

beverages be banned from radio, television, newspapers, and magazines; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

465. Also, petition of Mr. and Mrs. Harold Curtis, and members and friends of the Women's Christian Temperance Union of Ferndale, Wash., in support of legislation prohibiting the mailing of obscene literature to persons under 19 years of age; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

466. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the secretary, Governors' Conference, Chicago, Ill., relative to resolution adopted at the Western Governors' Conference held at Colorado Springs, Colo., February 26, 1958, recommending passage of legislation granting statehood for Alaska and Hawaii; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

467. Also, petition of the secretary, Governors' Conference, Chicago, Ill., relative to resolution adopted at the Western Governors' Conference held at Colorado Springs, Colo., February 26, 1958, recommending highway mileage allocation for Hawaii; to the Committee on Public Works.

468. Also, petition of the city clerk, Trenton, N. J., relative to the Board of Commissioners of the City of Trenton, N. J., going on record as being in favor of pay increases for postal workers and all Federal employees recommended by the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

469. Also, petition of the chief clerk of the council, Philadelphia, Pa., requesting favor-

able consideration of the omnibus rivers, harbors, and flood control authorization bill (S. 497), which provides for the improvement of anchorages between Philadelphia and the sea; to the Committee on Public Works.

470. Also, petition of the clerk of the city council, Reno, Nev., requesting the Bureau of Public Roads to take necessary action to expedite the approval of the Third Street route so as to cause the survey and construction of said highway to become a link in the chain of highways across the Nation; to the Committee on Public Works.

471. Also, petition of the president, Alaska National Guard Officers' Association, Anchorage, Alaska, urging the granting of immediate statehood to the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

In Defense of Secretary Benson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDGAR W. HIESTAND

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 10, 1958

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, rarely has a Cabinet member been vilified as much as Ezra Taft Benson.

As Secretary of Agriculture during one of the most critical periods in the history of American farming, Benson has been badgered constantly by pressure groups and free spenders who charge "he has not done enough for the farmer," while at the same time housewives and wage earners blame him because their food bills are at sputnik levels.

It is time to check the facts.

First, we must realize that Congress, not the administration, makes the laws. The Secretary of Agriculture has a right to propose, or oppose, laws while they are being made, but Congress does not have to take his suggestions. Furthermore, once the laws are on the books he has no choice but to enforce them.

Congress has been tampering with the farm economy for years, ever since it passed the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933. Controls, rigid supports, acreage allotments, conservation programs—all passed originally as "emergency programs"—have been held over and each year Congress adds new variations and twists.

The result has been hodgepodge legislation which has cost the overwhelming majority of Americans billions of tax dollars to support a farm minority which generally neither needs nor wants these farm laws and their modifications.

The farm economy is so inseparably interwoven with the rest of the national production pattern that this constant meddling by Congress has gone too far to throw out the whole mess of laws and just start over, nice as that sounds.

Instead, Benson has had to treat the effects of the laws rather than the causes. He has had President Eisenhower's full blessing in trying to untangle the problems.

But Congress under Democratic control has been hostile in the extreme. A recent hearing before the Senate Agri-

culture Committee was an example. Benson began to read a statement incorporating the major part of his 1959 farm plans. He was set upon immediately by Members of the majority side who seized this chance to belabor Benson and the administration. What they offered in return were the same outmoded, unworkable system of high, rigid price supports which have been responsible for the overwhelming surpluses and for the climbing costs of farm products.

With complete disrespect for the housewife and her husband's paycheck, these Senators lashed Benson with vicious personal attacks and smears because of his program. Mobilized behind these Senators are farm pressure groups, spearheaded by the radical Farmers' Union, which to date have been so powerful that it was political suicide for a farm-State officeholder to oppose them.

Nevertheless there are indications that in this session of Congress the farm bloc will not be so united as heretofore. Even with huge subsidies, the Democrats' farm program has forced poverty on a great segment of the farm population, especially the small farmer. The hard facts are that a large percentage of the money that is being paid out in subsidies is going to the wealthy farmer with large-acreage holdings. This goes to emphasize the inequity of the present laws.

No one knows better than Benson that any Government subsidy is unsound. Where his proposals have gone into effect through the years, they have worked. Surplus holdings in the hands of Government were reduced last year. Three-fourths of our farms are owned by those who operate them, the highest percentage on record. Farm net income stabilized from a year ago, and farm real estate prices moved to the highest on record. But still the outmoded laws are being handed to him to enforce.

There is hope that this year there may be a little change. The administration's farm program which was presented by President Eisenhower on January 16 has several first-rate features. And as mentioned earlier, there are chinks in the solidity of the farm bloc. This may be a year for the food buyer as well as the food grower.

Ezra Taft Benson was a Mormon clergyman before taking office as Secre-

tary. He took the job only on assurance from President Eisenhower that it was a spiritual duty to restore the faith of the American people in the integrity of their Government and the farm economy.

If he falls in this duty, it will not be for lack of trying but for lack of votes on the Democratic side of the aisle.

Allan E. Pestcoe, Science Talent Search Award Winner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 10, 1958

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, Allan E. Pestcoe, 17, a high-school senior from Miami Beach, Fla., has been in Washington February 27 through March 3, as one of 40 most promising research scientists in America's high schools selected in the 17th annual science talent search conducted for the Westinghouse science scholarships and awards by science clubs of America. He was invited to Washington for an all-expense trip along with other winners from 19 States and the District of Columbia chosen by judges from among 25,039 contestants.

As his qualifying scientific projects, he investigated the effects of 2,4-D, a commonly used plant spray, on the absorption of sulfur in plants and has determined the movement rates of sulfur and phosphorus in leaves. Both projects were carried out in the radioisotopes laboratory in his high school and are reported in his required search paper. As student director of the laboratory, he has helped to design and build a gamma-ray chamber and to adapt Atomic Energy Commission handbook procedures to the equipment available to the students. He is now planning the construction of a small heavy-ion linear accelerator.

The son of Mr. and Mrs. Harry Pestcoe, 6375 Indian Creek Drive, Miami Beach, Allan would like to attend the California Institute of Technology following his graduation this year from Miami Beach High School.

I feel his unusual scientific ability is certainly well evidenced by these very able activities. In this era of great scientific emphasis, I take pleasure in congratulating him and commending his efforts to my colleagues' attention.

Surplus Property for Science Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 10, 1958

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, on January 27, 1958, I inserted in the RECORD at pages 1131-1132 some data indicating that interested executive agencies were cooperating in an effort to break a number of bottlenecks to increase the amount of surplus property made available for educational, health, and civil defense purposes.

I have been pleased to note that the allocations of property for the month of January 1958 have increased to an all-time high of \$29,078,312. The latest report from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare indicates the following allocation of property by States:

Total property allocated to the States, by regions and States

Region I:	
Connecticut.....	\$577,335
Maine.....	101,227
Massachusetts.....	322,180
New Hampshire.....	57,229
Rhode Island.....	92,617
Vermont.....	69,764
Total.....	1,220,352
Region II:	
Delaware.....	89,970
New Jersey.....	592,029
New York.....	2,161,158
Pennsylvania.....	917,960
Total.....	3,761,117
Region III:	
District of Columbia.....	\$104,184
Kentucky.....	325,687
Maryland.....	521,228
North Carolina.....	1,204,070
Virginia.....	416,049
West Virginia.....	443,900
Puerto Rico.....	107,773
Virgin Islands.....	
Total.....	3,122,891
Region IV:	
Alabama.....	473,766
Florida.....	497,288
Georgia.....	644,637
Mississippi.....	306,806
South Carolina.....	414,783
Tennessee.....	692,654
Total.....	3,029,934
Region V:	
Illinois.....	1,462,351
Indiana.....	597,375
Michigan.....	856,538
Ohio.....	757,299
Wisconsin.....	370,634
Total.....	4,044,197

Total property allocated to the States, by regions and States—Continued

Region VI:	
Iowa.....	165,696
Kansas.....	192,867
Minnesota.....	152,246
Missouri.....	2,423,710
Nebraska.....	1,540,855
North Dakota.....	36,845
South Dakota.....	193,568
Total.....	4,705,787
Region VII:	
Arkansas.....	160,659
Louisiana.....	248,638
New Mexico.....	225,645
Oklahoma.....	375,750
Texas.....	980,264
Total.....	1,990,956
Region VIII:	
Colorado.....	612,862
Idaho.....	226,810
Montana.....	99,060
Utah.....	180,364
Wyoming.....	66,107
Total.....	1,185,203
Region IX:	
Alaska.....	10,179
Arizona.....	331,588
California.....	4,049,135
Hawaii.....	111,611
Nevada.....	93,178
Oregon.....	862,436
Washington.....	559,743
Total.....	6,017,875
Grand total.....	29,078,312

A more recent development regarding donable property for science and research in educational institutions has been initiated. On February 5, 1958, as chairman of the Special Subcommittee on Donable Property, I addressed a letter to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, raising the question: First, whether or not it would be possible for that Department, in cooperation with interested educational agencies and institutions, to develop a list of priority items needed in the teaching of scientific courses and, second, if the Department of Defense which controls most of the available stocks of property and the General Services Administration could not cooperate in screening available stocks and expedite the declarations of excess property in order to meet the educational requirements.

The other members of the Subcommittee on Donable Property are: Hon. JOHN E. MOSS, JR., Hon. EDWIN H. MAY, JR.; ex officio, Hon. WILLIAM L. DAWSON, Hon. CLARE E. HOFFMAN.

I have been pleased to receive a favorable letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare on the subject. Copies of my letter of February 5, 1958, and Secretary Folsom's reply of February 27, 1958, follow at this point:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
OFFICE OF THE MAJORITY LEADER,
Washington, D. C., February 5, 1958.

HON. MARION B. FOLSOM,
Secretary of Health, Education, and
Welfare, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Further reference is made to my letter of November 12, 1957, and to your reply of January 3, 1958, concerning suggestions for improvement of the donable surplus property program.

In amplification of the suggestions contained in my letter and with a special reference to educational requirements for scientific purposes I would appreciate your reaction to the following:

1. HEW, after consultation with interested educational agencies and institutions might submit a list of requirements to the Department of Defense. This list to set forth priorities and be in accordance with the classification and nomenclature of items as reflected in the new cataloging system.

2. The Department of Defense, the General Services Administration and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare expedite the screening, declaration and allocation of these items to the extent feasible.

I believe that there may be many surplus items of current use and need for scientific training in our educational systems, and that priority screening and expeditious declaration of these items will be in the public benefit with little or no additional cost or inconvenience to the holding agencies. It also seems to me that the procedure herein outlined leaves the discretion with the holding agencies as to necessary inventory levels for current missions.

It will be appreciated if you will consult with other interested agencies and advise me as to your conclusions at your convenience.

I am sending a copy of this letter to Assistant Secretary of Defense (Supply and Logistics) Perkins McGuire and the Administrator of the General Services Administration, Franklin G. Floete.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN W. McCORMACK.

THE SECRETARY OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION, AND WELFARE,
Washington, February 27, 1958.

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. McCORMACK: This will acknowledge your letter of February 5, 1958, wherein you make certain amplifications to the suggestions contained in your earlier letter regarding surplus property, particularly in the areas of scientific utilization.

Your first suggestion that, after consultation with interested educational agencies and institutions, there might be submitted a list of requirements to the Department of Defense is generally a good suggestion. We have not as yet determined the best method for accomplishing this purpose.

Your second suggestion that the Department of Defense, the General Services Administration, and this Department expedite the screening, declaration, and allocation of these specialized items to the extent feasible is currently under consideration.

In order that you may be brought up to date on our activities of improving the procedures of allocation of materials appropriate for use by schools and colleges in the areas of mathematics and science, we can advise you that the Office of Field Administration is working with the Office of Education. A special committee has been established in the Office of Education, composed of specialists in secondary and higher education, for the purpose of working out with educational organizations and the Office of Field Administration more effective methods and procedures in this area.

In addition, we have been in contact with the National Science Foundation, which agency is planning some 200 to 400 workshop programs for science teachers during the summer. It is hoped that we will be able to contact each of these teacher workshops with a view to outlining how the schools which they represent can secure surplus scientific equipment. We have also been in touch with the Atomic Energy Commission with a view to learning if that agency can be of assistance in this area.

Our Division of Surplus Property Utilization staff is at work in the development of

procedures to improve scientific equipment allocation.

The plans outlined above should result in the development of an action program. In carrying out such a program, we will solicit the cooperation of the National Association of State Agencies for Surplus Property, through their executive committee.

One other aspect of this development which we think would be helpful is the proposal to suggest to the States that they name a small advisory committee in each State, to be composed of a secondary, higher, and administrative education person, which could serve to assist the State operational unit in the development of special need lists and in expediting procedures generally.

Sincerely yours,

MARION B. FOLSOM,
Secretary.

Hearings on H. R. 10293

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. OREN HARRIS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 10, 1958

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, March 7, I issued the following release with respect to hearings to be held on H. R. 10293, a bill to establish a national scientific reserve fund, introduced by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DAWSON]. In view of the great interest which has been manifested by many scientists throughout the country, I would like to serve notice that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce stands ready to hold hearings on this legislation as soon as possible after reports have been received on this bill from the departments and agencies of the Government.

The text of the release is as follows:

Congressman OREN HARRIS, Democrat, of Arkansas, chairman, House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, announced today that hearings would be scheduled on H. R. 10293, a bill to establish a national scientific reserve fund, as soon as possible after receipt by the committee of reports from the various departments and agencies of the Federal Government, setting forth their views with regard to this legislation.

The committee has been advised that the National Science Board of the National Science Foundation will meet on March 14, 1958, at which meeting the Board will consider the position of the National Science Foundation with regard to this legislation. Requests have been made of the departments and agencies of the executive branch to submit their views on this legislation as soon as possible so that hearings may be scheduled promptly on H. R. 10293.

The Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce is aware of the great and urgent need for additional support for basic research. As a matter of fact, hearings were begun by the committee on January 24, 1958, on this very subject in the course of which Dr. Detlev Bronk, Chairman of the National Science Board and President of the National Academy of Sciences; Dr. Alan T. Waterman, Director of the National Science Foundation; and Dr. Paul M. Gross, Chairman, Executive Committee, National Science Board, testified.

Since introduction of H. R. 10293 by Congressman DAWSON, Democrat, of Illinois, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has received hundreds of communica-

tions from scientists who are active at universities and research institutions all over the country, in support of this legislation. These communications indicate the great interest in this legislation on the part of all those who are seeking to keep the United States ahead in basic research.

Lincoln and American Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 10, 1958

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the text of the Lincoln Day address delivered by the distinguished senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] at Toledo, Ohio, on February 12, under the title "Lincoln and American Foreign Policy."

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

LINCOLN AND AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY

(Lincoln Day address of Senator JOHN W. BRICKER, Toledo, Ohio, February 12, 1958)

"We live in the midst of alarms; anxiety beclouds the future; we expect some new disaster with each newspaper we read. * * * These were Lincoln's words in a speech at Bloomington, Ill., on May 29, 1856. Today, 102 years later, the alarms, the anxiety, and the expectancy of disaster have increased manifold. My remarks here tonight will be more in keeping with the somber background than with this festive occasion.

What should be the response of the Republican Party, the response of the American people, to the looming threat of global annihilation? There is no possibility, of course, of turning back the clock; of pushing back into the bottle the destructive capabilities of human intelligence. To believe that scientific inquiry having military applications can be suppressed is a form of idle daydreaming. It is our destiny to explore the infinitely small recesses of the atom and the infinitely vast distances of outer space and yet somehow avert a catastrophe springing from finite limitations on human wisdom and morality.

I do not know of any better way to keep freedom from going under than by drawing upon the profound wisdom shown by Lincoln during his ordeal. This will not be easy. It will be necessary to separate the real Lincoln from the Lincoln of myth and legend. In addition, analogies between the events of one century and those of another are often imperfect or misleading. As Lincoln himself said:

"The dogmas of the quiet past are inadequate to the stormy present. The occasion is piled high with difficulty, and we must rise with the occasion. As our case is new, so must we think anew, and act anew. We must disenthrall ourselves, and then we shall save the country." (Annual message to Congress, December 1, 1862.)

The perils of the present are also unprecedented. I believe, however, that the world's best hope of peace and freedom lies in a thoughtful, modern adaptation of Lincoln's political philosophy.

Stripped to its fundamentals the survival of the Free World hinges on the foreign and defense policies of the United States. The long-term effectiveness of these policies depends in turn, wholly and absolutely, on the quality of American education.

In what President Eisenhower has aptly described as total cold war, a host of domestic issues—Federal spending and taxation, civil rights, internal security, agricultural production, industrial employment—are extremely important in the mortal struggle against international communism. However, an unwise decision on one or more domestic issues is not likely to prove fatal. On the other hand, a basic miscalculation in foreign or defense policy may easily spell the difference between life and death.

Because foreign and defense policies are of such crucial importance many well-meaning people have said they should be taken out of politics; that they should not be subjected to extended political debate. Let me say right here and now that I am in 100 percent disagreement with this curious notion. I am not one who believes that politics must stop either at the water's edge or outside the doors of the Pentagon. The people have a right to know and a duty to decide. Only in a crucible fired by political controversy can we formulate policies which are sound and durable.

Of course, there are all kinds of politics—good, bad, and indifferent. This is true whether the issue is paving a street or testing nuclear weapons. The people of Ohio are smart enough to detect any demagogic handling of political issues.

Ordinarily, there is not much political mileage in crying over spilled milk. But so long as Democrats insist that the Truman-Acheson foreign policy is a model for the future or that their national defense policies were far sighted, we should not hesitate to prove them wrong. We did it in 1952 and we can do it in 1958. However, new issues affecting the next generation are vastly more important than old issues debated in the last election.

In urging that the great issues of our time be settled by political debate, Lincoln is the only witness we need to call. If there was ever a time for a moratorium on politics it was in 1864. The outcome of the war was still in doubt. The North was divided into three hostile groups: the supporters of Lincoln; the forces of appeasement; and the faction demanding unconditional surrender and harsh retribution. Two days after his victory at the polls Lincoln cited the election as convincing proof that a government not too strong for the liberties of its people can be strong enough to maintain its own existence in great emergencies. And then he said, "If the rebellion could force us to forego or postpone a national election, it might fairly claim to have already conquered and ruined us." I see a great difference between conquest by the Confederacy and conquest by communism, but I see little difference between foregoing an election and holding one in which issues intimately related to the survival of the human race cannot be discussed.

No one has suggested that the problems of American education should be taken out of the political arena. In fact, the leftwing of the Democratic Party hopes to capitalize in this year's election on what most people agree is a crisis in education. The solution of these New Deal retreats at least has the virtue of simplicity. They merely take all the proposals of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and then multiply all the figures by 4 or 6 or 10 depending on the degree of their irresponsibility. However, the most serious weakness of American education is due to an organic illness, what the progressive educators praise as life adjustment but diagnosed by Dr. Arthur Bestor (and by most scientists and scholars) as perilously close to death adjustment for our Nation and our children. How reckless it is to pretend that this illness can be cured by splints of gold or bandages made of greenbacks.

In our justifiable concern about the quality of American education let us never come to regard those who do not go on to college as second-class citizens. Remember Abraham Lincoln. He educated himself with a few classics of history and literature, the Bible, and apprenticeship at the bar. Yet he turned out to be the most profound political thinker in our history. Jefferson was more brilliant and his intellectual range was wider, but there has never been anyone who could reduce a problem to its bare essentials so well as Lincoln, or whose actions correspond so closely to his principles. That such a man appeared on the political scene at the time he did must be accounted the nearest thing to a miracle in American history.

In recent years we have tended to emphasize only a certain side of Lincoln's character. Of course he was inspired by humanitarian impulses, by a hatred of oppression, by confidence in the people, and by faith in God. But, unfortunately, we seem in recent years to have forgotten other characteristics which tempered those mentioned and which were perhaps more important in the preservation of the Union.

We might look first at the matter of passion. If we did not detest communism we could not hope to remain free, nor would Lincoln have returned to politics had he not hated the institution of human slavery. But this is what Lincoln said on the subject: "Passion has helped us but can do so no more. * * * Reason, cold, calculation, unimpassioned reason—must furnish all the materials for our future support and defense. * * * Lincoln was always ready to negotiate with the South upon one condition. The condition was not unconditional surrender but simply the return of the Southern States to the Union. At the bottom of our policy of unconditional surrender in World War II was passion, not reason. Hitler's atrocities make that passion understandable, but because passion was not restrained by Lincoln's cold and calculating reason we have today a divided Germany, a Red China, and the enslavement of Eastern Europe. As a result, America has never been in greater danger. I am not trying to put all the blame on the Roosevelt administration. The policy of unconditional surrender was generally approved by the American people. What I do want to stress is that we dare not make the same mistake again.

I do not know any man less likely to be consumed by passion than Dwight D. Eisenhower. His temperament is a precious asset for the Free World. Moreover, the people of the world know that President Eisenhower, notwithstanding all manner of Soviet provocations, is not going to abandon the quest for peace. Still, there are many Americans who seem to believe that we should negotiate with the Soviet Union only on the terms of its dissolution. The best help we can give President Eisenhower in his crusade for peace is to stamp out, wherever we find it, the idea that the only alternative to the cold war is the unconditional surrender of the Soviet Union.

Lincoln's confidence in the commonsense of the people was tempered by a profound understanding of the flaws in human nature. His law partner, W. H. Herndon, no doubt exaggerated, but Herndon said that Lincoln always took the negative position in their discussions on the subject of unselfish human actions. We do know that Lincoln advised young lawyers not to take the whole fee in advance as that would put too great a strain upon a natural inclination to be lazy. Also, Lincoln opposed a bank bill solely on the ground that the duty and the self-interest of the custodians of funds did not coincide.

We could use more of Lincoln's skepticism about the innate goodness of human nature. The man who advised young lawyers always

to link duty and self-interest would be quick to see that in any unenforceable agreement banning the production of nuclear weapons the moral duty of the Soviet Union would not coincide with its declared self-interest.

We need, too, in this hour of crisis a greater measure of Lincoln's humility. How strange it must appear to many people today that Lincoln never placed God in the corner of the Union. Instead, in 1862 he conceded that in the present civil war it is quite possible that God's purpose is something different from the purpose of either party. In a letter written in 1864 he suggested that the war was divine retribution on both North and South for their toleration of slavery. And in his second inaugural address he supposed God's will to be to continue the war until every drop of blood drawn with the lash shall be paid by another drawn with the sword. Only with this tremendous perspective is it possible to say with Lincoln: "I shall do nothing in malice. What I deal with is too vast for malicious dealing." This generation deals with something much more vast and the necessity of humility and honest self-appraisal is thus even greater.

There is a very close parallel between a nation half slave and half free in 1858 and a world in that condition a century later. We can learn much from the cool reason and rigorous logic which Lincoln applied to his problem. It was territory, rather than morality or legislation, on which Lincoln built his case. The territory of a nation, Lincoln said, is the enduring part, whereas generations fade away and laws can be repealed or amended. Slavery he regarded as a moral wrong, but knew it to be a legal right. His strategy, therefore, was to confine slavery to the territory it already blighted. Knowing that if slavery could not grow it must wither and die, he would thereby put it in course of ultimate extinction.

Soviet oppression is a moral wrong, but in the present state of international law a legal right. Communism, too, will wither away if it cannot grow. A vital part of the East-West conflict is a dispute over territory, primarily that of Germany. If we concentrate on the territorial problem, rather than on international moral and legal reformation, we may be able to put communism in course of ultimate extinction. As Republicans we can be very proud of the record of the Eisenhower administration in avoiding war while at the same time confining communism to virtually the same territory it held 6 years ago.

In Ida Tarbell's Life of Lincoln there is a moving chapter on the journey of Lincoln's funeral train and this conclusion: "The result was a demonstration which in sincerity and unanimity has never been equaled in the world's history." Ninety-three years ago this April the train carrying Lincoln and his son Willie on their last earthly journey rolled slowly through Ohio, not a bell ringing or whistle sounding. The grandparents of many Ohioans were eyewitnesses. I want to read a few sentences of Ida Tarbell's description of the scene as an indication of how deeply the American people revered a leader who never sacrificed principle for expediency:

"At many points arches were erected over the track; at others the bridges were wreathed from end to end in crape and evergreens and flags. And this was not in the towns alone; every farmhouse by which the train passed became for the time a funeral house; the plow was left in the furrow, crape was on the door, the neighbors were gathered, and those who watched from the trains as it flew by could see groups of weeping women, of men with uncovered heads, sometimes a minister among them, his arms raised in prayer. Night did not hinder them. Great bonfires were built in lonely countryside, around which the farmers waited patiently to salute their dead. At the towns the length of the train was lit by blazing

torches. Storm as well as darkness was unheeded. Much of the journey was made through the rain, in fact, but the people seemed to have forgotten all things but that Abraham Lincoln, the man they loved and trusted, was passing by for the last time." (Tarbell, Life of Lincoln, vol. 2 (1917 ed.), p. 258.)

That was the first Republican President; the man who in life saved the Union; and whose principles long after his death may save the world if we have the courage to act upon them.

Tennessee Valley Authority

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 10, 1958

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, recently I had a letter from Mr. H. L. Rice, of Florence, Ala. He was writing me from 2640 First Street, Fort Myers, Fla., where he spends the winter each year.

In his letter, Mr. Rice asked me some pertinent questions regarding TVA.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the letter from Mr. Rice and my reply to him.

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

Mr. JOHN SPARKMAN,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: My home is at Florence, Ala. I spend 6 months each winter down here.

It seems that everyone down here thinks that the TVA is a gift to that section and they are taxed for it.

I am not posted well enough to argue with them. They say that the TVA borrowed \$20 billion and no interest.

I would like what TVA owes Government, what interest they pay, if any, and what amount they paid. And at what rate they are paying this money back.

Yours truly,

H. L. RICE.

FEBRUARY 22, 1958.

Mr. H. L. RICE,
Fort Myers, Fla.

DEAR MR. RICE: A good deal of misinformation has been spread by people who are hostile to TVA. I am glad you took the trouble to write me so that I, through you, may contribute some facts which every citizen should know about this great Federal agency.

Of course, as you and I know, TVA undertakes many programs in the region of its operation which are similar to activities carried out in other areas by different Federal agencies. TVA has made the river navigable. It has provided flood protection. Likewise it has promoted excellent programs in the field of agriculture, forestry, and so on. Such programs are undertaken by the Federal Government in all parts of the country. There should be no misunderstanding about that.

When people talk about the amount they are taxed for TVA, I believe they usually have in mind the TVA power system. In this area the Federal Government, through TVA, owns the facilities for power generation and transmission. The distribution systems, over 150 of them, which purchase power at wholesale from TVA for resale to their con-

sumers are not owned by the Federal Government. They are locally owned and managed. Discussing only the investment in power facilities, therefore, I am amazed that anyone would believe that TVA had borrowed \$20 billion. The money provided by the Federal Government for investment in TVA power facilities is not a loan to TVA. The Government is the owner of the properties and the figure of \$20 billion as the amount invested by taxpayers is more than 10 times overstated. At the present time about \$1,200,000,000 of the total power investment represents the net amount of funds made available through appropriations by the Congress.

You are probably aware that there is pending before the Congress a bill which would permit TVA to issue revenue bonds to provide future investment in power facilities. This means that the power consumers of the area would in the future provide the money for the capacity additions which are required to keep up with the growing loads. The Government would still own the property. Its assets would grow without the appropriation of further funds from the Treasury. As a matter of fact, the consumers of electricity have already provided over \$350 million for investment in TVA power facilities, facilities which are operated for purposes and under policies laid out by Congress. And in addition to plowing back proceeds to increase power assets, TVA has made cash payments into the Treasury from power proceeds. To date \$240 billion has been paid in cash to the Treasury. Under present law, those cash payments must in 40 years from the time a power facility goes into operation equal the amount made available by the Congress for investment in the facility. Under the pending self-financing legislation the schedule of cash payments into the Treasury will be changed and in the future the amounts will be, at a minimum, large enough to cover the cost to the Government of the remaining appropriation investment. This means that the Government, as owner, will always be kept whole, and that the assets of the Government-owned system will continue to increase by the investment of proceeds from bonds issued against future earnings.

It is important to remember that the benefits to the Nation from TVA power operations are not measured by the direct cash return to the Treasury. They are measured rather in the increasing economic strength of the region which means in turn that the people bear a larger share of the total national tax burden. National benefits can be measured in the stimulation of the economy of other areas as the TVA region becomes a better market for the goods and services of all parts of the country. Few people, for example, stop to realize that TVA itself has spent over \$1 billion in States which lie outside the region and that since the end of the war the power consumers of the area have themselves spent over \$1½ billion to purchase the electrical appliances which are made in other areas. They do this because Congress directed TVA to make power available to the people at rates which, while covering the cost of power production, would encourage the abundant use of energy on the farms and in the homes of the area. No one can measure the national benefit of this demonstration of the effect of the low rate-high use marketing policies which Congress directed TVA to adopt. Power systems and power consumers everywhere have benefited because TVA and its distributors took the risk involved in selling power at rates lower than people in the Southeast had ever enjoyed it before, depending upon increased volume of sales for adequate revenues.

We can estimate the direct benefit to the Federal Treasury which has resulted because TVA has served Federal installations with power at reasonable cost. The taxpayer pays the power bills of the Army, the Air Force,

and the Atomic Energy Commission. The latter particularly uses power in vast amounts. It is reliably estimated that to date the Government has saved over \$250 billion in its power bills because of TVA and that savings of \$50 million a year will be realized as long as AEC uses power in the quantity it requires today.

These are some of the factors you will wish to keep in mind as you talk about TVA with your friends in Florida. I am enclosing a couple of pamphlets which may be helpful to you, and I hope you will be able to convince those with whom you talk that TVA is an asset to the Nation, that every citizen should be proud of its performance, and that it is contributing and will continue to contribute to regional and national strength.

With best wishes, I am,
Sincerely,

JOHN SPARKMAN.

Situation in the Sudan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 10, 1958

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, in view of the present tense situation in the Sudan I am extending my remarks to include a report I made early in the year to my constituents in the Second District of Illinois. This report was based upon my observations as a member of Chairman WAYNE HAYS' subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. The gentlewoman from Illinois [Mrs. CHURCH] was the third member of the study group. The report follows:

THE SUDAN

Khartoum is a charming city of 75,000 near the junction of the Blue Nile and the White Nile. In our Embassy the personnel go to work at 6 or 7 in the morning, quit at 2 in the afternoon, as a matter of living with the climate. There are 15 Americans in all, including the Ambassador and the USIS staff which has many headaches not attributable to the climate to make an annual allowance of \$36,000 stretch far enough to cover a country a third the size of our country with American books, films, and broadcasts to offset Communist propaganda.

Pitted against this lone Ambassador and his corporal's guard are 61 Soviet diplomats, each with a regal retinue of highly trained persons who engage in every phase of infiltration under the protection of diplomatic immunity.

This is a relatively recent device in Soviet strategy. We found it first in the Sudan. There are six Soviet bloc countries. Instead of one Ambassador representing all, as would be sufficient, a fully accredited Ambassador is assigned by each of the bloc nations. As the Ambassador must have a staff, the reasonable size of which cannot be questioned under diplomatic courtesy, this device is literally flooding Africa, even in countries friendly to us, with past masters at infiltration.

In the Sudan, for instance, we learned that of the five newspapers three were Soviet controlled either by ownership or subsidy and that individual newsmen had been whispered where to go when in personal need of funds.

This is why the Soviet regards the Sudan as fertile field; northern portion is inhabited by Moslem Arabs, 6 million in all; southern portion largely by pagan primitive

tribesmen, numbering about 4 million, and overall illiteracy is over 90 percent. Moreover, the Sudan is a signatory of the pact and treaties of the Arab League. (It is also a member of the United Nations and is reportedly party to a mutual defense treaty with Ethiopia.)

Despite the tremendous drive the Soviet is making to take over the Sudan, there was little indication that the infiltration has reached responsible circles. Indeed, everything seemed to the contrary. We had a long talk with the Prime Minister, Sayed Abdulla Bey Khalil, and later were dinner guests at his home. At a reception by the Minister of Foreign Affairs there were 64 guests, with whom we talked freely. We did not miss any facet of opinion.

Most important were our long conferences with the two religious leaders, Sayed Ali al Mirghani and Sayed Aba al Rahman al Mahdi, at their respective homes, which really are palaces. You will remember that it was through an agreement of these rival religious leaders that the present national cabinet was formed and Sudanese independence accelerated. The Sudan has been an independent nation only since January 1, 1956. At present it is governed by a Supreme Commission with the Prime Minister elected by the national house of representatives, 68 of whose 98 members were elected by direct vote. In February of 1958 another election will be held and a permanent constitution adopted.

My conclusion is that the leaders of the Sudan have their hearts and minds set primarily on the development of their own independence, that there is a pretty general feeling of distrust of Egyptian designs, springing largely from a common but conflicting interest in the Nile River, and that the influence of the two great Arab religious leaders will go far in countering Soviet efforts to stir unrest among the people. The not-announced mutual defense treaty with Ethiopia is an indication of the trend.

Nevertheless, the Sudan is a most critical area. We cannot afford to make mistakes. It has been receiving no American aid, has shown willingness to help itself by spending (1957) \$50 million of its own money in development projects. It now looks to the World Bank for a loan to build the Roseires Dam on the Blue Nile, opening another 1.2 million acres to irrigation. This is foreign aid on a sound banking basis.

The Japanese Don't Make Plywood From Soviet Lumber

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES O. PORTER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 10, 1958

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to report to the House that I have requested from the United States-Japan Trade Council some authoritative information on a charge made here the other day that Soviet lumber was being purchased by Japan, remanufactured into cores for plywood-faced doors and then being exported to the United States. In response, I have received the following information from the Embassy of Japan, in the form of a cable from the Japanese Government:

In 1957 about 500,000 koku (or approximately 4.9 million cubic feet) of lumber was imported from the Soviet Union. None of

this lumber was used in the manufacture of plywood in Japan. The Soviet lumber is unsuitable for plywood manufacturing (either as core or facing) because of the following characteristics: (1) It has too many knots; (2) adhesion of this type of wood is difficult; and (3) its diameter is too small. For these reasons, the percentage of utilization would be low and the cost of production high, as compared to Philippine lauan (mahogany) lumber which is available in adequate quantities for the manufacture of plywood.

The timber imported from the Soviet Union consisted mainly of logs of silver fir, abies sachalinensis, and larch trees. The former two varieties were used for construction 42 percent, packing materials 34 percent, and furniture manufacture 24 percent. The latter variety was used for construction 68 percent, and, as logs, for stakes, posts, piles, and pickets 32 percent.

I should think this cablegram would constitute sufficient refutation of the claim to silence it once and for all. The least we can do in the present widespread discussions of our foreign-trade policy is to keep the fight fair and honest on both sides.

The United States Army Band

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 10, 1958

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, while the American public is understandably and properly preoccupied with those ramifications of national defense dealing with such critical areas as the combat potential of the component armed services, frequently overlooked is the continuing contribution of the military to the scene of American culture.

Such an outstanding example, well-known to Members of Congress and residents of the Washington area, is the internationally known United States Army Band, led by Maj. Hugh Curry, of Cambridge, Mass. One of the services' quartet of great musical organizations stationed in this city—the others of equal fame being the Marine Band, Navy Band, and Air Force Symphonic Band—the United States Army Band is an active contributor to the cultural life of the National Capital, performing at frequent intervals before the public, during the summer season at such locations as the steps of the Capitol and the Watergate and, during the midwinter series of concerts, at the Interdepartmental Auditorium.

Maj. Hugh Curry, the leader and commanding officer of the United States Army Band, the official representative band of the Department of the Army is the son of the late Hugh Curry and of Alice Duggan Curry. He attended St. Paul's Parochial School in Cambridge, the Cambridge High and Latin School, and graduated from the Boston University College of Music with the degree of bachelor of music. Just prior to entering the Army of the United States, he

was prominent as a teacher of music at Rindge Technical School in Cambridge, Mass.

Hugh Curry entered the Army in 1941 and served as an enlisted man in the band of the 101st Field Artillery of the 26th Division, Massachusetts National Guard, until June of 1942 when he entered the Army Music School for Band-leader Candidates in Washington. He was later appointed a warrant officer band leader, and subsequently served in the United States Army Band as its assistant leader. The band was at that time assigned to Allied Force Headquarters of the North African theater of operations in Algiers.

On October 1, 1945, Assistant Leader Curry was designated acting leader and commanding officer of the Army Band, shortly after which he directed the band on a highly successful concert tour of the United States in the interest of the victory bond drive sponsored by the United States Treasury Department. On January 4, 1946, Chief Warrant Officer Curry was appointed leader of the Army Band to succeed Capt. Thomas F. Darcy. He was commissioned a captain in the Army of the United States in 1946, and in 1952 was promoted to the rank of major.

Among the first acts of Gen. John J. Pershing on becoming Chief of Staff after World War I was the creation of the United States Army Band.

Although the General Headquarters Band of the American Expeditionary Force was organized in France in 1917 by General Pershing, then commander in chief of the AEF, it was only temporary and broke up soon after the armistice.

Partly because of that unit's outstanding record during its brief existence and partly because of a genuine need for a permanent military musical outfit, General Pershing brought the United States Army Band into being in 1922.

The United States Army Band quickly assumed its important role in local, national, and world affairs. The general's faith and judgment were increasingly justified down through the years, and to the present day it has become an inseparable part of the pride and colorful tradition of the United States Army.

It is made up of more than 100 bandsmen—the cream of the Army's musicians. Before their incorporation into military service, they played in well-known orchestras and dance bands throughout the country, and many of them are products of America's finest music schools. Names of brothers are on the rolls and there is also a father-and-son team. Nucleus around which the organization revolves is a respected, slowly dwindling little group of men who are all one-time members of the "Pershing's Own" 1917 band.

The United States Army Band is often called on as the lead unit in important parades. It has taken part in parades commemorating national holidays, both here and abroad, and in parades of welcome for returning heroes. A partial list of the more noteworthy of these parades gives some idea of the

scope of its job as the United States Army's representative musical outfit.

For example, there were Bastille Day, 1943, in Algiers; Armistice Day, 1944, in Paris; Dwight D. Eisenhower's homecoming in Washington in 1945, and the homecoming of the 82d Airborne Division in New York City in 1946.

It has marched in the glittering inaugural parades of five of our Presidents—Calvin Coolidge, Herbert Hoover, Franklin D. Roosevelt, Harry S. Truman and Dwight D. Eisenhower; and it has solemnly led the way in the funeral corteges of Warren G. Harding, Woodrow Wilson, and William Howard Taft.

On July 19, 1948, the band once more marched slowly to the muffled beat of drums. On the way to his final resting place in Arlington National Cemetery was its gallant progenitor, Gen. John J. Pershing.

Simple ceremonies at the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier in Arlington National Cemetery and elaborate, formal receptions for visiting dignitaries are frequent highlights in the United States Army Band's notable career. Other, more diversified activities for which it is called on are the annual Cherry Blossom Festival in Washington, the opening baseball game of the American League season when the President traditionally tosses out the first ball, and national meetings of patriotic groups like the Daughters of the American Revolution, American Legion, Veterans of Foreign Wars, and Gold Star Mothers.

The United States Army Band has been a regular contributor to radio and television and it has made countless broadcasts over the country's major networks since it first went on the air in 1923. Some of its better known presentations have been Division Diary, This Week in History, and Campus Salute. Its annual Freedom Sings series of concerts, featuring internationally famous guest stars, for a number of years has been a steadily popular Tuesday night feature.

During World War II it traveled extensively overseas, entertaining American and allied troops and civilians, and from June 1943 until its return to the United States, 2 years later to the month, it gave more than 500 performances in 17 African and European countries.

American Merchant Ships, Foreign Trade, and National Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOR C. TOLLEFSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 10, 1958

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, I have just read again the excellent address of our colleague, the Honorable FRANK T. Bow of Ohio, before the American Merchant Marine Conference and the Propeller Club Convention, at Houston, Tex., on October 22, 1957. I had previously read a copy of the speech

last fall during the recess of Congress, and would have placed it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD then had Congress been in session. It is an outstanding address given by one of the outstanding Members of the House of Representatives. Mr. Bow's contributions to the well-being of our Nation have been many. Amongst them has been his fine work in behalf of the American merchant marine which is our country's fourth arm of defense and which is an important segment of our economy. I insert his address in the RECORD so that other Members of Congress may read it.

AMERICAN MERCHANT SHIPS, FOREIGN TRADE, AND NATIONAL SECURITY

Quite frankly, my views of your great industry have altered radically in the last few years. Some time ago, before I became a member of the House Appropriations Committee, I do not think it would have occurred to the Propeller Club to extend the sort of invitation that brings me here today.

In recent years, however, I have had the opportunity to become much more acquainted with the objectives, problems and contributions of the United States merchant marine. And no one, as we know, is more zealous than a convert.

What has brought about this conversion? As you might expect, it has been the opportunity, for which I shall always be grateful, of serving as a member of the House Appropriations Committee. I have attended literally hundreds of hearings and heard scores of industries and Government agencies present their justifications for Government financial support.

The testimony given at these hearings varies, of course, both in style and skill of preparation and execution. As committee members, our great challenge, always, is to overlook personalities and other surface impressions and probe for the real issues involved. Why, we must ask ourselves, is the request for financial assistance necessary at all? Is it reasonable in amount—or is the appropriation sought more than required? Or, as sometimes happens, is it inadequate to do the job properly? Is it in line with past requests—and if not, why not? What is its importance to the national interest relative to other Government obligations? Must the expenditure be made now, or can it be deferred?

As taxpayers, I am confident that you would be gratified by the skill and patience which committee members, notably Congressman PRINCE PRESTON of Georgia and your own ALBERT THOMAS of Texas, exercise in assuring that our recommendations will result in a fair return on each tax dollar.

But Congressmen, of course, are human. They frequently enter Congress with preconceived points of view, subconsciously or not, on many issues with which they will have to deal as committee members. These are predispositions formed by childhood, education, geographical environment, and other factors. The last factor—geography—had, I suppose, much to do with my early disinterested view regarding the merchant marine. You see remarkably few C-3's on Nimishillen Creek in Stark County, Ohio, where I come from. My childhood sleep was seldom lulled by the sound of surf or interrupted by fog-horns.

MIDWEST GREAT SOURCE OF CARGO

There are many others like me in this country. Yet it is we who are the great source of your cargoes, inbound and outbound; and we of Ohio, we of the Midwest, and we of all the inland areas have a right to know more about you. You have an obligation—to us and to yourselves—to make us aware of your

tremendous contributions to our economic and our military strength.

It is not enough that you are ably represented in Washington. We in Congress are obliged to steer a navigable course between our responsibilities to our constituents and, where there is a difference, our conviction as to what is best for all the country. Our Nation's need for adequate ocean transportation under its own flag has become crystal clear to me; it may be less clear, and understandably so, to many other people of Ohio and the Midwest.

It is my duty to act in the best interests of the merchant marine where I consider this, as I must do, to be congruent with the best interests of Ohio and the entire country. I would think that it is your obligation and opportunity, more so than mine, to make known this mutuality of interests that exists between the United States merchant marine and inland America.

Consider for a moment that national problem—the national budget. Paring anything from the costs of governing this burgeoning population of ours is inexplicably difficult. Yet, your industry is part and parcel of an \$18 billion entry on the credit side of the national ledger. I refer, of course, to our income from the goods we sell abroad. There would, of course, still be foreign trade without an American merchant marine. But what sort of foreign trade? And at what cost, in terms of reliability, freight rates, assured access to vital imports we lack domestically, and so on? This is obviously too important a piece of United States income to be handed over, lock, stock, and barrel, to our foreign friends—much less our foreign enemies.

A full 8 percent of all those goods we produce that can be moved at all are shipped overseas to foreign customers. Can we trust their delivery to our competitors? I think not. Our worldly wise British friends have an expression applicable here that requires little explanation. The gist of it is, "Don't lend your doughnut to your friend." Or, as they say in New York, "Does Macy's tell Gimbel's?"

NATION DEPENDENT ON AMERICAN MERCHANT SHIPS

Few persons in the country know better than you assembled here today how dependent we are on shipping and foreign trade to sustain life in our Nation's industrial machine. I thought I had a fair idea of our dependence upon imports, but I learned just this week that there are only two metals (magnesium and molybdenum) for which we are not at least partially dependent on foreign supplies.

Coming as I do from a highly industrialized area, totally dependent on imports to keep its assembly lines busy and its workers employed, I respect the words I heard recently from one of your industry's greatest leaders, James A. Farrell, Jr.: "The carriage of our export and imports," he said, "is too critical to the health of American industry—which is, after all, the ultimate source of our defensive strength—to be entrusted to the whims, vagaries, and competitive urges of foreign maritime powers. It is a national jewel far too precious for delivery by the first available messenger."

Let me tell you something else about this Mr. Farrell, while I am about it. He visited my home town of Canton recently, at my suggestion and at the invitation of our chamber of commerce, and what he had to say there about your industry and what it means to Canton and the surrounding area was an education to all those fortunate enough to hear him. I readily admit that I learned some things about Ohio's kinship with the merchant marine that were news to me. Let me mention just one figure that I shall not soon forget. The Committee of American Steamship Lines, which Mr. Far-

rell represented during his Canton visit, did some work with a pencil and a research economist and developed figures showing that Ohio's share of United States exports last year totaled approximately \$1 billion.

Now, gentlemen, let us be completely realistic. If you will take the time to develop figures like that for every State in the Union, and make this information available to the people in interesting, understandable terms, you shall certainly have an easier job from here on in, gaining understanding and justifying support for the United States merchant marine. All this, of course, has to do only with the commercial aspects of our national shipping policy. I am not one of those who believe that national defense considerations are the sole basis for Government support to United States shipping.

I see no sensible distinction between a strong domestic industrial economy and a secure military potential. I see no way in which we can be commercially dependent and militarily secure. I have no formula for developing military independence out of an industrial machine beholden to foreign powers for its bread and water.

MERCHANT MARINE VITAL TO DEFENSE

Nor, so long as we are on this military tack, do I subscribe for an instant to the view that modern warfare has altered the role of our merchant marine. I say this confidently because, unlike some of my associates in Washington, I am not hobbled by the gift of clairvoyance. I do not know what form modern warfare will take. Will the world really seek suicide with an all-out hydrogen war? Or will the very effectiveness of modern weapons serve to prevent their use, reducing future combats to such primitive techniques as those employed in Korea and World War II? For safety's sake, must we not assume something in between the two, in which event the need for seapower and reliable ocean transportation will be no less than it has been historically? Should we risk arming to the teeth with H-bombs and ICBM's, only to find ourselves helpless against any well-directed musket fire?

I make no pretenses at being a military expert; I can only impose the tests of common sense and past experience on the arguments of those who are. But isn't it reasonable to assume that one way to determine how the next war shall be fought is to examine the facts as we know them to be, then lay our plans from there—fully prepared to revise them as subsequent information, not hunches, indicate?

If that is so, then isn't there some useful indication of the war to come in the fact that Russia currently has a fleet of more than 475 submarines, and is building them at the rate of better than 80 a year? Let me remind you that Hitler started World II with but 57 submarines. Russia, obviously, foresees the need to destroy as much enemy shipping as possible in any future war—which would suggest that she believes merchant ships are important to us, even if some of our own people do not.

SOVIET NAVY GAINING ON UNITED STATES

Since 1950, in fact, the Soviet Navy has been outbuilding our own in combatant tonnage of many classes. They have outbuilt us in destroyers 9 to 1, and in cruisers 14 to 1.

Russia fully appreciates the fact, which some of our own countrymen seem quick to forget, that last year 99.6 percent of our commercial tonnage was carried in ships and 99.15 percent of our military tonnage. One reason for this is that it requires 4 tons of aviation gasoline to fly 1 ton of freight across the Atlantic, for example. So it is clear why Russia would seek to deprive us, when the time comes, of access by sea to our friends, allies and forces overseas. And

should she obtain control of these seas, she would dominate nearly 95 percent of the earth's surface.

Will airpower, not immediately, but eventually, make shipping obsolete? I cannot foresee it, but again, I would rather look into the facts than into a crystal ball. Facts show me, as we have seen, that over 99 percent of our foreign trade is currently moved in ships. Every day more than 2,000 merchant ships are traveling the North Atlantic sealanes alone. True, this may change, but I am confident that such change is not so imminent that it could possibly affect the plans we make today. And as of today, there is nothing under this sun to challenge the payload carrying capacity of an oceangoing ship.

You of the maritime industry, then, have much to claim for the role that ocean shipping is destined to play for an indeterminate number of years. You also have problems, of course, that are serious and require assiduous attention. One particularly prominent area for critical self-examination and improvement is cargo handling which, I understand, absorbs between 50 and 60 percent of a cargo liner's revenue. The same attention should be directed to unity within your industry so that you can speak clearly and authoritatively on issues that concern all of you. Then, of course, your labor-management relationship is an area of continuing concern to all Americans.

INDUSTRY SHOULD GET COMMUNICATIVE

None of these problems are easy, but neither are they insoluble. Nor are they the only ones you face. One of the most important of these remaining has to do with your public. This problem will be discussed rather fully by another speaker, so I shall not dwell on it except to say this: that I am part of your public. So are all the other Members of Congress. What you do and what you tell the public about what you are doing will be seen, heard and read by us as well as others. I would suggest that your industry get more communicative. Certainly a long and fruitful step in this direction has been that taken by the committee of American steamship lines. I would hope other industry representatives would follow the committee's example of visiting Midwestern communities to talk in factual terms about the impact that reliable ocean transportation has on their economies.

I understand that it has visited Cedar Rapids and Racine as well as Canton, with top line executives touring local plants, appearing on radio and television and speaking before chambers of commerce and manufacturers associations on the importance of a strong merchant marine. This should be a continuing activity.

The reason that such efforts must be unceasing is clear. Since the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 was passed, the taxpayers have contributed \$1,028,000,000 to the support of the United States merchant marine in the form of construction and operating subsidies. Based on present population figures, that breaks down to little more than the cost of a pack of cigarettes a year per capita. Nevertheless, it is still more than a billion dollars. But, in my opinion, it is an expenditure that can be justified.

It is simply the nature of the business you are in that justification before the bar of public opinion is an additional task you must assume willingly and execute both skillfully and unceasingly. It is not enough that certain of us in Washington are aware of the need for an adequate United States merchant marine. Our constituents in every town and village should be equally aware. I wonder if they are?

This, gentlemen, is an opportunity for your industry; more importantly, it is your responsibility to your country.

Why Modern Highways Are Essential to America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. R. HULL, JR.

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 10, 1958

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, we in Missouri are extremely proud of our State highway system. A large part of the credit for our excellent system goes to the voters of Missouri who have consistently supported sound road programs.

The will of the people for good roads, soundly financed, has been given a push toward realization by an outstanding professional group, the Missouri Highway Engineers Association.

This group met recently in Kansas City, Mo., and those in attendance had an opportunity to hear, among other speeches by outstanding men, a very fine talk by Missouri's distinguished Senator, the Honorable STUART SYMINGTON.

A former member of the Senate Committee on Public Works, Senator SYMINGTON, discussed the subject, Why Modern Highways Are Essential to America.

Under unanimous consent, I include his speech in the RECORD:

WHY MODERN HIGHWAYS ARE ESSENTIAL TO AMERICA

(Address by Senator SYMINGTON before the Highway Engineers Association annual dinner, Kansas City, Mo., February 27, 1958)

At a time when the minds of many are concentrated on outer space, it would seem wise—and it is certainly pleasant—to get down to earth and talk about our highways.

This is one subject on which we can point up our needs, outline our deficiencies, and still know that we are far superior to any other country on earth.

There are those who believe that world conditions make it necessary to curtail heavily our highway program, in order to increase our defense strength.

Nothing could be more erroneous—or, for that matter, more dangerous.

In this nuclear age, highways are an integral and vital part of our defense strength. We must be able to move rapidly. There can be no breakdown in transportation. Such a breakdown would immobilize America.

As illustration, into the city of New York alone, there moves each day over the bridges and through the tunnels over 20,000 tons of food.

Without one of the world's most modern highway systems leading into that city, this would be impossible.

Let's not consider as any luxury, therefore, our planned, modern highway system. It is a necessity, and the record so proves.

For some time I sat on the Senate Public Works Committee, that committee which handles the highway program in the Senate.

Both in that committee and on the Senate floor, Senator ALBERT GORE, of Tennessee, was the leader in development of progressive highway legislation.

The ranking minority member and former chairman is Senator EDWARD MARTIN of Pennsylvania; and I never heard the matter of good highways come up that he did not emphasize their value to our national security.

Such a system is also vital to our prosperity. America can only continue to exist as we

know it through emphasis on a strong, progressive, dynamic economy.

In the past 10 years our gross national product has increased from \$257 billion to \$434 billion. Our highways must be geared to support that gigantic increase in economic activity.

Money and effort efficiently devoted to highway construction can only be a sound investment in the future of the United States.

Today, with this country experiencing an economic decline, the Nation's highway program has an added significance.

It is quite possible that the tortoiselike speed exhibited in much highway construction throughout the country has in itself contributed to the current recession. Certainly, this added stimulus to employment, plus the increased demand for construction materials and equipment, would help turn the trend of our economy in the right direction.

But essentials such as highways should not be postponed, like medicine, for use only when economy is ill.

A construction program geared to the increased needs and increased population is sound, regardless of our general economic health.

It is better to have a stepped-up highway program now, with the resultant improvement in our economy, than to have a relief program inaugurated later in order to stay the rate of deterioration of our economy.

This same principle applies to school construction, flood-control projects, and other comparable programs.

The Federal Government as well as the State and local governments have a constructive tool ready at hand to accomplish two major objectives—eliminate our highway deficiencies, and reverse the recession trend.

The Federal-aid highway program is based on the principle of partnership between the Federal Government and the States. It is important that this does not involve a taking over by the Central Government of the prerogatives of the States.

The broad interests of the country as a whole, and of each taxpayer in particular, should be protected and encouraged by the Federal Government. In so doing, that Government has insisted on minimum construction standards; and has retained a veto power as to where Federal funds should be used.

These powers have been embodied in law and are all right if used in an atmosphere of agreement on objectives.

But the role of the States is largely unimpaired by this centralized authority. Federal highway aid should not and has not been translated into Federal domination.

On this point may I give deserved credit to the contributions—both in attitude and in ideas—of Missouri officials and Missouri citizens who have played a most important role in the passage of the 1956 act.

As you know, the proposal for an all-powerful Federal organization to administer our road programs was discarded; and is something we plan to do our best to see will not be revived.

Any actions which would tend to delay or stymie effective implementation of the present program can only encourage the proponents of greater centralized control to revive their unfortunate proposals.

Historically, Federal-State cooperation in building highways has been increasing at an irregular pace. Fortunately, however, it has been going in the right direction.

As we view the history of this progress, three major legislative actions stand out.

The Federal Highway Act of 1916 initiated the development of an integrated highway system, and established the requirement that every State must have a functioning highway department before it could be eligible for assistance under the act.

The Federal Aid Act of 1944 authorized a national system of interstate highways to connect metropolitan areas and industrial centers throughout the country.

The most recent legislative milestone in this field is the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1956. In this act our legislative program came of age—more nearly geared, in magnitude and policy, to the economic and defense needs of the country.

If this legislation is administered as Congress intended, we will have, in fact, a national highway system.

This 1956 act earmarked funds from specific sources. I cannot say I believe that this is necessarily the best way to finance a program of such importance and magnitude, as the amount of funds can fluctuate downward while the need for the highways increases.

Actually, a sound and adequate highway structure benefits all—not just the users—and hence necessary funds might appropriately come from general revenue accounts.

In spite of certain weaknesses, however, I consider the 1956 Highway Act an outstanding development in highway legislation.

Now that the intent of the American people, reflected through their Congress, has been clearly expressed in this law, it would seem wise to go about getting the job done as effectively and promptly as possible.

At this point, let me draw a brief parallel with what happened last year in the military defense program.

National intelligence information substantiated beyond reasonable doubt that we were rapidly losing both our qualitative and quantitative superiority to the Soviets in weapons systems. The need to act to reverse our relative decline was clear. Yet, our military manpower was cut back, funds for research and development were withheld, production schedules of planes and submarines were decreased, and ballistic missile programs were curtailed.

Turning to our new highway program, we see some of the same forces at work. Efforts are being made to stretch out the program. Actions are proposed for diverting money from the trust fund to pay expenses of the Labor Department, to pay tax collectors of the Treasury Department, to finance costs for national forest roads, and to withdraw revenues obtained from the aviation gasoline tax.

These diversions are estimated to amount to as much as \$68 million per year.

Here, again, we have evidence of the policy of placing fiscal objectives ahead of this country's welfare.

In the face of increasing costs and increasing requirements, the need is to increase the highway trust fund—not to raid it.

There are many features of this highway program about which you know much more than I.

As an example, there is the question of the State allocation formula, currently being reviewed because the Congress soon has to take action regarding it.

Hearings are being held, and I understand the Comptroller General is being asked to analyze the data.

Without attempting to suggest the proper formula before we have all the facts and analyses, I do believe that it is necessary to have uniform criteria for defining the needs of the respective States, regardless of what formula is used.

And so, in summary, it would seem that a sound approach to carrying out the highway program can be stated simply: Determine the needs for highways for all purposes; provide, on a Federal-State cooperative basis, as much financing as is required to meet those needs fully; and then put the program into effect as quickly as possible, without adjustments for nonhighway objectives.

Revision of Coal Mine Safety Law Is Imperative in Safeguarding Human Lives

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 10, 1958

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, legislation was introduced in the Congress on January 13 to bring all underground coal mines in the United States, no matter how many men are employed, under the jurisdiction of the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act of 1952.

Under the present law, mines employing 14 or less men cannot be shut down by Federal coal mine inspectors no matter how hazardous are the conditions existing in the mines. These are known as title I mines. Title II mines—employing 15 or more men—can be ordered shut down by Federal inspectors for violations of the safety law.

I was a Member of Congress when the first mine safety bills were introduced. The legislation received my full support throughout the years when it was being shunted back and forth between Congressional committees and from the House to the Senate. The fight was hard and bitter. The United Mine Workers of America, as sponsors of the original bill, were opposed by the Federal Bureau of Mines, the State bureaus of mines, the coal mining industry and other powerful interests of the Nation who were violently opposed to such legislation on principle. It was a desperate and bitter struggle which ended year after year with no action by Congress. The bills died and coal miners died. Meanwhile as many as 2,500 a year were crushed or blown to eternity, as high as 50,000 injured, and many crippled for life. Widows and orphans were thrown upon cold charities for an existence or forced to depend upon friends and relatives, in many cases almost as poor as the dependents themselves.

One of the strongest arguments used throughout the vicious fight was the argument that there was no necessity for the law, because it provided a duplication of State effort which was unneeded. It was a powerful argument and carried great weight with legislators who knew nothing of coal mining or coal law enforcement. So the slaughter went on from day to day, month after month, year after year, until the saying that "every ton of coal mined in America was stained with the blood of the men who mined it" became almost literally true.

Then came Centralia with its 111 burned and blasted bodies and Orient number 2 with its 119 dead, to awaken the public conscience and lend force to the demand that the Congress do something. And the Congress, acting slowly and reluctantly, passed a punchless and toothless law that gave the experts of the Bureau of Mines the right to inspect any mine in America but gave them no power to enforce their findings. Presumably the Congress of the United

States had hoped by its action to force the various mining States to provide more rigorous laws and strict enforcement under the threat of having the blame for these explosions laid right upon the doorsteps of the State. If so, it did not work and the killing and maiming went on although in a slightly less degree.

It remained for a colleague of mine from Pennsylvania and a fellow Republican to provide the answer for most of the mining problems of that day, particularly those of major disasters. Representative Samuel J. McConnell, the ranking Republican member of the House Committee on Education and Labor, troubled by the terrific death and injury rate in the coal industry, introduced legislation covering mine safety. The bill was referred to a special subcommittee of the Committee on Education and Labor, under the leadership of the late Augustine B. Kelley, Democrat, of Greensburg, Pa. With thousands of people prophesying defeat, these dedicated men sat down with the experts from the mining industry, the Government and the union, and drafted a bill which became Public Law 552 in the 82d Congress.

I know every man on the Education and Labor Committee at that time is today proud of the part the committee played in passing title II of the coal-mine-safety bill. It was brought out of the full committee with a few added amendments, one in particular by the present chairman of the committee, Hon. GRAHAM A. BARDEN, which has resulted in the setting up of 9 modern State mining laws, more efficient, more up to date than our own Federal setup. Another amendment, limiting Federal law enforcement to mines employing 15 or more men was accepted in committee in the interests of getting legislation passed. It was accepted under protest by the United Mine Workers of America, the Bureau of Mines and some coal operators. Other Congressmen besides myself doubted that it was good legislation but in the spirit of compromise it was accepted. Both Republicans and Democrats in the Congress gave this bill enthusiastic support and approved it with little opposition. And the result was overwhelming. From an industry which had killed as high as 2,500 men a year and injured many thousands, it became an industry that saw 461 killed in 1953, 396 in 1954, 413 in 1955, 446 in 1956, and 473 in 1957. In 1955 and 1956 there were no major disasters, an almost unbelievable phenomenon. At long last everyone in the business of mining coal—operator, miner, inspector, State and Federal—were working together and the death and injury rate started dropping. It is unthinkable that it should be allowed to start once again on an upward spiral.

Mr. Speaker, I am confident that no Member of Congress wants the return of conditions in coal mining which prevailed before 1952. I am sure everyone was highly elated at the success of Federal participation and wants it to continue as long as it is doing a good job.

There is plenty of work for all concerned—Federal, State, county, and local safety groups, which aid and implement each other to the benefit of all who work in this necessary and dangerous industry.

I am alarmed, however, over the rising death and injury rate as shown in recent statistics from the Bureau of Mines. Times are hard and economic conditions are forcing workers to accept risks and corner cutting in safety measures that they would not accept under ordinary circumstances. The death and injury rate in roof falls is increasingly alarming. In my own State of Pennsylvania we read regularly of whole mining communities being called upon to spend agonizing days and hours trying to save the lives of poor unfortunates who have taken their lives in their hands trying to make a living in some doghole or abandoned mine.

The most appalling is the fact that proportionately there are 3 deaths in the small mines to every 1 death in the larger mines.

The small mines produced in 1956 only 7.6 percent of the total production of coal, both anthracite and bituminous coal, but they killed 21.1 percent of the men who died in coal-mine accidents.

In 1955 the small mines killed 19.2 percent of the total number of men killed. In 1956 the small mines killed 21.1 percent of the total. And in 1957 the small mines killed 25.9 percent of the total.

The fatality rate in the small mines for 1957 was 4.49 per million man-hours of exposure. In the larger mines the fatality rate for the year was 1.22 per million man-hours of exposure.

In 1956 the small underground mines produced only 28,139,454 tons of coal, while the larger underground mines produced 344,254,843.

Yet there were in 1957 a total of 7,659 small underground mines producing, as against only 1,484 larger underground mines. The charge has been made that many small coal operators purposely employ 14 or less men so that they will not have to obey the Federal law.

In addition to the 7,659 underground small mines, there were, in 1957, 1,586 strip mines in production and 150 auger mines. These surface operations are not covered by the Federal law as far as authority to close them down is concerned.

Latest information, for the period from January 1 through January 30, 1958, shows an ever increasing trend in fatalities in the small underground mines. For that period the small underground mines killed 37 percent of the men killed; the larger underground mines killed 53 percent, and strip mines killed 10 percent.

Mr. Speaker, I have sponsored H. R. 10807, a bill to bring all underground mines in the United States under the jurisdiction of the Federal Mine Safety Act of 1952. Many of my colleagues are sponsoring similar bills. I think the legislation is needed. I can see no justification for saying that a mine which employs 15 or more men must comply with the law and keep its mine in a safe

condition while one that employs 14 or less can do as they wish about conditions and no one can intervene in the cause of safety. Personally, I can see no reason why any employer should object to this amendment to the existing law. Any man who keeps his mine in a safe condition has nothing to fear from an inspection whether he employs 1 or a 1,000 men. If it is not safe he should not be allowed to operate. I think every man who enters a hole in the ground to mine coal is entitled to every protection his government—Federal, State and county—can give him. Surely, now with conditions depressed in the coal industry, we should be more vigilant than ever. Since we have found the answer to some of the problems of this dangerous industry it is my opinion we should strive more diligently to further reduce its perils by strengthening the law wherever possible.

Italy Will Stand With the West

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 10, 1958

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, Nikita S. Khrushchev, now Grand Panjandrum of the Soviet Russian empire, is seeking to catch Italy. He is attempting to woo her with his usual cunning, wiles and trickery. But Italy will not, I am sure, rise to the bait.

Boss Khrushchev, who has caused many heads to decorate the platter, asks Italy to get out of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and become a neutral between the East and the West. In return, the Moscow chief would grant Italy "esteem and understanding." That is like asking one to give up a pearl of great price for a bauble. Independence and freedom in return for a gewgaw. Unthinkable.

President Gronchi and Premier Penna were not—in common parlance—born yesterday. They will, I am sure, reject the invitation of the Kremlin in no uncertain terms.

Khrushchev promises peace, trade, prosperity, unlimited atomic power—plus advice of Russian technicians on agriculture. The sting is in the tail. A procession of Russian spies and agents provocateur would stream into Italy, presumably to help in the depressed areas, but actually to subvert the Italian democracy into a Communist state.

Another price that Italy would pay for ushering in the Soviet millenium would be Italy's pulling out of European Common Market and Euratom. The European Common Market—Euromarket—and European Atomic Energy Community—Euratom—consist of six Western European nations, who signed a treaty at Rome in 1957 and committed themselves to abolish within 15 years all customs barriers and to cooperate for the peaceful uses of atomic energy.

This is just Soviet midsummer madness. But the Moscow boss places no limitation on his "delusions of grandeur."

The leaders of Italy, well aware of the new Machiavelli from the north, are on guard. They know that Czar Khrushchev's offer came at a time when all the Italian political parties are opening their campaign for the general elections to be held on May 25 and 26. This is but a shrewd and abortive attempt to augment the Communist vote in Italy. It is a crude and rough interference in the internal affairs of Italy. The offer of Khrushchev has already been headlined in the Italian Communist press for fellow travelers.

Italy will rebuff the latest knavery from the Kremlin. She will stand by her commitments. She cherishes her independence. She realizes she is an equal among the Western Democracies and will not be prided away from the Western Alliance.

Educational Standards

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT J. McINTOSH

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 10, 1958

Mr. McINTOSH. Mr. Speaker, today the American people are engaged in an effort to improve educational standards throughout the country. Before the Congress are a number of proposals with that object in view.

Certainly at the heart of attempts to improve educational standards stands the teacher himself. No scholarship program, however vast, and no Federal-aid program, however extensive, can ever take the place of the character, skill, and devotion of individual teachers. Every effort must be made to provide incentives to well-qualified teachers. The impressively sponsored and staffed Educational Policies Commission said this:

The quality of learning in schools and colleges depends upon skillful teaching * * * the highest single priority, therefore, in responding to the contemporary challenge to American education is the recruitment, education, and retention in the profession of qualified teachers.

Teachers, however, have seldom received the incentives that their crucial role in the life of our society deserves. Through the years, teachers' salaries have lagged behind compensation for other professions and vocations. The average college faculty salary is estimated by the NEA to be around \$4,100 for instructors and \$5,730 for associate professors. The average salary of an instructor on the college level is less than the average income of an industrial worker. A full professor's salary is only slightly more.

While low salary levels affect recruitment of teachers, this is primarily a problem to be met by local action. But complex and confused rulings by the Internal Revenue Service on the deduc-

tibility of teachers' continuing education costs have discouraged the teacher, once licensed, from pursuing his education to his full capacity. This situation which discourages ambition at the very level where it should be most encouraged is one that falls within the scope of Congressional action. Legislation that will permit the teacher to deduct the costs of continuing his inservice training should be enacted.

In a sense, such legislation does not properly fall into the category of tax relief but rather into the category of a just correction of a now existing discriminatory practice against the teaching profession. A lawyer can attend a real estate institute and deduct the costs as necessary expense. An insurance man can take a short course in estate planning and deduct the costs as necessary expense. A doctor can take a refresher course in anesthetics and deduct the costs as necessary expense. An actor may take a physical culture course to shed excess poundage and deduct the costs as necessary expense. The science teacher, however, who takes a summer course in physics to keep abreast of ever-expanding horizons cannot deduct the costs as necessary expense.

The *Celina* (Ohio) Daily Standard described the inequity in this somewhat blunt but picturesque way:

A businessman is after a fat contract. So he loads the prospect into a private plane and flies to Florida. They live in \$60-a-day hotel suites, eat the best food, drink the best liquor, take in all of the night spots.

Every penny—the liquor bill and the tips and all—is tax deductible. It is part of the expense of making a buck. But an underpaid teacher goes to school for the summer. He lives in the cheapest room he can find, cooks beans on a hotplate, buys dog-eared textbooks.

Tax deductible? Are you kidding? Not if he is going to school just because he wants to become a better teacher.

Sounds incredible, does it not? But, incredible as it sounds, it is happening every day. At present, teachers can deduct the expenses of attending a summer school or evening classes only if they take these courses in order to keep their present positions. This concession was made only after the courts ruled in Hill against Commissioner that courses taken under administrative edict were deductible. The Internal Revenue Service has taken a very narrow view of this ruling. In effect, its interpretation holds that a teacher cannot deduct these educational expenses unless he would have been fired had he not taken the courses. This interpretation is so restrictive that its effect has made it almost impossible for a teacher to deduct any educational expenses. A strong recommendation is not enough. It must be a requirement. To take just one example, the Chicago Board of Education does not require that any teacher expend any money to keep a position after passing the exam to receive it. Thus, no Chicago teacher, under this interpretation, is able to deduct any expenses for professional improvement. Examples could be multiplied ad infinitum.

The Internal Revenue Service's defense in strictly limiting deductions by

teachers is an alleged lack of statutory authority for deductions. The history of uncertainty in interpretation and ambiguity of regulation on the whole issue seem to suggest that a satisfactory resolution of the problem can only be achieved through clarifying legislation.

In the case of Coughlin against Commission, the courts have upheld the right of an attorney to deduct the cost of attending a series of lectures on taxation. The court pointed out that the attorney was morally bound to keep himself informed and up to date and that expenses of this sort were deductible when directly connected with practices of his profession. Surely, the teacher has an equally great moral obligation—if not greater—to keep himself informed and up to date. Yet even the proposed modifications will not permit him to do so and deduct the expenses.

So clearly do such examples reflect a demand for more just and equal treatment for teachers that 25 Members of Congress, including myself, have introduced bills designed to bring greater justice to the American teacher.

Most of the bills provide that established teachers may deduct the amount of their educational expenses up to \$600 in any 1 taxable year, without having to prove that the courses taken were necessary to prevent loss of job.

Many organizations have studied and endorsed this legislation. They include:

The United States Chamber of Commerce which calls for permission for teachers to deduct from gross taxable income reasonable costs for courses taken to increase their competence and professional position.

The National Science Teachers' Association which says the Federal Government can stimulate and assist in this area—opportunities for science teachers to update their knowledge of subject matter and techniques of teaching—by passing legislation to allow income-tax deductions for funds spent by teachers to take inservice and summer courses for self-improvement.

The National Education Association which believes that the Internal Revenue Code should be amended to establish a uniform policy granting tax exemptions for professional expenses.

It is, of course, axiomatic that if the youth of the country are to be well educated, we must have a well educated and well informed body of teachers. With summer school attendance becoming more and more costly, many teachers who would like to take additional instruction are financially unable to do so. The small relief provided by this legislation would undoubtedly enable some teachers to make these expenditures and would provide an incentive to others.

The annual revenue loss is estimated to be—at most—\$18,372,374. The legislation does not involve any appropriations for increased salaries or subsidies or Federal control of any kind. It simply extends to teachers the even break they deserve. It is a positive step in the right direction that can be taken now to provide personal incentive to improve our teaching profession.

Everyone agrees that something must be done to help our schools. Here is a simple way to enable teachers to help themselves. This bill will end discriminatory practices against and provide incentive for the most overburdened and underpaid professional in our society: the American teacher.

The Financial Institutions Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE E. KILBURN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 10, 1958

Mr. KILBURN. Mr. Speaker, I am sure the Members of the House will be interested in the following insertion. It is part of a speech given by Senator A. WILLIS ROBERTSON, of Virginia, at a banquet of group 1 of the Virginia Bankers Association at Virginia Beach, March 8, 1958. I have selected the portions of Senator ROBERTSON'S speech which have to do with the Financial Institutions Act already passed by the Senate. A companion bill has been introduced in the House by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BROWN]. These bills are now before the House Banking and Currency Committee.

I hope all the Members will read Senator ROBERTSON'S clear and concise statement:

As I stated in a speech before the State bank division of the American Bankers Association in Atlantic City last September, there is no group in the United States that is more interested in a sound economy and a stable dollar than our bankers. It was in recognition of that fact that I proposed in the summer of 1956 a review of our banking and credit laws and their codification.

That proposal resulted in a bill, designated as the Financial Institutions Act of 1957, which was passed by the Senate last March and which is now pending in the House along with a companion bill sponsored by Representative BROWN of Georgia.

These bills, unfortunately, have become the subject of misrepresentation and unfounded charges, including one that they are bankers' bills. To put the real facts on record, I want to review with you, briefly, the history of the Senate bill.

Virginia lawyers know how often the general laws of Virginia have been reviewed, new acts codified and published as a new code. Lawyers also know how often the criminal provisions of the United States Code have been codified and a few years ago the Congress codified the tax laws. But, strange to say, never in our history has there been a codification of the Nation's banking and credit laws. Prior to 1956 the banking laws had not even been reviewed since the passage of the Banking Act of 1935.

So, in the summer of 1956, Chairman FULBRIGHT of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee authorized me to conduct a study on behalf of the committee of all the Federal statutes governing banks, savings and loan associations, and credit unions.

All of the Federal supervisory agencies, namely, the Comptroller of the Currency, the Federal Reserve Board, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, and the Bureau of Federal Credit Unions were asked to review their

statutes and submit recommendations for amendments. In addition, the Treasury Department, the General Accounting Office, and the Bureau of the Budget undertook similar studies.

Along with the help of the Government agencies, we also desired the views of private industry. In August 1956, an advisory committee consisting of leading experts representing all segments of the financial field was appointed to assist our committee.

Some critics of the bill have implied that there was something sinister about the advisory committee, and have said that it was terrible to have one. I have never been associated with a finer group of public-spirited men. They paid all their own expenses in connection with their committee work and did not receive any compensation from the Government. Each Senator on the Banking Committee appointed one member of the advisory committee, and the attempts that have been made to impugn the motives of the advisory committee are resented. It is experiences such as this that make private citizens reluctant to serve the Federal Government in any capacity.

In November 1956 our committee held hearings on the more than 180 amendments recommended by the Government agencies. In December 1956, the advisory committee submitted a report covering more than 200 different proposals.

After carefully reviewing all of the testimony and the recommendations made by the Federal agencies and the advisory committee, the able counsel of my subcommittee, Don Rogers, and I prepared what I announced to the press as a tentative bill which would be the basis for public hearings.

I deliberately eliminated from the tentative bill new policy issues and limited the controversial issues as far as practical to those which had previously been considered either by the Senate or the House but on which no final action had been taken.

This draft was printed as a committee print bill, and in January and February 1957 5 weeks of hearings were held on it. Testimony was received from the Government agencies, all the major financial trade associations, and all private individuals who requested to be heard. As a result of these hearings, the proposed bill was revised and amended and reported to the Senate as the Financial Institutions Act.

The Senate debated the bill for a week and adopted further amendments before it was passed late in March 1957.

There is no basis in this history to support a charge that this is a bankers' bill. It is true that the views of the financial industry were solicited—it would be foolish not to. However, we also solicited the views of the Government agencies and of every private individual who expressed an interest in the legislation. And certainly the United States Chamber of Commerce in endorsing the Senate bill was speaking for the business interests of the Nation and not just for bankers.

I do not suggest that this is a perfect bill, and I don't want to imply that I agree with every provision in it. There is room on some items for honest differences of opinion, as was brought out in the debate in our committee and on the Senate floor. But on the whole, the bill is a constructive one and in the public interest. Therefore, I object to anyone characterizing the bill as being dictated by any segment of private industry. To make such a charge is to impugn the integrity of every member of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee and the United States Senate—to say nothing of our splendid committee staff members who worked so faithfully on the technicalities involved.

Those who make the charge that this is a bankers' bill never mention the provisions that strengthen the powers of the banks'

supervisory authorities. To mention just a few of these provisions: There is the prohibition against conflicts of interest by supervisory agency employees; the requirement for the disclosure of the identity of major stockholders; the authority to limit dividend payments by national banks; the strengthening of the procedure for the removal of bank officers and directors for unsafe and unsound practices; the strengthening of the procedure to terminate FDIC insurance; the prohibition against political contributions by insured banks; and many others. These provisions are specifically designed to give the Federal agencies authority to meet modern day problems and to better protect the depositors of our banks.

It has been charged that there are a great number of sleepers in the bill. I can assure you that the Members of the Senate were not asleep when they voted for the bill. It was given careful consideration.

Among items called sleepers was a provision permitting national banks to write insurance in cities of under 5,000 population. This statute has been on the books since 1916 and was not changed by the Financial Institutions Act. The extraordinary charge has been made that if this provision is continued in the law, it will put the jobs of 200,000 insurance agents in jeopardy.

How absurd. The statute has been in operation for over 30 years, and there are only 77 national banks writing insurance in cities under 5,000 population. This is just one example of the fantastic campaign of misrepresentation that has been waged against the bill. I am happy to say that the National Association of Insurance Agents has not been misled by this accusation and has filed a statement with the House Banking and Currency Committee stating that the association has no objection to the present law.

A great turmoil has been stirred up about another relatively minor provision of the bill. This amendment to the present statute regarding the maximum rate of interest that may be charged by a national bank consists of only one sentence, as follows: "The purchase of obligations or evidences of indebtedness from the actual owner thereof shall not for the purposes of this section, be deemed a loan or discount if such purchase would not, under the law of the State in which the purchasing bank is located, be deemed a loan or extension of credit subject to the interest or usury statutes of such State."

There is nothing mysterious about this language. It merely puts national banks on a par with State banks and is clearly in line with our desire to perpetuate a dual banking system. Yet it has been charged that this provision is "immoral" and would permit national banks to charge 50 percent interest. If those who made such charges would talk to our State bankers and their customers, they would find out how wrong they are.

It also has been charged that the bill would permit banks to make gifts, such as tickets to My Fair Lady and Cadillac automobiles, to their big depositors. This is really a bewildering accusation, because the bill contains exactly the same language as the present Federal Reserve Act concerning time and demand deposits. The irresponsible nature of these charges seems to have no bounds.

I am confident that H. R. 7026, by Representative Brown, which to a large extent is the companion bill to S. 1451, will be passed and differences between the House and Senate adjusted in conference. It is constructive legislation to codify the banking laws so that bankers can get easy access to the rules under which they operate, and it is in the public interest to make the Federal supervision of financial institutions more effective while helping these institutions to meet the modern-day credit needs of our people.

Last, but not least, this banking legislation recognizes a vital principle of our Government—a dual banking system functioning within the framework of private enterprise. It contains no new encroachment of Federal powers over the rights of the States—a trend which I deplored in a speech at Virginia Beach last October.

Adapting Federal laws to meet modern-day demands without upsetting the delicate balance of powers between Federal and State units is essential if we are to preserve the unique system of government fashioned by our Founding Fathers.

I feel that the Financial Institutions Act is in keeping with that fundamental principle and merits the support not only of bankers but of all businessmen interested in the perpetuation of the American system of competitive enterprise privately financed.

Reciprocal Trade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 10, 1958

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the reciprocal trade bill I am introducing today is the only reciprocal trade bill before Congress at this time. My bill will promote an increase in foreign trade on a truly reciprocal basis.

The following is an analysis of my bill which I believe an overwhelming majority of this Congress can support:

SECTIONAL SUMMARY

This bill spells out a declaration that the Congress seeks to restore reciprocal, mutually advantageous trade with friendly foreign nations in a manner which is consistent with a sound domestic economy, in harmony with broad aspects of our foreign trade policy, and also protects domestic agriculture, industry, and labor and benefits our national security.

Section 360 of the bill continues in effect existing rates of duty, including rates established by trade agreements. Even though existing trade agreements be canceled, there would be no automatic increase of such rates.

Section 361: The Tariff Commission is renamed and designated as the legislative agency to carry out the policy of the Congress. There is vested in it additional powers to carry out its duties as the legislative agent to whom the Congress has delegated the task of administering the provisions of the bill. The name of the Tariff Commission is changed to the Foreign Trade Board and the present Tariff Commissioners continue to be members of the Board.

This section of the bill also provides that the number of members of the Board shall be increased to seven and that members hereafter appointed to the Board shall be removable from office only by the Congress.

Section 362: This section sets out duties to be performed by the Board in carrying out the general principles of the bill so as to vest in the Board full responsibility to provide information by which the President shall be guided in negotiating trade agreements.

This section also establishes criteria by which the Board may determine whether a trade agreement would be reciprocal and beneficial to the United States and a foreign country. It also describes types of discriminations against the commerce of the United States.

This section further provides that the Board, rather than an executive department

agency, shall prepare a list of items on which it is proposed to negotiate a trade agreement with a foreign country.

Section 363 directs the Board to advise the President as to the extent to which duties and other import restrictions applied by foreign countries affect exports from the United States.

Section 364: This section establishes the principle that trade agreements shall be concluded on a bilateral basis with a foreign government as to any or all items of merchandise for which each foreign government is a principal supplier to the United States.

This section also utilizes provisions of existing law, modified in some respects, requiring public hearings to be held in connection with items which are intended to be included within a proposed trade agreement.

Section 365: This section continues the existing provisions of law defining domestic industry.

Section 366 is an entirely new provision of law in which the Board is directed to establish peril points. Criteria are set forth to guide the Board in making peril-point determinations prior to the negotiation of a trade agreement, including the establishment of quota limitations.

Section 367 is a modification of existing law as to application of reductions in rates.

Section 368 continues existing law limiting the term of a trade agreement to a period of 3 years, subject thereafter to termination upon 6 months' notice. It also requires that each foreign trade agreement concluded pursuant to provisions of the bill shall be reviewed periodically in order to determine whether the entire agreement continues to be truly reciprocal and mutually advantageous.

This section continues the provisions of the existing law insofar as the most-favored-nation principle is concerned. It amends existing law in that it spells out categories of discrimination against American commerce which nullify or impair the most-favored-nation principle. The enumeration and description of acts of discrimination represent a means of protecting our export markets as well as our domestic commerce.

Section 369. This section puts into law administrative practices which were followed prior to the proclamation of GATT. In bilateral agreements concluded under the Trade Agreements Act of 1934, several of these agreements contained provisions that either party could withdraw from the agreement, or modify its terms in the event that a third country became chief beneficiary of a concession contained in such agreements. The bill would establish this desirable administrative practice as a permanent policy objective of the Congress.

Section 370. This section substantially repeats the provisions of existing law concerning escape-clause remedies. It provides, however, that in instances where injury or threat of injury under the escape-clause provisions has been found to exist, that the President may not disregard such findings but injury or threat of injury shall be deemed to constitute a discrimination against domestic commerce.

Section 371 modifies existing law concerning products having a national defense or national security aspect.

Section 372 provides for "escape" relief, where a product involved has a national defense or security aspect.

Section 373 provides that existing trade agreements shall be reviewed in order to determine whether they conform to the policies and standards expressed in the bill for the conduct of our future reciprocal trade relations with foreign countries.

The section also provides that existing trade agreements shall also be reviewed in order to determine whether concessions made therein have been destroyed or adversely modified the duty rate structure established in the

Tariff Act of 1930, which recognized and provided for percentage differentials in rates of duty upon (a) a raw material, (b) a semi-processed article produced in whole or in part from such raw material, or (c) a finished article or product produced by utilizing the semi-processed item in whole or in part.

Section 374 provides that wherever a recommendation of the Board for concessions in duty or modifications of import restrictions be limited to a certain volume, that the President in his negotiations with a foreign country be required to limit such concession to permit imports to be admitted up to an amount equivalent to 5 percent of domestic production of like or directly competitive articles during a specified period of time.

The Alleged Inherent Right of the Executive To Withhold Information From Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 10, 1958

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, for years the executive branch of the Government has encroached upon the field of law-making—all in the guise of inherent power.

Without constitutional direction, without statutory permission, without judicial sanction, the executive branch has slowly and surely introduced into our governmental structure a great mass of orders, rules and regulations designed to have the force and effect of law.

Upon occasion the President has even attempted to fashion law by letter, by press conference, or by mere oral communication. A particular example of this unusual lawmaking power came to light in our study in the Government Information Subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations.

On May 17, 1954—during the Army-McCarthy hearings—President Eisenhower directed a letter to the Secretary of Defense concerning that Department's problems with supplying information to a Congressional committee, the Senate Committee on Government Operations.

In effect, he said to the Secretary of Defense: You will instruct employees of your Department that in all of their appearances before the subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Government Operations regarding the inquiry now before it they are not to testify to any such conversations or communications or to produce any such documents or reproductions.

This was a mere letter of instruction. Yet at a hearing before our subcommittee on November 14, 1956, that mere letter was construed by legal counsel in the Department of Defense as the law.

Specifically, we were told:

Well, the May 17 letter is a statement of the law. I think you could analogize it to a decision of the Supreme Court. For example, the Supreme Court addresses itself to specific cases which are before it, but when it renders a decision on a specific case it enunciates law, and that law is relied upon by lawyers generally as an expression of what the law generally is.

The May 17 letter expresses the President's position with respect to a certain type of subject matter, and I do not think we could expect him to reinstruct us on each succeeding occasion once he had indicated what the position of the executive branch of the Government was to be (hearings, p. 1815).

Amazingly enough our subcommittee's hearing record indicates that this letter of May 17 has been cited by 19 agencies—House Report No. 2947, page 281—as authority for actions taken by other departments—other agencies. Similarly other committees of Congress have had this same letter, or the memorandum from the Attorney General attached to it, cited authoritatively about 11 times.

Why is this letter of May 17 cited so widely and so often interpreted as the law? We have been able to find no memorandum directing it to the attention of other heads of executive departments or executive agencies—hearings page 1821. It appears to be simply a letter to the Secretary of Defense.

But it was directed to departments and agencies we are told. Counsel within the Department of Defense explains:

The very day it came out the whole matter was given publicity by a press release * * * the press release was transmitted throughout the Government (hearings, p. 1821).

A great deal of information is so informally communicated they say.

A letter—a press release—a writing from the President's Office—anything enunciating a principle is enough, we are told. "It is binding." In this particular instance the Defense Department attorneys tell us that it is bound by the President's letter of May 17, and its interpretations as expounded in a press conference of July 6, 1955, a letter from Sherman Adams to Hon. WILLIAM L. DAWSON on July 2, 1956, and a letter from Mr. Gerald Morgan to Mr. Clark Mollenhoff, of the Des Moines Register, on October 26, 1956—hearings, page 1830.

And so it appears that if the President chooses to enunciate a principle, it makes no difference how it is communicated, the Defense Department is bound by it—hearings, page 1831—other departments and agencies are bound by it—"it enunciates the law."

If we are to silently submit and not object to these methods and these interpretations of so-called binding law we are abdicating our legislative power vested in the Congress of the United States by the Constitution.

If we submit to this unqualified, unsupported, unfortified claim of "inherent power" in the Executive, the day will come when Congress will not have to come to Washington. The Executive will fully legislate as well as administer.

Therefore, my distinguished colleagues, I repeat what the House Government Information Subcommittee reported, and unanimously approved by the 30-member full Committee on Government Operations, in its report to the House in July 1956:

The most flagrant abuse of so-called legal authority is the misuse of the May 17, 1954, letter from the President to the Secretary of Defense at the time of the Army-McCarthy controversy. Regardless of the questionable

legal basis of the Attorney General's memorandum on which the President acted, the letter was, by its very terms, a specific instruction to the Secretary of Defense for a specific purpose and to a specific committee of the Senate. It seems inconceivable that 19 Government departments and agencies would cite this letter as a shadowy cloak of authority to restrict or withhold information from the Congress and the public. This flimsy pretext of so-called legal authority only serves to demonstrate to what extent executive departments and agencies will go to restrict or withhold information.

The letters discussed are as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE.

The honorable the SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: It has long been recognized that to assist the Congress in achieving its legislative purposes every executive department or agency must, upon the request of a Congressional committee, expeditiously furnish information relating to any matter within the jurisdiction of the committee, with certain historical exceptions—some of which are pointed out in the attached memorandum from the Attorney General. This administration has been and will continue to be diligent in following this principle. However, it is essential to the successful working of our system that the persons entrusted with power in any one of the three great branches of Government shall not encroach upon the authority confided to the others. The ultimate responsibility for the conduct of the executive branch rests with the President.

Within this constitutional framework each branch should cooperate fully with each other for the common good. However, throughout our history the President has withheld information whenever he found that what was sought was confidential or its disclosure would be incompatible with the public interest or jeopardize the safety of the Nation.

Because it is essential to efficient and effective administration that employees of the executive branch be in a position to be completely candid in advising with each other on official matters, and because it is not in the public interest that any of their conversations or communications or any documents or reproductions concerning such advice be disclosed, you will instruct employees of your Department that in all of their appearances before the subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Government Operations regarding the inquiry now before it they are not to testify to any such conversations or communications or to produce any such documents or reproductions. This principle must be maintained regardless of who would be benefited by such disclosures.

I direct this action so as to maintain the proper separation of powers between the executive and legislative branches of the Government in accordance with my responsibilities and duties under the Constitution. This separation is vital to preclude the exercise of arbitrary power by any branch of the Government.

By this action I am not in any way restricting the testimony of such witnesses as to what occurred regarding any matters where the communication was directly between any of the principals in the controversy within the executive branch on the one hand and a member of the subcommittee or its staff on the other.

Sincerely,

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

OCTOBER 26, 1956.

Mr. CLARK R. MOLLENHOFF,
Des Moines Register and Tribune,
National Press Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CLARK: At the press conference on September 27, 1956, you asked the President

whether all employees of the Federal Government, at their own discretion, can determine whether they will testify or will not testify before Congressional committees when there is no security problem involved.

In the President's letter of May 17, 1954, to Secretary Wilson, the President set forth the general principles that are to govern all employees in the executive branch concerning their testimony, or the production of documents, relating to their conversations or communications with, or their advice to, each other on official matters. In his press conference of July 6, 1955, the President further amplified the principles set forth in this letter as follows:

"If anybody in an official position of this Government does anything which is an official act, and submits it either in the form of recommendation or anything else, that is properly a matter for investigation if Congress so chooses, provided the national security is not involved.

"But when it comes to the conversations that take place between any responsible official and his advisers, or exchange or mere little slips, of this or that, expressing personal opinions on the most confidential basis, those are not subject to investigation by anybody. And if they are it will wreck the Government."

In so writing to Secretary Wilson, and in further amplifying these principles, the President was exercising a right which is his, and his alone, to determine what action is necessary to maintain the proper separation of powers between the executive and legislative branches of the Government. In the orderly administration of the Government, the head of each executive agency directs the manner in which these principles are enforced.

The underlying reasons for these principles are set forth in the President's letter of May 17, 1954. It is essential to efficient and effective administration that employees of the executive branch be in a position to be completely candid in advising each other on official matters. It is essential, if channels of information are to be kept open, that confidences among employees should not be breached.

It will continue to be this administration's policy to keep the Congress and the people fully informed of what is being done in the executive branch. An employee is not free merely to exercise his own discretion but in the final analysis information will be withheld only when the President or agency heads acting under the President's authority or instruction determine it is contrary to the public interest to disclose it.

All of the above, of course, is subject to the Executive order dealing with the classification of information in the interest of security, and to the various statutes and regulations of the department and agencies relating to information to be held in confidence.

I hope this answers your inquiry.

Sincerely,

GERALD D. MORGAN,
Special Counsel to the President.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, July 2, 1956.

HON. WILLIAM L. DAWSON,
Chairman, Committee on Government
Operations, House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. DAWSON: This will acknowledge your June 25 letter to the President about a book by Robert J. Donovan.

Your letter refers to minutes of the Cabinet and to verbatim reports of Cabinet meetings. Cabinet discussions are not so recorded. When the Cabinet acts on a matter, a memorandum is prepared. This is called a Cabinet record of action. Some of these memorandums relate to classified matters affecting national security; many do not.

However, regardless of classification, all Cabinet actions constitute advice to the President. I cannot agree with your observation that the privileged nature of advice to the President is "dissipated" by the publication of Mr. Donovan's book, whatever it may concern.

Obviously, I cannot agree with the implication in your letter that your committee and its subcommittees may examine Cabinet records in instances where it is felt that certain information may not have been made available by department or agency officers.

Final official action taken by an executive department or agency on any subject is the very proper concern of Congress and the public. In this connection, the President's record for prompt and full publication of the business of his administration needs no elaboration. It has been, and shall remain, the purpose of this administration to keep Congress and the public fully informed of our actions and the reasons which underlie them.

It has, of course, been necessary on occasion, for reasons of national security, to give some of this information to committees of Congress on a classified basis. But in any event, the Congress and the public have been kept informed of the actions of this administration, and I can assure you, they will continue to be so informed.

It should also be borne in mind that the public interest demands orderly and efficient operation of the executive branch of the Government. This order and efficiency could not be maintained if officers and employees were not in a position to be completely candid with each other in discussing their official business. Therefore, while final actions of Government should be made known, it does not necessarily follow that the public interest is also served by divulging the discussions, recommendations, or advice of subordinates.

I note your reference to a passage in Mr. Donovan's book which apparently discusses a Cabinet meeting about the use of advisory committees. I am not familiar with the passage, and in any case would not presume to assess its accuracy. However, I can assure you that your interest in advisory committees commends itself to any department or agency making use of such committees. In any such instance, the responsible officers of the department or agency stand ready to answer the questions of your committee, and all appropriate committees of Congress, on whatever final action that department or agency may have taken.

This cooperation, as you are aware, is not limited to questions about advisory committees. I want to again assure you that on all official matters, each department and agency shall continue to give Congress and its committees the same cooperation, and the same information we have repeatedly given about final actions and the general reasons which underlie them.

Sincerely,

SHERMAN ADAMS.

Credit Where Credit Is Due

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDGAR W. HIESTAND

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 10, 1958

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, the American labor movement has suffered tremendously because of the actions of a few corrupt union bosses. Millions of honest, devoted union members have

been the biggest sufferers, first, because they are most conscious of corruption yet powerless to combat it; and, second, because it is their dues money which is used to feather the nests of the crooks.

It is fitting, therefore, that we pay tribute to some of the well-managed decent labor unions which are operated for the benefit of their members and the public at large, instead of being run to fill the pockets of the union bosses.

An outstanding example of a soundly operated union is local 11 of the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, AFL, which has a membership of just less than 9,000. It has four units in southern California; one in the Los Angeles Harbor area, one in downtown Los Angeles, one in the San Fernando Valley and one in the San Gabriel Valley.

Local 11 takes great pride in upholding good relations among the union, its members and their employers. Naturally, there are occasions when all do not agree, but usually some common ground can be found where problems can be resolved. The union is interested in the advancement not only of its members, but of the electrical industry as a whole and the Nation as a whole.

Local 11's internal affairs are exemplary. Every bill is approved by the executive board before being paid. A certified public accountant gives a quarterly financial report which is available for any member's inspection at any time. A summary of this report is posted on

every bulletin board with copies of it in every district office where anyone can request and receive it.

Moreover, the international brotherhood gives a complete financial report in its Journal Quarterly which is mailed to all members.

In local 11 an election is held every 2 years. Balloting is secret. The polls are open from 7 a. m. to 7 p. m. in each district office. Judges and tellers are elected by the membership to conduct the election. The same method of voting is used as in civil elections, with booths and ballots.

Members take a sincere interest in their union's affairs. At the general meetings there is an average attendance of about 800. Officials estimate that between the general meetings and the unit meetings that somewhere between 2,300 and 2,500 of the members attend a meeting every month.

Local No. 11 feels a strong sense of responsibility to the public. The IBEW construction department has not had a major strike since 1922. There is a clause in the constitution which forbids any local union to strike without permission of the international office.

In 1923, the council of industrial relations was formally established in the IBEW. It is composed of six members representing the employers and six representing the union, and they come from various parts of the Nation so that a broad segment of the electrical industry

is represented. The council of industrial relations considers any unresolved problems arising during negotiations if these problems cannot be decided locally. Decisions of the council are binding and none has ever been violated.

Locally, there is a joint conference committee set up to resolve minor grievances which arise because of differences in interpretations of agreements.

The organization has a pension plan which has been in effect for some 30 years. Both employers and employees contribute to the plan.

Local No. 11 publishes a newsletter to keep its members informed of union affairs and problems. It encourages the families of members to take part in union activities.

Contests for members—including families—with Government bonds as prizes, family picnics, sponsorship of youth activities and other community projects, apprentice-training programs with savings bonds and other awards for outstanding trainees, and information programs for all members, are among the many activities which local No. 11 promotes for the benefit of its members.

Local No. 11 is an outstanding example of a union which operates from the ground up, in behalf of the rank-and-file union man and his family. What a contrast this is to some unions, and especially to some union leaders whose performance and reputation are far more widespread.

SENATE

TUESDAY, MARCH 11, 1958

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a. m.

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

Eternal Spirit, in whom alone is the strength of our hearts and the hope of our world: In this, our morning fellowship of prayer, we would bring our frail and faltering lives to the waiting resources of Thy grace. In the midst of events so colossal on the confused world stage, O God, who sittest above the flood of man's insanity, lift us into the only greatness we shall ever know, by using us as the channels of Thy purpose and intent. In these days of great peril and of critical decision, as we face powers of darkness which have not Thee in awe, save us from all shortsighted policies whose reaping may bring a harvest of horror for our children's children. Give us to know clearly and to follow faithfully the things that belong to our peace and to the peace of the whole world. We ask it in the Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, March 10, 1958, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT— APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on March 6, 1958, the President had approved and signed the following acts:

S. 1568. An act to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain public lands in the State of Nevada to the Colorado River Commission of Nevada acting for the State of Nevada; and

S. 1714. An act for the relief of Roma H. Sellers.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, if it is necessary, in order to have the Senate dispose of the supplemental appropriation bill, I hope the Senate may be able to remain in session and to have yea-and-nay votes until at least 7:30 this evening.

Mr. President—
The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Texas.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10:30 A. M. TOMORROW

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business today, it stand in adjournment until 10:30 a. m. tomorrow.

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

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

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

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

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

PLANS FOR CERTAIN WORKS OF IMPROVEMENT
A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, plans for works of improvement in the States of New Mexico, New York, Oklahoma, and Wisconsin (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORT ON RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT PROCUREMENT ACTION, DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE

A letter from the Director, Legislative Liaison, Department of the Air Force, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on research and development procurement action, for the period from July 1, 1957, to December 31, 1957 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON REVIEW OF PROCEDURES FOR CANCELING PRODUCTION OF CERTAIN JET ENGINES IN DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to