor of the bill as it then read, nor would I be in favor of it if my amendment were adopted.

I simply felt that the bill should so read that any ordinary person with a moderate amount of intelligence could determine from reading the bill itself what the proposal was.

Canada is opposed to this measure. Last year, as Senators know, there was some question as to whether Canada was opposed to a pending Chicago water diversion bill. Today there is not question.

In the Canadian note of April 9, 1959, to the United States, Canada expresses in no uncertain terms its opposition to H.R. 1 and other similar measures. This note has been made a part of the files and records of the Committee on Public Works.

Canada on August 21, 1959—only last Friday—again set forth her strong opposition to the bill.

Furthermore, the Canadian-United States Interparliamentary Group, composed of 24 members of the U.S. Congress and 24 Members of the Canadian Parliament, met for the second time on June 25 to 28, 1959, in Canada. At that meeting the Chicago water diversion, among other subjects, was discussed by the group.

A report of this meeting is contained in House Report No. 730, dated July 29, 1959. The group agreed, with respect to water matters between the two nations, that "unilateral action should not be taken in legislative or administrative matters affecting the interests of both countries without entering into discussions aimed at reconciling divergent views."

It was also agreed that a steering committee should explore the adequacy of existing bodies and procedures having jurisdiction over boundary-waters problems, specifically the Great Lakes and the St. Lawrence Seaway, and should then report its findings with suggestions to the group.

In reference to Chicago water diversion, the group recommended:

> The steering committee of the Canada-United States Interparliamentary Group collect all existing reports, studies, and other data relating to problems of pollution, recreation, conservation, power utilization, industrial development, port facilities, and navigation in the Great Lakes area.

It was recommended to the steering committee that it review and evaluate this material looking toward the making of further suggestions at the next meeting of the steering committee.

Actually, the whole question of Chicago water diversion is now before the U.S. Supreme Court. On June 29, 1959, the Court appointed Hon. Albert B. Maris, U.S. circuit judge, as a special master in four cases in the Supreme Court, each of which directly involves water diversion from Lake Michigan.

At an informal conference in Philadelphia, Pa., on Tuesday, August 4, 1959, Judge Maris met with attorneys representing the Lake States, the State of Illinois, the city of Chicago, the sanitary district, and the Elmhurst-Villa Park-Lombard Water Commission, at which time the scope of the special master's investigation to be made pursuant to the order of the Supreme Court appointing him, was outlined.

The special master will begin his hearings in Chicago on October 5 of this year. His investigation will involve every facet of water diversion out of Lake Michigan, including methods of sewage treatment, efficiency, and the like. Obviously, it will be an extensive survey, so common sense alone tells us that we ought to let him complete his investigation and make his report to the Supreme Court, and that all who are concerned should wait for the Supreme Court to act again in this matter.

It should be borne in mind that the 1,500 cubic feet a second which Chicago is now diverting, in addition to all domestic pumpage—approximately 1,800 cubic feet a second—is being made pursuant to the 1930 decree of the Supreme Court. Furthermore, the U.S. Supreme Court has retained jurisdiction, and the Court has exercised this jurisdiction on many occasions since 1930.

In fact, Chicago invoked the jurisdiction of the Supreme Court in 1956 in a suit for a declaratory judgment against the Lake States. This case is one of the suits now pending in the Supreme Court and under active consideration by the special master.

One more point: This bill was reported out of our committee by a vote of 8 to 6 with six of our committee filing strong minority views opposing this measure. Furthermore, two of the eight majority have filed individual views expressing support for reference of this bill to the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations. So in our committee there is no unanimity on this bill.

And just the other day another member of the committee who voted to report the bill, stated that he believed that the responsibility for exploring the international aspects rests primarily with the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, and added that purely on that jurisdictional question he would vote for reference of the bill to that committee.

Six members filed the minority views. When we add to those 6 the 2 just mentioned, who filed individual views, and the third Member, who spoke on the floor of the Senate, we find 9 of the 14 members of the committee opposed to the passage of this measure by the Senate at this time. Certainly this does not speak very highly for the merits of the bill, insofar as enactment now is concerned.

Since this whole question of water diversion is now before the Supreme Court, and since the Court has appointed a special master who is wasting no time in looking into this situation, and in view of the strong protests of our Canadian neighbor to the north, as well as the objections of our Lake States, it seems to me that Congress should take no action on this proposed legislation at this time.

Mr. President, I urge all of my colleagues to oppose passage of House bill 1.

Mr. President, I repeat that there is nothing new about this proposal. President Eisenhower vetoed two previous measures practically identical with H.R. 1. In his veto message he said that his veto was based on the following reasons:

First. Existing diversions are adequate for navigation on the Illinois Waterway and Mississippi River.

Second. All methods of control of lake levels and protection of property on the Great Lakes should be considered before arbitrarily proceeding with the proposed increased diversion.

Third. The diversions are authorized without reference to negotiations with Canada.

Fourth. The legitimate interests of other States affected by the diversion may be adversely affected.

At hearings of our Subcommittee on Flood Control, Rivers, and Harbors on this particular measure, we were told by proponents of this measure that it would aid navigation on the Illinois Waterway and down the Mississippi. In my opinion, that is sheer nonsense. The depth along the Illinois sanitary canal is only 9 feet, a level which is easily maintained with the present allowed diversion of 1,500 cubic feet per second, as authorized by the Supreme Court. Any further

increase would only serve to overflow the banks of this 9-foot channel, and thus inundate adjacent lowlands. Several shipping interests from Minnesota submitted to our subcommittee statements in which they urged this diversion on the ground that it would assist in navigation on the Mississippi from the point where the Illinois River enters the Mississippi, at Alton, Ill., to dam and lock 26, some distance below the confluence of the Illinois River and the Mississippi River. This, too, is a specious argument. Actually, during World War II, when an increased diversion was allowed, the resulting overflow caused serious damage to the docks, locks, and piers along the Illinois Waterway. In all probability, if the diversion now proposed were allowed, the same thing would occur again.

But aside from that, our own Committee on Public Works at the last session reported an omnibus flood control bill which became Public Law 85-500. That law authorizes, among other things, an appropriation of approximately $6 million for improvement of navigation between St. Louis and dam and lock 26 for the express purpose of solving completely, and for all time, navigation problems incident to navigation on that portion of the Mississippi. Hence, the plea that this sought-for diversion will aid navigation through the Illinois Waterway and a portion of the Mississippi is wholly without merit.

Unquestionably the bill will help Chicago solve its sewage problem. But such a taking of the waters of the Great Lakes cannot be justified on any moral or legal ground. From a moral standpoint, the waters of the Great Lakes Basin belong to all of the citizens of the Lakes States. Each of them has an interest in these waters. Every day we realize more and more the truth of the old adage that water is liquid gold. It is becoming more precious by the minute, and we ought not to squander this priceless heritage of the people of the Great Lakes States simply to aid the city of Chicago in its sanitation problem.

The people of my State of Michigan and the people of the other Great Lakes States are strongly opposed to this proposed diversion.

This is a "heads I win, tails you lose," proposition, so far as the people of the Lakes States are concerned. If the diversion were granted and if there were an unusual amount of rainy weather, so that the diversion for the 3-year period did not appreciably lower the level of the Lakes States, Chicago would ask for more water, on the ground that the diversion had done no harm. On the other hand, if Chicago were unable to solve her sewage problem with the 2,500 cubic feet of water provided in this bill, she would seek more water, on the ground that sufficient water to provide a fair test was not authorized.

I cannot emphasize too highly the opposition of the people of my State to this proposed diversion. We are opposed to it for many reasons. We are opposed to it because of the adverse effect it would have on navigation on the Great Lakes. As previously mentioned, the Corps of Engineers made a study for our Senate Committee on Public Works; and that study was based, not on a 2,500-cubic feet per second diversion, as proposed in this bill, but on a diversion of only 1,000 cubic feet per second. The Corps of Engineers pointed out in its study that if a diversion of 1,000 cubic feet per second were permitted for a 3-year period, it would take 15 years after the diversion was terminated for the level of the lakes to reach their prediversion depth.

Moreover, even the more conservative estimates indicate that the result of a lowering of the lake levels by means of a 1,000-foot flowage would mean the loss of approximately 1½ million tons of cargo in a conservative-year period. If we multiply this 1½ million ton estimate—and it is a conservative estimate, because figures presented to our committee went as high as 2 million tons annually—we reach an estimated loss of tonnage on the Great Lakes, for this period, of nearly 57 billion tons.

In hearings on this bill, held by the Subcommittee on Rivers and Harbors, of the House Committee on Public Works, it was pointed out that with each new drop in levels, the bulk carriers on the Great Lakes must limit the amount of cargo carried, in accordance with the depth in the inbound and upbound channels between the upper and lower lakes, and to conform to the depth available in the various harbors on the Great Lakes. The large bulk carriers could carry up to 100 tons of cargo per inch of immersion. Therefore, it seems clear that if additional diversion at Chicago were authorized, it would have the effect of reducing the carrying capacity of the Great Lakes fleet about 100 tons per ship per inch of loss of lake level for each trip made. One of the more interesting facets of the report of the Corps of Engineers is the statement that it would take 15 years after the termination of the proposed diversion for the level of Lake Michigan to reach the same level it had at the time when the diversion was begun.

Proponents of this measure sneer at a reduction of the lake level by only an inch, but they neglect to point out that when one adds this inch to the billions of gallons already being pumped out for domestic purposes in Chicago, the level of the lake will be lowered considerably more than an inch, particularly when one multiplies the amount of water taken out for domestic purposes by the number of years that Chicago has been taking this water.

The report of the Corps of Engineers states that a diversion of only 1,000 feet per second for a 3-year period would adversely affect hydroelectric power projects on the St. Lawrence, and would tend to adversely affect navigation on Lake Michigan and Lake Huron. Charts and data in inches on the effect of this diversion are more fully set forth in this report—Senate Document No. 28, 85th Congress, 1st session. Speaking of hydroelectric power, it is interesting to note that the Great Lakes Harbor Association in House hearings on H.R. 2 suggested that the real motive behind this demand for increased diversion was the desire on the part of the sanitary district to obtain additional hydroelectric power to be generated by the facilities that own and operate the hydroelectric project at Lockport, Ill.

While the Sanitary District of Chicago has repeatedly denied that it is interested in the development of this additional power at Lockport, its denials cannot be given too much weight, because at every opportunity the sanitary district has pressed for increased diversion of lake water which will, in fact, increase the power to be produced at Lockport.

In 1946, Mr. Horace P. Ramey, assistant chief engineer for the sanitary district, asserted that increased diversion would double the power output at the Lockport plant of the sanitary district; and in 1947, a suggestion was made that increased diversion of water was needed for development of atomic power because of the establishment of the Argonne Laboratory on the banks of the sanitary district canal some 20 miles southwest of Chicago.

Furthermore, in 1950 an appeal was made to President Truman to obtain additional diversion in order to obtain additional hydroelectric power during the coal strike, thus it appears that despite the repeated denials the Chicago Sanitary District is interested in obtaining additional diversion for power purposes.

The report of the Corps of Engineers shows an estimated loss, if this diversion were allowed, of an estimated 188 million kilowatt-hours. The maximum estimated energy losses from a 3-year increase in diversion, as based on existing and proposed plants, are 148,700,000 kilowatt-hours in U.S. plants and 294,300,000 kilowatt-hours in Canadian plants for a total estimate loss of 443 million kilowatt-hours. The energy losses are therefore estimated to be plants for a total estimated loss of 443 million kilowatt-hours, and will vary with the timing of installation of additional generating capacity at the several power sites on the Niagara and the St. Lawrence Rivers.

The Corps of Engineers found that the 3 year increase of diversion of 1,000 cubic feet per second would increase energy production at the Lockport plant on the Illinois Waterway by about 70,400,000 kilowatt-hours. In other words, this diversion while it would aid Chicago in solving its sewage problem and in increasing its production of electricity at the Lockport plant, would at the same time, would rob Canada and the Lake States and the States of New York and Vermont and possibly others, as well, of power output real and potential of plants along the St. Lawrence.

The proposed version would unquestionably adversely affect the interests of Canada, our neighbor on the north. I am not a spokesman for Canada. Canada should and it can speak for itself, and it has spoken on many occasions in objecting to proposals of Illinois and the Chicago Sanitary District for additional diversion of water from Lake Michigan.

The committee on uses of international waters, a committee of the international comparative law section of the American Bar Association, in its report dated May

17, 1958, prepared for submission to the American Bar Association at its annual meeting in Los Angeles, Calif., on August 26, 1958, with a resolution for submission to the American Bar Association, opposed in its entirety H.R. 2, a similar measure, for reasons set forth in that report. It is an excellent treatise on this proposed diversion and I have found occasion to refer to it quite frequently.

While on the subject of Canada, I might point out that there is another facet to Canada's interest. I refer to proposed Canadian diversions in the Pacific Northwest involving the Columbia River. The Columbia River, as we all know, originates in Canada, but almost two-thirds of its length lies within the boundaries of the United States. Most of the water is derived from Canadian sources. The waters of the Columbia are now being used extensively by the United States for hydroelectric power projects. Five dams are completed, two more are under construction, and five more are planned. In addition, the waters are being used for irrigation and reclamation. Great quantities of water from the Columbia are being used also for the operation of the Hanford Atomic Works. The lower reaches of the river are used for navigation, and the fishing industry draws on the same water for its supplies.

Canada is now planning some diversion of the Columbia River waters, which will greatly affect not only the Northwest but the entire west coast of our country.

My concern is primarily because of the adverse effect passage of this bill would have on all of the people of my State of Michigan. The Supreme Court has found, and it is undisputed, that the purposed diversion would lower the levels of all of the Great Lakes. The report prepared by the Corps of Engineers conclusively shows that the lake levels in Lake Superior, Lake Michigan, Lake Huron, and Lake St. Clair, have been steadily dropping since 1952. In fact, in the hearings held in 1956 on H.R. 3300 by our Subcommittee on Flood Control, Rivers, and Harbors, Senate Committee on Public Works, it was brought out that the level of Lake Michigan had dropped 2½ feet since 1952, in the 4½-year period from 1952 to July 1956. This drop has already increased considerably the cost of dredging the connecting channels of the Great Lakes and the St. Lawrence Seaway. These connecting channels are being dredged to a 27-foot depth, and in many cases the dredging is being carried on through almost solid rock at a tremendous expense to the U.S. Government. It would seem foolhardy on one hand to continue with this costly dredging of these connecting channels on the Great Lakes Waterway and the St. Lawrence Seaway and at the same time to lower the lake levels of the Great Lakes, thereby necessitating even more and costly dredging of the connecting channels between the lakes. It simply does not make sense.

Michigan is a great industrial State touching on four of five of the Great Lakes. Water navigation is one of the great industries of that area, and many of our industrial products—for example, automobiles made in Detroit, furniture from Grand Rapids, iron ore from the mines in the Upper Peninsula, and the many thousands of products manufactured in our factories—are carried on the waterways constituting the Great Lakes.

In addition to our many other industries, one of the great industries of our State is our tourist industry, and we are blessed by our proximity to the waters of Lake Superior, Lake Michigan, Lake Huron and Lake Erie. Our upper lakes region is rightfully proclaimed as "the Playground of the Middle West." It offers boating, fishing, swimming, wildfowl hunting; in fact, all forms of outdoor sports. We know that the proposed diversion will lower the levels of our Great Lakes. The people in the Upper Peninsula, and particularly the owners of land along the shallow bays on the north shore of Lake Michigan, are keenly aware of the impact of this Chicago diversion on them. For example, Portage Bay, just west of Escanaba, was at one time a beautiful, wide but shallow bay teeming with wildfowl and game fish of every description. Portage Bay is no more. The water has receded from the bay with the drop in the level of Lake Michigan, and that entire area is now a series of mud banks, reed beds, rushes, and cattails.

Some effort was made at our subcommittee hearing to belittle the impact of this diversion on Canada on the theory that the Canadian boundary was some 38 or 40 miles away. However, the waters of Lake Michigan and Lake Huron are connected by a narrow band of water called the Straits of Mackinac, some 25 or 30 miles long, up to 250 feet deep, and 4 or 5 miles wide in the narrowest portion. Canada owns almost three-fourths of the waters and the lands along Lake Huron and if Chicago takes out a million gallons of water from Lake Michigan, thereby lowering Lake Michigan to that extent, a million gallons of water will flow from Lake Huron through the Straits of Mackinac into Lake Michigan, and the level of Lake Huron will be lowered. Hence, Canada does have an interest. Moreover, the Corps of Engineers in its report pointed out that the diversion at Chicago would decrease the depths of Lake Michigan, Lake Huron, and Lake Erie, and would adversely affect hydroelectric power projects at the St. Lawrence.

To summarize, this proposed study cannot be justified on the theory that it would assist in navigation on the Chicago Sanitary District Canal and the lower Illinois River and a portion of the Mississippi, because the present authorized diversion of 1,500 cubic feet per second is sufficient to maintain a maximum desired depth of 9 feet in the canal and any navigation problems on the Mississippi immediately below the confluence of the Illinois River and the Mississippi will be ultimately resolved on the completion of the $6 million aid to navigation project already authorized for that portion of the Mississippi.

The proposed increased diversion in H.R. 1 would adversely affect Canadian navigation and Canadian power projects on her side of the Great Lakes. Moreover, Canada now proposes a diversion of a portion of the headwaters of the Columbia River in the Pacific Northwest. If we go ahead with this Chicago diversion without Canada's consent, we will have established a precedent which may preclude us from objecting to a Canadian proposed diversion in the Northwest.

The proposed increased diversion would have an adverse affect on the Great Lakes States and Canada because it would lower the levels of the waters of the Great Lakes, which in turn would adversely affect navigation and hydroelectric power developments along the St. Lawrence.

It would also adversely affect the constitutional right of citizens of the Lake States to enjoy their God-given blessings in the form of waters of the Great Lakes and the tributaries thereto.

The lowering of the levels of the lakes will result in a tremendous loss of shipping on the Great Lakes in addition to injuries to navigation. Chicago has no legal, moral, or constitutional right to a single drop of water from Lake Michigan. As pointed out, the Chicago River originally flowed into Lake Michigan until its course was reversed by action of the City of Chicago in digging a canal, thereby causing the waters of the Chicago River to flow southward into the Des Plaines, thence into the Illinois, thence into the Mississippi.

Moreover, Chicago's remedy lies with the Supreme Court of the United States, which authorized its present 1,500 cubic feet per second diversion, in addition to domestic pumpage. Chicago has gone to the Court time after time to secure additional diversion, and it has on several occasions secured additional diversions by an appropriate plea to the Supreme Court. While the diversion will unquestionably aid Chicago in solving its sewage problem, Chicago has had nearly 70 years to resolve that problem. Chicago is in no worse a fix now than any of her sister cities of the Middle West, who for reasons of health, have been forced to construct suitable sewage disposal plants.

I have gone into this matter at some length because I feel very strongly about this bill. I have had communications from practically every community in our State opposing this measure.

Mr. President, some questions have been raised here during the debate of the last few days, and some of them have been answered. Perhaps some have not been. One of the questions raised over and over again is: Should this matter be before the U.S. Congress at this time?

Obviously it should not be before us at this time. The Supreme Court, as I have pointed out previously, is now handling this matter. The Court recently appointed a special master who has promptly taken action. He called a meeting in Philadelphia of all the interested parties, and he then announced

that he would begin hearings in Chicago on this matter on October 5 and all the interested parties would be given the opportunity to present their case. This meeting, as he has announced, will take place in Chicago on October 5.

Why should this matter be before Congress? It has been decided time and time again by the courts. We now have it before us and, generally speaking, few of us have any interest, little vested interest, at any rate, in the proposal. People on the east coast and the west coast and in other areas of the country are just not directly concerned with this problem. This is a problem of interest to just a few States. This in itself accounts for the fact that the Senate has been empty practically all the time during this debate.

I am sure that when we consider the machinery established by the courts, and the fact that a regional setup of the interested States has been approved by the Senate, though not as yet approved by the House, we all can agree that this matter should be handled regionally and through the courts before it reaches the Federal Congress for consideration.

In the figures I have presented here I have pointed out the amount of water involved, in gallons. I repeat that these figures show well over 2 billion gallons of water being diverted. One just cannot explain to the people in my area of the country, to the people of the State of Michigan, that the taking of 2 billion gallons of water a day, much more than 2 billion gallons of water a day, out of the Great Lakes Basin, will not substantially affect the water levels. That is a tremendous amount of water. As the Governor of Pennsylvania said recently, it is about equal to the flow of the Delaware River.

THE LABOR-MANAGEMENT REFORM BILL

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

Mr. McNAMARA. I am happy to yield to my colleague from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I agree that my remarks may follow the debate on the bill.

Mr. McNAMARA. The Senator may go right ahead.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the first matter to which I should like to call the attention of the Senate is a problem in reference to the labor bill now in conference. It involves a highly controversial issue which is before us in the resolutions submitted by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] with reference to the garment industry and the clothing industry, which is so heavily represented in New York, and it deals with the question as to whether unionization of contractors who do work which is farmed out to them by people who are called jobbers shall come under the inhibition of the provisions of this new labor bill which would prevent unionization from taking place by agreement with the jobber who farms out the work.

Mr. President, this is a longstanding course of business in the clothing industry. The International Ladies Garment Workers' Union is probably as correct a union in terms of its fight against racketeering and other excesses which have been disclosed in the McClellan committee hearings as any in the country. It is also, incidentally, one of our leading anti-Communist unions. I certainly hope that we do not intend to inhibit it in its legitimate activities.

I raised this question on Friday night when these resolutions were submitted, and I am much pleased, therefore, to be able to ask unanimous consent to make part of my remarks an editorial in the New York Times of August 30, 1959, calling attention to this situation, and urging that great care in drafting the new legislation is needed, and is demonstrated by the reflection that interference should be avoided with already established and legitimate labor union practices in the effort to check corruption, dictatorship, and the violation of the rights of innocent parties in the garment and men's apparel fields.

Mr. President, it is readily felt that the elimination of sweatshops in these two industries is heavily attributable to this method of proceeding to unionization through the fact that there is an integrated production process. I ask that the editorial to which I have referred may be made a part of my remarks.

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

A LABOR BILL PROBLEM

Of all the complicated controversial issues raised by the House and Senate labor bills, on which the conference committee has asked instructions from the Senate, one is really not controversial nor is it especially complex. It ought to be quickly settled. We refer to subdivision 8(a) of section 705 (a) of the Landrum-Griffin bill which prohibits the making of any collective agreement with an employer "whereby such employer * * * agrees to cease doing business with any other person."

A narrow court interpretation of this language might wreck the whole structure of labor-management relations in the garment and clothing industries built up over the years and now become traditional. It has largely done away with sweatshop conditions in these trades and has established relatively high wage and working standards which neither the leading employers nor the workers want to have broken down.

In these industries the firms responsible for the manufacture of clothes (called jobbers) design and cut the goods but farm out to other shops (called contractors) the sewing and the pressing—run by firms which are fiercely competitive, constantly changing and difficult to organize. The vast improvement in working conditions in the contractors' shops has largely come about through agreements between the jobbers and the unions which require the jobbers to farm out their work only to contractors who live up to union standards.

So close have these two parts of the single production process become that jobbers and contractors have been considered as one in applying the provisions of the Taft-Hartley law which probihit secondary boycotts. Senator Taft himself agreed to this in discussing the law's intent on the Senate floor and so have Representatives LANDRUM and GRIFFIN as to their bill during the debate in the House and in the conference committee discussions.

But such assurances do not have the force of law. Whatever bill may emerge from the deliberations this week should clearly and explicitly exempt these traditional union-jobber agreements from secondary boycott prohibitions. This situation is a good illustration of the urgent need for care in drafting this legislation so as to avoid interference with already established and legitimate labor union practices in the effort to check corruption, dictatorship and the violation of the rights of innocent parties.

Mr. JAVITS. I express great hope that we shall find our way out of the present impasse, because I deeply believe that it results really only from the difficulty of finding a formula to be employed rather than from any disposition on the part of any of those in the conference committee, who are thoroughly cognizant of the work of the ILGWU and of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers Union. It is that which has so far frustrated our endeavor to solve this dilemma.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield?

Mr. McNAMARA. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I should like to comment on what my friend from New York has been discussing.

We conferees are in the very peculiar position of everyone of us agreeing that we do not intend to upset the status quo of the garment or apparel industries. I am one who is probably closer to this situation than anyone except my friend from New York [Mr. JAVITS]. I have been engaged in the retail end of this business all my life. I have watched what has happened in the garment section of New York and the garment section of Philadelphia and St. Louis and Chicago and on the west coast, and I have seen sweatshops disappear. I have seen order come out of chaos. I have seen unions create profits for businesses which were unable to produce profits, and, Mr. President, none of us wants to disturb for one second the status the garment trade now occupies under the present law.

We know full well the very complicated manner in which this complicated industry works, and I can assure my friend from New York that the efforts of Senator JAVITS and Senator KEATING and Senator SCOTT have been most appreciated by those of us of the conferees as we have tried to develop language to take care of this situation which all of us are sincerely interested in taking care of.

I thank my friend for his continued interest in this matter.

Mr. JAVITS. I not only am deeply interested, Mr. President, but I also have confidence in the statements just made by my friend and colleague from Arizona, and I believe that with his help it is very likely that this matter may find a resolution satisfactory to all. I thank my colleague.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I thank my friend from Michigan.

Mr. COOPER subsequently said: Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield to me in order that I may direct a question to the distinguished Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER].

Mr. McNAMARA. I shall be glad to yield for that purpose, provided I do not lose my right to the floor.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, what was the request?

Mr. COOPER. I asked if the Senator from Michigan would yield to me to address a single question to the Senator from Arizona in connection with the colloquy he had with the Senator from New York.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I have no objection.

Mr. COOPER. I return for a moment to the colloquy between the Senator from New York and the Senator from Arizona on the subject of the labor bill conference. The Senator from Arizona said that the conferees were still trying very hard to come to an agreement upon the particular problem in the garment industry. I know that there are a very limited number of questions which were left for decision in the conference.

I ask the distinguished Senator from Arizona if the conferees are attempting to resolve those questions, so that they will be able to present to the Senate an agreed-upon bill.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, in answer to that question, let me say that the conferees never had any intention of breaking up the conference, nor did the conference take any formal action to break up. We merely used the precedents of the Senate in asking for instructions. At the same time, we agreed to continue with our conference.

This morning, for example, we met from 10:30 a.m. until 12:30 p.m. We had scheduled another conference this afternoon at 4 o'clock, but because groups of us working together have been engaged in something we cannot complete by 4 o'clock, we have agreed to meet again at 10:30 tomorrow morning.

Speaking as one conferee, I am sincerely hopeful that we can bring out a conference report. I think the Senate would much rather vote on a conference report than go through 4 or 5 days of battle in a floor debate on a very complicated problem involving highly emotional factors.

So, to complete my answer to my friend from Kentucky, let me say, Yes; we are continuing to confer, and we are continuing to hope and pray that, as reasonable men, we may be able to reach a reasonable solution.

Mr. COOPER. I thank the Senator. I make only this comment: If the conferees do not agree, I am prepared to vote on the issues, as are my colleagues.

Remembering the Taft-Hartley bill, and the consequences of that bill, and the opinions which were inflamed in the country, rightly or wrongly, I believe that if the conferees can agree, there will be a large vote in this body, as well as in the House, and there will be public acceptance of the bill, which is very important.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I say to the Senator in closing that as one conferee, I do not believe the difference between success and failure in this conference is any wider than the thickness of a Gillette blade; and that is mighty thin.

THE STEEL STRIKE

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I should like to acquaint the Senate with a statement issued over the weekend by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] and myself relating to the steel strike. The Senator from Vermont is in the Chamber and may have some comment on it.

Mr. President, the Senator from Vermont and I had the honor of seeking the release by Secretary of Labor James Mitchell of the facts found by him for the President on the steel strike, and we are happy to say that, whether it was because of our efforts or whatever may have been the cause, they were released, and we hope that the release of those facts will enable the public to be the jury in the dispute. The public has now had a chance to consider the facts, and the public now has the opportunity to influence the situation as it exists at this moment.

The steel strike settlement talks have been set over to September 2, and while each of the parties is thinking it over, this is an opportunity for the public to make its voice heard clearly in demanding intensive continuance of collective bargaining negotiations and a settlement of the strike.

The longer we wait, Mr. President, the nearer is brought that emergency which a long cessation of production of so vital a commodity as steel must bring about in the private economy, as well as in defense production orders.

Already the strike is in its 48th day, a postwar record exceeded only by the 58-day strike of 1952. The emergency will, it appears, begin in mid-September, when we are already told steel shortages may affect operations of freight car manufacturers and manufacturers of machinery and chemicals will be acute by early October reaching out to autos, aircraft, and shipbuilding. Then Taft-Hartley procedures for an 80-day injunction are the most likely to be invoked. The result will be a dug-in struggle between management and labor which will only make a settlement harder to attain. We believe that the leadership of the United Steel Workers will have no real trouble in calling out the men at the end of the 80-day period, should the dispute remain unsettled.

The result of such an exacerbation of this industrial conflict can only be seriously damaging to the national interest. If management is waiting for the invoking of the national emergency provisions of the Taft-Hartley law, it is making a serious mistake.

The ominous calm at present—as though the strike did not exist, and were not before us—makes me feel very strongly that people are sitting around waiting for the Taft-Hartley law to be invoked. I believe, and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] believes—although he will speak for himself in a moment—that nothing would be more unwise, in terms of the best interests of our country.

Labor is apparently already not insisting on its total demand for this, too, would be a serious mistake as we are convinced the public will not stand for a price increase in steel. Indeed there is strong opinion that in the highest public interest what should result from the strike is a price decrease in steel.

I insert parenthetically two thoughts. First, steel is rarely produced at maximum capacity; and steel is beginning to feel very seriously the influence of foreign competition, with about 1½ million tons of steel imported this year already.

These are two situations which are of the gravest interest, not only to management, but to workers and to the United States, in terms of maximum production of steel. This is best for the steelworker, because he works more hours.

One of the points made by Secretary Mitchell in his findings of fact is that whereas hourly wage rates for steel production workers are at about $3.10 an hour, on the average, which is pretty good, the fact is that the average steelworker earns only about $5,600 a year; and in 1958, 22 percent of the steelworkers earned less than $3,000 a year.

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

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I point out that the $3.10 an hour applies to all the workers. The manual laborer receives $2.13 an hour, I believe.

I was glad to join the Senator from New York in undertaking to prod the public into becoming a bit resentful over the steel strike. The more one reads the fact sheets released by Secretary Mitchell a week or so ago, the more one must be convinced that a settlement is possible without any increase in the price of steel. The longer the strike continues, the more it looks like a planned test of strength between the companies and the unions; and that is not good for the public. I believe that if public pressure should be exerted anywhere, it should be exerted upon the participants in this gigantic battle, which promises, if it continues unchecked, to do a great deal of harm to the national economy.

I believe that we must keep prodding the participants as well as the public. The side which will win will be the side which has public opinion with it. I should like to see them both meet each other half way, and perhaps the entire industry would have public confidence. But if the strike continues, many people will be hurt who do not deserve to be hurt.

Mr. JAVITS. My colleague is exactly right. I am very grateful to him for joining me in this effort. The public does need to be prodded into taking an active part in the effort to obtain a settlement. From the figures given by Secretary Mitchell, one can almost draw a line down the middle and determine what can be done without a steel price increase.

The situation is clearly one in which a settlement is indicated and demanded and should be made. The figures bear

this out. Steel company profits as a percentage of net worth compared with the annual earnings of steel production workers and the pattern of major wage negotiation settlements in the first half of 1959 as disclosed by Secretary Mitchell all show that there is enough "give" possible for both management and workers to make a settlement entirely practicable without a steel price increase. We urge the public to demand a negotiated settlement most insistently at this time.

I shall not stop, and I hope the Senator from Vermont will continue to cooperate with me, and that other Senators will join us, in urging the public most insistently to demand a negotiated settlement at this time. I cannot help feeling that if we come to a Taft-Hartley law injunction, it will be our common and collective fault, in not having made our demands felt keenly enough, both by management and by the leaders of labor.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 1958) to amend title 46, United States Code, section 601, to clarify types of arrestment prohibited with respect to wages of U.S. seamen.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled joint resolution (H.J. Res. 510) amending a joint resolution making temporary appropriations for the fiscal year 1960, and for other puropses, and it was signed by the President pro tempore.

ISRAEL AND THE UNITED ARAB REPUBLIC

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, may I have 2 more minutes?

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from New York, without losing my right to the floor.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I should like to comment upon a colloquy which took place this morning.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I make the point of order that the Senator who occupies the floor may yield only for a question. If the Senator from New York intends to make a statement, I shall reluctantly be compelled to raise the point of order.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, did I correctly understand the Senator's request to be in the nature of a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York will state it.

Mr. JAVITS. I believe I made a unanimous-consent request that I might interrupt the Senator from Michigan for the purpose of transacting other business, and that my remarks would follow his, and that he would not lose his right to the floor. I believe that request was granted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York is correct.

Mr. JAVITS. I may say to the Senator from Illinois that I shall intrude for a matter of only 2 minutes.

I understand a colloquy took place on the floor this morning about the way in which the Egyptians are running the Suez Canal. I was unfortunately delayed in my arrival by airplane this morning and was unable to participate in the colloquy. I am grateful that my colleague from New York [Mr. KEATING] and the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] were able to participate and point out, as I understand they did with great effect and with great eloquence, that it is one thing to operate the Suez Canal technically, so that the banks do not cave in and ships do not collide with one another, but that it is another thing to obey international law and keep the commitments which were made to the United States at the time this country helped Nasser out of the toughest spot he was ever in when the forces of the United Kingdom and France were all in Egypt. Then the United States used its great influence to get these forces out, with the implied understanding that international law and the Suez Canal Convention itself would be obeyed in respect to the operation of the canal. President Eisenhower on February 20, 1957, in urging the Israeli to withdraw their forces, had declared:

> We should not assume that, if Israel withdraws, Egypt will prevent Israeli shipping from using the Suez Canal or the Gulf of Aqaba. If, unhappily, Egypt does hereafter violate the armistice agreement or other international obligation, then this should be dealt with firmly by the society of nations.

The fact is that Israel is blockaded in terms of its cargoes moving through the canal. There is no justification whatever for this in international law, yet the United States is now proposing, through the International Bank of which we are a principal member, to make a loan to Egypt, notwithstanding the violation of international law and the Suez Canal Convention—the Constantinople Convention of 1888. I have protested against this in company with the junior Senator from New York and the junior Senator from Pennsylvania. We will continue to protest. While, on the one hand, the mechanical operation of the canal seems to be proceeding all right, for which Egypt is entitled to credit—and no one would deny it to them—on the other hand, we protest against the infraction of international law, a practice which we simply cannot condone and remain civilized countries, obedient to the dictates of human personal relations.

In making this statement I join with my colleagues in this particular effort, because I wish to identify myself with their point of view. I shall continue this effort to make certain that justice is done in terms of lifting the blockade which has been imposed upon Israel and its cargoes, because it is quite illegal and in violation of every international concept of law and order and commerical practice being imposed by the Government of the United Arab Republic on Israel and its people and is, indeed, a very real threat to the peace in a sensitive area of the world.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I express to the Senator from Michigan my application for his courtesy in yielding and to the Senator from Illinois by thanks for allowing me to proceed. I was detained this morning. I was at my office. I should have been here. I am very grateful to both Senators.

FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, while we have this interruption in the proceedings connected with the Lake Michigan water diversion bill, I should like to comment upon an editorial entitled "Under the Rug," published in the Washington Post of Sunday, August 30, 1959. The editorial points up the hypocrisy of the administration with respect to Federal aid to education.

Year after year the administration makes pious noises about the shortage of classrooms and other deficiencies in education—and it occasionally proposes legislation aimed at meeting these problems.

Yet—when the time comes to act—the administration is figuratively looking in the other direction—or else talking about what an effective program would do to the President's sacred budget.

Helping to provide a sound elementary and secondary education system is still one of the most pressing needs facing this country.

Even the administration officials concede the seriousness of the situation. But they refuse to do anything about heeding the grave warnings contained in their own statements.

As I have said year after year in this Senate, this situation will not cure itself. The States desperately need assistance. It is our duty as a Congress, representing all the States, to provide that assistance. I am hopeful that we now are coming closer to that goal.

The Subcommittee on Education of the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee has favorably reported a school-construction bill—which would provide $500 million a year for 2 years.

It is my belief that the full committee will soon give the bill its approval and that it will be reported to the Senate for action.

We have again an opportunity to back up words with action. We must not fail.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the body of the RECORD.

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

UNDER THE RUG

The administration is going through its customary ritual of calling attention to the desperate condition of the country's public

school system without doing anything effectual to correct that condition. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare issued an unringing appeal on Wednesday for congressional action on an administration-sponsored installment plan of Federal aid for building classrooms. But no one seems to suppose seriously that it has any possibility of passage in this session of Congress. And no one can pretend that it proposes to do anything more than apply a poultice to a hemorrhage.

A fortnight ago Secretary Flemming told a news conference that when the public schools open next month for the 1959–60 school year there will be a shortage of about 140,000 classrooms throughout the United States. The shortage a year ago at the opening of school was 140,500 classrooms. "What does this continuing neglect by the Federal Government of this classroom shortage mean in terms of the actual loss of educational opportunity?" the Secretary asked the reporters rhetorically. He answered his own question, as follows:

"When there aren't enough classrooms, there are generally more pupils per teacher. Educational facilities are crowded. Half-day and split sessions are imposed. There are fewer hours for children in school. Parents, teachers, children are subjected to constant frustration. A crowded classroom robs every child in that room—not just those who make up the statistical excess enrollment for the school."

The Commissioner of Education, Dr. Lawrence G. Derthick, has just announced that a total of 1,563,000 teachers will be needed in both public and nonpublic schools in the coming year, whereas the number presently qualified is 1,368,000. "The deficit of teachers will mean, in many communities, overlarge classes or the employment of teachers without adequate training, or both," Commissioner Derthick said. "In many instances it will also mean curtailing the number of subjects offered."

The administration school-aid bill does not even pretend to do anything about the shortage of teachers. And it is by no means clear that it would do what it pretends to do about the shortage of classrooms. It would commit the Federal Government to pay, each year for 5 years, half the annual principal and interest on school bonds representing a capital outlay of $600 million to be allocated among the States on the basis of school population, per capita income, and school financing efforts. The Federal share of principal and interest would be $17 million in the first full year of operation, rising by the fifth year to a maximum level of $85 million which would be maintained until the bonds are paid off.

The virtue of this installment program is that it would not unduly swell the budget of an administration unwilling to recommend additional taxation to meet imperative human needs. It undoubtedly represents the most that Secretary Flemming, an educator who surely understands the problem, thinks he can induce the President to approve. Its vice is that it is niggardly and inadequate; it would mortgage the future without solving the problem; it would finance, at best, hardly half of the additional classrooms admittedly needed; and the terms of financing would be unacceptable or unattainable for school districts already at the limit of their financial resources. Worst of all, perhaps, it is a program presented with so little fervor, with so slight a sense of the urgency of school needs and with so conspicuous an absence of Presidential leadership or even support that it can evoke enthusiasm neither in Congress nor in the country.

Congress must bear, no doubt, a heavy burden of the blame for failure year after year to deal with the Nation's school needs. But a still heavier share of blame must be shouldered by the administration for its failure to give this problem the priority it deserves. Together, Congress and the administration can once more, as they have done so often in the past, brush this problem under the rug. But they will be brushing under the rug about 10 million American children—the number doomed to overcrowded and obsolescent classrooms in the richest nation on earth.

DIVERSION OF WATER FROM LAKE MICHIGAN, AT CHICAGO

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 1) to require a study to be conducted of the effect of increasing the diversion of water from Lake Michigan into the Illinois Waterway for navigation, and for other purposes.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, to continue my remarks on the questions which were raised about the water diversion proposal which we are now considering, I was pointing out that Canada has every right to be worried and concerned about her rights under the treaty of 1909 and the Niagara Power Treaty of 1950. Lake Michigan and Lake Huron are, to all intents and purposes, one body of water. That has been so recognized by the Army engineers for many years. All the material which is on display in the rear of the Chamber indicates that these two lakes are considered as one body of water. References to reports and surveys by the Army engineers always treat this area as one body of water.

Canada has great interest, not only in the hydroelectric features which have been mentioned, but in the rather newly developed area for recreation and vacationing in the Georgian Bay area and in the Bruce Peninsula area. All of this vacationland hunting and fishing area is dependent upon the maintenance of a reasonable water level.

We are not talking about all the rest of the Canadian shore, which is indicated here on the map; we are stressing again the connection between Lake Michigan and Lake Huron, which is such as to make those two lakes one body of water, which rise and fall together.

I think one of the things which puts the State of Illinois, on the one hand, and the State of Michigan and the other Lake States, on the other hand, in a little different position in this situation, in the consideration of the bill before us, is the difference in their shorelines. Illinois and the Chicago area have approximately 100 miles of lake shoreline. Michigan has 3,000 miles of lake shoreline. It is understandable that Illinois and Michigan are concerned in opposite manners in this matter. The developments of boating, fishing, and all other kinds of water recreation are 30 times as great in Michigan as they are in the State of Illinois.

I am sure that these answers to the questions which have been raised, and some other answers which I am sure my colleagues are about to present in the course of their arguments against the pending bill, will go far toward convincing the few Senators who will take the time to read the RECORD or to listen to what my colleagus have to say that this measure is bad proposed legislation and should not be passed at this time.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

OPPOSITION TO DISCRIMINATION IN THE AMERICAN LEGION

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I am about to make an announcement which I believe it is important to make with respect to an issue which was raised last week at the national convention of the American Legion, in Minneapolis.

This morning I have been in touch with Mr. Martin B. McKneally, of Newburgh, N.Y., the new national commander of the Legion. Mr. McKneally has authorized me to make public a statement in which he makes clear:

First. That he is personally strongly opposed to the policy of the Forty and Eight, a subsidiary of the American Legion, which restricts membership in the Forty and Eight to white males.

Second. That as national commander of the American Legion, he will take immediate action, by examination of the legal aspects and through appointment of a committee to meet with the Forty and Eight on this issue, in an effort to eliminate this membership restriction.

I shall now read Mr. McKneally's statement in full.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will my colleague yield briefly to me?

Mr. KEATING. I am very glad to yield.

Mr. JAVITS. I should like to compliment my colleague on this job.

A short time ago, when he happened to be off the floor, I took occasion to "say my piece" on this subject, as a member of the American Legion; and I, too, expressed the hope that the new national commander of the American Legion—whom both my colleague and I know—would seek to do something about this situation.

I am especially delighted it was my own colleague from New York who was able to report to the Senate that our friend and the new national commander of the American Legion, from Newburgh, N.Y., is really going to dig into this situation.

Mr. KEATING. I appreciate the remarks of my colleague from New York.

I shall now read the rather short statement which Mr. McKneally has authorized me to release today. It reads as follows:

An issue raised at the recent national convention of the American Legion in Minneapolis has received much public comment and calls for a statement from me as national commander.

The comment is based on the rejection of a resolution by the convention which declared the eligibility requirements of the Forty and Eight to be in violation of the constitution of the American Legion and called for immediate compliance by the Forty and Eight with the American Legion constitution.

The convention, it must be borne in mind, did not stop there. It adopted the report of the constitution and bylaws committee of the convention which declared "that exclusion of members because of race, creed, or color in either the Legion or its subsidiary organizations is presently considered unlawful." It also passed a resolution which called upon the Forty and Eight to reexamine its eligibility requirements with the purpose of making them coincide with those of the American Legion.

This resolution, while general in tone, nevertheless calls for immediate action by the American Legion.

As national commander, it is my responsibility to see that that action is not delayed. For the information of all, I shall state my own personal position in this matter:

(1) I believe that the membership requirements for eligibility in the American Legion, as set out in its constitution, should not be added to by subsidiary organizations. The Forty and Eight, while it is an independent corporation, restricts its membership to legionnaires who are "white males." The membership requirements of the American Legion, be it noted, are simple: "Honorable service by a U.S. citizen in time of war," and none other.

(2) I believe that the American Legion, composed as it is of veterans of three wars, which were fought for the preservation of freedom and human dignity, should be in the forefront in promoting brotherhood and should be the leader in allaying prejudices.

(3) I am required in this connection to do all that lies within my power to uphold the constitution of the American Legion and to do less would be a clear violation of my obligations as national commander.

I shall direct that an immediate examination by the American Legion of the legal aspects of this issue be made. I shall appoint a committee to meet with the Forty and Eight to discuss and clarify and bring to a proper conclusion this conflict; and I shall act in all these matters without delay.

In conclusion, I say that my responsibility as national commander is to preserve the American Legion in all of its original greatness as the guardian of American ideals and to lead this organization in the difficult days that lie ahead, and to act always in accordance with the high and best traditions of the American Legion and of the United States of America.

That concludes the statement of Mr. McKneally.

Mr. President, I should like to add that I share Mr. McKneally's opinion as to the membership policies of the Forty and Eight and shall do all I can, as a member of the American Legion, to support him in his efforts to rectify this situation.

I might note, as a matter of information, that the Forty and Eight has a membership of about 100,000, while the American Legion, as a whole, has a membership in excess of 2,700,000.

I feel that Mr. McKneally is to be congratulated for his forthright approach to this serious problem which confronts him at the outset of his tenure as national commander.

The election of Mr. McKneally as national commander of the American Legion is a high honor for the State of New York and a great tribute to Mr. McKneally's outstanding record in fostering the principles of Americanism.

As president of the board of education in Newburgh, commander of his hometown American Legion post, commander of the Department of New York of the American Legion, American Legion representative on the Governor's committee on youth and delinquency, and in many other important roles within and without the Legion, Mr. McKneally has performed extraordinary public service. I extend to him my heartiest congratulations.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a brief biography of Mr. McKneally be printed in the RECORD following my remarks.

I shall not read the biography, but I call attention to the fact that Mr. McKneally is a graduate of Holy Cross College and Fordham Law School, had distinguished service in the war, and has been an outstanding citizen in every sense of the word. As is stated in this biography, he has been a very busy man, but he has carried out the precept that if one wants something done well, he should be sure that he gets a busy man to do it.

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

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

Martin B. McKneally was born in the picturesque old town of Newburgh, N.Y., a short distance up the Hudson River from Manhattan. He was graduated from the Newburgh public schools and from Holy Cross College and Fordham Law School.

On March 17, 1941, in response to greetings extended by the President of the United States, he joined the long OD line. In a rapidly expanding Army, he won sergeant's chevrons as a field artilleryman and, after sweating through officers candidate school at Fort Washington, he won a commission in September 1942.

Overseas service included an assignment on the staff of Lt. Gen. Robert C. Richardson, commanding general, mid-Pacific areas, and duty at several Far Eastern points. During overseas service, he was promoted to major and left the service in that rank at the end of World War II.

Since returning from service, he always has given the American Legion a top priority on a busy time schedule. He has been in the forefront of this service, beginning as Americanism chairman in the Judson P. Galloway Post No. 152 of Newburgh. Honoring local citizens for outstanding Americanism and bringing top speakers to the community, he has augmented those regular American Legion programs that are dedicated first to God and country.

Success with a local Americanism program and ability and willingness as a speaker brought him the department's Americanism chairmanship, a task performed with distinction for 3 years. While giving generously of himself to other causes, it is on the cornerstone of Legion Americanism that he has built a career of community service.

He comes to the top level of department work from a distinguished career which has included outstanding duty as parliamentarian for the national convention in Miami, and commander of his hometown post. He has served as a member of the department convention resolutions committee for 3 years, has been a representative of the American Legion on the Governor's committee on youth and delinquency, and is currently a member of the national foreign relations committee of the American Legion.

For some years the confidential secretary to a supreme court justice of the ninth judicial district, New York, McKneally has also found time to serve as president of the board of education in the city of Newburgh, justifying the old saying that "If you want something done well, be sure to get a busy man to do it."

He was unanimously elected department commander at the 38th New York Department convention at Rochester on July 28, 1956, and national commander at the national convention in Minneapolis on August 27, 1959.

DIVERSION OF WATER FROM LAKE MICHIGAN, AT CHICAGO

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 1) to require a study to be conducted of the effect of increasing the diversion of water from Lake Michigan into the Illinois Waterway for navigation, and for other purposes.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, the debate in which we are now engaged has at times become a little acrimonious, and I hope as time wears on such acrimony will not return.

Mr. President, I should like to offer a small historical footnote to the current debate with respect to the Lake Michigan water-diversion bill.

I do not anticipate that this offering will change any votes, but it may be of interest at least to those Senators who are students or connoisseurs of early American jazz.

The late Jelly Roll Morton, one of the great pianists which New Orleans gave to the Nation, used to sing a 12-bar blues song not long after the turn of the century, and the title of that song was "Michigan Water Blues."

The first chorus went as follows:

Michigan water tastes like sherry wine,
(I mean sherry wine);
Mississippi water tastes like turpentine,
Michigan water tastes like sherry wine.

Frankly, I do not know at this point whether Michigan water tastes like sherry wine, but even if it should, that would still be no justification for diverting it to the Chicago sewer system.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I desire to express very vigorous opposition to H.R. 1. This bill in different forms and various guises has been before the Congress for a number of years. It has been vetoed twice, and justifiably so.

Although watered down somewhat from previous versions, it still constitutes, in my mind, a prime example of bad legislation.

The alleged purpose of the bill is to clean up a malodorous pollution problem in the Illinois River, created by the sewage effluent of one of our great municipalities. It proposes that the increased diversion of 1,000 cubic feet per second of water from Lake Michigan cover a period of 1 year, for the purpose of determining future recommendations for action.

I feel that this would constitute a dangerous precedent, would have a harmful effect on the economic interests of many Americans and Canadians, and is an

example of special legislation of the worst type.

We in Vermont of course are interested in any action which would affect the generation of hydroelectric power at the St. Lawrence power project. Vermont has been a high-cost power region for many years and only now is beginning to enjoy some benefit from this long-dreamed-of project. Loss of hydro power caused by diversion of water from Lake Michigan as would be authorized by passage of this proposed legislation may be difficult of determination but it is certain to be material.

The Power Authority of the State of New York is even more deeply concerned with the St. Lawrence Seaway and power projects and as a committee member I have been greatly impressed with facts and figures they marshaled at the hearings to substantiate their objections. They have stated, for example, that if the power authority is deprived of the historic flow of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence system by a 1-year additional diversion at Chicago of 1,000 cubic feet per second, and Canadian interests do not share the loss, the authority will suffer a total revenue loss of $1,038,000. If the diversion of 1,000 cubic feet per second should become permanent the annual loss, they assert, would amount to $1,142,046. For every lost kilowatt in a month the authority believes it will lose $1 of revenue which will have to be made up by its customers who will have to purchase such lost kilowatts from private utilities at substantially higher cost.

Only a few weeks ago the two great North American democracies were hosts to the Queen of England and her consort. The primary focal point of the latters' visit was the formal dedication of one of the age's great engineering accomplishments, the twin projects—the St. Lawrence Seaway and power projects.

It should be noted that one of the recurring themes stressed in much of the press coverage of the dedication was the extremely fine relationships between the two neighboring countries. Now, however, the Congress and the Senate, are confronted with a legislative proposal—H.R. 1—which would strike a blow that would imperil the friendly atmosphere of cooperation and amicable give and take characterizing relationships between these nations.

As a member of the Committee on Public Works I had the honor of officially attending the dedication of the St. Lawrence Seaway and power project. There I had the opportunity of talking with a number of Canadian officials. It was made very clear to me that Canada is strongly opposed to any increased diversion of Lake Michigan water.

While Canada recognizes fully that Lake Michigan is within the jurisdiction of the United States that nation has rightfully expressed concern over the proposed diversion. In a note to the United States last February Canada stated that—

> It is the considered opinion of the Canadian Government that any authorization for an additional diversion would be incompatible with the arrangements for the St. Lawrence Seaway and power development, and with the Niagara Treaty of 1950, and would be prejudicial to navigation and power development which these mutual arrangements were designed to improve and facilitate.
>
> The point has been made repeatedly by Canada that every withdrawal of water from the basin means less depth available for shipping in harbors and in channels. Additional withdrawals would have adverse effects on the hydroelectric generation potential on both sides of the border at Niagara Falls and in the international section of the St. Lawrence River, as well as in the Province of Quebec, and would inflict hardship on communities on both sides of the border.

Canada is not alone in its opposition to this diversion of water from Lake Michigan. The U.S. Department of State is opposed, on the score that it would endanger present amicable relations with a friendly neighbor through its damaging affects on power generation in the St. Lawrence, Niagara, and Quebec hydroprojects. It would also disastrously affect navigation on the Great Lakes. It has been estimated that the shipping interests of the United States as well as Canada would suffer damages through lowering of lake levels and consequent restrictive effects on navigation, of up to $2 billion annually.

All of the other States bordering the Great Lakes oppose this bill, and rightly so, because of its adverse effect on navigation.

Enactment of the authority to divert additional water from Lake Michigan, aside from its immediate affect on navigation and hydropower generation, would constitute a dangerous precedent. Other communities might take this as a justification for additional diversions for their own purposes. This could well nigh become disastrous in cumulative total loss of waterflow from the lakes through the St. Lawrence. Many communities could more economically use water from the lakes than from other sources but do not do so at present.

Another dangerous byproduct involved in an approval of this proposed legislation would be the encouragement it would give Canada to believe that boundary waters are the property of those who get there first. That nation could, were this proposed legislation to pass, be well justified in feeling that the waters of several international streams may be utilized by them, to the disadvantage of those on the American side of the border.

If we establish the precedent of water diversion against the objections of a neighboring friendly country, what argument will we then have available to us to oppose the proposed diversion of water from the international Columbia River to the all-Canadian Fraser River?

It is perhaps not as widely known as it ought to be that Canada is proposing to divert 15 million acre-feet of water annually from the Columbia River into the Fraser River to increase its production of electricity. We all know that the Columbia River originates in Canada and most of its water is derived from Canadian sources, although almost two-thirds of its length lies in the United States. In the United States the waters of the Columbia River are used extensively for hydroelectric power projects, for irrigation and reclamation. The Hanford Atomic Works depends for its operation on the waters of the Columbia. The lower reaches of the river are used for navigation, and the fishing industry draws on the same water for its supplies. The proposed diversion would cut off approximately 25 percent of the flow of the Columbia River into the United States, with the result that American industries and projects dependent on the waters of the river could operate only at 75 percent of capacity.

This could also work in reverse. The United States, utilizing H.R. 1 as a precedent, could insist on preemption of some of these international waters at the expense of our Canadian neighbors. This would be an unfortunate situation, one fraught with danger. It could result in much ill will between the two nations, ending the present hard-earned and well deserved feeling of good will between neighbors.

Passage of H.R. 1 bypasses the mechanism provided by the International Boundary Waters Treaty of 1909 which has been an important factor in maintaining good relations between the United States and Canada.

The U.S. Supreme Court still has jurisdiction over diversion of water from Lake Michigan by Chicago. It has acted numerous times in the past, and may, in the future, act to meet any emergency situation which can be the only equitable reason for increased water diversion. Proponents of the bill in question have produced no evidence to demonstrate the inadequacy of this procedure.

Passage of H.R. 1 would constitute privileged legislation and preferred treatment by Congress of the worst possible type. Special consideration would thus be granted, providing a supposedly easy solution to a problem for which there are undoubtedly other less damaging solutions. This consideration would be at the expense of the economic welfare of the several States and those Canadian Provinces which would suffer as a consequence. Further, international relations with a great, friendly, democratic nation will be strained as a consequence, laying the foundation for future conflicts of interest and points of friction.

Actually there is considerable doubt as to whether diversion of an additional 1,000 cubic feet per second would accomplish the declared purpose of cleaning up a bad pollution problem in the Illinois River caused by its use as a depository for the sewage of the Chicago area. I believe that the 1 year test period would be utilized to accumulate evidence favoring a very much greater diversion beyond that period. This of course would multiply the potential damages many times.

If, as the Chicago Sanitary District maintains, it is the Seventh Wonder of America, it certainly is not too much to expect them to develop some other solution to their problem which would work no hardship on millions of other good American and Canadian citizens.

I have no wish to see legislation sanctioned for the advantage of a few at the expense of many, especially legislation which attempts to solve a problem by such hazardous means where there surely must be alternate solutions which will have no harmful effects on others.

For these reasons, therefore, I oppose passage of H.R. 1 and urge this body to refuse to sanction such potentially dangerous legislation.

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

Mr. PROUTY. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I wish to compliment my colleague on the speech which he has made.

Mr. PROUTY. I thank the Senator very much.

Mr. AIKEN. What the Senator has said about releasing Canada from any obligations relating to the upper reaches of the Columbia River is very true. There is the treaty of 1909, establishing the International Joint Commission to handle matters of disagreement relating to waters which affect the boundary waters, or waters which are common to both countries.

It so happened that Canada once proposed to divert 20,000 cubic feet from the upper reaches of the Columbia into another river so that those waters would not then flow down through the States of Idaho, Washington, and Oregon, and finally enter the Pacific Ocean. The United States naturally protested this diversion, and Canada agreed that under the agreement which both countries had signed the matter should be referred to the International Joint Commission. That was done last fall.

The International Joint Commission has been working on this problem involving waters in Canada several hundred miles above the international boundary, and within the next few months is expected to have some report to make to the governments of the two countries. That will be in accordance with the rules and regulations which both countries entered into and signed supposedly in good faith. They have demonstrated their good faith up to now. But if we violate that agreement, I cannot see why it should continue to be binding on Canada as it relates to the headwaters of the Columbia River.

We need that 20,000 cubic feet in the Columbia River. I understand that all the firm power from Bonneville has already been sold, and that the Bonneville Power Administration has recently been operating in the red. It cannot afford to lose any more of the flow of the Columbia River.

I think there may be those who may say, "We will vote for this bill. We will please the leadership on both sides of the aisle." Why in the world the leadership on either side should advocate the violation of a treaty with another country is beyond me.

Some Senators may say, "We will vote for the bill anyway, because the President never will sign it." Of course the President cannot sign any measure if it provides for violating an agreement with another country.

We never had a President who would do a thing like that, and I am sure that the President who is now in the White House would not so lightly regard the promises and the pledges of the United States as to be a party to their violation. In fact, anyone who advocates violating a treaty with a friendly country should never be President of the United States, should never even aspire to be President or Vice President, and certainly anyone who is in the White House could never agree to a willful violation of any agreement with any friendly nation, even if it were sanctioned by Congress.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I appreciate very much the observations which have just been made by my distinguished senior colleague from Vermont. I am sure that the Members of the Senate realize that no one in this body has done more to cement and further cement good relations between this country and the Dominion of Canada. If any of my colleagues had had the privilege of being in Montreal during the dedicatory exercises of the St. Lawrence Seaway, they would have recognized the deep respect in which the senior Senator from Vermont is held by his counterpart in the Canadian Parliament, and I can assure my colleagues that these men in that great legislative body are deeply concerned at the action which it is contemplated we shall take as a result of action on H.R. 1.

I think it would be a great mistake to pass the bill. I believe, Mr. President, that all the pronunciamentos nurtured in the agony of tortured logic cannot make this an equitable, fair proposition for the people of this country, and certainly not for the citizens of our great neighbor to the north.

I hope very much that the Senate will consider its action on this question very seriously, because a great deal is involved.

Mr. President, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I should like to make a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. PROXMIRE. When the Parliamentarian is present I should like to make an inquiry about the rollcall vote that was taken earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey in the chair). The Senator will state it.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I wish to make it clear for the RECORD that the Parliamentarian was present. He was sitting at his desk, but his back was turned. A motion was made to refer H.R. 1 to the Foreign Relations Committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. PROXMIRE. That motion was defeated. At that point there was a motion to reconsider the vote by which the motion was defeated. A motion to lay that motion on the table then was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. PROXMIRE. My inquiry is whether or not it is in order for opponents of the bill—or, I should say, for those who feel that the bill deserves the consideration of the Foreign Relations Committee—to move again at a later date to refer the bill to the Foreign Relations Committee, after the first committee amendment is agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Such a motion would be in order after the adoption of the pending committee amendment or it would be in order if the instructions set forth in the motion were modified.

Mr. PROXMIRE. So if the date of April 1 were modified to March 15 or to April 15 it would be in order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It would be in order.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Or in the event that the first committee amendment were adopted. As I understand, if the first committee amendment and the second committee amendment were not adopted and the bill were exactly the same, then it would not be in order. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct, until at least a reasonable length of time has elapsed.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I thank the Presiding Officer.

Mr. President, this morning the Washington Post and Times Herald carried an excellent editorial on the very issue that was just voted on by the Senate, one which I earnestly hope will be voted on again and voted on favorably, regarding this issue of diverting an additional thousand cubic feet of water from Lake Michigan.

This is such a pertinent editorial that I shall read it into the RECORD. It is entitled "Affront to a Neighbor." The editorial reads as follows:

The argument usually heard in support of the bill to permit Chicago to divert 1,000 cubic feet of water a second from Lake Michigan is that it would lower the level of the lake by only one-quarter of an inch. This argument seems to us both dangerous and fallacious. In one sense, of course, one-quarter of an inch off the surface of Lake Michigan seems very little; but in another sense it is an immense amount of water.

Minnesota, Wisconsin, Indiana, Michigan, Ohio, Pennsylvania, New York, and our neighbor Canada have very direct interests in this water. With so large an area vitally concerned about the water of this great inland sea, it is difficult indeed to justify additional diversions to aid Chicago with its sewage problem. One must remember that Chicago already takes 3,300 cubic feet a second from the lake to flush its sewage through the Illinois Waterway.

This move in Congress to reduce the level of the Great Lakes by unilateral action is especially unfortunate because it is an affront to Canada. Sponsors of the bill argue vehemently that Lake Michigan is wholly within the United States, which is true. But this is only a quibble in view of the fact that it is linked with the other four Great Lakes, which are international waters. Control over these waters is made an international concern by a number of treaties; Canada has protested against the diversion bill; the State Department has frowned upon it; and it must be obvious to any Senator that it cannot be passed without worsening our relations with a close neighbor who is already nursing a number of grievances against this country.

Before continuing with the editorial, I point out that the motion to refer the bill to the Foreign Relations Committee is not necessarily a motion to kill the bill, particularly if the motion contains instructions to the Foreign Relations Committee that it must report it back to the Senate.

It seems to me that it is the clearest kind of affront—perhaps I should use the more vigorous word "insult"—to a good neighbor, for us to refuse to have the one committee in the Senate which has jurisdiction over treaties, consider a matter which a friendly foreign power like Canada, rightly or wrongly, thinks violates a treaty. The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] and others have made an excellent case. I do not agree with the case they have made, but obviously they have argued it sincerely and fervently. They have contended that this proposal does not violate any treaty.

Whether they are right or wrong, Canada thinks they are wrong and has said so. Under those circumstances, it seems to me that, rather than have the Senate pass on this question, it is only proper to refer it to the Foreign Relations Committee, so that it can judge.

I point out further that a majority of the members of the Public Works Committee, which held extensive hearings, agree with that viewpoint. They also say that the bill should be referred to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. True, the bill was reported from the committee without specific instructions, by a vote of 8 to 6, but all six members who voted for it favored referring the bill to the Foreign Relations Committee.

In addition, the Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE] in a separate opinion printed in the report, states that he thinks it should be referred to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

In addition, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] has expressed an identical opinion. Moreover, the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] moved that the bill be referred to the Foreign Relations Committee, and it was his motion that was defeated today.

So it is obvious that the committee which conducted hearings on the bill in greater detail than any committee has devoted to a bill of this kind this year, by a substantial majority vote, feels that it should go to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

It is clear that the administration feels the same way, in view of the position of the State Department.

Obviously Canada is offended by our refusal to consider the foreign relations aspect of the question. It seems to me that the case is overwhelming that the Foreign Relations Committee is where the bill should go, and I think it would be a great mistake for those of us who feel as strongly as we do to give up at this point.

Senators are very busy, with vitally important matters. There has been deep concern over the labor bill. Most Senators are doing their best to familiarize themselves with this extremely difficult, complex legislation, upon which we shall be called upon to pass in a day or so. For that reason I do not believe that Senators have had an opportunity to consider the pending question fully, and on the basis of the merits. I am positive that if we can talk long enough to let Senators see fully the merits of our position, at least three or four Senators will come over to our viewpoint.

It should also be observed that those of us who oppose the bill have picked up votes. Our position has been strengthened. When the debate started we were defeated by a resounding vote on initial procedural motions. The motion by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] to table the bill was defeated by a decisive vote. Nevertheless, we were successful in defeating the motion to table the motion to send the bill to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, by a slim margin.

Continuing with the editorial:

> Since any water diverted from the Great Lakes by way of the Illinois Waterway into the Mississippi and the Gulf of Mexico will obviously not be available for the great St. Lawrence Seaway project that the United States and Canada have jointly built, the proposed diversion might easily be regarded as an act of bad faith on the part of the United States. Senator PROXMIRE pointed out, moreover, that Canada could easily retaliate by taking 25 percent of the water of the Columbia River before it flows into the United States.
>
> If Chicago can make a legitimate case for the diversion of more water from Lake Michigan to ease her sewage problem, at least the diversion should await full agreement with Canada.

The two distinguished Senators from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] and [Mr. PROUTY] have affirmed and emphasized this point. They have pointed out how this proposal would affect the Columbia River, and how it would affect the great States of the Northwest. I feel that the excellent case they have made should be very convincing. I earnestly hope that the case they have made will be read and considered by Senators who may have missed their speeches. I hope Senators will read them in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield to the Senator from Connecticut for a question.

Mr. BUSH. I wonder if the Senator will yield to me for perhaps 10 minutes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President——

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the Senator from Connecticut for 10 minutes without losing my right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I object.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I regret that the Senator from Illinois has objected. Obviously, it will make no difference whatsoever in the consideration of this matter. Ten minutes is a very brief time, and I feel that the good nature and fairness of the Senator from Illinois should permit the Senator from Connecticut to speak for only 10 minutes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, we are obviously being confronted with a filibuster, and I do not propose to be a party to it.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield to the Senator from Connecticut for a question.

Mr. BUSH. I should like to frame the question very carefully, and I should like to have the attention of the Senator from Illinois.

This debate has continued for a long time. The remarks which I had intended to make, and for which I asked the indulgence of my good friend from Wisconsin, have nothing to do with the pending issue. I wonder if that might modify the views of the distinguished Senator from Illinois, so that he might permit our mutual friend to yield in order that I might make some history on an entirely different subject for a few moments.

I see the distinguished Senator from Illinois is unmoved, so I suppose there is nothing I can do. I regret that he takes such a harsh view of this situation.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I believe in the orderly procedures of the U.S. Senate.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I think we all believe in the orderly procedures of the U.S. Senate. However, it is customary and habitual for Senators to yield, in situations of this kind.

Actually, we have not taken a great deal of time in this debate, as I am sure the Senator from Illinois realizes. At least to date we have not taken a great deal of time. It may be that in order to get our viewpoint across it will be necessary to do it.

I assure the Senator from Illinois that I have no intention of talking in order to prevent a vote. I do intend to talk, however—no matter how many hours it requires—to get the merits of this question before all Senators. The merits are very strong.

As I said before, I do not believe that Senators have had an opportunity to consider the issue on the merits. So once again I appeal to my good friend from Illinois to permit me to yield this one time to the Senator from Connecticut. I think the Senator from Illinois has made his point most emphatically. He may feel that if he yields now he will be called upon to do so again; but in view of the fact that I have spoken for less than 5 minutes, will not the Senator from Illinois permit the Senator from Connecticut to speak for only 10 minutes?

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. BUSH. I wonder if the Senator from Illinois would be mollified or would be more indulgent with me if he realized that the subject on which I had planned to speak would interest him very much, even though it does not have anything to do with water diversion.

I am afraid the silence of the Senator bespeaks his disapproval even of that suggestion.

I thank the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin will state it.

Mr. PROXMIRE. If I should yield the floor, and then the Senator from Connecticut should secure the floor, and then I should seek recognition again, that would mean that I would have spoken at that point twice on this amendment, and that I could not in this legislative day, which might carry on for a period of a week, be recognized again to speak in my own right on this amendment. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin is correct.

Mr. PROXMIRE. On the other hand, if I should offer an amendment to the pending amendment and change "175 miles" to "180 miles"—and I think such an amendment would have some merit—it would then be possible for me to secure the floor twice in support of that amendment. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin would be entitled to make two speeches on that amendment.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, in view of the fact that the Senator from Connecticut has a matter of considerable importance to discuss, I yield the floor.

THE IMPORTANCE OF PRICE STABILITY

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, on August 17 the Cabinet Committee on Price Stability for Economic Growth, of which the Vice President is Chairman, issued a statement entitled "What Do We Really Want From Our Economy?"

This statement was entirely consistent in emphasis and content with the interim report which the same Committee had given the President, and which the President made public on June 29.

Much of the press misinterpreted the new statement as representing in some way a shift of emphasis away from the important problem of price stability. No one who read the statement could interpret it that way, and no one who read the two statements together could possibly interpret them as inconsistent.

Following the press accounts, we are now having a number of comments on the statement by public figures. Several of these statements make it clear that the speakers have not read the statement itself, but only the erroneous press interpretations of the statement. In this connection, I regret that I find myself in disagreement with my esteemed friend, the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], who spoke on this subject on this floor on August 18.

Incidentally, I have advised the Senator from Tennessee that I would speak on this matter this afternoon, although there is nothing personal in my remarks, so far as he is concerned.

I can reassure the Senator from Tennessee that he need have no worries about the Cabinet Committee reducing the attention it is giving to the problem of inflation. In their interim report of June 29, the Committee listed three important reasons why inflation is bad for the economy. In their August 17 statement, they repeated these three reasons and added three additional reasons.

In the August 17 statement, the Committee indicated, as it had done in its June 29 interim report, that price stability ought to be a recognized aim of national economic policy, on a par with economic growth and maximum employment opportunities. A bill to accomplish this, Senate bill 64, has long been before the Senate, but has not been reported out of the Banking and Currency Committee. Indeed, no hearings have been held on the bill.

While the Cabinet Committee statement of August 17 did properly emphasize the importance of economic growth, so did the interim report of June 29, which said:

> In the long run, however, the most effective antidote to inflation is increased efficiency and productivity of the economy. This is one of the reasons why a major part of our work is directed toward actions to promote sustained economic growth.

If the Committee were to change its emphasis now, surely the change would be in the opposite direction. When the June 29 report appeared, the Consumer Price Index had been virtually stationary for more than a year, yet the Committee said at that time that the economy "is at a critical juncture urgently requiring action to forestall inflation." They also said that:

> Prices of industrial commodities and many other goods have been rising in wholesale markets and this is usually followed by rises at retail.

Developments since that time have certainly borne out this warning, for the Consumer Price Index has gone up a total of 0.8 point, which is as much as it had gone up in the 14 months preceding the month of June. Had the Committee not been foresighted enough to anticipate this development in June, it might have emphasized economic growth and minimized inflation at that time, but surely subsequent developments would have caused a reversal.

Furthermore, I am informed that the statement issued on August 17 was actually written, except for a few final revisions, before the Interim Report of June 29 was released. This was explained to the press at the time the August 17 statement was released. Perhaps the misinterpretations of the August 17 statement resulted from the fact that when it was released, the reporters were told that the Cabinet Committee entertains a cautious optimism that the line can be held on the general level of prices. It was emphasized that the fight is not over, that victory is not achieved, but that it is by no means the losing battle which everyone assumed 6 months ago.

I simply wanted to make this statement for the benefit of any other Senators who may not have read the statement of the Cabinet Committee, and may have been misled by the newspaper headlines and the reports. I commend the statement itself to the attention of the Senate as being a thoughtful and informative document.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the statement of August 17, 1959, to which I have referred, be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I particularly call attention to the emphasis which the statement places, contrary to the impressions of the Senator from Tennessee, upon reasonable stability of the price level and on the necessity of maintaining a sound dollar. The last two pages of the statement itself deal exclusively with the question of price stability. I particularly mention the following passage:

> A continuously rising price level, on the other hand, strikes at the roots of our way of life, economically and morally, for it inflicts unjust hardships on the many families whose incomes, pensions, or savings are fixed in dollars, or do not rise in proportion to prices; violates our standards of fair play by harming families whose incomes are average or below average more than families whose incomes are above average.

There is no question about that. I have said repeatedly that with inflation the rich can get richer and the poor get poorer. There is no doubt about that. That is why inflation is one of the pressing issues of this day; not that prices are increasing rapidly at the present time, but that the pressures of an economic boom may indeed tend to force prices up. We in Congress cannot ignore that possibility.

Mr. President, this condition of a continuing increase in the price levels contradicts the promises implied to the people when they put aside some of their income into insurance, Government bonds, retirement funds, and other forms of saving, for—if there is inflation—when that money is returned to them, it fails to buy the goods and the services they were led to expect it would buy, when they put the money aside.

Inflation also creates expectations of further price increases, and thus causes transfers of energy, ingenuity, and resources from productive activities to speculative activities, and so forth.

Indeed, Mr. President, the argument is so convincing and so thorough that I find it amazing that the press would have thought that the Cabinet Committee had changed its emphasis or in any way had departed from its earlier view that price stability is one of the important objectives of the national policy and is self-conducive to the maximum economic growth possible.

Mr. President, I hope my good friend, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], will read both the statement I have made and the statement of August 17, and, particularly, the quotations I have given from it and the parts of it to which I have directed especial attention. After he has done so, I do not think he can be—as he has said he is—"concerned that the contrast in emphasis between the two reports of the Cabinet Committee reflects a weakening of the administration stand against inflation."

Mr. President, I do not believe that anyone who reads the statement issued

on August 17 could possibly feel that there is any weakening of the resistance to inflation or any softening of the conviction that price stability is an essential ingredient for economic growth.

I remind the Senate that the title of the committee is "The President's Cabinet Committee on Price Stability for Economic Growth."

So, Mr. President, I am grateful to Senators for their attention to this matter.

I yield the floor.

EXHIBIT 1

STATEMENTS TO BE ISSUED BY THE PRESIDENT'S CABINET COMMITTEE ON PRICE STABILITY FOR ECONOMIC GROWTH

Thoughtful citizens are concerned increasingly with such questions as:

Are continual price increases inevitable?

If not, how can the general level of prices be stabilized?

Can price stability and maximum employment opportunities be maintained together?

How can a high and sustainable rate of economic growth best be brought about?

Can a high rate of growth and a stable level of prices be maintained together?

These are among the questions which the President's Cabinet Committee on Price Stability for Economic Growth is studying. From research now under way on these and related questions the Cabinet Committee will formulate a comprehensive program for price stability and economic growth.

Intelligent consideration of the broad questions listed above requires that several other questions be answered first. Among these are:

What do we really want from our economy?

What is economic growth, and what is the importance of economic growth to ordinary citizens in their daily lives?

What are maximum employment opportunities?

What is reasonable stability in the general level of prices, and what is the importance of price stability to ordinary citizens in their daily lives?

How much have prices actually risen?

What is the relation of productivity to wages and prices, and to wage-price spirals?

Would rising prices threaten our export markets and, more generally, would they threaten the continuation of prosperity?

Answers to such questions as these constitute building blocks from which can be constructed answers to the broader questions listed first.

The Cabinet Committee is summarizing its conclusions on these building block questions in a series of short statements. These statements are intended to help build a better public understanding of policies for maintaining growth and price stability. The first statement, on a question which is basic to any formulation of broad economic policy, "What Do We Really Want From Our Economy?" is presented herewith. Others will be made public soon.

Richard M. Nixon, Vice President (Chairman); Robert B. Anderson, Secretary of the Treasury; Ezra Taft Benson, Secretary of Agriculture; James P. Mitchell, Secretary of Labor; Frederick H. Mueller, Secretary of Commerce; Raymond J. Saulnier, Chairman, Council of Economic Advisers; Arthur E. Summerfield, Postmaster General; W. Allen Wallis, Special Assistant to the President (Executive Vice Chairman), Cabinet Committee on Price Stability for Economic Growth.

CABINET COMMITTEE ON PRICE STABILITY FOR ECONOMIC GROWTH—WHAT DO WE REALLY WANT FROM OUR ECONOMY?

AIMS OF ECONOMIC POLICY

What we really want is an ever freer, richer, better life for everyone.

Our economy must provide conditions that develop the mind and the spirit, as well as an abundance of material comforts and mechanical marvels. It must provide expanding opportunities for every individual to realize his own potentialities to the utmost and to open wider vistas for his children. It must encourage initiative, independence, and integrity. It must preserve and enlarge the dignity and moral worth of the individual. Our economy must, in short, strengthen the basic ideals and traditions of American life.

Our ways of working and of consuming constitute a large part of our whole way of life, and are closely intertwined with nearly all the rest. The goods and services provided by our economy, and growth in the economy, provide the means for preserving and enlarging the dignity of the individual. They make it possible to approach more closely our ideals of personal freedom, justice and fair play, broad and equal opportunity, the rule of law, and mutual respect and charity. Those very ideals and traditions are themselves responsible above all else for the unparalleled economic progress which our country has experienced under our Constitution.

These truths, old and familiar and almost commonplace, need to be restated here because policies for our material well-being must always be dominated by the fact that ours is a nation in which idealism, not materialism, is fundamental, a nation in which the government is the servant not the master of the people. If we think at all deeply about problems of economic policy we must recognize that economic growth is not an end in itself but a means of advancing toward more fundamental ends. In considering our economic goals, and in evaluating policies for achieving them, we must always keep in mind their contribution to the things we really want.

What then should be the economic aims of the American people?

Their aims should be economic growth—that is, a large and expanding output of goods and services; maximum employment opportunities; and reasonable stability of the price level.

While maximum employment opportunities and reasonable price stability both contribute to economic growth, they are worthwhile aims in their own right because they contribute directly to our ideals of self-reliance, integrity, and opportunity.

ECONOMIC GROWTH

A large and expanding output of goods and services makes possible a high and rising standard of living—and rapid improvement is as characteristic of the American standard of living as is its high level; national security and adequate roads, schools, and other public facilities; expanding job opportunities for ourselves and our children; an increasing range of choices of cultural, educational, recreational, religious, and social activities.

A large and expanding output requires improving health, education, skills, and job opportunities; discovering, developing, and conserving natural resources; expanding science and technology; increasing and improving our stock of tools, machines, buildings, and other equipment; improving organization and management, so that men, machines, and resources produce the things that are most useful, and produce them ever more efficiently.

Economic growth is complicated, and defies valid measurement. Numbers purporting to indicate what the rate of growth is, has been, will be, or should be, require intricate interpretation. Economic growth is measured sometimes by increases in the Nation's total output of goods and services. These increases are partly due simply to population growth, so for some purposes a better criterion of economic growth is average output per person. Even this is unsuitable for some purposes, for it fails to reflect increases in leisure due to shorter working hours, later ages of starting work, earlier ages of retirement, longer vacations, and other results of economic growth that are valuable but are not measured in terms of money. This difficulty is partly overcome by using still another measure, average output per hour of work. That average, too, may understate our real growth because as our incomes grow we spend more on services (education and medicines are examples) and other things for which measured productivity grows comparatively slowly. Thus the average may appear to grow more slowly or more rapidly merely because of shifts in consumption, not because of any real retardation or acceleration anywhere in the economy.

We shall present in a separate statement some basic facts about economic growth—what it is, how it is measured, and the limitations of any measurement, what the record is, how it may be stimulated.

MAXIMUM EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITIES

For economic growth it is essential that our people, our machines and equipment, and our natural resources all have the fullest practicable opportunities for employment.

Not only is it important that they have maximum opportunities for employment, but also that they be employed efficiently. They must be used to produce more useful rather than less useful things, and outputs must be as large as possible in relation to inputs.

Finally, they must be employed under conditions of economic freedom. People must be free to choose for themselves among a variety of occupations, industries, areas, and jobs; free to decide whether to venture into a new business or risk their savings on a new idea; and free to choose according to their own tastes the ways in which they will spend their incomes after paying the taxes necessary to support essential public needs.

Even the ideas of maximum employment opportunities and of unemployment are not as simple as they sound. Much unemployment—sometimes nearly all of it, especially during recessions or in depressed areas—involves the hardships and lack of opportunity that we all associate with the word "unemployment." Some unemployment, however, especially in prosperous times, represents people who have just recently made themselves available for work and have not yet found their first jobs, or people who have given up or declined jobs with confidence that they can get other jobs that will suit them better. This latter type of unemployment—which, paradoxical though it sounds, reflects breadth of opportunity, not hardship—accounts in part for the fact that no one who talks about "full employment" ever means "full" in the literal sense of 100 percent. It also explains why maximum opportunities for employment is a more appropriate goal than simply maximum employment.

A separate statement will present information about employment—what is meant by "maximum" or "full" employment opportunities, various reasons for unemployment, the measurement of employment and unemployment, and related topics. An understanding of these matters is particularly important in considering the relation between maximum employment opportunities and price stability, for policies to eliminate unemployment do not need to raise prices

unless an attempt is made to eliminate the unemployment that results from free choice rather than from lack of opportunity.

PRICE STABILITY

Reasonable stability of the general price level supports prosperity and growth. It also accords with our ideals of fairness and justice and the rule of law. A continuously rising price level, on the other hand, strikes at the roots of our way of life, economically and morally, for it inflicts unjust hardships on the many families whose incomes, pensions, or savings are fixed in dollars, or do not rise in proportion to prices; violates our standards of fair play by harming families whose incomes are average or below average more than families whose incomes are above average; contradicts promises implied when people put aside income in insurance, Government bonds, retirement funds, and other forms of savings, for when the money is returned it fails to buy the goods and services that people were led to expect when they put the income aside; creates expectations of further price rises and thus causes transfers of energy, ingenuity, and resources from productive to speculative activities; distorts the accounts of business firms, creating at times an illusion of profits when in fact capital is being consumed, thereby threatening jobs; reduces the Nation's ability to sell in foreign markets, further threatening jobs.

Resistance to rises in the general price level is bound to cause temporary inconvenience to some and to limit the gains of others, but reasonable price stability will powerfully promote the welfare of all.

Our economy has grown since the founding of the Republic because we have had faith in ourselves, because we have developed institutions that reward enterprise and efficiency, and because we have believed in progress sufficiently to put aside enough from our current income to expand the productive plant and build the technology needed by a venturesome and growing population. Increases in the price level have not contributed to our economic growth. On the contrary, prices have risen most during war periods. In other periods price rises have often led to speculative booms, which have been succeeded by recessions and, sometimes, by prolonged and acute depressions. We surely do not want booms followed by depressions. What we want and need is sound, sustainable economic growth. The lesson of history is that orderly growth is most likely to occur under conditions of price stability.

Price stability is an idea that involves more than meets the eye. It certainly does not mean that every individual price is stable. On the contrary, freedom of individual prices to change is essential to economic efficiency, for prices are the messages that tell producers and sellers what things should be made in greater quantities and what in smaller quantities, and what materials and services are abundant and what are scarce in relation to uses for them. "Price stability" must refer to the general level of prices. Even this is oversimplified, however, for the general level normally ebbs and flows with prosperity.

The idea of price stability must refer to the average over a period of time of the general level of prices.

In another statement we will explain more fully what is meant by reasonable price stability, how it is measured, what the record shows about price rises, and related matters that must be understood for the intelligent consideration of policies to promote price stability.

CONCLUSION

Policies for promoting economic growth, maximum employment opportunities, and price stability must be consistent with the fundamental goals and ideals of Americans.

Discussion of economic policies for promoting growth, employment, and price stability can proceed intelligently only on a basis of sound understanding of the many facets of the broad problem. This statement is the first in a series intended to help build that understanding. Later statements will deal with other facets of the problem of economic growth with price stability.

Richard M. Nixon, Vice President (Chairman); Robert B. Anderson, Secretary of the Treasury; Ezra Taft Benson, Secretary of Agriculture; James P. Mitchell, Secretary of Labor; Frederick H. Mueller, Secretary of Commerce; Raymond J. Saulnier, Chairman, Council of Economic Advisers; Arthur E. Summerfield, Postmaster General; W. Allen Wallis, Special Assistant to the President (Executive Vice Chairman), Cabinet Committee on Price Stability for Economic Growth.

DIVERSION OF WATER FROM LAKE MICHIGAN, AT CHICAGO

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 1) to require a study to be conducted of the effect of increasing the diversion of water from Lake Michigan into the Illinois Waterway for navigation, and for other purposes.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, to the pending amendment, I submit the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HART in the chair). The amendment to the amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. In the committee amendment on page 3, in lines 22 and 23, it is proposed to strike out "one hundred and seventy-five", and to insert in lieu thereof "one hundred and eighty".

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, in order that I may be sure of the parliamentary situation, let me state that I understand that I have been recognized at this time to speak on my amendment to the committee amendment; and that thus, Mr. President, up to this time I have been recognized only once to speak on the committee amendment and once to speak on my amendment to that amendment. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, once again, I wish to assure my good friend the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], that I am not attempting to delay the Senate or to act in a dilatory fashion.

Whenever the able and outstanding Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH] speaks on inflation, it is difficult for me not to engage in debate with him. Thus it is that a few minutes ago I was tempted once again to conduct an extended debate with him on the question of inflation. He and I agree on many things; but on the question of inflation we disagree. However, I was afraid that, if I were then to engage with the Senator from Connecticut in extended debate on the question of inflation, my friend the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] might regard that as an attempt by me to postpone the taking of action by the Senate on House bill 1. So I shall postpone my debate on inflation with the Senator from Connecticut until we dispose of House bill 1, because I do not want to hold up the taking of action on House bill 1; in fact, I want the Senate to vote on that bill as soon as possible.

Mr. President, I wish to clarify a statement in the RECORD which involves the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], who spoke on this particular matter, and myself. In that connection, I refer to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for last Friday, August 28; and I quote from page 17311. At that point I said:

> I submit that men of the caliber of Charles Evans Hughes and Albert Maris, who I understand was the senior judge of his circuit at the time of his appointment——

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] then stated:

> No; he was not the senior judge. Judge John Biggs was the chief judge, or senior judge. Judge Maris retired under the retirement laws available to the judiciary. He served on the bench for, I should say, 25 years.

Mr. President, I hold in my hand a document entitled "The Supreme Court of the United States—Wisconsin, et al, Against Illinois." I shall not read the entire document because, once again, I want to proceed as quickly as possible to get the case placed in the RECORD, but in that document we find the following:

> *Ordered*, That the Honorable Albert B. Maris, U.S. senior circuit court judge, be, and he is hereby, appointed special master in each of these cases, with authority to summon witnesses, issue subpenas, and take such evidence as may be introduced and such as he may deem it necessary to call for.

It was the Supreme Court of the United States that thus identified him as the senior circuit court judge. So I presume that identification is accurate and correct.

Incidentally, Mr. President, my good friend, the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], has once again told me what a very fine man Judge Maris is, what an outstanding character he has. This is pertinent, because it seems to me that when a judge of great character and outstanding reputation, who, as I have said, is the senior U.S. circuit court judge, is appointed to consider this matter, and to explore its every detail, and to make his recommendations and findings on it to the Supreme Court, legislation of the kind it is now proposed that the Senate pass is unnecessary, because Judge Maris wishes to make the study, and the Supreme Court has told him to do so.

It is also clear that the Supreme Court has exercised jurisdiction over this matter for a long, long time—ever since the early part of this century. The Supreme Court appointed Judge Hughes to make a study; and the Court has a number of times varied the amount of diversion from Lake Michigan into the Illinois Waterway. As recently as 1956, the Court increased the allowable diversion to 8,500 cubic feet a second, and allowed diversion at that rate to continue for 2½ months.

In view of all those circumstances, and particularly in view of the fact that so

outstanding a judge as Judge Maris is engaged in making the study, I am convinced that it would be a mistake for Congress to proceed with this bill, in the face of the strenuous objections of Michigan and the other Great Lakes States involved; and I believe that the Senate should not pass the bill.

Mr. President, at this time I wish to state—for it cannot be repeated too often, in my opinion—that every dispassionate, qualified expert who was consulted by the Senate Committee on Public Works agreed—without exception—that the proposed diversion of an additional 1,000 cubic feet of water a second from Lake Michigan into the Illinois Waterway is unnecessary or undesirable, or both. There is no question about that. The committee consulted four agencies of the Federal Government.

I also submit that in this particular case, no partisan politics is involved. The senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] is a very good Democrat, and is a proponent of the bill. I am a Democrat, and I am an opponent of the bill. The senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], my fine colleague, is a strenuous opponent of the bill. The junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], another Republican, is a strenuous proponent of the bill. So this bill is not a matter of partisan politics.

In this situation, when we ask the executive agencies for their opinions, certainly we can be sure that what they tell us is not based on a party-line position or is not in accordance with an order from the President for partisan advantage. The President has no interest in this matter, of course. All of us recognize that we have to rely on the various agencies and departments of the executive branch of the Government, for expert advice.

The Department of the Army spoke out, and the committee report, at page 13, indicates that it said legislation is not necessary—I repeat, is not necessary—to obtain data in relation to these items.

Those items refer back to the effect of diversion on navigation, on power, on aeration, and so forth—all the matters that are within the jurisdiction of the U.S. Army. The Army says, so far as it is concerned, this proposed legislation is unnecessary.

I repeat again, because I think, once again, it cannot be emphasized enough, the Public Health Service, which has jurisdiction over everything which does not come under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Army, spoke out with equal emphasis, and the Department of the Army has jurisdiction over navigation, power, and so forth, while the Public Health Service has jurisdiction over sanitation. In its letter to the chairman of the committee, the Honorable DENNIS CHAVEZ, it said this study is unnecessary.

Again, because it is so important and so pertinent, I am going to read into the RECORD once again a part of its report, which pertains to this matter.

> Our comment on this bill has been prepared in the light of the points raised and the generally adverse position taken in the July 1, 1959, letter from the Budget Bureau on S. 308. This Department is in agreement with the recommendations made in the July 1 letter. We believe that a study of the sanitary problems of the Metropolitan Sanitary District of Greater Chicago would be feasible without an increase in diversion.

To me, that sentence is the key to this whole bill. The Army has said that, so far as it is concerned, the proposed legislation is unnecessary. The Public Health Service, which is the dispassionate, objective, qualified judge of the sanitation aspect of the problem, which is the only other consideration in this bill, has said:

> We believe that a study of the sanitary problems of the Metropolitan Sanitary District of Greater Chicago would be feasible without an increase in diversion.

I read further:

> From the point of view of water pollution control additional diversion over the amount now authorized is not absolutely necessary for completion of a satisfactory study.

I shall document that matter a little later, but that is an extremely important point.

I hope all Senators are aware at least that the Public Health Service, which is our authority on health matters, so believes. I am sure that, in spite of several days of debate, a number of Senators feel the bill should be passed because the health of the people of Chicago is at issue and because they believe the safeguarding of health should take precedence over the requirements of navigation, power, and so forth. If the health of the people of Chicago could be benefited by this diversion, I would have no question this bill should pass.

Mr. President, under those circumstances, we do not go to the particular politician who is involved, no matter how fine his character may be, but we go to the experts. What do the experts say about this? The experts say the diversion is not necessary. Nobody has questioned the integrity or honesty of the Public Health Service in this matter. We know they speak honestly, sincerely, and, what is most important, competently; and they say no diversion is necessary.

I desire to go on and point out that this is not just a heartless statement the Public Health Service is making. It is not forgetting about Chicago, because it says:

> It should be noted, however, that the Budget Bureau proposal is for a study which would be limited to a study of the sanitation and sewage treatment problems of the district and the Illinois Waterway. Unlike the study proposed in S. 308, it would not include an exploration of the effects of an increased diversion of water from Lake Michigan into the waterway other than as one possible means of correcting existing and future sanitation problems in the area—and as such an alternative means of correction, increased diversion would be evaluated in terms of comparable costs and effectiveness.

At a later time today, I shall make reference to some excellent documentation, which dates back to 1947, which is the most authoritative, definitive, and expert study I have ever seen of any public health problem. It was made in Chicago, on this very problem, by some of the outstanding authorities in America, headed by the Public Health Service itself, which corroborates what has been said in the last few weeks by the Public Health Service.

I return to the report:

> Unlike the study proposed in S. 308, it would not include an exploration of the effects of an increased diversion of water from Lake Michigan into the waterway other than as one possible means of correcting existing and future sanitation problems in the area—and as such an alternative means of correction, increased diversion would be evaluated in terms of comparable costs and effectiveness. Authorizing legislation designed to carry out the Budget Bureau study recommendation should, therefore, carefully limit the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare responsibilities—

At that point, I should like to emphasize that the Department points out that it wants to consider and compare diversion of 1,000 cubic feet per second as one possible solution, aeration as another possible solution, chlorination as another possible solution, eliminating the tremendous industrial pollution at the source as another possible solution, and consider those possible solutions on a fair, equitable basis.

The study proposed by the Public Health Service would go into this. It would do so because it does not provide for 1,000 cubic feet of diversion for a year. I think it is very important to recognize that H.R. 1 does not provide for a fair study, because it gives great advantage to diversion as compared with these other alternative solutions.

Diversion is the one solution which is provided for as a practical, 1-year test. There is no such test provided for chlorination. There is no such test provided for aeration. There is no such test provided for any of the other proposals, but there is a test provided for diversion.

The fair way to do it, of course, if we are to go ahead with a practical test of the situation, is to provide for a 1-year test of diversion, and after that 3-year period is over, have another 3-year period with a test, under the same conditions, for aeration, and then another 3-year period with a test for chlorination.

I recognize that I am repeating to some extent what I have already said. I am almost through with the repetitive part of my talk. I have a great deal of other, new material I should like to put in the RECORD. I am repeating this matter, however, because I think it is so important to emphasize, and the only way we can emphasize something is to say it over and over and over again. I am convinced the 100 Senators in this body are honest persons, who will always vote on the merits of an issue if they know the merits; but I think it is difficult to call the merits of this bill to their attention at a time of tremendous distraction, when so many other matters are going on with which they are concerned.

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

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield for a question.

Mr. AIKEN. Is the Senator not aware of the fact that his reference to the 1,000 cubic feet of water per second, in addition to the 1,500 feet of water which is now being diverted, is a bit misleading? Is the Senator not aware that this bill provides for diversion of water from Lake Michigan at an annual average of not more than 2,500 cubic feet of water per second to flow into the Illinois Waterway during such a 1-year period? Did not the Senator from Wisconsin understand that through much of the year there would be no increase whatsoever in the water diverted from Lake Michigan, namely, during the high-water season?

Mr. PROXMIRE. That is my understanding. The Senator from Vermont is absolutely correct.

Mr. AIKEN. But the bill would permit the diversion of unlimited amounts of water from Lake Michigan during the dry season.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I think the Senator from Vermont is correct. It is my understanding that perhaps in the previous bill there was a provision of a limitation of 5,000 cubic feet per second.

Mr. AIKEN. Yes.

Mr. PROXMIRE. It is my understanding there is no such limitation in the bill now under consideration.

Mr. AIKEN. There is no limitation provided now. If the Senator will read the proposed legislation, he will find that not only 1,000 cubic feet per second but 5,000 or 10,000 cubic feet per second, or any amount, could be diverted under the provisions of the bill under consideration.

Mr. PROXMIRE. It is my understanding that the Senator from Vermont is correct.

Mr. AIKEN. I thought the Senator would want to have the situation made perfectly clear. This is not a bill for a 1,000 cubic feet per second diversion; this is a bill for unlimited diversion.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator from Vermont makes an excellent point.

I should like to supplement by emphasizing something which has already been pointed out. The fact is that there is a 1,500 cubic feet per second diversion for so-called navigation purposes, but also obviously for sanitation purposes. There is another 1,700 or 1,800 cubic feet per second diversion for domestic pumpage. I am going to come to a discussion of that matter in a minute, because it seems to me that is a very extravagant figure. We can show it is an extravagant amount. Chicago is the most extravagant user of water of any city in the country, on a per capita basis. It does not meter its water fully. It meters some 30 percent or less of its water. Many other cities meter all their water. By metering water the cities can cut down on the use of water.

I think the case is very strong that the amount of water being diverted from Lake Michigan at the present time is about 3,300 cubic feet per second, and this bill would make it 4,300 cubic feet per second.

What is more, if the entire 3,300 cubic feet per second were returned to Lake Michigan, it is my understanding the lake level would be raised some 3 inches.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield to the Senator from Vermont for a question.

Mr. AIKEN. Is the Senator aware of a report that a certain large corporation—the largest of its line in the country—has built a plant down the river, in the lower reaches of the river below the city of Chicago, and has found, to its discouragement, that there are certain times of the year when it cannot get the raw material down to the plant in the quantity desired, and that it is necessary to get a large amount of water out of Lake Michigan during the dry season to make that plant economically profitable? I am not pointing out the names mentioned in that report.

Mr. PROXMIRE. That is an interesting and understandable situation, I will say to the Senator from Vermont. I feel that this situation is much more a matter of commercial competition than a matter of health. I think I can show that a little later. There is not any question about the health angle. There is a question of keeping Chicago taxes low. There is a question of making it more attractive for industry to be placed in Chicago, at considerable expense to industry in Milwaukee and the other Great Lakes area cities. There is not a substantial question of health involved at all. There has not been one single health authority who has testified since 1954 on this issue who has said that the proposed legislation is necessary from a health standpoint, yet we have all kinds of testimony, which I am going to put in the RECORD, from the health experts, saying the proposed legislation is not necessary, and, as a matter of fact, would be undesirable.

Mr. AIKEN. I think the Senator will find, according to the report I received, that this is an economic proposition for a certain large corporation, which unfortunately cannot get full advantage of the situation so long as low water prevails, on some of the waterways it has to use, at certain periods of the year.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I thank the Senator from Vermont for that very interesting and helpful interjection.

Mr. President, I turn to the third bureau or agency of the Federal Government which was consulted in this matter, which is the Department of State. The Department of State voiced the belief that enactment of the proposed legislation would adversely affect our relations with a friendly foreign government, and therefore stated the Department was unable to support it.

Congress has gone to the Department of State on a matter which has no partisan political implications, a matter as to which the Department of State can particularly speak out as an expert. The Department of State has told us this proposal would adversely affect relations with a friendly foreign power.

I think many Senators perhaps did not recognize that when they voted against referring the bill to the Committee on Foreign Relations. If only three Senators who voted that way can recognize this point, and see its implications, then we can send the bill to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Whether the committee feels the bill is good or bad, such a referral will at least give us the opportunity to cooperate with our friendly neighbor Canada. It will prevent us from insulting our good neighbor, Canada. It will permit the Committee on Foreign Relations to give its own qualified expert opinion to the Senate, as to whether we would be acting in a way which would be offensive to our good neighbor Canada.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the distinguished Senator yield to me?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield to the Senator from New York for a question.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I make the point that the Senator can yield for a question only.

Mr. KEATING. I ask the Senator to yield for a question.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield to the Senator from New York for a question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin yields to the Senator from New York for a question.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I assure the Senator I have a question to ask.

Would the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin give us his analysis of the curious vote today, whereby the Senate voted not to table the motion to send the bill to the Committee on Foreign Relations and then in a reversal voted against sending the bill to the committee? Does the Senator have any analysis of that vote?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I think the only analysis of that vote which makes any sense at all—and I will say, incidentally, I think a vast majorty of Senators were consistent in their votes—is that obviously some Senators were not consistent in voting, and I think they were inconsistent in a perfectly proper and sensible way. Such action perhaps would make sense.

The only explanation which makes sense to me at all is that the Senators wanted to hear more debate. Their minds were not made up. The motion to table, if agreed to, would have ended the debate of the matter, but Senators were not satisfied with the debate and they wanted to hear more discussion. That is the only explanation I can think of as being a sensible one. Otherwise, as the Senator from New York implied in his question, Senators would have voted to table the motion, to end the discussion. However, the Senate voted against tabling the motion, saying, in effect, "We want you fellows to tell us a little more about this matter." And then the Senate voted against referral of the bill, which indicated Senators were not ready at that point to refer the bill to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The only way I can explain that action is that the Senators were telling us they want us to go into much more detail, and to explain this proposition in a much more convincing and persuasive manner.

Mr. KEATING. That we will try to do. There are not many Senators present. I wish all of those who voted in

that manner were present to hear the fine argument being made by the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I thank the Senator very much. I think that if we can continue to make this point perhaps many Senators will see it in the RECORD, and will benefit from our arguments.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, in that connection, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield to me for a question?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield to the Senator from Alabama for a question.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I think the question is quite pertinent. The question then comes to my mind, Why did we not receive the additional debate? I will say to the Senator from Wisconsin, I think his analysis is exactly correct. That was my own thinking. If the motion were voted down, then I thought we would have a debate on the question relating to the interest which Canada had in the matter, but instead of debate, immediately there came a vote on the motion to refer the bill to the committee, so we did not hear the debate.

I will say as one Senator, to me all of this is very confusing. There are many things concerning this matter I do not understand. I have not understood them yet. I will say, so far as I am concerned, the principal point is the interest which Canada has in this matter and the effect our action might have upon a friendly government.

I was disappointed that we did not have the debate immediately following the vote on the motion to table, before a vote was taken on the question of referral of the bill.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I thank the Senator from Alabama. I think it may have been a matter of misjudgment on both sides. We felt, of course, since we prevailed against tabling, that we had the votes. Obviously we did not have, and I think the position of the Senator from Alabama and the position of the Senator from New York, as brought out in their questions, was obviously the wise and sensible one. The only way we can remedy that is to talk about it now. It is very apparent that some Senators at least want more enlightenment on this subject. So we are going to take plenty of time to give it to them.

I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. KEATING. If the Senator will yield for a question, does not the Senator feel that perhaps the situation in which we find ourselves, where there has been inadequate debate of this question, could be cured by a motion to refer the matter to the Committee on Foreign Relations with instructions to report back at some date other than the date named in the previous motion? That would permit a very full debate of that particular issue, which I agree is a very important one.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I think that is an excellent point. I inquired from the Parliamentarian about the situation, and I was informed that there are two circumstances under which we can move to refer to the Foreign Relations Committee. One is with simply a change of instructions; the other is to adopt the first committee amendment or any other amendment that would change the bill, and then, even though we have the same date of April 1, we could make the motion once again.

But I would agree that it is obviously indicated that the Senate has told those of us who feel strongly on this bill that it wants to hear further from us, and make up its mind after it has heard from both sides.

Mr. KEATING. I think it might be helpful to start from the beginning and enlighten Senators on this international problem. It might be very helpful.

I thank the Senator.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I thank the Senator from New York very much.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield for another question?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Why does not the International Joint Commission have jurisdiction over this subject? Does it have any jurisdiction over it?

Mr. PROXMIRE. It is my understanding that the International Joint Commission apparently does not have jurisdiction over diversion from Lake Michigan, although it does have jurisdiction over diversion from the Columbia River, for example.

Mr. SPARKMAN. It may be that when it was set up, it was given certain limitations, but it seems to me we ought to have some kind of commission to look into the matter. This condition has existed certainly since before 1909, and it would seem that there would be a joint commission or joint committee of some kind to consider the problem.

Mr. PROXMIRE. That is exactly why it would seem to me that it would be inadvisable to pass this proposed legislation without at least giving these foreign policy questions further study, and at best it would seem to me that we should require our Government to sit down with the Canadian Government and find out exactly what the situation is and how it can be compromised fairly to both sides, or give the International Joint Commission jurisdiction over the matter.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I may say to the Senator from Wisconsin that I was perfectly sincere when I said a while ago that I was considerably confused about the whole thing. To be frank with the Senator, when the Senator talks about the diversion of 1,500 cubic feet per second, or whatever the figure is that might be used, it does not make much impression on my mind with reference to the lowering of the water in the lake as a whole or the effect it might have on Wisconsin or Michigan or any other area, and the same comment applies to the amount of power that may be generated in some of the streams.

But when the Senator talks about it being something in which two countries are interested, and are concerned, and that unilateral action is about to be taken, then that attracts my attention. It seems to me that that is the point a great many people would like to hear straightened out. I do not ask that the Senator do it now, but certainly in the course of this debate we ought to have a thorough discussion of that point.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I thank the Senator from Alabama. I think it is necessary for us to discuss that point. Later in my speech I am going to discuss, however, also what one might call the positive aspects of the bill, to consider whether or not there is enough merit in the benefits of this bill to overweigh or override the objections of Canada. It might be that it is a bill of such great interest and important to the health of the people of Chicago and the people of America that it should pass anyway, even though another country does object, and though it may violate treaty rights.

The Senator from Michigan has been very helpful, and has called to my attention article 3 of the convention, which bears directly on the point the Senator from Alabama has raised.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Could the Senator give the page numbers?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Page 205 of the hearings, toward the bottom of the page, from which I read:

> It is agreed that, in addition to the uses, obstructions, and diversions heretofore permitted or hereafter provided for by special agreement between the parties hereto, no further or other uses or obstructions or diversions, whether temporary or permanent, of boundary waters on either side of the line, affecting the natural level or flow of boundary waters on the other side of the line, shall be made except by authority of the United States or the Dominion of Canada within their respective jurisdictions and with the approval, as hereinafter provided, of a joint commission, to be known as the International Joint Commission.

I take it that the reason why this has not been referred to the International Joint Commission is because it is the conclusion of the proponents of the bill that Lake Michigan is not a boundary water and that Lake Michigan is not covered by the treaty. But I am sure that even the question as to whether or not diversion of Lake Michigan would be pertinent, I have read it in the treaty, though at the moment I do not know exactly where it is. It is the interpretation of this clause of the treaty that has convinced Canada that we are violating the treaty, and that the bill should not be passed for that reason.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Let me ask the Senator a question frankly. I did not know that the International Joint Commission entered into this question. I asked a question about it a few minutes and apparently it is tied in.

I read article VIII:

> This International Joint Commission shall have jurisdiction over and shall pass upon all cases involving the use or obstruction or diversion of the waters with respect to which under articles III and IV of this treaty the approval of this Commission is required—

And so forth. I wonder why Canada, if she feels aggrieved, does not refer the case to the International Joint Commission. In fact, it would seem to me, from reading this provision that the International Joint Commission, if the situation is a problem involving both Canada and the United States, would automatically

have jurisdiction over it and could assume jurisdiction, or could intervene in any one of the attempts to divert water.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I agree with the Senator wholeheartedly. It should be referred to the Commisison; but I think that, of course, Canada recognizes the futility of referring it to the International Joint Commission if Congress is going to act precipitately, as it has twice in the past, in that it passed a similar bill in 1954 and one in 1956 despite their protestations. Of course, the President vetoed the bills. There is a feeling of futility on the part of Canada, a feeling that they cannot get the Congress of the United States to recognize what they feel are their rights.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Would the Senator not agree with me that if the treaty sets up rights, an act of Congress cannot override those rights?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I would agree. I think it is a grave question as to whether or not an act of Congress would be valid.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Of course, I am not qualified to pass on the application of this treaty, but it would seem to me that if the treaty does apply, then an act of Congress that would contravene the provisions of the treaty would be unconstitutional. That is another problem, it seems to me, that should be gone into in the discussion on this bill.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator from Alabama raises a number of very important points, all of which indicate why this bill should go to the Foreign Relations Committee. These are foreign relations matters, and a majority of the members of the Public Works Committee said, "Send it to Foreign Relations." The fact is that the leadership of the Senate acted in contravention of what the Public Works Committee said we should do. Six members voted against reporting the bill. Three members voted for reporting the bill, but said, "Send it to Foreign Relations." That is what the Public Works Committee has told the Senate to do. What has happened is that the Senate has ignored the committee recommendations.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Does the Senator believe that the average Member of the Senate knew of these matters the Senator has just related? It seems to me that illustrates a part of the weakness of no debate.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I think the Senator is correct.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The Senator has called attention to things I have never heard of before. I did not know, for example, that a majority of the Committee on Public Works had recommended that the bill be referred to the Foreign Relations Committee. I did not know some of these other things. I did not know that the International Joint Commission had jurisdiction. I knew that there was such a commission. The Senator will recall that I asked him a while ago why it did not have jurisdiction. When we turn to the treaty of 1909, we find that it has jurisdiction.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The position of the proponents of the bill is an honest position. Their position is that the International Joint Commission does not have jurisdiction, because they say these are not boundary waters. They say it with sincerity. They may be correct. But whether they are right or wrong, a sovereign country thinks we are dead wrong, and that we are violating a treaty. The least we can do is to let the one committee in the Senate which is competent to pass upon this question have a look at it. I refer to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Under these circumstances I think the situation has become much clearer, by reason of the questions of the senior Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] and the junior Senator from Alabama.

I ask, Why in the world did the Senate refuse to table, and then seem to reverse its position and refuse to send the bill to the Foreign Relations Committee? The only reason is that Senators want more enlightening debate on what the merits are, on the question of whether the bill should go to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee or not. The Senator from Alabama is correct. After the Senate refused to table, it voted immediately on the motion to refer the bill to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. That was not the fault of the leadership. It was the fault of those who felt strongly about the bill. We should have spoken out at the time. However, we felt that we had the votes, and the other side felt that it had the votes. The other side was correct and we were in error. However, we are advised by the Parliamentarian that we shall have another opportunity to vote to refer the bill to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

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

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I was one of those who voted against tabling. I did so with the full expectation of hearing a discussion as to why the bill should be sent to the Foreign Relations Committee. I fully expected to vote to send it there. The Senator may recall that on the vote to refer the bill to the Foreign Relations Committee I had a pair with the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR]. Had I been free to vote I would have voted to refer it to the Foreign Relations Committee. But I was taken by surprise when there was no discussion following the vote to table. I believe that a number of Senators voted against tabling because they felt that the motion to table was merely to cut off debate, and that we were entitled to have this question debated.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I think I should take a couple of minutes to drive home a position which is obvious, but which has not been emphasized enough, as to what the Public Works Committee feels should be done with regard to the bill.

The six members who voted against reporting the bill all felt that it should be referred to the Foreign Relations Committee.

In addition, the Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE] has filed an individual opinion with the committee report, in which he says it should go to the Foreign Relations Committee, though he favored reporting the bill.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] takes the identical position, as he has stated in an individual opinion. That makes eight.

In addition, the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] moved to send the bill to the Foreign Relations Committee, although he favored reporting the bill.

Nine of the fifteen members of the Public Works Committee favored referring the bill to the Foreign Relations Committee, after the most extensive and exhaustive hearings that have been accorded any bill of this character in the Senate in a long time.

I thank the Senator from Alabama very much. He has been extremely helpful and to the point.

I refer now to the fourth and last agency of the Federal Government which was consulted, namely, the Budget Bureau. It was more emphatic than any of the other agencies. It perhaps speaks more nearly with the voice of the President than does any other agency. The Bureau of the Budget stated that it recommended against the enactment of the bill. On June 1, 1959, Phillip S. Hughes, Assistant Director for Legislative Reference, writing on the stationery of the Executive Office of the President, Bureau of the Budget, wrote to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Public Works, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], as follows:

> On February 20, 1959, and again on April 9, 1959, the Government of Canada communicated to the United States its opposition to any additional diversion from the Great Lakes and expressed the view that such diversions would have a damaging effect on Canadian interests. In the face of these protests from Canada and in view of the pending application by certain Great Lakes States before the Supreme Court for a review of the decree of April 21, 1930, the Bureau of the Budget must recommend against the enactment of S. 308.

The fact of the pending application by certain Great Lakes States before the Supreme Court for a review of the decree of April 21, 1930, has not been debated at great length in the Senate.

The Bureau of the Budget continued:

> However, there is an avenue of further exploration which may prove fruitful, i.e., a full technical study of the sewage treatment problems of the Metropolitan Sanitary District of Greater Chicago to be undertaken and financed jointly by the U.S. Public Health Service and the sanitary district without any actual increase in the present diversion of water from Lake Michigan.

ORDER OF BUSINESS—ORDER FOR RECESS TO 11 O'CLOCK A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] may yield to me with the understanding that he will not lose his right to the floor.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I do not know how long the Senator from Wisconsin plans to speak this evening, but

for the information of Senators, I hope he will conclude his address; and when he concludes his address, the Senate can take a recess until tomorrow.

I therefore ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business today, it stand in recess until 11 o'clock a.m. tomorrow.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. For the information of Senators, I will ask that when the Senator from Wisconsin concludes his address, a motion to recess pursuant to the order just entered be made. If there is a demand for a rollcall for any reason, I will ask the acting majority leader to move that the Senate take a recess until 11 o'clock a.m. tomorrow, in order that Members may understand that there will be no further rollcalls today.

DIVERSION OF WATER FROM LAKE MICHIGAN, AT CHICAGO

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 1) to require a study to be conducted of the effect of increasing the diversion of water from Lake Michigan into the Illinois Waterway for navigation, and for other purposes.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I do not wish to detain the Senate at too great length. On the other hand, I have a great deal of information before me. I know that Senators are weary. Members of the press who are compelled to cover the Senate are probably also weary. So I shall try to make this presentation as brief as possible.

The Senator from Alabama has emphasized a point which is very solid and very right, and that is that we should debate the subject at greater length. However, I think he will agree that it is extremely important that we debate it at a time and in such a way that the maximum number of Senators can be present to hear the discussion. For that reason I shall speak rather briefly at this time.

I now wish to address myself to my substitute for the first committee amendment. It is not merely a pro forma substitute. I am not sure that 180 miles is the correct figure. Perhaps it should be 185, 195, or 200. It is difficult to tell. Perhaps another amendment, involving a greater mileage, might be in order at a later date, when we receive information to the effect that the study of the currents of Lake Michigan indicates that an additional mileage is in order.

I hold in my hand the hearings on water diversion from Lake Michigan. On page 355 there is a map. The map indicates the currents. Why the committee chose 175 miles is difficult to discover. I questioned the chairman of the subcommittee at great length the other day as to why the committee chose 175 miles. As I recall, there was no precise justification for that particular distance. The map would seem to indicate that the mileage should be substantially greater than that. The major cities of Sheboygan, almost certainly Manitowoc, and by all means Kewaunee, Green Bay, and Marinette, are well beyond the 170-mile limit. It is my understanding that those cities would be affected by this current, and that therefore they deserve the same protection as does the southern half of the lake.

I raised this point and offered this amendment because it seemed that the benefits of the study were going almost exclusively to the city of Chicago.

One of the provisions in the bill is that the Federal Government shall pay for the whole study. The amendment which some of us have considered provides that Chicago shall pay for all the study, or perhaps half the study.

ORDER LIMITING STATEMENTS IN THE MORNING HOUR TOMORROW TO 3 MINUTES

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield again, and under the same circumstances?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I am glad to yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, under the rule, there be the usual morning hour tomorrow, with statements limited to 3 minutes.

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

DIVERSION OF WATER FROM LAKE MICHIGAN, AT CHICAGO

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 1) to require a study to be conducted of the effect of increasing the diversion of water from Lake Michigan into the Illinois Waterway for navigation, and for other purposes.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the amendment itself provides that the studies shall include the effect of the diversion of 1,000 additional cubic feet on the levels of the Great Lakes. Of course, that is included in the text of the bill. But I think this is something which either should not be done or, if it should be done, should be paid for by someone other than the Federal Government, instead of permitting a waste of money, because we know, and we know perfectly well, what the effect of the additional diversion will be on the level of Lake Michigan.

Furthermore, the effect of permanent diversion is quite different from the effect of a 1-year temporary diversion. What is more, the effect of a 1-year temporary diversion cannot, in the judgment of the best experts, the Corps of Engineers, be fully appreciated for at least 15 years. When will the report come in? It will come in only after 3 years.

It is perfectly obvious that for the Federal Government to appropriate a million dollars under those circumstances, some of which is directed to be spent on the effect of a permanent diversion of the lake level, is ridiculous and is, on the face of it, a waste of money.

I think everyone, including the senior Senator from Illinois, stipulates that it is already well known what the effect of the permanent diversion will be on the lake level.

Mr. President, I have a large amount of material to which I should like very much to call the attention of Senators, but the hour is late. In view of the fact that very few Senators are now on the floor, I yield the floor at this time.

SPOKANE VALLEY PROJECT—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 994) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Spokane Valley project, Washington and Idaho, under Federal reclamation laws. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HART in the chair). The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of today, p. 17430, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

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, without amendment, the following bills of the Senate:

S. 300. An act to amend the act of August 28, 1958, establishing a study commission for certain river basins, so as to provide for the apportionment to such commission of separate representatives for the Guadalupe and San Antonio River Basins, and of a representative of the Texas Board of Water Engineers;

S. 417. An act to place in trust status certain lands on the Standing Rock Sioux Reservation in North Dakota and South Dakota;

S. 551. An act to declare portions of Bayous Terrebonne and LeCarpe, La., to be nonnavigable streams;

S. 1221. An act to amend the act authorizing the Crooked River Federal reclamation project, Oregon, in order to increase the capacity of certain project features for future irrigation of additional lands;

S. 1448. An act to change the name of the Abraham Lincoln National Historical Park at Hodgenville, Ky., to Abraham Lincoln Birthplace National Historic Site;

S. 1453. An act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to sell and convey certain lands in the State of Iowa to the city of Keosauqua;

S. 1521. An act to provide for the removal of the restriction on use with respect to a certain tract of land in Cumberland County, Tenn., conveyed to the State of Tennessee in 1938;

S. 1645. An act to amend section 4161 of title 18, United States Code, relating to computation of good time allowance for prisoners;

S. 1647. An act to amend section 4083, title 18, United States Code, relating to penitentiary imprisonment;

S. 1947. An act relating to the authority of the Customs Court to appoint employees, and for other purposes;

S. 2013. An act 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;

S. 2029. An act to authorize a per capita distribution of funds arising from a judgment in favor of the Confederated Tribe of Siletz Indians in the State of Oregon, and for other purposes;

S. 2118. An act to amend section 4488 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, to authorize the Secretary of the Department in which the Coast Guard is operating to prescribe regulations governing lifesaving equipment, firefighting equipment, muster lists, ground tackle, hawsers, and bilge systems aboard vessels, and for other purposes;

S. 2334. An act to transfer from the Department of Commerce to the Department of Labor certain functions in respect to insurance benefits and disability payments to seamen for World War II service-connected injuries, death, or disability, and for other purposes;

S. 2339. An act to amend the law relating to the distribution of the funds of the Creek Tribe;

S. 2421. An act to amend the Klamath Termination Act; and

S. 2435. An act to provide that certain funds in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the Confederated Bands of Ute Indians be transferred to the credit of the Ute Mountain Tribe of the Ute Mountain Reservation, Colo.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 994) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Spokane Valley project, Washington and Idaho, under Federal reclamation laws.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 6596) 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.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the following joint resolutions of the House:

H.J. Res. 406. Joint resolution to facilitate the admission into the United States of certain aliens; and

H.J. Res. 444. Joint resolution for the relief of certain aliens.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 445) to facilitate the admission into the United States of certain aliens.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, August 31, 1959, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 2539) to extend and amend laws relating to the provision and improvement of housing and the renewal of urban communities, and for other purposes.

RECESS UNTIL 11 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, in accordance with the order previously entered, I move that the Senate recess until 11 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 55 minutes p.m.) the Senate took a recess, in accordance with the order previously entered, until tomorrow, Tuesday, September 1, 1959, at 11 o'clock a.m.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, AUGUST 31, 1959

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Isaiah 58: 11: *The Lord shall guide thee continually.*

O Thou who hast revealed Thyself as the Guiding Intelligence, grant that we may meet and master the difficult problems of this new week with an indomitable faith and the fortitude of an unconquerable soul.

May we never feel that we are the victims of fate and that the odds are against us as we face obstacles that seem to be insurmountable.

Help us to declare courageously that we are ready to follow without question or compromise whatsoever things are true and righteous.

We beseech Thee to establish deeply within us those resources and reserves which will enable us to carry on bravely when the winds are contrary and our strength is in danger of being depleted.

Hear us in the name of our blessed Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, August 27, 1959, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

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

H.R. 2886. An act to suspend for 3 years the import duties on certain classifications of spun silk yarn.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 981. An act for the relief of T. W. Holt & Co.; and

S. 1015. An act for the relief of Continental Hosiery Mills, Inc., of Henderson, N.C., successor to Continental Hosiery Co., of Henderson, N.C.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 6939) entitled "An act to repeal the act of October 20, 1914 (38 Stat. 741), as amended (48 U.S.C., secs. 432–452), and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 8374) entitled "An act to amend Public Law 85–880, and for other purposes."

AMENDING PUBLIC LAW 86–118

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of House Joint Resolution 510, a continuing resolution.

The Clerk read the House joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 1 of the Act of July 31, 1959 (Public Law 86–118), is hereby amended by striking out "August 31, 1959" and inserting in lieu thereof "September 30, 1959".

SEC. 2. The amounts appropriated by section 2 of Public Law 86–118 are hereby increased as follows: Mutual security programs from "$300,000,000" to "$430,000,000".

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, the pending resolution makes temporary provision beyond today for continuing those agencies and programs for which the regular supply bills have not become law. They are:

Independent offices bill—1 amendment unsettled.

Military construction—in conference.

Mutual security—in Senate committee.

Public works—veto message pending House action.

On appropriation bills sent to the President this session, the budget estimates for appropriations have been reduced by the net sum of $372,200,778, including the public works bill vetoed by the President last week. The final appropriations reduction will be increased several times over when the remaining bills are finally processed.

The House joint resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMUNICATION FROM CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House, which was read:

AUGUST 28, 1959.

The Honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

SIR: I have the honor to transmit herewith a sealed envelope addressed to the Speaker of the House of Representatives from the President of the United States, received in the Clerk's office at 3:15 p.m. on August 28, 1959, and said to contain a veto message on H.R. 7509, "An act making appropriations for civil functions administered by the Department of the Army, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, and the Tennessee Valley Authority for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, and for other purposes."

Respectfully yours,

RALPH R. ROBERTS,
Clerk, U.S. House of Representatives.

PUBLIC WORKS APPROPRIATION BILL, 1960—VETO MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 222)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following veto message from the President of the United States:

To the House of Representatives:

I return herewith, without my approval H.R. 7509, a bill making appropriations for civil functions administered by the Department of the Army, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, and the Tennessee Valley Authority, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, and for other purposes.

This public works appropriation bill for fiscal 1960 includes 67 unbudgeted projects estimated eventually to cost over $800 million. It ignores the necessity for an orderly development of America's water resources within the Nation's fiscal ability.

Without any of the unbudget projects provided for in this measure, 1960 expenditures for the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation will reach $1.1 billion—an alltime high and almost three-quarters again as much as the expenditure level in fiscal 1955. Moreover, just to carry on construction currently underway will require by 1962 even higher expenditures—approaching twice as much as those of fiscal 1955—and will ultimately cost $6 billion.

These future expenditure commitments result largely from the fact that in the last 4 years the Congress has added to budgeted construction over 200 unbudgeted starts, involving total costs of nearly $3.8 billion. In view of these commitments, I recommended in the January budget message that no funds be appropriated to start additional projects in 1960.

This tremendous expansion in Government expenditures in just this one area in so short a period of time brings into sharp focus how Congress by action in one year builds increases into the Federal budget in future years. For example, although the cost of the unbudgeted projects in H.R. 7509 will be relatively small in fiscal 1960—about $50 million—their ultimate cost will be more than $800 million. This illustrates how easily effective control of Federal spending can be lost.

Overspending in respect to water resources is hurtful to the United States and to the proper development of these resources themselves. The American people are opposed to overspending no matter where it is attempted.

The unbudgeted projects provided for in this bill will, at the proper time, make an important contribution to the economic development of the areas in which they are to be built and to the Nation as a whole. But by any sound test of urgency, these projects should not be started this year if we are to have a responsible Federal fiscal policy. I believe that the American people look to the Government to see that their tax money is spent only on necessary projects and according to a priority as to urgency that does not weaken our financial structure nor add to the tremendous debt burden that posterity will have to pay.

I urge the Congress to enact a new bill appropriating funds only to finance projects now under construction and other going programs. If the Congress continues its refusal, in the case of the Trinity River project, to save $60 million of taxpayers' money through providing for construction of electric power facilities by non-Federal interests, such new bill should of necessity include funds to provide for Federal construction of such facilities, since the dam is now being built and it is essential that power facilities be in place when the reservoir is full.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *August 26, 1959.*

The SPEAKER. The objection of the President will be spread at large upon the Journal and, without objection, the bill and message will be printed as a House Document.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further consideration be postponed until Wednesday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON ATOMIC ENERGY

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the resolution (H. Res. 356) to authorize printing of additional copies of the Joint Committee print entitled "Summary-Analysis of Hearings on Biological and Environmental Effects of Nuclear War."

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy be authorized to have printed for its use, at a cost not to exceed $1,200, additional copies of the Joint Committee print entitled "Summary-Analysis of Hearings on Biological and Environmental Effects of Nuclear War" prepared by the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy during the Eighty-sixth Congress, first session.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at the end of the proceedings today and to include an address by Ernest O. Thompson, chairman, Texas Railroad Commission, on Oil Centennial Celebration.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

HIRING OF OLDER PERSONS IN PRIVATE INDUSTRY

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill to encourage the hiring of older persons in private industry. It is an identical measure to H.R. 8695, introduced by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PUCINSKI].

One of the most difficult problems facing millions of middle-aged and elderly persons is the difficulty of finding jobs. Many companies refuse to hire persons over age 45, not because they are not experienced or capable of doing the job well, but because of higher costs of providing insurance, pension plan benefits, and other fringe benefits for which they would be eligible.

The bill would give employers full tax credit for the additional cost of hiring people of advanced age. It would permit the employer to compute what it costs him in fringe benefits for younger and older age group employees, and to receive a tax credit for the difference. Thus, he would be completely relieved of the additional cost of hiring older workers.

From personal experience I know the extent of job discrimination based on age and the hardships which it brings to these persons and their families. Many residents of my district faced with this discrimination have written to me to urge that the Government recognize this problem and find a way to solve it.

We cannot afford to waste the skills and productive capacity of our people merely because they are over a certain age. These persons are entitled to the chance to work and earn a decent living for themselves and their families. I am hopeful that this legislation will offer a workable solution to this problem.

REPORT OF THE BOARD OF VISITORS TO THE U.S. COAST GUARD ACADEMY, NEW LONDON, CONN., MAY 1, 1959

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert a report at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, the report is as follows:

THE PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE.
THE SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

GENTLEMEN: Pursuant to section 194 of title 14 of the United States Code, the following Senators and Members of the House of Representatives were designated to constitute the 1959 Board of Visitors to the U.S. Coast Guard Academy.

By the President of the Senate: Senator PRESCOTT BUSH, Republican, Connecticut.

By the chairman of the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce: Senator E. L. (BOB) BARTLETT, Democrat, Alaska; Senator NORRIS COTTON, Republican, New Hampshire.

By the Speaker of the House of Representatives: Representative CHESTER BOWLES, Democrat, Connecticut; Representative WILLIAM B. WIDNALL, Republican, New Jersey.

By the chairman, House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries: Representative GEORGE P. MILLER, Democrat, California; Representative ALTON LENNON, Democrat, North Carolina; Representative WILLIAM S. MAILLIARD, Republican, California.

Ex officio members: Senator WARREN G. MAGNUSON, Democrat, Washington (chairman, Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce); Representative HERBERT C. BONNER, Democrat, North Carolina (chairman, House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries).

MEETING

A meeting of the Board of Visitors was held at the Academy on May 1, 1959. The following members of the Board were present: Senator E. L. BARTLETT, Democrat, of Alaska, Representative GEORGE P. MILLER, Democrat, of California; Representative WILLIAM B. WIDNALL, Republican, of New Jersey; Representative CHESTER BOWLES, Democrat, of Connecticut; Representative WILLIAM S. MAILLIARD, Republican, of California; Representative ALTON LENNON, Democrat, of North Carolina.

The following officials of the U.S. Coast Guard were also present from headquarters: Vice Adm. A. C. Richmond, Commandant; Rear Adm. R. M. Ross, Chief of the Office of Personnel; Capt. G. R. Boyce, Jr., Chief of the Training and Procurement Division; and Capt. David O. Reed, liaison officer. From the Academy: Rear Adm. F. A. Leamy, Superintendent; Capt. J. A. Alger, Jr., Assistant Superintendent; Capt. A. A. Lawrence, head, Humanities Department; and Capt. W. J. Smith, Commandant of Cadets.

INSPECTION OF GROUNDS AND BUILDINGS AND REVIEW OF THE CORPS OF CADETS

Upon arrival at the Academy, the Board, accompanied by the Coast Guard officers, inspected the grounds and buildings. Following the inspection, the Cadet Regiment passed in review before the members of the Board. The Board then had lunch with the Corps of Cadets.

BOARD SESSION

The Board members were joined by Admiral Richmond, Admiral Leamy, Admiral Ross, Captain Alger, Captain Lawrence, Captain Smith, and Captain Boyce in formal session. Representative MILLER was unanimously elected Chairman of the 1959 Board of Visitors.

SYNOPSIS OF THE MINUTES OF THE BOARD SESSION

1. The Superintendent made a brief summary, outlined herein, of the formal report submitted to the Board, discussing its most important aspects.

2. The Superintendent stated that the corps of cadets at present consists of 571 cadets, including a graduating class of 80. The top 300 of the successful candidates for this year's entering class received notice of their appointment to the Academy. The new class is expected to number about 200. The attrition rate has dropped 10 percent without lowering any of the academic or adaptability standards. This reduction has been obtained primarily through the assignment of company officers to keep a closer supervision over the cadets. The attrition rate is expected to level off at 50 percent.

3. Upon questioning by the Board, the following additional facts were reported. About 35 percent of an entering class are lost due to involuntary resignations which result from academic failures, conduct deficiency or physical deficiency. About 30 percent resign voluntarily, primarily because they decide, after a period of time at the Academy, that they do not desire a career in the Coast Guard. Many find that they do not like the regimentation, organization, and the strict discipline which go with any military organization. On arrival, they frequently do not know enough about the Coast Guard to choose to make a career of it, therefore, every attempt is made to motivate a cadet to remain at the Academy. Between 7 and 10 percent resign during the fourth class summer training program, prior to returning to the Academy for regular courses. The Coast Guard Academy's attrition rate is higher than the Military Academy's 28 to 32 percent. The Naval Academy's attrition figure is approximately the same as at West Point, whereas, the Coast Guard Academy has been graduating about 35 percent of entering classes. The higher academic failure rate is believed to be a result of more difficult academic courses. Some of the voluntary resignations are probably caused by a feeling that the Coast Guard Academy has insufficient prestige compared to the Military and Naval Academies which are well known nationally.

4. The Commandant stated that before World War II, attrition of officers during the first 10 years of service was very small. After the war, the loss was terrific. The Coast Guard was losing approximately one-third of its Academy graduates. The obligated service was increased from 3 to 4 years. In an attempt to get reasons for this large increase in resignations, the Commandant wrote a letter to each officer to try to determine the reason why each resigned. Most of the reasons implied that they felt they would be better off financially following some other career. Besides the economic reason for leaving the service, some left because of the lack of home life—others because of benefits not available that were available to other servicemen. Another outstanding reason was the lack of medical services in many areas for Coast Guard dependents. This latter problem was eliminated with the passing of the medicare bill. Although the last pay increase helped to reduce attrition, it is believed the change in the economic situation in the country was more responsible for a reduction. Another important factor appears to be that the cadets are coming to the Academy with a better appreciation of the Academy and the Coast Guard. A further factor in the reduction of attrition, ironically, was the withdrawal of accreditation by the Engineer's Council of Professional Development. Prior to that time, some cadets accepted appointments solely because they felt they were getting a free engineering education. They were not planning to be career officers. Since the Academy no longer has this accreditation, the number of cadets who desire only an engineering education in lieu of a Coast Guard career is diminishing. This year only 10 to 12 graduates have resigned after their 4 years obligated service. During a recent field trip to isolated stations, it was noticed that the attitude of the officers assigned is entirely different from that noted on earlier tours. While isolated duty still is not considered desirable, by officers, it does not appear to be an important factor in causing them to resign. Further reasons for past attrition were the lack of career motivation of many cadets who entered the Academy during the Korean War and the fact that one Academy academic department head, no longer on the staff, appeared to require an excessively high academic standard.

5. A member of the Board commented on the possibility of developing more of a liberal arts background at the Academy. The Board was advised that this development is to be considered at the conference of Superintendents of the four service academies this year.

6. The Commandant stated that a sound reason for keeping the Coast Guard Academy course somewhat more technical than other service academies is because the Coast Guard is unable, due to operations commitments, to provide postgraduate training for its officers on as large a scale as other services. Therefore, they must receive the technical knowledge they need primarily while at the Academy. Other services have a much larger percentage of their officer personnel in training at any one time than the Coast Guard.

7. A member of the Board suggested the possibility of increasing the authorized number of Coast Guard officers to permit sending more officers to postgraduate training. This would allow a reduced level of technical training at the Academy and should result in a more favorable attrition rate.

8. The Commandant stated that the Academy course is definitely an engineering type and its attrition rate is not unfavorable when compared to engineering schools generally. He reported that the curriculum at the Academy has proven sound when considered in the light of the academic achievements of officers who take postgraduate training at engineering schools, such as Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

9. Additional statistics shown to the Board indicated that the attrition rate is presently down. For example, in 1956–57, 15 percent had to resign for academic failure. Last year only 5 percent were required to resign for this reason.

10. The Academy Commandant of Cadets stated that since all cadets come from the top 10 percent of the high school population, he believed that a further reduction in the academic standards would be possible without seriously affecting the basic competence of the Academy graduates.

11. The Superintendent reported that the first conference of the Superintendents of the four service academies which was initiated by the Superintendent, U.S. Coast Guard Academy, was so successful that the four Superintendents decided to make it a regular annual conference, rotated at the four academies. He also reported that the separate Officer Indoctrination School, consisting of the Officer Candidate School, the General Service School, and the Merchant Marine Safety School, will be transferred to the Coast Guard Reserve Training Center, Yorktown, Va., on July 1, 1959.

12. The Superintendent briefly outlined the 1958 Congressional Board of Visitors recommendations, including the establishment of an order of priority for projects for the improvement of the physical plant. He then discussed the construction, alterations, and improvement projects in the order of priority as follows:

(a) Extension of class space: Construction, alterations, and improvements to existing Academy buildings to provide additional classrooms and laboratories for the increased student enrollment. Estimated cost, $200,000.

(b) Maintenance building: Construction of a maintenance building to provide adequate facilities for all maintenance equipment, shops, and storerooms, office space, etc. Estimated cost, $555,000.

(c) Auditorium: Construction of an auditorium to replace the existing, deteriorated, hazardous, temporary, wooden, World War II structure with a permanent building of larger capacity. This building will be used to provide the cadets and faculty with the cultural and intellectual advantages of stimulating lectures and outstanding musical performances and to provide for student convocations and graduation exercises. Estimated cost, $990,000.

(d) Student activities building: Construction of a student activities building to replace the existing, deteriorated, hazardous, temporary, wooden, World War II structure with a permanent building, adequate in size to provide facilities for the extracurricular activities of the cadets and for the recreational and social activities of the cadets and faculty. Estimated cost, $1,125,000.

(e) Fieldhouse: Construct a fieldhouse to replace the existing, deteriorated, temporary, wooden, World War II structure with a permanent building of adequate size to provide the necessary facilities for the character building, leadership training, and physical development for the corps in the program of

physical education, intramural and intercollegiate athletic competitions. Estimated cost, $660,000.

(f) Concrete grandstand: Construct a concrete grandstand to replace the existing, deteriorating, wooden grandstands to provide enlarged and safe seating facilities for the corps of cadets, alumni, and the general public. Estimated cost $200,000.

(g) Wooden docks and causeways: Make major repairs to the wooden docks and causeways. The existing structures are deteriorating to the point where use is now restricted to light vehicles. Large vehicles transporting stores, supplies, and so forth, to vessels at the docks are denied access due to the unsafe conditions of the ramps and docks. Estimated cost $700,000.

(h) Additional playing fields: Reclaiming to land north and riverward of present area to provide additional playing fields for the expanded size of the corps of cadets. Estimated cost of the necessary fill and bulkheading, $1,315,000.

(i) Main entrance: Relocate the main entrance to eliminate the existing and increasing traffic hazards of access from and egress to the main highway. Estimated cost $50,000.

(j) Officers quarters: Construct four additional buildings each containing two family quarters for the senior staff officers and enlargement of the Superintendent's quarters to provide adequate accommodations and facilities for the increasing number of official guests visiting or in attendance at Academy functions. Estimated cost $500,000. Several Board members, the Commandant and other Coast Guard officers discussed various cost aspects of this project.

(k) Enlisted men's recreation building: Construct a building to provide adequate recreational facilities for the 270 enlisted men and their families. Estimated cost $260,000.

(l) Total estimated cost: Total estimated cost of all projects $6,565,000.

13. The Board then discussed at length with the Commandant, the Superintendent and the other officers present, the problems involved in obtaining funds for these projects.

14. The Board questioned if any difficulties remained in regard to the supervision of cadets by newly commissioned, inexperienced Reserve officers. The Board was informed that this problem had been satisfactorily resolved.

15. The Board asked and received clarification on a statement made during this session in regard to a department head at the Academy being able to influence the attrition rate by a personal policy of strict grading.

16. The Board, after considerable discussion, decided to arrange a meeting with the Secretary of Treasury to bring to his attention its views on the needs of the Coast Guard Academy as developed during the inspection and Board session.

CONCLUSION

The Board commends the Superintendent, Rear Adm. F. A. Leamy, and his staff for their efforts in maintaining the high standards of this institution, and the excellent caliber of the cadet corps. The Board wishes to extend its thanks to Vice Adm. A. C. Richmond, Commandant; Rear Adm. R. M. Ross, Chief of the Office of Personnel; Capt. G. R. Boyce, Jr., Chief of the Training and Procurement Division; and Capt. David O. Reed, liaison officer, for the assistance rendered to them. The Chairman and members of the Board wish to express their appreciation to the regimental officers, class presidents, and other members of the cadet corps for their very helpful assistance to the Board in expressing their views on the functioning of the Academy. The Board earnestly recommends to all Members of the Senate and House of Representatives that they assist in every way possible in bringing the Coast Guard Academy to the attention of eligible candidates, and urging their constituents to participate in the nationwide competitive examination to be held on February 23 and 24, 1960.

The Board urges all Members of the Senate and House of Representatives and particularly the Members of the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries to visit the Academy, inspect its grounds and buildings, classrooms and laboratories, and judge for themselves its facilities and needs.

GEORGE P. MILLER, *Chairman.*
E. L. BARTLETT.
WILLIAM B. WIDNALL.
CHESTER BOWLES.
ALTON LENNON.
WILLIAM S. MAILLIARD

GOOD LOBBYING SHOULD BE ENCOURAGED

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. 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 Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I am putting in the RECORD a copy of the letter that Sidney Zagri sent to Life magazine in answer to the charge that he had used improper lobbying techniques in presenting the Teamsters Union position on labor reform legislation.

I observed Mr. Zagri's lobbying techniques and discussed them with many of my colleagues. Mr. Zagri is a constituent of mine and I was interested for that and other reasons. To date I have heard only vague charges such as the one in Life's editorial and a recent article in Time magazine that his techniques were other than proper. These rumors have been unsubstantiated.

I am quite disturbed at this constant attack on lobbying by all sides. The attack on lobbying and lobbyists is an improper technique in itself to pass or defeat legislation. These attacks have contributed greatly to the disinclination of the public to participate in their government, in politics, if you please. After all if we are to have representative government the people must participate in it through their representatives and in choosing and electing their representatives. Lobbying in essence is nothing more than the people participating in their government. It should be encouraged not discouraged.

There are improper lobbying techniques. Falsely accusing another of improper lobbying techniques is itself an improper technique. These improper techniques should be attacked but when they are attacked one should be careful to make it clear that it is the improper technique not lobbying itself that is the basis of the adverse criticism. Good lobbying should be encouraged.

Frankly, I have been shocked by both Time and Life magazines. Nor is it just Time and Life. They merely reflect an approach to public debate that is all too common today in our country. But Time and Life seek the image of promoters of the best in public morals and to a great degree they deserve this image.

I want to say something else. I think a great deal of the criticism of the letter of James Carey is just as off base as some of the things Carey said in his letter. The fact that his letter said his group was going to try to beat those who had voted for the Landrum-Griffin bill I thought was perfectly proper. If we want our people active in Government they certainly should try to beat representatives they think are not good and elect those they think are good. My quarrel with Carey is that he does not think people can disagree with him unless they are tools, bigots, or uninterested in the welfare of the common man. I answered his letter by accepting his challenge at the polls, but appealing to him to keep the public debate on the facts and logic of the issue and off the attacks on the integrity of those with whom he disagreed.

Lest there be any misunderstanding I should mention that I basically disagree with Mr. Zagri on the Landrum-Griffin bill. I voted for it after thorough study and with conviction that this was in the best interests of the general public and of the unions themselves. Furthermore, the powerful Teamsters union headed by Harold Gibbons, another one of my constituents, has provided the basis of my opposition each time I run for election in a district which has powerful labor organization. There is little question in my mind that they will continue to provide this opposition.

Here is Mr. Zagri's letter. I think it is up to his accusers to prove their case. I will be happy to place in the RECORD the reply the editors of Life make to Mr. Zagri:

AUGUST 4, 1959.

EDITOR, LIFE MAGAZINE,
New York City, N.Y.

DEAR SIR: The editorial in Life's issue of July 27, titled "Danger: Hoffa Man at Work," is so grossly inaccurate and so brazenly unfair to the Teamsters and to myself that I cannot let it pass without a protest.

First of all, I most emphatically deny that I have ever threatened any Member of Congress with political reprisals of any kind, no matter how they choose to vote. I have far too much respect for our Nation's lawmakers to approach any of them with anything but the most complete courtesy. I hereby challenge any of the three Representatives you mention, Mr. UDALL, Mr. THOMPSON, or Mrs. GREEN to cite one example of unethical conduct on my part.

I might add that you are completely wrong regarding the lady from Oregon's unladylike departure from character. She most certainly never used the phrase you quote to me and I'm sure she never would.

Never at any time have I used the name of Speaker RAYBURN and again I challenge you to cite a single occasion on which I have.

We of labor are well aware that the right kind of labor reform legislation would benefit the Nation, just as business reform legislation would also, but we are convinced that none of the bills now under consideration could possibly do anything but great harm to all organized labor.

In this connection, informed labor relations experts are well aware of the ironic fact that the Teamsters Union, admittedly the prime target of all the proposed new

measures, would survive under even the toughest bill, whereas most other unions could not.

Nevertheless, we of the Temasters Union, as members of organized labor, undertook a drive to defeat pending laws which we feel to be punitive rather than corrective, and which we fear would eventually eradicate all the great gains made by labor since the Wagner Act emancipated the working man. In every case when we have opposed a measure which we considered harmful to labor we have suggested an alternative which we felt would be of actual benefit.

Since our campaign began we have followed the classic patterns adhered to by groups seeking to enlighten and influence their congressional representatives:

1. We met with Congressmen, most of whom were unaware of the key punitive sections of the proposed bills, and explained to them just why we objected to these sections.

2. We urged our members to contact their Congressmen and voice their feelings on such antilabor measures.

3. We sought wherever possible to bring about personal meetings between Congressmen and their constituents for discussions of the merits and demerits of the pending bills.

Our methods resemble nothing so much as your own when you urge, as you have repeatedly, that your readers contact their Congressmen and demand severe new labor reform laws, and they are no more sinister and no more "dirty" to quote from your editorial.

We are using the most fundamental of the democratic processes: Let your Congressman know how you feel about something he is going to vote on. If informing our own members of the activities and voting records of their Congressmen is unfair pressure then there is not an important segment of American business that is not equally unfair, because this is standard procedure. If, as Life magazine wrote, Speaker RAYBURN himself offered to campaign personally on behalf of any one in Congress who feels that his chances of reelection have been endangered by my activities, then we are certainly justified in campaigning for what we believe to be right.

In closing, to attribute to me so much power—as your editorial does—is absurd and unrealistic. The opposition arrayed against the other labor spokesmen and myself consists of an almost limitless army of lobbyists, lawyers, and public relations experts, backed by inexhaustible money and resources of every kind, all of them under direct orders from the enemies of labor to stop at nothing until organized labor as we know it today is destroyed forever.

Yours truly,

SIDNEY ZAGRI,
Legislative Representative.

THE STEEL STRIKE

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, many people have asked my views about the steel strike. Here are the observations I have made.

The way we get an increased standard of living is through increased productivity. In other words, due to new inventions and new ways of doing things, the same men can produce more goods. Then we have increased productivity.

The gain should be split three ways. One for labor, in increased wages; two for the investor, in increased investment and in dividends; and three for the consumer, in lower prices.

It now becomes apparent that in the steel industry the split has only been going two ways. Labor has been getting increased wages so that they are about the highest paid labor in America, and the investor has been getting dividends, plus a high increase in the value of his investment. But the consumer has been forgotten. The price of steel has not been decreased, in fact, it has been increased.

Fortunately, in the private enterprise system there are some automatic checks that will prevent any industry, even one as basic as the steel industry, from getting too far out of line in neglecting the consumer. One of the checks is becoming apparent—that of foreign competition. Foreign steel is beginning to come into the American market in large quantities. The second of these checks is competition from substitute materials. It is true that in many places where steel has to be used probably no substitute can be employed, but in many areas plastics and other materials can and do replace steel, if steel prices remain too high.

Sometimes the consumer has to wait a little bit for this marketplace operation to show its effect. Wise management and wise labor will anticipate the market operation, instead of waiting for it to hit. The Government's place is to preserve real competition in the marketplace and real collective bargaining in labor-management relations.

There are many people who, just as soon as an issue arises, want the Federal Government to rush in to solve it, instead of waiting for the marketplace to operate. I think one of the most damaging things that could happen would be for the Federal Government to move into the steel strike prematurely. Government control of prices or wages is a very poor second best to the operation of the marketplace. As long as competition and collective bargaining are real, the consumer will be assured his share of increased productivity, and the whole society will gain in a higher standard of living.

PENDING NOMINATIONS FOR U.S. JUDGESHIPS

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, I was pleased to see that the American Bar Association at the end of last week took strong action criticizing the majority side of the other body for failing to confirm 20 Presidential nominees for U.S. judgeships. The Federal courts of this country are far behind in disposing of the backlog of cases to be tried. In the southern district of New York alone it takes 2 years to get a civil jury case to trial. There are two distinguished lawyers who have been nominated to the trial court bench who have not been confirmed, although they were nominated in March.

It is a disgrace for this condition to continue, and it is imperative that the public become aware of the fact that no action has been taken yet to confirm these presidential nominees to the Federal courts of this country.

ARRESTMENT OF SEAMEN'S WAGES

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (S. 1958) to amend title 46, United States Code, section 601, to clarify types of arrestment prohibited with respect to wages of United States seamen, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BONNER]?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. NO. 1072)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 1958) to amend title 46, United States Code, section 601, to clarify types of arrestment prohibited with respect to wages of United States seamen, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House to the text of the bill and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following: "That the second sentence of section 12 of the Act of March 4, 1915 (38 Stat. 1169; 46 U.S.C. 601), is amended by striking out the period at the end thereof and inserting a colon in lieu thereof and the following: '*And provided further*, That no part of the wages due or accruing to a master, officer, or any other seaman who is a member of the crew on a vessel engaged in the foreign, coastwise, intercoastal, interstate, or noncontiguous trade shall be withheld pursuant to the provisions of the tax laws of any State, Territory, possession, or Commonwealth, or a subdivision of any of them.' "

And the House agree to the same.

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House to the title of the bill and agree to the same.

HERBERT C. BONNER,
GEORGE P. MILLER,
HERBERT ZELENKO,
THOR C. TOLLEFSON,
JOHN H. RAY,
Managers on the Part of the House.

WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
JOHN O. PASTORE,
CLAIR ENGLE,
E. L. BARTLETT,
JOHN M. BUTLER,
THRUSTON B. MORTON,
HUGH SCOTT,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 1958) to amend title 46, United States Code, section 601, to clarify types of arrestment prohibited with respect to wages of United States seamen submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

Both the Senate bill and the House amendment would prohibit a State, Territory, possession or Commonwealth, or a subdivision of any of them, acting pursuant to its tax laws, from withholding wages of seamen who are crew members of a vessel engaged in certain specified types of trade.

The Senate bill and the House amendment differ significantly in three respects.

First, the Senate bill is temporary since it is limited to the period prior to September 1, 1961. The House amendment contained no such time limit.

Second, the Senate bill referred only to a "seaman" while the House amendment spoke of "master, officer, or any other seaman."

Third, the Senate bill referred to certain specified types of trade, one of which was "interstate" trade. The House amendment omitted interstate trade from the specified type of trade.

The conference agreement is identical with the House amendment with the exception of the inclusion of interstate trade in the specified types of trade referred to in the legislation.

The House and Senate committee reports on this legislation pointed out the urgent and important need for clarification of the act of March 4, 1915 (46 U.S.C. 601), due to serious problems created by conflicting Federal court decisions interpreting the law. As matters now stand, shipowners are on the horns of a dilemma. Enactment of this legislation will resolve the complicated questions resulting from attempts by shipowners to follow a myriad of State withholding tax laws and a growing number of such laws in subdivisions of States such as counties, municipalities, and, in at least one case, a school district. The conferees considered the fact that such State and local withholding tax laws vary widely as to the scope of their coverage and the amounts to be withheld. Consideration of this legislation thus brought out the existence of tax problems of very great complexity involved in the withholding of State and local income and wage taxes as it affects persons whose salaries and wages are derived from interstate and foreign activities, both in the cases of persons who are residents of the State or locality for whose benefit the tax is withheld, and of persons who are nonresidents of such State or locality.

One of the purposes of the expiration date in the Senate bill was to give impetus to an examination and study by the Congress of these problems. The conference agreement does not contain any expiration date, however, because it was agreed that the matter of a study of tax laws should be undertaken by committees other than the committees having cognizance of the act in conference. Nevertheless, it was the unanimous agreement of the conferees that this statement should contain a recommendation that there be a thorough examination by the appropriate committees of the Congress of the entire question of multiple taxation involving businesses engaged in interstate commerce. If and when, through such a study, the complex questions of the various systems of State taxation of interstate commerce are resolved, there will be time to review this particular statute again.

HERBERT C. BONNER,
GEORGE P. MILLER,
HERBERT ZELENKO,
THOR C. TOLLEFSON,
JOHN H. RAY,
Managers on the Part of the House.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON ELECTIONS, COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BONNER. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Elections of the Committee on House Administration may be permitted to sit today during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

ARRESTMENT OF SEAMEN'S WAGES

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently no quorum is present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 149]

Adair	Cramer	Griffin
Albert	Curtis, Mass.	Hall
Andrews	Dague	Halleck
Anfuso	Delaney	Halpern
Ashley	Dent	Hardy
Barden	Denton	Hargis
Barrett	Derounian	Harris
Barry	Derwinski	Harrison
Bass, N.H.	Devine	Healey
Baumhart	Diggs	Hébert
Becker	Dollinger	Hess
Bentley	Donohue	Holifield
Blitch	Dooley	Holtzman
Boggs	Dorn, S.C.	Irwin
Bolton	Dulski	Jackson
Bosch	Farbstein	Jarman
Bowles	Fino	Jennings
Boyle	Flynn	Johnson, Md.
Brewster	Flynt	Jones, Ala.
Brock	Fogarty	Jones, Mo.
Buckley	Ford	Kelly
Burke, Ky.	Frazier	Keogh
Burke, Mass.	Frelinghuysen	Kilburn
Byrne, Pa.	Friedel	Kluczynski
Canfield	Gary	Lane
Casey	Giaimo	Lesinski
Coffin	Glenn	McDonough
Conte	Gray	McGovern
Cook	Green, Oreg.	Macdonald
Cooley	Green, Pa.	Machrowicz
Martin	Quigley	Taylor
Mason	Rabaut	Teague, Calif.
Minshall	Reece, Tenn.	Teague, Tex.
Mitchell	Rhodes, Ariz.	Teller
Monagan	Riehlman	Thompson, La.
Montoya	Rodino	Toll
Morris, N. Mex.	Rogers, Tex.	Van Pelt
Nix	Rooney	Van Zandt
O'Brien, N.Y.	Rostenkowski	Wainwright
O'Neill	St. George	Watts
Osmers	Santangelo	Westland
Philbin	Saund	Williams
Pillion	Sikes	Wolf
Poage	Staggers	Yates
Powell	Steed	Zelenko

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. IKARD). On this rollcall, 300 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

CONSENT CALENDAR

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is Consent Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first bill on the calendar.

ADDITIONAL COMPENSATION FOR DEAFNESS OF BOTH EARS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 268) to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide additional compensation for veterans having the service-incurred disability of deafness of both ears.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, except to ask the gentleman from Alabama if this is the same bill which I introduced in the 85th Congress, which passed the House unanimously.

Mr. BOYKIN. That is correct.

Mr. MICHEL. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, the bill (H.R. 268) to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide additional compensation for veterans having the service-incurred disability of deafness of both ears, is identical to my bill (H.R. 566) which I introduced in this Congress and is the very same measure (H.R. 4214) initially introduced in the 85th Congress, and which subsequently was unanimously reported by the Veterans' Affairs Committee and passed the House July 7, 1958, only to die in the Senate.

Mr. Speaker, an interview with one of my own constituents prompted me to introduce this legislation. Some time ago, I met a young man who belongs to the same Disabled American Veterans chapter as I do, and was astonished to learn from him that even though suffering from a complete loss of hearing as a result of his war service he was not receiving a statutory disability award. This young man was exposed to considerable gunfire and the noise of aircraft. There was no history of ear disease nor associated illness before his entry into the service.

This young man has beeen examined by the best qualified doctors in the country on ear disease, including Drs. Walsh, Rosen, and Shambaugh. Dr. Morris H. Cohen, of Peoria, who was also treating the patient, indicates in a letter to the

DAV—that the boy has "total disability of both ears."

I have been advised off the record that our pilots are under constant danger of incurring similar disability because of the noise produced by our jet engines. I am sure we all realize that the Air Force or any other branch of service would not submit a statement emphasizing the danger of a particular assignment even though it be obviously hazardous duty. Because it is obvious, there is no need to advertise the point, but each man takes a calculated risk and I think we ought to take a look into the periscope and provide for the future of those who might likewise suffer complete loss of hearing as a result of their service.

The case of the young man in my district is not an isolated one. Since introducing this legislation, I have received a number of letters from veterans in all sections of the country who are suffering from complete loss of hearing and who have urged me to press for favorable consideration of my bill. I am sure the chairman and the distinguished members of this committee have received communications from those individuals and veterans' organizations seeking passage of this legislation.

Subparagraph (k) of paragraph II, part I, Veterans Regulation No. 1(a), as amended, states if the disabled person as the result of service-incurred disability has suffered the anatomical loss or use in varying degrees of various body organs and appendages, the rate of compensation shall be increased by $47 per month for each such loss or loss of use, but in no event to exceed $420 per month. It seems only logical and fair that this same rate should be applied to the compensation given to veterans having the service-incurred disability of deafness of both ears since we are giving it to those who have injured their creative organs, feet, hands, eyes, and buttocks. To my mind complete loss of hearing is just as tragic, if not more so, as the aforementioned disabilities, and I see no reason why the House today should not give favorable consideration to this bill as they did on July 7, 1958.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 314(k) of title 38, United States Code, is amended by inserting after "having only light perception," each place it appears therein the following: "or deafness of both ears, having absence of air and bone conduction,".

SEC. 2. The amendments made by this Act shall become effective on the first day of the second month following the date of its enactment.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INCREASED COMPENSATION FOR CERTAIN DISABLED VETERANS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 283) to amend section 314(k) of title 38, United States Code, to provide an increased statutory rate of compensation for veterans suffering the loss or loss of use of an eye in combination with the loss or loss of use of a limb.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 314(k) of title 38, United States Code, is amended to read as follows: "(k) if the veteran, as the result of service-connected disability, has suffered the anatomical loss or loss of use of a creative organ, or one foot, or one hand, or both buttocks, or blindness of one eye, having only light perception, the rate of compensation therefore shall be $47 per month for each such loss or loss of use independent of any other compensation provided in subsections (a) through (j) of this section; and in the event of anatomical loss or loss of use of a creative organ, or one foot, or one hand, or both buttocks, or blindness of one eye, having only light perception, in addition to the requirement for any of the rates specified in subsections (1) through (n) of this section, the rate of compensation shall be increased by $47 per month for each such loss or loss of use, but in no event to exceed $450 per month;".

SEC. 2. Any increased compensation because of a combination of blindness of one eye with another disability, as herein authorized, shall be effective as of the first day of the first month, following this enactment.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 1, line 6, strike out "a creative organ, or".

On page 1, line 7, after the word "hand," insert "or one or more creative organs,".

On page 2, line 3, after the word "section" insert "but in no event to exceed $309 per month;".

On page 2, line 4, strike out "a creative organ, or".

On page 2, line 5, after the word "hand," insert "or one or more creative organs,".

On page 2, beginning on line 11, after the word "compensation", strike out "because of a combination of blindness of one eye with another disability as herein authorized," and insert in lieu thereof "authorized by section 1".

On page 2, line 14, strike out the word "first" and insert in lieu therof "second calendar".

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DISPOSAL OF COCONUT OIL FROM NATIONAL STOCKPILE

The Clerk called the resolution (H.J. Res. 441) relating to the disposition of coconut oil from the national stockpile under the Strategic and Critical Materials Stockpiling Act.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this joint resolution may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

LEASE PART OF TWIN CITIES ARSENAL, MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2449) to authorize the Secretary of the Army to lease a portion of Twin Cities Arsenal, Minneapolis, Minn., to Independent School District No. 16, Minnesota.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, I should like only to say that it seems to me that the House Committee on Armed Services ought to provide, in the next session of the Congress, a uniform policy with respect to the use of buildings for public purposes, that is, buildings on military establishments. I think there ought to be a uniform policy. We have two bills on the Consent Calendar today, and there is no uniformity in this matter. I hope that next year the Committee on Armed Services will provide uniformity through legislation.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from North Carolina, a member of the House Armed Services Committee.

Mr. DURHAM. I think it should be understood that we started to work out a uniform policy at this session of the Congress, but we found out, of course, that it was quite a job. Now, we have these two emergencies. These children will not be in school unless we do something for them this year. I can assure the gentleman that we will do everything we can to straighten this matter out. I agree with the gentleman that there ought to be some kind of an overall policy, because we go out and give them the money to relieve the situation in these impacted areas. We impact them, and then we do away with the business, and the children are sitting there not going to school and we find ourselves in this situation. It is an emergency.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman from North Carolina for his statement and withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Army is authorized and directed to lease for a five-year period to the Independent School District Numbered 16, State of Minnesota (Spring Lake Park School District) space it occupies in Building Numbered 105, and adjacent land area at the Twin Cities Arsenal, Minneapolis, Minnesota,

subject, however, to conditions and restrictions set forth in section 2 of this Act.

SEC. 2. The lease authorized by this Act shall be made without monetary consideration therefor, but upon condition that the property shall be used for the operation and maintenance of a public school only and in the event that it shall not be used for such purpose the lease shall immediately terminate and title to all improvements made by the school district during its occupancy shall vest in the United States without compensation therefor. The lease shall further provide that the school district shall at all times keep the premises in good repair, that use of the premises shall be subject to regulations by the commanding officer of the arsenal and shall in no way interfere with operations of the United States; that no change shall be made in the building or grounds without the prior consent of the district engineer, United States Army Engineer District, St. Paul, Minnesota; that no claim shall be made against the United States by the school district for damage to any of its property on the premises; that the school district will protect the United States against any claim for personal injury or property damage resulting from use of the premises; that the lease shall be revocable at will by the Secretary of the Army; and that the school district will on or before expiration or earlier termination of the lease vacate the premises, remove all its property, and restore the premises to a condition satisfactory to the aforementioned district engineer.

SEC. 3. Upon acceptance by the school district of the lease authorized by this Act, the Secretary of the Army is further authorized and directed to cancel lease (DA-21-019-eng-2100) under which the school district is occupying the property described in section 1 of this Act.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, line 1, following the word "therefor", insert a comma and the following language: "except for the cost of utilities or other special services furnished the lessee by the Government,".

Add a new section 4 as follows:

"SEC. 4. The Secretary of the Army, or his designee, may also include in the lease authorized by this Act such other terms and conditions as he considers to be in the public interest."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONVEYANCE OF REAL PROPERTY TO SACRAMENTO COUNTY, CALIF.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2247) to authorize the conveyance of certain real property of the United States to the county of Sacramento, Calif.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I probably shall object, information was given to me which leads me to believe that this bill should be taken off the calendar until a further investigation is made. This is income-producing property for which the Federal Government should be getting some quid pro quo. I do not understand why this should be on the calendar without a more thorough investigation.

Mr. Speaker, I object.

There being no other objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Air Force is authorized and directed to convey to the county of Sacramento, California, without monetary consideration, and subject to the condition set forth in section 3 of this Act, (1) all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the real property (including all improvements thereon) more particularly described in subsection (a) of section 2 of this Act, and (2) a perpetual easement for disposal of sewage effluent and waste water in, over, upon, and across the property more particularly described in subsection (b) of section 2 of this Act.

SEC. 2. (a) All that real property lying, being, and situate in the county of Sacramento, State of California, described as follows:

Beginning at a point located north 1,320.00 feet, thence east 569.00 feet from the corner common to sections 37, 38, 47, and 43 as shown on the recorded map of Rancho Del Paso recorded in the Sacramento County Recorder's Office in book 2 of maps, map numbered 32; thence from said point of beginning north 405.00 feet; thence east 211.6 feet; thence south 100.00 feet; thence east 138.4 feet; thence south 530.00 feet; thence west 350.00 feet; thence north 225.00 feet to the place of beginning, containing 4.744 acres, more or less.

(b) A perpetual easement for disposal of sewage effluent and waste water, in, over, upon and across the following described property, lying, being, and situate in the county of Sacramento, State of California, described as follows:

PARCEL NUMBERED 1

A strip of land 25.0 feet wide lying 12.5 feet on each side of the following described centerline: Beginning at a point in the west line of said section 48 located north 710 feet from the southwest corner of said section 48; thence along a ditch channel known as Magpie Creek south 89 degrees 30 minutes east 620.0 feet to a point located 12.5 feet west from the west line of Attu Road (so-called) and thence north 0 degrees 15 minutes east 450.0 feet to a point in the south line of the parcel described in subsection (a) of section 2 herein, known as the sewage treatment plant; containing 0.614 acre, more or less.

PARCEL NUMBERED 2

A strip of land 25.0 feet wide, lying 12.5 feet on each side of the following described centerline: Beginning at a point in the north line of Palm Avenue located north 89 degrees 10 minutes 30 seconds west 730.0 feet and north 00 degrees 49 minutes 30 seconds west 30.0 feet from the southeast corner of said section 37; thence along a ditch channel known as Magpie Creek in a northeasterly direction the following five courses and distances: North 22 degrees 30 minutes east 90.0 feet, north 53 degrees 30 minutes east 450.0 feet, north 1 degree 45 minutes west 180.0 feet, north 31 degrees 15 minutes east 150.0 feet, and south 89 degrees 30 minutes east 280.0 feet to a point in the east line of said section 37, containing 0.66 acre, more or less.

SEC. 3. The conveyances authorized by this Act shall be subject to the condition that the county of Sacramento shall process without charge to the United States all sewage and waste water from the McClellan Air Force Base laundry and the McClellan Air Force Base communications building for so long as such laundry and building remain the property of the United States, and if such condition is not fulfilled, all right, title, and interest in and to such property shall revert to the United States, which shall have an immediate right of entry thereon.

With the following committee amendments:

On pages 3 and 4 strike out section 3 and insert in lieu thereof a new section 3 as follows:

"SEC. 3. The conveyance authorized by this Act shall be subject to the negotiation of an agreement between the county of Sacramento and the Secretary of the Air Force, or his designee, providing for the county to process without charge, all sewage and waste water from the McClellan Air Force Base laundry, and the McClellan Communications Building so long as such facilities remain the property of the United States. In addition, the agreement will specify any requirements for service to be provided by the county in event additional Federal facilities are involved at Camp Kohler proper. If such conditions are not fulfilled, all right, title, and interest in and to such property shall revert to the United States which shall have an immediate right of entry thereon."

Add a new section 4 as follows:

"SEC. 4. The Secretary of the Air Force, or his designee, may also include in the conveyance authorized under this Act such other terms and conditions as he considers to be in the public interest."

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Is it too late to have three objectors?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. It is.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that objection by three objectors may be in order at this time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, on that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 204, nays 94, not voting 136, as follows:

[Roll No. 150]

YEAS—204

Abbitt	Boland	Coad
Abernethy	Bolling	Cohelan
Addonizio	Bonner	Colmer
Alexander	Bowles	Daddario
Alford	Boykin	Daniels
Anderson, Mont.	Boyle	Davis, Ga.
Ashmore	Brademas	Davis, Tenn.
Aspinall	Breeding	Dawson
Avery	Brooks, La.	Denton
Bailey	Brooks, Tex.	Dingell
Baldwin	Brown, Ga.	Dowdy
Barden	Brown, Mo.	Downing
Baring	Broyhill	Doyle
Barr	Burdick	Durham
Bass, Tenn.	Burleson	Edmondson
Beckworth	Carnahan	Elliott
Bennett, Fla.	Chamberlain	Everett
Blatnik	Chelf	Evins
	Clark	Fallon

Fascell
Feighan
Fisher
Flood
Flynn
Fogarty
Forand
Forrester
Fountain
Gallagher
Garmatz
Gathings
Gavin
George
Granahan
Grant
Griffiths
Gubser
Hagen
Haley
Harmon
Hays
Hechler
Hemphill
Herlong
Holifield
Holland
Holt
Huddleston
Hull
Ikard
Inouye
Irwin
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Colo.
Johnson, Wis.
Karsten
Karth
Kasem
Kastenmeier
Kee
Kelly
Kilday
Kilgore
King, Calif.
King, Utah
Kirwan
Kitchin
Kowalski
Landrum
Lankford
Lennon
Levering
Libonati
Lipscomb
Loser
McCormack
McDowell
McFall
McGinley
McMillan
McSween
Madden
Magnuson
Mahon
Mailliard
Marshall
Matthews
Metcalf
Meyer
Miller, Clem
Miller, George P.
Mills
Moeller
Moorhead
Morgan
Morris, Okla.
Morrison
Moss
Moulder
Murphy
Murray
Natcher
Norblad
Norrell
O'Brien, Ill.
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
O'Konski
Oliver
Passman
Patman
Perkins
Pfost
Pilcher
Porter
Preston
Price
Prokop
Pucinski
Rains
Randall
Reuss
Rhodes, Pa.
Riley
Rivers, Alaska
Rivers, S.C.
Roberts
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Rogers, Mass.
Rooney
Roosevelt
Roush
Rutherford
Scott
Selden
Shelley
Sheppard
Shipley
Sisk
Smith, Iowa
Smith, Miss.
Smith, Va.
Spence
Steed
Stratton
Stubblefield
Sullivan
Thomas
Thompson, Tex.
Thornberry
Trimble
Tuck
Udall
Ullman
Vanik
Vinson
Walter
Wampler
Watts
Whitener
Whitten
Wier
Winstead
Wright
Young
Younger
Zablocki

NAYS—94

Alger
Allen
Andersen, Minn.
Arends
Auchincloss
Baker
Bates
Belcher
Bennett, Mich.
Berry
Betts
Bow
Bray
Broomfield
Brown, Ohio
Budge
Bush
Cahill
Cannon
Cederberg
Chenoweth
Chiperfield
Church
Collier
Conte
Corbett
Cunningham
Curtin
Curtis, Mo.
Dixon
Dorn, N.Y.
Dwyer
Fenton
Fulton
Goodell
Gross
Henderson
Hiestand
Hoeven
Hoffman, Ill.
Hoffman, Mich.
Horan
Hosmer
Jensen
Johansen
Jonas
Judd
Kearns
Keith
Knox
Lafore
Laird
Langen
Latta
Lindsay
McCulloch
McIntire
Mack, Wash.
May
Meader
Merrow
Michel
Miller, N.Y.
Milliken
Mumma
Nelsen
Ostertag
Pelly
Pillion
Pirnie
Poff
Quie
Ray
Rees, Kans.
Robison
Saylor
Schenck
Scherer
Schwengel
Short
Siler
Simpson, Ill.
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Kans.
Springer
Taber
Thomson, Wyo.
Tollefson
Utt
Wallhauser
Weaver
Weis
Wharton
Withrow

NOT VOTING—136

Adair
Albert
Andrews
Anfuso
Ashley
Ayres
Barrett
Barry
Bass, N.H.
Baumhart
Becker
Bentley
Blitch
Boggs
Bolton
Bosch
Brewster
Brock
Buckley
Burke, Ky.
Burke, Mass.
Byrne, Pa.
Byrnes, Wis.
Canfield
Carter
Casey
Celler
Coffin
Cook
Cooley
Cramer
Curtis, Mass.
Dague
Delaney
Dent
Derounian
Derwinski
Devine
Diggs
Dollinger
Donohue
Dooley
Dorn, S.C.
Dulski
Farbstein
Fino
Flynt
Foley
Ford
Frazier
Frelinghuysen
Friedel
Gary
Giaimo
Glenn
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Griffin
Hall
Halleck
Halpern
Hardy
Hargis
Harris
Harrison
Healey
Hébert
Hess
Hogan
Holtzman
Jackson
Jarman
Jennings
Johnson, Md.
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Mo.
Keogh
Kilburn
Kluczynski
Lane
Lesinski
McDonough
McGovern
Macdonald
Machrowicz
Mack, Ill.
Martin
Mason
Minshall
Mitchell
Monagan
Montoya
Moore
Morris, N. Mex.
Multer
Nix
O'Brien, N.Y.
O'Neill
Osmers
Philbin
Poage
Powell
Quigley
Rabaut
Reece, Tenn.
Rhodes, Ariz.
Riehlman
Rodino
Rogers, Tex.
Rostenkowski
St. George
Santangelo
Saund
Sikes
Simpson, Pa.
Slack
Staggers
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Teague, Tex.
Teller
Thompson, La.
Thompson, N.J.
Toll
Van Pelt
Van Zandt
Wainwright
Westland
Widnall
Williams
Willis
Wilson
Wolf
Yates
Zelenko

So the bill was ordered to be engrossed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Green of Pennsylvania with Mr. Halleck.

Mr. Barrett with Mr. Ayres.

Mr. Nix with Mr. Wainwright.

Mr. Toll with Mrs. St. George.

Mr. Teller with Mr. Baumhart.

Mr. Teague of Texas with Mr. Byrnes of Wisconsin.

Mr. Powell with Mr. Van Zandt.

Mr. Rabaut with Mr. Martin.

Mr. Friedel with Mr. Moore.

Mr. Dollinger with Mr. Rhodes of Arizona.

Mr. Machrowicz with Mr. Teague of California.

Mr. Carter with Mr. Bentley.

Mr. Hogan with Mr. Riehlman.

Mr. Healey with Mr. Minshall.

Mr. Harrison with Mr. Jackson.

Mr. Byrne of Pennsylvania with Mr. Hess.

Mr. Brewster with Mr. Dooley.

Mr. Foley with Mr. Ford.

Mr. Flynt with Mr. Curtis of Massachusetts.

Mr. Mitchell with Mr. Derounian.

Mr. Philbin with Mr. Fino.

Mr. Donohue with Mr. Becker.

Mr. Dulski with Mr. McDonough.

Mr. Boggs with Mr. Griffin.

Mr. Thompson of Louisiana with Mr. Devine.

Mr. Slack with Mr. Frelinghuysen.

Mr. Dorn of South Carolina with Mr. Derwinski.

Mr. O'Neill with Mr. Dague.

Mr. Monagan with Mr. Bosch.

Mr. Lane with Mr. Cramer.

Mr. Lesinski with Mrs. Bolton.

Mr. Holtzman with Mr. Canfield.

Mr. Morris of New Mexico with Mr. Bass of New Hampshire.

Mr. Santangelo with Mr. Wilson.

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Taylor.

Mr. Willis with Mr. Widnall.

Mr. Zelenko with Mr. Osmers.

Mr. Rodino with Mr. Van Pelt.

Mr. Keogh with Mr. Barry.

Mr. Buckley with Mr. Simpson of Pennsylvania.

Mr. Anfuso with Mr. Glenn.

Mr. Delaney with Mr. Westland.

Mr. Multer with Mr. Reece of Tennessee.

Mr. Farbstein with Mr. Kilburn.

Mr. Healey with Mr. Adair.

Mr. Giaimo with Mr. Mason.

Mr. ALLEN changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. IKARD). The question is on the third reading of the bill.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. 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 Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 8315, reported out by the Armed Services Committee, is listed on the Consent Calendar as a bill to authorize the conveyance of certain real property of the United States to the county of Sacramento, Calif.

The committee report concludes that this conveyance will not entail any additional expenditure on the part of the United States.

The question at issue is not brought out in the committee report. The question at issue is what is the real estate worth and what is the Federal Government getting for it?

The real estate is not just the few acres mentioned. On the acreage is a sewage disposal plant built during World War II at a cost of about $160,000 and subsequently leased to the county of Sacramento and improved by the county.

Sewage disposal plants are income producing property in the hands of private individuals and there are a number of private sewer companies in the United States which make a good profit in operating sewage disposal plants.

Actually, the reason for the request to transfer this facility to the county of Sacramento is essentially to benefit an operation of a large home builder who is developing a large private home construction project. This developer will spend about $700,000 to improve the present sewage disposal plant so that the homes may have proper sewage. Undoubtedly, the present disposal plant is of considerable value to this homebuilder, and undoubtedly it would be well worth his while paying something for the land and the sewage facilities presently on it. The private homebuilder will make a profit on this enterprise, as he should, but I submit the Federal Government under the circumstances should not contribute to his profit by turning over free of charge these facilities and the land.

The Government does get a meager quid pro quo. It gets the free use of the sewage facilities for a laundry and other facilities still on the military base. However, the amount of sewage charge the Government would have to pay per annum to a private company or to a municipality in lieu of sewer taxes would be infinitesimal compared to the value of the plant, and land. The Government is getting a rabbit for a horse.

This matter should not have been on the Consent Calendar. Indeed, the property if it was surplus to the Army's needs should have been turned over to the GSA for disposal. I believe the GSA has some

knowledge of the value of sewage disposal plants and would have insisted on a proper payment from the private developer, or the county whichever the case might be. Furthermore, the matter would then have been handled by the subcommittee of the Government Operations Committee which has been doing a splendid job of checking on these various items of Government surplus disposals.

The Congress has a law whereby any community can purchase at half the appraised value property and facilities which will be used for what might be regarded as governmental purposes. In this instance the general law could have been followed.

I am sorry that the proponents of this legislation undertook to try to push this matter through in such a way that the House was unable to consider the issues involved.

The Military Establishment has been disposing of surplus properties at the rate of many billions of dollars a year and has been realizing less than 8 cents on the dollar. It behooves Congress to watch this disposal program with real care. The only way to watch it is to follow correct procedures.

This matter has passed the House, but I trust it will not be enacted into law until a proper amount is paid for the property the Federal Government is conveying.

Mr. MOSS. 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. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I point out that passage of my bill, H.R. 2247, authorizing the conveyance of certain real property of the United States, known as the Camp Kohler Sewage Treatment Plant, to the county of Sacramento, Calif., will not involve any additional expenditure by the Government now or in the future.

This is not giveaway legislation. The Federal Government is getting more value out of this conveyance than it gives, as is definitely indicated by the fact that the Department of the Air Force has reported favorably on this bill to the Armed Services Committee.

The Camp Kohler Sewage Treatment Plant, adjacent to McClellan Air Force Base in California, was constructed by the Federal Government during World War II at an initial cost of $128,770. It was leased to the county of Sacramento for 4 years beginning December 12, 1950, and the lease was renewed in 1955. During all this time the county of Sacramento has been processing, without charge, the sewage from the laundry and communications buildings at McClellan Air Force Base. Currently, the county of Sacramento is processing without cost approximately 32,000 gallons of sewage effluent and waste water per day for the Federal facilities named.

In addition to processing sewage from McClellan Air Force Base, since 1950 the county of Sacramento has greatly improved the capacity of the Camp Kohler plant, spending an estimated $485,000 in the process. Within the next few months, the county will spend an additional $60,000 or more in repairs and modifications to the plant.

The legislation in question here authorizes the Secretary of the Air Force to convey to Sacramento County, without monetary consideration, all right, title, and interest to approximately 4.744 acres of land, including the initial $128,770 plant investment by the Government. In consideration for the conveyance of this property, the county of Sacramento has bound itself to process without charge all sewage and waste water from the McClellan Air Force Base laundry and communications buildings for so long as such buildings remain the property of the United States, with reversionary right if such condition is not fulfilled.

Under the current operation of Sacramento County, the Camp Kohler laundry is serving an area northeast of McClellan Air Force Base with a population of approximately 12,000 people, many of whom are defense workers employed at the base.

LEASE CERTAIN PROPERTY IN MISSOURI FOR SCHOOL PURPOSES

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 8315) to authorize the Secretary of the Army to lease a portion of Fort Crowder, Mo., to Stella Reorganized Schools R–I, Missouri.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Army is authorized and directed to lease for not to exceed a five-year period to the Stella Reorganized Schools R–I, State of Missouri, space it occupies at Fort Crowder, Missouri, subject, however, to conditions and restrictions set forth in section 2 of this Act.

SEC. 2. The lease authorized by this Act shall be made without monetary consideration therefor, but upon condition that the property shall be used for the operation and maintenance of a public school only and in the event that it shall not be used for such purpose the lease shall immediately terminate and title to all improvements made by the school district during its occupancy shall vest in the United States without compensation therefor. The lease shall further provide that the school district shall at all times keep the premises in good repair, that use of the premises shall be subject to regulations by the Secretary of the Army, or his designee, and shall in no way interfere with operations of the United States; that no change shall be made in the building or grounds without the prior consent of the district engineer, United States Army Engineer District, Kansas City, Missouri; that no claim shall be made against the United States by the school district for damage to any of its property on the premises; that the school district will protect the United States against any claim for personal injury or property damage resulting from use of the premises; that the lease shall be revocable at will by the Secretary of the Army; and that the school district will on or before expiration or earlier termination of the lease vacate the premises, remove all its property, and restore the premises to a condition satisfactory to the aforementioned district engineer.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 9, following the word "therefor" insert a comma and the following language: "except for the cost of utilities or other special services furnished the lessee by the Government."

Add a section 3 as follows:

"SEC. 3. This Act shall apply to any contract or lease heretofore entered into between Stella Reorganized Schools R–I and the United States that has not expired or been terminated, as well as to any contract or lease authorized by this Act."

Add a section 4 as follows:

"SEC. 4. The Secretary of the Army, or his designee, may also include in the lease authorized by this Act such other terms and conditions as he considers to be in the public interest."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WILDLIFE CONSERVATION IN MILITARY RESERVATIONS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2565) to promote effectual planning, development, maintenance, and coordination of wildlife, fish, and game conservation and rehabilitation in military reservations.

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wyoming?

There was no objection.

INCREASED RETIREMENT FOR MEMBERS OF LIGHTHOUSE SERVICE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 5431) to provide a further increase in the retired pay of certain members of the former Lighthouse Service.

There being no objection the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the annual rate of retired pay of each person retired prior to January 1, 1958, under section 6 of the Act of June 20, 1918, as amended and supplemented, shall be increased, effective on the first day of the first calendar month following the date of enactment of this Act, by 10 per centum.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DINGELL: On page 1, line 7, strike out the period and insert in lieu thereof a comma and the following: "or $150 per annum, whichever is the greater."

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DINGELL. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. May I inquire whether the gentleman has cleared this amendment with the chairman of our committee?

Mr. DINGELL. Yes. It is my understanding that it has been cleared with the chairman of the committee. This is similar to the amendment which was to be offered in the committee by me awhile ago. The reason it was not offered in the committee is that I did not have the full cost estimates. I now have the cost estimates, which it is estimated will be $3,000 a year. It will give raises to a few people who draw as little as $600 and $800 a year.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DINGELL. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. WEAVER. According to the information I have, the cost of the bill is in the neighborhood of $116,000, and this would make a total of $163,000.

Mr. DINGELL. I understood it was $122,000.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL].

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ARCTIC WILDLIFE RANGE, ALASKA

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 7045) to authorize the establishment of the Arctic Wildlife Range, Alaska, and for other purposes.

Mr. RIVERS of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alaska?

There was no objection.

GREAT LAKES PILOTAGE

The clerk called the bill (H.R. 57) to require pilots on certain vessels navigating U.S. waters of the Great Lakes, and for other purposes.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be passed over without prejudice.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will withhold that, those who formerly objected to the bill have talked to me about it and have withdrawn their objections. Without a doubt, something has to be done on the Great Lakes. Unless it is done, you will have a tragic situation and we will lose many lives. Here are these foreign vessels coming into these waters, and they do not have pilots on them nor the equipment to navigate the waters, and are not familiar with the conditions in the Great Lakes. I do hope that the gentleman will allow this bill to pass, and if there is anything that proves unworkable or unfair in the legislation, I assure you that if you come before our committee, we will amend it in the next session of the Congress. Give us a running start to see what can be done. Now, in this bill, as against the former bill, we have made provision for an international commission which was requested before.

Mr. REUSS. The bill does set up compulsory pilotage on the Great Lakes, something we have never had and my people in the State of Wisconsin are concerned about it. We should have pilotage in the harbors, and in difficult places, but to require pilotage over every foot of the Great Lakes is something else again. I regret having to ask unanimous consent that it be passed over, but I must ask it.

Mr. BONNER. We have compulsory pilotage in all the harbors in the coast ports of the United States. Of course, if there are those who wish this danger to exist, then they have the opportunity now and it will be their responsibility.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. REUSS. I yield.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Do they not now have pilotage into the harbors?

Mr. BONNER. No, there is no pilotage under the supervision of the Coast Guard on the Lakes at the present time. There have been about six accidents up there. The Coast Guard realizes its responsibility. When a tragedy happens I hope that the gentlemen who feel this way about this bill will not then say, "Well, why didn't you do something?"

Mr. PUCINSKI. Does this provide that the Coast Guard will supervise the pilotage?

Mr. BONNER. The Coast Guard supervises the pilotage into our harbors and out of our harbors at the present time. In the committee we have given a great deal of attention to the bill, but I want the House to know that the Committee on Merchant Marine's responsibility ceases here today and the responsibility for whatever happens in the future will be on someone else.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REUSS. I yield.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, I should like to inquire of the chairman whether or not this bill in any way gives preferential treatment to Canadian pilots.

Mr. BONNER. The gentleman asks an interesting question. As it is now, what pilots are assigned are assigned in Canadian waters.

Mr. VANIK. In Montreal.

Mr. BONNER. That is right. We are trying to work out a system here so that we will have joint pilotage. We will recognize the pilots that they say are certified and whom they certify as being qualified and they will recognize our pilots. In addition, as I have said, if there is anything in the bill that is not workable, we provide that this Commission shall make recommendations to the committee or to the Congress or to the administration, and those kinks will be worked out. But we have a serious condition here. I cannot imagine how it can do any harm. The intent here is lifesaving, safety at sea. That is about all we can say about it.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. REUSS. I yield.

Mr. VANIK. I should like to inquire of the chairman whether or not the pilotage concerns travel in the Great Lakes or only within certain harbors.

Mr. BONNER. It concerns the foreign ships coming into your ports, in American waters. We cannot do anything about the Canadian waters.

Mr. VANIK. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REUSS. I yield.

Mr. O'KONSKI. I would like to ask the author of the bill, is it not true under this bill you are asking the same consideration for American pilots as the Canadian pilots already have?

Mr. BONNER. That is exactly it. They can furnish the pilots to go with the ships. Under this bill there would be a joint arrangement of pilotage on the lakes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

CONVEYING CERTAIN LANDS IN SALT LAKE COUNTY, UTAH

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 5270) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey to the Metropolitan Water District of Salt Lake City, Utah, all right, title, and interest of the United States in certain lands located in Salt Lake County, Utah.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to convey to the Metropolitan Water District of Salt Lake City, Utah, without consideration, all the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the following described land located in Salt Lake County, Utah:

That certain parcel of land located in the southwest quarter of section 25, and in the southeast quarter of section 26, township 1 south, range 1 east, Salt Lake base and meridian, Salt Lake County, State of Utah, more particularly described as follows:

Beginning at a point from which the east quarter corner of said section 26 lies north 1,468.5 feet and east 61.6 feet, more or less, said point being on the north right-of-way boundary line of 33d South Street, and running thence south 89 degrees 58 minutes 45 seconds east 231.75 feet; thence north 25 degrees 20 minutes east 155 feet; thence north 3 degrees 17 minutes 10 seconds east 910.2 feet; thence along a regular curve to the left with a radius of 1,450 feet and a distance of 184.5 feet; thence west 283.4 feet; thence south 3 degrees 03 minutes west 987 feet; thence south 86 degrees 57 minutes east 50 feet; thence south 3 degrees 03 minutes west 40 feet; thence north 86 degrees 57 minutes west 50 feet; thence south 3 degrees 03 minutes west 208 feet, more or less, to the point of beginning, containing 7.7 acres, more or less.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PENALTIES FOR UNOFFICIAL USE OF GOVERNMENT VEHICLES

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 766) to amend section 5 of the act of July 16, 1914, relating to penalties for the use of Government-owned vehicles for other than official purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I need some light on the necessity for this bill. I wonder if there is any member of the Committee on Government Operations who can explain it to me. According to the stated purpose of the bill, it provides that any officer or employee of the United States who willfully uses or authorizes the use of any Government-owned vehicle or aircraft, owned or leased by the Government, for other than official purposes, shall be subject to such disciplinary action as the head of the department concerned or his representative may prescribe, which may include removal from office, if warranted.

That is the purpose of the bill. The existing law covering passenger-carrying vehicles or aircraft, owned or leased by the Government, provides a penalty of suspension from duty without compensation for not less than 1 month and suspension for a longer period or removal from office if circumstances warrant.

It is stated in the committee report that the present law is unduly harsh. I would like to ask someone why it is held that the existing law is unduly harsh.

Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that no one seems to be able to answer that question, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. IKARD). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

DIRECTING ADMINISTRATOR OF GENERAL SERVICES TO CONVEY TO MOBILE, ALA., INTEREST OF UNITED STATES IN CERTAIN LAND

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2386) to direct the Administrator of General Services to convey to the city of Mobile, Ala., all the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to certain land.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Administrator of General Services shall convey to the city of Mobile, Alabama, by quitclaim deed, all the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the land described in the deed, dated June 28, 1939, by which the United States of America conveyed certain lands to the city of Mobile, Ala., recorded on page 256 of deed book 285, probate ccurt records, Mobile County, Ala.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, lines 4 and 5, strike out "and without consideration" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "for the current appraised fair market value of the Government's interest as determined by the Administrator of General Services."

Page 1, after line 10, add the following:

"SEC. 2. This act shall expire 1 year after the date of its enactment unless the conveyance authorized and directed hereby is effected prior thereto."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING FEDERAL PROPERTY AND ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES ACT, DONATION OF SURPLUS PROPERTY TO VOLUNTEER FIREFIGHTING ORGANIZATIONS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3722) to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to permit donations of surplus property to volunteer firefighting organizations, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object and I shall not object, I support this bill and ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have the opportunity to speak in support of legislation to permit donations of surplus property to volunteer firefighting organizations. On February 17, 1959, I introduced H.R. 4646 which is similar in purpose and effect. Let me say at the outset that it is unimportant to me whose name this legislation bears. My only concern is that Congress, at this session, pass legislation which will make available to volunteer fire companies certain surplus property for which they have a continuing need.

Under existing law, the procedure governing the disposal of Federal surplus property by donation is contained in the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended. The General Services Administrator is authorized to donate available surplus materials to tax-supported or non-profit tax-exempt institutions, hospitals, clinics, schools, colleges, universities, and civil defense units, upon allocation by the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare. The General Services Administrator has statutory jurisdiction over disposal of property as provided in title 40, United States Code, section 484(j), and the purpose of the legislation is to enlarge his jurisdiction to include the power of donation to volunteer fire companies not included in the civil defense setup.

My file contains many letters from volunteer fire companies, State organizations of volunteer fire companies, municipal officials, and citizens who must depend upon these departments for protection of their lives and property. From an urban area in the congressional district I am privileged to represent, I have a letter stating that the city will shortly be forced, for economic reasons, to curtail its fire protection to outlying areas. It will now fall upon these small, financially weak communities to provide for their own fire protection. From a rural area in my district, I have a letter from a group that has been trying, without success, to organize a volunteer fire company for the mutual protection of its residents. This area is remote from any town or city with a department; yet, they are financially unable to purchase the expensive equipment needed to equip a fire company to even a minimum degree. In the event of a civil disaster, such areas as these face two unpleasant possibilities: First, neighboring communities must dispatch their own fire apparatus to these outlying areas at great risk to the lives and property of the lending community; or, more likely, second, the community which has its own fire department will be so busily engaged with its own disaster that it will be unable to give any assistance whatever to the small community's needs. It is apparent that the passage of this legislation would have a salutary effect on the civil defense effort.

For these communities to buy new tools to do their job may be impossible, but to supply old tools in which the taxpayers already have a depreciated investment is not only possible, but logical in every respect. The average Government recovery on the sale of property declared to be surplus, regardless of life expectancy, is about 10 cents on the dollar. It is poor business to sell Government property for such an uneconomic return on investment when it can be used to the benefit of the tax-weary people of our small communities for such a worthwhile purpose.

During World War II, Prime Minister Churchill called upon the American people to "Give us the tools, and we'll finish the job." Now, the American people are calling on Uncle Sam to give them the tools to finish a job. Our volunteer "smoke-eaters" never fail to answer the call of a neighbor in distress. Uncle Sam can do no less.

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, thousands of communities throughout the country are completely dependent on volunteer firefighting organizations for the protection of life and property from fire. Tens of thousands of civic-minded individuals give their time, effort, and resources to keep these firefighting units in operation. Their biggest problem is money for equipment. Modern fire engines cost anywhere from $25,000 to $30,000, and other types of very necessary equipment are also expensive.

Much of the needed equipment, which includes water tanks, pumps, firehoses, tank trucks, ropes, axes, tarps, picks, shovels, lanterns, and so forth, is now reposing in Federal Government ware-

houses. As surplus property not needed by the Federal agencies nor by the education, health, and defense agencies, the equipment has been sold at a small return to the Government.

While it is true that this surplus property can be purchased by the firefighting organizations, it is usually offered for sale in larger lots than the volunteer fire departments can afford to acquire. Therefore, they are forced to purchase the equipment from retail sources at a higher cost, while the Government's surplus firefighting equipment is sold for scrap.

Mr. Speaker, it is my firm belief that this property, bought with public funds, should be donated to the volunteer fire departments to aid them in their public-spirited undertaking. H.R. 3722, which is identical to a bill that I have introduced, would extend the benefits of the surplus personal property donation program to any incorporated or unincorporated volunteer fire department, fire company, or other similar firefighting organization which is tax supported or tax exempt.

Congress has already made surplus property available for civil defense purposes. And since the volunteer firefighting organizations perform civil defense functions, this is one more reason why these groups should be included in the surplus property donation program.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, during the last Congress and in this first session of the 86th Congress I have introduced legislation with objectives similar to those of H.R. 3722—to make the Nation's volunteer fire departments eligible for donable, surplus, Federal property. Therefore, I support the passage of H.R. 3722 today.

In the last Congress, my bill was H.R. 242. Late in the second session of that Congress, H.R. 13673 was favorably reported from the Government Operations Committee and was passed in the House. However, it was not acted upon in the Senate before adjournment last year.

This year, I have introduced H.R. 105. The committee has now favorably reported H.R. 3722, which is being considered by the House in plenty of time for final passage in this Congress.

Mr. Speaker, the bills that I have sponsored went beyond the provisions of H.R. 3722. They would have expanded the donable property program to both volunteer rescue and lifesaving squads, and to volunteer fire departments. I regret that H.R. 3722 was not amended in committee to include rescue and lifesaving squads, and I will give consideration to introducing another bill to make these organizations eligible for such property. The rescue and lifesaving squads are very numerous in the Nation and should be allowed to utilize any donable property that might meet their needs.

Although H.R. 3722 does not go as far in its provisions as I would prefer, it should be approved today as a step in the right direction. The Nation's volunteer firemen should receive every possible assistance in their important and dedicated work.

This legislation has the endorsement of the Virginia State Firemen's Association and the Southwest Virginia Firemen's Association. This latter group—generally—is located in my area of Virginia.

In a meeting last spring, the Southwest Virginia Firemen's Association adopted a resolution in support of H.R. 105, stating that many volunteer departments within the United States would benefit by passage of this bill. I am sure they support passage of H.R. 3722.

It is clear that Congress intends that the donable property program be aimed at helping those organizations and institutions serving the public interest. The Nation's volunteer fire departments meet this test in every respect.

I hope that H.R. 3722 can be passed today and given final approval at the earliest possible date.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) the first sentence of section 203(j)(1) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (40 U.S.C., sec. 484(j)(1)) is amended to read as follows: "Under such regulations as he may prescribe, the Administrator is authorized in his discretion to donate without cost (except for direct costs of care and handling) for use in any State for purposes of education, public health, or civil defense, or for research for any such purpose, or for the purpose of aiding in the protection of life and property by volunteer fire-fighting organizations, any equipment, materials, books, or other supplies (including those capitalized in a working capital or similar fund) under the control of any executive agency which shall have been determined to be surplus property and which shall have been determined under paragraph (2), (3), or (4) of this subsection to be usable and necessary for any such purpose."

(b) The last sentence of section 203(j)(1) of such Act is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof the following: ", except that notwithstanding a State agency is not designated under State law for the purpose of distributing property for use by volunteer fire-fighting organizations, such property may be transferred to such State agency for use for purposes of education, public health, or civil defense, or for research for any such purpose".

SEC. 2. (a) The first sentence of section 203(j)(3) of such Act (40 U.S.C., sec. 484(j)(3)) is amended to read as follows: "Determination whether such surplus property (except surplus property allocated in conformity with paragraph (2) of this subsection) is usable and necessary for purposes of education or public health, or for research for any such purpose, or for the purpose of aiding in the protection of life and property by volunteer fire-fighting organizations, in any State shall be made by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, who shall allocate such property on the basis of needs and utilization for transfer by the Administrator to such State agency for distribution to (A) tax-supported medical institutions, hospitals, clinics, health centers, school systems, schools, colleges, and universities, (B) other nonprofit medical institutions, hospitals, clinics, health centers, schools, colleges, and universities which are exempt from taxation under section 501 (c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, or (C) to any incorporated or unincorporated volunteer fire department, fire company, or other similar fire-fighting organization which is tax-supported or has been held exempt from taxation under section 501 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954."

(b) The second sentence of section 203(j)(3) is amended by inserting "or for the purpose of aiding in the protection of life and property by volunteer fire-fighting organizations in the State," after "in the State,".

SEC. 3. Section 203(k)(2) of such Act (40 U.S.C., sec. 484(k)) is amended by striking out "or" at the end of clause (D), by striking out the comma at the end of clause (E) and inserting in lieu thereof "; or", and by inserting immediately after clause (E) the following new clause:

"(F) the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, through such officers or employees of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare as he may designate, in the case of property transferred pursuant to this Act to volunteer fire-fighting organizations for aiding in the protection of life and property by such organizations,".

SEC. 4. Section 203(o) of such Act (40 U.S.C., sec. 484(n)) is amended by inserting "or volunteer fire-fighting organizations" after "educational or public health institutions".

With the following committee amendments:

On page 3, lines 18 and 19 strike out "(40 U.S.C., sec. 484 (k))" and insert in lieu thereof "(40 U.S.C., sec. 484 (k)(2))".

On page 4, lines 6 and 7, strike out "(40 U.S.C.(sec. 484(k))" and insert in lieu thereof "(40 U.S.C., sec. 484(o))".

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TRIBE OF SILETZ INDIANS, OREGON

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6790) to authorize a per capita distribution of funds arising from a judgment in favor of the Confederated Tribe of Siletz Indians in the State of Oregon, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that S. 2029, to authorize a per capita distribution of funds arising from a judgment in favor of the Confederated Tribe of Siletz Indians in the State of Oregon, and for other purposes, an identical bill, be considered in lieu of H.R. 6790.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the consideration of the Senate bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized and directed to distribute on a pro rata basis, to the persons whose names appear on the final roll approved pursuant to section 3 of the Act of August 13, 1954 (68 Stat. 724), or their heirs or legatees, the balance of the

funds, after paying approved attorney fees and expenses, appropriated by the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1959, in satisfaction of the judgment against the United States obtained in the Indian Claims Commission in docket Numbered 239, and accrued interest thereon. The funds so distributed shall not be subject to Federal or State income tax.

SEC. 2. (a) Except as provided in subsection (b) of this section, the Secretary shall distribute a share payable to a living enrollee directly to such enrollee, and the Secretary shall distribute a share payable to a deceased enrollee directly to his next of kin or legatees as determined by the laws of the place of domicile of the decedent, upon proof of death and inheritance satisfactory to the Secretary, whose findings upon such proof shall be final and conclusive.

(b) A share payable to a person under twenty-one years of age or to a person under legal disability shall be paid in accordance with the laws applicable to such person in the place of his domicile, or in the discretion of the Secretary to the natural parent or guardian of such person.

SEC. 3. All costs incurred by the Secretary in the preparation of the roll and in the payment of shares in accordance with the provision of this Act shall be paid by appropriate withdrawals from the judgment fund.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks before the passage of Calendar No. 241.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

UTE MOUNTAIN TRIBE OF THE UTE MOUNTAIN RESERVATION, COLO.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 8344) to provide that certain funds in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the Confederated Bands of Ute Indians be transferred to the credit of the Ute Mountain Tribe of the Ute Mountain Reservation, Colo.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate bill (S. 2435) to provide that certain funds in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the Confederated Bands of Ute Indians be transferred to the credit of the Ute Mountain Tribe of the Ute Mountain Reservation, Colo., an identical bill, be considered in lieu of H.R. 8344.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the Senate bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the entire proceeds of the judgment in Court of Claims case numbered 47565 entitled "The Confederated Bands of Ute Indians against the United States of America", now on deposit in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the Confederated Bands of Ute Indians, together with all accrued interest thereon, be transferred and credited to the account of the Ute Mountain Tribe of the Ute Mountain Reservation, Colorado, to be used as directed by the Ute Mountain Tribal Council and approved by the Secretary of the Interior. Any part of such funds that may be distributed per capita to the members of the tribe shall not be subject to Federal or State income tax.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill was laid on the table.

KLAMATH TERMINATION ACT

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 8501) to amend the Klamath Termination Act.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate bill (S. 2421) to amend the Klamath Termination Act, an identical bill, be considered in lieu of H.R. 8501.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the consideration of the Senate bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That in order to permit an immediate payment of the purchase price of the Klamath Marsh, the title to which was taken by the United States by the Act of August 23, 1958 (72 Stat. 816), and thereby make possible partial distribution of funds to the Klamath Indians who have elected to withdraw from the tribe, which will lessen the need for making interim loans to such Indians, subsection 28(f) of the Act of August 13, 1954, as amended (72 Stat. 816), is hereby amended by changing the effective date for the taking of title by the United States from April 1, 1961, to the earliest date after September 30, 1959, when the Secretary of the Interior determines that funds for the payment of the purchase price are available from the sale of stamps under the Migratory Bird Hunting Stamp Act of March 16, 1934, as amended (16 U.S.C. 718).

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill was laid on the table.

AGUA CALIENTE (PALM SPRINGS) RESERVATION

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6672) to authorize longer term leases of Indian lands on the Agua Caliente (Palm Springs) Reservation.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I have been asked by a Member who is not present, and I cannot find him, to ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

GUADALUPE AND SAN ANTONIO RIVER BASINS AND TEXAS BOARD OF WATER ENGINEERS

The Clerk called 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 and San Antonio River Basins, and of a representative of the Texas Board of Water Engineers.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the 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 section, 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;
"(C) Brazos 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."

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

STANDING ROCK SIOUX RESERVATION IN NORTH DAKOTA AND SOUTH DAKOTA

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3144) to place in trust status certain lands on the Standing Rock Sioux Reservation in North Dakota and South Dakota.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill (S. 417) to place in trust status certain

lands on the Standing Rock Sioux Reservation in North Dakota and South Dakota, an identical bill, be considered in lieu of H.R. 3144.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the Senate bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That all the right, title, and interest in and to the west half northeast quarter, section 23, township 130 north, range 80 west, fifth principal meridian, Sioux County, North Dakota, containing 80 acres, more or less, on the Standing Rock Sioux Reservation in North Dakota, purchased by the United States with funds derived from the "Indian Moneys, Proceeds of Labor, Standing Rock Boarding School" account, shall hereafter be held by the United States in trust for the benefit of the Standing Rock Sioux Tribe of North Dakota and South Dakota.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill was laid on the table.

CATAWBA INDIAN TRIBE OF SOUTH CAROLINA

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6128) to provide for the division of the tribal assets of the Catawba Indian Tribe of South Carolina among the members of the tribe and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of American in Congress assembled, That the membership roll of the Catawba Indian Tribe of South Carolina is hereby classed as of midnight of the date of enactment of this act, and no child born hereafter shall be eligible for enrollment. The Secretary of the Interior with advice and assistance of the tribe shall prepare a final roll of the members of the tribe who are living at such time, and when so doing shall provide a reasonable opportunity for any person to protest against the inclusion or omission of any name on or from the roll. The Secretary's decisions on all protests shall be final and conclusive. After all protests are disposed of, the final roll shall be published in the Federal Register.

SEC. 2. Each member whose name appears on the final roll of the tribe as published in the Federal Register shall be entitled to receive an approximately equal share of the tribe's assets that are held in trust by the United States in accordance with the provisions of this act. This right shall constitute personal property which may be inherited or bequeathed, but it shall not otherwise be subject to alienation or encumbrance.

SEC. 3. The tribe's assets shall be distributed in accordance with the following provisions:

(a) If the State of South Carolina by legislation authorizes assets that are held by the State in trust for the tribe to be included in the distribution plan prepared by the Secretary in accordance with the provisions of this Act, they may be included.

(b) The tribal council shall designate any part of the tribe's land that is to be set aside for church, park, playground, or cemetery purposes and the Secretary is authorized to convey such tracts to trustees or agencies designated by the tribal council for that purpose and approved by the Secretary.

(c) The remaining tribal assets shall be appraised by the Secretary and the share of each member shall be determined by dividing the total number of enrolled members into the total appraisal. The tribal assets so appraised shall not include any improvements that were placed on the part of an assignment that is selected by an assignee, or his wife or children, pursuant to subsection (d) of this section. Such improvements shall be property of the assignee.

(d) Subject to the provisions of this subsection, each member who is an adult under the laws of the State and who has an assignment shall be given the option of selecting and receiving title to any part of his assignment that has an appraised value not in excess of his share of the tribe's assets. A wife, husband, or child of such adult member may select and receive title to any part of such assignment that has an appraised value not in excess of her or his share of the tribe's assets; and, if the child is a minor under the laws of the State, the option on his behalf may be exercised by such adult member. Each selection shall be subject to the approval of the Secretary of the Interior, who shall consider the effect of the selection on the total value of the property. The title to any part of an assignment so selected may be taken in the name of the person entitled thereto, or the title to all of the parts of an assignment so selected may be taken in the names of the persons entitled thereto as tenants in common.

(e) Each member who has no assignment may select and receive title to any part of the tribal land that is not selected pursuant to subsection (d) of this section and that has an appraised value not in excess of his share of the tribe's assets.

(f) All assets of the tribe are not selected and conveyed to members pursuant to subsections (d) and (e) of this section shall be sold and the proceeds distributed to the members in accordance with their respective interests. Such sales shall be by competitive bid and any member shall have the right to purchase property offered for sale for a price not less than the highest acceptable bid therefor. If more than one member exercises such right, the property shall be sold to the member exercising the right who offers the highest price. Any tribal assets that are not sold by the Secretary within two years from the date of this Act shall be conveyed to a trustee selected by the Secretary for disposition in accordance with this subsection, and the fees and expenses of such trustee shall be paid out of funds appropriated for the purposes of this Act.

SEC. 4. The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to make such land surveys and to execute such conveyancing instruments as he deems necessary to convey marketable and recordable titles to the tribal assets disposed of pursuant to this Act. Each grantee shall receive an unrestricted title to the property conveyed.

SEC. 5. The constitution of the tribe adopted pursuant to the Act of June 18, 1934 (48 Stat. 984), as amended, shall be revoked by the Secretary. Thereafter, the tribe and its members shall not be entitled to any of the special services performed by the United States for Indians because of their status as Indians, all statutes of the United States that affect Indians because of their status as Indians shall be inapplicable to them, and the laws of the several States shall appply to them in the same manner they apply to other persons or citizens within their jurisdiction. Nothing in this Act, however, shall effect the status of such persons as citizens of the United States.

SEC. 6. Nothing in this Act shall affect the rights, privileges, or obligations of the tribe and its members under the laws of South Carolina.

SEC. 7. No property distributed under the provisions of this Act shall at the time of distribution be subject to any Federal or State income tax. Following any distribution of property made under the provisions of this Act, such property and income derived therefrom by the distributee shall be subject to the same taxes, State and Federal, as in the case of non-Indians: *Provided,* That for the purpose of capital gains or losses the base value of the property shall be the value of the property when distributed to the grantee.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 3, after the word "That", strike out the word "the" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "when a majority of the adult members of the Catawba Indian Tribe of South Carolina, according to the most reliable information regarding membership that is available to the Secretary of the Interior, have indicated their agreement to a division of the tribal assets in accordance with the provisions of this Act, the Secretary shall publish in the Federal Register a notice of that fact. The."

Page 1, line 4, strike out the words "is hereby" and insert in lieu thereof the words "shall thereupon be."

Page 1, line 5, strike out the words "enactment of this Act," and insert in lieu thereof the words "such notice".

Page 5, following line 24, add a new section to read as follows:

"SEC. 8. Prior to the revocation of the tribal constitution provided for in this Act, the Secretary is authorized to undertake, within the limits of available appropriations, a special program of education and training designed to help the members of the tribe to earn a livelihood, to conduct their own affairs, and to assume their responsibilities as citizens without special services because of their status as Indians. Such program may include language training, orientation in non-Indian community customs and living standards, vocational training and related subjects, transportation to the place of training or instruction, and subsistence during the course of training or instruction. For the purposes of such program, the Secretary is authorized to enter into contracts or agreements with any Federal, State, or local governmental agency, corporation, association, or persons. Nothing in this section shall preclude any Federal agency from undertakng any other program for the education and training of Indians with funds appropriated to it."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ASPINALL: Page 4, line 15, after the word "tribe" insert the word "that."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ASPINALL: Page 4, line 25, after the word "date" insert the words "of the notice provided for in section 1."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DISTRIBUTION OF THE FUNDS OF THE CREEK TRIBE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 8317) to amend the law relating to the distribution of the funds of the Creek Tribe.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill (S. 2339) to amend the law relating to the distribution of the funds of the Creek Tribe, an identical Senate bill, be considered in lieu of the House bill.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 5 of the Act of August 1, 1955 (69 Stat. 431), is amended by changing "$200,000" to "$325,000".

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider and a similar House bill (H.R. 8317) were laid on the table.

USE OF FUNDS OF KIOWA, COMANCHE AND APACHE TRIBES

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 7437) to authorize the use of funds arising from a judgment in favor of the Kiowa, Comanche, and Apache Tribes of Indians of Oklahoma, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the funds on deposit in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the Kiowa, Comanche, and Apache Tribes that were appropriated by the Act of May 20, 1959 (Public Law 86-30), to pay a judgment by the Indian Claims Commission for inadequate compensation for lands ceded by the Act of June 6, 1900 (31 Stat. 677), and the interest thereon, may be advanced or expended for any purpose that is authorized by the tribal governing body and approved by the Secretary of the Interior. Any part of such funds that may be distributed per capita to the members of the tribe shall not be subject to Federal or State income tax.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LAND OF THE CREEK TRIBE OF INDIANS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 8514) to authorize the sale of 40 acres of land owned by the Creek Tribe of Indians.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to sell all of the right, title, and interest of the United States and of the Creek Tribe of Indians in the southeast quarter northeast quarter section 3, township 9 north, range 16 east, Indian base and meridian, containing approximately 40 acres, and located near the Eufaula Indian boarding school, Oklahoma. The land may be offered for sale to the city of Eufaula, Oklahoma, at its appraised fair market value, as determined by the Secretary, and if the offer is not accepted the land may be sold on the basis of competitive bids for not less than its appraised value or an amount substantially equal thereto. The proceeds of the sale shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the Creek Indian Tribe.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TABLET IN HONOR OF DR. SAMUEL ALEXANDER MUDD

The Clerk called the resolution (H.J. Res. 80) providing for the erection of a memorial tablet at Garden Key, Fla., in honor of Dr. Samuel Alexander Mudd.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BENTLEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to make a statement on behalf of my bill, House Joint Resolution 80, which provides for the erection of a memorial tablet at Garden Key, Fla., in honor of Dr. Samuel Alexander Mudd.

On April 14, 1865, at 4 o'clock in the morning, two men appeared at the Maryland home of Dr. Mudd. One of the men, who called himself Tyler, asked the doctor to treat him for a broken leg which he said he received when he fell off his horse. Of course, the doctor treated the man. Not until the following afternoon did Dr. Mudd discover that this man was not named Tyler but was actually John Wilkes Booth, the assassin of Abraham Lincoln.

Dr. Mudd was taken to Washington, tried before a military court with seven other "conspirators," convicted as an accessory after the fact, and sentenced to life imprisonment at the island fortress of Garden Key, Fla., for giving medical aid to Booth.

Four years later, in 1869, Dr. Mudd was released from this prison and returned home, a "frail, weak, and sick man, never again to be strong during the 13 years he survived."

Two motivating reasons stand behind my desire to see Congress pass a bill providing for a memorial tablet for this Dr. Mudd. The first is that Dr. Mudd was without much doubt innocent of the charges brought against him. While it is impossible to conclusively prove Dr. Mudd's innocence or guilt one way or the other, most historians of the Civil War agree that Dr. Mudd could hardly have known either of President Lincoln's death or of the true identity of the man named Tyler at the time he treated this man for the broken leg. It was in recognition of this fact that President Johnson pardoned Dr. Mudd 4 years after he had been imprisoned.

Secondly, despite the fact that Dr. Mudd was unjustly convicted, he nevertheless unselfishly and heroically rendered medical aid to yellow fever victims at the fortress prison in Florida. Dr. Mudd undoubtedly saved many lives which would have otherwise been lost.

It is in recognition of these two facts, Dr. Mudd's unjust conviction and his unselfish medical aid to unfortunate yellow fever victims, that I think we should unanimously authorize the Secretary of the Interior to erect a memorial tablet to Dr. Mudd at Garden Key, Fla. It is especially appropriate that we in some measure make reparation to Dr. Mudd for the dishonor and punishment inflicted upon him, since the prison site where Dr. Mudd served his term has been declared by former President Roosevelt to be a national monument.

Therefore, I strongly urge the House to unanimously approve my bill, House Joint Resolution 80.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, as a cosponsor of the legislation under consideration, I express my hope that it will be approved by the House today. The location of the tablet in honor of Dr. Samuel A. Mudd which is proposed by the legislation is Fort Jefferson on Dry Tortugas, Garden Key, Fla., which lies in the southernmost part of my congressional district.

Dr. Mudd was imprisoned in Fort Jefferson after being convicted by a military court as an accessory after the fact in the conspiracy which assassinated Abraham Lincoln. However, grave doubts and questions arose concerning the doctor's guilt and on June 29, 1869, he was unconditionally pardoned by President Andrew Johnson. During his imprisonment at Fort Jefferson, he rendered great and selfless service in caring for those stricken by the yellow fever epidemic of 1867.

I have received numerous expressions of support of establishing this memorial from various individuals and groups, including the Dade County Medical Association, Miami, Fla., and the Southern Cross and Miami-Yulee Chapters of the United Daughters of the Confederacy of Coral Gables and Miami.

I was very pleased that the distinguished chairman and members of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs granted approval of this measure; and I hope it can be passed today unanimously.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Whereas historians are virtually in unanimous agreement that Doctor Samuel Alexander Mudd, of Charles County, Maryland, did not know of the death of Abraham Lincoln at the time the said Doctor Samuel Alexander Mudd gave medical and and a night's lodging to John Wilkes Booth, the assassin of President Lincoln; and

Whereas the same historians agree that John Wilkes Booth concealed his true identity from Doctor Samuel Alexander Mudd when he visited Doctor Mudd's home in the black of the night, following the assassination of President Lincoln; and

Whereas following his conviction as an accessory after the fact and following his subsequent sentence to life imprisonment at

Fort Jefferson, the United States Government prison at Garden Key, in the Dry Tortugas, Florida, Doctor Samuel Alexander Mudd, though a prisoner, rendered heroic and invaluable medical aid to yellow fever victims who inhabited said fort and said key; and

Whereas in recognition of Doctor Samuel Alexander Mudd's innocence of the charges which resulted in his life imprisonment he was given a complete and unconditional pardon by President Andrew Johnson; and

Whereas the ruins of Fort Jefferson, Garden Key, Florida, were declared a national monument by President Franklin D. Roosevelt: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress Assembled, That, in recognition of the unselfish services rendered to fellow prisoners by Doctor Samuel Alexander Mudd while he was imprisoned for a crime which he did not commit the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to erect a memorial tablet of appropriate design on the site of the ruins of Fort Jefferson, Garden Key, Florida, to the memory of Doctor Samuel Alexander Mudd.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, line 5, strike out the words "imprisoned for a crime which he did not commit", and insert in lieu thereof the word "imprisoned.".

Strike out all of the preamble.

The amendments were agreed to.

The resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RELATING TO PENITENTIARY IMPRISONMENT

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1647) to amend section 4083, title 18, United State Code, relating to penitentiary imprisonment.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 4083, title 18, United States Code, relating to penitentiary imprisonment, is amended to read as follows:

"§ 4083. Penitentiary imprisonment; consent

"Persons convicted of offenses against the United States or by courts-martial punishable by imprisonment for more than one year may be confined in any United States penitentiary.

"A sentence for an offense punishable by imprisonment for one year or less shall not be served in a penitentiary without the consent of the defendant."

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMPUTATION OF GOOD TIME ALLOWANCES FOR PRISONERS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1645) to amend section 4161 of title 18, United States Code, relating to computation of good time allowances for prisoners.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the first paragraph of section 4161 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by striking out the words "to be credited as earned and computed monthly".

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RESIDENCE REQUIREMENTS FOR POSTMASTER APPOINTMENTS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 5571) to exempt regular and classified substitute employees in post offices of the first, second, and third classes from residence requirements governing appointment and service of postmasters at post offices to which such employees are assigned.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be passed over without prejudice.

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, as author of the bill I would like to explain anything the gentleman from Massachusetts wishes to know about the bill.

Mr. BOLAND. As one of the official objectors I have been requested to ask that the bill be passed over, and that is what I have done.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

AUTHORITY OF CUSTOMS COURT TO APPOINT EMPLOYEES

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1947) relating to the authority of the Customs Court to appoint employees, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That chapter 55 of title 28 of the United States Code is amended to read as follows:

"CHAPTER 55—CUSTOMS COURT

"Sec.

"871. Clerk, chief deputy clerk, assistant clerk, deputies, assistants, and other employees.

"872. Marshal and deputy marshals.

"873. Criers, bailiffs, and messengers.

"§ 871. Clerk, chief deputy clerk, assistant clerk, deputies, assistants, and other employees.

"The Customs Court may appoint a clerk, a chief deputy clerk, an assistant clerk, deputy clerks, and such deputies, assistants, and other employees as may be necessary for the effective dispatch of the business of the court, who shall be subject to removal by the court.

"§ 872. Marshal and deputy marshals.

"The Customs Court may appoint a marshal and deputy marshals, who shall be subject to removal by the court.

"The marshal and his deputies shall attend court at its sessions, serve and execute all process and orders issued by it, and exercise the powers and perform the duties concerning all matters within such court's jurisdiction assigned to them by the court.

"Under regulations prescribed by the Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts, the marshal shall pay the salaries, office expenses, and travel and subsistence allowances of the judges, officers, and employees of the court, and shall disburse funds appropriated for all expenses of the court.

"On all disbursements made by the marshal of the Customs Court for official salaries or expenses, the certificate of the payee shall be sufficient without verification on oath.

"§ 873. Criers, bailiffs, and messengers.

"The Customs Court may appoint such criers as it may require for said court, which criers shall also perform the duties of bailiffs and messengers and such other duties as the court directs and shall be subject to removal by the court."

SEC. 2. Section 550(b) of title 28 of the United States Code is amended by striking out "judges of the Customs Court,".

SEC. 3. The first paragraph of section 253 of title 28 of the United States Code is amended to read as follows:

"The chief judge of the Customs Court, with the approval of the court, shall supervise the fiscal affairs and clerical force of the court. The chief judge shall assign or reassign, before trial and under rules of the court, any case for hearing, determination, or both; and promulgate dockets."

SEC. 4. Nothing contained in the amendments made by this Act shall be construed to deprive any person serving on the date of enactment of this Act as an officer or employee of the Customs Court of any rights, privileges, or civil service status, if any, to which such person is entitled under the laws of the United States or regulations thereunder.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DETENTION OF MAIL FOR TEMPORARY PERIODS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 7379) to amend the act of July 27, 1956, with respect to the detention of mail for temporary periods in the public interest, and for other purposes.

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

ADDITIONAL FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK DIRECTORS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 8591) to amend section 7 of the Federal Home Loan Bank Act so as to authorize additional directors for Federal home loan banks under certain circumstances.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

GRANTING CONSENT TO THE WABASH VALLEY COMPACT

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 5711) granting the consent and approval of Congress to the Wabash Valley Compact, and for related purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of

America in Congress assembled, That the consent of Congress is hereby given to the States of Illinois and Indiana to enter into the Wabash Valley Compact in the form as follows:

"THE WABASH VALLEY COMPACT

"Article I

"Findings and Purpose

"The party states find that the Wabash Valley has suffered from a lack of comprehensive planning for the optimal use of its human and natural resources and that under-utilization and inadequate benefits from its potential wealth are likely to continue until there is proper organization to encourage and facilitate coordinated development of the Wabash Valley as a region and to relate its agricultural, industrial, commercial, recreational, transportation, development and other problems to the opportunities in the valley. To this end it is the purpose of the party states to recognize and provide for such development and coordination and to establish an agency of the party states with powers sufficient and appropriate to further regional planning for the valley.

"Article II

"The Valley

"As used in this compact, the term 'Wabash Valley' shall mean the Wabash River, its tributaries, and all land drained by said river and tributaries, to whatever extent they lie within the party states.

"Article III

"The Wabash Valley Interstate Commission

"(a) There is hereby created an agency of the party states to be known as the Wabash Valley Interstate Commission (hereinafter called the Commission). The Commission shall be composed of seven Commissioners from each party state designated or appointed in accordance with the law of the state which they represent and serving and subject to removal in accordance with such law. The federal government may be represented without vote if provision is made by federal law for such representation.

"(b) The Commissioners of the party states shall each be entitled to one vote in the Commission. No action of the Commission shall be binding unless taken at a meeting in which a majority of the members from each party state are present and unless a majority of those from each state concur, provided that any action not binding for such a reason may be ratified within thirty days by the concurrence of a majority of each state. In the absence of any Commissioner, his vote may be cast by another representative or Commissioner of his state provided that said Commissioner or other representative casting said vote shall have a written proxy in proper form as may be required by the Commission.

"(c) The Commission may sue and be sued, and shall have a seal.

"(d) The Commission shall elect annually, from among its members, a chairman, a vice-chairman and a treasurer. The Commission shall appoint an executive director who shall also act as secretary, and who, together with the treasurer, shall be bonded in such amounts as the Commission may require.

"(e) The Commission shall appoint and remove or discharge such personnel as may be necessary for the performance of the Commission's functions irrespective of the civil service, personnel or other merit system laws of any of the party states.

"(f) The Commission may establish and maintain, independently or in conjunction with any one or more of the party states, a suitable retirement system for its employees. Employees of the Commission shall be eligible for social security coverage in respect of old-age and survivors insurance provided that the Commission takes such steps as may be necessary pursuant to federal law to participate in such program of insurance as a governmental agency or unit. The Commission may establish and maintain or participate in such additional programs of employee benefits as may be appropriate to afford employees of the Commission terms and conditions of employment similar to those enjoyed by employees of the party states generally.

"(g) The Commission may borrow, accept, or contract for the services of personnel from any state or the United States or any subdivision or agency thereof, from any interstate agency, or from any institution, person, firm or corporation.

"(h) The Commission may accept for any of its purposes and functions under this compact any and all donations, and grants of money, equipment, supplies, materials, and services, conditional or otherwise, from any state of the United States or any subdivision or agency thereof, or interstate agency, or from any institution, person, firm or corporation, and may receive, utilize, and dispose of the same.

"(i) The Commission may establish and maintain such facilities as may be necessary for the transacting of its business. The Commission may acquire, hold, and convey real and personal property and any interest therein.

"(j) The Commission may adopt, amend, and rescind bylaws, rules, and regulations for the conduct of its business.

"(k) The Commission annually shall make to the Governor of each party state, a report covering the activities of the Commission for the preceding year, and embodying such recommendations as may have been adopted by the Commission which report shall be transmitted to the legislature of said state. The Commission may issue such additional reports as it may deem desirable.

"Article IV

"Finances

"(a) The Commission shall submit to the executive head or designated officer or officers of each party state a budget of its estimated expenditures for such period as may be required by the laws of that jurisdiction for presentation to the legislature thereof.

"(b) Each of the Commission's budgets of estimated expenditures shall contain specific recommendations of the amount or amounts to be appropriated by each of the party states. Subject to appropriation by the respective legislatures the Commission shall be provided with such funds by each of the party states as are necessary to provide the means of establishing and maintaining facilities, a staff of personnel, and such activities as may be necessary to fulfill the powers and duties imposed upon and entrusted to the Commission.

"(c) The Commission may meet any of its obligations in whole or in part with funds available to it under Article III (h) of this compact, provided that the Commission takes specific action setting aside such funds prior to the incurring of any obligation to be met in whole or in part in this manner. Except where the Commission makes use of funds available to it under Article III (h) hereof, the Commission shall not incur any obligations prior to the allotment of funds by the party jurisdictions adequate to meet the same.

"(d) The expenses and any other costs for each member of the Commission shall be met by the Commission in accordance with such standards and procedures as it may establish under its bylaws.

"(e) The Commission shall keep accurate accounts of all receipts and disbursements. The receipts and disbursements of the Commission shall be subject to the audit and accounting procedures established under its bylaws. However, all receipts and disbursements of funds handled by the Commission shall be audited yearly by a qualified public accountant and the report of the audit shall be included in and become a part of the annual report of the Commission.

"(f) The accounts of the Commission shall be open at any reasonable time for inspection.

"Article V

"Advice and Cooperation

"(a) The Commission shall establish a technical advisory committee which shall be composed of representatives of such departments or agencies of the governments of the party states as have significant interest in the subject matter of the Commission's work: Provided that if pursuant to the laws of a party state a representative of any such department or agency serves as a member of the Commission said department or agency need not be represented on the technical advisory committee. The Commission shall provide under its bylaws for the procedures for the reference of questions to such committee.

"(b) The Commission may establish other advisory and technical committees composed of private citizens, expert and lay personnel, representatives of industry, labor, commerce, agriculture, civic associations, and officials of local, state and federal government, and may cooperate with and use the services of any such committee and the organizations which they represent in furthering any of its activities under this compact. The Commission shall encourage citizen organization and activity for the promotion of the objectives of this compact.

"Article VI

"Functions

"The Commission shall have the power to:

"A. Promote the balanced development of the Wabash Valley by

"(1) Correlating and reporting on data significant to such development.

"(2) Recommending the coordination of studies by the agencies of the party states to provide such data.

"(3) Publishing and disseminating materials and studies which will encourage the economic development of the Valley.

"(4) Recommending standards as guides for local and state zoning and other action which will promote balanced development by encouraging the establishing of industrial parks to facilitate industrial development, the reservation of stream bank and lake shore areas for recreation and public access to water, the preservation of marshes and other suitable areas as wild life preserves, the afforestation and sustained yield forest management of submarginal lands, the protection of scenic values and amenities and other appropriate measures.

"(5) Preparing in cooperation with appropriate governmental agencies a master plan for the identification and programming of public works.

"(6) Cooperating with all appropriate governmental agencies in the encouragement of tourist traffic and facilities in the Valley.

"B. Recommend integrated plans and programs for the conservation, development and proper utilization of the water, land and related natural resources of the Wabash Valley, including but not limited to:

"(1) Encouraging the classification of Valley lands in terms of appropriate uses.

"(2) Cooperating in the development of appropriate plans for flood protection, including but not limited to the construction of protective works and reservoirs.

"(3) Developing public awareness of the need for flood plain zoning and in cooperation with the appropriate agencies of the party states and their political subdivisions evolving standards for the implementation and application of such zoning in the Valley.

"(4) Reviewing the need for and appropriate sources of suitable water supplies for domestic, municipal, agricultural, power, industrial, recreation and transportation purposes.

"(5) Encouraging a pattern of land use and resource management which will increase the natural wealth of the Valley and promote the welfare of its inhabitants.

"(6) In cooperation with appropriate agencies, analyzing the recreational needs and potential of the Valley and developing a program for the use and maximization of recreational resources.

"C. Secure the necessary research and developmental activities by:

"(1) Correlating such research and developmental activities as are placed within its purview by this compact. The Commission may engage in original investigation and research on its own account or secure the undertaking thereof by a qualified public or private agency.

"(2) Making contracts for studies, investigations and research in any of the fields of its interest.

"(3) Publishing and disseminating reports.

"D. Make recommendations for appropriate action to:

"(1) The legislatures and executive heads of the party states and the federal government.

"(2) The agencies of the party states and the federal government.

"E. Undertake such additional functions as may hereafter be delegated to or imposed upon it from time to time by the action of the legislature of a party state concurred in by the legislature of the other.

"Article VII

"Enactment and Withdrawal

"This compact shall become effective when entered into and enacted into law by the States of Illinois and Indiana. The compact shall continue in force and remain binding upon each party state until renounced by legislative action of either party state.

"Article VIII

"Construction and Severability

"The provisions of this compact shall be severable and if any phrase, clause, sentence or provision of this compact is declared to be unconstitutional or the applicability thereaof to any state, agency, person or circumstances is held invalid, the constitutionality of the remainder of this compact and the applicability thereof to any other state, agency, person or circumstance shall not be affected thereby. It is the legislative intent that the provisions of this compact be reasonably and liberally construed."

SEC. 2. A Federal representative to the Wabash Valley Interstate Commisison shall be appointed by the President, and he shall report to the President either directly or through such agency or official as the President may specify. Such representative shall have no vote on the commission. His compensation shall be in such amount, not in excess of $100 per diem, as the President shall specify, but the total amount of compensation payable in any one calendar year shall not exceed $10,000: *Provided,* That if the Federal representative be an employee of the United States he shall serve without additional compensation: *Provided further,* That a retired military officer or a retired Federal civilian officer or employee may be appointed as such representative, without prejudice to his retired status, and he shall receive compensation as authorized herein in addition to his retired pay or annuity but the sum of his retired pay or annuity and such additional compensation as may be paid hereunder shall not exceed $12,000 in any one calendar year. The Federal representative shall be entitled to travel expenses, he shall also be provided with office space, stenographic service, and other necessary administrative services. The compensation of the Federal representative shall be paid from available appropriations for the White House Office or from funds available to the President in connection with special projects. Travel expenses, office space, stenographic, and administrative services shall be paid from any available appropriations selected by the head of such agency or agencies as may be designated by the President to provide such expenses.

SEC. 3. The Wabash Valley Interstate Commission constituted by the compact shall make an annual report to Congress not later than sixty days after the beginning of each regular session thereof.

SEC. 4. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this Act is expressly reserved.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, lines 4 and 5, strike out the words "to enter into the Wabash Valley Compact" and insert in lieu thereof "for the compact, known as the Wabash Valley Compact. (Laws of Indiana, 1959, chapter 3, approved February 26, 1959, House Enrolled Act No. 22; Laws of Illinois, 1959, approved March 20, 1959, Senate bill No. 78)."

Page 13, line 16, add the following new sections:

"SEC. 5. Nothing contained in this act or in the compact herein consented to shall be construed as impairing or affecting the authority of the United States of any of its rights or jursdicition in and over the area or waters which are the subject of the compact.

"SEC. 6. That all future legislation enacted pursuant to Article V, Clause E of the compact, requiring concurrent action by the States of Indiana and Illinois, shall be submitted to Congress for approval before such legislation becomes effective.

"SEC. 7. Nothing contained herein shall be interpreted or construed as approving any act, action or conduct which is or has been or may be in violation of existing law nor shall anything herein contained constitute a defense to any action, suit or proceeding pending or hereafter instituted on account of any prohibited antitrust or monopolistic act, action or conduct.

"SEC. 8. The right is hereby reserved to the Congress or any of its standing committees to require the disclosure and furnishing of such information or data by the Wabash Valley Interstate Commission as is deemed appropriate by the Congress or any such Committee."

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ROGERS of Colorado: On page 14, line 9, strike out "V" and insert "VI."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FOREIGN AGENTS REGISTRATION ACT

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6817) to amend sections 1 and 3 of the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938, as amended.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will some member of the committee tell me whether this bill increases the number of foreign agents? Or just what does it do?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. This bill proposes to broaden and clarify present law. There is a question as to whether or not an individual working for an organization engaged in legitimate business financed or party financed by a foreign country, should come under this act. This bill makes it certain that they do.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. I was the author of the original act back some years ago in 1935 and 1936, the Foreign Agents Registration Act, and, naturally, I follow any amendment to it very closely. I can assure the gentleman that these amendments are very good ones. I originally introduced the bill as a result of the findings of a special committee of which I was chairman, which investigated communism, nazism, fascism, and bigotry in 1934.

This bill was one of the recommendations of my special committee, and what is known as the Smith Act was another recommendation of my special committee. This Foreign Agents Registration Act was very effective during the war, and it is a very effective piece of legislation in meeting subversive activities, sabotage, or anything of that kind. This amendment is a very good one, I assure the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. My interest in this matter goes to the small army of Americans who are now hiring themselves out to represent foreign governments and foreign corporations in this country. Some of them are being paid fancy fees for representing governments and corporations.

A former Governor of New York, I understand, is being paid a couple of hundred thousand dollars to promote trade for Japan, and so it goes. He is also on the payroll of the Turkish Government for a substantial fee, or was a few months ago.

Does this bill deal with those people? That is what I am trying to get at. Does this bill have anything to do with those people? They are agents of foreign governments, are they not?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. For propaganda purposes.

Mr. GROSS. I do not believe it is limited to propaganda. I think in this instance the former Governor is engaged in something more than propaganda.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. All I can say to the gentleman is the purpose of it, and I am sure the gentleman from New York on your right will verify this, is to define a foreign principal as that term is being used in the act: Domestic organizations which are substantially supervised, directed, controlled or financed by a foreign government or a foreign political party. That is the wording of the law, and this additional definition will bring agents of domestic corporations within the purview of the registration requirement of the act, regardless of whether such organizations are subsidized, which was heretofore the only requirement. In other words, it broadens rather than narrows, and this

has been requested by the Department of Justice.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. LINDSAY. I may say to the gentleman from Iowa that the gentleman from Colorado is absolutely correct. The effect of this amendment will be to broaden the coverage of the Foreign Agents Registration Act.

Mr. GROSS. Let me ask the gentleman, by "foreign agents" the gentleman means those who are being paid a fee for representing foreign governments in this country?

Mr. LINDSAY. That is correct. Prior to this time a domestic organization was required to have been found to be "subsidized" by a foreign principal in order to come within the coverage of the act. They have found in the administration of the act that there have been technical difficulties surrounding the requirement of making that finding, therefore this amendment broadens it to include the words "supervised, directed, controlled, or financed."

Mr. GROSS. I wish the amendment had provided for a reduction in the number of American agents representing foreign governments for fat fees. I wish the bill had provided for that.

Mr. LINDSAY. The purpose of the Registration Act is to require registration.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. PELLY. I think in fairness the gentleman would want the record straight. He just made reference to the fact that a former Governor of New York was getting $200,000 a year for representing a foreign government. I saw a statement in a number of papers to that effect, but subsequently I saw a statement in the papers where he had declined the offer to represent a foreign government.

Mr. GROSS. And subsequently there was another item in the paper saying he was reconsidering his alleged declination.

Mr. PELLY. The gentleman has made a statement, and I do not believe it is proper to leave it in that loose fashion unless the gentleman knows he is representing the foreign government. I do not think the gentleman should make that statement.

Mr. GROSS. A few weeks ago I called the Justice Department to find out if he was then representing the Government of Turkey and was being paid for that representation. I was informed that was correct and the amount of his last payment was given me. I have no doubt he is now representing the Government of Japan. He is not the only one. Do not misunderstand me. I can recall a certain law firm of which a former Secretary of State was a member. His name did not appear on the door when he was Secretary of State but he was in and out of the State Department. His law firm was paid, as I recall it, $90-000 as a fee in connection with a loan for Poland. That has been several years ago. But it was after Poland fell behind the Iron Curtain.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. This is not a question of who gets what fees. The question is, Shall he register under the Registration Act?

Mr. GROSS. I will say to the gentleman I am now satisfied on that point. I was responding a moment ago to the remarks of my friend, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. PELLY]. I am now satisfied on the point that the gentleman has made with reference to the bill.

I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 1(b) of the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938, as amended (56 Stat. 248), is amended by adding thereto a new paragraph (6) to read as follows:

"(6) A domestic partnership, association, corporation, organization, or other combination of individuals, supervised, directed, controlled, or financed, in whole or in substantial part, by any foreign government or foreign political party;".

SEC. 2. Section 3(d) of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"(d) Any person engaging or agreeing to engage only in private and nonpolitical financial or mercantile activities in furtherance of the bona fide trade or commerce of such foreign principal or in the soliciting or collecting of funds and contributions within the United States to be used only for medical aid and assistance, or for food and clothing to relieve human suffering, if such solicitation or collection of funds and contributions is in accordance with and subject to the provisions of the Act of November 4, 1939, as amended (54 Stat. 48), and any such rules and regulations as may be prescribed thereunder;".

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. 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 Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 6817 amends the Foreign Agents Registration Act by adding to the definition of a "foreign principal," as that term is used in the act, domestic organizations which are substantially "supervised, directed, controlled, or financed" by a foreign government or foreign political power. This additional definition will bring agents of domestic corporations within the purview of the registration requirements of the act irrespective of whether such organizations are subsidized, which was heretofore the only requirement.

In addition, the bill clarifies the so-called commercial exemption provisions of the Foreign Agents Registration Act by providing that an agent of a foreign principal, in order to be eligible for exemption from registering under the act, must be engaged in activities which are either private and nonpolitical and financial or private and nonpolitical and mercantile.

The present language of the act has proved ambiguous and has led to difficult administrative problems. It has been argued that an agent of a foreign principal is exempt from registering if the agent is engaging only in private, or nonpolitical, or mercantile or other activities in furtherance of the business of his foreign principal. In other words, if the agent is engaged in only one of the above conditions, as distinguished from meeting several or all of the requirements, he is not obliged to register. As rewritten, the section makes it clear that for an agent to qualify for exemption from the obligation of registering he must be engaged in activities which meet either of two sets of three requirements, namely, the activities must be private and nonpolitical and financial or private and nonpolitical and mercantile. If any one of these requirements is lacking, the agent cannot qualify for exemption and therefore must register under the act.

House Report No. 949, 86th Congress, which accompanies the instant bill H.R. 6817, is incorrect on this point and does not make it clear that it is the agent and not the foreign principal who, under section 2 of the bill, must be engaging in private and nonpolitical financial or mercantile activities. Likewise with regard to section 1, it is intended in further defining "foreign principal" to bring agents of domestic organizations within the purview of the registration requirements of the act.

PROGRAM FOR BALANCE OF THE WEEK

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I take this time in order to ask the majority leader if he will inform us as to the program for the balance of the week.

Mr. McCORMACK. I will be very happy to do so. The other day, when I obtained unanimous consent that tomorrow would be considered suspension day, I stated that I would announce to the House before the day was over the bills that would be on the program tomorrow for suspension. They are as follows:

S. 2162, health benefits program for Federal employees.

H.R. 2164, reduce cabaret taxes.

H.R. 7379, detention of mail, obscene matter.

H.R. 7476, extending Air Pollution Control Act.

H.R. 7889, rice marketing quotas.

H.R. 8639, Agricultural Research and Development Commission.

H.R. 3151, withholding city income taxes.

S. 2181, amend Mineral Leasing Act of 1939.

H.R. 4279, construct lower Rio Grande, Tex., rehabilitation project.

H.R. 7681, Reorganization Plan No. 1, 1959.

H.R. 3792, admitting the vessel *John F. Drews* to American registry.

H.R. 5004, fish, research on migratory species.

H.R. 5813, fish and wildlife, effect of insecticides.

S. 107, vessels, definition of drydocks.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARENDS. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. It is my understanding that H.R. 7681 has been scheduled, by agreement between the leadership on both sides, for suspension on Tuesday.

Mr. McCORMACK. Under certain conditions.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. With certain amendments that have been agreed to by both the majority and minority and by the Bureau of the Budget and the department involved; is that correct? Those amendments will be offered at that time?

Mr. McCORMACK. The bill was put on the list for suspensions with the understanding that certain amendments would be offered, and if they were not, that the bill was not going to be subject to suspension.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. That is the understanding, I think, we had with the gentleman from Illinois and the chairman of the committee.

Mr. McCORMACK. So, if the chairman of the committee and the minority members are in agreement with reference to certain amendments, the bill will come up. If there is a difference of opinion, the bill will not come up.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARENDS. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. May I ask the majority leader if these bills will come up in the order in which he has read them.

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes; that is, generally in that order. Do not hold me to it, but it is the intention to bring them up in that order.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARENDS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. May I ask the majority leader this question: I note with regret that the civil rights bill is not on this list. I would like to ask the gentleman what the position of the civil rights bill is at this time.

Mr. McCORMACK. Well, the gentleman's knowledge on that is as good as mine. If the gentleman asks me what my personal views are, I will answer the gentleman.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I would be glad to have the gentleman's personal views, because it is important for us to know what the position of the leadership is.

Mr. McCORMACK. Expressing my personal views, I would certainly like to see a civil rights bill passed this year. We know what the situation is. We have to have three Republican votes on the Committee on Rules in order to get it out. I would like to see a civil rights bill acted on this year because I think it would be for the best interests of both parties, because next year both parties will have their national conventions and if it is possible to get it out of the way this year, it will be advantageous to both parties.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, the majority leader made reference to Republicans on the Rules Committee. The fact is that the Rules Committee is made up of 8 Democrats and 4 Republicans. Is it not a fact, if I may ask the majority leader, that this great liberal leadership of the Committee on the Judiciary did not apply for a rule until just a few days ago?

Mr. McCORMACK. In justice to the Committee on Rules, the bill was reported out last week and it was only in recent days that a request was made, yes. Anything I said is not to be construed at all as any direct or indirect criticism of the Committee on Rules in relation to any hearings up to date. I will agree with the gentleman in that respect.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. McCORMACK. But that does not change my expression of personal hope.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. The gentleman's personal hope may be in line with mine, as far as that is concerned. But is it not also a fact that this bill could be brought up on Calendar Wednesday, which is next Wednesday week?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Would it not be possible for the Committee on Rules to meet, hold a short hearing and report a resolution immediately?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I do not know. I suggest that the gentleman from California discuss that with the Democratic leadership that controls the Committee on Rules. I do not control it, so I cannot speak for it. But the Democratic leadership also controls the matter of Calendar Wednesday.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I hope we will have the gentleman's support in the committee.

MISSOURI-ILLINOIS BI-STATE DEVELOPMENT AGENCY COMPACT

The Clerk called the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 465) approving certain additional powers conferred upon the Bi-State Development Agency by the States of Missouri and Illinois.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Whereas the Congress is consenting to the compact between Missouri and Illinois creating the Bi-State Development Agency and the Bi-State Metropolitan District in Public Law 743, Eighty-first Congress, approved August 31, 1950, provided that no power or powers shall be exercised by the Bi-State Agency under that certain portion of article III of such compact which reads:

"8. To exercise such additional powers as shall be conferred on it by the legislature of either State concurred in by the legislature of the other or by Act of Congress."

unless and until such power or powers shall have been conferred upon the Bi-State Agency by the legislature of one of the States to the compact and concurred in by the legislature of the other and shall have been approved by an Act of Congress; and

Whereas such States have now enacted certain legislation in order to confer certain additional powers on such Bi-State Development Agency: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Congress hereby approves the additional powers conferred on the Bi-State Development Agency by senate bill numbered 364, Laws of Illinois 1953; senate bill numbered 97, Laws of Illinois 1959; senate bill numbered 11, Laws of Missouri 1957, second extra session; and senate bill numbered 25, Laws of Missouri 1959.

SEC. 2. The provisions of Public Law 743, Eighty-first Congress, approved August 31, 1950 (64 Stat. 568), shall apply to the additional powers approved under this joint resolution to the same extent as if such additional powers were conferred under the provisions of the compact consented to in such public law.

SEC. 3. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this joint resolution is expressly reserved.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, after line 16, insert:

"SEC. 4. The right is hereby reserved to the Congress and to its standing committees to require the disclosure and furnishing of such information or data by the Bi-State Development Agency as is deemed appropriate by the Congress or any such committee."

Page 1, first line of first whereas clause, change "is" to "in".

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BAYOUS TERREBONNE AND LECARPE, LA.

The Clerk called the bill (S. 551) to declare portions of Bayous Terrebonne and LeCarpe, La., to be nonnavigable streams.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the project for a navigation channel in Bayou Terrebonne authorized by the River and Harbor Act of June 25, 1910 (36 Stat. 630, 647), insofar as said project relates to said bayou west of Barrow Street in the city of Houma, State of Louisiana, be and the same is hereby, abandoned.

SEC. 2. That Bayou Terrebonne west of Barrow Street and Bayou LeCarpe west of the Intracoastal Waterway in the city of Houma, State of Louisiana, be, and the same are hereby, declared to be not navigable waters of the United States within the meaning of the Constitution and laws of the United States.

SEC. 3. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this Act is hereby expressly reserved.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INCLUDING FLOATING DRYDOCKS UNDER THE TERM "VESSEL"

The Clerk called the bill (S. 107) to amend title XI of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, relating to Federal ship mortgage insurance, in order to include floating drydocks under the definition of the term "vessel" in such title.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the gentleman what cost may be involved in this proposal.

Mr. BONNER. There is no cost.

Mr. WEAVER. There is no reference to cost?

Mr. BONNER. That is correct. We now insure the mortgages on construction of new vessels under the American flag. This would extend the existing law and make provision for insuring the loan for the construction of floating drydocks. The reason is that there is only one floating drydock on the Atlantic coast of the capacity to take care of the new ships now being built. It is not applicable to one case. It is general in scope.

In the experience of this entire program they have had to take back only one vessel over the years. That was a passenger vessel that was built for operation on the Pacific coast. That is the only mortgage that the Maritime Administration insured under this that has had to be taken back. So the experience has been a good one and it is an inducement to use private capital.

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to inquire of the gentleman from North Carolina if this bill includes also graving docks as well as drydocks?

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman knows that I am very sympathetic to his situation. I know why he has asked the question. The committee considered shore installations. When we come to the matter of graving docks that is a fixed installation in a shipyard, fixed just as the warehouses are fixed and the piers are fixed and other things that cannot be moved from the particular yard. If the committee had included graving docks, eventually we would come to docks and piers. It was thought at this time in all probability that the situation the gentleman is interested in could be served by a floating drydock just as well as it could be served by graving docks. This offers that opportunity. I assure the gentleman in the next session of the Congress I will again consider and have hearings on the situation he is interested in with respect to graving docks.

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, of course I appreciate these words of hope that the chairman has given me about next year. But I have been around here long enough to learn that these hopes, although they spring eternal, never always are realized. It seems to me the purpose of this type of dock is simple. Whether it is floating or whether it it cut out of the bank of the river, it is the same thing. These two docks are designed to accept ships for repairs and for construction. So I cannot see where it makes any difference whether it is floating in a river or cut into a bank as a graving dock is, with a gate where the ship is put in and the water is pumped out and the ship is worked on in a graving dock. We appeared before the committee and sought to have this language included. It has been excluded because of the objections of some members of the committee who had more than a passing interest in shipyards in their own localities. But we have just as much interest in shipyards in our areas as they have and when we in a port like the city of Savannah cannot repair a modern vessel simply because we have a small river that is too narrow to put a floating drydock in and because the existing graving docks are so small that they cannot accommodate modern vessels, I think we bring a fairly good case to the Congress in seeking to have the language "graving docks" included in the bill, as well as floating drydocks. For the benefit of the Members of the House let me say that this law was created originally to insure ships. This bill would expand it to include floating drydocks which in no sense of the word are ships. There is just as much reason to include warehouses as there is to broaden the act to include a floating drydock.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRESTON. I gladly yield to my colleague.

Mr. BONNER. This bill is supported by the National Defense and the Navy. During World War II we had these floating drydocks all through the Pacific and they would repair the badly damaged vessels in the immediate area, rather than return them back to Pearl Harbor or to the Pacific coast or to any other shore base. That is the reason you can take this drydock and move it any place in the Atlantic or any place in the Pacific or send it any place where there is a sufficient draft of water to repair the vessels at sea or in port. That is the close kinship of a floating drydock to the insurance construction of a vessel. I have the deepest sympathy in the world with the gentleman from Georgia in his problem. The gentleman knows my position. I have endeavored to do the best I could in this situation. This does fit the pattern of American national defense. That is the only reason this bill has been brought out here.

Mr. PRESTON. I am sure if the gentleman from North Carolina had had his way about the matter, graving docks would have been included, but there were forces within the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries who have great appreciation for their shipyard installations which were apparently able to overcome the wishes of the distinguished chairman who has done so much for the American merchant marine and for whom I have the highest and the greatest admiration. But consistency is a jewel that we should cherish in this House. Sometimes we go astray and are not always consistent. In this instance I think it is not proper to change the intent of this act to accommodate one situation without at the same time accommodating another one which has for its purpose the identical purpose of the floating drydocks. I have tried every way I know, appearing before the committee with the proper witnesses and I think we made out a good case. This bill lounged around in the committee for some time before they finally decided to bring it out. There was grave doubt about it coming out at all. Now finally it is on the Consent Calendar. I am constrained to object to it unless I might be given an opportunity to offer an amendment which would include graving docks. May I inquire of the chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, would he object to an amendment at this time to include graving docks?

Mr. BONNER. I personally would not object.

Mr. PRESTON. Would the minority object to an amendment to include graving docks?

Mr. PELLY. I think in fairness to the committee, in view of the fact that we delayed action on it, that it should not be offered as an amendment on the Consent Calendar. I think the gentleman made a wonderful presentation; he put on very fine witnesses. I know the chairman of the committee stated in committee that he was asking that this be considered, but I do not believe this is the proper place, the Consent Calendar, and I would have to object to an amendment if the gentleman offered one.

Mr. PRESTON. In the light of these statements, Mr. Speaker——

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield before he objects?

Mr. PRESTON. I yield.

Mr. BONNER. This bill is not restricted to one area. Under this bill a drydock can be built on the Pacific coast, the Atlantic coast, the gulf coast, or the Great Lakes; it is not for any specific location; and, as I have said before, these drydocks are necessary, are needed, since we have increased the size of ships, and I do hope the gentleman will not object.

Mr. PRESTON. We all have our responsibility here. I certainly have one to represent my district, and I think in fairness to a large number of workers in my district and in the matter of consistency and in the matter of fairness to the people who work in this shipyard in Savannah, Ga., that I should object to this measure being considered on the Consent Calendar.

We will have an opportunity tomorrow under suspension of the rules. It was just announced by the majority leader that this bill will be called up under a suspension of the rules if it is not passed today.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRESTON. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman understands, of course, he will have no opportunity to offer an amendment if the bill is called up under suspension.

Mr. PRESTON. Between now and tomorrow there could be a lot of con-

versation taking place about this bill and perhaps something might be worked out. I have seen things arranged in the last few days of a Congress that could not be arranged at any other time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Speaker, I object.

CONVEYANCE OF LAND TO KEOSAUQUA, IOWA

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1453) to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to sell and convey certain lands in the State of Iowa to the city of Keosauqua.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to sell and convey to the city of Keosauqua, Iowa, by quitclaim deed, at the fair market value as determined by him, and subject to all outstanding rights, all the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to that certain tract of land containing ninety-nine and fifty-seven one-hundredhs acres, more or less, located in Van Buren County, Iowa, in and adjacent to the city of Keosauqua, conveyed to the United States by the Grand Lodge of the Ancient Order of United Workmen of North Dakota by deed dated December 10, 1936, and recorded in Van Buren County in book 78 on page 303.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

USE OF CUMBERLAND COUNTY, TENN., LANDS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1521) to provide for the removal of the restriction on use with respect to a certain tract of land in Cumberland County, Tenn., conveyed to the State of Tennessee in 1938.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized and directed to convey by quitclaim deed or other appropriate means to the State of Tennessee all right, title, and interest remaining in the United States in and to the following described tract of land situated in Cumberland County, Tennessee, which is held by such State under a deed executed by the Secretary of Agriculture in 1938:

Beginning at a stake in the center of State Highway Numbered 28 where the lands of Cumberland Homesteads and the lands of Cumberland State Park corner and runs with the centerline of said highway south 45 degrees 12 minutes and 15 seconds east 177.73 feet to a stake; thence continuing with the centerline of said highway south 23 degrees 38 minutes and 30 seconds east 755.40 feet to a stake; thence continuing with the centerline of said highway south 43 degrees 03 minutes and 15 seconds east 155.65 feet to a stake; thence leaving said highway south 44 degrees 13 minutes and 45 seconds west 600 feet to a stake; thence north 29 degrees 54 minutes and 00 seconds west 1,073.90 feet to a stake; thence north 44 degrees 13 minutes and 45 seconds east 600 feet to the beginning; containing 14.36 acres, more or less; being located at the northeast corner of the Cumberland State Park in Cumberland County, Tennessee.

SEC. 2. The conveyance authorized by this Act shall provide that in the event that the lands cease to be used for public purposes all right, title, and interest therein shall immediately revert to and revest in the United States.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. EVINS. 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 Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, the bill just passed will permit the State of Tennessee to make more effective and efficient public use of 14.36 acres of a larger tract of land conveyed to the State of Tennessee in 1938 by the United States.

This bill is, in effect, a quitclaim to the State of Tennessee of a small parcel of land which is now a part of the Cumberland State Park, Cumberland County, in the Fourth District of Tennessee which I have the honor to represent. The land conveyed was transferred to the State of Tennessee by the Farm Security Administration in 1938 for use as a park. This park and forest area covers approximately 1,250 acres.

The Commissioner of Highways and the State Highway Department of Tennessee have plans for constructing a highway maintenance garage at a remote northeast corner of this tract using this small portion of the land conveyed for this purpose. A public use of the land will thus be continued and assured.

The use of this land by the State Highway Department at this particular location will in no sense affect the operation of the park. As a matter of fact, the commissioner of conservation, State of Tennessee, who has jurisdiction over the State parks, has expressed his agreement and approval of the use of this land for the purposes indicated.

The Secretary of Agriculture and the Bureau of the Budget have indicated that there is no objection to the passage of the bill.

In the original conveyance of this land from the Farm Security Administration to the State of Tennessee there is a clause providing for reversion of the property in the event it ceases to be used exclusively for State park or State forest purposes. The Secretary of Agriculture has indicated that he has no authority to permit modification or release from the reversionary provisions in the original conveyance. Thus, the passage of this bill is necessary to release this land to the State Highway Department for the more effective public use and for the desired purposes.

The Senate has previously passed the bill. The cost will be negligible. The public interest will be served.

EXTENDING TIME FOR VESSEL CONSTRUCTION RESERVE FUNDS

The Clerk called 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.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the chairman of the committee kindly explain the reserve fund involved in this legislation?

Mr. BONNER. Yes. These are funds that are placed in the reserve deposits of the Maritime Administration for ship construction. Under the law the fund is available for a certain length of time. If it is not used for the replacement of a vessel it has to be taken out and these funds are put in there tax exempt and may only be used where a new vessel is built to replace an old vessel of 20 years or more.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. BONNER. I yield.

Mr. VANIK. Are these funds subject to investment at the discretion of the American-Hawaiian Steamship Co.?

Mr. BONNER. They are subject to investment by the Maritime Board under certain conditions, yes, not by the shipping company; but the funds are preserved for the replacement of the American fleet. That is the purpose.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the proviso at the end of section 511(h) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, is amended to read as follows: *"Provided,* That until January 1, 1961, in addition to the extensions hereinbefore permitted, further extensions may be granted ending not later than December 31, 1961."

SEC. 2. The amendment made by the first section of this act shall take effect June 30, 1959, or on the date of enactment of this act, whichever date first occurs.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COAST GUARD TO PRESCRIBE LIFESAVING REGULATIONS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2118) to amend section 4488 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, to authorize the Secretary of the Department in which the Coast Guard is operating to prescribe regulations governing lifesaving equipment, firefighting equipment, muster lists, ground tackle, hawsers, and bilge systems aboard vessels, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 4488 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (46

U.S.C. 481), is further amended to read as follows:

"(a) In order to provide against hazard to life and property, the Secretary of the Department in which the Coast Guard is operating (hereinafter referred to as the 'Secretary') shall prescribe such rules and regulations as may be necessary for vessels subject to inspection and certification by the United States Coast Guard with respect to the following matters:

"(1) Lifesaving equipment, including, but not limited to, the number, type, size, capacity, details of construction, methods of operation, stowage, maintenance, manning, use, testing, and inspecting of such equipment, and drills and exercises necessary to assure proper functioning and use of such equipment.

"(2) Firefighting equipment and precautionary measures guarding against fire, including, but not limited to, the number, type, size, capacity, details of construction, methods of operation, stowage, maintenance, manning, use, testing, and inspecting of such equipment, and drills and exercises necessary to assure proper functioning and use of such equipment.

"(3) Muster lists, including, but not limited to, the posting of such lists, and prescribing the special duties to be performed by crew members in the event of emergency.

"(4) Ground tackle and hawsers, including, but not limited to, the number, size, stowage, use, maintenance, manning, testing, and inspection.

"(5) Bilge systems for the removal of liquid from the various parts of the vessel, including, but not limited to, design, installation, capacity, composition, functioning, manning, testing, and inspection.

"(b)(1) In prescribing rules and regulations pursuant to this section, the Secretary shall give consideration to the age, size, service, route, and other factors affecting the operation of the vessels.

"(2) Unless otherwise prescribed by treaty or other international agreement, the rules and regulations prescribed by the Secretary pursuant to this section shall be applicable to all foreign vessels carrying passengers from ports of the United States.

"(3) The Secretary may, upon his own motion, or upon the application of any interested party, determine that the application to any vessel of the rules and regulations prescribed pursuant to this section, or any part thereof, is not necessary in the public interest, and he may order such vessel exempt from their application upon such terms and conditions and for such periods of time as he may specify in the order.

"(c) The owner or operator of any vessel who neglects or refuses to provide and equip his vessel with the lifesaving, firefighting, or other equipment, or take other measures required by the rules or regulations issued pursuant to this section shall be liable to the United States in a penalty of $1,000 for each such neglect or refusal for which sum the vessel shall be liable and may be seized and proceeded against by way of libel in any district court of the United States having jurisdiction of the violation; and any master or person in charge of such vessel who so defaults shall be liable to a penalty of $500.

"(d) Any person who willfully and knowingly manufactures or sells, or offers for sale, or has in his possession with intent to sell, any lifesaving, firefighting, or other equipment subject to the provisions of title 52 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, which is so defective as to be inefficient to accomplish the purpose for which it is intended, shall be fined not more than $10,000 and may, in addition thereto, in the discretion of the Court, be imprisoned for a term not exceeding five years."

SEC. 2. To the extent that any existing provision of law, or any rule or regulation prescribed pursuant thereto, is in conflict with any provision of section 4488 of the Revised Statutes (46 U.S.C. 481), such section as amended by this Act, and the rules and regulations hereafter prescribed pursuant thereto, shall prevail.

SEC. 3. (a) The following Acts or parts of Acts and all amendments thereto are hereby repealed:

(1) Section 4470 of the Revised Statutes (46 U.S.C. 463).

(2) Section 4471 of the Revised Statutes (46 U.S.C. 464).

(3) Section 4479 of the Revised Statutes (46 U.S.C. 472).

(4) Section 4481 of the Revised Statutes (46 U.S.C. 474).

(5) Section 4482 of the Revised Statutes (46 U.S.C. 475).

(6) Section 4483 of the Revised Statutes (46 U.S.C. 476).

(7) Section 4492 of the Revised Statutes (46 U.S.C. 490).

(8) Section 2(a) of the Act of October 9, 1940 (ch. 777, 54 Stat. 1028; 46 U.S.C. 463a).

(9) Section 11 of the Act of May 28, 1908 (ch. 212, 35 Stat. 428; 46 U.S.C. 396).

(b) Any reference in any other law to any Act, or any part thereof, repealed by this Act shall be deemed as a reference to section 4488 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (46 U.S.C. 481).

SEC. 4. Any rights or liabilities existing on the effective date of this Act shall not be affected by the enactment of this Act. Any procedures or rules or regulations in effect on the effective date of this Act shall remain in effect until modified or superseded under the authority of this Act.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WORLD WAR II INSURANCE BENEFITS FOR SEAMEN

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2334) to transfer from the Department of Commerce to the Department of Labor certain functions in respect of insurance benefits and disability payments to seamen for World War II service-connected injuries, death, or disability, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of Commerce shall certify to the Secretary of Labor amounts payable under crew life and injury and second seamen's war risk insurance policies issued under authority of subtitle "Insurance" of title II of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, extended, and supplemented (Act of June 29, 1940, section 222 (54 Stat. 689); Act of March 6, 1942 (56 Stat. 140); Act of April 11, 1942 (56 Stat. 214); Act of March 24, 1943, section 2 (57 Stat. 45); Act of September 30, 1944 (58 Stat. 758); Act of August 8, 1946 (60 Stat. 937)). Payments of such amounts so certified shall be made by the Secretary of Labor from the Employees' Compensation Fund established under the Federal Employees' Compensation Act of September 7, 1916, as amended (5 U.S.C. 751, 785).

SEC. 2. The powers, duties, and functions of the Secretary of Commerce in respect of permanent total or partial disability benefits (allowable upon exhaustion of insurance benefits referred to in section 1 hereof) under section 2(c) of the Act of March 24, 1943 (Public Law 17, Seventy-eighth Congress; 57 Stat. 45), as amended by the Act of September 30, 1944 (Public Law 449, Seventy-eighth Congress; 58 Stat. 758), are hereby transferred to the Secretary of Labor. Payments of such benefits, including costs and payments on account of medical care authorized by the Secretary of Labor, shall be made by him from the Employees' Compensation Fund as established under the Federal Employees' Compensation Act of September 7, 1916, as amended (5 U.S.C. 751, 785). The Secretary of Commerce shall furnish to the Secretary of Labor such information, data, and reports and certifications in respect of cases within the purview of this section as the Secretary of Labor may request. Nothing in this section shall be construed to authorize any appeal to, or review or redetermination by, the Secretary of Labor from any order, finding, determination, or adjudication in respect of eligibility for benefits made by the Secretary of Commerce in force on the effective date of this Act, except upon a showing to the satisfaction of the Secretary of Labor of a change in the nature and extent of the disability for which benefits were approved for payment in accordance with the provisions of such Acts.

SEC. 3. The Secretary of Labor is authorized to make such rules and regulations as he may deem necessary or appropriate to carry out the provisions of this Act and the functions vested in him by this Act.

SEC. 4. This Act shall become effective as of July 1, 1959.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from North Carolina yield?

Mr. BONNER. I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER] to explain the bill.

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, this bill would transfer from the Maritime Administration to the Department of Labor the matter of the payment of benefits to disabled ex-seamen. Heretofore this has been handled by the Maritime Administration. There are only 62 of these ex-seamen now receiving benefits. The purpose is to transfer to the Department of Labor where other similar claims are handled.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. I yield.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Will this then enable a reduction of the staff now handling it?

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. No; they are not reduced because the determination of the amount due the seamen is made by the Maritime Administration.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Possibly the gentleman does not understand my question. In transferring these responsibilities to the Department of Labor will it be possible for the Department of Commerce to reduce its staff for the number of people now required to handle the claims of these 62 men?

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. I presume it will, but I do not know. It presumably would take a very small staff to handle such a small number of claims, but this is to be transferred to another department that has been set up for such purposes.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FORT McDERMITT PAIUTE AND SHOSHONE TRIBE OF INDIANS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 24) to provide that certain real property of the United States situated in the State of Nevada shall be held in trust for members of the Fort McDermitt Paiute and Shoshone Tribe of Indians of the Fort McDermitt Indian Reservation, Nev.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That all right, title, and interest in the United States in and to the real property described in section 2 of this Act and lying within the Fort McDermitt Indian Reservation, Nevada, is hereby declared to be held in trust by the United States for the use and benefit of the members of the Fort McDermitt Paiute and Shoshone Tribe of Indians of the Fort McDermitt Indian Reservation, Nevada.

SEC. 2. The real property referred to in the first section of this Act is more particularly described as the south half northeast quarter and north half southeast quarter section 7, township 47 north, range 39 east, Mount Diablo base and meridian, Nevada, containing 160 acres more or less.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, following line 8, add a new section to read as follows:

"SEC. 3. This Act shall become effective upon agreement by the Fort McDermitt Paiute and Shoshone Tribe of Indians to eliminate from their suit now pending before the Indian Claims Commission under the Act of August 13, 1946 (60 Stat. 1049), any claim based on alleged inadequate compensation for the lands involved in this Act and to renounce any other claim they may have with respect thereto. If the lands involved herein are not embraced within said suit, the transfer hereby authorized shall be considered by way of offset under section 2 of said Act. Nothing contained in this Act shall be construed as an admission of liability on the part of the United States with respect to these or any other lands."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WHEAT ACREAGE HISTORY

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4874) to amend section 334 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, to provide that for certain purposes of this section, farms on which the farm marketing excess of wheat is adjusted to zero because of underproduction shall be regarded as farms on which the entire amount of the farm marketing excess of wheat has been delivered to the Secretary or stored to avoid or postpone the payment of the penalty.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask a question. I am looking at the report and under "Purpose" it says the purpose of this bill is to correct an equitable situation. If we have to correct equitable situations around here, I would like somebody to explain the purpose of the bill.

Mr. SMITH of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, this bill is an effort to do a little justice on base acreage. A farmer has a certain allotment and if he overplants the allotment he must pay a penalty when he harvests. If he has a storm and does not raise the number of bushels he should, he is penalized too. The man who raises his wheat and markets it does not pay a penalty. It is only the man who by hail storm or some other disaster has less acreage in his base.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I have such good respect for my friend that I think what he means is "an inequitable" situation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 334 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is further amended by inserting a new paragraph (d) between paragraphs (c) and (e) to read as follows:

"(d) For the purposes of paragraphs (a), (b), and (c) of this section, any farm on which the farm marketing excess is adjusted to zero because of underproduction pursuant to regulations implementing paragraph (12) of section 1340 of title 7 of the United States Code (7 U.S.C. 1340 (12)), shall be regarded as a farm on which the entire amount of the farm marketing excess has been delivered to the Secretary or stored in accordance with applicable regulations to avoid or postpone the payment of the penalty."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE CROOKED RIVER FEDERAL RECLAMATION PROJECT, OREGON

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4952) to amend the act authorizing the Crooked River Federal reclamation project, Oregon, in order to increase the capacity of certain project features for future irrigation of additional lands.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I do not intend to object, I wonder if the gentleman from Oregon, author of the bill, would take a moment to clear for the record the extenuating circumstances which necessitate the continuing of this project by this legislation without a feasibility report being first submitted to the Congress.

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, this involves an enlargement of the canal on a reclamation project, the Crooked River Federal reclamation project in Oregon, now under construction. This is a matter of great urgency. The reclamation project itself contains some 51,000 acre-feet of water and this involves an extension of the project by an additional 2,900 acres which would receive a portion of this surplus water supply.

I called the Commissioner of Reclamation, Mr. Dominy, this morning in reference to this matter because I knew of its urgency, and I knew that the gentleman would be interested in the feasibility report. Mr. Dominy authorized me to make the following statement:

With respect to H.R. 4952, we have examined the findings of engineering and economic feasibility that will be embodied in the report on the Crooked River extension and have found them completely satisfactory.

The only reason this extension was not incorporated in the original plan was because of the matter of timing. As far as the Bureau is concerned, there remains only the matter of putting the report into final form.

He has assured me that this matter is feasible and they are very anxious that the bill be approved because they have to let contracts within the next few weeks.

Mr. WEAVER. I would like to say to the gentleman I have also talked to the Commissioner of Reclamation, Mr. Floyd Dominy, and he wholeheartedly agrees with the gentleman's statement. I withdraw my reservation, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate bill (S. 1221) to amend the act authorizing the Crooked River Federal reclamation project, Oregon, in order to increase the capacity of certain project features for future irrigation of additional lands be considered in lieu of the House bill.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the Senate bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 1 of the Act entitled "An Act to authorize construction by the Secretary of the Interior of the Crooked River Federal reclamation project, Oregon," approved August 6, 1956 (70 Stat. 1058), is amended by adding to that section the following: "The Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to construct extra capacity in the canal below said reservoir and pumping plants located on the canal for the future irrigation of approximately three thousand acres of land, in addition to the presently proposed development, and to recognize the cost of providing such extra capacity as a deferred obligation to be paid under arrangements to be made at such time as the additional area may be brought into the project."

SEC. 2. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums, in addition to the sum of $6,339,000 authorized to be appropriated for the Crooked River Federal reclamation project in section 5 of the Act of August 6, 1956 (70 Stat. 1058), as may be required to carry out the purposes of this Act.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A similar House bill (H.R. 4952) was laid on the table.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LOUISIANA STATE UNIVERSITY AND AGRICULTURAL AND MECHANICAL COLLEGE LANDS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6669) to amend the act of July 14, 1945, to provide that the Louisiana State University and Agricultural and Mechanical College may use certain real property heretofore conveyed to it by the United States for general educational purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the first section of the Act entitled "An Act to transfer certain lands situated in Rapides Parish, Louisiana, to board of supervisors of Louisiana State University and Agricultural and Mechanical College", approved July 14, 1945 (59 Stat. 468), is amended by striking out "for the establishment and maintenance of an agricultural and vocational school" and by inserting in lieu thereof the following: "for educational purposes".

SEC. 2. The Secretary of Agriculture shall execute such instruments in writing as may be necessary to carry out the amendments made by the first section of this Act.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 3, strike out lines 3 through 5 and insert the following:

"SEC. 2. The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized and directed upon written consent of the Louisiana Rural Rehabilitation Corporation, to execute such quitclaim deed or other instruments in writing as may be necessary to carry out the amendment made by the first section of this Act.

"SEC. 3. Public Law 41, 82d Congress, approved May 29, 1951 (65 Stat. 46), which provided for transfer of 25 acres of the subject property to the Police Jury of the Parish of Rapides, is hereby repealed since such transfer was not made because the proposed transferee made other arrangement for holding livestock and agricultural expositions."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EQUITY UNDER SOIL BANK CONTRACTS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 8043) to amend the Agricultural Act of 1956.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a similar Senate bill (S. 2457) to provide equitable treatment for producers participating in the soil bank program on the basis of incorrect information furnished by the Government be considered in lieu of H.R. 8043.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

Mr. FORRESTER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, I would like to ask my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MARSHALL], a few questions, if he would be kind enough to answer them for me.

Mr. MARSHALL. Certainly.

Mr. FORRESTER. First, I want to say to the gentleman that I know he is the author of H.R. 8043, which is the bill that is going to be dispensed with by substituting therefore the Senate bill S. 2457. I want to compliment the gentleman on the bill that he introduced, H.R. 8043, and I want to say to the gentleman that I have looked over the Senate bill here, and so far as I can see the only difference in the House bill that the gentleman introduced is the provision for payment is made mandatory, whereas in the Senate bill the discretion is in the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I would like, first, to thank the gentleman for his kind remarks. The Senate bill and the House bill were very similar, as I have stated, when I asked for unanimous consent that the Senate bill be substituted. It is true that the House bill language was mandatory, but the Senate report relieves any anxiety which anybody might have on that score. So, I am sure, so far as the bills are concerned, that the two bills are comparable and would accomplish exactly the same purpose.

Mr. FORRESTER. As I understand it now, the purpose of the Senate bill is the same as the House bill, H.R. 8043, as is set out in the report which accompanies H.R. 8043, where it is entitled "Purpose of the bill"; is that correct?

Mr. MARSHALL. That is correct.

Mr. FORRESTER. Now, I notice in the report from the Senate committee on the Senate bill there are several instances that they refer to which have already occurred and which they say will be covered by this legislation, if passed. In other words, the bill, by its very nature, to cover those transactions the bill is naturally retroactive.

Mr. MARSHALL. That is correct. It was the purpose of the authors of these two bills, and it was also the purpose of the report from the Department of Agriculture and the report from the Committee on Agriculture, which was unanimous, that they be retroactive.

Mr. FORRESTER. Now I would like to ask the gentleman this question. This question is based upon certain hard facts which have occurred down in the district in Georgia which I have the privilege of representing. It involves two of my constituents, Mr. J. H. Daniel and his son, down in Pulaski County, Ga. Their applications under this program had been approved by the local ASC office; approved by inspectors of the State ASC office, and by the State ASC office and payments authorized to them, and payments were made under the terms of the program. Later they, the Daniels, were advised that they had been paid $2,929 too much, and a claim for that amount was placed in the county debt register. Now, these two constituents of mine, for many reasons, paid that amount of $2,929 which was set out in the county debt register. Now, under the terms of this Senate bill, they would be authorized to file their claim with the Secretary and they are not barred by reason of the fact that they have paid that money; is that correct?

Mr. MARSHALL. I am sure that under the purposes of this bill they would not be discriminated against in any way, and were their claims just, under the provisions of this bill, they would be covered by this legislation. The matter referred to may have resulted from the fact that they may have received some misinformation, which undoubtedly is the case.

Mr. FORRESTER. In other words, in the case I just narrated to you, to inquire into such and reimburse if proper, is one of the prime purposes for this legislation.

Mr. MARSHALL. The gentleman is absolutely correct.

Mr. FORRESTER. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation on the substitution, but I still have a pending objection on the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the Senate bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Soil Bank Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 128. Nothwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary may, to the extent he deems it desirable in order to provide fair and equitable treatment, pay a producer compensation under the acreage reserve or conservation reserve program which he otherwise would not be entitled to receive because the contract, application therefor, action, or conduct of the producer is—

"(1) not in conformity with the provisions of the program, or

"(2) less favorable to the producer than would have been the case if it had been based on correct information, or

"(3) based on an understanding that payment would be forthcoming in an amount in excess of that permitted by the program, if it is established to the satisfaction of the Secretary that the contract, application, action, or conduct of the producer was the result of relying in good faith on the erroneous approval of such contract, application, action, or conduct by, or on the erroneous advice, determination, or computation of, an authorized representative of the Secretary."

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, I offer a committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MARSHALL: At the end of the Senate bill, strike out the quotation marks and add the following:

"No contract heretofore or hereafter entered into shall be modified, invalidated, or changed because of the marriage of any two contracting parties.' "

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, this is a committee amendment. There is no controversy over it and I recommend that it pass.

Mr. CARNAHAN. 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 Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 8043 introduced by my colleague the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MARSHALL], and I commend him for the work he has done in clearing up a perplexing problem. This bill directs the Secretary of Agriculture to pay producers compensation under the acreage reserve or conservation reserve program which the Secretary has ruled is not permitted under the law. These cases involve contracts made by producers who relied in good faith on erroneous advice of an authorized representative of the Secretary.

I introduced H.R. 8443, a similar bill this Congress and feel strongly that this legislation should be passed. A great number of producers throughout the United States have suffered extreme hardship and will continue to be unfairly treated without this legislation. In one county in the Eighth Congressional District of Missouri, there are more than 20 producers who are being asked by the Department of Agriculture to make refunds as the result of an audit made of their contracts. Based on this audit the Department of Agriculture ruled that a part of the land the individual producers were permitted to place in the Conservation Reserve was ineligible land.

More than a year after these conservation reserve contracts were signed by the producers and the Department, and the producers had accepted payment in good faith after complying with the terms and conditions of the contracts, the producers were notified that these payments must be refunded because a part of the land was later determined to be ineligible. The farmers in my area rightfully resent this injustice. They are being penalized because of errors made by authorized representatives of the Department of Agriculture. It is only right that these producers should receive fair and equitable treatment for participation in the soil bank program and I urge that H.R. 8043 be passed so that these cases may be equitably settled.

Mr. RANDALL. 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 Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, I want to associate myself with the efforts of the Honorable FRED MARSHALL, of Minnesota, who has had a long and distinguished record of effective efforts to help the American farmer under an intelligent and workable farm program. His efforts today are certainly following this same course when he introduced H.R. 8043 and when on the floor we asked consent to amend by substituting S. 2457, introduced by Hon. STUART SYMINGTON of Missouri. While I am aware of only two or three cases in the Fourth Missouri District which would come in the classification covered by this bill, I feel sure there are many cases throughout the country which would be quickly settled by the permissive provisions of this measure. This bill permits the Secretary of Agriculture to pay compensation under the conservation reserve program where, in good faith, the farmer relied on the erroneous advice of an authorized representative of the Department of Agriculture.

The inequities such as this should not be perpetuated. This bill affords the needed authority and I am glad I can join in with the timely and appropriate efforts of the gentleman from Minnesota and urge passage of a measure whose purpose is fairness for the American farmer.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment. The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ANDERSEN. 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 Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I will take but a moment of the time of the House for a brief explanation of H.R. 8043 and the companion bill recently approved by the other body. Although this is a relatively minor measure, it is of vital importance to a few farm operators who have been unjustly penalized under the soil bank program.

I should point out that a similar bill which I introduced on the same date as the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MARSHALL] introduced his bill was referred to the U.S. Department of Agriculture and was the subject of an official report from that Department in which its approval was recommended. In substance, what this bill will do is give the Secretary of Agriculture and his authorized representatives the legal right to make necessary economic adjustments in deserving cases.

As the bill and the committee report indicate, this authority is needed in a very few instances in which farm operators, acting in good faith, did something or failed to do something which resulted in their being declared ineligible for payment or otherwise penalized. This bill is intended as much to protect the integrity of the county committees locally administering the farm programs as it is to protect the farmers because it allows adjustments where honest mistakes have been made. If we failed to show such good faith, farmers in the future would have to refer all of their questions to higher authority and the administration of our farm programs would become costly and burdensome in the extreme.

Typical of the adjustments that would be authorized under this bill is the case of a farmer in my district who, acting in good faith and on the advice of an official employee in his county committee office, failed to technically comply with the soil bank regulations. As a result, he was directed to destroy a crop of soybeans and suffered a considerable loss. When this bill becomes law the Department will have the authority to recompense that farmer and others in his unfortunate position for the losses they suffered because of improper or incorrect information given him by representatives of the U.S. Department of Agriculture. In this particular case in my district, it is our intent that the farmer involved be compensated for his soil bank contract and reimbursed for the loss of his soybean crop.

There are only a few of these deserving cases, Mr. Speaker, and equity and justice demand that these wrongs be righted. I know the circumstances in some of these cases, and I urgently recommend approval of this bill.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AGRICULTURAL ATTACHÉ ROTATION

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 8074) to amend section 602 of the Agricultural Act of 1954.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I wonder if some member of the Committee on Agriculture can explain this bill. I have a number of questions I should like to ask.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I am delighted to yield.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I am delighted to do my best to explain this bill. It concerns the agricultural attachés who are attached to our embassies abroad, not a part of the embassies, of course, but responsible to the Department of Agriculture.

At the present time these gentlemen are called back to the Department of Agriculture here in Washington for a period sometimes of a year or two, for reorientation on problems of export, for information that would enable them to do a better job for America, in helping with our agricultural exports.

It has been found during the time that they have been assigned duty here in the Department of Agriculture in the United States, because of civil-service regulations often they have had to be downgraded. Sometimes for a period of a year or two they do a type of work that makes it necessary for them to get a little bit less money. So it was felt that if we passed this bill that would correct the situation. This is what the bill states.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman says that they might have to take a little less money, that they would be downgraded. As a matter of fact, just listen to the terms of this bill: "be assigned for duty in the continental United States, without regard to the civil service laws and without change in grade, for a period of not more than 4 years."

They would not be downgraded.

I should like to ask the gentleman this question. What are the grades of the people who would be affected by this bill?

Mr. MATTHEWS. I think they go up to about grade 13 or grade 14 which, as the gentleman knows, is a very high grade.

Mr. GROSS. And they could be supergrades; let us be frank about this, they could be supergrades, could they

not? They could be grades 16, 17, or 18, is not that right. There is no definition of what constitutes an officer or employee under the terms of this bill. They could be anything; in any grade. What you are doing here is setting aside the civil service law. How this bill got to the gentleman's Agriculture Committee in the first place, I will never know.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I would like to say to the gentleman that ordinarily I think he is 100-percent correct in his viewpoint. I do not always agree with him——

Mr. GROSS. There are others who do not always agree with me.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I want to say that I really do not believe that his viewpoint on this particular matter is exactly my viewpoint and the correct viewpoint, for this reason. There is no intention to upgrade these men.

Mr. GROSS. I did not say there was any intention to upgrade these employees. But you talk about a grade 16 being rotated back to this country. As I understand this bill, he could be put in grade 12 and still be paid the salary of a grade 16; is that correct.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Yes, sir.

Mr. GROSS. Certainly. What happens to the civil service system in this country if all other agencies are given such authority?

Mr. MATTHEWS. I would like to say to the gentleman that here is a man who has a higher grade. We do not want to penalize him.

Mr. GROSS. I am not desirous of penalizing him, not for half a second. But you are doing violence to the civil service system in this country when you start this kind of operation. This bill is not well thought out and I do not propose to take a lot of time of the House to argue it today. The gentleman cannot tell me how many people are going to be brought back and what their grades are going to be or how they will get jobs in this country and whose jobs they will displace. I have no idea how they are going to be reassigned to this country.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I know that the gentleman from Iowa is always fair and will give me at least 2 or 3 uninterrupted minutes for me to do the best I can to explain this bill. In the first place I want to assure the gentleman there will be no effort at all to tear down any civil service regulation. The intent is to do a better job for America and for the export of agricultural commodities. These gentlemen are few in number. There are just a few dozen of them. At the present time it is necessary to bring them back to this country for a few months to give them orientation and to give them more information so that they can do a better job. If they hold grade, let us say, 15 as an agricultural attaché, ordinarily in this country they could probably hold the same grade. But sometimes, perhaps for 2 or 3 months or for a year, they would have to downgrade them and the Department of Agriculture did not think it was fair. I know the gentleman will not interrupt me for just 1 more minute, because the gentleman is eminently fair. The Department of Agriculture feels it is not fair to these men to give them a lesser salary for doing the fine job that they are doing. I would like to say I think they are doing a good job. I want to assure the gentleman this will not cost any more money. It has been approved by the Bureau of the Budget. It has been approved by the Civil Service Commission. It has been approved by Mr. Benson in the Department of Agriculture and, please, sir, with all these gentlemen approving any measure I submit, perhaps it does have some pretty good points, let us say, on the conservative side.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. May I ask the gentleman, If this is such a good thing why we should not look at the Foreign Service Act itself? Why is this reserved just for Department of Agriculture personnel? Why is it not a perfectly good thing for Department of Commerce personnel also?

Mr. MATTHEWS. If the gentleman will yield, I would like to say to the gentleman that the Department of State has that same privilege.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. How about the Department of Commerce?

Mr. MATTHEWS. I am not sure.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. How about the Department of Labor?

Mr. MATTHEWS. I am not sure about them, but the Department of State certainly has this privilege. The gentleman may recall that the agricultural attachés at one time were attached to the Department of State. All we are asking for is that they just be treated now on the same basis as officials of the Department of State.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. It would seem to me before we start picking favorites around here that we ought to go to the basic act and do a good job, and I will join with the gentleman and I object.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

HUNTLEY RECLAMATION PROJECT, YELLOWSTONE COUNTY, MONT.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 8726) to amend the acts approved April 16 and June 27, 1906 (34 Stat. 116 and 519), so as to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain lands on the Huntley reclamation project, Yellowstone County, Mont., to school district No. 24, Huntley Project Schools, Yellowstone County, Mont.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to inquire as to whether or not the figure of $115 for which, as I understand it, this property would be transferred, is the fair market value?

Mr. ANDERSON of Montana. The representative of the Department of the Interior who testified before our committee gave that as his opinion, that this was the fair market value of the land involved.

Mr. PELLY. Does the gentleman from Montana think this figure is the fair market value?

Mr. ANDERSON of Montana. Yes; I do. This is what the Government paid for it.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the gentleman from Montana, since the other body passed a similar bill, what figure was provided in it?

Mr. ANDERSON of Montana. The other body did not provide for any reimbursement at all. The Senate bill provides simply for the ceding of the land. The Bureau of the Budget and the Department indicated it should include a figure and this is the figure that the Department of the Interior recommended be included.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WEAVER. I yield.

Mr. ASPINALL. It is my purpose to ask for the consideration of the Senate bill and then offer an amendment which would bring the Senate bill in line with the House bill.

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate bill (S. 53) to amend the acts approved April 16 and July 27, 1906 (34 Stat. 116 and 519), so as to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain lands on the Huntley reclamation project, Yellowstone County, Mont., to school district No. 24, Huntley Project Schools, Yellowstone County, Mont., be considered in lieu of H.R. 8726.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the consideration of the Senate bill?

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, do I understand your amendment would have the figure of $115 or would it be "fair market value"?

Mr. ASPINALL. The amendment would have the figure which the Department suggested was a fair figure, $115.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the consideration of the Senate bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, notwithstanding the provisions, terms, and conditions of any other Act of Congress, the Secretary of the Interior shall cause to be conveyed without restriction, save as hereinafter set forth, to school district numbered 24, Huntley Project Schools, Yellowstone County, Montana, its successors and assigns, the following described land and premises located and situated in Yellowstone County,

Montana: Lot 3 of block 3 of the original townsite of Ballantine, Montana, and block 14 of the original townsite of Pompeys Pillar, Montana, and block 15 of the original townsite of Huntley, Montana, subject to reservation from said land of a right-of-way thereon for ditches and canals constructed by the authority of the United States in accordance with the provisions of the Act of August 30, 1890 (26 Stat. 391), and any and all existing easements on said lands; reserving to the United States, and its assigns, all coal, oil, gas, and other minerals, including, without being limited by enumeration, sand, gravel, stone, clay and similar materials, together with the usual mining rights, powers, and privileges, including the right at any and all times to enter upon said land and use such part of the surface thereof as may be necessary in prospecting for, mining, saving, and removing said minerals and materials, upon payment of damages caused by said surface use to the owner thereof, or upon giving a good and sufficient bond or undertaking in an action instituted in any competent court to ascertain and fix said damages.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized and empowered to execute and deliver to school district numbered 24, Huntley Project Schools, Yellowstone County, Montana, any documentary evidence which he may determine to be necessary to carry out the intent of this Act.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ASPINALL: Page 1, line 5, after the word "shall" insert a comma and the words "upon payment of $115 to the United States,".

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ASPINALL: Page 2, line 4, strike out the word "and".

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On the motion of Mr. ASPINALL the title was amended so as to read: "A bill to amend the acts approved April 16 and June 27, 1906 (34 Stat. 116 and 519), so as to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain lands on the Huntley reclamation project, Yellowstone County, Mont., to school district No. 24, Huntley Project Schools, Yellowstone County, Mont."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill was laid on the table.

ESTABLISHING THE ARKANSAS POST NATIONAL MEMORIAL, ARK.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6108) to provide for the establishment of the Arkansas Post National Park, in the State of Arkansas.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Interior shall acquire, by gift, purchase, condemnation, or otherwise, the lands (together with any improvements thereon) known as the Arkansas Post State Park, and any other lands adjacent to such park which, in his opinion, are necessary or desirable to carry out the purposes of this Act.

SEC. 2. (a) The lands acquired under the first section of this Act shall be set aside as a public park for the benefit and enjoyment of the people of the United States, and shall be designated as the Arkansas Post National Park. The Secretary of the Interior shall administer the park as a part of the national park system, subject to the provisions of the Act entitled "An Act to establish a National Park Service, and for other purposes", approved August 25, 1916 (39 Stat. 535).

(b) In order to provide for the proper development and maintenance of the park, the Secretary of the Interior shall construct and maintain therein such roads, trails, markers, buildings, and other improvements, and such facilities for the care and accommodation of visitors, as he may deem necessary.

SEC. 3. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, line 1, strike out the word "Park." and insert in lieu thereof the word "Memorial."

Page 2, line 13, strike out all of section 3 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"SEC. 3. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums, but not more than $125,000, as may be needed for the acquisition of lands and interests in lands and for development of the Arkansas Post National Memorial, of which not more than $25,000 shall be used for acquisition purposes, and in addition thereto such sums as may be needed for its administration and maintenance."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended to read "A bill to provide for the establishment of the Arkansas Post National Memorial, in the State of Arkansas."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. NORRELL. 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 Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the bill H.R. 6108, which I introduced, is to establish Arkansas Post within the national park system. The House Committee on Interior reported favorably thereon and recommended passage of the bill as amended.

The amendment designates Arkansas Post as a national memorial, rather than as a national park. This is in accordance with the recommendation of the Department of the Interior that the appropriate classification for commemorating the historical events associated with Arkansas Post would be that of a national memorial. It is understood that there are a number of categories used in designating areas within the national park system, and that the Advisory Board on National Parks, Historic Sites, Buildings, and Monuments, has set up certain criteria under each category is classified.

Under the provisions of the Historic Sites Act of 1935, Arkansas Post was included in the national survey begun in 1937, and in 1939 a special report was prepared by the Branch of Historic Sites in the Department. However, the outbreak of World War II shortly thereafter led to the discontinuance of this program for many years.

Early in 1956 the National Park Service informed me that the Department was prepared to proceed with definitive surveys, both historic and archeologic, if funds for the purpose were made available. The Congress did appropriate funds for these on-site surveys at Arkansas Post, and the Department assigned two highly qualified men—a historian and an archeologist—to conduct the surveys.

The work was completed in 1958, and the official reports on the surveys were scheduled for inclusion by the Advisory Board on National Parks in a theme study then in progress on "French Exploration and Settlement." In March 1959, I received word from the Under Secretary of the Interior that the Advisory Board had concluded its study of Arkansas Post and had passed a resolution in the following language:

The Advisory Board on National Parks, Historic Sites, Buildings, and Monuments recommends Arkansas Post State Park and its environs, Arkansas, as of exceptional value for commemorating the important historical events associated with the exploration and settlement of the lower Mississippi Valley.

In the reports of official surveys made over a period of more than 2 years by the National Park Service there is a wealth of historical information on Arkansas Post. The great significance of Arkansas Post is that it was the first white settlement in the lower Mississippi Valley and the later Louisiana Purchase. From the Louisiana Territory, 16 of our States came into being. This was the beginning of the white man's westward advance from the Mississippi River to the Pacific Ocean.

Arkansas Post was established in 1686 as a fur trading post by Henry de Tonty, a lieutenant of the famed explorer, Robert Cavalier de La Salle. Later it was involved in the "Mississippi Scheme" or the "Mississippi Bubble" of the Scotch promoter, John Law.

In his evaluation of the national significance and historical importance of Arkansas Post, the field historian of the Department of Interior stated as follows:

It presents a strong claim for being a point or base from which the entire story of French, Spanish, and English colonial expansion in the lower Mississippi Valley might be told. Arkansas Post is associated with a number of phases of French-Spanish colonial history. These include La Salle's expeditions, the John Law colony, French-Spanish-English colonial rivalry, French-Indian relations, Spanish-American rivalry to control the lower Mississippi, and Spanish-Indian relations.

Arkansas Post was considered by the colonial administrations of both France and Spain to be of such importance that from the early 1730's a military garrison was maintained. Following the transfer of Arkansas Post to the United States in 1804, the area continued to be an important center for Indian trade.

During the Civil War, the Confederacy recognized its strategic location on the Arkansas River by fortifying it and placing 3,000 troops there. In January 1863, 30,000 Federal troops under Maj. Gen. John A. McClelland captured the Post and kept control of the area during the remainder of the war.

Arkansas Post was the birthplace of the State of Arkansas. It was the capital of the Arkansas Territory in the years 1819 to 1821. The site is preserved as Arkansas Post State Park. The State will tender to the United States the 62 acres of land and improvements for the establishment of the national memorial.

The purpose of the bill has been approved by the Advisory Board on National Parks, by the Department of the Interior and the Bureau of the Budget, and by the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

I shall appreciate passage of the bill by the House.

ABRAHAM LINCOLN BIRTHPLACE NATIONAL HISTORIC SITE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 5764) to change the name of the Abraham Lincoln National Historical Park at Hodgenville, Ky., to Abraham Lincoln's Birthplace, and for other purposes.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a similar Senate bill (S. 1448) be considered in lieu of the House bill.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Abraham Lincoln National Historical Park at Hodgenville, Kentucky, shall hereafter be known as Abraham Lincoln Birthplace National Historic Site, and any law, regulation, document, or record of the United States in which such historical park is designated or referred to under the name of Abraham Lincoln National Historical Park shall be held to refer to such historical park under and by the name of Abraham Lincoln Birthplace National Historic Site.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider and a similar House bill, H.R. 5764, were laid on the table.

ACQUISITION OF LAND IN VICINITY OF PENAL INSTITUTONS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 7571) to amend section 7 of the act of July 28, 1950 (ch. 503, 64 Stat. 381; 5 U.S.C. 341f), to authorize the Attorney General to acquire land in the vicinity of any Federal penal or correctional institution when considered essential to the protection of the health or safety of the inmates of the institution.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 7 of the Act of July 28, 1950 (ch. 503, 64 Stat. 381; 5 U.S.C. 341f), is amended by inserting the words "or in the vicinity of" immediately following the words "adjacent to".

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COUNTY OF CUYAHOGA, OHIO

The Clerk called the resolution (H. Res. 309) providing for sending the bill (H.R. 4583) for the relief of the county of Cuyahoga, Ohio, with accompanying papers, to the Court of Claims.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the bill (H.R. 4583) enentitled "A bill for the relief of the county of Cuyahoga, Ohio," together with all accompanying papers, is hereby referred to the Court of Claims pursuant to sections 1492 and 2509 of title 28, United States Code; and the court shall proceed expeditiously with the same in accordance with the provisions of said sections and report to the House, 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.

The resolution was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is the last eligible bill on the calendar.

AMENDING THE FEDERAL BOATING ACT OF 1958

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H.R. 8728) to amend the Federal Boating Act of 1958 to extend for an additional year the period when certain provisions of that act will take effect, notwithstanding the fact it has not been on the calendar for the required number of days.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) paragraph (8) of subsection (c) of section 3 of the Federal Boating Act of 1958 is amended by striking out "April 1, 1960," and inserting in lieu there of "January 1, 1961".

(b) Subsection (b) of section 11 of the Federal Boating Act of 1958 is amended by striking out "April 1, 1960." and inserting in lieu thereof "January 1, 1961."

(c) Section 12 of the Federal Boating Act of 1958 is amended by striking out "April 1, 1960." and inserting in lieu thereof "January 1, 1961."

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 1, line 6, strike out "January 1, 1961" and insert in lieu thereof "April 1, 1961."

Page 1, lines 9 and 10, strike out "January 1, 1961" and insert in lieu thereof "April 1, 1961."

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RESIDENCE REQUIREMENTS FOR POSTMASTER APPOINTMENTS

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to return to Calendar No. 257, H.R. 5571, to exempt regular and classified substitute employees in post offices of the first, second, and third classes from residence requirements governing appointment and service of postmasters at post offices to which such employees are assigned, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maine?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to have the gentleman explain the measure, and before he makes the explanation, may I make this observation, that as I recall, for the appointment of a postmaster there are certain residence requirements. Naturally I think all of us would be concerned as to just how this particular measure would change those requirements and I would be very glad to have an explanation from our colleague.

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Speaker, in order that the explanation may be as intelligent as possible under the circumstances, I think perhaps I should yield to the author of the bill, the gentleman from California [Mr. GUBSER].

Mr. GUBSER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, this is the third session of Congress in which this legislation has been reported out by the Committee on the Post Office and Civil Service unanimously. It is endorsed by all the major employee organizations, including the clerks and carriers, supervisors, rural carriers, and postmasters.

I think I can best explain the purpose of the bill by using a hypothetical example. As you know, it is not under present law possible for a career employee to have an opportunity to be appointed as postmaster of the office unless he lives within the delivery limits of that office. To use a hypothetical example, let us assume that we had an employee working in the Washington Post Office who was a career employee, who had been there 3 or more years as a career employee. If he lives in Arlington, Va., it would not be possible for that career employee ever to be appointed to the position of postmaster.

This bill would make it possible if the person or persons responsible for the recommendation cared to have it that way. There is nothing in the bill which would change the present situation except that the residence requirement would be waived for a career employee only insofar as the office to which he hopes to be appointed postmaster is concerned.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GUBSER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. If, for instance, in Culver City, Calif., the appointing officer wanted to appoint a civil service or a career person from outside the State but we had an eligible list, would it be possible to bypass that eligible list and appoint a civil service employee from the outside?

Mr. GUBSER. No. Under present law postmasters must live within the delivery limits of the office to which they seek appointment. This would make an exception to that in this one instance, and that is where an employee in that particular office—no other—who had been there for 3 or more years could be appointed to the top job in that office.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. If there happened to be a Democratic administration and I had a good Democrat that I wanted to promote, it would simply mean I could move him in there to get rid of a Republican who was actually there by previous examination?

Mr. GUBSER. I do not believe the gentleman could move him in there because he would have to come in under present civil service requirements, but any classified employee who was in the Culver City post office and working there for 3 years and the gentleman had the right to make the recommendation, yes, he could recommend him to be postmaster. This must be a presently employed individual.

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me this bill is too far reaching to come up here for a few minutes' discussion, therefore I object.

AMENDMENT OF WATERSHED ACT

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H.R. 4781) to amend the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act to provide that its loan provisions shall be applicable to certain other projects, and for other purposes, notwithstanding the fact it has not been on the Consent Calendar for the required time.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, will the gentleman state for the purpose of the RECORD what the bill does. The report is favorable.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, I will be happy to explain the purposes of the bill.

The purpose of this bill is to make the provisions of the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act—Public Law 566, 83d Congress, as amended—applicable to areas included in watershed improvement programs authorized by the Flood Control Act of 1944.

Eleven major watershed projects were authorized by the Flood Control Act of 1944. Work on these projects has been going on for some 10 or 12 years and all the projects are in a partial state of completion. When the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act was passed in 1944, the authority for these 11 major watershed projects was specifically continued, but the provisions of the new act were not made applicable within these major watershed areas. It now appears highly desirable that some of the work which needs to be done within these major project areas should be done under the authority of the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevent Act, since a substantially more complete job of water conservation and use can be carried out under the provisions of the later act. The need for the legislation is explained in some additional detail in the letter of the Department of Agriculture recommending enactment of this bill, which is as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D.C., August 25, 1959.

Hon. HAROLD D. COOLEY,
Chairman, Committee on Agriculture,
House of Representatives.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN COOLEY: This is in reply to your letter of February 26, 1959, requesting a report on H.R. 4781, a bill to amend the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act to provide that its loan provisions shall be applicable to certain other projects, and for other purposes.

We recommend that the bill be enacted.

The bill, by amendments to sections 7 and 8 of the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act (Public Law 566, 83d Cong., as amended), would authorize the Secretary of Agriculture, in connection with the 11 watershed improvement programs authorized by the Flood Control Act of 1944, to prosecute additional works of improvement for the conservation, development, utilization, and disposal of water in accordance with the provisions of section 4 of Public Law 566, and to make loans or advancements to State and local agencies to finance the local share of costs of works of improvement for any part of the purposes provided for by that act that are included as integral parts of watershed or subwatershed work plans agreed upon by the Secretary of Agriculture and the concerned State and local agencies.

Complete development of the water resources of subwatersheds of the 11 watersheds authorized by the Flood Control Act of 1944 is not possible with Federal assistance because existing authorizations applicable to the programs in those watersheds do not provide for Federal assistance on structural works of improvement for purposes other than for flood prevention. This is an undesirable restriction when compared to the broader authorities under which Federal assistance is now being furnished in areas outside the 11 authorized watersheds under the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act.

The bill would remove this restriction by simply authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to undertake in cooperation with State and local agencies the installation of additional works of improvement for the conservation, development, utilization, and disposal of water in accordance with the provisions of section 4 of the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act and to make loans or advancements to State and local agencies to finance the local share of the cost of carrying out works of improvements in the 11 watersheds.

Work plans for subwatershed areas within the 11 watersheds are now prepared and approved by the State conservationist or the Administrator of the Soil Conservation Service by delegation of authority from the Secretary of Agriculture essentially as for Public Law 566 projects.

In carrying out the provisions of the bill, if enacted, this Department would expect to obtain the views and recommendations of the Secretary of the Interior, the Secretary of the Army, and other interested agencies with respect to plans incorporating any of the additional features provided for in the bill, under procedures similar to those set forth in section 5 of the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act as amended. It is also expected that suitable amendment of the President's rules and regulations, issued in accordance with the provisions of section 5, would be considered in order to assure the coordination of work authorized under the bill with related work of other agencies.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that there is no objection to the submission of this report.

Sincerely yours,

MARVIN L. MCLAIN,
Acting Secretary.

There would be no direct additional cost resulting from enactment of this bill since the engineering and technical work is now being done by the Soil Conservation Service and any project expenditures will come within the annual limitations established generally for this work in appropriation acts.

Mr. WEAVER. I thank the gentleman.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the first sentence of section 8 of the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act (68 Stat. 666), as amended, is amended to read as follows: "The Secretary is authorized to make loans or advancements (a) to local organizations to finance the local share of costs of carrying out works of improvement provided for in this Act, and (b) to State and local agencies to finance the local share of costs of carrying out works of improvement for any of the purposes provided for by this Act in connection with the eleven watershed improvement programs authorized by section 13 of the Act of December 22, 1944 (58 Stat. 887), as amended and supplemented: *Provided,* That the works of improvement in connection with said eleven watershed improvement programs shall be integral parts of watershed or subwatershed work plans agreed upon by the Secretary of Agriculture and the concerned State and local agencies."

SEC. 2. Section 7 of the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act (68 Stat. 666), as amended, is amended by changing the period at the end thereof to a colon and adding the following: *Provided further,* That in connection with the eleven watershed improvement programs authorized by section 13 of the Act of December 22, 1944 (58 Stat. 887), as amended and supplemented, the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to prosecute additional works of improvement for the conservation, development, utilization, and disposal of water in accordance with the provisions of section 4 of this Act."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING SECRETARY OF COMMERCE TO RESELL FOUR C1–SAY–1 VESSELS TO THE GOVERNMENT OF THE REPUBLIC OF CHINA

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H.R. 8042) to

authorize the Secretary of Commerce to resell four C1–SAY–1 type vessels to the Government of the Republic of China for use in Chinese trade in Far East and Near East waters exclusively.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to clarify with the gentleman from Maryland as to whether or not he has in mind to offer an amendment which would change this legislation to provide for the sale of two vessels and to apply the payment which the Government of China has previously made to two vessels instead of four?

Mr. GARMATZ. It will be two instead of four.

Mr. PELLY. Otherwise it is the same legislation which was reported out of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries and placed on the Consent Calendar but eligible on the call of the next Consent Calendar?

Mr. GARMATZ. Yes.

Mr. PELLY. I understand that the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BONNER] is agreeable to this legislation?

Mr. BONNER. Yes. The price for the sale of the two ships is identical with the price as if it were four ships as is in the bill at the present time, but allowing the former payments on the two ships which they will purchase under this amendment.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of Commerce is authorized, at any time prior to twelve months from the date of enactment of this Act to sell, on an as is, where is, basis to the Government of the Republic of China the four C1–SAY–1 type vessels that the Maritime Commission had heretofore sold to the Chinese Government but which the Chinese Government had been compelled to return to the United States Government.

SEC. 2. The sales authorized in this act shall not be made unless—

(a) after consultation with the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Commerce determines that such sales will contribute to the economic development of Taiwan and will serve the interests of the United States;

(b) after consultation with the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of Commerce determines that such sales would not adversely affect the defense of the United States; and

(c) The Government of the Republic of China agrees that vessels sold will be used in trade in Far East and Near East waters exclusively.

SEC. 3. (a) The sales authorized in this Act shall be made at—

(1) the statutory sales price, as defined in section 3(d) of the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946, except that in the subtraction of amounts from such price for normal depreciation under the provisions of such section, amounts for depreciation shall continue to be subtracted after the minimum provided for in such section has been reached, but at a reasonable rate, to be determined by the Secretary of Commerce, or

(2) the present fair market value of the ships to be sold, as determined by the Secretary of Commerce, whichever is greater.

(b) The Government of the Republic of China shall be credited with the downpayments made on such vessels under the original sales thereof to such Government and shall also be credited with the payments made under the installment notes in such original sales. After making such credits the unpaid balances shall be secured by first preferred mortgages. Interest on such unpaid balances shall be charged as specified in the mortgages in such original sales at 3½ per centum. The Secretary of Commerce shall fix the terms of payment on such balances over a period of time not in excess of the expected natural life of the vessel or twenty years, whichever is the lesser, and on such other terms as are not more favorable than terms applicable in the case of sales of vessels to citizens of the United States. Any such mortgage shall contain provisions according to such mortgage priority over other liens and encumbrances accorded any mortgages on merchant vessels, under the laws of the country to which the registry of the vessel is to be transferred.

SEC. 4. All repairs and betterments required to fit the vessels for their intended use shall be done in a shipyard in the United States at the expenes of the purchaser.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That the Secretary of Commerce is authorized to sell, within one year after enactment hereof, on an 'as is, where is' basis, to the Government of the Republic of China the four C1–SAY–1 vessels, Empire Anvil, Empire Battleax, Empire Cutlass, and Empire Spearhead, for $778,000 each, subject to the further terms and provisions of this bill. Such vessels shall be sold only if (1) the Department of State finds that such sale will contribute to the economic development of the Republic of China and will serve the interests of the United States, (2) the Department of Defense finds that such sale would be compatible with the interests of the United States, and (3) the Government of the Republic of China gives assurances acceptable to the Secretary of Commerce that each vessel sold under this Act shall (a) remain documented under the laws of the Republic of China for ten years after such sale, or so long as there remains due the United States any principal or interest on account of the sales price, whichever is the longer period, (b) be used only in trade between Taiwan and ports in the Far East and ports east of the Suez Canal, and not engage in trade prohibited to United States-flag vessels under Department of Commerce Transportation Orders T–1 and T–2 or any modification thereof, and (c) be returned to the ownership of the United States, upon request of the Government of the United States, during any national emergency declared by the President of the United States and during any war in which the United States is participating, the compensation for the vessel to be the value of the vessel but not exceeding the statutory sales price of the vessel under the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946 ($1,100,000) depreciated at the rate of 10 per centum per annum from the date of sale under this Act to the date ownership of the vessel is returned to the United States, or the scrap value of the vessel, whichever is higher. No downpayment of any part of the purchase price shall be required at the time of the sale. The purchase price shall be payable in not more than ten equal annual installments with interest on the unpaid balance at a rate determined by the Secretary of Commerce after consultation with the National Advisory Council on International Monetary and Fiscal Problems. The obligation of the Government of the Republic of China to pay the purchase price and interest thereon shall be secured by a mortgage on the vessel with terms satisfactory to the Secretary of Commerce. All repairs and betterments required to fit the vessels for their intended use shall be done in a shipyard in the United States at the expense of the purchaser."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FACILITATING THE ADMISSION INTO THE UNITED STATES OF CERTAIN ALIENS

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the resolution (H.J. Res. 406) to facilitate the admission into the United States of certain aliens, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 3, strike out all after line 23 over to and including line 4 on page 4.

Page 4, line 5, strike out "10" and insert "9".

Page 4, line 10, strike out "11" and insert "10".

Page 4, line 16, strike out "12" and insert "11".

Page 4, line 24, strike out "13" and insert "12".

Page 5, line 7, strike out "14" and insert "13".

Page 5, line 12, strike out "15" and insert "14".

Page 5, after line 19, insert:

"SEC. 15. For the purposes of sections 101(a)(27)(A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Lewis Dosa, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Mr. and Mrs. William Dosa, citizens of the United States: *Provided,* That the natural parents of Lewis Dosa shall not, by virtue of such parentage, be accorded any right, privilege, or status under the Immigration and Nationality Act."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman state what this bill proposes to do?

Mr. WALTER. This bill as it passed the House contained a number of names for suspension of deportation. The Senate deleted one of the names, and we are now concurring in the Senate amendment that deletes one name and adds another name.

Mr. GROSS. I withdraw by reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FOR THE RELIEF OF CERTAIN ALIENS

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the resolution (H.J. Res. 444) for the relief of certain aliens, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The clerk read the title of the resolution.

The clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 1, strike out all after line 2 over to and including "For" in line 4 on page 2 and insert "That, for".

Page 2, line 17, strike out "3" and insert "2".

Page 2, line 20, strike out "Ohannes Vartanyan".

Page 2, lines 20 and 21, strike out "Agavni Vartanyan".

Page 3, line 1, strike out "4" and insert "3".

Page 3, line 12, strike out "5" and insert "4".

Page 3, line 13, strike out "Anna Almo".

Page 3, line 17, strike out all after "fees:" down to and including "Galli" in line 20 and insert: *"Provided,* That a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the said Act in the case of Primetta Galli".

Page 3, line 21, strike out "6" and insert "5".

Page 4, line 5, strike out "7" and insert "6".

Page 4, line 6, strike out "John C. Flores and".

Page 4, line 10, strike out "parents" and insert "father".

Page 4, line 10, strike out "beneficiaries" and insert "beneficiary".

Page 4, line 13, strike out all after "Act." down to and including line 20.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FACILITATING THE ADMISSION INTO THE UNITED STATES OF CERTAIN ALIENS

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the resolution (H.J. Res. 445) to facilitate the admission into the United States of certain aliens, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The clerk read the title of the resolution.

The clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 3, after line 12, insert:

"SEC. 8. For the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Lee Kuhn Wui and Makoto Yabusaki shall be deemed to be nonquota immigrants."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SPOKANE VALLEY PROJECT, WASHINGTON AND IDAHO

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (S. 994) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Spokane Valley project, Washington and Idaho, under Federal reclamation laws, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 1051)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 994) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Spokane Valley project, Washington and Idaho, under Federal reclamation laws, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House to the text of the bill, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by section 2 of the House amendment insert the following:

"SEC. 2. In constructing, operating, and maintaining the Spokane Valley project, the Secretary shall be governed by the Federal reclamation laws (Act of June 17, 1902, 32 Stat. 388, and Acts amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto), except that (1) he may extend the base period of any contract entered into under section 9, subsection (d), of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 (53 Stat. 1187, 1193; 43 U.S.C. 485h(d)), as amended, to not more than fifty years, exclusive of a development period if he finds such to be proper, (2) the amount to be repaid during said base period shall be not less than $4,400,000, (3) the remaining reimbursable cost of the project, except for such parts thereof as may be returned under temporary water supply contracts or from other sources, shall be accounted for in the same manner as provided in item (c) of section 2 of the Act of July 27, 1954 (68 Stat. 568), and (4) he may, upon the request of any contracting entity, transfer to it the care, operation, and maintenance of those project works which serve it alone or, upon the request of two or more contracting entities, transfer to them or to any agency designated by them and satisfactory to him the care, operation, and maintenance of those project works which serve them, all on terms and conditions satisfactory to him."

And the House agree to the same.

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House to the title of the bill, and agree to the same.

WAYNE N. ASPINALL,
WALTER ROGERS,
JACK WESTLAND,
CRAIG HOSMER,
Managers on the Part of the House.

CLINTON P. ANDERSON,
HENRY M. JACKSON,
THOMAS H. KUCHEL,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 994) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Spokane Valley project, Washington and Idaho, under Federal reclamation laws, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report.

The language agreed upon by the conference committee differs from the language of the House-passed bill principally with respect to the amount of the repayment obligation of the project water users. The House-approved language would have required full repayment of the cost of the Spokane Valley project, estimated at $5,100,000, within a base period of 50 years, exclusive of any development period that might be required. The Senate-approved language would have required the water users to repay not less than $3,700,000 in the same period and provided for return to the reclamation fund of the difference between the amount paid by the water users and the full reimbursable project cost from net revenues derived from power marketed through the Bonneville Power Administration.

The conference committee, after carefully considering the studies and views of the Department of the Interior with respect to the repayment ability of the water users, agreed that the repayment obligation of the water users should be not less than $4,400,000 to be repaid in a base period of 50 years. In considering how the difference between this amount and the reimbursable project cost should be handled, the conference committee adopted language requiring that this amount, estimated at $700,000, be accounted for and paid into the reclamation fund in the manner provided in the act of July 27, 1954, relating to the Chief Joseph Dam project. That act already authorizes financial assistance from Chief Joseph power revenues to reclamation projects in the general vicinity of the Chief Joseph Dam and Congress has on two other occasions authorized reclamation projects to receive such assistance. The procedure under that act is already well established. On the other hand, to provide financial assistance from net revenues derived from power marketed through the Bonneville Power Administration, as provided in the Senate-passed bill, would have involved new policy and procedure as well as additional bookkeeping problems.

WAYNE N. ASPINALL,
WALTER ROGERS,
JACK WESTLAND,
CRAIG HOSMER,
Managers on the Part of the House.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COAL RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 6596) 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, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this Commission is now to be located in the Department of the Interior; is that correct?

Mr. ASPINALL. For bookkeeping and housing purposes. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. GROSS. But none of the money already being spent on research in the development and use of coal in the Department of the Interior is being diminished as a result of the creation of the new Commission?

Mr. ASPINALL. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. GROSS. So this may well be a layer of fat added to a research and development program for this purpose and already costing millions of dollars annually.

Mr. ASPINALL. I will say to my friend from Iowa, if it is the purpose of the people down in the Department of the Interior to make some transfers of the personnel that they have on research work at the present time, there is no reason in the world why they could not make some savings. But, it is up to them to make the move.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 1052)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 6596) 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, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendment numbered 1.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 2, 3, and 4, and agree to the same.

WAYNE N. ASPINALL,
ED EDMONDSON,
JOHN P. SAYLOR,
J. ERNST WHARTON
By proxy,
Managers on the Part of the House.

JAMES E. MURRAY,
FRANK E. MOSS,
GORDON ALLOTT,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 6596) 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, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

The Senate-passed bill proposed striking out the House language designating the Coal Research and Development Commission as an independent agency in the executive branch. This amendment was rejected by the committee of conference and the Commission will remain an independent agency as proposed by the House.

A Senate amendment locating the Coal Research and Development Commission for administrative purposes in the Department of the Interior was accepted. This provision will give the Commission building space and provide it with housekeeping facilities and, if and to the extent requested by the Commission, budgetary, personnel, legal, and other ancillary services. It will not, on the other hand, interfere with the Commission's independent conduct of its essential research functions.

Subsections (b) and (c) of section 6 of the House bill are stricken as proposed by the Senate and there is inserted in lieu thereof an amendment to the first section of the act of August 1, 1947 (Public Law 313, 80th Cong.), adding to that act authority for the Coal Research and Development Commission to establish and fix the compensation of not more than 11 scientific or professional positions in the Commission.

This amendment was suggested after the bill passed the House by the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee. It brings the establishment and fixing of compensation for scientific and professional positions called for by the bill within the act of August 1, 1947, as is the usual practice. This amendment is perfecting in nature and does not alter the substance of the bill as passed by the House.

The committee of conference accepted a Senate amendment requiring the Commission to submit its annual reports to the Secretary of the Interior for transmittal to the President and to Congress. This will establish an appropriate channel for the transmittal of the annual reports of the Commission and will assist the Secretary in coordinating the activities of his Department with those of the Commission. It will not prejudice the status of the Commission as an independent agency in the executive branch or in its direct relations with and responsibility to the President and the Congress.

WAYNE N. ASPINALL,
ED EDMONDSON,
JOHN P. SAYLOR,
J. ERNEST WHARTON,
By proxy,
Managers on the Part of the House.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, the creation of a new Coal Research and Development Commission will be a significant forward step in meeting some of the great needs of a major American industry. I earnestly hope the President will speedily approve this measure and activate the new Commission.

No other industry in America offers greater hope in the years ahead for substantial increases in both employment and capital investment. The Nation's great coal reserves are our richest mineral resource, and the research program assured by this legislation will provide another key to full use of this tremendous treasure.

Both Chairman WAYNE ASPINALL, of Colorado, and Congressman JOHN SAYLOR, of Pennsylvania, have rendered great public service in the advancement of this measure, and it has been a privilege and a pleasure to work with them in the cause of resource development and use.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H.J. Res. 510. Joint resolution amending a joint resolution making temporary appropriations for the fiscal year 1960, and for other purposes.

CIVIL RIGHTS BILL

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 objeciton.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I am very happy to state that a discharge petition will be filed on H.R. 8601 as soon as the 7-legislative-day period required by the rules of the House has expired. This will give all Members of the House an opportunity to participate in bringing to the floor for debate and passage a civil rights bill reported by the House Judiciary Committee on August 20, 1959. This bill provides for important legislative advance in the field of civil rights and a significant opportunity for Congress to return home with a record of real achievement in this most vital field. The provisions of the bill are as follows:

First. It proposes to strengthen the penal law with respect to the obstruction of court orders in public school desegregation cases.

Second. It proposes to make criminal flight in interstate or foreign commerce to avoid prosecution or punishment for damaging or destroying any building or other real or personal property.

Third. It provides for preservation of Federal election records and authorizes their inspection by the Attorney General.

Fourth. It amends the Civil Rights Act of 1957 so as to extend the existence of the Civil Rights Commission for 2 years.

Fifth. It contains a proposal to enable the Federal Government to provide for the education of all children of the members of our Armed Forces, whether they are or are not residents on Federal property, when public schools have been closed because of desegregation decisions or orders.

Although this bill is not as strong or forward looking as I would like, it is, nonetheless, a long stride forward in the field of human rights.

It has been reported widely in the press and rumored around the Halls of Con-

gress that our Republican colleagues and our southern Democratic friends made a deal in which the Republicans promised to assist in preventing enactment of any civil rights legislation during this Congress if southern Members would support harsh, punitive, antiunion legislation.

I hope this story is untrue, and I know our Republican colleagues will be happy to join with us in the swift filing of the discharge petition to bring this vital legislation on the floor quickly on the merits of the matter alone. Such action will show the American public that there was no deal made here on matters of such grave importance to both working men and women and to minority groups in this country. The challenge is before Congress and the actions of Members on both sides of the aisle from both North and South are being weighed in the balance on this legislation.

AREA REDEVELOPMENT ACT VITAL PROGRAM FOR MONTANA'S INDIAN TRIBES

Mr. ANDERSON of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objeciton.

Mr. ANDERSON of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I am greatly disappointed in the continued delay in bringing up the Area Redevelopment Act legislation. America needs to make this sound investment in its future.

While my congressional district does not have any major metropolitan cities, we do have six Indian reservations. There is no type of area in the entire United States which is as deserving of the assistance offered by the Area Redevelopment Act as is this area where the Indian tribes are located.

Mr. Speaker, My remarks will be confined to one aspect of S. 722, the Area Redevelopment Act, or perhaps I should say more correctly, to the aspect with which one minority group of American citizens is particularly concerned. I refer to the American Indians. In the report of the House Committee on Banking and Currency, House Report No. 360, the eligibility of Indians is noted, but no explanation or justification is made for the special mention of Indians in the legislation. The reason for the special mention is simply that Indian reservations are not legally subdivisions of the States and counties in which they lie. Indians are citizens of the United States and of the States in which they reside, and they should be included in a national program such as we are here considering. It is proper that Indian tribes be eligible both for loans and grants.

Some Members may ask is there a need for such assistance to Indians. Does not the Federal Government already provide aid in various ways for the redevelopment of Indian areas and the rehabilitation of the Indian people? The answer is "No." Through the Bureau of Indian Affairs, the Public Health Service, and other agencies, the Government is providing, at least in part, education, medical care, farm and home extension service, and other aid. Yet it is a notorious fact that the standard of living in almost every Indian community is lower than that of their non-Indian neighbors. If an Indian community is surrounded by a depressed area it is imperative that the entire community be considered, not merely the Indians alone, or the non-Indians alone. And if the Indians' economy is substandard, as it is on many reservations, then this act would provide one way of tackling the problem.

I do not wish to give the impression that enactment of S. 722 would solve all Indian problems. It would not be a panacea. It would, however, open the way for improvement on some reservations, and it would help to teach both Indians and non-Indians that a festering spot, be it Indian or non-Indian, in a commuity needs to be treated with every possible remedy.

I call the attention of the House to the data and the maps which appear in hearings on this bill and its predecessors. In the 84th Congress, my colleague, the gentleman from Montana [Mr. METCALF], was one of the Members directly responsible for bringing the Indian problems to attention of the sponsors of this legislation. He testified about conditions on Indian reservations in Montana. Even though some of the Montana tribes are considered prosperous, as compared to tribes in other States, the employment figures were almost unbelievable. On the Northern Cheyenne Reservation, which is in my district, out of 972 adult males only 189 were employed. In percentage, 81 percent were unemployed. On the Crow Reservation, out of 1,418 males, 280 were employed, an unemployment ratio of 80.3 percent. On Fort Belknap the percentage of unemployment was slightly lower, only 72 percent, but the average family income was also lower. On that reservation the only families with incomes over $1,500 a year were Government employees. Finally, I refer to Rocky Boy's Reservation, where the average family income was less than $1,000 and the unemployment ran as high as 90 percent.

These reservations I have mentioned, Mr. Speaker, are in my district. I have seen the conditions there. I cannot vouch for the exact percentages I have quoted, but they are taken from official House documents—House Report 2503, 82d Congress, 2d session; House Report 2680, 83d Congress, 2d session. I can say that unemployment in these reservation areas is chronic, and it makes little difference whether the percentage is 70, 80, or 90. The situation is desperate. Such aid as is contemplated in the pending bill could make a fundamental change in the local economy.

The testimony of Indians and non-Indians, including Members of the Congress, discloses that similar conditions exist in other States. The map inserted in the Senate hearings on this bill, part 1, February 25, 26, 27, 1959, shows that several areas which may qualify for assistance contain concentrations of Indian population: southeastern Oklahoma, northwestern New Mexico, northern Michigan and Minnesota, and western Washington. In addition, as Members from the States know, there are tribal groups in the Dakotas, in Nevada, in Arizona, and perhaps other States, which might qualify.

I have said enough, Mr. Speaker, to show that the American Indians need the kind of help which this legislation would permit.

JAPANESE RED CROSS AND THE NORTH KOREAN COMMUNIST RED CROSS

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, a matter has been brought to my attention which, in my opinion, is of vital importance to the Congress and to the American people, and I should like to briefly comment upon it.

A white paper, issued by one of the strongest allies of the United States in the Far East, the Government of South Korea, contains facts which, if substantiated, may well shock the conscience of mankind and imperil the safety and security of the United States in the Far East.

Briefly, it concerns an agreement between the Japanese Red Cross and the North Korean Communist Red Cross, whereby 600,000 Korean nationals now resident in Japan are to be sent to Communist North Korea and known slavery. More than 95 percent of the persons to be sent to North Korea come from the southern part of Korea.

The background of this situation, I am informed, is as follows:

During and prior to World War II, the Japanese ruled Korea by power of armed conquest. Some 2 million Korean nationals were forcibly taken to Japan and there compelled, in the words of the Korean Government, to work "virtually as slaves" in Japanese war industries and able-bodied men among the group were, in many cases, drafted into the Japanese Army to fight against the United States and her allies.

One million four hundred thousand of these Korean nationals were later repatriated to the Republic of Korea, but 600,000 remain, and it is the fate of these people that the present controversy between Japan and the legitimate Government of Korea is concerned.

The Korean Government, through its Ambassador, Dr. You Chan Yang, has issued the following statement:

Why is Japan taking this drastic step? Sending 600,000 persons into Communist slavery? Drastically increasing the war potential of Communist North Korea * * * branded an aggressor nation by the United Nations? (For many of the able-bodied men will unquestionably be drafted into the North Korean Army * * * or sent to the

Communist war factories in Manchuria as laborers.)

By this cruel act, Japan is trying to defeat the just claims of these pathetically treated human beings for compensation for the service performed as virtual slaves in Japanese factories during World War II.

The facts are these:

Japan, as ruler by conquest of Korea prior to the late World War, forcibly seized more than 2 million Koreans and forced them to work virtually as slaves in Japan's war factories. In some cases, Koreans were forced to serve in the Japanese armed forces, fighting against the United States and the democratic nations of the West.

All that Korea insists upon is that these Korean nationals should be given some pay * * * an amount to be determined by negotiation * * * for the services they performed for so many long, weary years in Japanese factories.

To defeat this small, pathetic claim, the Japanese Government is willing to turn over to Communist North Korea, a government it does not even recognize as legitimate, 600,000 human beings.

This is an act of infamy that cannot but shock the conscience of the world once the facts are known.

Ambassador Yang has informed me that the legitimate Government of Korea is now, and has at all times been, willing to accept a mass repatriation of Korean nationals in Japan, but feels that Japan should compensate these persons for the labors they performed.

The Korean Government has urged the U.S. Government to extend its good offces in composing the differences between two of America's allies in the Far East, Japan and Korea. It seems to me that this is a step, the advisability of which the American Government should give serious consideration.

AGRICULTURE

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objeciton.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, it is time to dispel the cloud of confusion and frustration surrounding our farm programs by letting in the clear light of facts.

My purpose in speaking is not to offer simple solutions or to belabor the present but to recall some of the basic principles so long enshrouded in the fog of controversy.

Some of this fog has been generated by those seeking political advantage and much has been added by the press, radio, and television industries which are often more guilty than politicians of telling people what they want to hear rather than giving them cold, hard facts.

DISREGARD REALITIES

There are those so committed to various theories that they overlook the realities of the farm question.

There are those who remain unaware of the tremendous evolution which has taken place in agriculture.

There are those who cling to antiquated ideas and opinions unrelated to the present and future of a modern agriculture.

There are those who slip into the all-too-human error of confusing criticism with action.

OVERBURDENED WITH THEORY

Agriculture has become so overburdened with economic theories that the eminently practical business of farming is almost forgotten. Economists continue to try to impose upon agriculture rules long ago abandoned by labor and industry. To expect agriculture to be prosperous within one economic framework while labor and industry operate within another is pure fallacy.

It is equally ridiculous to expect that industry and labor will abandon the economic practices which have become accepted by society. Can anyone imagine industry or labor accepting an economic policy of unlimited production and unlimited working hours?

The control of prices, wages, working hours, and factory output are all developments outside of agriculture but they are certainly factors with which farmers must contend as one of industry's best customers and suppliers.

DISUNITY IS FACTOR

Certainly another major factor in the situation today is the disagreement among farm organizations themselves. What one proposes, the others oppose. With farmers a minority at the polls and in the Halls of Congress, this assuredly creates new problems. In order to win a skirmish, these organizations sometimes engage in sectional strife and while the skirmish may be won, the overall effect on farm policy is disastrous. Labor is not divided today by jurisdictional disputes as is agriculture.

LACK OF LEADERSHIP

In considering the problem, we cannot overlook the Secretary of Agriculture. He is a political appointee of the administration and as a political appointee is carrying the responsibility for an administration not noted for intelligence in farm matters. The present occupant of the position has confused the issue by attempting to direct political pressure toward some vision compounded of misconceived "morality" and "freedom." The ingredients of this mystic farm plan are never wholly revealed to farmers or to Congress. This lack of leadership has caused a loss of confidence and a feeling of mistrust on the part of farmers that will not be improved to any marked degree as long as he remains in his position.

It is unfortunate that this misguided man who has so much ability in so many ways should see fit to disregard the facts of his own Department in presenting the Department's views. The present lack of leadership is a calamity coming as it does when vision and imagination are sorely needed to solve a difficult problem. What we need is positive action, not negative reports and studies.

FARMERS WILL PROVIDE ANSWER

Where then can we look for an answer? I say it will come from farm people themselves. By and large they understand their problems. They have shown leadership in the past; they will in the future. It is true they need some legislative help and an attitude on the part of a Department of Agriculture of trust and factual information. Farmers have a long record of doing things for themselves in a cooperative way. Farmers are ready and willing to adjust to market needs. Farmers are ready and willing to continue the long-range soil-conservation efforts as stewards of a precious resource. Farmers are willing to think out their problems and apply remedies that will work. We need only to dispel the fog so that the path is clear and the goal is understood.

Let us examine the recent egg situation. It provides us with a good example of the need for looking at the record without political emotion and with a sincere regard for the facts.

REVIEW EGG SITUATION

A review of the records of the Department of Agriculture on this situation is an informative experience. It does not of itself answer the questions of the future, but it does suggest some alternative policies worthy of consideration.

My State, Minnesota, ranks among the Nation's largest egg-producing States. When the farm price of eggs fell to an 18-year low this spring and early summer, it meant hardship and worry for many farm families who must rely on egg production for a good part of their income.

Prices have moved up some but the outlook for the immediate future is still far from promising. The victims are efficient farmers whose only mistake may be doing their job too well.

To bring the situation into perspective, we have traced the egg price story through the Department's records for the past 10 years. Some interesting facts immediately become apparent.

EGGS AT 44.6 CENTS IN 1949

Under the Steagall amendment in effect in 1949, providing mandatory price support at not less than 90 percent of parity, the farm price of eggs was held at 44.6 cents a dozen. This was the average January through June price. For the corresponding period this year, 1959, the average farm price was 31.7 cents a dozen.

Our per capita consumption of eggs in 1949 was 383 eggs per person. The Department of Agriculture estimates that we will consume 352 eggs per person during 1959—or 31 fewer eggs per person at reduced prices. In the same period, our population increased 28 million.

MARKETING COSTS CONSTANT

The market spread between the farm and retail price was 18.6 cents a dozen in 1949. For the comparable months this year—January through June—the market spread was 18 cents a dozen. Regardless of the bigger drop in price, marketing costs have remained fairly constant.

For the comparable months of 1949 and 1959, the retail price of eggs dropped 13.7 cents a dozen. The farm value dropped 12.9 cents a dozen. So all of the decline in price came out of the farmer's pocket.

FARM COSTS CLIMB

Even this does not tell the whole story. Farm costs have climbed 19 percent since 1949 and the dollar taken in this year will buy only 81 cents worth of goods in 1949 terms.

Estimated cash receipts for eggs in 1959 have a buying power of less than $1.5 billion—a drop of $649 million in buying power as compared with 1949. Though the number of dollars taken in from the sale of eggs in 1950 was not much larger than the Department of Agriculture's estimate for this year, the 1950 receipts would buy $365 million worth more of these things the farmer needs than will this year's estimated income. During 1950, price supports were dropped to 75 percent of parity.

MORE EGGS—FEWER HENS

Poultrymen will produce approximately 62.8 billion dozen eggs this year compared to 52.1 billion in 1949. Yet the Department of Agriculture reports only 363 million laying hens and pullets on farms today compared to 399 million in 1949.

No one can question the increased efficiency of the poultry farmer. They have produced for markets, not for storage. They have converted increased and lower priced feed supplies into nourishing products. They have remained free to produce, to compete, and to make their own management decisions. In other words, they have done everything the Department of Agriculture has been urging them to do. Did they do their job too well?

TABLE I.—*Egg production, prices, income, and potential market*

	Hens and pullets of laying age on farms, Jan. 1	Production, millions	Parity price, cents per dozen	Average farm price, cents per dozen	Cash receipts from eggs, millions	Population, millions	Civilian per capita consumption, number
1949	399	56,154	52.0	45.2	$2,103	149.2	383
1950	424	58,954	51.0	36.3	1,773	151.7	389
1951	399	58,063	52.7	47.7	2,298	154.4	392
1952	397	58,068	50.7	41.6	2,002	157.0	390
1953	373	57,891	47.4	47.7	2,289	159.6	379
1954	371	58,933	46.7	36.6	1,795	162.4	376
1955	369	59,496	46.1	38.9	1,924	165.3	371
1956	360	60,877	46.2	38.7	1,961	168.2	368
1957	369	60,448	47.9	35.2	1,799	171.2	358
1958	352	60,681	48.7	37.3	1,935	174.1	349
1959	363	[1] 62,804	[2] 47.4	[1] 33.0	[1] 1,726	177.0	[1] 352

[1] Estimated.
[2] 1st 6 months.

Source: U.S. Department of Agriculture.

This table clearly shows that a reduction in price supports does not of itself decrease production. Compare the years of 1949 and 1950, both years under a Democratic administration. Is it not a little ironical that this experience with eggs should be so completely ignored and misunderstood by a Republican administration that could be expected to criticize rather than follow the same course. As the table shows, when price supports were lowered, the average farm price of eggs dropped from 45.2 cents a dozen to 36.3 cents a dozen. At the same time, production rose from 5.6 billion dozen to 5.9 billion dozen. This same result has almost always taken place when the so-called flexible price theory has been put into effect.

LOWER PRICE—MORE PRODUCTION

With example after example in Department files showing the fallacy of this theory, the Department of Agriculture still persists in selling it to the public. Price supports on corn were lowered from $1.36 to $1.12 per bushel and the farmers responded with an anticipated corn production of an alltime record of 4.2 billion bushels.

The American consumer paying 45.2 cents a dozen to the farmer used 383 eggs in 1949. In 1958, he paid 37.3 cents a dozen and used only 349 eggs. This year, with an estimated average farm price of 33 cents per dozen, he is expected to use 352 eggs. And while all this is going on, the poultry farmer will take in $649 million less this year compared with 1949.

SECRETARY COMMENTS

This is what the Secretary of Agriculture had to say about it in Philadelphia on June 18, 1959:

We have urged the American people to increase consumption of eggs during this period of plentiful supplies. The way to get out of a surplus situation is to eat our way out—not to pile up supplies in warehouses.

We are not going to put the Government into the egg business. As you know, the Government has been in the egg business before—in 1950 for example. Various programs around that time resulted in losses totaling approximately $190 million. Even more important, these attempts to support egg prices simply did not attain the objective.

We are not going to repeat the fiasco of 1950. We still, on the contrary, help the poultry industry with sound positive measures.

We could go on with many other illustrations of how the sound programs I've been talking about improve the marketing and use of farm products. Such programs serve all the people. They result in food and fiber of higher quality. They expand existing markets—create new markets. They cut marketing costs—reduce spoilage in transportation, handling, and processing.

AGRICULTURE DEPARTMENT SAYS

So says the Secretary of Agriculture. Now, let us briefly review the facts as presented in Department of Agriculture figures a few moments ago.

Our population is up.

Our poultry farmers are producing more eggs with fewer hens.

Our marketing costs are constant.

Our egg prices hit a new low.

Our egg consumption is down.

Is this the answer to the surplus situation? If it is, why must farmers alone be expected to carry the full burden.

TABLE II

[1949=100]

Year	Farm prices	Farm costs	Total production	Population	Retail price
1949	100	100	100	100	100
1950	80	102	105	102	87
1951	106	112	104	104	106
1952	92	114	104	105	97
1953	106	110	103	107	101
1954	81	110	105	109	85
1955	86	109	106	111	88
1956	86	111	107	113	87
1957	78	113	108	115	83
1958	83	117	108	117	88
1959 [1]	73	119	112	119	79

[1] Estimated.

These are interesting figures and they tell an important story. We are repeatedly told in speeches and in the press that four-fifths of American agriculture is operating successfully without price support operations. The table above needs to be reexamined by those who accept this statement.

GREATER LOSS THIS YEAR

The Secretary implies that what he calls the egg fiasco of 1950 cost $190 million. The farmer can expect a greater loss than this in buying power this year as a result of the egg market bust.

How does this affect the consumer: The average retail price from January through June was 49.5 cents per dozen in 1959. In 1950 it was 49.2 cents for the same period. The farmer receives less, the consumer pays slightly more. It is difficult to believe that consumers profit by loss of buying power on the part of farmers and a chaotic market that could easily mean more costly eggs in the future.

TABLE III.—*Purchasing power of egg receipts*

	Farm cost index, 1910-14=100	Change from 1949, percent	Egg cash receipts, millions	Purchasing power of cash receipts, millions	Change in buying power of cash receipts since 1949, millions
1949	251	100.0	$2,103	$2,103	0
1950	256	102.0	1,773	1,738	−365
1958	293	116.7	1,935	1,658	−445
1959	298	118.7	[1] 1,726	1,454	−649

[1] Estimated.

The relationship between farm prices and farm costs plays an important role in the farmer's well-being. Using 100 as an index figure for 1949, we see that farm prices stood at 83 last year and are estimated to 73 this year. In the meantime, costs rose to 117 in 1958 and are estimated to be 119 this year. Production has risen to 108 in 1958 and is expected to go to 112 this year. Population, or mouths to feed, has risen even faster—to 117 in 1957 and to an estimated 119 in 1959.

HIGHER COSTS—LOWER INCOME

This illustrates the plight of the egg producer. He has increased his efficiency yet he is not keeping pace with the growth of population. His costs

have risen but he took in $445 million less from eggs last year and will probably take in $649 million less this year as compared with 1949.

Department of Agriculture figures reveal that egg purchases in 1949 has an influence upon the cash receipts from eggs three times greater than the cost of purchasing the eggs. Purchases in 1950 again boosted receipts to farmers by three times the cost of eggs.

SPREAD EFFECTS OF LOW COST

This illustrates a function of price support operations that is often overlooked. Price support spreads the effect of low prices among all the people, rather than concentrating the effect on farmers alone. At the same time it assures steady supplies at fair prices, as is illustrated by the higher rate of consumption.

A similar function is served by the postal subsidy to the big national magazines, such as Life, Look, Reader's Digest, and the Saturday Evening Post—magazines which are so often critical of farm price support programs.

TAXPAYERS PAY MAIL BILL

These magazines could not afford to mail the large numbers they circulate at the rates they charge if they had to pay the full costs of mailing. So all the taxpayers help to finance the circulation of these magazines, whether they are subscribers or not, through the second-class mail subsidy.

It costs the Government $179,000 to deliver Life magazine through the mails every week it is issued. An issue of the Saturday Evening Post costs the Government $117,000. The tab Uncle Sam picks up for an issue of the Reader's Digest is $348,000.

Commodity Credit Corporation reports losses after the commodity has been disposed of or its inventory value has changed. The total realized loss listed for eggs from 1941 through 1958 is $298.3 million.

The realized loss therefore averages about $16 million a year. This is $3 million less than it costs the Government in postal subsidies to deliver three magazines of national circulation—Life, Saturday Evening Post, and Reader's Digest.

FOR MANY OR FEW?

It must be remembered that the postal subsidy is a price-support program for the benefit of a few large publishers. The egg industry is made up of millions of farm families producing an essential food product for 177 million people.

We must all ask ourselves this. As a national policy can be permit our resources to be depleted in producing eggs, pork, dairy products, corn, cotton, wheat, et cetera, for which we have no markets? Can we deny our efficient farm families a just return for their investment and labor? Must the people in our cities and towns who need the wholesome products of our farms be faced with disorderly marketing, markets with shortages and gluts being reflected in waste and costs.

When an answer is found to those questions we will be on our way to solving the farm problem.

The egg situation was not good in 1950. From a farmers standpoint it is admittedly worse now. An estimated loss of $284 million is not chickenfeed.

Mr. Speaker, the egg fiasco of 1959 recalls to us a pledge made by General Eisenhower at Brookings, S. Dak., on October 4, 1952:

> The Republican Party is pledged to the sustaining of the 90 percent of parity price support and it is pledged even more than that to helping the farmer obtain full parity, 100 percent of parity, with the guaranty in price supports of 90.

LET US OVERRIDE THE PRESIDENT'S VETO

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Speaker, I have just returned from a brief trip to my State of Indiana and have felt firsthand the reaction of the people to the President's action in vetoing the public works bill. My people are aroused and indignant and rightly so. For years Indiana has been seeking effective flood control and just when it seemed that we were going to make some real progress the bill which was to provide the means for adequate flood control for our State was vetoed. By one stroke of his pen the President has destroyed the vision and dreams of thousands of Hoosiers.

The veto message contains much talk of sound fiscal policies and yet this bill which was vetoed deals with a relatively small portion of our total budget. The amount is comparatively only slightly higher than that requested by the President. However, Mr. Speaker, the expenditure of funds for the protection and safety of property and lives is certainly never amiss.

The President speaks of new starts and of unbudgeted items which are included in the bill. But Mr. Speaker, I would call to his attention and to the attention of the people that every project in the public works bill has the approval of the Corps of Engineers and the interested Government agencies. These experts after long and arduous study had determined that the various projects were economically sound in that the economic benefits outweighed the cost and on this basis recommended the projects. Every single project in this bill underwent this test.

The President is provoked and upset because the bill contains the appropriation of funds beyond that which he requested. I wonder if we are placing the emphasis in the proper place. Not too long ago he was complaining because the House of Representatives cut his request for foreign aid by 1¼ billion dollars. Ironically there will be included in that $3-billion-plus to be spent abroad millions of dollars for projects of the very type which the President says we cannot afford for America. In other words the President is demanding funds for dams, reservoirs, and reclamation projects abroad and deploring requests for the same projects in America.

It seems to me that it is the responsibility of the Congress to legislate and that it is the primary responsibility of the President to administer the laws. Just because the President says we have not complied with his wishes and his demands does not mean that we should sit idly by as duly elected Representatives and meekly bow to his will disregarding our responsibilities to our constituents. The mere utterance by one man that this bill would promote an unsound fiscal policy does not make it so. As much as we may respect our President's judgment we cannot blindly and without protest substitute his judgment for that of this Congress. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that we reaffirm our belief that the public works bill is legislation which will benefit America and that we without hesitation or delay override the President's veto.

PROMOTING MAXIMUM EMPLOYMENT, PRODUCTION, AND PURCHASING POWER

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] is recognized for 45 minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, one of the tragedies of our political discourse in the matter of economic issues is that we must necessarily accept a gross oversimplification of some very complex issues.

It is a necessity of our structure of government that we must deal with the complex problems of the impact of the Federal Government's action on our national economy one step at a time. The result is that we rarely get a full perspective on the issues with which we must deal. And so because of this habit of the press, of the Members, and of the committees in dealing with these issues one at a time, I welcome that rare document which embraces more than a single issue, the report of Monday, August 17, by the Cabinet Committee on Price Stability for Economic Growth. I do so because this Committee, which is asking itself the question, "What do we really want from our economy?" has at least taken the trouble to reaffirm that the administration in 1959 is in support of the Employment Act of 1946.

There was a time, Mr. Speaker, you may remember, shortly after this administration took office, when they seemed to have repudiated the Employment Act of 1946. But the present report makes it clear, on page 2, that the aims of the American people should be economic growth, maximum employment opportunities, and reasonable stability of the price level. The balance of the report discusses those questions in very general terms.

The Employment Act of 1946 has spelled out the objectives which the Congress then hammered out in great detail, very explicitly.

> The Congress hereby declares—

We said then—

> that it is the continuing policy and responsibility of the Federal Government to use all practicable means consistent with the needs and obligations and other essential consid-

erations of national policy to coordinate and utilize all of its—

That is the Federal Government's—

plans, functions and resources for the purpose of creating and maintaining conditions under which there will be afforded useful employment opportunities, including self-employment for those able, willing, and seeking to work and to promote maximum employment, production, and purchasing power.

This last phrase is the one which we most frequently hear, that it is the purpose of Congress to promote maximum employment, production, and purchasing power. But let us not quibble about a distinction found in the language of the Cabinet Committee report and the language of the Employment Act, even though I would prefer the language of the Employment Act. But although this report dated August 17 gives us an overall view of the purposes of our economy, we received barely a week later, on August 25, 1959, from the President another report to the Congress. Unhappily this report narrows the focus down to the very fine and detailed item of the management of the Federal debt. It calls upon us to again resuscitate that twice dead bill to raise the ceiling on the interest rate on long-term loans. It also asks us to raise the interest rate on savings bonds which, as the Members know, is about 1 percent lower than the interest rate on other long-term bonds.

As a witness before the Committee on Ways and Means, I have indicated my willingness to accept a higher interest rate on savings bonds. It has been my understanding, Mr. Speaker, that the reason we have not raised the interest rate on savings bonds is because the Treasury has taken the position, at least informally, that if they cannot have the whole package they want none of it.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. METCALF. Would the gentleman say that these two matters can be divided and that we should handle them in two separate packages instead of the whole package?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I think it is very clear the Congress can divide, and as a matter of fact they have divided this thing. We raised the ceiling, for example, on the public debt, which was a related issue, in a completely separate package. I see no reason why we could not raise the interest rate on savings bonds, since in raising that it would still be below the 4¼ percent ceiling on long-term bonds, and these savings bonds are also long-term bonds. It seems perfectly reasonable to assume that many of us would accept a higher than 3¼ percent rate without necessarily accepting higher than a 4¼ percent rate on long-term bonds. I would hope a separate bill could be reported out so that we can honor this request of the President.

Mr. METCALF. I want to assure the gentleman I would certainly support such a separate bill to increase the interest rate on savings bonds, although I am vehemently opposed to any increase in the interest rate on other long-term bonds.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I thank the gentleman. If one were only to read, for example, the editorials in the New York Times or in the press which concerns itself with our debt policy and our Federal finances, one would have the mistaken impression that raising the rate of interest on long-term Government bonds is the only thing that can stand between the American people and some awful bugaboo of inflation. By inference we get the information if we were to approve the higher rate of interest on long-term Government bonds, that somehow that would save the Nation and protect us against inflation. Now, neither proposition can be fully supported by the facts or by the logic of our national economic life. The issues with which we must deal are far more complex than this; and this one adjustment, whatever its merits or demerits may be, will not by itself do the things which are claimed for it.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I am happy to yield to my colleague.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I wonder if the gentleman can identify who it is that said that that is the essence of the problem of inflation. I have never heard anyone advance such a theory.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I was referring most recently to the report submitted to the Congress in a special message from the President of the United States where this is the sole issue singled out for discussion.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. If the gentleman will yield further, it is an issue that the President pointed out and he is pointing out, of course, that the manner in which we manage the debt does have an influence on how much inflation we have. But for the gentleman to read into that a statement that that would be the be-all and end-all of the problem of inflation is certainly an erroneous reading.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I would go on to answer the gentleman, then, by pointing out that editorials in such distinguished journals as the New York Times and others have chosen to abuse the Congress on this point. I yield to no man with respect to my desire to avoid inflation and I shall in the course of my remarks this afternoon spell out the complexities of this issue and insist that we not oversimplify it.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. On that point I agree with the gentleman. The only reason I rose to question him was I think you were implying, in fact you actually said, that somebody, presumably the administration, was advancing the theory that this debt mangement bill would solve the problem of inflation and the administration certainly has not advanced that. I think the administration pointed out that the real cause of inflation and the thing that feeds it most is spending more money than we take in.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Indeed, indeed. I thank the gentleman very much for his contribution. I want to come back to that at a later point in my remarks this afternoon. I would have preferred, this being in fact the last day of August, I would have preferred at any time in the last 2 months for the President, through his Council of Economic Advisers, to have sent down to the Congress a full midyear economic report. There have been profound changes in the nature and progress of the economy since the report which we received in January, and it would have been a very opportune time for the President to have sent to the Congress not a message on a single issue alone but a full-blown review of our economic situation.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. REUSS. Is it not a fact that the administration is currently opposing legislation which would redirect the administration's attention to that section of the Employment Act of 1946 which on a permissive basis makes possible midyear reports?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Yes; and I regret the administration's view. I was a recipient of the reports of the Council from the first day of its creation. Many of its early staff members were friends of mine and colleagues in the same work that I had been engaged in, in the Bureau of the Budget during the war years. The midyear reports which were made were very helpful.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PATMAN. Is it interesting to the gentleman to witness a problem like this, and the many solutions offered by the Secretary of the Treasury and the administration generally without actually laying the blame where it belongs, on the Federal Reserve Board, when the Congress turns the Nation's purse over to the Federal Reserve Board and the Federal Reserve Board does not use that purse? The one organization that is wholly to blame and is always excused by the administration is the Federal Reserve Board and the Open Market committee.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I confess I have difficulty understanding how the administration can hold its nominees to office free from blame for the consequences of their choices. Now that brings me to my very next point.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield before going on to his next point?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Does the gentleman wish to engage in a colloquy with the gentleman from Texas or with me?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. With the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I would be very happy to have a colloquy with the gentleman from Texas on that point, because I took issue on that with him. Mr. William McChesney Martin, Chairman of the Federal Reseve Board, is a former Assistant Secretary under Mr. Truman. But I wanted to discuss the midyear report.. These are several factors connected with this midyear report.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I am thinking that this is the 31st day of August.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. The Joint Economic Committee on which I happen to serve and which is chairmaned by Senator DOUGLAS has not made any such request, has it?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I am not a member of that committee. I am speaking as a Member of the House.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I think there is a great deal of merit in what the gentleman suggests, but I think the proper way for Congress to act is through the committee which has jurisdiction of the subject matter which, of course, is the Joint Economic Committee.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Then let us treat this as a request between the gentleman and myself, that the Joint Economic Committee be requested to ask for it. They should have done it, obviously.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Where does the gentleman draw the conclusion that they were opposing it?

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. REUSS. I would be very glad to respond to the question of the gentleman from Missouri. The House Committee on Government Operations in June of this year reported favorably to the floor the so-called Clark-Reuss bill which was bitterly opposed by the administration, particularly a provision which memorialized the administration to go back to the wholesome practice which prevailed before the time of the present administration, of submitting a midyear report to the House Committee on Government Operations. This committee, as the gentleman knows, has competent jurisdiction over the Employment Act of 1946.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Briefly.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I might say that I think the gentleman, to be fair, should concede there is a great deal more of importance in that particular bill.

Mr. REUSS. Yes, but the administration also opposed the many other wholesome provisions of the Clark-Reuss bill.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Just one other statement in clarification, if the gentleman will permit.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Certainly.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I know the administration is opposed to particular features of the bill and I am very strenuously opposed to the bill as a whole because of these features, but the one feature the gentleman referred to about midyear reports, I doubt if the administration is opposed to it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. May I comment further for myself that the Council does not need additional language in law to give us a midyear report. For many years they were issued by the previous Council of Economic Advisers.

Mr. KASEM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. KASEM. This question of inflation is vital not only because of higher prices but also it is vital because the administration has chosen to make a political issue of it.

I have always been under the impression that inflation was a condition that existed when there was a disparity between the supply of merchandise and goods available for sale and the monetary supply, or in this relative position there was an excess of money.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. "Too much money chasing too few goods," is the stock phrase.

Mr. KASEM. The way the country has been flooded with this massive propaganda campaign that is so well concerted and directed against the country I thought perhaps I was wrong in my understanding, so I went to Webster's Dictionary. But I found I was not wrong; it was described just exactly as I have described it.

I know many people will ask: "What difference does it make as long as prices are rising?" In order for there to be true inflation in the economic sense there has to be a shortage of goods. I have great confidence that anyone can walk into any store in the United States and the merchant will tell him that he can get all the merchandise he can sell. That should quickly put to rest the idea that there is any economic inflation.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for an observation?

Mr. KASEM. The gentleman from Colorado has the time. Let me finish my remarks and then if the gentleman from Colorado desires to yield, that is up to him.

I have for this purpose coined a word "uplation," which means a phenomenal production of goods accompanied by rising prices.

It takes into account the other factor that goes into rising prices besides the shortage of goods which we well know does not exist, and the factors that follow.

It is interesting to see one report that reads like the National Association of Manufacturers. This is not significant; that is, the difference of various things included under the word "inflation." It makes no difference whether it is caused by their own factors or by a disparity in the monetary and goods supply. I would like to know if the gentleman feels it is not important to make this distinction?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. That is precisely the purpose of my comment this afternoon, and I thank the gentleman from California. I would point out consumer prices are continuing to rise; the aggregate of the price level is continuing upward. If the word "inflation" means rising prices, regardless of causes, there is a fact base for concern about inflation. But the tragedy has been that we have tended to close our eyes to the effect of administered prices, which is to say that a certain part of the economy can control prices at will, and more than that it does control prices at will. That is testimony that has been given before committees of Congress at great length by a very good economist, Gardner Means, and I shall not go into detail.

What I want to say now is you cannot avoid making choices in our society. To take no action and hence choose inaction is to make a choice. You cannot avoid the consequences of the choices, including the choice of inaction; therefore the sober question facing the Congress is, Do we know what the consequences are of our inaction or action? Are those the consequences we want to have? If they are not the consequences we want to have, what choices might we have made that would have come closer to the consequences we seek? Both in the administration documents and in the Employment Act of 1946 there are spelled out a general set of goals. So our quarrel should not be with goals. Our question should relate to the means by which we might attain those goals.

Let me this afternoon briefly review those varieties of policy choices which Congress cannot avoid acting on which have a real impact on the answers to this thorny question: "Can we have economic growth without inflation?" I speak under these topical headings: "Monetary Policy, "Credit Policy," "Budget Policy"—including expenditures, revenues, and debt—and "Price Policies." If I can at least give these a quick review for the record, I want to show that we cannot solve the problem by focusing all of our attention upon one feature of debt management, because this is inadequate.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PATMAN. While the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] referred to the fact that in my reference to the Federal Reserve Board I was referring to the Chairman who was Assistant Secretary of the Treasury under Mr. Truman, that is very true, and Mr. Truman selected him as Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, and I believe that in the public interest it was done with a distinct understanding, an understanding that no one could even claim there was any other factor or consideration involved, that Mr. Martin, as Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, would hold the line on 2½ percent U.S. Government bonds and not let them go below par. I state that as my belief, based upon the sound knowledge of the subject, and I do not believe it will be denied by the parties participating in it—President Truman and William McChesney Martin.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I would be very happy to have the comment of the Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, and if I can get it I will put it in the RECORD at this point.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I would be happy to have it, too.

Let us turn to the question of monetary policy.

MONETARY POLICY

Certainly we have a power of Congress which everyone has recognized since the year 1 of the American Republic. It has a profound impact on our national economic life, this power to coin money and to regulate the value thereof. It is also true that 40 years ago we gave this power in substantial part to the Federal Reserve. Their policies with respect to raising or lowering of reserve requirements, the increasing of bank reserves, the purchase or sale of Government bonds are powers which are administratively exercised, but in keeping with delegation under the broad powers of Congress.

The debates which have been taking place before the Joint Economic Committees with respect to this issue are most illuminating, and I commend them to any Member of the House who wishes to explore the difference in debt management between the Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board and members of the Joint Economic Committees who are apparently not completely unanimous among themselves with respect to this issue.

Suffice it to say that I aline myself with those who believe we must have a growing money supply. The rate of increase must not be allowed to get out of hand, but it must be reasonably related to growth in economic activity. I do not accept the proposition that the Federal Reserve should not be concerned with the cost of the alternatives to the Treasury and, therefore, really to the American taxpayer.

I would support the position taken by the distinguished chairman of the Joint Economic Committee and other Democratic members thereof who hold that since the same end can be achieved by at least two alternate routes, that route which lowers the aggregate cost to the taxpayer ought to be the preferred route.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. PATMAN. Does the gentleman know of any other major country in the world whose central bank does not come to the aid and rescue of its parent government when it is needed? It is my statement that this is the only country in the world whose central bank is absolutely refusing to come to the aid and rescue of the Government when it is its duty to do so.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I have not made as thorough a study of central banking as the gentleman from Texas has, but so far as my training and experience are concerned, it would tend to support the view of the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a comment?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I think, again, there is a tendency to oversimplify this problem. The Federal Reserve does not take the position of not being interested in the management of the Federal debt. The Federal Reserve, through its chairman, testifying before our committee, with the gentleman from Texas present and the gentleman from Wisconsin interrogating, constantly made the point that they do have regard and gave specific examples in very recent times of when they did go to the aid of the Treasury. One particular example I recall was in the Iraq-Lebanese crisis when they were going to market some bonds at the same time. All I am trying to say is that it is not all black or white, gentlemen.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I do not have the transcript of the hearings here, but members of the committee are on the floor. As I read the transcript, it is my impression that the Federal Reserve's position was that it was not a primary concern of theirs as to what the burden was on the taxpayer of the alternatives which might be selected for increasing bank credit.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I think the gentleman is correct when he uses the word "primary." They said it was not their primary concern to deal with the stability of the dollar, but they certainly did have some concern for the management of the debt.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Let me then proceed to the second point.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield to the gentleman from Wyoming.

Mr. METCALF. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. REUSS] the other day put into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial from Business Week, which points out in almost the words that were used by the gentleman from Texas that the Reserve System is the only banking system in the whole world that does not come to the aid of its Government in assisting in the financing of the Government debt.

In spite of the pious statements that Mr. Martin continuously makes, that does not only hold true as far as research by the gentleman from Texas is concerned, but many others, including the very conservative Business Week, join in the feeling that the Federal Reserve System does not and has not, since the adoption of the act, assisted in the management of the public debt.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. From my own knowledge as a member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, reading the memorandum of the Federal Reserve staff submitted to us in the course of our consideration of the vault-cash bill, subsequently approved, and from reading the testimony of the chairman of the board of the Joint Economic Committee, I get, instead, the impression that an even stronger consideration has to do with the level of bank earnings. These apparently are viewed as being inadequate when they are roughly 10 percent on capital. Now, I do not view this as a deficiency in the earning rate, because I have not adjusted myself to the new economics of this administration.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I did want to make this brief comment with reference to the editorial in Business Week. I did not know it was in the RECORD, but I replied to that as soon as I saw it. I think I will put my reply in the RECORD, if I may, because just the other day I put into the RECORD a more recent report from Business Week which I think is quite a bit different from their original editorial.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I would like to go on now to credit policy.

CREDIT POLICY

I would note that the Congress has created a whole host of credit-related agencies. In the field of agricultural credit we deal with farm-home loans, we deal with crop loans, we deal with producer-cooperative loans, and so forth.

We have in the Housing and Home Finance Agency and in the housing bill which passed the House just the other day, a whole series of housing credit features in Federal law which have become an established part of our economy and upon the operation of which depends the well-being of a very basic industry and the housing accommodations of millions of Americans.

We have Federal insurance of loans and the rules and regulations under which this insurance takes place has an impact upon the availability of credit. We make direct loans to State and local governments for certain particular purposes. We make loans to businesses under certain circumstances. We have a growing number of loans to foreign governments as a part of the Federal Government's policy, starting with the Export-Import Bank and running on through the World Bank for Reconstruction and Development and the new Bank for Inter-American Loans.

The amount of money made available and the terms under which it is made available—including interest rate, the length of the loan, the purposes for which such loans are made available—these present choices which both the Congress in its basic statutes and the administration in its operation must decide. We must decide many questions and the decisions we make will have consequences for the well-being of our own economy, for the nature of our economy, and for the well-being of the world.

These are programs which have stood the test of time. Nonetheless the administration has chosen to ignore them as devices whose operation can be used to influence advantageously the health of the economy and the problem of inflation.

Upon other occasions we have given special powers to the Federal Reserve with respect to consumer credit. I do not want to go into that in detail now except to say that the kinds of credit which we encourage or discourage by law have an impact upon the places where inflation shows up and have an impact upon the ultimate success of our economy in meeting the very goals recently endorsed by the Cabinet Committee.

BUDGET POLICY

Let me turn to budget policy. The appropriations which are approved here each year are a direct allocation of about 20 percent of the economic life of this country. Just under 20 percent of the economic life of this country is determined by decisions which are ratified

in this House and which are made in the various subcommittees of the Committee on Appropriations. We tend to get our eyes focused solely on the amounts because of the nature of our law and our legal process. But we should not lose sight of the purpose for which these appropriations are made and the differences in the kinds of purposes for which our appropriations are made.

For example, certain of our appropriations are really self-liquidating. Some of them are truly loans and every dime advanced will be repaid with interest. A part of the debate with respect to the features of the Housing Act confuses the dollar outflow as though it were an outright expenditure which would not be reimbursed when in point of fact some of these are direct loans which will be repaid with interest and have no net ultimate cost to the taxpayer. They do have an effect upon the economy to be sure, but we tend to confuse economic control with taxpayer burdens. We talk about balancing the whole budget as though every dollar loaned out had to be covered by a dollar of taxes, even though the money was to be repaid by the person who was the recipient of the loan.

In addition to self-liquidation projects we have a whole host of reproductive projects. I am certain some of the projects contained in the public works bill which will be before us on Wednesday are projects which will reproduce for the health of the economy many times over the sums we spend on them. For example, those which improve our harbors, those which protect us against floods, those which improve the water supply systems—these are investments in the ultimate well-being of America. And, again, a careful reading of the Cabinet Committee's report shows that they found that "a large and expanding output requires improved health, education and skills."

Where is the administration's bill for education? Where is the administration's program for improving the Nation's health?

The Cabinet Committee speaks about the requirement of "discovering and developing and conserving natural resources." We in the West are especially concerned that a portion of our moneys be devoted to those reproductive investments in our natural resources which will make this a larger and better Nation in accordance with the wisdom which is contained in the statement over the House door, by Daniel Webster.

Some of our expenditures are merely productive. They improve our well-being but they do not put any dollars directly back into the Treasury. But they do raise the standard of living.

Some of our appropriations, let us face it, are not productive. They are wasteful. And just as there is every reason to increase expenditures which are self-liquidating and reproductive there is an equally good reason for reducing those expenditures which are essentially wasteful. I commend those Members of the Congress and those committees that are bird-dogging to flush into sight every dollar which may be wasted in any program, be it civilian program, public works program, foreign aid program, military program or whatever. We should not countenance waste, because it is an uneconomic use of funds. Even if it increases employment it is an uneconomic use of funds.

To turn from expenditures to revenues, our tax laws indirectly influence the allocation of resources. As we put heavy burdens upon some types of industry and discourage them, and as we give special subsidies or special tax favors to other types of industry, we may encourage them but we ought to be concerned when we pass upon such bills with the question, "Does this measure truly improve the well-being of America or are we merely allocating resources that might better go to some other purposes, to this more favored purpose?"

The rates of taxes are an important consideration. But from the standpoint of the national budget, ultimately the total amount of revenues is the figure which is used and we are measured not by the wisdom with which we design the tax law but by the aggregate revenue raised.

Last year the Congress was roundly abused because of the $12 billion deficit. But that $12 billion deficit was not because of congressional tax cuts, that was because the national income as a whole fell—for a variety of reasons that I will not go into now. But we must recognize that our revenues are a function not merely of the tax law, the structure of the tax base and the tax base schedules, but also of the economic base growing out of these administrative decisions about which I have been speaking.

DEBT POLICY

What about debt policy, the subject of the presidential message of August 25? Debt policy is, insofar as we are dealing with the aggregate amount of debt, merely the consequence of all of our decisions about appropriations and total amounts of revenues which flow as the result of our tax base. We cannot completely control our debt policy but we can intend to control it by seeking to balance, overbalance or underbalance that budget.

Most of you know, in fact, that during a depression it is the course of prudence and wisdom to incur some deficit so as to build back to prosperity. But in times of high employment and prosperity, as the gentleman from Texas said so effectively the other day in committee, we ought to encourage a surplus and pay down the debt because if we cannot pay off the debt during periods of high levels of employment, when will we ever reduce the debt? More than that, this is one of the best ways of fighting inflation. I, for one, hold at a time like this—assuming the steel strike will shortly be ended—with employment relatively high, we might do well to plan for a debt policy which will reduce the aggregate outstanding debt by planning for revenues in excess of total expenditures.

But there is another part of the debt policy which has been receiving a bit of our attention, and that is the question of debt management, whether more of the debt should now be placed in long-term obligations at higher interest rates or in short-term obligations at higher interest rates. The problem of how to manage the debt will always be a problem, whether we are running a budget deficit, or have a balanced budget or have a budget surplus, because we must refinance crudely $100 billion. There is at least $50 billion which floats in short-term obligations and the Treasury must pay off and resell at least $100 billion of debt in the course of a normal working year.

In these circumstances how the Treasury and the Federal Reserve, as its fiscal agent, manage the Federal debt is the question which deserves close attention. But I have not known anyone who willingly sought to incur a long-term debt at high interest rates when he could hope, by temporarily taking care of his financing by high interest short-term loans, that he might later refinance at a more favorable time with a long-term loan at low interest rates. The President's suggestion that we cannot afford to rely exclusively on borrowing that must be continually renewed raises the question of what the word "afford" means. Frankly, I do not know what it means in this connection.

PRICE POLICY

Against that background let us close with the matter of a review of price policies. We have been conducting a battle over the price of money. The same administration which has concerned itself so zealously in the public prints with the job of an attack upon inflation has insisted that we be inflationary and raise the price of long-term money. Raising the price of long-term money will not increase the supply of money. I call the attention of the Members to the excellent discussion in the August 1959 Federal Reserve Bulletin on savings and financial flows.

I think a careful reading of that will support these conclusions (a) that by and large the supply of money is not appreciably responsive to changes in the price of money; (b) that changes in the price of money results in a particular allocation of alternative uses among potential demanders of money; and (c) the allocation is determined by a series of administrative decisions which are made by the Federal Reserve and the banking system.

The result unfortunately has been for the money to go to the wrong places. Allocation by high interest has encouraged consumptive uses, which are inflationary, and has discouraged productive uses of money which are anti-inflationary. High interest certainly opposes those creative uses of funds which would improve our health and education, our natural resources, our science, and our technology, which the Cabinet Committee says it wants to accomplish.

The administration has chosen largely to look the other way on the whole question of administered prices, but we ought to have a way of encouraging competition. We ought to consider this matter of administered prices. That means, of course, we ought to have an even more

vigorous antimonopoly program in both the Federal Trade Commission and in the Department of Justice.

Finally, I suggest that the administration might well consider requesting standby price controls. I have said before, and I will say again, that it is better to have a shotgun in the closet and not need it, than to need it and not have it. I submit that in these times the administered price increases still remain the fundamental basis of the present inflation in our economy.

The administration would certainly do well to endorse the Clark-Reuss bill which does not go that far. The Clark-Reuss bill says in effect, let us put the spotlight of publicity on price rises. The administration has demonstrated that it agrees with this, for the President directed the Secretary of Labor a couple of weeks ago to put the spotlight of publicity upon the steel industry. The administration apparently does recognize de facto what it is not willing to consider de jure—if I may be permitted to indulge in some Latin here. We must stop any excessive increase of prices as against the national interest. We have been told at high levels that it requires more jawbone treatment. We have been using the jawbone against price inflation for 6 years, and the jawbone does not do the job; prices keep going up.

No one wants any more control than is absolutely necessary, but price control now exists; it is in private hands. What I am asking for is public review of the private control of basic prices which affect the health and well-being of the American economy.

Adequate economic growth without inflation depends on wise choices over the whole field of all these policies. Let us keep it in perspective.

I am concerned about inflation, not as a campaign issue; I am concerned about inflation because inflation is a danger to the well-being of the American economy and our place in the world. Under those circumstances I want to give the administration adequate power to deal with it. But we are not asked to grant adequate power, we are asked to grant power only to deal with a pimple of the whole problem.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Colorado has expired.

NEEDED: A CHANGE FROM A POLICY OF TIGHT MONEY AND FISCAL LOOSENESS TO A POLICY OF ADEQUATE MONEY AND FISCAL TIGHTNESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. REUSS] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, the House Committee on Ways and Means has recently turned down the administration's request to lift the 4¼ percent ceiling on U.S. bonds. The administration was offered several alternatives. It was offered the alternative of lifting the 4¼ percent rate, accompanied by the "sense" resolution recommending to the Federal Reserve that when increasing the money supply, it should be done by purchasing U.S. securities, of varying maturities. That the administration turned down. It was also offered the alternative of lifting the ceiling on savings bonds. Lifting it, I believe, would be in the public interest. They turned that down.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REUSS. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Who makes these offers and these turndowns? The Ways and Means Committee has jurisdiction over this, and there was no proposal made on this E- and H-bond proposition.

Mr. REUSS. My understanding was from press sources that the Ways and Means Committee had offered that to the administration.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. No.

Mr. REUSS. I am delighted to hear what my ears tell me I hear, that the gentleman is now suggesting, or rather, the Republican Party is now suggesting, that the administration will accept a lifting of the savings bond interest ceiling.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. No. The gentleman goes from one extreme to the other. I was simply pointing out that no proposition has been offered, therefore no proposition could have been turned down. I myself would recommend against such a thing, but certainly in order to let the House work its will on this whole debt management thing, I would vote to report a bill, provided we had the opportunity to offer amendments to cover the field of debt management and this interest rate problem. Now, that is something that could be done, I believe, if the Ways and Means Committee would meet tomorrow. But there has been no proposition offered in resolution form, therefore none has been turned down.

Mr. METCALF. The gentleman from Missouri knows there was an opportunity offered in the Ways and Means Committee to vote out a bill so that the House of Representatives could work its will, but that was objected to. That was the sense of Congress amendment, the amendment that provided for a moderate admonition to the Federal Reserve System. The gentleman from Missouri did not vote for that.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. The gentleman from Missouri did vote twice with the majority, incidentally, 15 to 10, to report a bill out. The point I was raising is in reference to this new point that has recently come up of the E and H. The gentleman knows that proposition has never been offered in the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. METCALF. It has not been formally offered, but the gentleman from Missouri will recall the situation, and I will say no member of the committee has been more faithful in attendance than has the gentleman from Missouri. In all the time we have had under consideration this question of the increase in debt limit and interest rate, we had 10 or a dozen representatives from the Treasury Department and the Federal Reserve System and asked, Would you agree, would you consent to bring out an increase in savings bonds? And each time the Secretary of the Treasury or his representative has said he would prefer to have the whole package and he feels he would resist the simple increase in interest rates on savings bonds.

Mr. REUSS. I will yield to the gentleman from Missouri so that he may respond, but meanwhile I want to assert again what I think I heard the gentleman say a moment ago, that he, the gentleman from Missouri, opposes any offer of just lifting the ceiling on savings bonds.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Yes. I want to agree with the gentleman from Montana that this certainly has been the subject matter of discussion in the Ways and Means Committee with the officials of the Treasury Department. But I think I am correct in saying that never once was a formal proposition offered, so there never was anything to accept or to reject.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD the names of those departmental representatives who sat with us in conference of the Ways and Means Committee.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

The matter referred to follows:

DEPARTMENTAL REPRESENTATIVES

Treasury: Hon. Robert B. Anderson; Julian B. Baird, Under Secretary for Monetary Affairs; Charles E. Walker, Assistant to the Secretary; Robert P. Mayo, Assistant to the Secretary; Nils A. Lennartson, Assistant to the Secretary; Nelson P. Rose, General Counsel.

Federal Reserve System, Board of Governors: Hon. Wm. McC. Martin, Jr.; Jerome W. Shay, legislative counsel; Winfield Riefler, Assistant to the Chairman; Charles Moloney, Special Assistant to the Board.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to get on to my central point, which really goes beyond this 4¼ percent interest rate. What was in the mind of the Democratic majority of the Ways and Means Committee when they turned down the administration's request to pierce the 4¼ percent interest ceiling? I believe that what the Ways and Means Committee was doing was expressing its unwillingness to ratify the economic policy that the administration has been pursuing in the last 6 years. That policy is a policy of tight money and fiscal laxity; of rising interest rates on the one hand, and decreasing fiscal restraint on the other. What the Ways and Means Committee was saying was: "No."

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REUSS. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. When the gentleman makes the statement he is advancing his own theory of what the administration policy is, certainly not the administration's theory of what that policy is.

Mr. REUSS. My theory of the administration's fiscal and monetary policies is: "By their deeds ye shall know them."

Tight money and high interest rates have been the one cardinal economic policy of this administration. The administration has achieved this by a variety of devices. On numerous occasions, a higher interest coupon was put upon new Treasury issues than the market required. Federal Reserve rediscount rates have repeatedly been raised. And the money supply, from 1954 to 1958, was held down to a 6.6 percent increase, compared with a 21.6 percent increase in gross national product during this same period.

Loose fiscal policies have equally been a characteristic since 1953. The Internal Revenue Act of 1954 saw our tax system riddled with loopholes; no successful attempt has been made since to plug them. The inadequacy of our tax system, of course, contributed to this deficit.

I am going to try to demonstrate, Mr. Speaker, that the tight-money-loose-fiscal-policy mix of the administration hurts the United States where it hurts most, by seriously retarding our rate of growth.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, I ask the gentleman to make this point along with his development. The Congress has been under the control of three Democratic leaderships now in a row. Now, surely the responsibility for our tax policy and tax establishment, the Federal Reserve System, and so on is in the hands of the Congress, too; will the gentleman not agree?

Mr. REUSS. No. The gentleman has a different theory of government from mine. I believe that the President is elected by the people to be President.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. That is true.

Mr. REUSS. And the Employment Act of 1946 placed upon him the obligation, as the guardian of our economy, to come up before the Congress with a healthy and proper legislative program, a proper tax program, a proper monetary program. As I will try to demonstrate in just a few moments, he has not done so. Therefore, whatever may be the sins of Congress, the original sin is that of the President.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. The gentleman has answered my question. He does not feel Congress has the responsibility.

Mr. REUSS. I did not say that. I said the primary, initiating responsibility is on the President, and it is to the manner in which he has discharged his responsibility that I want to turn the spotlight.

I think we all know the rather unhappy facts of our growth rate. While during the postwar period from 1947 to 1952 it was at a healthy rate of around 4½ percent a year, since 1953 it has declined to around 2 percent. This compares unfavorably with the 5 to 6 percent in Western Europe, and the 8 to 10 percent achieved in the Soviet Union.

This lagging growth rate endangers our security abroad and our national welfare at home.

But how does this obsession with monetary restraints and high interest rates, to the neglect of fiscal restraints, retard economic growth?

Let us look at monetary restraint. First of all, what does it do to State and local governments? Take a community that wants to build schools, hospitals, bridges, or streets, for which State and local governments ought to be responsible. The evidence is clear that high interest rates have a very pronounced dampening effect.

Similarly, capital developments, particularly of small and new business enterprises, those that cannot go to the equity market, are dealt mortal blows by high interest rates. Indeed, large business enterprises find that their capital programs are likewise curtailed as a result of high interest rates.

Finally, the whole construction industry, housing and nonresidential construction alike, through the impact of high interest rates on the mortgage structure, shows a very high degree of responsiveness to high interest rates.

So, it looks at first blush as if the main effect of a restrictive monetary policy is to dampen and restrain growth: growth private, through the housing industry and through private business expansion; growth public, through the building and construction activities of State and local governments.

Now, what does monetary policy do to consumer spending? If it operates at all, it has to operate in one of two ways.

It has to operate directly by increasing interest charges for consumer credit. All the evidence available to anybody who turns on his car radio and listens to advertising for installment purchasing from discount houses, leads to the conclusion that high interest rates have no effect whatsoever on consumer purchasing. The length of payments can be strung out from here to eternity, and the installment purchaser never knows what has hit him.

What about the other way in which high interest rates might effect a dampening of consumer expenditures, namely, by increasing the propensity to save? Here again the evidence is overwhelming that high interest rates do not seem to have any effect one way or the other on consumer decisions as to whether to spend or whether to save. For example, if we look at the situation today, with recordbreaking high interest rates, saving by consumers does not seem to have expanded.

Therefore, the administration's tight-money, loose fiscal policy mix fights inflation principally at the expense of investment. In addition to slowing our rate of growth, it has reduced management of the national debt to a shambles. Higher and higher interest rates mean lower and lower market prices for outstanding U.S. securities. This has led to the present debacle of Treasury debt management.

What about fiscal policy, on which I believe we must place much greater emphasis? From the standpoint of limiting total demand to noninflationary proportions, fiscal policy can be every bit as effective as monetary policy. You can restrain total demand just as well by one policy as by the other.

A comparison of the two 6-year post World War II periods—1947–52 and 1953–58—shows that either policy mix can produce about the same anti-inflationary action.

During the 6-year period 1947–52, the policy in effect was one of monetary ease and fiscal stringency. Because of Federal Reserve policy, money was easy and interest rates were low. At the same time, the tax and expenditure policies which were followed resulted in a series of cash budgets surpluses totaling $12.4 billion.

Yet the total price rises during the period 1947–52, if we leave out the distortions produced by Korea, are, if anything, less than the price increases in the period 1953–59, during which a policy of tight money—fiscal laxity prevailed.

In both periods, of course, we could have done a much better anti-inflationary job than we did. The point I wish to make is that our anti-inflation record will be largely determined by what restraints we put upon total demand, and that these restraints can be produced as effectively by a combination of fiscal stringency and adequate money as by a combination of tight money and fiscal laxity.

But the crucial difference is that in monetary policy, when you use that to achieve restraint, you hit at growth, you hit at investment—investment in housing, investment in construction, investment in new plant and equipment, investment in homes, in highways, in schools, in the antipollution programs attempted by our State and local governments.

But when you use fiscal restraint, you can tailor your program to what needs to be done.

For example, if you use fiscal policies and there are inflationary demands, on the expenditures side you can cut down certain governmental outlays as total economic activity increases. If something has to be cut down and the choice lies between cutting down swimming pools on the one hand and cutting down schools on the other, fiscal policy at least helps one to make the choice. On the revenue side, tax policy can be adjusted so as to restrain the demand as between capital goods and consumption goods, and as between different types of consumption goods.

For example, if a higher rate of expansion of productive capacity is needed, in order to achieve more growth, tax policy can be directed toward restraining the increase in consumer demand, as by resisting a general individual income tax decrease.

This, Mr. Speaker, is the issue we face. Shall we not, in the interest of promoting a more rapid growth and in the interest of managing our national debt economically and sensibly—shall we not rely more heavily than we have in the past 6 years on fiscal policy, and less heavily on monetary policy?

I realize that Congress is on the verge of adjournment, and that the administration continues to engage in economic ancestor-worship, so that we can hardly hope to take a new look at our policy now. But January next is another story.

The President, in pursuance of his statutory duty, has to bring in a budget message. He has to bring in an economic report. And I hope, Mr. Speaker, that in those historic documents he will jettison his tight-money, fiscal-laxity policy, and instead substitute, as long as we have inflationary processes, a policy of monetary adequacy and fiscal tightness.

If he will do so we can get on with the job of making our economy grow. If he will do so, our national debt will cease to nag us, and be reduced to manageable proportions.

If recovery continues, there is an excellent prospect that in the fiscal year 1961 budget, to be submitted next January, we can adequately provide for the Nation's needs and still show a surplus on the order of $2 or $3 billion. It seems to me that it would be the course of responsible statesmanship for the President to scotch the idea of a vote-catching election-year tax reduction, and instead to hold that surplus.

Moreover, next January will be long overdue for a loophole-plugging reform of our entire tax structure—the oil depletion allowance, failure to report dividends and interest payments, excessive entertainment deductions, to mention only a few such loopholes. If these were closed, our surplus could well be widened to the order of $5 billion.

This combined action—holding the line against a general tax reduction and plugging the loopholes—would produce a program of adequate fiscal tightness. This by itself—and here is the main point—would result in greater monetary ease. Running a surplus means that some of the national debt can be retired, and investments in U.S. securities can become available to the private sector of the economy and to State and local governments. Credit will become more abundant, and interest rates will go down. This development will reduce the present constraint on investment.

Easing tight money, furthermore, would very substantially help to ease the difficulties of managing the public debt. With interest rates generally declining, the 4¼-percent ceiling should present no problem.

I can cite the most impeccable authority for the proposition that fiscal tightness produces budget surpluses, that budget surpluses permit reducing the national debt, and reduction in the national debt cause interest rates to decline.

Secretary of the Treasury Anderson in testifying last month before the Ways and Means Committee said:

> Budget surpluses in the twenties allowed the Federal Government to reduce the public debt by more than one-third. As a direct result, interest rates declined during a period of general prosperity. (Hearings, p. 17.)

Coming events cast their shadows before. The action of the Ways and Means Committee in turning down the administration's interest rate request reveals a dissatisfaction with the present tight money-loose fiscal policy mix. If inflationary pressures persist, we cannot have both monetary laxity and fiscal laxity—easy money and lower taxes. If price stability, growth of the economy, and a well-managed public debt, are primary objectives of national policy—as they assuredly are—then the tight money-fiscal laxity policy should be abandoned, and a policy of fiscal tightness and adequate money should be substituted.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REUSS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. In all this list of things, did I fail to hear cutting expenditures, or did not the gentleman refer to the expenditure side?

Mr. REUSS. What I say on expenditures is this: Cut out the fat and waste. In the defense program, in the agriculture program, in the foreign-aid program, in many other programs are great opportunities to eliminate wasteful expenditures. On the other hand, let the expenditure program of the Nation take care of the great priorities of the Nation's needs. Let it take care of our defense program. Let it take care of our international responsibilities. And let it take care of the needs of this country for the kind of welfare at home which the people deserve and want. If that is done, and if a long overdue program of plugging some of the more grievous tax loopholes is adopted, then we will be able to see the kind of surplus that I have indicated.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Does the gentleman believe that we can cut Federal expenditures below the levels that we have been making and the ones projected for the next fiscal year?

Mr. REUSS. We do not now have any projections for the next fiscal year. But let me say, in answer to the gentleman's question, this year's $77 billion-plus budget is going to about balance out. In next year's budget, I would look to an expenditure level which is just slightly above the present level. That can be achieved by cutting out the hundreds of millions of dollars of waste and extravagance that are in this year's budget request and substitute for them attention to some of the great priority needs of the country. So my concept of how you make a budget is that you first look at the things that need to be done in this country, and then, on the next go-around, you look at the tax structure and your economic structure, and you see to what extent you can run a surplus by proper adjustments in the tax structure—particularly to the imperative need to plug these loopholes, which are the greatest cause of the sievelike fiscal policy of the Eisenhower administration.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. In theory certainly I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. REUSS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Where we run into difficulty is applying that theory, and that is why I am led to ask this specific question. Will the gentleman vote to sustain the President's veto on this public works project that will come before us Wednesday? There is an example of cutting expenditures, because frankly I have never seen the gentleman from Wisconsin once vote to cut any proposal to spend money. Not once have I seen the gentleman vote against any of these expenditures.

Mr. REUSS. I do not know where the gentleman was when I led the fight to prevent Secretary Benson from writing these million-dollar checks to the large corporation farms. I do not know where the gentleman was when Secretary Benson thumbed his nose at the Congress and insisted on writing these checks anyway. I do not know where the gentleman was when I led the fight to cut out waste and extravagance in some of the airfield programs this year.

But getting back to the public works program, I intend to vote in favor of this year's public works program, because by and large this is a sound program which recognizes the present and future needs of the Nation for resource development. I would say to the gentleman there is a difference in our philosophy. The first concern of Republicans, it seems to me, is to cut out on the expenditure side of the budget those items that are necessary for the health and welfare and well-being of the American people. My effort is to see that we get a proper health and welfare program, and then see how, by plugging the tax loopholes, we can run the type of surplus that I am talking about, which would enable us to discard the present high-interest rate policy of the administration, and by encouraging national growth, produce a tax base upon which we could in the years to come run a steady surplus, which I believe is a necessity.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield at that point, since he brought in the question of Republican policy?

Mr. REUSS. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I do not know where you got that idea.

Mr. REUSS. I see it demonstrated here on the floor of the House every day.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I do not see it. As a matter of fact, I think the gentleman would observe that actually on the Republican side there is an attempt to try to bring down expenditures in whatever area, depending on whether they are well spent or not. I am happy to hear the gentleman say what he has said in regard to the farm program. But there the bulk of the support came from this side of the aisle. I am glad the gentleman is trying to cut expenditures there and in the other areas that he mentioned.

Mr. REUSS. I want to pay tribute to the many economy-minded Republicans who supported me in my fight against Secretary Benson and the Republican administration to stop these wasteful million-dollar payments to the large corporation farms.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. The gentleman keeps referring to this Benson farm program. It is not entirely Secretary Benson's program. I came down here under the Truman administration and we have had that thing in here all along.

Mr. REUSS. But it was Secretary Benson who thumbed his nose at the $3,000 limitation which Congress inserted.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. He recommended it and I tried to get it through in several Congresses. I will say to the gentleman that I do not know why he quibbles about it, for this Congress has its share of the blame for the farm mess.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REUSS. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. Just a moment. I ask the gentleman what party has been in control of the executive branch of the Government for the past 6½ years?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. May I answer that?

Mr. McCORMACK. I think the gentleman from Wisconsin can answer that.

Mr. REUSS. I have already made the point that the Republican Party and its leader, President Eisenhower, have been charged with giving to the Congress a sound economic program, and they have failed to do so.

Mr. McCORMACK. And they have not come up with a farm bill yet.

Mr. REUSS. That is correct.

Mr. McCORMACK. Secretary Benson promised the Senate last January that he would recommend to Congress a farm bill, back 3 or 4 months ago. He has not come up with it.

Mr. REUSS. Perhaps it will come in October.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. Just a minute; this is interesting.

Mr. REUSS. I yielded to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I am asking the gentleman from Massachusetts if he in turn will yield for a correction.

Mr. McCORMACK. Of course, the gentleman from Wisconsin has the floor.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REUSS. I have yielded to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. As I remember, the Republican Party in 1952 promised to reduce the national debt. It is now $20 billion higher, is it not?

Mr. REUSS. That is correct. And the interest rate is almost doubled.

Mr. McCORMACK. Oh, talk about the interest rate. I am talking about what the American people have paid, $10 billion a year in interest alone as a result of the policy of the present administration.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. We will get around to you in a minute.

Let me call the gentleman's attention to the fact that in the last 6 years of the Truman administration the income tax revenue was $292,500 million. In the first 6 years of the Eisenhower administration the tax revenue was $444,500 million.

Mr. REUSS. And the significant portion of these figures is that in the Truman administration, during the years 1947 to 1952, the budgetary position was one of surplus. In other words, here was a policy of fiscal tightness at the same time there was a policy of adequate money. As a result, we got a more than doubled growth rate per annum.

Since the Eisenhower administration took over, instead of following a policy of adequate money and fiscal tightness such as was followed in the years 1947 to 1952, it has followed a policy of tight money and fiscal laxity. That has obtained since 1953. The former is a better policy, because it resulted in national growth at twice the annual rate we have had since 1953. It is a better policy, since it makes the national debt our servant rather than our master; I commend to the administration that it ponder the thesis that I advance this afternoon. If the administration will see the error of its ways, and come up next January with a sensible policy of adequate money and fiscal tightness, it will get overwhelming support on this side of the aisle, and once again our country can go forward to adequate growth and adequate management of the national debt.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REUSS. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I thank the gentleman. I thought maybe this was going to be a one-way street. I simply point some things to the majority leader that he conveniently forgets in this presentation: No. 1, the Republican controlled 80th Congress deserves a great deal of the credit for what fiscal responsibilities there was during this period. Second, during this period this administration came into power with appropriations made in preparation for handling the Korean war which creates an unusual economic condition and unusual expenditures.

And one further thing, during this same period that is regarded as the millenium, we had this heavy inflation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

REA IN TRANSITION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ALGER] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, electric service, with all of its work-saving and pleasure-giving benefits, is available to practically all rural residents today. That was not true in 1936; comparatively few farms were reached by powerlines. City dwellers, enjoying their lights, radios and refrigeration, nodded approval when Congress created the Rural Electrification Administration. The purpose of this lending agency was to help extend electric service to residents of rural areas who did not have it, and this has been done.

Propagandists for the rural electric cooperatives imply that most farmers would still be without electric service had it not been for the REA. That is anything but a logical assumption, since our living standards in many other respects have also risen since 1936—mainly because our free enterprise system thrives on progress.

It may be conceded, however, that the REA caused electric service to reach some rural areas sooner than it would have in the normal process of economic revolution—that is, had the law of supply and demand been allowed to operate without benefit of bureaucracy. The REA speeded up rural electrification at the expense of all the people, the principal subsidies to its co-op borrowers being exemption from Federal taxation and loans at 2 percent, which is less than the money costs the Government.

My purpose here, however, is not to argue the merits or demerits of the REA. The point is that this lending agency was created to do a specific job, and that original job is now done. Quoting from the law creating it, the REA's purpose originally was "for the furnishing of electric energy to persons in rural areas who are not receiving central station service."

According to REA's own figures:

> REA estimates[1] that 95.4 percent of the farms in the United States had central station electric service at June 30, 1959.

This being the case, it would seem in the public interest that the farmers of America might be assisted by the Congress in setting up a program where they might operate and finance their own future programs.

But such is not the way of bureaucracy. As one New Dealer so aptly put it, "the nearest thing to immortality on this earth is a Government agency." If one works itself out of a job, it seeks a new one or a new identity. This is especially true of the million dollar lobby that now lives on the pennies and dimes taken from the farmers of America.

The REA-financed rural electric cooperatives want to keep growing, but they are unwilling to give up the tax advantage and subsidies provided them for farm service—even though their new business must come from nonfarm customers. Commenting on certain Federal spending programs "no longer related to the needs of today," Federal Budget Director Maurice H. Stans recently had some interesting comments on the rural electrification program. He said that $3,500 million had been invested in the program at 2 percent interest, and further pointed out that the program has been continued in its original form even though about 95 percent of all farms are now electrified—page 3, second paragraph, report of the REA Administrator, 1958. Half of all REA electricity now goes to industries and other nonfarm customers, and three out of four new customers being added by rural electrics are nonfarm consumers, which is not in keeping with the intent of the law.

As the horrible specter looms—the possibility that a Government lending agency might well go out of business—bureaucrats, lobbyists, and politicians have all joined to urge cooperatives to launch new expansion programs which will extend the need for Federal supervision, and of course, new lending programs.

This year, the electric cooperatives launched a nationwide movement to change the basic law which limits the operation of rural electric cooperatives to areas not receiving central station service, and to eliminate the provision which restricts REA co-op service to cities of not more than 1,500 population. Not only have attempts been made to change the Federal law, but in my own State of Texas, a similar attempt to expand the permissible coverage of electric co-ops was made during the 1959 sessions of the legislature.

[1] Report of the Administrator of the REA, 1958, p. 2, line 33.

It takes no keen analyst to see that with 95.4 percent of the farms of the Nation electrified, the electric co-ops will next try to move into cities and suburban areas already served by existing utilities. The future customers of these so-called rural electric cooperatives will not be farmers but will be factories, markets, refineries, and other nonfarm customers.

The National Rural Electric Cooperative Association is an organization which purportedly represents rural electric cooperatives, and which maintains one of the most powerful lobbies on the Washington scene. The NRECA derives its income from a 1-cent-per-month head tax on each of its 4,500,000 members. NRECA is trying to boost this head tax to 1½ cents per month, and while it is not a taxing authority, it should be able to impose this tax on its captive members with impunity.

The NRECA house organ Rural Electrification in a recent issue mentions the following questions in an editorial headed "Set Thine House in Order"—Rural Electrification, page 6:

> Are the rural electric systems a bunch of "fat cats"?
>
> Are the electric co-ops really being operated as true cooperatives?
>
> Are the electric co-ops violating the spirit and intent of the REA Act?
>
> Do they have a formalized and defensible reserve policy?
>
> Are they borrowing funds from REA at 2 percent and investing them at a higher percent?
>
> Are the electric cooperatives speculating in the market with their reserve funds?

According to the NRECA writer, these are "only some of the questions being asked about your rural electric cooperative."

Electric cooperative spokesmen make much of the fact that their groups are repaying their Government loans. The Administrator reports that "electric borrowers have made debt payments totaling $1,002,581,110"—report of the Administrator of the REA, 1958, page 5, last line—"since the program began." The REA partisans suggest that the 2 percent interest paid by co-op borrowers on loans is profit to the Government. But, as the Administrator points out in his report:

> The REA accounts do not take into consideration the interest costs incurred by the Treasury in excess of the amount received from REA for funds made available to finance REA lending programs.

Fifteen million dollars on amount outstanding last year—Comptroller General's report, page 11. And note that the cost of administering the REA program through 1958 totaled $115,794,850—report of the Administrator of the REA, 1958, page 13, line 33—in addition to the interest losses mentioned.

In a recent speech to members of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association at their annual convention, President Eisenhower said:

> I like to think that the program which lighted the farm homes of America will also help illuminate the path to sound finance, good government and responsible citizenship.

This thought, along with his suggestion that the co-ops had grown up, and no longer comprised an infant industry, was received coolly by the delegates.

The Government has been lending co-ops money for almost 15 years now at 2 percent interest. The President's suggestion that electric co-ops should pay their own way, by at least paying more realistic interest rates on their Government loans brought forth loud wails of anguish from co-op members and politicians alike. This, they said, was "driving the co-ops to Wall Street for their money." Conveniently ignored was the fact that in the original REA Act of 1936 it was stated that loans should bear an interest rate equal to that which the United States paid on its long-term obligations, which is now about 4 percent per year.

Just recently, here in Washington, we have witnessed the electric co-op lobby at work. Pursuing their convention resolution to strip the incumbent Secretary of Agriculture of his authority over loans made by the Rural Electrification Adminstration, the NRECA made every effort to obtain passage of their pet bill, which would have left only housekeeping functions of the REA to the Agriculture Department.

The No. 1 lobbyist for the REA co-ops in Washington is Clyde Ellis, a former Congressman from Arkansas, who heads NRECA. Mr. Ellis had his own reasons for wanting the transfer of the REA loan authority from the Secretary of Agriculture to the Rural Electric Administrator, even though there is no record of any loan request having been denied by the Secretary. Peculiarly enough, when Mr. Ellis was in Congress in 1939, he voted to have the loan authority placed under the then Secretary of Agriculture, the great liberal leader and progressive Democrat, Henry Agard Wallace.

Electric cooperatives receive special income tax benefits, and therefore are given an unfair advantage by the Federal Government over their taxpaying, investor-owned competitors. Efforts made in the past to tax cooperatives on an equitable basis have always failed.

The Treasury, recognizing the inequalities inherent in this double standard of taxation, has proposed that the so-called certificates which co-ops often give their members in lieu of cash dividends, be made tax-free for 3 years only. After that period, they would be taxed just as are corporate income and stockholder dividends. In 1 year, 1954, approximately $150 million was retained by co-ops for reinvestment and to pay off old certificates. Taxes on such an amount would run from $12 million to $30 million.

May I cite two examples of the REA planned economy in my own State. I might mention that electric co-ops claim 341,561—report of the Administrator of the REA, page 18, table 3—members in Texas. According to a recent estimate made by the U.S. Census Bureau, the population of my district, Dallas County, is 917,000, or almost three times the electric co-op membership in the entire State of Texas. Now, since the taxpayers in my district are being tapped regularly through income tax deductions to help pay interest and tax subsidies given to electric co-ops, I believe that these two cases should be mentioned for the record.

On March 20, 1959, ground was broken for a new 66,000-kilowatt steam-electric generating plant to be constructed by the Medina Electric Cooperative of Hondo, Tex. The Medina Electric Cooperative serves some 6,700—REA Bulletin 1–1, page 188, 1957 last issue—consumers, and purchases its power from Ceneral Power and Light Co. and from the San Antonio Public Service Board. The co-op's power capacity requirement in 1958 was approximately 17,000 kilowatts, compared with the 66,000-kilowatt capacity of the plant now under construction.

This new generating plant was financed by two loans approved by the Rural Electrification Administration, one of $3,700,000 and another of $11,480,000.

Here are two points to be noted: At no time has this co-op required more power than was available from present sources of supply, and the rate charged for this energy is one of the Nation's lowest.

When it was first learned that the Medina Electric Cooperative was contemplating the construction of a steam generating plant, engineers of the Central Power & Light Co., which was under contract to supply power to the co-op, inquired in a letter to David Hamil, REA Administrator, as to whether there had been a change in the criteria for REA generation and transmission loans, as outlined in Administrative Bulletin, No. 61, dated May 30, 1950, and signed by Claude R. Wickard, then Rural Electrification Administrator. This policy bulletin included the following provisions:

First. The Rural Electrification Administration will make loans to finance the initial construction of generation facilities and transmission facilities only under the following conditions:

(a) Where no adequate and dependable source of power is available in the area to meet the borrower's needs.

(b) Where the rates offered by existing power sources would result in a higher cost of power to the borrowers than the cost from facilities financed by REA.

Administrator Hamil replied that there had been no change in this policy.

The two Government loans amounting to $13,893,000 increase the Medina co-op's indebtedness to more than $3,500—according to REA Bulletin 1–1, 1957, plus new loan—announcement 2561–58—per customer—compared with an average for all Texas rural electric co-ops of $726—report of Administrator of the REA, 1958, tables 1 and 3, pages 16 and 18—per customer. Even at the subsidized REA interest rate of 2 percent, this means that each co-op member will be paying more than $70 per year in interest costs alone.

No question has been raised by the Medina co-op as to the adequacy and dependability of their power sources, and although the co-op has been advised of a small rate increase to become effective upon the expiration of present contracts, the cost of power will remain lower than that at which the co-op could generate and transmit it to consumers. It should also be noted that neither the matter of rates nor of service adequacy was used

as a criterion in granting the first loan of $3,709,000.

If the Medina co-op generates 88 percent of its power requirements as planned, it will reduce its bill for purchased power by about $320,000 per year on the basis of 1957 use. At the same time, the interest on the money required to construct the plant will amount to almost $280,000. Even with slightly higher power costs in years to come from Central Power & Light, it will cost the Medina Electric Cooperative more to generate its own power than to purchase it from the private utility. I think that the members of the Medina Electric Cooperative are entitled to have this information.

I think the Members of Congress and the people generally are entitled to the information provided by the Comptroller General in his annual report to Congress regarding the specific provisions of this loan, inasmuch as the Medina corporation proposed to use $675,000 of this money to relend to a private corporation—at 5 percent interest—to construct the gas pipeline which would provide Medina's fuel. Ownership of the pipeline would remain in the hands of the private corporation. The Comptroller General makes two points very clear: First, that REA funds borrowed from the Government at 2 percent were thus reloaned to a private entity not entitled to REA funds; and, second, that funds borrowed from the Government at 2 percent were reloaned by this corporation at 5 percent.

Another interesting development in Texas has to do with the operation of the Brazos Electric Power Cooperative of Waco, another REA-financed generating and transmission system. A recent survey of power costs of cooperative members of this group clearly demonstrates that the cost of energy purchased by REA co-ops from generating and transmission systems is the most expensive that the farmer purchases—REA Bulletin 111-2, page 65, line 2, and page 83, line 1. Private utilities 7.9 mills per kilowatt-hour versus 1.12 cents per kilowatt-hour for power supplied by the G. and T. REA systems. During the past 8 years, power supplied by the Brazos Electric Power Cooperative to distribution cooperatives has cost these farmers $2 million more than if the same service had been supplied by previously existing suppliers. Incidentally, this information comes altogether from figures published by the Rural Electrification Administration.

Gentlemen, I do not get these figures from anybody who in any way can be considered an opponent of the REA.

I might say relative to this matter of competition—and that is what we are talking about—I would like to quote here from the Comptroller General's statement. Actually, it is the report to the Congress by the GAO and it quotes here earlier from Speaker RAYBURN. Mr. RAYBURN is quoted as saying, and I am quite certain this is correct:

> Mr. RAYBURN. May I say to the gentleman that we are not, in this bill, intending to go out and compete with anybody. By this bill we hope to bring electrification to people who do not now have it. This bill was not written on the theory that we were going to punish somebody or parallel their lines or enter into competition with them.

Can our Government afford to continue making these ill-advised and questionable loans to power-type electric cooperatives, to pay for unnecessary duplication of utility services in areas served by taxpaying corporations?

Can the farmer members of these co-ops afford the luxury of higher costs for electric service?

Proponents of public power can see, a short distance over the horizon, a completely socialized electrical industry with those who planned it in comfortable command of the empire they survey.

The time has come when this grasping for more power, for more territory, for more funds must be curbed. Taxpayers cannot support many more freeloaders. This Nation cannot long endure half socialist and half free. That is another interesting observation.

Mr. Speaker, I conclude by saying that with a debt interest of over $8 billion, with the many demands we have in domestic programs and in foreign programs as well as great defense programs, it would seem that it behooves all of us to save money where we can. I might say that the farmers of this Nation should want, and I think they do want, to cooperate in fiscal responsibility.

Mr. KASEM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALGER. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. KASEM. Mr. Speaker, I want to preface my remarks by saying that the gentleman speaking is one of the ablest proponents of the philosophy advocated on the other side of the aisle; and I do not mean that in any derogatory way at all. I very frequently agree with his remarks and very seldom agree with his conclusions.

However, there was one noticeable other instance in which that was not true, that was on continuance of the renegotiation proceedings in defense contracts. I agreed with the gentleman's conclusions. The gentleman's talk has been an excellent compliment to the great Democratic program of the REA and the service it has rendered to this country. I would like to point out certain fallacies that I believe appear in his argument. One, if this program has served well and has brought light even to the moderate degree that the gentleman is willing to admit, to the unelectrified rural areas of the United States, it appears to me and it should appear to him, since he is on the threshold of that area of the United States where we have vast undeveloped areas yet to be developed, that we should certainly continue the REA.

Mr. ALGER. I must observe to the gentleman that I hope he will not make a speech but ask me questions. May I answer that if that is in the form of a question? Ninety-five point four percent of the farms of the great United States are now electrified. By the way, I might counsel you, when you have the time, to read the report of the Comptroller General. My remarks stem from the report of the Comptroller General, with the preparation of which I had nothing to do, and about which I am sure no political party has anything to do. If I speak on this side of the aisle, the gentleman may know if he observes my record that I do these things generally based on some principles that I believe in and not necessarily because of a party platform.

Mr. KASEM. I concede that very readily and that is why I always like to hear the gentleman speak. I think he is a very sincere and very able Member. I would say this. There are 95 percent electrified farms but there are infinitely varying degrees of electrification and within that 95 percent I am sure there should and will be more improvements. There is the unelectrified 5 percent and there is going to be more ruralization, if you please, in vast areas of the United States that are not developed now at all.

Some financing vehicle must exist that will encourage them to electrify where it cannot be an attraction to private capital to sponsor such development.

Mr. ALGER. Does the gentleman think there is anything anywhere in my statement to indicate that I was opposed to that?

Mr. KASEM. I got a suggestion of that. I was not sure. But I would like to ask the gentleman on that point if he would abolish the REA program?

Mr. ALGER. May I counter that by saying to the gentleman wherever the REA can clearly be established as providing a need that cannot otherwise be met, I am for it. I am merely saying to them that the original intent of the law should be followed. I would turn right around and fight for the right of the REA to provide electricity. And I think you are missing the best point and that is in the telephone field. There are only half of the necessary telephones provided. In fact, I went further here and said, and I realize I did not permit any interruption and it certainly would have aided the gentleman in questioning me, and I apologize for that, but I thank him for permitting me to go on, but I point out to you and I want to quote that in case the gentleman would like to take issue with me:

> The farmers of America should be assisted by the Congress in setting up a program where they might operate and finance their own future programs.

I would actually put into the hands of the farmers the means to do this, but I would not duplicate existing facilities, particularly where, as the Comptroller General shows, in one instance they were building duplicate facilities within 160 feet and running a $120,000 transmission line when the service facilities were already there.

I am only looking at the inequity and the waste that has been so well pleaded here before the committee. I am not trying to disband the REA.

Mr. KASEM. I am very happy to hear that. I would go along with the gentleman in those instances where we can eliminate waste. But with the gentleman's permission I would like to move to another point. The gentleman has spoken of taxpaying corporations and the taxpayers of his district carrying the burden for other areas. He refers to areas in Texas, but it would presumably apply to all other areas. The rural electrification financing is by way of loans,

and I believe at the rate of 2 percent; is that not correct?

Mr. ALGER. That is correct.

Mr. KASEM. And the burden that falls upon the taxpayers——

Mr. ALGER. However, the gentleman knows that the original law stated the interest charged should be at the same rate that the Government pays. Did the gentleman know that?

Mr. KASEM. No; I did not know that, and there is an abundance of things that this gentleman does not know.

Mr. ALGER. I am in that same category. Let me assure the gentleman there is much that I do not know about the REA, but having made a study of this matter on which I am speaking today I might point out to the gentleman that the original law said that the interest should not be less than that paid by the Government itself. But we cut it back to 2 percent. With that I take issue, but it is the present law.

Mr. KASEM. I think at that time it was intended to make it a subsidy. It was originally made 2 percent because the Government was paying 2 percent. It really seems if the burden is on the taxpayers, it is because of the fiscal policies that it has increased interest rates to the Government. Would that not be true?

Mr. ALGER. I think the gentleman is wandering far afield from the basic point of whether the original intent of the law should be followed and the interest rate be the same as the Government pays and why the Government should pledge its assets in order to subsidize these industries by letting these industries have money at a cheaper rate than the Government can borrow it. Can you tell me? And what would you tell your constituents in your home district?

Mr. KASEM. I would tell the gentleman what I tell my constituents: There are areas of the economy that need the general help of all that are in the throes of initial development. This is the answer given by those who want to have protective tariffs, you see.

Mr. ALGER. I cannot yield further to the gentleman for I need to use my own time. The gentleman is perfectly welcome to take the position that he does. It is proper to recognize that the Government subsidizes this particular field. My point is that the Government should not make loans at a rate of interest lower than what the Government itself has to pay. We should not ask the taxpayers to take up the difference.

Mr. KASEM. We are in basic disagreement. I think it is fair that we certainly encourage embryonic endeavors that promise great public good. We subsidize practically everything in the United States of America and obviously we have heavily subsidized some things that were good and some that were not so good.

Mr. ALGER. I must yield to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS].

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. First I want to commend the gentleman for a well-prepared and fine presentation and a very good study of the subject. I just want to make one point.

I am afraid the gentleman from California has one misconception. The REA program was not born in politics and it has never been in politics in its essence. In other words, it has been supported by Republicans and Democrats since its beginning and I trust that it will continue to be supported by Democrats and Republicans, both.

The gentleman on the other side of the aisle I hope will realize that the gentleman from Texas and others on this side who have the term "Conservative" applied to us, and I think properly, that we believe in certain Federal expenditures but we hold that they should be well documented, that they should be proper expenditures; and, certainly, even where an expenditure might be justified in a particular program that we should be careful to see that it is spent for that particular program and not for something else.

One other point, and a very important one that is involved in this question is this: It has been pointed out if REA duplicates services provided by the private sector of our economy we take out just that much of the tax base. Whenever the Government assumes an operation it removes that operation from the tax base and thereby puts an added burden on those who are paying the taxes. So whenever we can properly turn something over to the private sector of our economy we gain two advantages: One, it does not come from Federal expenditures; two, it actually adds to the Federal revenues, for it enlarges the tax base.

Mr. ALGER. I thank the gentleman. I have tried to give a fair example of the operations under the present administration of REA and I think from the examples shown I have proved in many instances people are paying higher rates; and secondly, that REA is duplicating existing facilities. Apparently many people do not know this, but will become more aware of it when they realize that their electric rates are higher than others.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALGER. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. With respect to the REA, I see the distinguished former Administrator of REA in the Chamber, the gentleman from Minnesota, Mr. NELSEN, and his distinguished successor, Mr. Hamil, a former speaker of the State Legislature of Colorado, under whom I served. Am I to understand that the gentleman's remarks made this afternoon are intended to be a criticism of the administration of either of these two estimable gentlemen?

Mr. ALGER. My remarks, as the gentleman well understands, were intended to be just about as critical as they could be in the examples I gave.

It seems to me I have presented a problem that the gentleman from Colorado would like to help solve because he spoke so eloquently of the need for a sound fiscal policy.

The thing I object to is that the taxpayers have paid $15 million of interest more for REA than they should have. In other words, the REA interest rate has been less than the rate the Government had to pay to borrow that money in the first place. The REA has been subsidized in its operations to this extent. They have actually been paying a lower interest rate than the Government had to on the money it borrowed. I suggest that the gentleman should be very much interested in helping to correct this situation.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I thank the gentleman for his comments. If I may comment further I will say that my purpose earlier this afternoon, as was that of the gentleman from Wisconsin, was to note that if present interest rates are too high I would prefer to get the level of interest rates back to a lower point rather than provide higher interest on long-term government bonds, which seems to be the policy of the Government and the policy of the President.

Mr. ALGER. If I may be permitted an answer in rebuttal, I am not trying to place blame; I was presenting a case I thought, for the correction of REA administration, a system that has actually done a fine job. The gentleman has misunderstood me entirely if he thought I wanted to wreck the program. I want to strengthen it and put it on a sound basis. I am sure the gentleman is just as interested in eliminating waste, in economizing, and in making this country right for the taxpayers who ultimately pay the bill.

Am I wrong?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I would agree with that, and to footnote: This is one of the cases where the investment in the long run is self-liquidating. As you electrify the farms, we have far fewer farmers producing more, you increase the amount of money the Government recovers in income taxes from the farmers because of their increased productivity. So that is entirely different from apparently what the gentleman believes.

I would note, too, that in the campaign last fall my two Republican opponents coming from Mr. Hamil's district preceded me in answering the question by saying they would not dream of raising interest rates. You can see where that puts me.

Mr. ALGER. I can see the problem, but I would rather not get mixed up in the gentleman's campaign. The gentleman, like myself, does not believe we should duplicate private facilities with REA's side by side; is that correct?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I would make this further comment: You must take both a short- and long-run view. The use of electricity in this country has increased tremendously, and I would not want to assume that because at the moment there was a surplus of power in one area, a new generation and transmission facilities might not be needed. I would have to examine it case by case. I would not want to generalize.

PUBLIC WORKS VETO

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I understand the House is to vote on

the question of whether or not to override the President's veto of the public works appropriation bill.

I find myself in sympathy with one argument being advanced by those who wish to override the veto. This argument is that the Congress should not have to take just what the President says in his judgment is a proper public works project. Because I am in sympathy with this argument, I have opposed and still do oppose the proposal for an item veto. I wonder how many advocates of the item veto will vote to override this veto? Those who try to make a party issue out of this veto will, but those who put their belief in the propriety of an item veto will not.

I am also in sympathy with those who disagree with the President's principle of "no new starts" in public works projects. I think many public works need to be started which have not been and there are many which have been started that should be stopped. However, I do appreciate the practicality of the President's policy. It is one way to keep public works expenditures within some budgetary limit.

In spite of this sympathy I shall vote against overriding the President's veto for the following reasons:

First. Federal expenditures must be held within some budgetary limit. The problem of inflation and the fiscal solvency of this Nation is serious. Those people who do not like to vote for increasing the debt limit, or removing the ceiling on interest which we pay for the Federal debt, or do not want to increase taxes must recognize that there is only one way to avoid that which they dislike and that is to stop appropriating more money than we collect in taxes.

Second. The Congress has not set up a workable method to hold public works appropriations in hand. Or, for that matter, Congress has adopted no workable procedure for keeping any appropriations within a total budget. Therefore, it ill behooves Congress to raise a fuss because the Executive through the Bureau of the Budget is trying to bring this desirable thing about.

If Congress will exercise self-discipline in the area of expenditures then we have a basis to quarrel with the Executive about cutting back as he sees fit, but not otherwise.

Third. Not only has Congress not set up a method of holding expenditures in line, it submits to pressures by individual Members to violate the rule it has set up to regulate public works appropriations. Most of the projects in the appropriation bill to which the President has objected to in his veto are projects that were put into the budget in violation of the ground rules set up.

When a Member gets a project in the bill contrary to the rules it makes it tough on every other Member who did not get a project in because his fell short of meeting the standards set. Most Congressmen prefer to follow fair rules if the rules are enforced. I personally will fight the battle for my projects within the rules. When I find a bill vetoed because others have violated the rules I lose a great deal of sympathy for their pleas to override a veto in order to protect the prerogatives of the Congress.

I want to say a word about another argument that is being advanced by some of my colleagues. We hear it all the time as justification for voting for expenditures. The argument is, if we are going to spend the money abroad, let us spend it at home, too.

One of the reasons I have voted against foreign aid appropriation bills, though not the primary one, is the damage done to fiscal responsibility just because of this kind of argument is appealing to so many Congressmen.

I notice, however, that the main persons using this argument are those who vote for all expenditures—at home, abroad, or in outer space, it matters not where it is spent to them. I cannot appeal to them, I know. But I do appeal to those who sincerely are concerned about holding Federal expenditures to a budget figure. Instead of giving into this phony argument of the spenders let us boil it down to what it really is. If we are going to be fiscally irresponsible in spending money abroad why should we be fiscally responsible about spending money at home? The answer is this. To be fiscally responsible we must be fiscally responsible in all things. It matters little where the budget is burst, the net result is the same. It creates inflation and damages the budget of all our people, stunts economic growth, and destroys prosperity.

We can have a good appropriation bill stripped of the projects which were in violation of the rules the rest of us abided by in trying to get our projects included. The President will sign a bill which includes the projects that met the tests set up. Let us sustain the veto and submit a bill divested of the projects which are in violation of the standards which were set in full time for all Members to comply with.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I would like to make reference to the previous debate that has ensued involving our fiscal difficulties and debt management. It was very noticeable in all the remarks the gentlemen on the other side were making that hardly ever did they talk about cutting expenditures. There was no attention paid to what creates high interest rates. What creates high interest rates, of course, is the demand for money; demand for investment capital.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I thought I spent some time, in the brief period I had, on budget policy, pointing out that you can differentiate between liquidating and self-liquidating, productive and unproductive, or wasteful expenditures, and the gentleman from Wisconsin joined me in singling out a number of places where he felt there was waste. And, I think it would be a misunderstanding about what was said here this afternoon to suggest that we were not concerned with the quality as well as the amount.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I might say to the gentleman that the answer is not general theory. When I interrogated the gentleman from Wisconsin, I said in theory that was very fine, but I thought we had to get down to some details. Then I made the charge to which he answered and pointed out two instances where he said that he had voted to cut expenditures. But, I want to point out again that the gentleman from Colorado, I have observed, has not been among those—and this is not in criticism of his views—has never been among those who tried to cut these budget requests down and has always been for those who want to increase the budget request.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. If the gentleman reviews my voting record, I think he would find he is in error.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] in debate the other day, was telling some of his friends "I voted for your projects, and therefore you should be voting for these." And I felt like taking the floor, but I could not grab it quite then.

There was too much going on, but I wanted to take the floor and ask the question whether the gentleman had ever voted against anybody's proposal for expending money. There is the issue. I think economy has to begin at home, as it were. It has to begin with the Congressman's own district. If we are not willing to start cutting and to consider cutting budgets with reference to projects that affect our own district, things of that nature, then I think all our talk about trying to keep expenditures down is just so much talk.

Essentially it is this, reverting again to the addresses of the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. REUSS]. They create the impression, and I think it is their theory, that the administration is a high-interest-rate administration, that it believes in high interest rates. That is untrue. The administration has denied it. I, who believe the administration's theories are essentially correct, deny it. I do not think anyone in this country is for high interest rates. We want to have interest as low as practicably possible. But what creates high interest rates? Again I say it is the demand for investment capital. If you have the demand high, and with a tremendous Federal debt, such as we have, and continued deficit financing, you will have high interest rates. To finance the $12 billion deficit of last year means that there is an added demand for investment capital. That is a basic cause of high interest rates. Not that anyone plans it, but because there is the demand for investment capital and our people's savings have not kept up with the demand.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The deficit last year, of course, is now history so far as the financial life is concerned.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. No, no. The deficit of last year is having its impact right now. It did not have it until—well, I think you could say that the deficit began having its impact probably around April or May. We are now in the full swing of it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Then how do you account for the rise in interest rates in years when there was not a $12 billion deficit?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. There is more to interest rates and demand for private capital than the Federal sector. That is another error that I think the gentleman from Colorado and the gentleman from Wisconsin and those who follow their theories, are constantly making. They think the Government can set interest rates. The point that I am trying to advance is that the marketplace essentially sets the interest rates. When interest rates go up, it may be partly due to Government policy, but Government is only one factor and not the largest factor, either. It may be the largest single factor. But the Government is by no means the only factor in the money market.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BOLLING). The time of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] has expired.

THE HONORABLE EDWARD EAGLE BROWN DIED AUGUST 24, 1959

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BOLLING). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. LIBONATI] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, the germinating of a seed or bud means life, in plant or man, but the genes in man are his inheritance from his ancestry.

Mr. Speaker, nature works its wonders through all living things. It follows a definite pattern and manifests itself according to rules. Its work, in such an undeviating manner, can only be indicative of a God-like obedience to God's will—if not the power, then the Almighty Himself.

And so, as the sprouting bud, cracking forth as a rudimentary crinkled, delicate transparent silk green finger of plant tissue, alive with freshness and peeking at the world.

And this perfect leaflet, nurtured by the earth and the elements, grows to a predestined maturity. Its perfections or imperfections are nature's secret.

A low, soft whistling in the leafy trees; the foliage lazily turning on twisting stems, as though to escape the sun's penetrating beams that play upon their veined and green-tinted summer faces, and tomorrow changingly wears a coat of brown or tinted colors that scintillate in the sun, as the wind buoyantly lofts it into space and away.

And so it is with life.

Nature displays the utmost of perfection of form and symmetry in the leaf—but for man, with mind and soul, nature leaves to his offspring the future development of the genes of his posterity.

It was not a mere accident of nature that Edward Eagle Brown was a brilliant and talented man in the field of finance and corporation law. He was the son of distinguished parents. It is a scientific fact that the offspring inherit, congenitally, those strong characteristics and talents of the parents. It can be truthfully said that geniuses are born of intellectually favored mothers. Eagle Brown was truly a real genius and his revolutionary contributions to the advancement of corporate organization and the development of new methods of corporate control for modern business proved it. He needs no monument dedicated to his memory—by his work the world of finance has received its highest contribution in the perfection of rules to insure financial security protection. His resourceful mind perfected functioning organization for big business. It was sorely needed.

And so it was with the career of Edward Eagle Brown, a native Chicagoan, born June 4, 1885, of a distinguished father, Judge Edward Osgood Brown, for many years attorney for the First National Bank, before his ascendancy to the bench in 1903.

He was graduated from Harvard Law School in 1908 and admitted to the Illinois bar. Several years later he become one of the staff of legal counsel for the First National Bank.

In 1913 he married Miss Phyllis Wyatt, the literary columnist on the staff of the Chicago Evening Post. She died in 1944; the couple was childless.

It was during these early years after graduation that he came under the direction of our beloved Jane Addams of Hull House. As a resident at Hull House he participated in all youth activities, teaching in evening classes, and as a director of club activities. It was here that he studied life's experience of others in the raw. He never lost the urge for, nor failed to support worthy charities for the welfare of those less fortunate than himself.

In his early youth, he became very active in Democratic politics and his identification with the party gave him many opportunities to advance the interests of his bank, both in Washington, D.C., and Springfield, Ill., and, of course, at home.

He was an astute student of every phase of banking and relative financial interests. He knew the monetary practices and intricacies of world governments. His mind became so retentive in all areas of finance that, mentally, he could retain all of the financial figures of every corporation of importance to his banking interests. He was said to have a photographic memory.

His rise was immediate, in that his knowledge was profound. He became an expert in banking methods and its involved operations.

His advice was law. His solutions were infallible. He worked far into the nights—he believed in work. He rewarded those who joined the ranks of the bank employees. The high level pension system and employees' bank stock buying plan was a revelation to American enterprise. The longevity of service years of valued employees increased.

His work and value did not escape the good notices of those in authority. He served as assistant attorney and general counsel for 14 years, and then as vice president for 12 years, and as president of the bank for 12 years, to 1945. He was then elected chairman of the board, and served until 1955.

The greatest era of the bank's progress was during his term as president and chairman of the board, deposits advancing from $583,000 in 1934 to $2,800,000 in 1955.

The legislative history of the Illinois Assembly is replete with many laws touching the financial structure of State, county, and city governments. The practical approach in their applicability to intricate and momentuous programs was due to his consistent and clarifying proposals. He alone did much to perfect the legalistic language of the Chicago Transit Authority. His tremendous knowledge of the financial implications involved, permeated the legal structure of its financial operation. He was the last word in the reorganization of the antiquated practices of the financial departments of government. His valued advice in formulating these changes into law bridged across dishonest practices and recouped public confidence. Time and again he lent his talents toward that end—he was a godsend to honest government in the handling of public moneys.

Everyone loved Eagle Brown. He was a clean and honest man. He loved his city, county, State, and country and worked hard for the attainment of perfection in the handling of public funds. As he often said, it is difficult to legislate honesty but, at least, foolproof measures of control will guard against temptation.

The First National Bank, its officers and personnel, venerated and loved the Old Eagle—Vice President George Sisler and Jeannette were ever at his call, they knew him for what he was—the grand old boss. He was their friend in times of need. The employees, over the years, looked upon him as their anchor to a feeling of security. He was not a demonstrative man, but one who liked people, especially those who needed his advice. He was no exhibitionist and never sought public nor political aggrandizement. He was a gentleman of the old school of thought—do your job well and you will feel rested in doing it.

It was Mr. Brown who kept the bank open certain nights to receive the deposits or cash the checks of working people, who were unable to leave their duties elsewhere to transact their business. No problem escaped him—he always had a solution. He believed that a satisfied depositor is one who is accommodated. Depositors traveled far from the boundaries of the metropolitan area to continue to do business with the First National Bank—it gave good service. Good service instills confidence. Real confidence insures good business and a secure bank. No one withdrew an account to change to another bank near home.

Among his many friends in all walks of life, were those whom he had approved as men of character. To these he extended the advantages of his bank's facilities. He was a veritable genius in determining to whom loans should be given. Hundreds of enterprising businesses would never have survived the financial pressures of their formative years had it not been for the acute and discerning qualities of Eagle Brown. The most affluent businesses owe their financial success to him. He believed in the growth and expansion of business in Chicago and approved many loans that contributed to the economic stability of a growing city.

Mr. Eagle Brown believed in the principles of the American Legion. He realized the high purpose of the organization to keep America strong; to aid and serve the veteran who was unable to help himself; to protect the widows and the orphans. He spoke glowingly of the auxiliary, in its contributions of time, effort and money to the veterans in hospitals and on sick beds; their many sacrifices for the orphans and abandoned children of veterans at the Soldiers' and Sailors' Home at Normal, Ill. His constant interest in their cause was further reflected by his unqualified support of the First National Bank Post, the American Legion, Department of Illinois, in all of their endeavors. His employment of hundreds of veterans seemed to place those men, who served their country in time of war, in his special esteem.

He was elated over the election of Jack Gleason, vice president of the First National Bank, as national commander of the American Legion. He was proud of Jack's career in national affairs of the organization. It was a natural feeling, for Jack was the son of his deceased friend and fellow official at the bank for many years. He was especially proud of the accomplishments of Vice President "Bumps" Cross, presently retired after 50 years with the bank, whose activity in the Legion for over 40 years marked him as a powerful associate of Jim Ringley, the leader and last word in American Legion politics. The Legion, at every level, responded to his friendliness by depositing thousands of dollars of their funds and accounts in his bank. He held their highest confidence and admiration.

And so we have lost a genius of finance; a great American; a man who believed in hard work, integrity, intelligence, studied knowledge and an uncompromising courage to stubbornly resist exploitation of an honest principle.

He was a simple man both in dress and manner. He said what he meant and did not seek to say things to please the ears of a listener. He was forthright and gruff when he drove home a point. He was frank and did not equivocate on a subject. Above all he was never guilty of crooked thinking. The high regard and respect that others held for him was not unearned. His sentimental depth of feeling was a secret—that he kept well—no doubt it was a flame unquenched and undiminished since the Hull House days when we little urchins of the old neighborhood sat upon the floor and listened to this teachings and guidance. I really was proud of him always, but especially the last time he came before the State legislative commission, appointed to report upon the CTA problems of financing and subsidy proposals, of the 1957 session of the Illinois General Assembly. He was not too well but nevertheless he came to the hearing. The wisdom of his words upon the subject, spoken in a low measured tone, carried the weight of a sage.

He was a straight thinker who instilled in others a will to follow through. His thorough knowledge of the subject matter under consideration was the product of a careful study and years of hard work tempered by experience. He was no dreamer but visualized the application of the principles of practical and sound thinking to gain the solution of the problem presented. He was given every courtesy—for he had long ago proven to us that he spoke an honest tongue with an honest heart.

The Nation, the State of Illinois, and the metropolitan area of Chicago have lost one of their most distinguished and patriotic citizens in the death of this brilliant genius of the world of finance, Edward Eagle Brown, on the 24th day of August 1959.

May God rest his soul.

We of the Illinois delegation in Congress extend our heartfelt sympathy to his sister, Mrs. John W. Brown; his brother, Walter E. Brown, naval captain retired; his neices and nephews, Wilburt, Walter E., Lee B., Mary W. and Francis E. Haggerty; Eloise B. Thornburg; Edward O., Robert L., and Dorcas P. Brown; Helen W. B. Levine and Sarah W. B. Zorn.

A MINUTE OF SILENT PRAYER TO GREET KHRUSHCHEV

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ZABLOCKI] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, last Friday, August 27, a movement was launched in Washington to unite Americans of all faiths, and in every walk of life, in a dramatic demonstration of our Nation's unity and devotion to God when Khrushchev arrives in the United States on September 15.

A unique organization made up of Americans of all major religious faiths—Protestant, Catholic, Jewish, and Eastern Orthodox—is urging our citizenry to observe a nationwide "minute of silence"—devoted to prayer and meditation about our spiritual heritage—at 11 a.m. on the day of Khrushchev's arrival.

The organization sponsoring this movement is the Foundation for Religious Action in the Social and Civil Order—FRASCO. Its chairman and executive director is Dr. Charles Wesley Lowry, a well-known theologian and Episcopal clergyman. Other prominent national leaders in religion and education, leading the movement, include the Reverend Theodore M. Hesburgh, president of Notre Dame University; Rabbi David Panitz, minister of Washington's Adas Israel Congregation; and Rev. Demetrios G. Kalaris, pastor of Sts. Constantine and Helen Greek Orthodox Church, Washington, D.C.

The minute of silence will be a dramatic demonstration of solidarity of the American people and our Government during these grave times. It will be an open reaffirmation of our Nation's faith in God and of our belief in the dignity of each human being, arising out of our origin at the hands of our Creator.

I understand that FRASCO is planning to promote the observance in various ways. Church leaders of all denominations are being urged to sponsor the minute of silence with special services in their churches and synagogues.

Workers, businessmen, and farmers are being asked to stop work during the minute where this will not entail a great inconvenience. Schoolchildren will be asked to stand beside their desks in silence, and housewives can pause in their daily routine.

Under present plans, the minute of silence will also include the halt of automobile, bus, and truck traffic on every road and street in America. Travelers in trains and airplanes can simply bow their heads in meditation.

Dr. Lowry expressed the hope that church bells and air raid sirens will sound out at 11 a.m. on Tuesday, September 15, and again at 11:01, to mark the beginning and the end of the minute.

Requests are going out to Governors asking them to issue proclamations for an official minute of silence in every State, Commonwealth, and territory. Congressional leaders and Government officials are also being asked to join in this religious and patriotic observance.

According to Dr. Lowry, the individual may pray or meditate during the minute, as his own conscious dictates to him. "This is a measure to unite all Americans," he says, "in the way we are united in every Thanksgiving Day, when we stop our work and express our gratitude to the Almighty."

FRASCO has prepared a short meditation entitled "A Creed for Americans," which can be used as the basis for individual meditation. The creed is made up entirely of quotations from America's state papers and other sources. It begins with a quote—"In the name of God, amen"—from the Mayflower Compact and ends with a quote from the pledge of allegiance to the flag—"One nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all"—which was amended and approved by Congress in 1954, as well as with our national motto—"In God We Trust"—approved in 1955.

The full text of the creed reads as follows:

A CREED FOR AMERICANS

In the name of God, amen. (Mayflower Compact, Plymouth Rock, Mass., 1620.)

"Proclaim liberty throughout all the land unto all the inhabitants thereof." (Leviticus 25: 10: Inscription on Liberty Bell at Independence Hall, Philadelphia, Pa., 1752.)

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, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. * * *

That to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed, that whenever any form of government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the right of the people to alter or to abolish it, and to institute new government, laying its foundation on such principles, and organizing its powers in such form, as to them shall seem most likely to affect their safety and happiness. (Declaration of Independence, Philadelphia, Pa., 1776.)

No people can be bound to acknowledge and adore the invisible hand which conducts the affairs of men more than the people of the United States. Every step by which they have advanced to the character of an independent Nation seems to have been distinguished by some token of providential agency. (Washington, First Inaugural Address, New York, N.Y., 1789.)

Our reliance is in the love of liberty which God has planted in our bosoms. Our defense is in the preservation of the spirit

which prizes liberty as the heritage of all men, in all lands, everywhere. (Lincoln, speech at Edwardsville, Ill., 1858.)

We cannot escape history. * * * No personal significance, or insignificance, can spare one or another of us. The fiery trial through which we pass, will light us down, in honor or dishonor, to the latest generation. (Lincoln, message to Congress, Washington, D.C., 1862.)

We here highly resolve that these dead shall not have died in vain—that this Nation, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom—and that government of the people, by the people, for the people, shall not perish from the earth. (Lincoln, address at Gettysburg, Pa., 1863.)

One Nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all. (Pledge of allegiance to the flag, 1892, 1954.)

"In God We Trust." (National motto, 1864, 1955.)

Dr. Lowry pointed out that the minute of silence will sweep across the Nation in eight waves, since it will be observed at exactly 11 a.m. in standard or daylight time beginning on the east coast and Puerto Rico, and continuing across the continent and on out to Hawaii and the Bering Strait.

In an effort to assist in the movement originated by the Foundation for Religious Action in the Social and Civil Order, I introduced a resolution in Congress today, House Resolution 367, "to affirm the solidarity of the American people and their faith in God at the time of the visit to the United States of the Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the U.S.S.R."

The text of my resolution reads as follows:

RESOLUTION TO REAFFIRM THE SOLIDARITY OF THE AMERICAN PEOPLE AND THEIR FAITH IN GOD AT THE TIME OF THE VISIT TO THE UNITED STATES OF THE CHAIRMAN OF THE COUNCIL OF MINISTERS OF THE U.S.S.R.

Whereas the Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the U.S.S.R. has been invited to the United States of America for an official visit and for discussions with American officials regarding the relations between these two nations, and is scheduled to arrive in the United States on September 15, 1959; and

Whereas the Government of the U.S.S.R. and the Communist Party are, on the basis of repeated declarations, committed to the denial of the existence of God, and the ultimate extirpation of belief in Him; and

Whereas the American heritage, as enshrined in our Declaration of Independence and other state papers, has been one of constant acknowledgment of and gratitude to Almighty God: Therefore be it

Resolved, That in order to reaffirm the solidarity of the American people and the United States Government during these discussions, and to demonstrate this Nation's adherence to our traditional motto, "In God We Trust," a minute of silence, for prayer or meditation, according to the conscience of the individual, be commended to the American people, for observance at 11 a.m., local time in each time zone, on September 15, 1959.

Mr. Speaker, I sincerely hope that this resolution will receive speedy and favorable consideration in this House, thereby lending the support of the membership of this body to this worthy movement.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. KOWALSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may extend their remarks in the RECORD on the bill H.R. 3722, the voluntary firemen's bill, on donable surplus property, which passed the House earlier today.

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

There was no objection.

ADDRESS BY GEN. ERNEST O. THOMPSON, CHAIRMAN, TEXAS RAILROAD COMMISSION, ON OIL CENTENNIAL CELEBRATION

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, Gen. Ernest O. Thompson is the best informed man in all the world on oil and its related products. No other person has had the wide experience dealing with the difficult problems concerning oil that General Thompson has experienced during the past 30 years. It is appropriate that General Thompson was called upon to make one of the principal addresses on August 27, 1959, at Titusville, Pa., at the Oil Centennial Celebration commemorating Drake's discovery of oil. His address was as follows:

ADDRESS BY GEN. ERNEST O. THOMPSON, CHAIRMAN, TEXAS RAILROAD COMMISSION, OIL CENTENNIAL CELEBRATION COMMEMORATING DRAKE'S DISCOVERY OF OIL, TITUSVILLE, PA., AUGUST 27, 1959

Today we celebrate the discovery of a new source of energy that has greatly shaped the course of mankind in bringing more light and satisfaction under control.

Here in Titusville, Colonel Drake was the persistent searcher who, 100 years ago, hit oil in a well drilled on purpose to find oil. He found oil and by this success he set off a chain of events that has revolutionized our lives the world around.

Down in Corsicana, Tex., on May 5 of this year, it was my great privilege to send on its way, through the great pipeline system, a steel capsule which carried a microfilm of a message from 33 oil State Governors to you, Governor Lawrence, expressing their greetings and congratulations on this the centennial of the discovery of oil—nature's bounty to mankind.

Along with these men, may I as one who has devoted over a quarter of a century to the stewardship of oil and gas conservation join in these congratulations on this proud celebration put on by the people of Pennsylvania. Surely Pennsylvania can be proud of this day and the event it memorializes.

It is of the greatest concern that the United States is producing our oil six times faster than the rest of the world when production is compared to reserves.

Little did Colonel Drake know about the revolution that his discovery of oil would bring about. He of course was looking for a source of kerosene, or coal oil as it was then called, for the lamps of the country and the world. Coal oil was to find its way throughout the world.

Pennsylvania crude was to become the lubricant standard of the world. The gasoline ran down the creeks as an unwanted byproduct of kerosene.

Then, in the 1890's, the internal combustion engine was perfected. This brought on the automobile.

The discovery of Spindletop Field in 1901, in Texas, assured the supply of oil to aid Pennsylvania in fueling the engines to run the automobiles of the world.

Drake found the oil, Ford put in the assembly line to make cars fast and cheap, then Kettering invented the self-starter making it possible for women to drive automobiles thus doubling the number of cars in use. It remained for the industry, through conservation and exploration, to find the oil.

While we celebrate the discovery of oil, from the first oil well drilled for oil, we can very well also take note of the first dry hole started just 4 days after Drake's discovery. This dry hole was drilled on the J. L. Grandin farm and although put down in an oil spring the hole was dry. It is to the courage of thousands of dry hole drillers that we pay respect along with Colonel Drake for his successful effort.

I read in Petroleum Week that you people had placed a marker on the site of this first dry hole as a perpetual reminder of the heavy odds that oil operators face in drilling for oil. Only one wildcat out of nine finds any oil at all. I know of no other business that has the hazards faced by oil operators in their constant search for oil.

I have often heard it said that more money has been spent than has been recovered in oil to date.

There has been throughout the years constant recurrent talk about running out of oil. We are not running out of oil. There is at the present time in the United States the reserve daily producing ability of 3 million barrels of oil; that is, we can produce 3 million barrels more oil than we are now producing from the wells presently drilled at their most efficient rate. It should be remembered that under proper conservation rules, with the wells producing no faster than their most efficient rate, it is entirely possible to recover four times as much of the oil in place as was formerly recovered under the old open flow methods.

We are constantly going deeper to find more oil. It was in 1931, or 72 years after Drake's discovery, before an oil well went down to 10,000 feet. Now we have reached a 25,000-foot depth.

It is a remarkable achievement that in this 100th year of oil, and after the production of 62 billion barrels of oil, we find ourselves with a reserve of 37 billion barrels of oil and a gas reserve of 260 trillion cubic feet; both the largest in the history of a hundred years of oil.

With broader spacing of wells we have made it possible to keep up the reserves without drilling so many wells. Forty-seven thousand wells per year drilled today do the work of 58,000 wells in the years past. Broader spacing is a necessary improvement to prevent unnecessary waste and keep petroleum products cheap. Of course, closer drilling can be had later on if found necessary.

Drilling for ol is going on from Alaska in the north to Australia on the south, also in the Middle East in a big way, and in the Sahara Desert. In fact, it is hard to find a spot on the globe where oil is not sought. Success crowns these efforts in a surprising manner. We are blessed with a surplus of oil the world around and we are assured of ample supplies for the forseeable future.

Ample oil supplies have made it possible for the United States to win two World Wars and many brushfire wars in the last generation or two.

Sixty percent of the United States' oversea tonnage in World War II was petroleum products. Never was there any fuel shortage at the front. Sometimes an army would run ahead of its supplies but the supply of gasoline was within their army zone. They simply went forward faster than they had anticipated.

The good that oil has done for humanity is almost impossible to evaluate. The discovery of oil has meant more to man's progress than any invention since man learned how to make a wheel.

Sixty million automobiles in use give the greatest mobility to the United States of any nation on earth. The railways have dieselized their trains, the Navy moves by oil, and the airplanes are fueled by petroleum. Trucks and buses, tractors, and farm machinery move on oil.

One of the reasons of our great agricultural surpluses is that the farmers do not have to raise feed for horses and mules. Some experts say this contributes one-fourth to the available farm production in net gain for human consumption.

Manpower and animal power has been supplanted largely by petroleum motivated engines.

Some hundreds of products are now being extracted and made from petroleum to fill new needs of our people in all walks of life.

The broadening of the use of petroleum and natural gas has even taught our Federal and State Governments how to work together, each in its unquestioned field of jurisdiction. The soverign States have the exclusive control of conservation of oil and gas in its production within its borders, except on Federal lands and indeed even in that area the Federal Government stands in the position of the ordinary landowner where conservation, as it applies to waste prevention, is concerned. Then, too, the Federal Government is bound to look after the Indian lands since the Indians are wards of the Federal Government.

Most of the oil-producing States have passed wise conservation statutes to prevent physical waste in connection with the production and transportation and storage of oil and its products. Conservation, to my mind, means wise use of the reservoir energy which propels the oil through the rocks and raises it to the well bore and thence up to the surface of the earth. This is in contrast to the old gusher days practice of letting wells blow their heads off for a spell and dissipate the God-given energy to their air instead of wisely controlling the flow and fully utilizing this motivating energy. This means greater ultimate recovery of oil from each field. This is good stewardship of a God-given resource.

Perhaps no other industry in America is as fiercely competitive as is the oil industry in all its divisions.

The operators find the drilling contractors bidding at lower figures to drill wells on lands the operators have hotly competed for in the bidding for leases for oil and gas.

The producers compete for their share of the production in every field that produces oil or gas and this competition is great in view of America's ability to produce for more oil than is needed to fill all demands.

Foreign oil, although limited by quota, seeks to come in in ever-increasing quantities.

The refining capacity is far greater than present demand for products, yet the refineries freely run far more crude than is possible to sell. Filling stations dot almost every corner to serve the public. It really seems that the refiner and the marketer are truly, in fact, merely the outlet to sell the crude which is so plentiful. I do not say this is in any way wrong; I am simply stating a fact as I see it. This fact is deeply impressed upon me by the circumstances that cause Texas' 190,000 oil wells to be allowed to produce only 9 days a month because we can produce all we can sell in a month with only 9 days' operation.

More wells are brought in every day to supply more oil. In Texas, last year (1958), we brought in 12,268 new oil producers. We plugged 3,050, thus showing a net gain of 9,218 new producers for the year. Of course the same progress is being made all over the world. Thus does the surplus of oil-producing ability increase in spite of greater use.

It should always be kept in mind that this oil surplus, ready to be produced from the reservoirs already drilled and hooked up to pipelines to refineries of the land, is stored at the exclusive cost to the producers. I mean there is no cost of storage to the Government in connection with this storage. And it must always be emphasized that God's or nature's reservoir is the place to keep this oil until it is needed for our expanding peacetime economy or for national defense, come war.

The wise 27½-percent tax recognition in depletion helps to keep on building these reserves. There can be no finer or better example of the wisdom of this legislation passed in 1926 by the Congress.

IMPORTS

Department of the Interior (July 30, 1959) reported: "Imports of crude and unfinished oil, finished petroleum products, and residual fuel oil totaled 1,441,059 barrels daily throughout the United States and Puerto Rico during the first allocation period under mandatory controls, the Department of the Interior announced today. This figure does not include 93,776 barrels daily of Canadian crude oil imported during June and exempt under Presidential Proclamation 3290."

So here are more than 1.5 million barrels per day of crude and products that must be made room for every day before there is need for any domestic crude to be produced.

This new mandatory oil imports control seems to be working. It at least furnished an effective roadblock to what had been an every mounting flood of foreign crude and products.

HISTORY OF THE CONNALLY ACT

In all my experience and study of administrative law and its practical application, there has come to my attention no such helpful and constructive cooperation between State and Federal agencies as has been furnished by the provisions and the administration of the Connally Act.

The Connally Act covers only movements of the oil in interstate commerce where the oil is not produced in accord with the statutes, rules, and regulations of the oil-producing origin State.

The act applies only to the strictly Federal field of constitutional authority and leaves entirely to the States the complete control of their oil and gas conservation laws, rules, and regulations.

Such was the aim and intent of the Congress when the act was passed in 1935 on February 22.

Some background may be of interest. The Texas legislature passed the market demand statute and the Texas Railroad Commission in east Texas set up a tender system by which each well was given its daily allowable credit and movements of oil by pipeline, truck, and tankcar by rail were permitted only when the oil shipment had been cleared as legally produced and a tender issued to accompany the oil, attached to the bill of lading or shipping ticket on the oil concerned. We in Texas even checked the throughput rate would yield out of the specific number of barrels of crude oil tender covered.

This action proceeded very well until we were met by the opposition of the railroad companies and shipment of oil by tankcars. It was pointed out by the railroad attorneys that the Railroad Commission of Texas was acting beyond its scope of authority in placing a burden on interstate commerce by requiring these tenders, and the railroads contended that if they did not obey our orders they would be subject to action by the Railroad Commission of Texas; and, at the same time, if they refused to take the oil that was tendered to them by interstate shippers they themselves—the railroads—would be subject to a penalty of $1,000 a day at the hands of the Interstate Commerce Commission for not taking the shipments. They were afraid of that course—a course which would subject them to possible risk—and, of course, the railroads naturally were not anxious to lose some 700 cars of freight movement a day when they were hard pressed for revenue. And I do not suppose that it took a very strong urge for the railroad lawyers to raise the constitutional ground and thereby be compelled to take this business. Anyway, a part of the problem was to stop the movement of this excess produced oil from interstate commerce.

I suggested to the railroad lawyers and to the other members of our Commission that we send a telegram to the President asking him to issue an executive order which would relieve the railroads of this penalty pending the passage of an act. Here follows the telegram which I sent to the President on July 8, 1933:

"In order that full cooperative effect can be given to oil-control measures, may we suggest that our enforcement of oil proration orders could be made more effective if you could at this time prohibit the shipment of illegally produced oil in interstate and foreign commerce. We have called a hearing for July 31 at Austin to ascertain the amount of oil that will be permitted to be stored in Texas and will issue orders prohibiting storage in excess of that amount. Prevention of shipment of illegal oil and elimination of excess storage of crude will go far toward a solution of the oil problem. Your order at this time prohibiting interstate and foreign shipment of oil illegally produced or withdrawn from storage will greatly assist in bringing all elements of the industry in accord. The situation in Texas is steadily improving. The Railroad Commission of Texas is now getting the unqualified support of the greater part of the industry.

"ERNEST O. THOMPSON,
"Member, Railroad Commission of Texas."

On July 11, 1933, the President issued the requested executive order prohibiting the transportation in interstate and foreign commerce of petroleum and products thereof unlawfully produced or withdrawn from storage. The order follows:

"By virtue of the authority vested in me by the act of Congress entitled 'An act to encourage national industrial recovery, to foster fair competition, and to provide for the construction of certain useful public works, and for other purposes,' approved June 16, 1933 (Public, No. 67, 73d Cong.), the transportation in interstate and foreign commerce of petroleum and the products thereof produced or withdrawn from storage in excess of the amount permitted to be produced or withdrawn from storage by any State law or valid regulation or order prescribed thereunder, by any board, commission, officer, or other duly authorized agency of a State, is hereby prohibited.

"FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT."

After such action was taken by the President, all three members of our Commission sent the President the following telegram:

"THE PRESIDENT,
"Washington, D.C.:

"The Railroad Commission notes with much gratification your order of today prohibiting interstate transportation of oil produced or withdrawn from storage in excess of allowable amounts. This will, to a large extent, solve a vexatious problem in the oil industry and will help this Commission in maintaining orderly production and fairness to operators so that all may benefit. The order means that the State and national authorities are cooperating for the good of the whole, and we congratulate you on the promptness and sympathetic interest you have given. With such forces at work and with harmony prevailing, the oil problem will be satisfactorily adjusted for the common welfare.

"TEXAS RAILROAD COMMISSION,
"LON A. SMITH,
"Chairman.
"C. V. TERRELL,
"ERNEST O. THOMPSON,
"Commissioners."

This cleared the atmosphere until the Supreme Court knocked out the Industrial Recovery Act, after which time Senator Connally promptly, on February 22, 1935, passed through the Congress the Connally Act which prohibits the shipment in commerce of petroleum and its products produced in violation of State law.

The Federal Petroleum Board has an annual appropriation of $209,000 which gives employment to a total of 25 persons in 4 offices located at Lafayette, La., and Kilgore, Midland, and Victoria, Tex.

Fines have been collected in the sum of $1,092,000 in 22 years—1936 to 1958.

All said and done, only praise and commendation can be given, and must be given, to this fine example of State and Federal cooperation, each division—State and Federal—operating strictly within its own sphere of unquestioned jurisdiction, thus showing that the sovereign States and the Federal Government can operate together, each on its own ground.

THE INTERSTATE OIL AND GAS COMPACT

This is a treaty between the sovereign signatory oil and gas producing States. Provision for such compact is found in article I of the U.S. Constitution. Thirty States are now members of the compact, and two prospective oil States are observers hoping to become members when oil or gas is discovered.

Canada's Alberta and Saskatchewan provinces are observers as is the Republic of Venezuela.

The compact was formed by five States and approved by the Congress in 1935.

It was a determined expression of the States' desires to block threatened Federal encroachment upon the exclusive right of each State to control its own conservation of oil and gas through the effective prevention of physical waste.

Each State has its own laws. The compact permits them to meet and coordinate their police powers to prevent waste. The text of the compact follows:

"AN INTERSTATE COMPACT TO CONSERVE OIL AND GAS

"ARTICLE I

"This agreement may become effective within any compacting State at any time as prescribed by that State, and shall become effective within those States ratifying it whenever any three of the States of Texas, Oklahoma, California, Kansas, and New Mexico have ratified and Congress has given its consent. Any oil-producing State may become a party hereto as hereinafter provided.

"ARTICLE II

"The purpose of this compact is to conserve oil and gas by the prevention of physical waste thereof from any cause.

"ARTICLE III

"Each State bound hereby agrees that within a reasonable time it will enact laws, or if laws have been enacted, then it agrees to continue the same in force, to accomplish within reasonable limits the prevention of:

"(a) The operation of any oil well with an inefficient gas-oil ratio.

"(b) The drowning with water of any stratum capable of producing oil or gas, or both oil and gas in paying quantities.

"(c) The avoidable escape into the open air or the wasteful burning of gas from a natural gas well.

"(d) The creation of unnecessary fire hazards.

"(e) The drilling, equipping, locating, spacing, or operating of a well or wells so as to bring about physical waste of oil or gas or loss in the ultimate recovery thereof.

"(f) The inefficient, excessive, or improper use of the reservoir energy in producing any well.

"The enumeration of the foregoing subjects shall not limit the scope of the authority of any State.

"ARTICLE IV

"Each State bound hereby agrees that it will, within a reasonable time, enact statutes, or if such statutes have been enacted, then it will continue the same in force, providing in effect that oil produced in violation of its valid and/or gas conservation statutes or any valid rule, order or regulation promulgated thereunder, shall be denied access to commerce; and providing for stringent penalties for the waste of either oil or gas.

"ARTICLE V

"It is not the purpose of this compact to authorize the States joining herein to limit the production of oil or gas for the purpose of stabilizing or fixing the price thereof, or create or perpetuate monopoly, or to promote regimentation, but is limited to the purpose of conserving oil and gas and preventing the avoidable waste thereof within reasonable limitations.

"ARTICLE VI

"Each State joining herein shall appoint one representative to a commission hereby constituted and designated as the Interstate Oil Compact Commission, the duty of which said Commission shall be to make inquiry and ascertain from time to time such methods, practices, circumstances and conditions as may be disclosed for bringing about conservation and the prevention of physical waste of oil and gas, and at such intervals as said Commission deems beneficial it shall report its finding and recommendations to the several States for adoption or rejection.

"The Commission shall have power to recommend the coordination of the exercise of the police powers of the several States within their several jurisdictions to promote the maximum ultimate recovery from the petroleum reserves of said States, and to recommend measures for the maximum ultimate recovery of oil and gas. Said Commission shall organize and adopt suitable rules and regulations for the conduct of its business.

"No action shall be taken by the Commission except: (1) By the affirmative votes of the majority of the whole number of the compacting States, represented at any meeting, and (2) by a concurring vote of a majority in interest of the compacting States at said meeting, such interest to be determined as follows: Such vote of each State shall be in the decimal proportion fixed by the ratio of its daily average production during the preceding calendar half-year to the daily average production of the compacting States during said period.

"ARTICLE VII

"No State by joining herein shall become financially obligated to any other State, nor shall the breach of the terms hereof by any State subject such State to financial responsibility to the other States joining herein.

"ARTICLE VIII

"This compact shall expire September 1, 1937.[1] But any State joining herein may, upon 60 days notice, withdraw herefrom.

"The representatives of the signatory States have signed this agreement in a single original which shall be deposited in the archives of the Department of State of the United States, and a duly certified copy shall be forwarded to the Governor of each of the signatory States.

"This compact shall become effective when ratified and approved as provided in article I. Any oil-producing State may become a party hereto by affixing its signature to a counterpart to be similarly deposited, certified and ratified.

"Done in the city of Dallas, Tex., this 16th day of February 1935."

The compact has just been renewed by the Congress for another 4 years. The U.S. Attorney General's report on the compact to the Congress was that it was operating in accordance with its charter which is the treaty or compact itself.

In all these years since 1935 it has not been necessary to change a word of the original treaty or compact.

The Commission meets twice a year and its committees freely and publicly exchange information on better ways to conserve oil and gas.

The compact—like the Connally Act—backing up State law, strengthens our military and economic strength to help maintain the freedom of action in this changing world.

THE NEXT 100 YEARS

Oil will continue to furnish over 60 percent of our energy and will be ample for the foreseeable future—certainly through 1980 when it is predicted that atomic energy will come into competition for large units of energy.

With the driving force of the oil industry, its aggressive research program, the constant increase in percentage of recovery per reservoir and even more efficient use of its products, I see nothing but a bright future for oil. Our present oversupply, worldwide, will in time be worked off by the increasing use of petroleum fuels all over the world.

The determined spirit of Colonel Drake and the early pioneers of oil will be the constant inspiration to the oil men of today and tomorrow. We accept the challenge to be good stewards of this natural resource placed here by our Creator for man's use in an ever better economy.

I thank you.

[1] The States have successively extended the compact with congressional sanction.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. BAUMHART, at the request of Mr. HALLECK, until September 20, 1959, on account of official business with Space and Astronautics Committee.

Mr. ANFUSO, at the request of Mr. DENT, for an indefinite period, on account of official business.

Mr. RODINO, at the request of Mr. GALLAGHER, for Monday, August 31, 1959, on account of illness in family.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE, at the request of Mr. ARENDS, on account of official business to attend Interparliamentary Union in Warsaw, Poland.

Mr. DAGUE, at the request of Mr. FENTON, on account of death in immediate 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. PORTER, for 30 minutes, on tomorrow.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri, for 15 minutes, on today.

Mr. LIBONATI (at the request of Mr. KOWALSKI), for 20 minutes, today, to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ZABLOCKI (at the request of Mr. KOWALSKI) for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. HECHLER (at the request of Mr. KOWALSKI), for 10 minutes, on tomorrow.

Mr. PUCINSKI (at the request of Mr. KOWALSKI), for 45 minutes, on tomorrow.

Mr. EVINS (at the request of Mr. KOWALSKI), for 40 minutes, on Wednesday, to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MEYER (at the request of Mr. KOWALSKI), for 10 minutes, on Wednesday.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. WHARTON.

Mr. CANNON and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. SAYLOR in two instances.

Mr. ALGER.

(At the request of Mr. KOWALSKI, and to include extraneous matter, the following:)

Mr. DINGELL in three instances.

Mr. KITCHIN in two instances.

Mr. MCDOWELL.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina in two instances.

Mr. COOLEY.

Mr. EVINS in two instances.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 981. An act for the relief of T. W. Holt & Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1015. An act for the relief of Continental Hosiery Mills, Inc., of Henderson, N.C., successor to Continental Hosiery Co., of Henderson, N.C.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 968. An act to provide for the construction by the Secretary of the Interior of the Bully Creek Dam and other facilities, Vale Federal reclamation project, Oregon;

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

H.R. 2886. An act to suspend for 3 years the import duties on certain classifications of spun silk yarn;

H.R. 6000. An act to amend title 28 of the United States Code to increase the limit for administrative settlement of claims against the United States under the tort claims procedure to $3,000;

H.R. 6118. An act to amend section 6 of the act of September 11, 1959; and

H.J. Res. 510. Joint resolution amending a joint resolution making temporary appropriations for the fiscal year 1960, and for other purposes.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 2539. An act to extend and amend laws relating to the provision and improvement of housing and the renewal of urban communities, and for other purposes.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 968. An act to provide for the construction by the Secretary of the Interior of the Bully Creek Dam and other facilities, Vale Federal reclamation project, Oregon;

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

H.R. 2725. An act to amend chapter 3 of title 18, United States Code, so as to prohibit the use of aircraft or motor vehicles to hunt certain wild horses or burros on land belonging to the United States, and for other purposes;

H.R. 2773. An act to amend section 1701 of title 38, United States Code, to provide the same educational benefits for children of Spanish-American War veterans who died of a service-connected disability as are provided for children of veterans of World War I, World War II, and the Korean conflict;

H.R. 2886. An act to suspend for 3 years the import duties on certain classifications of spun silk yarn;

H.R. 6000. An act to amend title 28 of the United States Code to increase the limit for administrative settlement of claims against the United States under the tort claims procedure to $2,500;

H.R. 6118. An act to amend section 4 and section 6 of the act of September 11, 1957;

H.R. 7373. An act to amend section 801 of title 38, United States Code, to provide assistance in acquiring specially adapted housing to an additional group of severely disabled veterans;

H.R. 7645. An act to provide for the construction, alteration, and acquisition of public buildings of the Federal Government, and for other purposes;

H.R. 8159. An act to amend the national banking laws to clarify or eliminate ambiguities, to repeal certain laws which have become obsolete, and for other purposes;

H.R. 8160. An act to amend the lending and borrowing limitations applicable to national banks, to authorize the appointment of an additional Deputy Comptroller of the Currency, and for other purposes;

H.R. 8284. An act to amend the National Science Foundation Act of 1950, as amended, and for other purposes; and

H.J. Res. 354. Joint resolution for the relief of certain aliens.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. KOWALSKI. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 48 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until Tuesday, September 1, 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:

1342. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting the Annual Report of the U.S. Soldiers' Home for the fiscal year 1958, and the Report of the Annual Inspection of the Home, 1958, by the Inspector General of the Army, pursuant to the act approved March 3, 1883, as amended (24 U.S.C. 59 and 60); to the Committee on Armed Services.

1343. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting a notice of a proposed disposition of approximately 4,413 short tons of cadmium-magnesium scrap and 451 short tons of magnesium scrap now held in the national stockpile, pursuant to the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act, 53 Stat. 811, as amended, 50 U.S.C. 98b(e); to the Committee on Armed Services.

1344. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "a bill to amend section 203(j) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended (40 U.S.C. 484(j)), to provide that the Department of Defense may allocate surplus property under its control for transfer under that act only to educational institutions conducting approved military training programs"; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1345. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting a report on tort claims paid by the General Services Administration during fiscal year 1959, pursuant to title 28, section 2673, of the United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1346. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "a bill to repeal certain retirement promotion authority of the Coast and Geodetic Survey"; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

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. THOMPSON of New Jersey: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 1075. Report on the disposition of certain papers of sundry executive departments. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 1076. Report on the disposition of certain papers of sundry executive departments. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. MORGAN: Committee on Foreign Affairs. S. 1973. An act to extend the validity of the passport to 3 years; without amendment (Rept. No. 1077). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MILLS: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 5054. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 with respect to the marking of imported articles and containers; with amendment (Rept. No. 1078). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MILLS: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 5920. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that an individual who had maximum earnings for a year before 1951 shall be credited with four quarters of coverage for such year (with certain exceptions) in the same manner as is provided for years after 1950; with amendment (Rept. No. 1079). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MILLS: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 6132. A bill relating to the rate of tax on the issuance of shares or certificates of stock by regulated investment companies; without amendment (Rept. No. 1080). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MILLS: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 6785. A bill to amend section 4071 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954

so as to fix a tax of 1 cent per pound of certain laminated tires produced from used tires; with amendment (Rept. No. 1081). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MILLS: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 7947. A bill relating to the income tax treatment of nonrefundable capital contributions to Federal National Mortgage Association; with amendment (Rept. No. 1082). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. COOLEY: Committee on Agriculture. H.R. 8578. A bill to amend the Soil Bank Act so as to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to permit the harvesting of hay on conservation reserve acreage under certain conditions; with amendment (Rept. No. 1083). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. Senate Joint Resolution 25. Joint resolution to change the name of Roosevelt Dam, Reservoir, and Power Plant in Arizona to Theodore Roosevelt Dam, Lake, and Power Plant; without amendment (Rept. No. 1084). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ZABLOCKI: Committee on Foreign Affairs. House Concurrent Resolution 393. Concurrent resolution to promote peace through the reduction of armaments; without amendment (Rept. No. 1085). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana: Committee on Science and Astronautics. Report on first Soviet moon rocket (Rept. No. 1086). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana: Committee on Science and Astronautics. Report on space propulsion. (Rept. No. 1087). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ROBERTS: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. S. 2220. An act to strengthen the Commissioned Corps of the Public Health Service through revision and extension of some of the provisions relating to retirement, appointment of personnel, and other related personnel matters, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1091). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE 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. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1149. An act for the relief of Capt. Thomas J. McArdle; without amendment (Rept. No. 1088). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1891. An act for the relief of Donald G. Coplan; without amendment (Rept. No. 1089). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MORGAN: Committee on Foreign Affairs. S. 252. An act to authorize Col. Philip M. Whitney, U.S. Army, retired, to accept and wear the decoration tendered him by the Government of the Republic of France; without amendment (Rept. No. 1090). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. TOLL: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1540. A bill for the relief of Edward F. Stefan; with amendment (Rept. No. 1092). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. TOLL: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 4546. A bill for the relief of Margaret P. Copin; without amendment (Rept. No. 1093). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 4965. A bill for the relief of Pioneer Air Lines, Inc.; with amendment (Rept. No. 1094). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 6712. A bill for the relief of Sam J. Buzzanca; with amendment (Rept. No. 1095). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 6885. A bill for the relief of Neal Anderson; with amendment (Rept. No. 1096). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 7260. A bill for the relief of John Napoli; with amendments (Rept. No. 1097). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. TOLL: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 7932. A bill for the relief of William E. Dulin; with amendment (Rept. No. 1098). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 7935. A bill for the relief of Father Kenneth M. Rizer; without amendment (Rept. No. 1099). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 8110. A bill for the relief of Miss Elsie Robey; with amendment (Rept. No. 1100). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 8801. A bill for the relief of the Maco Warehouse Co.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1101). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. House Resolution 266. Resolution providing for sending the bill (H.R. 7081) with accompanying papers to the U.S. Court of Claims; without amendment (Rept. No. 1102). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDERSON of Montana:

H.R. 8946. A bill relating to emergency relief, and amending sections 120 and 125 of title 23, United States Code; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BALDWIN:

H.R. 8947. A bill relating to the operation and maintenance by the Secretary of the Interior of reclamation works on rivers and streams tributary to the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta in California; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CELLER:

H.R. 8948. A bill to include certain officers and employees of the General Services Administration within the provisions of the United States Code relating to assaults upon, and homicides of, certain officers and employees of the United States as constituting a crime; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHENOWETH:

H.R. 8949. A bill to provide for payment of a death gratuity in certain cases involving deaths of members of the uniformed services after June 27, 1950, and before January 1, 1957; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. FASCELL:

H.R. 8950. A bill to amend the act of July 27, 1956, with respect to the detention of mail for temporary periods in the public interest, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HAGEN:

H.R. 8951. A bill to permit the Department of Agriculture to cooperate with the meat inspection services of the various States; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HALEY:

H.R. 8952. A bill to authorize longer term leases of Indian lands on the Seminole reservations in Florida and the Agua Caliente (Palm Springs) Reservation, Calif.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 8953. A bill to repeal the cabaret tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HORAN:

H.R. 8954. A bill to permit the Department of Agriculture to cooperate with the meat inspection services of the various States; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H.R. 8955. A bill to amend the act of October 19, 1949, entitled "An act to assist States in collecting sales and use taxes on cigarettes"; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BOSCH:

H.R. 8956. A bill to amend the act of October 19, 1949, entitled "An act to assist States in collecting sales and use taxes on cigarettes"; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LOSER:

H.R. 8957. A bill to permit the flying of the flag of the United States for 24 hours of each day over the grave of Capt. William Driver in City Cemetery, Nashville, Tenn.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MACDONALD:

H.R. 8958. A bill to authorize the payment to local governments of sums in lieu of taxes and special assessments with respect to certain Federal real property, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. METCALF:

H.R. 8959. A bill relating to emergency relief, and amending sections 120 and 125 of Title 23, United States Code; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 8960. A bill to amend section 18 of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide free transportation on any railroad carrier subject to that act for individuals receiving pensions or annuities under that act, and for their dependents, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. McFALL:

H.R. 8961. A bill relating to the operation and maintenance by the Secretary of the Interior of reclamation works on rivers and streams tributary to the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta in California; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H.R. 8962. A bill to amend section 502 of the General Bridge Act of 1946, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. OLIVER:

H.R. 8963. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide for refund to States of certain taxes on distilled spirits and wine destroyed by fire, casualty, or act of God; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H.R. 8964. A bill to extend the period for commencing construction of buildings and improvements on certain land heretofore conveyed by the United States to the State of Texas; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. PRICE:

H.R. 8965. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that full benefits (when based upon the attainment of retirement age) will be payable to both men and women at age 60; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RAY:

H.R. 8966. A bill to amend the Employment Act of 1946 to emphasize the policy of promoting employment under stable prices; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 8967. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide credit

against income tax for an employer who employs older persons in his trade or business; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SAYLOR:

H.R. 8968. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to enter into cooperative agreements with States for research and management investigations on migratory and other marine species of game fish, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BARING:

H.R. 8969. A bill to provide a health benefits program for certain retired employees of the Government; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FASCELL:

H.R. 8970. A bill to provide a health benefits program for Government employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HALEY:

H.R. 8971. A bill to provide a health benefits program for certain retired employees of the Government; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. LOSER:

H.R. 8972. A bill to provide a health benefits program for certain retired employees of the Government; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MACDONALD:

H.R. 8973. A bill to provide a health benefits program for certain retired employees of the Government; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. McGOVERN:

H.R. 8974. A bill to provide a health benefits program for certain retired employees of the Government; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. PELLY:

H.R. 8975. A bill to provide a health benefits program for certain retired employees of the Government; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida:

H.R. 8976. A bill to provide a health benefits program for certain retired employees of the Government; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H.R. 8977. A bill to provide a health benefits program for certain retired employees of the Government; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BRAY:

H.R. 8978. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide for the establishment of country-by-country quotas for the importation of shrimps and shrimp products, to impose a duty on all unprocessed shrimp imported in excess of the applicable quota, and to impose a duty on processed shrimp and prohibit its importation in excess of the applicable quota; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GROSS:

H.R. 8979. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide for the establishment of country-by-country quotas for the importation of shrimps and shrimp products, to impose a duty on all unprocessed shrimp imported in excess of the applicable quota, and to impose a duty on processed shrimp and prohibit its importation in excess of the applicable quota; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By McMILLAN:

H.R. 8980. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide for the establishment of country-by-country quotas for the importation of shrimps and shrimp products, to impose a duty on all unprocessed shrimp imported in excess of the applicable quota, and to impose a duty on processed shrimp and prohibit its importation in excess of the applicable quota; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. OLIVER:

H.R. 8981. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide for the establishment of country-by-country quotas for the importation of shrimps and shrimp products, to impose a duty on all unprocessed shrimp imported in excess of the applicable quota, and to impose a duty on processed shrimp and prohibit its importation in excess of the applicable quota; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina:

H.R. 8982. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide for the establishment of country-by-country quotas for the importation of shrimps and shrimp products, to impose a duty on all unprocessed shrimp imported in excess of the applicable quota, and to impose a duty on processed shrimp and prohibit its importation in excess of the applicable quota; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DONOHUE:

H.R. 8983. A bill to require Panama Canal tolls to be prescribed in accordance with the tolls formula provided in section 412 of title 2 of the Canal Zone Code and pursuant to the provisions of the Administrative Procedure Act; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. RANDALL:

H.R. 8984. A bill to provide for the establishment of a U.S. Foreign Service Academy; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. McGINLEY:

H.R. 8985. A bill to provide for the inclusion of the Nebraska Mid-State unit in the Missouri River Basin project; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. LOSER:

H.J. Res. 512. Joint resolution to help make available to those children in our country who are handicapped by deafness the specially trained teachers of the deaf needed to develop their abilities and to help make available to individuals suffering speech and hearing impairments those specially trained speech pathologists and audiologists needed to help them overcome their handicaps; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MARTIN:

H.J. Res. 513. Joint Resolution designating the 17th day of December in each year as "Wright Brothers Day"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHENCK:

H.J. Res. 514. Joint resolution designating the 17th day of December in each year as "Wright Brothers Day"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ZABLOCKI:

H. Res. 367. Resolution to reaffirm the solidarity of the American people and their faith in God at the time of the visit to the United States of the Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the U.S.S.R.; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BUCKLEY:

H. Res. 368. Resolution to amend House Resolution 91 of the 86th Congress; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BOYLE:

H.R. 8986. A bill for the relief of Eleftherios John Theodoropoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CRAMER:

H.R. 8987. A bill for the relief of Sterie D. Todorov; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FALLON:

H.R. 8988. A bill for the relief of Warren S. Boggess; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HEMPHILL:

H.R. 8989. A bill for the relief of Ralph W. Anderson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of Illinois:

H.R. 8990. A bill for the relief of Bogdan Kusulja; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H.R. 8991. A bill to authorize the President to issue posthumously to the late Jane A. Delano a commission as general, Army of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BOYLE:

H.R. 8992. A bill for the relief of Monicilo Velickovic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXIII,

267. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the city clerk, Los Angeles, Calif., recommending that the State Department be requested to conduct negotiations with the Mexican Government to obtain a suitable site for a monument to Hidalgo in Mexico City; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Maj. Gen. W. P. Fisher, Director of Legislative Liaison, Department of the Air Force

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 31, 1959

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, in September 1959, a familiar Air Force figure will be missing from Capitol Hill, Maj. Gen. W. P. Fisher is being assigned to the Military Air Transport Service after completing his assignment as Director of Legislative Liaison, Department of the Air Force.

General Fisher has provided outstanding service to both Houses of Congress as Director of Legislative Liaison since March 1958. Members of Congress have great responsibilities pertaining to our national defense in these turbulent times, and General Fisher has been most helpful with his sincere and clear representation of the U.S. Air Force capabilities and requirements. His insight and experience has especially been of unusual assistance in military personnel matters, such as the officer promotion program, to name but one area out of hundreds.

My colleagues in the House join in wishing General Fisher much success in his assignment. We, in Congress, lose a capable and effective liaison officer, but the Military Air Transport Service gains a leader for its Eastern Transport Air Force.

Analysis of Public Works Bill Veto Message

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE CANNON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 31, 1959

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, an analysis of the veto message on the public works appropriation bill for 1960—H.R. 7509—shows clearly that the basis of the President's objection to the bill is the unbudgeted construction starts. No reference is made to unbudgeted general investigations and preconstruction planning items. Items in these categories do not represent substantial dollar commitments and the absence of any reference to them in the veto message warrants the conclusion that the President has no objection to them. Unbudgeted items added by the Congress in these two categories are:

Rivers and harbors and flood control:	
General investigations	89
Advance planning	32
Subtotal	121
Bureau of Reclamation:	
General investigations	1
Advance planning	0
Subtotal	1
Total	122

The veto message makes no reference to increases or decreases made by the Congress on budgeted items. It can therefore be assumed that there is no objection on the President's part to the individual project figures in H.R. 7509 for all projects which were budgeted.

The only reference which the veto message makes to power facilities concerns the Trinity River project in California. The statement concedes that funds for starting Federal construction of these facilities are necessary unless partnership development with Pacific Gas & Electric Co. is authorized. In the absence of any other reference to power facilities, it may be assumed that there is no objection to other adjustments made by the Congress in the power program.

The following two lists indicate which unbudgeted items would remain in the bill and which would be eliminated if the veto is sustained:

Unbudgeted items remaining in the bill if veto is sustained

GENERAL INVESTIGATION ITEMS

Arizona:	
Gila River below Painted Rock Dam	$20,000
Gila River, Phoenix metropolitan area	30,000
Arkansas: Benton Dam survey	5,000
California:	
Dry Creek resurvey	50,000
Napa River	5,000
Soquel Creek	3,000
Sweetwater River	40,000
Connecticut:	
Connecticut River at Essex	5,000
Popuonock River, Groton	5,000
Delaware:	
Indian River Bay via Peppers Creek to Dagsboro	9,000
Broad Creek River, Sussex County	5,000

Unbudgeted items remaining in the bill if veto is sustained—Continued

Florida:	
Pensacola Harbor	$7,500
Tampa Harbor (Ybor Channel)	27,000
Georgia:	
Oostanaula River	25,000
Savannah turning basin	4,000
Tugaloo River, Georgia and South Carolina	26,000
Illinois:	
Illinois River	25,000
Little Calumet River	10,000
Indiana: Michigan City	8,000
Kansas:	
Cow Creek	20,000
Three Mile Creek, Leavenworth	5,000
White Clay Creek, Atchison	8,000
Kentucky:	
Bunches Creek	15,000
Kentucky River	12,000
Licking River Basin	20,000
Louisiana:	
Bayou Bartholomew and tributaries	25,000
Bayou Bonfouca	10,000
Calcasieu River salt barrier	9,000
Maine:	
Kennebunk River	9,000
Monhegan River	2,500
Portsmouth Harbor, Piscatague River, Maine and N.H	9,000
Searsport Harbor	9,000
Stave Island Harbor	8,000
Maryland: Wicomico River	15,000
Massachusetts: Town River survey	9,000
Michigan:	
Detroit metropolitan area	5,000
Holland Harbor: Lake Michigan-Lake Macatawa Channel	13,500
Kawkawlin River	8,000
Ontonagan Harbor	8,900
Red Run-Clinton River	10,000
Traverse City Harbor or Refuge	5,000
Minnesota: Levee Wall at Winona	9,000
Mississippi: Okatibbe Creek	25,000
Missouri: Clarksville	6,000
Nevada: Las Vegas Wash	9,000
Nebraska:	
Missouri River slackwater navigation	10,000
Republican River	15,000
Missouri River bank, stabilization and navigation, Sioux City to Yankton	20,000
New Jersey:	
Newark Bay—Passaic River Channel	15,000
Sandy Hook Inlet (Shrewsberry River, N.J.)	25,000
New York:	
Buttermilk Channel	10,000
Cazenovia Creek	10,000
Hudson River siltation	114,000
Little Neck Bay	9,000
New York State Barge Canal	10,000
New York Harbor deepwater anchorage	10,000
Tonowanda Creek	32,000
North Carolina:	
Rogue Inlet and Swensboro Harbor	15,000
Cape Fear River	10,000
Rollinson Channel-Hatteras Harbor	6,500
Shallote River	7,500
Wrights Creek	10,000
North Dakota:	
Missouri River bank stabilization, Garrison to Oahe	10,000
Souris River	10,000
Ohio:	
Chagrin River	10,000
Crab Creek at and in the vicinity of Youngstown	30,000
Mad River drainage basin	22,000
Sandusky River basin	60,000
White Oak Creek	10,000
Oklahoma: Oklahoma City floodway extension	6,000

Unbudgeted items remaining in the bill if veto is sustained—Continued

Oregon:	
Rogue River	$11,000
Umpqua River, north to Reedsport	11,000
Walla Walla River, Milton Freewater	13,500
Willow Creek	18,400
South Carolina: Santee River and tributaries	30,000
Texas:	
Arkansas-Red River pollution survey	75,000
Big and Little Vince Bayou	21,000
El Paso	20,000
Guadalupe River	11,000
Gulf Intercoastal Waterway Channel to Port Isabel	7,500
Lake Kemp	35,000
Neches River	10,000
Salt Fork and Prairie Dog Town Fork of the Red River	90,000
San Jacinto survey	15,000
West Fork, Double Bayou	2,000
Utah: Great Salt Lake (Saltair)	25,000
Washington:	
Ben Franklin Dam	20,000
Swinomish Slough	20,100
West Virginia:	
Deckers Creek	15,000
Twelve Pole Creek	10,000

ADVANCE PLANNING ITEMS

Alabama: Holt lock and dam	150,000
Arkansas:	
DeGray Reservoir	150,000
Gillham Reservoir	80,000
Illinois: Subdistrict No. 1 of Drainage Union No. 1 and Bay Island Drainage and Levee District No. 1	50,000
Indiana:	
Clinton (deferred for restudy)	5,000
Sugar Creek levee	15,000
Terre Haute-Conover levee (deferred for restudy)	2,000
West Terre Haute	30,000
Iowa:	
Green Bay Levee and Drainage District No. 2	75,000
Saylorville Reservoir	200,000
Kansas:	
Frankfort	50,000
Marion Reservoir	25,000
Kentucky: No. 2 Green Reservoir	50,000
Michigan: Hammond Bay Harbor	20,000
Missouri: Marion County drainage district	73,000
New York: Herkimer	48,000
Ohio: Belleville locks and dam, Ohio and West Virginia	125,000
Oklahoma:	
Lukfata Reservoir	50,000
Pine Creek Reservoir	80,000
Oregon:	
Willamette River basin channel improvement and major drainage: Coyote and Spencer Creek	50,000
Yaquina Bay and Harbor	100,000
Pennsylvania: Turtle Creek	25,000
Texas: Matagorda ship channel: 36-foot channel	150,000
Virgin Islands: Christiansted Harbor (inactive)	3,000
Washington:	
Columbia River between Vancouver, Wash., and The Dalles, Oreg.: (b) Bingen Barge Channel	10,000
Little Goose lock and dam	450,000
Wisconsin:	
Bad River:	
(a) Mellen Channel	25,000
(b) Odanah, moving village and raising school	25,000
Eau Galle River	75,000
Saxon Harbor	31,000

FLOOD CONTROL, MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES

Construction and planning:	
Greenville Harbor	60,000
Lower White River	107,000

Unbudgeted construction items to be eliminated if veto is sustained

CORPS OF ENGINEERS

Project	Benefit-cost ratio	Total estimated Federal cost	Appropriation to date	Amount in H.R. 7509
Arkansas: Beaver Reservoir [2]	1.1	$56,100,000	$1,291,000	$1,500,000
Alaska: Dillingham Harbor	1.3	412,000	6,000	406,000
California:				
Mill Creek levees	2.1	1,740,000	107,000	500,000
New Hogan Reservoir	1.7	19,300,000	740,000	1,500,000
Redwood City Harbor: 30-foot depth San Bruno Shoal entrance and Redwood Creek channels	1.6	1,380,000	2,000	1,378,000
San Jacinto River and Bautista Creek	2.1	5,770,000	215,000	225,000
Connecticut:				
Hall Meadow Brook Reservoir	2.4	2,210,000	20,000	250,000
Mad River Reservoir	1.2	5,970,000	18,000	275,000
Florida:				
Apalachicola Bay:				
(a) Channel at East Point: Reimburse	N.A.	[1] 39,100		39,100
(b) St. George Island: Reimbursement	N.A.	[1] 43,000		43,000
Intracoastal Waterway, Caloosahatchee River to Anclote River	N.A.	6,860,000	370,000	600,000
Hawaii: Kahului Harbor	2.9	963,000	14,000	140,000
Illinois:				
Drury drainage district	3.7	1,520,000	84,000	540,000
Henderson River: Diversion unit	2.8	1,750,000	150,000	550,000
Hunt drainage district and Lima Lake drinage district	1.8	5,420,000	174,000	1,000,000
Iowa: Red Rock Reservoir	1.5	71,400,000	1,717,000	1,113,000
Kansas:				
Council Grove Reservoir	1.8	12,700,000	303,000	300,000
Wilson Reservoir	1.2	18,100,000	259,000	500,000
Kentucky: No. 2 Barren Reservoir	2.3	23,500,000	214,000	1,000,000
Louisiana:				
Gulf Intracoastal Waterway: (a) Algiers Cutoff, Jefferson-Plaquemine drainage district	N.A.	[1] 1,420,000		1,420,000
Barataria Bay	3.5	2,400,000	85,000	1,000,000
Massachusetts:				
Boston Harbor: (b) 35-foot reserved channel	2.3	829,000	4,000	825,000
Westville Reservoir	1.1	7,450,000	328,000	1,800,000
Michigan: Grand Marais Harbor	N.E.	1,020,000	5,000	300,000
Mississippi: Pascagoula Harbor	1.8	1,248,000	6,000	1,242,000
Missouri: Des Moines and Mississippi Levee District No. 1	2.7	1,690,000	103,000	500,000
Nebraska: Gering and Mitchell Valleys	1.8	$1,400,000	$45,000	$350,000
New Mexico:				
Two Rivers Reservoir	1.2	6,900,000	390,000	75,000
Rio Grande Floodway, Cochiti to Rio Puerco	N.A.	4,400,000	50,000	800,000
New York:				
Buttermilk Channel [2]	N.A.	1,551,000		1,500,000
Hudson River, New York City to Albany 32-foot channel	1.9	36,300,000	65,000	500,000
New York-New Jersey pierhead line [2]	1.4	1,311,000		500,000
Ohio Street Bridge, Buffalo River	N.E.	4,520,000		2,000,000
North Carolina:				
Morehead City Harbor	1.9	1,382,000	12,000	600,000
Wilkesboro Reservoir	1.2	8,350,000	387,000	1,000,000
Ohio:				
Muskingum River Reservoir [2]	N.E.	615,000		500,000
West Branch Mahoning River Reservoir	1.3	6,940,000	261,000	525,000
Oregon: Malheur River, Vale unit	2.3	423,000	70,000	250,000
Pennsylvania:				
Allegheny River Reservoir [2]	1.3	113,000,000	2,733,000	1,400,000
Brookville	2.7	1,340,000	87,000	500,000
Shenango River Reservoir, Pennsylvania and Ohio	1.7	28,000,000	374,000	500,000
Texas:				
Colorado River channel	1.5	1,310,000	54,000	400,000
Gulf Intracoastal Waterway, channel to Port Mansfield	1.1	3,446,000	15,000	150,000
Port Aransas-Corpus Christi Waterway, channel to La Quinta	5.4	[1] 959,000	5,000	954,000
Proctor Reservoir	1.4	17,100,000	325,000	300,000
Virginia: Pound Reservoir	1.2	17,700,000	331,000	2,500,000
West Virginia:				
East Rainelle	2.0	840,000	58,000	500,000
Princeton	1.8	1,085,000	74,000	500,000
Summersville Reservoir	2.6	46,800,000	685,000	2,000,000
Flood control, Mississippi River and tributaries:				
West Tennessee tributaries	3.0	8,400,000	170,000	200,000
Wolf River and tributaries	1.3	2,025,000	43,000	300,000
Yazoo backwater	2.2	30,900,000	279,000	50,000
Total, Corps of Engineers (52 projects)		598,231,100	12,728,000	37,809,100

RECLAMATION

Project	Benefit-cost ratio	Total estimated Federal cost	Appropriation to date	Amount in H.R. 7509
California: Trinity power facilities		$59,607,000		$2,415,000
Idaho: Burns Creek		44,616,000		500,000
Washington: Greater Wenatchee Division	7.0	7,579,000		500,000
Missouri River Basin:				
Kansas: Cedar Bluff unit	2.02	4,625,000		400,000
Montana: East Bench unit	2.07	20,597,000		1,000,000
Nebraska: Red Willow Dam	1.87	6,597,000	$214,253	525,000
Upper Colorado River:				
Colorado: Smith Fork	1.2	$4,420,000		$500,000
New Mexico: Hammond project	2.1	3,280,000		500,000
Wyoming: Seedskadee project	1.5	37,885,000		1,354,000
Loan program (6 projects)		17,089,500		6,016,500
Total reclamation (15 projects)		206,295,500	$214,253	13,710,500
Grand total (67 projects)		804,526,600	12,942,253	51,510,600

[1] Reimbursements to local interests.

[2] Resumption of construction.

Maj. Gen. William P. Fisher

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. PAUL KITCHIN

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 31, 1959

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, this seems to be the year for many changes in key command and staff officers in the armed services. Recently we were informed that Major General Michaelis was leaving his assignment as Chief of Legislative Liaison for the Army. Now, I have been told that Maj. Gen. William P. "Bill" Fisher, Director of Legislative Liaison for the Department of the Air Force has been assigned as Commander, Eastern Transport Air Force, Military Air Transport Service at McGuire Air Force Base, N.J. He will be leaving here about the 10th of September. He is a personal friend and one of my most distinguished constituents.

General Fisher has been the Director since March of last year and has done an outstanding job in handling the very difficult task of providing Congress with prompt and accurate answers to its many inquiries. He has rendered invaluable assistance to the Members of Congress and their constituents in efficiently and effectively helping to solve their innumerable difficult problems.

General Fisher has a long history as an enthusiastic pilot and as a highly respected commander. His impressive combat record is filled with repeated praise of his ability as an outstanding leader and his easy, sensible way of doing things. These attributes were recognized early in his career when he was given command of the 20th Bomb Squadron at Clark Field prior to Pearl Harbor. Wounded during the bombing there, he lead his squadron from Bataan to Mindanao where he became an infantry commander when his unit joined the ground fighting against the Japanese until we were forced to leave the Philippines.

After a short tour in the United States, he went to the China Theater in command of a B–24 Group. This was the beginning of a long series of assignments in strategic bomber operations, including duty with the Strategic Air Command. His duties included those of wing, base, and air division commander, Inspector General of the Strategic Air Command, and Deputy Commander of 8th Air Force.

He served for a year on the faculty of the Air War College and headed the Far East Air Forces Bomber Command during the Korean war. As a command pilot and command observer, General Fisher has logged more than 6,600 hours in jet and conventional aircraft and flew 59 combat missions during World War II and Korea.

General Fisher's decorations include the Distinguished Service Medal, Legion of Merit with three Oak Leaf Clusters, Distinguished Flying Cross with one Oak Leaf Cluster, Air Medal, Purple Heart, and Presidential Unit Citation with four Oak Leaf Clusters.

I regret that he is leaving Washington, but know that he is looking forward to commanding another flying organization in one of the combat arms of the Air Force. I am certain that many of us will see more of General Fisher as this outstanding officer assumes positions of increasing importance as the continues his successful Air Force career.

Conservation and Management of Migratory Marine Fish

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 31, 1959

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, a serious problem regarding the conservation and management of migratory marine fish has been brought to my attention. At my request, the Department of the Interior has informed me of the phenomenal growth of recreational salt water fishing in recent years, which growth has created many problems in the field of management and its relationship to commercial fishing.

During the year 1955, 4½ million sportsmen participated in this popular sport for a total of 59 million days and spending $489 million.

I have been advised that the annual sport harvest may now approximate a half-billion pounds of fish and may double in the next decade.

For these reasons, Mr. Speaker, I would like to suggest that future study and consideration be given to authorizing a comprehensive and continuing study of migratory marine fish of interest to recreational fishermen of the United States.

The purpose of such a study would be to develop wise conservation policies and constructive management activities.

It is my belief that a cooperative program of research between the States involved and the Federal Government would be a logical approach to the problem. The Federal Government could supply funds in equal proportion to those supplied by the States for this purpose, limited to 50 percent of the cost of the program. I would recommend that not more than $100,000 be made available, on a 50–50 matching basis, with any one State in any one year.

Federal funds employed on a joint Federal-State level have in the past proven to create greater State financial participation and interest in planning research programs of this nature.

It is my hope, Mr. Speaker, that in the next Congress we may establish a continuing research program for the conservation and improved management of migratory marine fish in the United States and contiguous waters.

For the purpose of studying this problem, I am introducing H.R. 8968. I welcome any and all comments from interested conservation and sportsmen's agencies on this proposed new program.

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 31, 1959

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newsletter of August 29, 1959:

WASHINGTON REPORT BY CONGRESSMAN BRUCE ALGER, FIFTH DISTRICT, TEXAS

AUGUST 29, 1959.

Before flying to Europe, President Eisenhower appealed to Congress to pass necessary legislation in the closing days prior to adjournment. In two messages to Congress he stressed three programs. He asked: (1) Remove interest rate ceilings on long-term Government borrowing; he explained this is necessary because (a) bondholders deserve a fair rate of return; (b) $85 billion refinancing of Government debt is necessary in the next 12 months; (c) it costs Government more to refinance time and again, on a short-term basis, as we're forced to do now; (d) present law stimulates inflation, weakens our currency, and worries investors both here and abroad; the urgency of this item he made clear when he warned that those unwilling to pass the needed legislation "must assume full responsibility for the possibly serious consequences," for the administration cannot and will not; (2) FHA loan insurance authorization—the President said, "An increase in FHA's loan insurance authority should not be made contingent upon the possibility of approval by the President, after the Congress has adjourned, of legislation which contains features that the administration finds seriously objectionable and that are entirely unrelated to FHA's home loan insurance program." (3) Increased tax reserves to pay for highway program—he stressed the need, in his opinion, for maintaining the pay-as-we-go play by providing the money needed for the increased costs. (See Newsletters of August 1 and July 25.)

The Housing Act of 1959 (second version) passed 283 to 105, containing many features objected to by the President in his veto of the original bill. The House leadership completely disregarded the earlier message from the President (see above) and tied many undesirable items to the necessary extension of FHA home insurance authority. Efforts to eliminate (a) public housing, and (b) direct loans for college classroom construction, failed. Efforts to reduce urban renewal by stretching the $650 million to 2 years failed. The bill contains other administration-opposed provisions as well. I voted to improve the bill, and the amendments failing, voted against the bill. This bill may well be vetoed again.

The vehicular safety standards bill offers a prime example of a bill whose noble sounding title and obviously desirable objective makes it difficult for Congressmen to vote against, however impracticable its language. Who wants to appear to vote against safety? This bill directs the Commerce Department to establish minimum safety standards for all Government autos. It would put the Government into the auto design and engineering field and was condemned by every Government agency which considered it. Result? It passed, pointing up again that many feel that any need can be met by simply passing a law. Incorrect solutions, though they bear fine and imposing titles, can do more harm than good, and that has been pointed up, in my opinion, by congressional action on housing, highways, and interest rates, no less than on vehicular safety standards.

Political issues, and how to find, define and exploit them, seem to be dominant in these closing days of Congress. A special session now appears quite possible since the President may have to force Congress to face up to its responsibility, primarily in the fields of housing and interest rate flexibility.

A lot of dust is being thrown in the voters' eyes these days in the debate over who is really economy minded. Under pressure from home, economy, you know, has suddenly turned fashionable again among political candidates. Hence, it's not surprising that the back page of each day's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD now features a chart, crammed full of figures and purporting to show that Congress, far from exceeding the President's budget, has actually slashed administration requests by a present total of some $650 million. Oh? Take just one item, out of several which might be mentioned, housing. According to this chart, the President wanted $1,650 million for housing, while Congress "reduced" that figure to $1,300 million, a cut again according to the chart of $350 million. What the chart doesn't say is that the figures cover entirely different periods of time. Hence, the President's proposal called for spending $1.5 billion on urban renewal over the next 6 years. Congress instead voted to spend almost one billion in only 2 years. Some cut. If you "economized" around your house this way, you could "save" yourself broke in a hurry.

The President's veto of the public works appropriation (money for rivers, harbors, dams, reclamation, etc.) will spark a fight next week on the floor. It seems to me that if we're to live within our means, these public works programs provide an obvious opportunity to cut down spending. The only responsible alternatives is to raise taxes, and I believe they are too high now. Hence, though only 20 of us voted that way when this bill passed the House, I believe the President should be commended for his determination to hold the line on public works spending.

Position of Congress on Public Works Appropriations Should Be Sustained

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 31, 1959

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, once again an effort of the Congress to meet the executive branch halfway on an important issue has been nullified by a Presidential veto—this time, the public works appropriations bill of 1960. In considering a vote on this veto we are faced once again with the question of how far the Congress should go in knuckling under to the Budget Bureau and the executive branch in the matter of determining the policies of this government.

The question at issue here between the Congress and the President is purely on a matter of policy. As we know, the bill as it was sent to the President's desk called for only a very slightly larger expenditure than the recommendations in the budget—an increase of approximately 3 percent. The President's objections to this bill appear to be based largely on the fact that the Congress has refused to accept the Budget Bureau's policy against new starts or even any new planning studies. The basic issue therefore is largely whether the Congress or the President shall determine the policy underlying the development of our water resources of the Nation.

The President, as we know, has guarded the prerogative of the Presidency. He has stated that he would not leave the White House with the powers of the President diminished. But, Mr. Speaker, Congress must guard its prerogatives also and no Congress would be living up to its constitutional responsibilities if it permitted its own powers to be diminished.

There are other good reasons why this veto should be overridden:

First. In rejecting the administration's "no new starts" policy, the Congress did not act capriciously or hastily. Let me recall that the Public Works Appropriations Subcommittee spent many months taking testimony on this matter. It heard from some 1,200 witnesses, including the representatives of the Federal agencies and 243 Members of the Congress. The testimony filled four volumes and 4,222 pages of printed hearings. In the other body, the comparable committee also held extensive hearings and heard many witnesses.

The Appropriations Committees and the Congress has considered carefully and well this whole matter.

Second. The "no new starts" policy with which your appropriations Committee was faced when the budget was submitted to the Congress by the President is both unwise and unrealistic. If it were continued it would lead to a drying up of the water resources program of the Nation.

Third. Even more unrealistic is the policy restricting surveys and planning of new projects. It takes many years to make and complete intelligent and prudent surveys, and additional years for making plans for efficient projects. Stopping surveys and planning might very well lead us into a position where in a sudden emergency we would be forced into hurried surveys and planning where the possibilities for costly mistakes and errors would be greatly multiplied. Both the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation feel that this Nation should have new starts and an orderly, progressive, and efficient program of water resource development. The amounts budgeted for new surveys and planning in this bill this year are modest indeed and insure a continuation of construction on an orderly basis.

Fourth. We must look at our water resources program as a positive program to develop the resources of our country and to lay a foundation for the continued growth of every region of our country.

Fifth. This Nation cannot run a water resource development program on a "stop and go" basis. We must have an orderly and well-planned continuing program of surveys, of planning and construction. On this basis our country can go forward on a more economical and sound basis.

Sixth. With respect to the questioned construction projects added to this bill by the Congress there are five which resume construction of already started but not yet completed projects; there are four which are actually reimbursements to local interests for expenditures made by these local communities; and there are six which are small loan projects. So that there are actually only 50 completely new projects involving construction by the Federal Government. This is just one for each State. Surely, in view of the billions we are expending for projects abroad, these investments in the development of our own country cannot be considered extravagant.

Seventh. The bill is a good bill, a realistic bill, and a measure that faces up, not only to the present needs of our Nation for the development of our water resources, but also looks to and prepares for the future.

Eighth. It is a bill that insures that this great program of water-resources development which we have had under way for the past 25 years will continue in an orderly and uninterrupted program.

Ninth. It is a bill with a truly national point of view which recognizes the needs of every area of our country and the different types of programs needed in the different regions, and continues a well-balanced program that is truly in the interest of the entire Nation.

Tenth. In short, Mr. Speaker, the Congress in writing and passing this bill did a good job and responsible service. It should stand behind this bill now and see that the months of work which went into the writing of this bill will not have been in vain.

A vote to override the veto will sustain the prerogative of the Congress to establish the policy of our Nation.

Pothole Drainage Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 31, 1959

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, the most important waterfowl production area remaining in the United States is localized in the prairie pothole sections of Minnesota, North Dakota, and South Dakota. Within some 140 counties in these States, over a million potholes totaling some 4 million acres of wetlands are concentrated. The potholes are water-holding depressions varying in size from fraction acre puddles to shallow lakes covering hundreds of acres. They vary in depth from shallow temporary areas containing a few inches of water in wet weeks of early spring to semipermanent and permanent water areas 6 feet or more in depth which retain water the year round in seasons of normal precipitation. The deeper and more permanent potholes are the less numerous.

In recent years, the tristate area of Minnesota, North Dakota, and South Dakota has produced an average of 4 to 5 million ducks annually or nearly three-fourths of the ducks produced in the United States south of the Canadian border.

Because of its importance from a production standpoint, preservation of the U.S. prairie pothole region as a breeding area for waterfowl has been of major concern to the Fish and Wildlife Service. For over 10 years the Service has been concerned with loss of breeding habitat to farm drainage in this area. Studies conducted by the Service during 1949 and 1950 indicated that during those 2 years more than 32,000 water areas valuable to waterfowl were eliminated annually in this region. Estimates for the 12-year period 1943–54 are that about 350,000 potholes valuable to waterfowl were drained. Additional studies have shown that, while the rate of loss declined somewhat during subsequent years, substantial loss of valuable breeding acreage has continued. During the past year the rate of loss has again increased.

A major factor in sustaining the program of farm drainage in the pothole area has been the subsidy payments and the technical assistance provided by the Federal Government. For at least 8 years the Fish and Wildlife Service has studied this situation in an effort to find alternative uses for wetlands which farmers could adopt and other means of discouraging pothole drainage. To date this effort has not been successful. It appears therefore that as long as Federal subsidies and technical assistance without cost to the farmer are available, drainage of farm wetlands and loss of valuable waterfowl breeding habitat in the prairie pothole sections of Minnesota, North Dakota, and South Dakota will continue.

Faced with the above situation, the Fish and Wildlife Service, several years ago, began thinking in terms of a more positive program to preserve pothole wetlands as waterfowl breeding habitat. Additional field studies were initiated to determine which of the 140 pothole counties in the tristate area contained the most and best remaining habitat for waterfowl production. As a result of these studies, it was determined that there were 90 counties which contained the best remaining waterfowl production habitat. This total of 90 counties includes 22 counties in eastern Minnesota, and 34 counties each in eastern North Dakota and eastern South Dakota.

The enactment of Public Law 85–585 provided amendments to the Migratory Bird Hunting Stamp Act, authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to acquire by lease, purchase or other means, small wetlands and pothole areas to preserve them for waterfowl production. The amendments also provided, through the increase of the duck stamp cost from $2 to $3, additional funds to finance the future acquisition of such areas. The

Fish and Wildlife Service, through the field staff of the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, currently is initiating a long-range program to preserve selected pothole wetlands within the 90-county delineated area in Minnesota and the Dakotas by lease and purchase.

This program of small wetland acquisition has not yet progressed to the point where the degree of its success in future years can be appraised. There is no question, however, that continued Federal subsidies and free technical assistance to the landowner for drainage of potholes will make acquisition of pothole wetlands by the Service for waterfowl breeding habitat more difficult and more expensive than would be the case if they were not available.

The overall problem of preserving wetland habitat for waterfowl breeding and for other wildlife is recognized and appreciated by the State fish and game agencies in the prairie pothole States. The Minnesota Conservation Department has acquired about 56,100 acres of land under its wetland preservation program since October 1951, at a cost of about $1,770,000. The South Dakota Department of Game, Fish, and Parks has acquired about 30,100 acres using $754,327 of Federal aid funds, and in the past 20 years has also purchased about 30,000 acres with its regular funds. North Dakota has acquired about 15,000 acres of wetlands at a cost of about $212,000.

This year we all anticipate a drastic reduction in hunting seasons and bag limits for ducks and coots, especially in the Central, Mississippi, and Atlantic Flyways. These cutbacks may reduce the hunting season to 40 days in the Atlatic and Mississippi Flyways, and 50 days in the Central Flyways.

These drastic reductions will be necessary because of reduced waterfowl breeding this year in the prairie pothole region of the continent. The waterfowl reduction has resulted from widespread drought from the destruction of breeding areas by drainage and other factors. While widespread drought produces a sudden spectacular reduction in duck breeding habitat and in duck production, these losses are temporary and the naturally prolific birds can restore their populations to former levels when normal water conditions return to the prairies.

There can be no such recovery by waterfowl populations from extensive drainage programs. Insofar as breeding waterfowl are concerned wholesale pothole drainage is the establishment of permanent drought.

To those who may question this statement, the State of Iowa can serve as an example. In 1900 numerous potholes and sloughs in Iowa produced vast numbers of ducks, including nearly all of our important game ducks. Today the production of waterfowl in Iowa is but a fraction of that of a short half century ago. The difference in this production lies in the almost total conversion for agricultural uses of the sloughs and potholes which once constituted some of the finest duck breeding habitat on the North American Continent.

There can be no question but that we must move quickly to preserve these pothole areas. Ducks and other migratory waterfowl need water—and they need it badly.

Significant Comments by Lawrence, Truman, McCormack, and Walter on Khrushchev Visit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 31, 1959

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, there has been considerable comment about the exchange of visits by Premier Khrushchev to this country and President Eisenhower to Soviet Russia. Among these the following by David Lawrence, former President Harry Truman, and our distinguished colleages, the majority leader, Hon. JOHN MCCORMACK, and the Honorable FRANCIS E. WALTER, as reported in U.S. News & World Report, are especially significant; and under unanimous consent I include them in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

THE ONE BIG DANGER

(By David Lawrence)

Missiles and nuclear bombs are in themselves no menace to mankind—nor are the conventional weapons which can inflict widespread destruction. The menace is the man who, in disregard of the wishes of his people, can order the trigger pulled.

The one big danger in the world, therefore, is one-man rule—autocratic government.

The basic cause of World War I and World War II was the power of an autocratic one-man government to make war on other nations.

Despite public appeals in 1912 for a naval holiday, one man—the Kaiser—started the war in 1914.

Despite the peace talk and appeasement at Munich in 1938, one man—Hitler—started the war in 1939.

What, then, are we doing to remove the menace of one-man government? Will we remove it merely by showing Khrushchev our might—a sort of veiled threat—or even by President Eisenhower's politeness in making a return visit to the Soviet Union?

We shall not make progress by enhancing the prestige of the dictatorship government in Moscow.

We shall not make progress by abandoning our position in West Berlin in favor of a "deal" that satisfies the material cravings of some of our allies for more trade with the Soviets but robs us of our self-respect and, indeed, reveals us as irresolute and faltering.

We shall not make progress by oversimplifying our dilemma with the Soviet Union as we give an impression that, by temporarily restraining the hand of the mad man, we have accomplished peace for the world.

There has been too much emphasis on the "one man" idea as the answer to the current crisis. Personal diplomacy cannot be of avail against an autocratic system that rules only through intimidation and terror.

Nikita Khrushchev is accustomed to brutishness, to murder—"purges"—and to the exercise of whatever force seems necessary to him to gain his ends.

We must use the occasion of the Khrushchev visit to talk over his head to the peoples behind the Iron Curtain. The protests from groups of citizens in our midst will be made, but there must be forthcoming also from the Government of the United States a restatement of the case for democracy.

Warning must be given that democratic governments cannot "peacefully coexist" alongside an autocratic government that keeps on threatening to destroy us.

This is not just an internal question—it is external in its global effects. The lives of free men everywhere are at stake. As long as an autocratic government is in power in Moscow, there can be no disarmament agreement, no treaty to bar aggression, no written pledge that will be worth the paper on which it is written.

Only when peoples are able, in free elections, to choose their leaders and to remove them at will can there be an assurance of peace in the world. Peoples don't make war—only dictators do.

Until the people of the Soviet Union and the peoples of the neighboring countries of Eastern Europe are free, there can be no relief from the burdens of armament. Tension cannot be relaxed anywhere while the murderous regime in Moscow keeps its conspiratorial agents in every part of the world and its troops quartered in supposedly independent countries.

The menace is one man rule. We should be courageous enough to tell Nikita Khrushchev that we cannot feel safe as long as his people are enslaved and that we will feel secure only when the peoples of the many nationalities that make up the Soviet Union have successfully asserted their right to individual freedom. This may not happen soon, but we must not lose sight of the long-range goal—the removal of autocratic governments from a position that enables them to endanger the peace of the world.

TRUMAN: "I QUESTION WISDOM OF IKE'S VISIT"

(One of the criticisms of the Eisenhower-Khrushchev program was written by ex-President Harry S. Truman, and appeared in newspapers a few hours before the President's news conference. Full text of Mr. Truman's article is given here:)

(By Harry S. Truman)

I seriously question the wisdom of President Eisenhower's going to Moscow. If this journey leads the world to expect that peace can be advanced by the mere exchange of visits between heads of government, then we all face certain disappointment.

The President already has declared that he has no intention of conducting separate negotiations with Khrushchev. If that is the case, why could not the amenities be confined to Khrushchev's visit to the United States, where he will be received with the consideration due him?

When a President of the United States leaves the country it should be a momentous occasion in the exercise of the unique authority of his office. The power and leadership of the Presidency should not be dissipated in ceremonial visits so reminiscent of those days when diplomats and rulers traveled back and forth on their balance of power visits, which marked this, the bloodiest century of history.

President Eisenhower is leaving shortly for Europe to dispel from the minds of our allies any anxiety they may have that the United States and the Soviet Union would engage in separate negotiations. I am sure that President Eisenhower would be quick to resent, and rightly so, any suggestion that he is embarking on a course of the United States going it alone with Russia.

The critical problems we continue to have with the Kremlin are how to get it to keep the commitments and to stop it from interfering and plotting in the internal affairs of other nations.

There can be no durable peace until we make some progress in those two areas.

From Yalta to Potsdam to Geneva we have had many meetings, all of which have resulted in failure—not because of any acts of ours—but solely because the Communists have not lived up to their promises.

An exchange of visitors holds no more promise of success than we have had in conferences and diplomatic negotiations. The President probably will meet the same Khrushchev in Moscow that he met in Geneva and will meet again in Washington—a man with an unyielding ambition and fixed purpose.

Khrushchev is not coming to Washington to learn anything about us or our strength that he does not know already. The real purpose of his visit is to appraise our determination and will to stand up and resist Communist aggression and mischievous probings around the world.

Khrushchev's main objective, I believe, is to see whether he can divide us as a people and lure us into compromising our rights. He would also seek by every means to divide us from our allies and then go about picking them off one by one. Since Khrushchev has the initiative to make war, he also has the advantage of beguiling us with offers of peace. This is where Khrushchev is most dangerous and why we have to be exceedingly careful about maintaining our strength and never letting down our guard.

It would be most unfortunate if, by the exchange of visits, we allow the Russians or the world to gain the impression that we are being lulled into complacency.

I hope that Khrushchev, when he leaves here, will have a clearer understanding of what he and the Kremlin are up against in American determination to stand with our allies. Let us be sure that it is a more accurate and realistic evaluation than either Mikoyan or Kozlov (Anastas I. Mikoyan and Frol Kozlov, Soviet Deputy Premiers) seemed to have got out of their visits.

Disregarding all the ceremonies that will be connected with Khrushchev's visit—a visit that I have favored—it is in Washington that Khrushchev must learn conclusively where and how we stand.

The reception accorded the President in Moscow will have little bearing on Khrushchev's decisions and acts, and that is why I feel that little purpose will be served and a great deal of misunderstanding might arise from the President's return of Khrushchev's visit.

There are all sorts of interpretations that can be given to a visit by a President of the United States, and such a journey to Russia could be distorted for propaganda purposes beyond the announced intent. The claim that the tensions of the "cold war" between the East and the West could be lessened by such visits is to ignore the basic reasons for the cold war.

I do not think the Communists are impressed by anything except force. They do not respond to tough talk unless that talk is backed by force. The only way to insure peace is to make certain that they who threaten understand that we will fight if given no other choice.

Up to now I see no evidence that the Communists have changed their goal, which is to impose their rule on the world. This we have to prevent.

One place where we must make that clear to Khrushchev is at the White House. Equally important is that our Allies and friends should never have reason to entertain any misgivings as to the firmness of this resolve. I think it would have been more in keeping with our responsibilities and our leadership to have invited the heads of allied governments and the Secretary General of NATO [North Atlantic Treaty Organization] to come to Washington before Khrushchev's visit to this country. This would have been an opportunity to remind the world, and ourselves as well, that our security and peace are mutually interdependent.

But, in his decision to visit Bonn, Paris, and London in preparation for his meeting with Khrushchev in Washington, the President has the complete support of a nation united.

I cannot say it too often that the proper place to conduct any negotiations affecting the peace of the world is in the United Nations. The world has had all it ought to stand from the maneuvering and bickerings of nations seeking to exploit others. The United Nations has played an increasingly important role in focusing the light of world opinion on transgressors.

In this period of transition from old, exploitive colonialism to independence and nationalism, let us not overlook the growing menace of a new brand of colonialism—the Red exploitive colonialism.

If Russia is sincere in her professed desire for peace, Khrushchev ought to come before the United Nations to try to work out a constructive plan for disarmament and control of nuclear weapons and to cease interfering in the internal affairs of other nations. But from experience we ought to know that plans, resolutions, and agreements made by the Communists up to now are meaningless.

What the world needs is a show of good faith by peaceful acts and deeds by Khrushchev and not through visits, fanfare and gala performances.

While we are striving to achieve some common working ground for peace with the Communists, we are compelled to maintain and build our military might, no matter what the cost.

REMARKS BY HOUSE MAJORITY LEADER JOHN W. MCCORMACK, DEMOCRAT, OF MASSACHUSETTS

The invitation by President Eisenhower of the Soviet dictator, the head of the worldwide Communist conspiracy and also Prime Minister of the Soviet Union, Mr. Khrushchev, to visit the United States, has been received with sharp discussion and much concern by our people, and properly so. It is my opinion that time will show that President Eisenhower made a serious mistake. It will be interesting to note "the law of natural and probable consequences" operating as a result of the President's invitation and the coming visit of Mr. Khrushchev.

REMARKS BY REPRESENTATIVE FRANCIS E. WALTER, DEMOCRAT, OF PENNSYLVANIA, CHAIRMAN OF HOUSE UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES COMMITTEE

(In a Letter to President Eisenhower)

Your attention is respectfully directed to two phases of the total war which the international Communist conspiracy is waging against the free world with the United States the principal target.

The first phase is the extensive current Communist espionage operations in this country.

The second phase is the flood of Communist propaganda which is being sent into the United States at an ever-increasing rate.

May I conclude, Mr. President, by quoting the words of Dimitry Z. Manuilsky given in the Lenin School of Political Warfare in Moscow in 1931: "So we shall begin by launching the most spectacular peace movement on record. There will be electrifying overtures and unheard-of concessions. The capitalist countries, stupid and decadent, will rejoice and cooperate in their own destruction. They will leap at another chance to be friends. As soon as their guard is down, we shall smash them with our clenched fist."

Contempt of the People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 31, 1959

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include therewith an editorial from the Allendale County Citizen, Allendale, S.C., concerning James B. Carey's threat against me and the other 229 Members of the House who supported the Landrum bill. I also enclose therewith a copy of my letter to Carey along with his record in the archives of the Un-American Activities Committee.

[From the Allendale County Citizen, Allendale, S.C., Aug. 28, 1959]

CONTEMPT OF THE PEOPLE

The arrogant, well-nigh stupid, attitude of union labor leaders is well exemplified in letters which James B. Carey, AFL–CIO vice president, sent to 229 Representatives who voted for the Landrum-Griffin labor bill, which Carey opposed. The letters over Mr. Carey's signature threaten the legislators with retaliation at the polls.

The same type of letter could have been written by the head of a criminal syndicate to law enforcement officers trying to protect the lives and property of their neighbors. The labor movement is not a government and has no more right to interfere with due process of law than any other group in this Nation.

Thousands of people, who hitherto have desired to give labor its due, will be disgusted by the Carey tactics and will vote for those Congressmen who, faced with the mounting power, almost the power of life and death, accumulated by union leaders, saw fit to set the Nation's welfare above that of a group seeking only its own benefit at whatever cost to the public.

Too often in the past several years we have seen how a powerful minority, using pressure, blackmail and other unethical if not criminal methods, can force its will upon a reluctant people in spite of all those safeguards assured us in the Bill of Rights and the U.S. Constitution.

We know that the power exercised unscrupulously by these minorities enters into the highest and most sacrosanct areas of Government, in direct contempt of the people of this Nation.

The people of this district and every other congressional district in the land should at once let Congressmen know that no influence within or without the district can be used against men who have honorably made decisions within their best ability and understanding.

Few of us object to the right of labor to better itself, or to seek its full value; but when the power of labor unions is used to serve the ends of racketeers and gangsters, the people have a right to call a halt. They called such a halt in the Congress, where 229 Congressmen, moved by the wishes of the people, conveyed to them by every form of communication, voted for the Landrum-Griffin bill.

The men and women who form the rank and file of the organized labor movement probably realize that the Landrum-Griffin bill provides them a voice in their own affairs. They know that to date they have not had a voice. They, too, will be with and of the people when Mr. Carey's showdown comes at the polls.

Meanwhile, the severest condemnation should be Mr. Carey's lot. His threatened blackmail of Congressmen speaks poorly, indeed, of his concept of justice, democracy, and American principles of honest dealing and fair play.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., August 31, 1959.

JAMES B. CAREY,
Washington, D.C.

SIR: Your insolent letter of August 18 wherein you, among other things, attempt to threaten me for my support of the Landrum antiracketeering and antiextortion bill, has been received. This bill will harm nobody in organized labor who is honest. It has nothing to do with the rights, privileges and immunities of labor. These are taken care of in the Taft-Hartley Act. The Landrum bill is to protect the American public and the American workingman from those who are wrecking the labor movement in America.

As you and I go through life we make a record. My record in public life, for the most part, is in the archives of the Congress of the United States. Yours is in the archives of organized labor as well as the Committee on Un-American Activities. Of all the labor leaders in America, you should be the last one to try to intimidate anybody from my section of the world. South Carolinians in the ranks of organized labor will not heed your advice.

If I had to hold public office at your pleasure and under your sufferance, I would rather go down to the "tongueless silence of the dreamless dust" then ever again be entrusted with the high responsibility of serving my fellow man. My people know my record and they know yours and will know it better when I place the Un-American Activities' report in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. They will be quite interested to learn how many years it took you to get religion. I will see you at the ballot box.

Sincerely,

L. MENDEL RIVERS,
Member of Congress.

INFORMATION FROM THE FILES OF THE COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

AUGUST 21, 1959.

For: Hon. L. MENDEL RIVERS, Member of Congress.

Subject: James D. Carey.

This committee makes no evaluation in this report. The following is only a compilation of recorded public material contained in our files and should not be construed as representing the results of any investigation or finding by the committee. The fact that the committee has information as set forth below on the subject of this report is not per se an indication that this individual, organization, or publication is subversive, unless specifically stated.

Symbols in parentheses after the name of any organization or publication mentioned herein indicate that the organization or publication has been cited as being subversive by one or more Federal authorities. The name of each agency is denoted by a capital letter, as follows: A—Attorney General of the United States; C—Committee on Un-American Activities; I—Internal Security Subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee; J—Senate Judiciary Committee; and S—Subversive Activities Control Board. The numerals after each letter represent the year in which that agency first cited the organization or publication. (For more complete information on citations, see this committee's "Guide to Subversive Organizations and Publications.")

Mr. Carey was a featured speaker at the national convention of the United Electrical, Radio, & Machine Workers Union, CIO, which was held in Cleveland, Ohio, as was shown in the Daily Worker of September 3, 1940, page 1: he was reelected president of the union at that convention, as was revealed in the Daily Worker of September 4, 1940, page 1, September 5, 1940, page 4, and New Masses of September 17, 1940, page 18. He testified at hearings before a special subcommittee of the Committee on Education and Labor during an investigation of Communist infiltration of the UREMWA (hearings held during September and October 1948); Mr. Carey identified himself before that committee as secretary-treasurer, Congress of Industrial Organizations, Washington, D.C.

The Special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of March 29, 1944, pages 18 and 19, listed the United Electrical, Radio, & Machine Workers of America among the 21 CIO unions in which the committee had found Communist leadership strongly entrenched. The 1949 convention of the Congress of Industrial Organizations expelled the United Electrical, Radio, & Machine Workers from the CIO on grounds of Communist domination (press release, 12th CIO constitutional convention, November 20–24, 1950).

After the expulsion of the United Electrical, Radio, & Machine Workers, the Congress of Industrial Organizations set up a new anti-Communist electrical union and at an organizational convention held in Philadelphia formally approved the name, International Union of Electrical, Radio, & Machine Workers, and the identifying initials, IUE-CIO. The convention inserted in the constitution of the new union clauses barring Communists or adherents of other totalitarian organizations from holding national or local office. (See article in the New York Times of December 1, 1949, p. 3, datelined Philadelphia, November 30.)

It is noted that James B. Carey was listed as chairman of the International Union of Electrical, Radio, & Machine Workers (IUE-CIO) on a letterhead of the union dated January 12, 1950.

An article in the Daily People's World, west coast Communist Party organ (issue of October 13, 1952, p. 3) reported that "Under impetus from Red-baiting union buster James B. Carey, a new anti-Communist organization was being projected today by the Los Angeles CIO Council." The organization was described as "a chapter of Carey's latest brainchild, the so-called Negro Labor Committee, U.S.A." which, "he said frankly, is being designed to counteract the influence nationally of the Negro Labor Council."

The Committee on Un-American Activities, in its annual report for 1952, released December 28, 1952, stated: "The National Negro Labor Council is a Communist-front organization, designed to infiltrate communism into Negro life" and "by accusing established labor organizations of overlooking the needs of the Negroes, it hopes to capture more Negroes for communism" (p. 11).

The National Negro Labor Council has been redesignated as subversive and Communist by the Attorney General in a list of organizations previously designated pursuant to Executive Order 10450, released April 1, 1954.

Reference to Mr. Carey is found in the committee's report, "100 Things You Should Know About Communism," released May 14, 1951, as follows:

"96. What's a good program for an American union man against communism? Here is one given by James B. Carey, secretary-treasurer of the CIO: Full exposure of the Communists, plus a strong, progressive policy far in advance of the bogus progressivism of the Communists. Swift, flexible infighting that defeats the Communists at their own game within the union" (p. 86).

Masses and Mainstream of November 1950 (pp. 53–54) reported that Mr. Carey had headed a delegation to the Soviet Union in October 1945; the article revealed that "Mr. Carey, speaking for the delegation, said they had 'been deeply moved by the personal warmth and friendship' shown to them by the Soviet workers. He emphasized that no American could himself see the Soviet Union and its peoples without being 'moved by the same feeling of deep human sympathy which we have felt and by the same desire to assist and cooperate in the great tasks in which the Soviet people are now engaged.' The delegation, said Mr. Carey, was especially impressed by the manner in which 'the Soviet trade unions * * * promoted the interests of the workers' and by the 'many activities of a social, welfare, and cultural character and the comprehensive nature of the social security system which they operate.'"

A pamphlet, "Report of the CIO Delegation to the Soviet Union" (p. 1), reveals James B. Carey, secretary-treasurer of the CIO, was the chairman of the CIO delegation which visited the Soviet Union as guests of the All-Union Central Council of Trade Unions in return for a visit paid to the United States by a Soviet trade union delegation invited by the CIO.

The Daily Worker of September 3, 1940 (p. 4), identified Mr. Carey as a member of the National Council of the Emergency Peace Mobilization (C—1944; A—1942) at which the American Peace Mobilization (C—1942; A—1942; I—1956) was formed. Mr. Carey was a delegate to the American Congress for Peace and Democracy (C—1944), according to the Daily Worker of January 6, 1939 (p. 2). He was nominated for membership on the National Labor Committee of the American League for Peace and Democracy (C—1939; A—1942), which was formed by the Congress held in Washington, D.C., January 6–8, 1939 (pamphlet "7½ Million * * *," p. 32); he spoke on the subject "Labor and Democratic Rights" at a meeting held during the congress (ibid., p. 46); in this source he was identified as president, UERMWA, and secretary, CIO. A letterhead of the American League, dated February 8, 1939, named him as a member of the national labor committee of the league.

The "Call to a Conference on Civil Rights, April 20–21, 1950," page 3, issued by the Washington Committee for Democratic Action C—1942; A—1942), named James B. Carey as one of the speakers at the conference. He was one of the sponsors of the Greater New York Emergency Conference on Inalienable Rights (C—1944), as was revealed by the prorgam of the conference dated February 12, 1940.

Mr. Carey contributed to the publication, Champion (C—1942), as shown by the November 1937 issue, page 9, and by the Daily Worker of February 17, 1938, page 7.

According to the Daily Worker of March 29, 1938, page 4, James Carey endorsed the Committee for Peace through World Cooperation (C—1944). He spoke before the committee (Daily Worker of Apr. 2, 1938, p. 1; New Masses, April 5, 1938, p. 27) and before the Jewish People's Committee (C—1944; A—1948) (Daily Worker of Jan. 21, 1939, p. 4).

Equal Justice for October 1938, page 4, named James Carey as having been arrested in Chicago for distributing leaflets and as having been defended by the International Labor Defense (C—1939; A—1942). He spoke at the fourth annual convention of the American Student Union (C—1939) on December 26–30, 1938, as shown in "The Student Almanac" for 1939, page 32; he was identified as National Secretary, Congress of Industrial Organizations in this source.

In the call to the New York Legislature of Youth, issued by the American Youth Congress (C—1939; A—1942) for January 28–30, 1938, James Carey is shown as one of those who signed the call; he was identified as president, UERMWA. In the proceedings of the American Youth Congress, July 1–5, 1939, page 48, he was named as vice chairman; "Youth Defends America," a report of the Sixth American Youth Congress, July 3–7, 1940, reveals (on p. 44) that he was

elected vice chairman of the group; he was identified as president, UERMWA.

Mr. Carey was a member of the organizing committee of the World Youth Congress (C—1939) (Daily Worker, April 4, 1938, p. 3) and a delegate from the United States to the Second World Youth Congress, August 16–23, 1938 (report of the congress entitled "Youth Demands a Peaceful World").

A leaflet announcing a public meeting to revise the neutrality act to be held in Carnegie Hall, February 13, 1939, named James B. Carey as a speaker at the meeting held under the auspices of the Union for Concerted Peace Efforts (C—1944). He spoke before the Negro People's Committee to Aid Spanish Democracy (C—1944) (Daily Worker, February 8, 1939, p. 2). Mr. Carey was one of those who signed a petition of the American Committee for Democracy and Intellectual Freedom (C—1942), as shown on a mimeographed sheet attached to a letterhead of that committee dated January 17, 1940.

Mr. Carey signed a telegram of the Joint Committee for Trade Union Rights (C—1944) addressed to President Roosevelt on behalf of the International Fur and Leather Workers Union (C—1944) defendants (Daily Worker, Nov. 11, 1940, pp. 1 and 5).

Mr. Carey's activities in the World Federation of Trade Unions were described in Free Trade Union News for July 1948, pages 3, 4, and 7. The Daily Worker of September 19, 1947, page 5, reported that he had praised the Soviet trade unions, and the Daily People's World of October 11, 1948, page 6, quoted him in a statement of cooperation with Soviet trade unions.

However, after the CIO withdrew from the WFTU, an article, "Why the CIO Bowed Out," by James B. Carey, secretary-treasurer, CIO, as told to Sidney Shallett, appeared in the Saturday Evening Post of June 11, 1949, pages 28, 128–132. In brief, Mr. Carey commented as follows:

"The CIO was under no illusions when, in February, 1945, we took the momentous step of participating in organization of the World Federation of Trade Unions. We knew that Soviet Russia and her satellites were in the WFTU. From the pitched battles we had fought against Communist attempts to dominate our own organization, we had a precise blueprint of what could be expected from the Reds. Still, the CIO, together with the British and other democratic trade unions, took on the job of attempting to work with the Communists in building a solid, lasting structure of security for the workingmen of all nations.

* * * * *

"Three years and eleven months later, the CIO and the British Trades Union Congress, disillusioned and doublecrossed, had to walk off the job. * * * Thanks to the Reds, the foundation of our structure for the international workingman was built of sand, its timbers were wormy and its roof was full of leaks. Once again we had learned the old lesson that when the Communist brethren give you the kiss of friendship, they also take a bite out of your cheek."

Hon. J. Bayard Clark

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. PAUL KITCHIN

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 31, 1959

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, I desire to join my colleagues in paying tribute to an outstanding North Carolinian and a truly great American who has passed to his reward. While it was not my privilege to serve in this body with the Honorable J. Bayard Clark, I know of his long and able public service and have been intimately acquainted with the Clark family through long friendship with his distinguished brother, Jim Clark, of my hometown. Mr. Clark sprang from an illustrious family, and throughout his life demonstrated a keen interest in the affairs of his State and Nation. The works he did in life remain as an imposing monument to his memory.

My heartfelt sympathy goes out to his beloved wife, daughters and sons.

Safeguarding Our Scenic Shorelines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 31, 1959

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, the distinguished junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER] has been a leader in the field of conservation of natural resources ever since he entered the Senate in 1955.

True to his tradition, he is now a vigorous and effective sponsor of bills for national shoreline parks in such scenic areas deserving of preservation as Indiana Dunes on Lake Michigan, Oregon Dunes in his own State along the Pacific Ocean, and Padre Island beside the gulf coast.

In the New York Sunday Times for August 30, 1959, Senator NEUBERGER has written an excellent and comprehensive article entitled "Plan for Shoreline Parks," which summarizes the efforts of many of us in the Senate to preserve these lovely shorelines and seacoasts before it is too late. I commend the New York Times for publishing this splendid article. I commend the Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER] for writing it.

The Senator from Oregon emphasizes what many of the rest of us know to be true: That this is a nationwide movement to protect our scenic shorelines. because Americans know that each has a heritage in the relatively few outdoor areas beside our oceans and lakes which still are susceptible of being established as national parks, monuments, or seashores.

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

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

[From the New York Times, Aug. 30, 1959]

PLAN FOR SHORELINE PARKS—U.S. SENATE BILLS WOULD SET ASIDE RECREATIONAL AREAS ON SEACOAST AND IN THE GREAT LAKES REGION

(By RICHARD L. NEUBERGER)

Nearly all the great national parks of the United States are in mountain ranges—Grand Canyon, Yosemite, Crater Lake, Rainier, Shenandoah, Yellowstone, Zion, and most of the rest. In the process of setting aside these magnificient upland reserves, the Nation has neglected another realm which is equally alluring to the tourist and the seeker of outdoor recreation. This realm consists of the seacoasts and shorelines of the United States, which are among the most beautiful on earth. Indeed, the first settlers in America found pleasure and inspiration where white-maned breakers spent their strength on sandy ocean strands.

Today, a belated effort is underway in the U.S. Senate to add headlands and beaches to the gorges and alpine peaks which already are part of the national park system. This effort is expressed in an omnibus bill that would create some 10 waterside parks on four picturesque shorelines. The shores are those of the Atlantic, Gulf, Great Lakes, and the Pacific. No major coast has been omitted.

TEN PROPOSED PARKS

Principal authors of the bill are Senator JAMES E. MURRAY, of Montana, chairman of the Senate Interior Committee; Senator CLINTON P. ANDERSON, of New Mexico; Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS, of Illinois; and the writer of this article. The 10 national shoreline recreational areas proposed for inclusion in the country's park network, with the maximum acreage of each, would be as follows:

Cape Cod, Mass., 30,000 acres.
Padre Island, Tex., 60,000 acres.
Oregon Dunes and Sea-Lion Caves, Oreg., 35,000 acres.
Indiana Dunes, Ind., 5,000 acres.
Point Reyes, Calif., 35,000 acres.
Cumberland Island, Ga., 25,000 acres.
Huron Mountains, Mich., 90,000 acres.
Channel Islands, Calif., 76,000 acres.
Pictured Rocks, Mich., 100,000 acres.
Sleeping Bear Dunes, Mich., 26,000 acres.

The four at the top of the roster—Cape Cod, Padre Island, Oregon Dunes, and Indiana Dunes—have been specifically recommended by the National Park Advisory Board as having qualities worthy of this recognition. It is these four areas around which most of the controversy revolves, because they probably will be reserved first. In fact, along with Senator GORDON ALLOTT, of Colorado, I also am sponsoring a bill at the request of the Eisenhower administration which would authorize three shoreline parks, to be selected administratively by the Secretary of the Interior.

THE OREGON DUNES

The three probably would be chosen from among the leading four in the omnibus bill, and the Interior Department has gone so far as to disclose that Oregon Dunes would have an excellent prospect of being among these.

The omnibus shoreline bill authorizes $50 million for the acquisition of land for the parks. The administration bill is considerably more modest in this respect—$15 million. Furthermore, the omnibus bill specifies 10 additional seashores or Great Lakes shorelines to be studied by the National Park Service "for the purpose of determining what action should be taken by the United States to save and preserve them." They are these:

Fire Island, N.Y., 3,540 acres.
Cape Flattery, Washington State, 16,000 acres.
Leadbetter Point, Washington State, 4,250 acres.
Mosquito Lagoon, Fla., 9,700 acres.
Pigeon Point, Minn., 6,400 acres.
Debidue Island, S.C., 8,400 acres.
Kiawah Island, S.C., 7,300 acres.
Popham-St. John, Maine, 1,100 acres.
Parramoure Island, Va., 6,250 acres.
Smith Island, N.C., 11,900 acres.

Intensive congressional interest in this question dates from several years ago, when the National Park Service published, with funds given by an unidentified private benefactor, a brochure entitled "Our Vanishing Shoreline." It revealed that, while the Nation's conservationists had been guarding the mountains and hills, the seashore was being exploited and gobbled up.

This survey showed, for example, that of the 3,700 miles of shoreline in the Atlanitc and gulf coasts, only 240 miles were in Federal or State ownership for public recreational uses. And it disclosed that time was running out. Where a lovely 30-mile beach could have been purchased for national seashore park purposes in 1935 at a total cost of $260,000, the cost per mile by 1957 would have been $110,000.

Specific National Park Service studies of the Atlantic and gulf coasts, and then of the Pacific coast, soon followed. These studies furnish the basis for the recommendations contained in the omnibus bill now before the Senate Interior Committee. Senator MURRAY already has ordered public hearings to be held on the Oregon Dunes and Sea-Lion Caves Seashore at Reedsport and Eugene, Oreg., during the first week in October. Hearings are expected slightly later at Padre Island, in Texas. A special Interior Subcommittee headed by Senator ERNEST GRUENING, of Alaska, recently toured the Indiana Dunes region and made on-the-spot observations.

"Our organization regards the rescue of America's majestic shorelines as the most compelling outdoor issue of this era," declares Joseph W. Penfold, conservation director of the Izaak Walton League of America. "It is almost too late now. If we delay for many more years, expenditures to purchase the land not only may be prohibitive but steam shovels and bulldozers will have torn away many dunes and beaches, which can never be restored to their former grandeur and solitude. This is a national problem of great and crucial importance."

Practically all the shorelines proposed as national parks have one essential element in common. They offer outstanding recreational opportunities where land and water meet. Otherwise, they are strikingly different in appearance and character. Padre Island and Indiana Dunes are gleaming white beaches which are comparatively flat as a contour.

By contrast, Oregon Dunes are among the highest billows of sand in the world, and timbered mountains loom in the background. The shorelines of the Great Lakes are caressed by fresh water, whereas the Atlantic and Pacific shorelines are rimmed and crusted with salt.

OPPOSING VIEWS

Controversy surrounds some of the national seashore proposals. Although they are 3,000 miles apart in location, both Cape Cod and Oregon Dunes have witnessed protests by cottage owners, who fear they will be displaced, and by taxpayers' groups, who claim that valuable property will be removed from the tax rolls in order to make room for the parks. In addition, at Indiana Dunes, there are claims by Indiana political leaders that the Lake Michigan strands and inlets might more profitably be made the site of a vast steel mill and ore dock.

Interest in the situation is so great that an enterprising newspaper near the Oregon Dunes, the Eugene Register-Guard, assigned a reporter and photographer to study the Cape Hatteras national seashore, on the opposite side of the continent, along the North Carolina coast. This is the only such shoreline reserve thus far established by Congress. It was set aside some 6 years ago. The writer for the Register-Guard, A. Robert Smith, discovered that many of the arguments then voiced locally against the Cape Hatteras Park were almost identical to those opposing Cape Cod, Oregon Dunes, and Indiana Dunes today.

Mr. Smith reported, however, that many original adversaries of the Cape Hatteras seashore had become its enthusiastic backers, as the years have passed. He also noted that the 100,000 visitors a year who traveled to the area just before the national park was created, burgeoned to 348,000 last year.

A leading banker in the vicinity of the park told Mr. Smith that, while it was true some property had been taken off assessment lists in order to make the park possible, nearby property remaining in private possession had soared in value 50 to 100 times. This more than made up the difference to taxing authorities. "The fishing business is gone," this banker added. "If it hadn't been for the Hatteras Park, I don't know what we would have done."

Senator JAMES E. MURRAY, who has been in the Senate since 1934, has been urging his Interior Committee to hurry in its action on the omnibus national seashore bill. He recently told us that, in the quarter of a century since he entered Congress, costs of acquiring some of this shoreline land actually have gone up as much as 3,000 percent.

"In 1935," Senator MURRAY said, "there was a magnificent 70-mile stretch of ocean beach on the Delaware-Maryland Eastern Shore which could have been acquired for $2 a front foot. Most of this stretch is beyond preservation today. It has already been subdivided and developed." And the cost of the Cape Cod national seashore alone is estimated as approximately $16 million, whereas it might have been purchased a few years ago for less than $9 million.

Dr. Conrad L. Wirth, director of the National Park Service, and his associates hope that some private benefactions may help to ease the pressure on the Treasury in buying the land required to safeguard representative scenic sections of the Atlantic, Gulf of Mexico, Great Lakes, and Pacific coasts. Such a donation occurred in the towering Grand-Tetons 30 years ago, when John D. Rockefeller, Jr., and his family bought up the land around Jackson Lake in Wyoming, which eventually became the citadel of one of our most stirring alpine parks.

Between 1916 and 1958, annual visits by tourists to the national parks of the United States soared from 400,000 to 58 million. If this rate of increase should continue, not even the 20 national shoreline parks sought in our omnibus bill will be sufficient to assure Americans of the future the travel opportunities which ought to be theirs.

Americans Provided Best and Cheapest Food Anywhere in World While Farm Program Has Operated—Benson Works To Destroy This Program—Farmers Enter a New Depression—A Report on Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD D. COOLEY

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 31, 1959

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, as the 1st session of the 86th Congress draws to a close, I feel it is my duty, as chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture, to review for Members of the House the work of our committee and of the Congress in behalf of agriculture and to bring into proper perspective for the Nation the general circumstances of our farmers and their families.

In this session of Congress, as in past sessions, Mr. Ezra Taft Benson, the chief agriculture officer of our country, has placed roadblocks and obstacles in the pathway of progress.

The Secretary of Agriculture has not provided leadership commensurate with the responsibilities of his high office. On the contrary, he has continued his efforts to divide the agricultural forces of our country and to array consumers against producers and to bring the farm program into disrepute. He has not championed the cause of agriculture nor has he demonstrated a willingness to compose differences with those who do not see "eye to eye" with him. He has been stubborn and unrelenting.

Mr. Benson has not presented a single new thought nor has he proposed a single new program, nor has he been courageous enough to advocate the outright repeal of a single law or program which he has so constantly and consistently criticized. He says that he dislikes the production adjustment programs and the price-support programs but when challenged to do so he refuses to advocate the repeal of either. He seeks only to modify the price-support programs and to lower prices to starvation levels.

"Freedom" and bankruptcy for the farmers of America is Mr. Benson's program.

Unfortunately he does not understand the plight of our farmers nor does he understand their problems, and he is definitely not in favor of a Federal farm program for the farmers of our country. He believes in letting the farmer earn his living "by the sweat of his brow" and to live by the harsh and cruel law of supply and demand without any aid or assistance from the Government, such as are extended to other areas of our economy.

Certainly he should know that the farmers of America have mastered the techniques of production and are now capable of producing more food and fiber than the Nation can possibly consume. Unless our farmers are permitted to exercise some control over production our supplies will be abundant, our surpluses will accumulate, prices will deteriorate, and farmers will suffer. He wants the farmer to go it alone while every other great segment of our economy enjoys a high degree of Government protection.

Our Secretary just does not want to understand the farm program which operated successfully for 20 long years and under which our farmers and the people of our Nation prospered. He wants to destroy the program and to permit our farmers to bury themselves beneath the abundance they are capable of producing.

Mr. Speaker, we hear a lot of talk about the administration's farm program. There is no such thing. I have challenged the Secretary, and I now challenge any Member of this House to tell us what the Eisenhower-Benson farm program really is. We know and we understand the program which operated so long and so well and we know that under that program America has been the best fed Nation on earth and we know that the consumers of America have had more, better, and cheaper food than at any other time in all history.

THE CONSUMER

The average worker in the United States in 1958 spent only 25 percent of

his earnings to buy the average amount of food consumed by a family of three. Thirty years earlier the same food would have cost the same worker 48 percent of his earnings.

Over the 30-year period, with farm price support programs in operation in most years, 23 percent of the average worker's earnings has been released by lower food prices for other uses—to improve his home, send his children to college, buy an automobile, and in many ways to increase and dignify his standard of living.

Farmers in no other country of the world have lowered food costs, in relation to workers' earnings, so dramatically. Food costs, in spite of sharp increases in processing and marketing charges, are lower in the United States in terms of workers' wages than anywhere else in the world.

This has been made possible by the great forward strides in farmers' production efficiency, and we may credit the farm program as a dominant factor in bringing about this high level efficiency. With this farm program, the earnings of farmers were raised from the former low levels and they were able to invest in mechanization, in soil improvements, in chemicals, in new plant varieties, and in production methods which previously were impossible because the farmers were so poor.

Mr. Speaker, if all farm program costs had been added to the cost of food in 1958, the average worker would have spent only 26 percent of his earnings for food, as compared with 35 percent for the same food 10 years earlier, 41 percent 20 years earlier, and 48 percent 30 years earlier.

Yet, there is a movement abroad in this country to heap ridicule upon all farm price stabilization and production adjustment programs, and upon farmers as well. The movement aims to prejudice nonfarm people against farm people, and thus to destroy and foreclose a workable program aimed at economic justice for the people who produce our food and fiber.

Mr. Speaker, there are sly and insidious political calculations back of this movement, as some politicians bid for the vote of the cities, deserting our farmers because they now are so few.

THE BENSON PROGRAM

Mr. Benson has conjured up a program without real form or substance, which he glibly alludes to at every opportunity as the route to a free, prosperous, and expanding agriculture. In fact, however, the Benson program is an incredibly inadequate proposal involving unlimited free production, higher Government costs, and lower prices to farmers. The nearer he has moved agriculture toward his philosophy, the poorer our farmers have become.

The Secretary during his tenure has spent more money than the accumulated total expenditures by all his predecessors in this office during the prior 90-year history of the Department of Agriculture.

Yet in these 6½ years the net income of our farmers has been almost $20 billion less than in the 6½ years prior to his taking office. The earnings of our people in agriculture have been reduced drastically, while other areas of our Nation's economy have experienced unprecedented prosperity. Moreover, Government investments in surplus farm commodities have increased more than threefold, from $2,452 million on January 1, 1953 to $9 billion by the latest report.

And now the stage is set, as a result of Mr. Benson's dreamworld economic theories, for an even greater farm debacle within the next 2 years. Prices received by farmers are in a new downward swirl. They stand now at a level 17 percent below 1952. Hog prices have joined in the decline, falling in July to the lowest level for that month since July 1944. Economists are predicting a slide in beef cattle prices in the months ahead.

The situation demands action.

THE VETO

But, Mr. Speaker, the unyielding, uncompromising, negative position of Mr. Benson and this administration has brought about a paralysis in Washington where the interests of our farmers are concerned.

The veto power of the President, placed at Mr. Benson's disposal, has been raised as an absolute barrier between the farmers and their Government.

The President himself, in a special farm message shortly after this Congress convened, proposed further retreat of the Government from responsibility in the price stability of agriculture and from farm production adjustment undertakings. He called for outright repeal of the parity principle, which is the only means under law to determine a fair relationship of farm prices and costs to the total of the Nation's economy.

Notwithstanding the President's pronouncements, this Congress set out with earnestness and dedication to arrest the 6-year deterioration of our agricultural economy, and to return our farmers nearer to a parity position in our free enterprise society.

But, Mr. Speaker, it soon became crystal clear that no bill could become law unless it hewed to the line laid down by the President. Our efforts were scuttled by the President's negative power—the veto.

WHEAT NO. 1 PROBLEM

It was evident to the Congress and to the President, when this Congress convened, that the great accumulation of wheat surpluses presented the Nation with its No. 1 farm problem. The Congress passed a bill cutting the wheat acreage in 1960 by 25 percent below 1959. It would have brought wheat plantings down to 41 million acres and would have reduced production substantially. This would have been less than half the 84 million acres our farmers seeded to wheat 10 years ago. The legislation represented a willingness of our farmers to assume great sacrifices to bring down the wheat surplus.

The President vetoed the bill.

He condemned the legislation because it included price supports which sought to prevent great hardships to wheat farmers while they were reducing their crops so severely. He did this in the face of a Department of Agriculture statement that the price support would not influence the price of bread, and despite a sound showing that the legislation would save the Government and taxpayers approximately a half billion dollars over a 2-year period.

By this action the President has assumed full responsibility for the future buildup in wheat surpluses and for the huge costs of financing these extraordinary supplies.

TOBACCO BILL

The Congress passed a tobacco bill, the effect of which was to prevent increases in the support prices of tobacco, so that our tobacco might continue to compete pricewise in world markets. All interests in the tobacco industry supported the legislation.

The President vetoed this bill. I never have understood why.

Our Committee on Agriculture held hearings on long-range farm program proposals in an effort to bring general farm legislation before this session of the Congress. We sought to halt the dangerous decline in farm prices and to restore agriculture to an equitable position in the general economy. We would not accept the administration's proposals for agriculture. As a consequence, we were unable to develop legislation which would meet with the President's approval. The farmer does not now have, in the political alinement existing in the Congress, sufficient strength for a two-thirds vote in both Houses to override a veto of legislation in his interest.

Nevertheless, Mr. Speaker, the deep concern of the Members of this House for the well-being of agriculture is spread vividly in the records of our committee. I have been especially impressed and pleased by the dedicated work in behalf of agriculture by the newly elected Members of this body. Our committee records show that Members of the House have introduced to this date in the first session of the 86th Congress 461 bills dealing with conditions on our farms.

Our committee held 113 sessions.

We reviewed these bills and sent 118 to the Secretary, to determine his position upon them. Mr. Benson approved only eight of these bills, and most of these were of a minor nature. He disapproved, proposed changes, or did not report at all, with respect to all the others. He rejected all legislation proposing fundamental improvements in the operation of farm laws to increase the income of farm families.

In fact, Mr. Benson's predisposition to oppose everything would be comical, if it were not so tragic.

SCHOOL MILK

He went so far as to send his assistants before our committee to oppose an additional national authorization of $3 million for the special school milk program, without which the program through which milk is supplied to children would have been closed down in many schools before the last school term ended. We passed the authorization bill, Mr. Benson notwithstanding and, not risking a chance of being overriden in the Con-

gress on a milk-for-schoolchildren issue, the President signed it.

CORN GLUT

Early in the session it became evident that Mr. Benson's action drastically reducing the prices of oats, rye, barley, and barley and grain sorghums would severely aggravate the feed surplus situation, by influencing a shift from these small grains to the production of corn. To remedy this our committee developed a bill which would have balanced the price supports of the small grains to their feed value relationship with corn. The Secretary opposed this legislation. And now there is in prospect the largest corn crop in history, to add to the surplus and create graver problems for the livestock industry in the years ahead.

INDUSTRIAL USE RESEARCH

In the Agricultural Act of 1956 the Congress provided for the establishment of a Commission to examine the possibilities of new markets by increasing research in industrial uses of the products of our farms. The Commission made its recommendations. The administration opposed the legislation embracing these recommendations. Our committee worked throughout the session to develop legislation Mr. Benson would accept.

EGGS AND BROILERS

Our poultry industry suffered a price disaster in the spring of this year. It was ironic that the President, in his January farm message condemning the farm price support program, had singled out the poultry industry specifically as an example in agriculture where prosperity abided without the help of Government. Many hundreds and perhaps thousands of family enterprises in poultry were wiped out by the price debacle. The poultrymen appealed to the Congress and to Mr. Benson for help. Mr. Benson opposed legislation to deal with the long-range problems of the industry. He refused to ease the egg market glut by using funds which already were available to buy laying hens, although the product could have been used in a substantial way to improve the school lunch and relief food programs. He did inaugurate a modest egg-buying program, the effect of which came too late to aid many family poultry farms.

REA AND THE VETO

The Congress approved a bill to return to the Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration the full loan-making authority, so that such authority would not rest with an unsympathetic appointee of the Secretary of Agriculture. Mr. Benson opposed the bill. The President vetoed it. The Senate voted to override, but the House failed to cast the necessary two-thirds vote to set aside the veto.

FOOD FOR THE NEEDY

Many bills were presented to provide for more effective distribution of surplus foods, through a food stamp plan, among needy people. Mr. Benson opposed all these bills.

COUNTRY LIFE COMMISSION

The bill to establish a bipartisan Country Life Commission, to study the most pressing problems of the changing rural scene, drew a neutral report from the Department of Agriculture. This Commission would have been similar in its operations to one appointed by President Theodore Roosevelt in the early part of the century and which made recommendations which brought about substantial improvements in the farm economy and in country living.

HOGS

As the autumn marketing season approached, it became increasingly clear that a crisis was building up in farmer prices for hogs. When July prices for hogs dropped to the lowest level for that month in 15 years there no longer was any doubt that positive measures should be taken to forestall a price catastrophe which might bring grave consequences to the economy of the Midwest and in some other areas of the Nation. Several bills were introduced, proposing various ways of dealing with the situation. Our committee brought up for consideration the bills proposing a program of incentive payments to encourage the marketing of lightweight hogs and thereby ease market gluts. This approach was supported by the National Planning Association, a nonpartisan body. Mr. Benson opposed it. Our committee reported a bill embracing this approach to the hog price problem, but with the opposition of the administration it did not become law.

The Secretary of Agriculture has surplus removal funds already available to initiate a pork purchase program, with the pork to be used in schools and for relief food. It is my hope that he will use his authority and the funds the Congress has provided, in the manner and to the extent necessary, to maintain the maximum stability in the hog markets under the pressures of huge supplies during the impending marketing season. Our bill encouraging lightweight marketings would deal more effectively with the problem, at smaller expense, with the major benefits going to farmers rather than to meat processors; but the Secretary can do an effective job with the authority and funds already at hand, if he will use them wisely.

We have sent to the Secretary, in this and previous Congresses, bills proposing revisions in the present price support and production adjustment program. We forwarded to him bills proposing two-price or domestic parity systems for various commodities which would let these crops move competitively into world markets while maintaining a reasonable price in our domestic markets. We sent to him proposals for production payments, compensatory payments, or marketing equalization payments to farmers. He has returned them with the Department's stamp of disapproval.

In these circumstances I have set forth, Mr. Speaker, we have been unable to put on our statute books the public policies so sorely needed to stop the piling of surplus upon surplus, reduce Government costs and to arrest the new and deeper depression that is settling upon our farms.

ACCOMPLISHMENTS

We have, however, brought forward, with the prospect of Presidential approval, legislation to extend and improve Public Law 480, the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act. This bill embraces a section calling upon the Secretary to initiate a food stamp plan for a more adequate distribution of surplus foods among needy people. It includes another section which should prevent the destruction of the extra long staple cotton production industry in the United States. I hope that when the President signs the Public Law 480 extension bill it will include these provisions, although his Secretary vigorously opposes any food stamp plan.

We passed and the President signed legislation important to cotton producers, in that it provides a sound base for making cotton acreage allotments.

Legislation was enacted to assure the operation of special school milk program throughout the last school term, and the authorization for this program was increased by $6 million to $81 million for the school term now commencing and by $9 million to $84 million for the 1960–61 school term.

We took steps to improve farm credit operations, crop insurance, pest control and several other laws important to agriculture.

We approved numerous watershed projects, for soil and water conservation.

Mr. Speaker, while our efforts to write general farm legislation have been thwarted by the administration, our studies and our work should be of substantial value in the development of sound farm policies when we have an administration sympathetic to the needs of the people who produce our food and fiber.

I would remind the House that before Mr. Benson became the Secretary of Agriculture we had a farm program under which for 11 consecutive years the average prices paid to farmers were at or above 100 percent of parity. I would point out that this program operated for two decades prior to 1953 at an actual profit of $13 million on Commodity Credit Corporation price supports for the basic crops. CCC operations for all crops including perishables and nonperishables, cost only $1,064 million over a 20-year period.

This program which worked so long and so well, at so little expense, now is a virtual shambles.

THE GOVERNMENT AND FARMERS

Mr. Speaker, our Government has given labor the minimum-wage and collective-bargaining laws. We have clothed industry with the corporate structure and the many Federal and State statutes which regulate competition. With the help of these Government aids and regulations, both labor and industry have built up a marketing structure which maintains price and wage rates at balanced levels while adjusting supply to demand. How, then, can the modern, highly mechanized farmer survive, when he must do all his buying in the protected market of industry and labor, and do all his own selling at auction, with no protection?

Surely our national interest requires that we have a farm program which will enable farmers to adjust their marketing to available outlets and demand—

at prices in line with their costs, as is essential in any successful business.

Now, in conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I say this:

The well-being of agriculture is a matter of concern to all the people. Our Government research, conservation, and educational programs, combined with the intelligence and labor of our farmers, have given us the most efficient agricultural production in the world. They are giving consumers the cheapest food—in relation to wages—on record. Our farm marketing and pricing machinery, however, is woefully behind the times. Without governmental assistance in the marketing and pricing fields, the exploding production technology on our farms will surely proceed to create a disastrous economic situation for agriculture.

Government cannot now stand by while propagandists cry that all old programs have failed and all new programs are doomed to failure. This Government of ours, representing all the people, cannot say there is nothing it can do to avert the impending economic misery of the farmer. This Government can and must act to salvage some economic justice and stability for farmers—and protect everyone against the ruinous imbalance arising from the abnormal rate of technological advances in production, in relation to available market outlets.

This Government has a moral, an ethical, an inherent, and a constitutional obligation to establish public policies and programs that will open to the men and women of agriculture the opportunity for fair returns on their management, their risks, their capital investment, and their labor on a basis comparable with the workers in all other undertakings in this free enterprise economy and in this democratic society.

The safety, the health, the aspirations of all the people—the strength of our Nation—demand this.

District Juvenile Judges

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ERNEST WHARTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 31, 1959

Mr. WHARTON. Mr. Speaker, my remarks are no doubt prompted by the fact of my many years experience and connection with juvenile courts but I recall that my first impression of the Federal City was utter amazement when I learned that we have but one children's court judge. Even assuming the highest type of citizen, this would seem entirely inadequate and after due observation I would not characterize the juvenile court situation as bordering on the ridiculous. In neglecting this court we have invited an increase in the crime rate and it is a serious one.

A good juvenile judge should be about 30 percent judge, one-third probation officer and social worker and the remainder a sounding board for beatniks and teen-agers in their relations with society and the general public. In juvenile court the calendar should be clear from day to day. Here is a court where cases cannot be put off for 6 months, or even 6 days. These misguided and ill-advised young people are running up the criminal statistics by leaps and bounds. Many psychopathic cases find their way into the court.

If you want ot know what accounts for the rapidly rising crime rate, just call in a juvenile judge. However, with a single juvenile judge in the entire District of Columbia, I can assure you he has little time to appear before congressional committees, and there is ample work for several judges here.

In this connection let us take note of the statement of a Democratic Senator from Oregon on last Sunday's television program and not be "a Congress of mistaken judgment."

Rescue the World Court

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRIS B. McDOWELL, JR.

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 31, 1959

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, last week, in a major speech which he delivered at the 82d annual meeting of the American Bar Association, the U.S. Attorney General William P. Rogers called for repeal of the so-called Connally amendment.

Under this amendment the United States decides for itself what disputes it will put before the International Court of Justice.

It is this amendment, Attorney General Rogers said, which is partly to blame for the minor role the Court has taken in settling international disputes. In its 13 years of operation, it has decided only 17 major cases.

Those lawyers who heard the speech say it was the strongest plea to date by any top official of the Eisenhower administration for repeal of the amendment.

The Attorney General pointed out that France recently withdrew a similar provision and that now the United States is alone among 10 NATO nations to continue to insist on such a reservation.

President Eisenhower told the Congress in his state of the Union message that U.S. relations with the World Court should be reexamined "to the end that the rule of law may replace the rule of force in the affairs of nations."

Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY and I have introduced resolutions calling on the Senate of the United States to repeal the Connally amendment. The State Department has endorsed our proposal, but nothing much else had happened until the speech by Attorney General Rogers.

I am delighted that the Attorney General has now come forward to support this important step.

I include here the text of my House Resolution 267, an editorial from the Washington Post of August 24, 1959, and the text of the splendid speech by the Attorney General of the United States to which I have referred:

HOUSE RESOLUTION 267

Resolved, That it is the sense of the House of Representatives that the determination of whether an international dispute to which the United States is a party involves matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of the United States, and is therefore not within the compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice, should be made by the Court itself rather than by the United States; and that any provision of law or resolution to the contrary should be repealed or otherwise nullified.

[From the Washington Post, Aug. 24, 1959]

RESCUE THE WORLD COURT

What has happened to the movement to rescue the World Court? A few months ago a considerable head of steam was built up behind the demand for repeal of the Connally amendment, which has gravely limited the usefulness of the Court. President Eisenhower had said in his state of the Union message that U.S. relations with the World Court should be reexamined "to the end that the rule of law may replace the rule of force in the affairs of nations." Vice President NIXON, Charles S. Rhyne, past president of the American Bar Association, and others stirred up a great deal of interest in the subject. Senator HUMPHREY introduced a resolution to repeal the Connally amendment. The State Department endorsed the resolution in a letter to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee in April, and since then the proposal has not moved off dead center.

This is especially unfortunate because it leaves the United States in the position of holding back in the drive for substitution of judicial processes for force in the settlement of international disputes. This country can and does suggest that many international controversies be decided by the World Court, but it is an empty gesture. Through the Connally amendment the Senate asserted the right for this country to decide for itself in each case whether any dispute laid before the World Court is within its domestic jurisdiction. That gives every other country against which the United States may bring a case in the World Court a similar right to escape a judicial determination by asserting that the case is domestic regardless of what may be involved.

Every reason of justice and self-interest cries for removal of this court-crippling device. It would be especially salutary if President Eisenhower could inform our allies on his forthcoming visit and Premier Khrushchev on his September tour that the United States is accepting the compulsory jurisdiction of the World Court, without any strings attached.

Responsibility for the present inaction seems to be shared about equally by the administration and the Foreign Relations Committee (which reportedly is reluctant to move because of opposition mail). In any event, the President is in the best position to break the deadlock. Why doesn't he send up a rousing message asking for immediate passage of the Humphrey resolution as a means of striking a blow for world law.

ADDRESS BY HON. WILLIAM P. ROGERS, ATTORNEY GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES, BEFORE THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY, 82D ANNUAL MEETING, AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION, MIAMI BEACH, FLA., AUGUST 26, 1959

It is a great honor and privilege again to address the annual meeting of the American Bar Association. This association is the largest and most influential group in the

legal profession. What you think and do has a significant impact on the administration of justice and on public affairs.

We in the Department of Justice have a common objective with you in seeking constantly to improve our system of justice so that it may better serve the people of our Nation. In pursuit of this objective there may be, on occasion, an action taken or a statement made by this association, or one of its numerous committees, with which we are not in full accord. But I want you to know that I am well aware, particularly from reading some of my mail from you, that this occasional lack of togetherness is mutual.

Notwithstanding any infrequent minor differences, we in the Department know that the American Bar Association is earnestly and effectively striving to improve our profession and has made significant and important contributions to that end. The support you have given to the Department of Justice, especially in certain difficult and sensitive areas, has been of the highest order and I want you to know that I, and all of us in the Department, sincerely appreciate it. May I also commend the association for its splendid record of achievement this year under the outstanding leadership of your president, Ross Malone.

What is the responsibility of our profession in today's world? As I see it there are two broad areas to be considered.

First, the administration of justice in the United States is on display in every part of the world. When we talk about competing with international communism in the realm of ideas, we are talking in large measure about the ideas which are the basis of our legal system.

Second, in the long view the main hope for peace is that nations will be wise enough not to rely on sheer strength in dealing with each other but will move toward establishing systems based on considerations of law and justice in the resolution of international disputes. Nations have readily paid lipservice to the soundness of this proposition but progress in this area has been tragically slow.

Dramatic events in the past few weeks and those indicated in weeks to come suggest that we are at a point in our international relations at which our profession will have new opportunities to serve our Nation in these two areas.

As to the first, although Soviet leaders are still firmly committed to the policy of world domination there is hope today that they may be willing to permit a freer flow of ideas between our two countries than they have in the past. For this reason I believe the time has come when we should act and speak more vigorously and effectively for those ideals and ideas which have given this country its strength. People throughout the world, even to some extent in the areas controlled by the Soviet Union, may have an opportunity to get a more accurate picture of America and the meaning of justice and freedom here as contrasted with the Soviet Union.

In this international competition we must not fall into the trap of emphasizing material considerations to the exclusion of all else. To some of the uncommitted nations of the world the Soviet system of state controls and planning may seem attractive. The Russians point to the fact that their economic system has been applied in a country which was initially very backward in technology, with a low standard of living compared to the West. Because a similar situation exists to some degree in several of the new nations of the world, they see a parallel that has some surface attraction.

But the situation is different when it comes to the appeal of ideas. Freedom under law is one of the most powerful ideas ever conceived by the mind of man. Its appeal will continue to grow in the uncommitted nations of the world. It has not been too long since many of these nations completed their successful struggle for independence. With national freedom there has arisen a great awareness of and interest in the concept of individual freedom. Thus the free world has an unusual opportunity in the years ahead to place in bold relief the weaknesses of the Soviet system compared with the strength of ours.

Why does the legal profession have a responsibility for this? Because we are daily involved in the proceses of justice, and its administration is our business. We are officers of the courts of the United States and should be the leading spokesmen for presenting the case of freedom to the world. The merits of the case have to be articulated more effectively than has been done in the past. In the world in which we live it is not enough to be convinced that our system holds forth the greatest promise of individual liberty for people all over the world. We should present the true picture of a system of liberty under law to those who do not fully understand it or who may have been misled by Soviet propaganda. This must be done so that people will realize the importance of maintaining free governments and not succumb to the Soviet scheme for world domination.

These are a few of the truths which need to be dramatized:

1. We cannot rest our case on the size and productivity of our farms, factories, and mines, nor even on the excellent wages and working conditions of the American people. These are important, but they are the byproduct of freedom—not its source. The source of strength in a democracy is the freedom of the individual to think, speak, and do the things he decides to do as long as he does not transgress the rights of others. We must point out, too, that these freedoms are not a matter of grace but are guaranteed and protected by our legal system.

2. The land and the tools of production in our Nation are owned by the people, not by the Government as in Russia. It should be emphasized that our legal system protects this ownership against intrusion by any other individual or by the Government itself. Under this system in which the free initiative of the individual plays the major role the United States has achieved the greatest distribution of wealth among its people and has come closest to the ideal of prosperity for all.

3. We are a government of law, not of men. Regardless of wealth, power or station, no one is above the law in the United States. For this reason our people need never fear that they may become the victims of ruthless political leaders. Thus the fact, now generally conceded by everyone, that under Stalin thousands of innocent victims were killed and tortured in the Soviet Union, seems almost beyond belief to a free people. Yet, because the law in the Soviet Union is what the Communist Party says it is, many of those who acted in concert with Stalin in perpetrating these atrocities apparently have not been prosecuted nor has retribution been made for the wrongs committed.

4. We must constantly emphasize that the will of the people is controlling in the United States. Under our legal system public officials are responsive to the will of the people. Our Nation will never start a war because our people fervently want peace. Anyone who believes that our Nation might act in a manner inconsistent with the will of the people in maintaining peace is ignorant about how our system works.

These are merely a few ideas which can be emphasized. There are a great many others, of course, with which we are all familiar and with which you and this association will be concerned in the future. For the past several years this association has done an excellent job in awakening the public to the significance of the rule of law. I commend you particularly for the vigor and imagination with which you are planning to cooperate in the future with the legal professions of many other nations to intensify interest and support for the rule of law in resolving international disputes.

President Eisenhower expressed the thought well in his letter to Mr. Malone when he said:

"Peace cannot prevail until men and nations recognize that their conduct must be governed by respect for and observance of the law. The American Bar Association by seeking to promote this principle is helping to advance the cause of enduring peace in the world."

In this connection we should keep in mind that there is a good likelihood that the exchange programs between East and West will continue, and may even be expanded in the future. As you know, the exchange programs now in effect include representatives from industry, agriculture, medicine, student groups, the arts and sciences, athletics, and many other fields, but there has been little exchange between members of the legal profession.

It is my opinion that the legal profession should give its support to a carefully planned exchange program of lawyers and judges in order that the Soviets may study our constitutional system and the operation of our courts and that we be given an opportunity to study the system in effect in the Soviet Union. Because of fundamental differences the systems are in no sense similar but exchanges would provide a method for our profession to increase its knowledge of their system. At the same time there may be some value in having the Russians who come to our country judge for themselves the comparative merits of the two systems. In any event the exchanges would provide a means to dramatize more effectively to the rest of the world the contrast between a free system of government and a regimented system under Communist control.

Turning now to the second area, I believe we have a responsibility to work for the establishment of systems of law and justice to deal with international disputes.

In his state of the Union message this year, President Eisenhower said:

"It is my purpose to intensify efforts during the coming 2 years in seeking ways to supplement the procedures of the United Nations and other bodies with similar objectives, to the end that the rule of law may replace the rule of force in the affairs of nations."

The attainment of this high goal will not be achieved by any single stroke or by any single government. In fact, because the Soviet Union seems intent on world domination which is the antithesis of the rule of law, the concept is apt to seem illusory and of no practical importance in today's world.

The point to bear in mind is that there is no other way to travel which provides hope for peace. Despite the discouragements which may arise the United States must take the lead in an effort to make progress along this road. Certainly, in the foreseeable future, if it is necessary to live in a world in which the settlement of international disputes will depend principally on factors of terror rather than on justice, then we should make it clear that such an uncivilized stalemate is not of our choosing.

Following the state of the Union message, and as part of the intensification of effort referred to by the President, both Secretary of State Dulles and Secretary of State Herter supported a proposal in the Senate of the United States to strengthen the International Court of Justice by repealing the so-called Connally amendment.

This Court, as you know, was created by the United Nations in 1945 to decide legal disputes between nations. It sits at The Hague and is composed of 15 judges elected by the General Assembly and the Security Council of the United Nations.

When established, the Court appeared to hold great promise, but through no fault of its own it has played a minor role in the settlement of international legal disputes. In its 13 years of existence it has decided only 17 contentious cases.

The Court has suffered because some nations have refused to accept the Court's jurisdiction at all and as to many disputes it has no jurisdiction unless the nations agree that it has in the particular case. The blame—some might prefer to use the word responsibility—for this latter condition rests in some degree, at least, on the United States.

The United States accepted the jurisdiction of the International Court in 1946. The history of our declaration of acceptance is significant.

The resolution introduced in the Senate with bipartisan support contained a reservation excluding from the Court's jurisdiction "disputes with regard to matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of the United States."

Public hearings were conducted on the resolution in this form, and it was unanimously endorsed by the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations. Its report stated:

"The question of what is properly a matter of international law is, in case of dispute, appropriate for decision by the Court itself, since, if it were left to the decision of each individual state, it would be possible to withhold any case from adjudication on the plea that it is a matter of domestic jurisdiction."

Nevertheless, on the floor of the Senate the Connally amendment was adopted adding to our reservation the clause "as determined by the United States of America."

Thus, in the declaration of acceptance by the United States our reservation is that the Court shall not have jurisdiction of "disputes with regard to matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of the United States of America as determined by the United States of America."

We were the first Nation to provide that the jurisdiction of the Court should be determined not by the Court but by us. Following our example seven other nations made similar reservations.

Furthermore, the rule of reciprocity applies so that any nation may invoke the terms of the reservations of any nation with which it is involved in a dispute.

It is plain to see why the existence of this type of reservation has had an impact on the effectiveness of the Court. Imagine the impairment which would result to the court system in the United States if the defendant in a law suit had the right to determine for himself whether his case was within the court's jurisdiction.

The Court's statute explicitly limits its jurisdiction to international legal disputes. By the plain terms of the grant, it has no jurisdiction over domestic matters. So the "as determined by the United States of America" clause adds up, in the eyes of other nations at least, to a vote of no confidence that the Court will limit the cases it hears to those within its jurisdiction.

There are those who are concerned that the Court might exceed its jurisdiction. It is argued that our sovereignty might thus be impaired. As a practical matter the argument as to possible loss of sovereignty is not persuasive.

The International Court of Justice, in the final analysis, depends largely on world opinion for the enforcement of its decisions—in fact, for the participation of the nations. It has carefully stayed within the limits of its jurisdiction as provided by its basic statute. There is no reason to believe that the Court would invade areas properly reserved to domestic jurisdiction.

In July of this year, France, surely as sensitive as we are in matters of sovereignty, withdrew her reservation containing the equivalent of the Connally amendment.

Thus, today six NATO nations have not even deemed it necessary to make any express reservation with respect to domestic disputes. Three others—Canada, Great Britain, and now France—have done nothing more than make explicit the exclusion of domestic questions from the Court's jurisdiction. Hence, of the 10 NATO nations which have accepted the Court's jurisdiction, the United States is the only one which denies to the Court the right to determine its own jurisdiction.

For more than 50 years our statesmen have advocated an impartial international court to decide disputes between nations. In 1907, Secretary of State Elihu Root, in his instructions to our delegates at the Second Peace Conference at The Hague, said we should develop a permanent tribunal composed of judges who will devote their entire time to the trial and decision of international causes by judicial methods.

In 1925, President Coolidge, in his inaugural address, advocated the "establishment of a tribunal for the administration of evenhanded justice between nation and nation." As he put it, "The weight of our enormous influence must be cast upon the side of a reign, not of force but of law and trial, not by battle but by reason."

Every President since World War I has advocated the submission of international legal disputes to a judicial tribunal.

A half century of debate has resulted in little progress. It must be obvious to everyone that action in this field is long overdue. That is why our profession should urge the Senate of the United States to act at the earliest possible time on this important matter of the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice.

Finally, let me turn for a moment to the question of international agreements. The nations of the world today are in almost constant discussion and negotiation at the conference table. The purpose of the meetings is to arrive at agreements for the settlement of critical world problems.

From the standpoint of a lawyer, it is discouraging to see how often in important international agreements no provision is made for settling disputes which may arise about the interpretation of the agreement.

And an agreement, as every lawyer knows, may solve a lot of problems or may cause a lot of problems. It depends on how well the agreement is drafted and on the frame of mind of the parties to it.

Lawyers know, too, that it is not possible to draft an agreement to eliminate all possible future differences as to its meaning which might arise.

For that reason, even after exercising all possible care in drafting agreements, we know there must be a court—or at least some method agreed upon by the parties—to resolve disputes which may arise as to the interpretation of agreements.

The same principle, of course, applies to nations. For when two or more nations make an agreement, notwithstanding every effort to make the agreement as clear as possible, they know that disputes about the interpretation of it may arise. If no provision is made for disposition of these disputes, each nation will naturally insist on interpreting the agreement for itself. Thus, rather than resolving differences, the agreement may give rise to new tensions and recriminations.

Last April the Vice President in a significant address urged that the United States take the initiative in future agreements to secure the inclusion of provisions to the effect "(1) that disputes which may arise as to the interpretation of the agreement should be submitted to the International Court of Justice at The Hague; and (2) that the nations signing the agreement should be bound by the decision of the Court in such cases."

Certainly this basic idea deserves our support. A well-understood policy among nations to refer disputes with respect to the interpretation of treaties and other international agreements to the International Court of Justice, or some other impartial tribunal, would be a great step forward on the road to a rule of law among nations.

Knowing that an impartial tribunal would resolve any dispute as to meaning would strengthen the force of the agreement and cause less controversy about it.

The fact that we may not be successful in securing agreement to such a clause in all cases does not mean that we should fail to try. The fact that the Soviets, for example, might not agree to such a policy is no ground for not advocating it. The more often the Soviets oppose reasonable methods to solve world tensions, the more the nations of the world will come to recognize the significance of the Soviet policy of world domination.

For the reasons I have indicated, I hope that the American Bar Association will continue to give its vigorous support to the rule of law in the resolution of international disputes.

No one need point out that because of the present Soviet policy this seems less like a goal than a mirage. Nevertheless, we must believe in it and we must believe it is possible to attain. More than that, we must make some progress along this road.

Our Nation has no goal of world conquest, no intention of infringing the liberties of any people, and no desire other than to deal justly with the other nations of the earth. But there are persons in the world who are skeptical about this. Thus I believe that the members of our profession should make clear beyond any doubt that the United States has but this single goal—that the family of nations may live together in peace under law.