5. Since it is a voluntary program, an equalization payment is provided for feed grains fed by a producer so that livestock and poultry producers will not have to turn their grain over to the Government and buy replacement grain in order to receive some security of price for grain raised within an allotment. This would also encourage farmers who feed their grain to stay within the allotment.

6. Support loans and equalization payments on feed grains fed would be limited to those who stay within their allotment and observe cross-compliance.

7. Feed grains in Government ownership in excess of a 1½-billion-bushel reserve would only be sold at the rate of 1 bushel for each $2 spent for meat, dairy, and poultry products purchased by the Government and distributed to the needy, institutions, and the school lunch program. Thus, grain held would pay for more than one-half of the protein foods cost. We wouldn't think of raising pigs without a good protein supplement, but hundreds of thousands of our children are being raised without adequate proteins. The provision would assure the distribution of some of our feed grains that have been converted into proteins to the people who need more proteins.

8. It provides a referendum to let farmers decide whether they prefer this program. Feed grain farmers have never had an opportunity, like many other farmers, to vote for this type of a program.

I believe the application of H.R. 7710 would: (1) Assure an abundant supply of food for a longer time for more stable prices. It would avoid the low productivity and scarcity that follows periods of bankrupt prices for meat, poultry, and dairy products. If stable prices are a national goal as President Eisenhower has said, then this feed grains program is certainly in the public interest. (2) It would permit farmers to divide production so they can make a living on the farm instead of moving to town to replace city workers. (3) It would certainly cost the Government a lot less than the present program; and (4) it would provide for the conversion of feed grains now held in excess of needs into meat, dairy, and poultry products for people who need them. This program applies the law of supply and demand, and while it is set up for a 4-year period, it should need little changing when reviewed and extended.

WHEAT

In looking to a long-term program for agriculture, I believe we should recognize the shift in the importance of support prices under certain conditions. So long as production exceeds consumption, the support price is very important; but when a program is adopted to bring production below consumption, then the market price will be guided by the price at which the commodity in the Government warehouse goes onto the market.

To use an example we have currently considered, I would like to review the wheat situation. The compromise bill turned down by the House provided basically as follows:

1. A 20-percent reduction in acreage resulting in a 16-percent reduction in bushels down to a total production of 1 million bushels.

2. A payment in kind taking 125 million bushels from the Government bins and making a total market supply of 1,125 million bushels which is in excess of estimated consumption by 75 million bushels.

3. An increase in the support price from 75 percent to 80 percent. The provision in that bill for payment in kind would have resulted in an estimated unbalanced market, and, therefore, much grain would have gone through non-recourse loans to the Government. Under the circumstances, the support rate would have been the guide for the market price and would have been at about 80 percent of parity.

Let us suppose that the provisions of the bill were the same except (1) there was no payment in kind, and thus the market supply outside of Government stocks would be 50 million bushels less than consumption; and (2) nonrecourse loans were left at 75 percent of parity, but section 407 was amended to provide that no wheat can be sold from Government storage at less than 90 percent of parity instead of at support price plus 5 percent (or 79 percent).

Under those circumstances, the price in the marketplace would actually be guided by the price at which Government stocks were available, and therefore, the market price under the latter would be approximately 11 percent of parity more although the support price would be 15 percent of parity less. In the latter example, no new wheat would be going into Government bins, and the CCC would have a market for 50 million bushels of wheat it now has in storage and at a profit. In the latter case, wheat sold directly through regular channels would bring a great deal more than under the compromise bill. Thus the payment-in-kind feature in the bill actually took out of one pocket what it would have put into the other pocket for farmers who do not have storage for all their wheat and who sell to the market, and this is most farmers; and the cost to the Government through unbalancing the market would be far in excess of the value of the wheat it would distribute as payment in kind.

I believe a long-term program should (1) never let a payment-in-kind gimmick unbalance the market; and (2) amend section 407 so the prices received by the CCC for Government-held stocks are set according to a desired market price rather than the percentage of parity at which nonrecourse loans are made.

CONCLUSION

I would urge the committee to adopt long-term programs for basic commodities which would—

(1) Assure an abundant supply of food and fiber at reasonably stable prices by dividing the production of basics needed among farmers so that an efficient farmer can make a living on a 50-hour or less working week instead of moving to the city to replace a city worker;

(2) Depend less upon Government appropriations and more upon the market paying value for goods produced; and

(3) Provide a formula for converting stocks in Government storage into food and fiber for persons in need and for institutions.

I believe the basic provisions of the tobacco program as amended and improved in H.R. 7710 would provide the general formula for all of the basic commodities. At least there should be a referendum to vote on having that kind of a program as an alternative to unstable consumer prices and rugged individualism.

SENATE

FRIDAY, JULY 24, 1959

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

O Thou God of mercy and grace, amid the encircling gloom, grant us wisdom to follow the kindly light of Thy guidance patiently and obediently.

May we never lose sight of the gleam as it leads us on to the selfless ministries that will help to heal the sad world's open sores and burn away barriers to a world brotherhood of good will where mouths shall not cry for bread, where hands and feet shall not be shackled, where speech shall not be silenced, where eyes shall not be bandaged, nor minds darkened by distorting falsehoods hiding the light of truth.

In this forum of a free people—

We pledge our hopes, our faith, our lives
That freedom shall not die;
We pray Thy guidance, strength, and grace,
Almighty God on high.

Amen.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D.C., July 24, 1959.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. MIKE MANSFIELD, a Senator from the State of Montana, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

CARL HAYDEN,
President pro tempore.

Mr. MANSFIELD thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, July 23, 1959, 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 July 23, 1959, the President had approved and signed the following acts:

S. 660. An act to amend the District of Columbia Business Corporation Act; and

S. 726. An act to amend section 11 of the Clayton Act to provide for the more expeditious enforcement of cease and desist orders issued thereunder, and for other purposes.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a joint resolution (H.J. Res. 115) to reserve a site in the District of Columbia for the erection of a memorial to Franklin Delano Roosevelt, to provide for a competition for the design of such memorial, and to provide additional funds for holding the competition, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The joint resolution (H.J. Res. 115) to reserve a site in the District of Columbia

for the erection of a memorial to Franklin Delano Roosevelt, to provide for a competition for the design of such memorial, and to provide additional funds for holding the competition, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION TODAY

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on the Judiciary of the Committee on the District of Columbia and the Subcommittee on the Post Office of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service were authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

On request of Mr. DIRKSEN, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on the Judiciary was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Monday, July 27, 1959.

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

EXECUTIVE SESSION

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

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

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

PROTOCOL TO AMEND CONVENTION FOR UNIFICATION OF CERTAIN RULES RELATING TO INTERNATIONAL CARRIAGE BY AIR—REMOVAL OF INJUNCTION OF SECRECY

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the injunction of secrecy be removed from Executive H, 86th Congress, 1st session, a certified copy of a protocol dated at The Hague September 28, 1955, to amend the Convention for the Unification of Certain Rules Relating to International Carriage by Air, signed at Warsaw on October 12, 1929, transmitted to the Senate today, and that the document, with the accompanying message, be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and the President's message be printed in the RECORD.

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

The letter from the President is as follows:

To the Senate of the United States:

With a view to receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification, I transmit herewith a certified copy of the protocol, dated at The Hague September 28, 1955, to amend the Convention for the Unification of Certain Rules Relating to International Carriage by Air, signed at Warsaw on October 12, 1929. The protocol was signed in behalf of the United States on June 28, 1956.

I transmit also, for the information of the Senate, the report of the Acting Secretary of State with respect to the protocol, together with the enclosures thereto.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *July 24, 1959.*

(Enclosures: (1) Report of the Acting Secretary of State; (2) certified copy of protocol dated at The Hague, September 28, 1955; (3) Air Coordinating Committee study of June 20, 1957, with amendments; (4) composite text.)

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

THE AIR FORCE

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Dudley C. Sharp, of Texas, to be Under Secretary of the Air Force.

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

THE ARMY

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Army, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3442 and 3447.

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

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

THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3284 and 3299, which had been favorably reported and placed on the Vice President's desk, for the information of Senators.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

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

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

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

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

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

THE HOUSING BILL VETO

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I think the hearings on the housing bill veto which were held yesterday have developed a rather extraordinary situation. Apparently two of the most important agencies of the Government were not consulted about its contents.

I have always understood that the Budget Bureau was the official voice of the administration. But the Budget Director says that, so far as he knows, the Budget Bureau was not consulted about the veto message.

The Housing and Home Finance Administrator, who certainly has a heavy responsibility in connection with housing legislation, appeared to be in a similar state. It is obvious from his reactions, I believe, that he is in agreement that the whole story was not presented in the veto message.

Mr. President, it might be interesting to ascertain just who wrote the message. But that might become the old game of "button, button, who's got the button?" and it probably is not worth playing.

However, Mr. President, I believe it is clear that the President was misinformed in regard to some of the provisions of the housing bill. The testimony on yesterday seemed to indicate that. Perhaps we should come to a decision based on that thought.

I hope that the Members of the Senate and any of the chief executives of the States or the cities, or others who have a vital interest in this bill, will communicate any recommendations they may have to the Committee on Banking and Currency, which now is holding the hearings.

RESOLUTION OF THE MINNESOTA JUNIOR CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a resolution recently adopted by the Minnesota Junior Chamber of Commerce in favor of naming one of the locks in the St. Lawrence Waterway system in honor of Representative JOHN A. BLATNIK, of Minnesota, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

It was my honor and privilege to introduce on behalf of myself and my colleague, the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY], Senate bill 2340, to name the lock at Sault Ste. Marie, Mich., after this fine and highly respected Member of the Congress, JOHN A. BLATNIK. A companion bill to this effect has already passed the House of Representatives, H.R. 7808, and it is now before the Senate Committee on Public

Works. I am confident this committee will in the near future act favorably on it.

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

RESOLUTION COMMENDING CONGRESSMAN JOHN A. BLATNIK

Whereas the junior chamber of commerce believes that individuals should receive recognition for outstanding leadership, particularly when such leadership represents progress, provides the means for economic expansion, and in general affects the the economics and well-being of a vast area; and

Whereas Representative JOHN A. BLATNIK of Chisholm, provided continuous and diligent leadership in promoting Federal legislation in connection with the St. Lawrence Waterway; and

Whereas the St. Lawrence Waterway is expected to increase the trade, commerce, and industry of Minnesota and the surrounding States and the States encompassing the Great Lakes region; and

Whereas Congressman BLATNIK has worked for a number of years in an unselfish and nonpartisan basis to promote the St. Lawrence Waterway legislation; and

Whereas the naming of one of the locks in the St. Lawrence Waterway system in honor of Congressman BLATNIK would be proper and appropriate recognition for his outstanding work; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Minnesota Junior Chamber of Commerce go on record as favoring and encouraging the naming of one of the locks in the St. Lawrence Waterway system as the "John A. Blatnik lock"; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the President, the Honorable Dwight D. Eisenhower, the U.S. Senate, the U.S. House of Representatives, and Congressman BLATNIK, and that the proper officers are empowered to do all that which is necessary to carry out the intents and purposes of this resolution.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. FULBRIGHT, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, without amendment:

S. 252. A bill to authorize Col. Philip M. Whitney, U.S. Army, retired, to accept and wear the decoration tendered him by the Government of the Republic of France (Rept. No. 576);

H.R. 2067. An act to authorize the Honorable Thomas F. McAllister, judge of the U.S. court of appeals, to accept and wear the decoration tendered him by the Government of France (Rept. No. 577);

H.R. 6587. An act to authorize certain generals of the Army to accept and wear decorations, orders, medals, presents, and other things tendered them by foreign governments (Rept. No. 578); and

S. Con. Res. 48. Concurrent resolution to promote peace through the reduction of armaments (Rept. No. 575).

By Mr. GRUENING, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with an amendment:

S. 1855. A bill to amend the Mineral Leasing Act of 1920 in order to increase certain acreage limitations with respect to the State of Alaska (Rept. No. 579).

By Mr. MAGNUSON, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, with amendments:

S. 2118. A bill to amend section 4488 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, to authorize the Secretary of the Department in which the Coast Guard is operating to prescribe regulations governing lifesaving equipment, firefighting equipment, muster lists, ground tackle, hawsers, and bilge systems aboard vessels, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 580).

By Mr. SALTONSTALL, from the Committee on Armed Services, without amendment:

H.R. 3322. An act to amend title 10, United States Code, and certain other laws to authorize the payment of transportation and travel allowances to escorts of dependents of members of the uniformed services under certain conditions, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 581).

By Mr. JACKSON, from the Committee on Armed Services, with amendments:

H.R. 7508. An act to amend title 10, United States Code, to establish a Bureau of Naval Weapons in the Department of the Navy and to abolish the Bureaus of Aeronautics and Ordnance (Rept. No. 582).

By Mr. BIBLE, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, without amendment:

S. Con. Res. 59. Concurrent resolution amending Senate Concurrent Resolution 2, continuing the existence of the Joint Committee on Washington Metropolitan Problems (Rept. No. 583); referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

ADDITIONAL EXPENDITURES BY COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. FULBRIGHT, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 149), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Foreign Relations is hereby authorized to expend from the contingent fund of the Senate, during the Eighty-sixth Congress, $10,000, in addition to the amount, and for the same purposes specified in section 134(a) of the Legislative Reorganization Act, approved August 2, 1946.

BILLS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. NEUBERGER:

S. 2440. A bill to designate the Green Peter Dam and Reservoir on Middle Santiam River, Oreg., as the Douglas McKay Dam and Reservoir; to the Committee on Public Works.

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

By Mr. FREAR:

S. 2441. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to allow an additional income exemption for an individual who is a student at an educational institution above the secondary level; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. GRUENING (for himself and Mr. BARTLETT):

S. 2442. A bill to provide for the disposition of surplus personal property to the government of Alaska; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. MORSE:

S. 2443. A bill for the relief of Edgar Harold Bradley; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BIBLE:

S. 2444. A bill to exempt certain pension and other trusts established in the District of Columbia from the laws of the District of Columbia relating to perpetuities, restraints on alienation, and accumulation of income; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BIBLE (by request):

S. 2445. A bill authorizing the conferring of the degree of master of arts in education on certain students who enrolled in the District of Columbia Teachers College prior to July 1, 1958, and who, prior to July 1, 1961, are certified by the president and faculty of such college as having met all requirements for the granting of such degree; and

S. 2446. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the District of Columbia government to establish an Office of Civil Defense, and for other purposes," approved August 11, 1950; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

RESOLUTIONS

Mr. FULBRIGHT, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 149) authorizing additional expenditures by the Committee on Foreign Relations, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the above resolution printed in full when reported by Mr. FULBRIGHT, which appears under the heading "Reports of Committee.")

Mr. HART submitted a resolution (S. Res. 150) establishing the Senate Select Committee on the Economic Impact of National Defense, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

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

NAME CHANGE OF GREEN PETER DAM PROJECT TO HONOR THE LATE DOUGLAS McKAY

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I introduce a bill to change the name of Green Peter Dam on the Middle Santiam River, in Oregon, to the Douglas McKay Dam and Reservoir. I ask that the bill be referred to the appropriate committee.

Douglas McKay, ex-Governor of Oregon and former Secretary of the Interior, died in his home city of Salem, Oreg., on July 22, 1959. His funeral will take place in Salem on July 25.

I am proposing that the McKay name be honored by being attached to the dam project presently known as Green Peter, because this is one of the key units of the great Willamette Basin project. Douglas McKay was a pioneer advocate of this entire program, in the river valley where he was raised.

Mr. McKay was one of the 42 original members of the Willamette Basin Project Committee appointed by Oregon Gov. Charles H. Martin in 1935. At the first meeting of the committee, he was elected as chairman and served in that capacity until he became Governor of Oregon in 1948. During Douglas McKay's chairmanship the Willamette Basin Project Committee was instrumental in promoting and securing Federal authorization and construction of such projects as Cougar, Hills Creek, Detroit, and Green Peter Dams. Following his election as Governor, Mr. McKay gave his State's endorsement to the monumental 308 Review Report of the Corps of Engineers which proposed Federal construction of

a vast complex of dams in the Willamette and in the Columbia River basins.

Moreover, Mr. President, the interest of Douglas McKay in Willamette basin water resource development continued unabated long after his official connection with the committee was severed. I have been told by Mr. Ivan Oakes, the veteran executive secretary of the Willamette Basin Projects Committee, that Mr. McKay's interest in the work of this development group continued up to the time of his terminal illness.

I believe his record in support of multiple-purpose dams for the Willamette basin fully justifies the recognition provided in the bill which I have introduced. Also, there is nothing particularly historic or traditional in the project's present designation as Green Peter Dam, and this can easily be sacrificed to honor the name of Douglas McKay.

While Douglas McKay was Secretary of the Interior I did not agree with many of the resource-management policies adopted by the national administration and carried out by the Department of the Interior. I voiced my objections to these policies at the time they were put into effect and I sought to have them changed. Yet it would not be proper or fair to let these past differences stand in the way of recognizing the good works which Mr. McKay accomplished during his lifetime. This can be done by designating an important link in the chain of Willamette basin dams as the Douglas McKay Dam and Reservoir, and I hope that Congress will promptly approve the legislation I have proposed for this purpose.

The distinguished Representative from Oregon's Fourth District, Mr. PORTER, in whose district the Green Peter project is located, shares my belief that the dam and reservoir should bear the name of Douglas McKay. Mr. CHARLES O. PORTER has informed me of his plans to introduce a companion measure in the House of Representatives at the next session of that body, and he and I will work together to secure early passage of the proposal.

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

The bill (S. 2440) to designate the Green Peter Dam and Reservoir on Middle Santiam River, Oreg., as the Douglas McKay Dam and Reservoir, introduced by Mr. NEUBERGER, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON ECONOMIC IMPACT OF NATIONAL DEFENSE

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I submit, for appropriate reference, a resolution establishing a Senate Select Committee on the Economic Impact of National Defense. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution lie on the table for additional cosponsors for 1 week.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 150) was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, as follows:

Whereas a strong economy is essential to the continued welfare of the Nation, to its agricultural and industrial development and to the national security; and

Whereas Congress has recognized the need for controlling inflation and providing maximum production and employment; and

Whereas the spending of the Department of Defense is the largest single item in the national budget at the present time; and

Whereas the world situation indicates that this situation will continue into the foreseeable future; and

Whereas the impact of this spending has a direct relationship to the Nation's economic well-being; and

Whereas the termination, modification, or increase of the major defense undertakings frequently result in serious dislocation of the Nation's labor force; and

Whereas an international disarmament agreement would involve readjustments in our Nation's defense policies; and

Whereas maximum return for defense expenditures is essential to our continued prosperity; and

Whereas the Senate, in connection with provision of funds adequate for national defense and maintenance of a sound economy, desires to have recommendations relative to methods to achieve these essential goals: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That there shall be established a select committee of the Senate which shall make exhaustive studies of the extent to which defense procurement policies in the United States are related to the national economy, and the extent and character of defense procurement policies that can be expected to be required to provide for the national defense and maintain the Nation's economic strength, to the end that such studies and the recommendations based thereon may be available to the Senate in considering defense procurement policies for the future. The committee shall be designated "the Senate Select Committtee on the Economic Impact of National Defense."

SEC. 2. (a) The committee shall be composed of three members of the Committee on Armed Services, three members of the Senate who are members of the Committee on Banking and Currency, three members of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, three members of the Committee on Finance, and three members of the Select Committee on Small Business; all said members to be designated by the chairman of the respective committees, at least one member designated from each of the above committees being selected from the minority membership thereof. In addition, there shall be three Members of the Senate designated by the President of the Senate, at least one being from the minority membership thereof. The committee shall cease to exist at the close of business on January 31, 1961.

(b) Any vacancy in the membership of the committee shall not affect its powers, and any vacancy in the membership of the committee shall be filled in the same manner as provided for determining the original membership.

(c) Nine members of the committee shall constitute a quorum.

(d) The chairman shall be chosen by the members at the first meeting.

SEC. 3. The committee shall conduct a comprehensive study and investigation with respect to the following matters:

(a) The impact of defense procurement spending on the national economy from 1946 to the present time;

(b) The extent to which this spending is currently affecting our economy;

(c) Estimate of future trends in defense spending and their effect on the economy;

(d) Steps which could be taken consistent with the defense effort, to minimize the inflationary and deflationary effects of defense spending;

(e) The character of legislation that may encourage the adoption of new methods and improved processes of defense procurement which will result in the least depletion of our national strength; and

(f) Such other factors it may consider necessary to attain a full and complete understanding of the impact of defense spending and defense procurement policies upon our national economy, our foreign policy, and the national defense.

SEC. 4. (a) For the purposes of this resolution, the committee is authorized to (1) make such expenditures; (2) hold such hearings; (3) sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjournment periods of the Senate; (4) require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents; (5) administer such oaths; (6) take such testimony orally or by deposition; and (7) employ and fix the compensation of such technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants as it deems advisable, except that the compensation so fixed shall not exceed the compensation prescribed under the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, for comparable duties.

(b) Upon request made by the members of the committee selected from the minority party, the committee shall appoint one assistant or consultant designated by such members. No assistant or consultant appointed by the committee may receive compensation at an anual gross rate which exceeds by more than $1,200 the annual gross rate of compensation of any individual so designated by the minority members of the committee.

(c) With the prior consent of the executive department or agency concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, the committee may (1) utilize the services, information, and facilities of any such department or agency, and (2) employ on a reimbursable basis the services of such personnel of any such department or agency as it deems advisable. With the consent of any other committee of the Senate, or any subcommittee thereof, the committee may utilize the facilities and the services of the staff of such other committee or subcommittee whenever the chairman of the committee determines that such action is necessary and appropriate.

(d) Subpenas may be issued by the committee over the signature of the chairman or any other member designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member. The chairman of the committee or any member thereof may administer oaths to witnesses.

SEC. 5. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $175,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a statement which I presented today before the Special Subcommittee on Procurement of the Armed Services Committee, on the general problem of defense procurement and its relation to the well-being of our economy, be printed in the RECORD.

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

STATEMENT OF SENATOR HART BEFORE THE SPECIAL SUBCOMMITTEE ON PROCUREMENT OF THE SENATE ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE

For the 7 months I have been privileged to serve in the Senate I have been devoting

considerable time to assembling information concerning the impact of the Federal Government's procurement activities on the State of Michigan. Conferences have been held with representatives of 14 agencies of the Government. An intensive survey of some 3,000 Michigan firms as to their attitudes and problems in seeking defense work from the Government or from prime contractors is underway. While the results of this study are not complete, there is submitted for the record a preliminary report, and a copy of the survey questionnaire and transmittal letter. (See app. I.) [Not printed in RECORD.]

I do not come before you as an expert on this vast and complex subject. Certainly the distinguished members of this subcommittee, and others in the Congress, have an understanding of the impact of procurement policies that is far more informed than mine.

My appearance before you today is to present facts with regard to the shifting patterns of defense procurement as they affect the State of Michigan; to share with you some of the more general questions that have arisen as my work on this subject has proceeded; and finally, to make what I hope will be a useful suggestion as to the action the Senate might take on this matter.

Michigan has no quarrel with either New York or California. My reading of the record so far before your committee indicates to me that the problem is vastly more complex than a booster's explanation of the merits of one's own State.

The impact of defense procurement on our national economy is very great. It is often more evident as we narrow our sights and focus on a single region of the Nation. As a nation, we are concerned with the overall burden of directing almost 60 percent of our national budget to the necessary work of keeping this nation and the free world strong and militarily alert.

For fiscal year 1960 our national budget will show that of a total of $77 billions, almost $46 billion will be directed to major national defense efforts. Of this amount some $40 to $41 billion will be for the military functions of the Department of Defense.

The Defense side of the budget, compared with the increase in our gross national product over the past 20 years (1939–58), presents a startling picture. Gross national product increased from $91 billion in 1939 to over $437 billion for 1958, an increase of 380 percent. In this same period, national defense expenditures for goods and services increased from $1.3 billion to $44.4 billion, which is an increase of 3,315 percent. The size of this increase comes more clearly into focus when we note that the Federal Government's purchase of goods and services other than national defense items, increased in the same period $3.9 billion to $7.3 billion, or only 87 percent.

The purpose of citing these figures is to make crystal clear that Federal defense procurement activities have become an important factor in the forces affecting the economic stability and growth of our national economy.

I need not suggest to the members of this committee that the present rate of defense procurement activity will move upward in the foreseeable future.

A defense program of this size is a burden on our economy. It directs funds, material, and manpower from other nondefense uses all of us would like to see accomplished. I am not developing the thesis that defense procurement undertakings of the Federal Government should become a tool for national economic planning, but I do believe Congress cannot ignore the fact that defense procurement activities do have a very real impact on the needs of our economy. Given the necessity for such a continuing high level of defense expenditures, we must develop policies and directives which will minimize and reduce this burden, and lessen the impact of major shifts and changes in procurement policy on national, regional, or local economic activity.

There is a pattern of gradual shifting of procurement awards away from firms doing work in Michigan to firms located in other parts of the Nation. No other large manufacturing State has experienced the sharp fluctuation in Government defense procurement which has characterized the Michigan situation during the past decade. The attached charts will show that total military procurement in Michigan averaged 6.4 percent of all military prime contracts awarded during the 6½-year period, July 1, 1950, to December 31, 1956. It jumped to 17.2 percent during the first half of 1952 (the Korean emergency period), representing the largest emergency responsibility placed upon any single State at that time. The most recent figures from the Defense Department indicate that procurement in Michigan has fallen to 3.2 percent of the total. This is the greatest drop for any industrial State except Illinois, which declined 56 percent to Michigan's 50 percent.

In addition, 4 of the 10 consistently largest areas of military procurement—California, Massachusetts, Missouri, and Texas—have shown substantial increases in defense procurement allotted to their industry during the same period. Three other States—Ohio, New Jersey, and New York—have shown less than half of Michigan's decline. The 10th State—Pennsylvania—has dropped 37 percent.

The 10 largest defense procurement areas are: California, Illinois, Massachusetts, Michigan, Missouri, New Jersey, New York, Ohio, Pennsylvania, and Texas.

I submit for the record some tables showing these facts. (See app. II.) [Not printed in RECORD.]

There are observers who explain these trends by the shift in military equipment procurement, away from the type needed if we were doing a complete job of modernizing the equipment for the Army, to more procurement in the missile and electronic field. This shift is one factor. It has reduced the percentage of prime contract and subcontract work going into the manufacturing complex of Michigan. This is partly a result of changing demands for our weapons, and partly a result of policies to go slow in re-equipping our ground forces for airdrop and more transportable equipment. This would be the type of production for which many firms in Michigan are best qualified, but policy decisions have placed low priority on the procurement of this type of replacement equipment.

From an overall perspective, the impact of Federal defense procurement policies on the operation of the national economy was never more clearly evident than during the recent recession. The Wall Street Journal on January 7, 1958, commented on this under the headline, "Defense Outlays Rising Again After 7-Month Decline," as follows: "Defense spending after a 7-month decline caused by the Pentagon's presputnik economy drive, has begun to rise again. Latest figures at the Pentagon show that, after skidding to an annual rate of $36.8 billion in November (1957), military payments to troops, contractors and civilian employees jumped to a $40 billion annual rate in December." A month later, on the same subject, Assistant Secretary of Defense W. J. McNeil testified before the Joint Economic Committee. According to the February 6, 1958, edition of the Washington Post and Times Herald, the Assistant Secretary "testified that the stepped-up placement of defense orders this year will have an important psychological impact on business." He further stated, as reported by the Post, "that the order placement would result in a gradual increase in spending which would have at least a stabilizing effect in defense industries."

An analysis of the report issued by the Secretary of Defense on June 1 of this year, summarizing total military prime contract awards up to March of 1959, reveals another part of the relationship between military procurement and the national economy. For example, in the first half of 1957, military contract awards for supplies, services and construction were reduced almost $1½ billion under the comparable period in 1956—from $10 billion to $8.6 billion. They were trimmed almost an additional billion dollars during the next 6 months—down to $7.7 billion. This was the cycle of military procurement leading into the recent recession.

Continuing this description and relating it to the upswing, military contract awards made during the first half of 1958 increased by a substantial $5.4 billion to $13.1 billion. Awards made during the first half of 1959 are likely to be in about the same range.

I hope vigorous attention in the Defense Department can be given to an intensive review to insure that any procurement which may lend itself to labor surplus set-asides be so managed. My own inquiries as to why such set-aside practices are not carried out in the procurement of commercial trucks have indicated there may be many other such examples.

Between June 6, 1958, and May 29, 1959, the Defense Department purchased 25,865 commercial vehicles valued at $54,416,143. As an indication that purchases of this kind can be made in areas of both high and low employment, I have prepared a chart listing the location of truck production in the United States and showing that part of the output which occurred in areas of surplus labor. (See app. III.) [Not printed in RECORD.] I am also attaching copies of recent exchanges of letters from the Defense Department indicating that an effort is now being made to allocate these commercial vehicle awards in such a manner as to assist surplus labor areas. (See app. IV.) [Not printed in RECORD.]

This example points out that there is need for a directive, this time from the Congress, to supplement Defense Manpower Policy Order No. 4. A vigorous effort in this regard could do much to lessen the impact of shifting procurement policies and practices.

The increase in value of contracts going into labor surplus areas during the recent recession, when the Defense Department was urged to work on this, also provides evidence of the fact that meaningful results are possible if the effort is made.

For the 6-month period July 1957 through December 1957, there were 91 areas of substantial labor surplus in the Nation. Only three of these areas received defense contract awards as a result of preference valued at $927,260.

Now the interesting story. With considerable concern and interest in the recession problems being evidenced by the administration, we find for the second quarter of 1958, 118 areas of substantial labor surplus and 117 of these—all but 1—received awards as a result of labor surplus set-aside programs of the Department of Defense totaling $32,478,000.

The Nation's defense production capabilities and balance also are affected by procurement practices. I believe there remains the possibility that the United States and the free world may still be faced with the possibility of fighting limited or brush-fire-type wars. During this type of emergency situation, we will need the type of production capabilities we had during the Korean emergency. I call to the committee's attention

that one of the factors that has adversely affected the tool and die firms of Michigan has been the shift in defense procurement. This industry is highly important if we are again to tool up for speedy production as we did in Korea. At the height of the Korean crisis, Michigan was producing 17.2 percent of defense production, the highest of any State at that time. The committee, in its considerations of the regional aspects of procurement policy, must keep before it the dangers of lost skills and capabilities that can occur in so basic a segment of our industrial complex as the tool and die installations in an industrial city such as Detroit.

I believe that in this Nation there is essential need that the smaller business of our Nation not continue to receive a declining share of the business generated by Government procurement. On the basis of the survey I am conducting in Michigan, I presented preliminary findings to the Small Business Subcommittee of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee earlier this week. This data indicates that the small business set-aside programs as they relate to defense procurement are just not working. Partly this is a result of the trend toward more and more centralization in the procurement activities, with smaller businesses necessarily having to rely on negotiations with prime contractors for any business they may obtain. For example, for the fiscal year 1958, of a total of $21.8 billion defense contracts, $16.4 billion were let to 100 companies and their subsidiaries, or 74.2 percent of the total. A few additional comments from the preliminary returns of my questionnaire are, I fear, all too typical, and I submit them for the record. (See app. V.) [Not printed in RECORD.]

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I wish to commend you and your colleagues on the Armed Services Committee for probing into this most serious and fundamental question. I make no claims that this limited analysis is much more than suggestive of the profound and complex influence which military spending has on the national economy. I do believe, however, that because defense spending contains within it the capacity to produce both dislocation and prosperity, to bring about both labor surpluses and labor shortages, to foster both the growth and decline of all American enterprise, the policies that guide defense spending should be as much a matter of grave public concern on the internal economic level as on the international and military defense levels. It is or should be plain that the maintenance of a huge Military Establishment in a situation of total cold war requires a new and, one might even say, different kind of Federal management than is or has been true in situations of actual hostilities or of less constant tension.

With regard to the specific proposals before your committee, it seems to me Senator JAVITS' bill (S. 1875), if enacted into law, would provide needed direction to the Department of Defense to the benefit of all segments of our economy. In my opinion it is especially important that the labor surplus and small business programs be made to work.

In a small way, I have been attempting to study the effect of procurement policies. This study and a review of the hearings of your subcommittee has led me to a more general suggestion and it is with this that I conclude.

The Senate of the United States should consider the formation of a Select Committee on the Economic Impact of National Defense. I submit the resolution proposing such a select committee to your subcommittee for its consideration, and will introduce the resolution and let it lie on the table for cosponsors in the Senate today.

CIVIL RIGHTS ACT OF 1959—AMENDMENT

Mr. HART submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (S. 2391) to extend the Commission on Civil Rights, and to provide further means of securing and protecting the right to vote, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed.

PAYMENT IN LIEU OF TAXES TO LOCAL GOVERNMENTS—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the junior Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING] may be added as an additional cosponsor of the bill (S. 910) to authorize the payment to local governments of sums in lieu of taxes and special assessments with respect to certain Federal real property, and for other purposes, introduced by me—for myself and others—on February 3, 1959. Inadvertently, the Senator's name was left off the bill at the time of its introduction. He had asked to be included as one of the original cosponsors when the bill was introduced.

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

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

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

By Mr. CHURCH:

Statement prepared by him relating to the annual observance in the State of Idaho of Pioneer Day.

By Mr. NEUBERGER:

Telegram dated July 23, 1959, to Gov. Mark O. Hatfield, of Oregon; and an article entitled "Brucellosis Freedom Battle Accomplished" published in the Salem Capital Press of July 10, 1959.

FAILURE OF THE WHEAT PROGRAMS

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, yesterday was a rather historic and, in many ways, a sad day, too; it was referendum day for the wheat farmers. It was a little sad, I think, because although approximately 40 percent of the wheat farmers could vote, about 60 percent of them could not vote because of the 15-acre limitation in existing law.

Probably another reason why it was a sad day was that there was no realistic choice to be indicated by the farmers who voted. They had their choice between either the present program, with its excessive costs and the likelihood that excessive stocks will continue to pile up, or no program, since the law requires support at 50 percent of parity, and farmers still have to comply with allotments.

Mr. President, the choice presented was not a very realistic one. It was what the head of the American Farm Bureau Federation, Mr. Charles Shuman, an eminent farmer and a distinguished citizen, referred to as "an absurd farce that denies producers any realistic choice."

I think it is even more regrettable that prior to the vote on yesterday, the Congress had not provided for a workable wheat program. Certainly precious time has been lost in connection with this matter.

Mr. President, the wheat program needs overhauling, because on all sides it is admitted that it has failed. Certainly it has failed as measured by the standards and the criteria which are stated as objectives in the 1938 Agricultural Adjustment Act. The legislative findings in that act contain the following conclusions:

> Abnormally excessive supplies overtax the facilities of interstate and foreign transportation, congest terminal markets and milling centers in the flow of wheat from producers to consumers, depress the price of wheat in interstate and foreign commerce, and otherwise disrupt the orderly marketing of such commodity in such commerce.
>
> The provisions of the part affording a cooperative plan to wheat producers are necessary in order to minimize recurring surpluses and shortages of wheat in interstate and foreign commerce, to provide for the maintenance of adequate reserve supplies thereof, and provide for an adequate flow of wheat and its products in interstate and foreign commerce.

Those are the legislative findings in that act.

If what has been accomplished thus far is measured by those findings, I think we can only conclude that the wheat program has failed.

As of July 1 of this year, the estimated carryover of wheat was approximately 1.3 billion bushels. It is estimated that by July 1 of next year the carryover will be 1.4 billion bushels. That represents a gross investment, according to the Commodity Credit Corporation, of almost $3,500 million. It will be costing approximately $1,500,000 a day just for storage, interest, and transportation for that tremendously large wheat supply. The carryover is, incidentally, more than 2 years' domestic requirements.

Mr. President, this situation does not eventuate from any lack of diligence or activity on the part of the administration, because it has done a good many things to relieve the condition.

First of all, under Public Law 480, the administration programed the export movement of approximately 1,100 million bushels of wheat.

Then there is the subsidy program for wheat exports, which certainly is more liberal than that in the case of any other commodity. In the 1956–57 crop year, 546 million bushels of wheat were exported—the highest level in history. For the year 1957–58, the exports dropped to 400 million bushels. It is expected that for 1958–59, the exports will amount to 450 million bushels.

Incidentally, Mr. President, the current subsidy for wheat is approximately 60 cents a bushel.

The third item is that the administration, by means of a quality differential, has tried to discourage the production

of undesirable types of wheat. That differential amounts to 20 cents a bushel.

Then there was the authorization of the purchase of bins, in order to make space available where farmers could store wheat. There was also the provision of low-cost credit for farmers, in order to make it possible for them to build their own storage facilities. Thus, more wheat farmers were given an opportunity to use the loan.

The net realized cost of the wheat programs has been in excess of $4,500 million. The significant point is that the end is not in sight. It should be pointed out that although only 6 percent of farm cash receipts come from wheat, more than 25 percent of the costs of the whole farm program are for wheat.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. DIRKSEN. If the Senator from Missouri will bear with me for 30 seconds, I shall conclude.

Mr. President, despite the tremendously large expenditures made by the Federal Government, and despite the many wheat disposal activities, the stocks of wheat continue to pile up.

So, Mr. President, from everything that can be adduced, it is obvious that the wheat program has failed.

There has been an opportunity, I think, to work out some kind of an acceptable and practical program. The President recommended two alternatives. Then there was another suggested program which was proposed by Representative BELCHER, of Oklahoma, in the House of Representatives. It would have provided for a referendum in which the farmers certainly would have had a more realistic choice.

The administration was willing to accept almost any one of those three solutions, but, instead, we had to content ourselves, it seems, with a kind of unrealistic stopgap program which completely disregarded the technological advances in the whole field of agriculture.

So it is time, I think, we brought forth a wheat bill. It ought to be done before we go home, before we ring down the curtain on this session, because here we have price-destroying surpluses and excessive Federal expenditures.

Mr. President, I venture this prediction: I was around here when revulsion occurred against the potato program and the egg program. I would not be a bit surprised if a similar revulsion probably has been kindled in the hearts of people, not only consumers, but producers, with respect to this mass of wheat, unless we find an acceptable solution and a workable program. It should be done before we go home.

I now yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I thank the minority leader, the able Senator from Illinois, for yielding to me. I shall make a statement on the wheat situation later on my own time. But now I ask the Senator from Illinois what he thinks about the fact that, after Secretary of Agriculture Benson agreed to submit to us an omnibus farm bill on the 16th of February, nevertheless, he has not submitted that bill yet. He assured the Senator from Louisiana, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, the able junior Senator from Wisconsin, and myself that he would send to Congress an omnibus farm bill which would express his opinions as to just what should be done with respect to farm legislation. Mr. Benson has not yet done so. Why does he not come forward and submit the bill he promised, especially as he so consistently criticizes the Congress?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I think the reason is very simple. He appeared before the committee. Other representatives of the Department appeared before the committee from time to time. Within the compass of gentlemanly language, I think I would say he received some caustic going over in the committee. Yet in the testimony there were the essential outlines of what he had in mind. From them, the committee, as a part of the lawmaking branch of the Government, could have fashioned a bill, had it been so disposed.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I know the Senator respects my opinion, as I respect his. The Secretary gave a number of alternatives. He told us—indeed, promised us—that he would send us a proposal. He has not done so. That promise was made over 5 months ago.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The committee was free, on the suggestions given in his testimony, to fashion a bill, but the committee, for reasons best known to itself, saw fit not to do so.

Mr. SYMINGTON. That is not quite fair. More and more I come reluctantly to the conviction that the reason the Secretary has not sent us a bill, as he promised, is because he himself does not know what he should do about the farm problem.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I do not think that is correct.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I do.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I think the committee rebuffed the Secretary and took him over the coals.

Mr. SYMINGTON. The record will not show that.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I believe it will. I read some of the testimony, and it was reported in the press.

Mr. SYMINGTON. The Secretary of Agriculture told us he would send to Congress an overall, omnibus farm bill. Mr. Benson has yet to fulfill the pledge he made to us on the 16th of February last.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I will say to my distinguished friend from Missouri that if the words "caustic" and "highly critical" cannot be applied to that session, then I shall publicly apologize on the Senate floor to every member of the committee.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I do not want to get into a discussion of the meaning of words such as "caustic."

Mr. DIRKSEN. Sharp.

Mr. SYMINGTON. The Senator from Illinois brought up this subject. I thought, inasmuch as the Secretary of Agriculture had promised to submit an omnibus farm bill, and inasmuch as he had been criticizing consistently the Democratic majority in the Congress, he ought to come forward with that bill expressing his own recommendations that he promised over 5 months ago.

Mr. DIRKSEN. But is it not the responsibility of the legislative branch, on its own initiative, when there is such a pressing problem besetting the country today, to move forward with diligence and vigor and to provide a bill?

Mr. SYMINGTON. We have done that. It is unfortunate the wheat bill Congress advocated was vetoed by the President. In that connection, Mr. President, and I do not want to take the time of other Senators who came to the floor before me——

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I ask unanimous consent that the statement I make later this morning on yesterday's wheat referendum be included in the RECORD at this point.

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

WHEAT REFERENDUM AGAIN SHOWS FARMERS WANT TO COOPERATE IN SOLVING FARM PROBLEM

Mr. SYMINGTON subsequently said: Mr. President, once again farmers have overwhelmingly expressed a willingness, in fact, a desire, to cooperate in adjusting their production in turn for some degree of protection against sharp price fluctuations.

Conversely, farmers have again repudiated the claims of the Secretary of Agriculture and others that farmers do not want a farm program, that they would prefer freedom from production adjustment measures, and the disastrously low prices that would result.

Yesterday, for the sixth straight time and the ninth time in recent years, almost 81 percent of the wheat farmers of the Nation voted to comply with marketing quotas in turn for price supports at 75 percent of parity.

The President, acting on the advice of the Secretary of Agriculture, through the use of the veto, has denied farmers the opportunity to cooperate in a program which would not only have brought an end to overproduction in wheat, but would have reduced the wheat inventory by many millions of bushels a year.

The President's veto was an unfortunate action for the taxpayer, because under the wheat program as passed by Congress, and supported by wheat farmers, the cost of this program would have been reduced by an estimated $260 million a year.

And, therefore, no fairminded person can blame the farmers or the Congress when the Government inventory of wheat is increased next season by some 200 million bushels.

As yesterday's referendum again proves, the farmers were willing to cooperate in adjusting production.

The Congress acted in passing a responsible bill. Only the veto prevented this sound program from becoming law.

After drawing up this statement I listened to the remarks of the able minority leader [Mr. DIRKSEN]. I again invite the attention of the Senate to the fact that last February 16 the Secretary of Agriculture promised the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry to come forward with an omnibus farm bill which would express his views as to what the Congress should do. He has not yet fulfilled that promise. Inasmuch as he continues to travel around the country criticizing the Congress, it is time for him to carry out the promise he made; else we have the right to believe he does not know what he thinks should be done.

COMPETITIVE BIDS FOR GOVERNMENT CONTRACTS

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, notwithstanding the time limitation of 3 minutes during the morning hour, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Arizona may proceed.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, a matter recently was brought to my attention which, although it specifically affects my own State in a more general way, is of importance to every State and to every local, independent businessman who may bid for Government contracts.

I might say that I have more than a passing interest in business, with a background of merchandizing, and having served with the Select Committee on Small Business. The small businessman, in my estimation, is the real backbone of our Republic and has been the symbol of our Nation's progress and way of life since its beginning. The independent businessman forms the basis of our economy in every community, especially in the West, and merchants everywhere with courage, individuality, and foresight are recognized as civic leaders. They provide employment for people in all walks of life, from young people just learning the ropes of enterprise, through experienced executives and junior executives who form the core of any business, to semiretired and handicapped persons who have something of value to offer their community and are given this opportunity by small businessmen.

So I am sure my colleagues will agree that each independent firm which has proven qualifications and dependability in its own community and State should have the opportunity to seek new trade on a competitive but equal basis with a larger national firm.

I would like to cite a specific example in this case, without commenting on the merits or demerits of any one firm, but simply pointing out the restrictive nature of specifications which are written into a contract administered by the General Services Administration.

The specifications for the elevator contract for the Federal courthouse building in Phoenix, under section 2-22(b) demand that:

> The bidder must have installed the elevators in three separate buildings where the control and operation meet, and the loads and speed meet or exceed, that required by this specification, all of which have been in successful operation at least 2 years.

The specifications are described and the section states:

> A list of the three installations as required above shall be submitted upon request by the service after the bids are opened. The list should include the name of the building owner or manager, the location and the name of the building.

And I call the Senate's attention to the closing sentence of this section:

> Failure to meet the foregoing experience requirements, or to submit the list of installations required, will be reason for disqualification.

I can appreciate and applaud the desire of the GSA to protect the interests of the Government and to insure the proper use of the taxpayers' money. But this is operating in the opposite direction and even contrary to business practice. In this case—and I am certain there are hundreds of similar cases in which small- or medium-sized firms are involved in bids on Government contracts—the language of the specification ignores the local reputation of the firm, its financial soundness, and its ability to meet the technical requirements of a job.

The Select Committee on Small Business has had numerous complaints from small business concerns which have been disqualified as bidders on Government procurements. It appears to be a general practice of the General Services Administration to restrict small business concerns though clauses in their specifications.

In a contract for repairs on a post office at Grand Central Station in New York, the following was required:

> The bidder shall submit with his bid a list of not less than three projects satisfactorily performed by the bidder, with his own organization, within the past 5 years involving major alterations or construction work of a similar type and of a similar or greater scope as that included in these specifications.

Small contractors in New York protested that this was restrictive and would cause them to be unable to bid even though they had been doing similar work for GSA for the past 15 years.

It has been brought to the Small Business Committee's attention on numerous occasions that the Federal Government has a qualified products list and only those companies which have made the product are allowed to bid. In order to get on the list, it would mean considerable expense to produce a prototype not knowing whether the company would be allowed to have it passed or be allowed to produce it. This is an unreasonable cost to the small business concerns, and the committee has recommended that in such cases the first article approved be accepted in lieu of having their product tested in advance. This recommendation has not been accepted by the executive agencies.

For many years the only producer of lifeboats for the Government was a large concern, and the committee repeatedly insisted that the Department of Navy obtain a second source. After 5 years of insistence, it has finally been agreed that small business concerns should be allowed to bid on a lifeboat, and if this product is satisfactory the firm would be accepted as a qualified bidder.

There are two economic standards which are brushed aside by this type of restrictive, experience requirement.

First, it can eliminate the low bidder on a contract, costing the taxpayers money. It eliminates the low bidder and pushes the cost up, not because a firm is incapable of meeting the normal specifications of a job, but because this firm has no past experience in a specific type of installation. I might insert here that in the special case of my own State to which I draw attention, this firm has been in business since 1936 and its elevator installations have ranged the State, but it is impossible for this firm to meet the experience requirement of the contract simply because no building in the entire State has the specific—but not unusual—elevator requirements of the proposed Federal building.

To toss out a bid on this experience requirement, to me, is not even practical. To what lengths is it necessary for the GSA to go to guarantee satisfactory completion of a contract? If a business firm bids, and is the low bidder, and can show bondability and financial soundness, and has all the qualifications to handle the mechanics of a job, then how can anyone guarantee a satisfactory job by this or any other of the bidders? At this point it is up to the contractor to complete the job under the terms of the contract, or lose money satisfying the contract. At this point the responsibility no longer rests with the GSA, but with the contracting firm to do a satisfactory job.

The second economic standard which an experience requirement violates is competition. Eliminating the low bidder, or any bidder along the line, on the basis of this experience clause, opens the way to a noncompetitive selection of contractors.

Competitive bidding is the very core of Government contract letting. And any restriction on competition fosters the growth and the power of big busines, simply because it is big, and hobbles the independent businessman who is attempting to increase his productivity.

No independent enterprise can possibly grow and compete under terms such as these. And big business cannot help but grow bigger. It is not that we should restrict either in their efforts to prosper, for both big and little business, under the proper climate, benefit our Nation as they grow. But where the taxpayers' money is at stake, bidding should be done on an equal basis with the criteria of awarding bids being financial stability, adequate resources, and ability to meet contract requirements at the lowest price.

Mr. President, I would recommend that the General Services Administration review the impact of this restrictive experience requirement on the small businessman and eliminate it from their future contracts. It limits competition rather than encouraging it, and ignores many otherwise qualified contractors

who are technically and financially able to perform a contract.

Restrictions such as those imposed by GSA contracts, in my opinion, cannot benefit either the taxpayers or our lifeline of independent businessmen, or for that matter the Government itself, if they are allowed to continue.

In view of the effect of these restrictions on our free enterprise system I urge that the experience requirement of GSA contracts be carefully studied with a view toward striking this requirement from future specifications.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the regulation 2–22(b), containing the language in the contract, be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

2–22(b). The bidder must have installed the elevators in three separate buildings where the control and operation meet, and the loads and speeds meet or exceed, that required by this specification, all of which have been in successful operation at least 2 years. These three installations must each include a minimum of four elevators operating together in a bank or group from a riser or common risers of landing pushbuttons, and the elevator controllers, group supervisory control system, selector, machines M.G. sets, used must be the product of the same manufacturer or combination of manufacturers, which the bidder will use on this project if he is the successful bidder. A list of the three installations as required above shall be submitted upon request by the service after the bids are opened. The list should include the name of the building owner or manager, the location and the name of the building. Failure to meet the foregoing experience requirements, or to submit the list of installations required, will be reason for disqualification.

Mr. PROUTY subsequently said: Mr. President, I desire to associate myself with the views expressed a few minutes ago by the distinguished junior Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] in which he pointed out the difficulties being experienced by small business in obtaining General Services Administration contracts.

He is to be commended for bringing this matter to the attention of the Senate. More than 95 percent of the business in Vermont is classified as small business, and as the distinguished Senator has pointed out, experience restrictions in Government specifications are particularly harmful to small businessmen.

No one questions the right and the duty of the General Services Administration to protect the Government and see to it that the taxpayer gets his money's worth from contractors who produce under Government contracts. This is a commendable effort, but it should not be accomplished by restricting the contracts in such a manner as to disqualify and discourage new bidders.

The suggestion which the distinguished Senator has made to the General Services Administration should receive prompt attention. I thoroughly agree with the Senator's conclusions and recommendation and I assure him that I will do whatever I can to assist him in seeing to it that the General Services Administration reviews the impact of these restrictive specifications on small businessmen so that they may be eliminated in the future.

As a member of the Select Committee on Small Business, I will urge that the committee renew its efforts to eliminate these restrictive specifications. This is a field in which the Small Business Committee has been interested for some time, and I hope that the action of the Senator from Arizona in bringing this matter to the attention of the Senate will provide added support for the efforts of the committee to secure the removal of these restrictive provisions.

I thank the Senator for bringing this to the attention of the Senate and assure him of my support.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR GOLDWATER AT NATIONAL PRESS CLUB

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an address I delivered yesterday at the National Press Club be printed in the RECORD.

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

ADDRESS BY SENATOR GOLDWATER AT THE NATIONAL PRESS CLUB, WASHINGTON, D.C., JULY 23, 1959

In our 2½ years of McClellan rackets committee work we have listened to millions of words of testimony which fills more than 60 bound volumes, all of it dealing with corruption in the labor-management field.

Yet despite this flow of testimony the House Labor Committee has somehow managed to ignore the basic evil disclosed by the hearings and has put together a bill which, like the Senate passed labor bill, deals only with the symptoms of the disease. In casting my vote against the Senate labor bill, I was convinced that the bill was completely ineffective to cure some of the abuses revealed by the McClellan rackets committee.

The House Labor Committee version of this bill is even weaker. It does nothing to correct this evil condition of unjustified labor union power, and most of the House committee amendments actually compound the condition.

Among the more glaring defective amendments are those which:

Exempt more than 60 percent of the small labor union locals from financial reporting requirements. Among these small locals are the Johnny Dio type paper locals in which some of the worst abuses were revealed.

Nullify the power of the Secretary of Labor to investigate alleged violations.

Allow a union official who may be stealing union funds the use of additional union funds to defend himself in criminal proceedings.

Destroy one of the major safeguards established by the Senate bill against the abuse of the election process in unions by eliminating the requirement that rival candidates for union office be permitted to have a teller present at the counting of the ballots.

Destroy even the few inadequate protections provided in the Senate's version of the bill of rights. In the House committee version, the rights and privileges accorded union members need no longer be equal, and need be only such as are granted by the union constitution, bylaws, and other governing rules, with few exceptions.

These are but a few of the House committee bill amendments which serve only to further weaken and water down a Senate bill which was inadequate itself to deal with the unrestrained power of unions.

Now let us examine this point of power. What are the privileges to unions granted by the Federal Government which are granted to no other segment of our society? Let me list them:

1. Immunity under the antitrust laws.
2. Practically full immunity to injunctions in the Federal courts.
3. Immunity from taxation.
4. Power to compel employees to join unions as a condition of employment.
5. Right to represent all the employees as exclusive bargaining agent even if only a bare majority has selected the union as such agent.
6. Power to compel employers to bargain collectively.
7. Although not required to be incorporated, their members are free from the liability for the debts of the union, unlike the members of other unincorporated associations.
8. Unions are not liable for the acts of their individual members in contrast to other types of unincorporated associations.
9. Employers are prohibited from discriminating in hire and tenure of employment against employees because of their union membership or their union activities, including participation in picketing and strikes. Employers, however, are forbidden to engage in lockouts except in two unimportant types of situation.
10. Unions have the right, during collective bargaining, to compel the employer in some circumstances, to disclose his financial books and records, but there is no corresponding obligation on unions.
11. Unions, in some situations, have a legal right of access to the employer's property, the right to compel him to make his property available for use by the union, and the right to invade the privacy of employees who are not union members and sometimes even against their wishes.

As I have said on previous occasions, it is this power, and the abuse of this power legally vested in the union movement which is the basis of corruption exposed by the McClellan committee. It is not the men—not the Hoffas, Reuthers, or Meanys as individuals—but the power of the offices these men hold which is the core of the problem. If we direct our efforts at this power, then we will be dealing with the disease of labor corruption. If we do not apply ourselves in this direction, we are only dealing with the symptoms and are hoodwinking the public as well as ourselves.

Do union leaders themselves recognize this power? Of course they do, and they'll fight with every means possible to retain it. Let me quote a few statements of labor leaders which reveal their attitude toward this power, and which, incidentally also reveal their disregard for the general public.

On March 4, 1956, the St. Louis Post Dispatch printed this statement of James Hoffa: "The future of labor-management relations is big labor and big business, for there is no room for the small business or the small union. That is unfortunate, but true. We have reached the saturation point. Now we have to organize what don't belong to us to stay in business. We are in business to make money—not for profit. We are a nonprofit organization, but to expand, we are out for every quarter we can get."

George Meany is quoted in the New York Times on December 9, 1955, as follows: "We are banded together for the benefit and the welfare of the many, not of the few, and if there is fear about too much power, how can there be too much power if the power is for good and is used only for good. You just can't have too much power."

Here are the words of James B. Carey in 1956: "Every other nationwide strike from now on will be not just a one-union strike

but a strike of the entire American labor movement."

Here is an excerpt from the New York Times of August 8, 1957: "Mr. Hoffa announced, at a meeting of the union's constitution committee, that if he was elected he would fight for an all-embracing council of American transport unions—air, land, and sea—for joint action. 'You cannot have a one-city strike any more,' he said, 'or a strike in just one kind of transportation. You have to strike them all.'"

In 1956, the manager of a motor parts company testified that Bernard J. Marcus, organizing director for Teamsters Joint Council 53, told him: "You will get nothing. We will close you up first if you don't sign up. I control Philadelphia. The union controls the country."

It is a sad day when because of this unrestrained power, Congress is forced to negotiate in the Halls of the Senate with these union grandees to determine what the unions will accept in the way of labor reform measures. If Congress does not have the courage to stand up to this vengeful power and protect the rights of the honest union member and the American public, then who will? The extent to which unions carry their demands is shown in the following statement by James L. McDevitt, codirector of COPE, delivered at a meeting of local union officials in Hartford, Conn., in 1956:

"We are driving to see that every so-called labor leader speaks for what is best for the movement and not what is best for him. We are going to get the labor leaders who differ publicly with the position on candidates and issues already established by the labor movement. Such differing hurts the cause. These so-called labor leaders that differ with the movement will be uncovered. * * * We are warning you now, and we are warning all in the future: Do not differ with the movement with respect to issues or candidates. We will not stand for it."

I think by now it is quite clear that the mantle of unrestrained power which cloaks these union bosses is the matter to which the American public demands we address ourselves.

We are not interested in "getting" one man, or one union or in busting the union movement. We must, however, restrain this legalized power and restore the balance among the unions, business and the public. There was a time when the balance was tilted against unions and I believe that in the 1930's the Government acted justly in awarding to unions certain powers which would strengthen their position at the bargaining table. There is no denying there was a period when the union movement was the underdog and needed help. But this is no longer the case. And now it is the American public which needs the help. It is the American public which needs the attention of Congress to free them from the oppressive and abusive power wielded by corrupt labor bosses.

It is time we stopped considering a labor reform bill from the standpoint of the National Association of Manufacturers, or the unions and start considering it from the standpoint of the American public.

In the rackets hearings last week, I posed this situation to James Hoffa. This actually was a replay of testimony which he had given in 1957 at which time I asked him: "Because of those facts would you think it wise, too, that the Congress consider placing unions under antimonopoly or under antitrust laws the same as we place the large corporations of this country?" And Hoffa answered: "I certainly do not."

Last week I put the problem to him this way:

"I wanted to ask you if your union or your council or your combination, or whatever you want to call it, ever reaches a place where you can restrain trade in this country to the damage of the public, do you think that the Government should have the controls over the restraint the same as they have in corporations in business?"

Hoffa's reply was: "No, sir, I do not. Not now or in the future."

It is evident, I think that these unions do not intend to relinquish these powers, regardless of their effect on the consumer, their own union member, or the general public. And it is my opinion that it is the duty of Congress to recognize the destructiveness of this power to our Republic and to take the proper steps to place it in its proper perspective.

MAJOR WEAKNESSES IN THE AMENDMENTS MADE BY THE HOUSE LABOR COMMITTEE TO THE SENATE-PASSED LABOR BILL, S. 1555

On April 25, 1959, the Senate of the United States passed the Kennedy-Ervin labor bill, S. 1555 by a vote of 90 to 1. I cast the single adverse vote against the bill because I was convinced then, as I am right now, that the bill was completely ineffective to cure some of the most flagrant abuses revealed by the McClellan rackets committee. What is even more important, it failed utterly to reach the basic source from which these abuses flowed—excessive and unjustified labor union power.

Most of the amendments added to the Senate bill by the House Labor Committee not only do nothing to correct this evil condition, they actually compound it. Their total effect is to render the bill even more ineffectual than it was when it emerged from the Senate. Should these proposals become law in their present form, the American public, which has been emphatically demanding strong and effective labor reform legislation, will have been sold a pig in a poke. They will have secured a law which will be trumpeted by the labor leaders and their fanatical adherents as a genuine corrective measure. But behind a clever facade of professed reform, the new law will carefully and assiduously guarantee that nothing is done to stem the overbearing power of the labor bosses or even to compel them to pull in their horns somewhat in connection with most of the grosser and more obvious evil activities in which many of them are engaged.

The House Labor Committee made over a hundred amendments to the committee bill. A few of them, and I might add very few indeed, resulted in some minor improvements. A large number of others were primarily technical in nature but even these were generally in the direction of watering down the corrective aspects of the pending legislation. More than 25 of the added amendments, however, were designed to weaken major reform aspects of the bill, some of them being added to provisions which were already inadequate, thereby resulting in their almost complete nullification.

I do not have time to deal with all of these weakening amendments. I shall merely point out a few of the most glaringly defective.

1. Affirmatively exempts from the financial reporting requirements small labor unions comprising more than 60 percent of the locals in the United States. These would include practically all of the corrupt paper locals established by such criminals as Johnny Dio, among which the McClellan committee found some of the worst abuses of the many which it has revealed.

2. The power of the Secretary of Labor to investigate alleged violations of the bill is limited to cases where he can show probable cause, a limitation not imposed on him in connection with his investigations under the Fair Labor Standards Act or the Walsh-Healey Act, nor imposed on other administrative agencies having investigatory power such as Internal Revenue or the SEC. The probable result of this requirement is to diminish the Secretary's investigatory power almost to the point of complete futility.

3. Although continuing to prohibit payment by labor unions of the fines imposed on their officers for conviction for violating the act, as provided in the Senate bill, the payment by the union of the costs of the union official's defense in such criminal proceedings is not prohibited. Thus the dues of the union members can be used to finance the defense of the very individual who may have been cheating and exploiting them, or robbing them of their hard-earned money paid into the union treasury.

4. Destroys one of the major safeguards established by the Senate bill against abuse of the election process in unions by eliminating the requirement that rival candidates for union office be permitted to have a teller present at the counting of the ballots.

5. Under the Senate bill there is some doubt whether there is any provision which permits union members to invoke or enforce the procedures contained in their union's constitution or bylaws for the removal of union officers guilty of serious misconduct. Under the House amendments all doubts are removed—there is no such provision.

6. The House amendments, like the Senate bill, make it unlawful for an individual who has been convicted or imprisoned for having committed certain specified major crimes to hold union office or employment for a period of 5 years. But the House amendment permits a union official to continue to hold such office or employment even though he has refused to furnish conflict-of-interest information as required by the bill, on the grounds of self-incrimination under the fifth amendment. Moreover, the House proposals impose no penalty on a union or its officers for permitting individuals to hold union office or employment while unlawfully in violation of these provisions.

7. Weakens the fiduciary obligations imposed on union officials by the Senate bill to the point of complete futility by authorizing unions to grant unlimited power over union funds to union officials as long as they comply with their union constitutions and bylaws. There are no limitations on what these documents may authorize. The House amendments then provide union members a judicial remedy for breach of these nonexistent fiduciary obligations, in other words, they really provide no remedy at all. But at the same time they effectively preempt whatever remedies exist in this area, and there are some, under prevailing State law.

8. The weak and ineffective bill of rights for union members contained in title I of the Senate bill is replaced by a new title I which is quite accurately no longer designated a bill of rights because it nullifies even the few inadequate protections provided in the Senate bill. The rights and privileges accorded to union members need no longer be equal, and need be only such as are granted by the union constitution, bylaws or other governing rules, with a few exceptions. These few exceptions which profess to safeguard the union members' rights of freedom of speech and assembly, to protect him against arbitrary increase or imposition of fees, dues and assessments, to give him the right to sue the union or its officers without being punished therefor, and to be given due process when he is subjected to union disciplinary proceedings, are all qualified to the point of worthlessness by permitting the union to restrict these rights by means of its own rules and limitations in a manner far more extensive than permitted under the Senate bill.

Not only do these amendments permit a union member to be disciplined for what his union officials choose to call disloyalty to his union, he may also be punished for disloyalty to the labor movement as a whole. The only guarantee of due process which he is accorded in union disciplinary proceedings is a requirement that the union adhere to its

own constitution and bylaws in the conduct of such proceedings.

Like the Senate bill, if the union member sues or initiates any legal proceedings against his union, he is given no reimbursement for his court costs or attorney fees if he is successful. But what is designed to assure that no union member will have the temerity to proceed legally against his union or its officers, is the provision that no employer, not even a completely disinterested one, can help him, financially or otherwise, in his suit. Thus, even a bank loan secured by the union member to help finance his suit, would deprive him of the protection against disciplinary action by the union which the House amendments profess to guarantee him.

The final touch designed to assure the total worthlessness of the rights of union members which the House amendments profess to safeguard, is the elimination of the criminal penalties the Senate bill imposed on union officials and other persons who sought to interfere with union members in the exercise of even these inadequate rights. Without these criminal sanctions, machinery for enforcing these rights becomes under the House amendments, practically nonexistent.

9. Most of the amendments made by the Senate labor bill to the Taft-Hartley Act were concessions to the labor unions designed to make the reform provisions of the bill more acceptable to them. With one or two exceptions these Taft-Hartley amendments, popularly known as the sweeteners, were wholly irrelevant to the basic issue of internal labor union reform which even its most devoted supporters claimed to be the sole objective of their proposed legislation. Ironically, it was precisely those few amendments to Taft-Hartley most essential to an effective legislative program for labor reform which were either omitted or inadequately dealt with in the Senate bill. I refer to amendments designed to plug the loopholes in existing prohibitions against secondary boycotts, to limit substantially the practices of organizational and recognition picketing, usually referred to as blackmail picketing, and to eliminate the legal no man's land vacuum and its attendant problems which prevail under existing law.

As I have said, the Senate bill dealt little or not at all with these problems. The House amendments are equally worthless in these respects, and what is more, actually add a few spoonsful of sugar to the Taft-Hartley sweeteners in the Senate bill.

Thus, where the latter requires a 45-day interval before a prehearing representation election can be held by the NLRB, the House amendment cuts this down to 30 days thereby rendering the effects of the denial of due process which the prehearing election procedure imposes on litigants even more harmful than under the Senate bill.

Again, although the Senate bill permitted replaced economic strikers to vote in NLRB elections, but only under such conditions and during such periods as determined by the NLRB, the House amendment gives them the right to vote without any limitation whatsoever. As a result, if this proposal were to become law, the regular permanent employees in a particular establishment could be compelled by law to accept as their exclusive bargaining agent for an indefinite period, a labor union which only a tiny minority of them, or even none, wished to be represented by. I can think of no legislative provision more effectively designed to nullify the basic principle of both the Wagner and Taft-Hartley Acts—the right of employees to be represented by unions of their own choosing.

The House amendments would also result in further weakening the protection presently afforded, even if inadequately, under existing law, against secondary boycotts. Under these proposals secondary boycotts in the building and construction industry, some of which are now unlawful, would be legalized almost without exception, overruling important Supreme Court decisions in the process. And finally, the provisions in the Senate bill outlawing a special aspect of the secondary boycott, the notorious hot-cargo contracts as they are imposed in some parts of the trucking industry, would be watered down by the House amendments to a degree which it is impossible to determine because of the ambiguity of the language used in the amendments.

Thus, the use of the secondary boycott, the device which, as has been widely recognized, has been effectively utilized in aid of racketeering, corruption, and so forth, in the labor movement, has been strengthened by the House amendments, instead of weakened, as the American public demands.

TRIBUTE OF TIME MAGAZINE TO NATIONAL CANCER INSTITUTE AND ITS DIRECTOR, DR. JOHN R. HELLER

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, as one who has suffered from cancer myself, I have a profound and even emotional appreciation of the great discoveries in this field already made under the auspices of the National Cancer Institute, which is part of the marvelous National Institutes of Health in Bethesda, Md.

The July 27 issue of Time magazine has published a most informative and illuminating article in tribute to the National Cancer Institute in general and to its able director, Dr. John R. Heller, in particular. This article describes how great researchers in this realm of life and death—like Dr. Sarah E. Stewart, Dr. Sidney Farber, Dr. Peyton Rous, and many others—have been assisted in their life-giving efforts by the vast grants program of the National Cancer Institute.

The National Cancer Institute is much in the minds of Members of the Senate and House these days, because the conference committee is still meeting on funds for all the National Institutes of Health. It is the hope of those of us vitally concerned about medical research that the higher Senate figure, attained under the brilliant leadership of the senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], will more nearly prevail when the ultimate decision is reached.

I believe that many of my colleagues will come to appreciate more thoroughly than ever the attainments possible in medical research after they have read this Time cover article of July 27 about Dr. Heller and the National Cancer Institute. Therefore, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article from Time be printed in the body of the RECORD.

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

CORNERING THE KILLER

At 8 a.m., a stocky, short-legged man with a brush of steel-gray hair rises from a big breakfast at his Georgian-style house, shoehorns himself into a midget Triumph estate wagon, and drives a couple of miles to the rolling campus of the National Institutes of Health at Bethesda, Md. Parking his small car in the No. 1 reserved spot, Dr. John Roderick Heller, Jr., enters an unimpressive building labeled T-19.

Planned to house dogs used in research, the one-story structure is the temporary command post from which Dr. Heller leads the major part of the U.S. fight against one of mankind's oldest and deadliest enemies—cancer. T-19 is headquarters of the National Cancer Institute, and John R. Heller, 54, is the National Cancer Institute's Director.

Across Dr. Heller's desk, from his far-flung research fields, flow curious and varied intelligence items—students gathering puffball mushrooms, desert rats that have learned to smoke, a drug made from a chemical relative of DDT, a plastic iron lung for mice. To him, they all fit tiny corners of the vast jigsaw that must be filled in before cancer can be conquered. Meanwhile, his reports on the enemy's inroads are grim:

"Cancer will strike 450,000 Americans this year and kill 260,000, making it the biggest killer after diseases of the heart and arteries.

"Lung cancer is increasing faster than any other form of cancer, has a lower cure rate than most, will kill 35,000 Americans this year (85 percent of them men).

"After increasing alarmingly for a quarter-century, the death rate from leukemia in the North is leveling off, but is still rising rapidly in the South."

Anticancer forces have scored some gains, Dr. Heller notes: one cancer victim out of three is now saved, meaning cured or enabled to survive 5 years or more. Until recently, it was only one in four. But this advance could be upped by 50 percent merely by early detection and prompt treatment. About 75,000 cancer deaths every year are needless sacrifices to ignorance, apathy and fear.

To make sure that all cancer victims who can be successfully treated get help, and to find ways of saving the half who are now doomed, NCI, a branch of the U.S. Public Health Service, is mounting history's most intensive campaign against a human illness. Its budget is skyrocketing: from $14 million when Dr. Heller took over in 1948 to $75 million in the fiscal year just ended, to a probable $100 million in the fiscal year just begun. It musters the efforts of 675 direct employees and thousands of independent researchers through grants and contracts. NCI's budget embraces almost 80 percent of all U.S. outlays for cancer research. Next biggest backer: the American Cancer Society, with $9,250,000 a year.

NATURE OF THE BEAST

Research must find answers to three complex questions: (1) What is cancer and what are its causes? (2) How can it best be detected, treated, and cured? (3) How can it be prevented?

The experts are in close agreement on what cancer is. First, it is not one disease any more than infection is. Cancers ravage the entire plant and animal kingdoms. In man there are 200 to 300 kinds, though 90 percent of human cancers belong to 30 common types. So cancer is a collective term.

The experts are almost unanimous, too, in believing that wherever cancer appears, its essential nature is the same: a growth of cells that have rebelled against the body's rigid chemical control. Normally, hormones and enzymes work together in a delicate harmony of checks and balances to regulate cell growth. Once the cancerous process begins, it tends to snowball. The abnormal cells consume more than their share of cell foods, can flourish in a victim who is starving, or actually cause him to starve. Like juvenile delinquents, they grab what they want, and never grow up to assume the duties of normal, mature cells. They tend to reproduce early and die young.

How do the first abnormal cells get that way? The experts cannot agree. Columbia University's Dr. Samuel Graff expresses the current consensus: all cancerous cells are the result of mutation, and mutations can be set off by many known factors—inher-

ited defective genes, radiation by X or gamma rays, ultra-violet light, many chemicals, including some of the huge class of hydrocarbons, physical irritation of tissues, and certainly in some animal cancers by the invasion of a virus. There may be other, still unknown, factors causing mutation.

VILLAINOUS COMBINATION

Many people get cancer, but most do not. Are there no mutated cells in the systems of those who escape? Almost certainly there are, says Dr. George Moore, director of New York's Roswell Park Memorial Institute[1] in Buffalo, biggest of the few cancer research units operated by States. Dr. Moore has studied abnormal cells, which might well be precancerous, in the blood of apparently healthy people of all ages. His thesis: every bird, beast, and man produces some such cells at all times, but the body's defenses are usually strong enough to destroy them. That healthy people have a specific immunity against anybody else's cancer has been shown in dramatic tests by investigators from Manhattan's Sloan-Kettering Institute and Ohio State University on prisoner volunteers at Columbus' Ohio Penitentiary (Time, Feb. 5, 1957). Victims of advanced cancer have no immunity against their own or somebody else's cancer.

Why and how anticancer defenses break down is, in most cases, unknown. Many authorities accept the idea of some hereditary susceptibility. Sometimes there are easy, if superficial, explanations. The combination of a chemical carcinogen (cancer-causing factor) with physical irritation is plainly villainous. Cancer of the scrotum among London chimney sweeps was described by Percival Pott in 1775. The disease disappeared when the sweeps were taught to wash themselves clean of the carcinogenic soot. Lung cancer from inhaling chromate ore dusts and nickel-refining fumes can be prevented by the wearing of masks, coupled with adequate ventilation. Even the cancer-causing tobacco-tar fractions isolated by Sloan-Kettering's Ernest L. Wynder seem most potent when their powers are reinforced by irritation or by another chemical—perhaps from automotive or industrial exhausts.

THE HOTTEST THING

"Right now," says National Cancer Institute's Heller, "the hottest thing in cancer is research on viruses as possible causes." The Rockefeller Institute's Dr. Peyton Rous showed as long ago as 1911 (his findings were unpopular at the time) that one cancer (sarcoma) in chickens is caused and can be transmitted by a virus. Over the years, viruses were found to cause other tumors in birds and lower animals. But the gap between them and man seemed unbridgeable. Then the University of Minnesota's Dr. John J. Bittner showed that breast cancer in certain mice is transmitted by a factor, now accepted as a virus, in mouse mothers' milk. This led to the establishment of mouse dairies and the painstaking milking of tens of thousands of rodents. In 1951, Dr. Ludwik Gross of the Bronx Veterans Administration Hospital injected something (evidently a virus material) from leukemic mice into newborn mice, got a high incidence of leukemia and some odd tumors to which little attention was then paid.

Other researchers promptly tried to duplicate Gross's results. One was Dr. Sarah E. Stewart, a tall, vivacious microbiologist turned physician; and working in Baltimore for the National Institutes of Health. As so often happens in medical research, she did not get what she was looking for, but she got something better. Many of the mice she injected with Gross's leukemia virus got solid tumors, mainly in the parotid (salivary) glands. (Dr. Heller's theory: the Gross material had contained two viruses.) Dr. Stewart teamed with the NIH's Dr. Bernice E. Eddy to grow the solid-tumor virus in tissue cultures of monkey kidney cells (as polio virus is grown to make Salk vaccine).

VACCINATION

By now, the SE (for Stewart-Eddy) polyoma (multiple-tumor) virus has hurdled the species barrier and caused cancers not only in mice but in rats and in Syrian and Chinese hamsters. In rabbits, for some strange reason, it causes only benign tumors. so far, Drs. Stewart and Eddy have not been able to infect monkeys with their virus, but a determined effort to do so is under way at Roswell Park Institute. Patricia, a lone baby monkey harboring polyoma virus, has her own spotless nursery where she is cared for by Nurse Althea Higgins. Drs. Stewart and Eddy have gone a vital step farther, treated their virus with rabbit serum, and made a vaccine that protects a big majority of normally susceptible animals against the polyoma virus effects. At Sloan-Kettering Institute, Dr. Charlotte Friend has cultured a strain of mouse virus that causes leukemia in adult as well as newborn animals, and has perfected a protective vaccine. So in some animals, the circle of evidence is virtually complete; viruses are linked with leukemia and certain tumors, and immunity is offered through vaccination.

The problem: Applying these findings to man. At dozens of laboratories in the United States and elsewhere, material from human victims of both leukemia and solid tumors is being tested in animals. Some success is reported by Dr. Steven O. Schwartz of Chicago's Hektoen Institute, who has generated leukemia in mice with an extract from the brains of human leukemia victims. At the University of Texas' M. D. Anderson Hospital in Houston, Dr. Leon Dmochowski has taken electron-microscope photographs of what he is confident are virus particles from human leukemia. Other investigators want more proof, but this suggestive evidence helps to close the ring.

MIGHTY MOLECULE

The virus theory of cancer causation long seemed to be far out in leftfield, but growing knowledge tends to link it with other anticancer plays. Most fundamental of these involves nucleic acids, currently regarded as the secret of life itself (Time, July 14, 1958). Human cells, tiny as they are, normally contain 46 chromosomes, each containing in turn up to 1,000 molecules of nucleic acid. Each of these molecules, invisible even to the electron microscope under most conditions, is a huge chemical complex embracing tens of thousands of atoms. In mammalian cells the master molecule is one of the thousands of forms of deoxyribonucleic acid (DNA). The vital nucleus of many viruses, especially those causing disease in plants and animals (e.g., cowpox, which gives man immunity against smallpox), is also a form of DNA. Most viruses of human diseases have a nucleus of the slightly simpler ribonucleic acid (RNA). Whether polyoma virus has a heart of DNA or RNA is not yet known.

On how to weave these threads of evidence together there are almost as many theories as researchers. But they converge on this general line: DNA is the master molecule of life, with the power to reproduce itself and also to dictate how chromosomes and entire cells shall reproduce. So an abnormal DNA molecule might not only spawn more abnormal DNA, but also trigger the multiplication of abnormal cells that defy the body's usual chemical regulators—in a word, cancer. A DNA viral nucleus, entering a cell, may substitute part of itself for part of a normal DNA, thus scramble the signals for reproduction given by the master molecule.

To the layman, the most puzzling question remains: If any human cancers are caused by viruses, why have none been clearly identified? (The lowliest of benign tumors, the common wart, is definitely caused by a virus that can cause cancer in animals.) Dr. Eddy explains: "In human disease, it may be that the virus starts the cancerous process, but by the time we detect the tumor, there is so little virus left—or in an altered form—that we cannot detect it." Dr. Stewart sums up: "Perhaps we just haven't hit upon the right method." To find the right methods, National Cancer Institute is doubling its outlays for virus research, through grants to independent investigators, to about $4,500,000 in this fiscal year.

EARLY DETECTION

As for detection, treatment, and cure of cancer, Dr. Heller sees the most exciting new development in chemotherapy—treatment of the disease with drugs. But before the disease can be attacked, it must be detected, and all too often detection comes too late for treatment to do all that it might.

Probably no man has done more to save lives threatened by cancer than Greek-born Dr. George N. Papanicolaou, 76, of Cornell University Medical College, who devised a test for cancer of the uterus and cervix by smearing mucous secretion on a glass slide and examining the stained cells under a microscope. The "Pap smear" is now done routinely in hundreds of U.S. laboratories, for an estimated total of 3 million tests a year—most of them for healthy women wisely having regular examinations. Vast ingenuity has gone into extensions of the Pap test: aerosols to make a smoker cough up deep mucus to reveal lung cancer; swallowed balloons and brushes to catch cells from stomach cancer; special washings to reveal disease in the large bowel and rectum.

Attempts to devise a blood test for cancer (other than blood cancers such as leukemia) have been unrewarding, though Sloan-Kettering now has high hopes based on high levels of a substance called cytolipin H in cancer victims' blood. But even if such a test was reliable, it would not tell the cancer's location. Physicians still rely mainly on traditional diagnostic methods: physical examination, visual inspection of accessible sites with such aids as the proctoscope and bronchoscope, Pap smears, and X-rays.

KNIFE AND RAYS

Treatment also is usually traditional: with surgery or X-rays. For the most part, cancer specialists have to be content with 5- or 10-year survival for their patients, and rate this as a substantial cure.

Surgery by itself has made such strides that most authorities (including many surgeons) figure that it is nearing the end of the road. Thanks to advances in general surgical techniques and patient care, it is now possible to remove huge masses of tissue, including whole organs and limbs. Hence the grim jest: "They put the specimen to bed and sent the patient to the laboratory." For some cancers there is no doubt that "radical" (meaning drastic and extensive) surgery has prolonged useful life. (The University of Minnesota's famed Heart Surgeon C. Walton Lillehei's most productive years have followed removal of a lymphosarcoma and much related tissue in 1950.)

[1] Named for no greensward, but for Surgeon Roswell Park (1852–1914), who announced in 1897 that cancer was probably caused by infective particles, decided that in 2 years they could be pinpointed, and that a cure could be found if he had an appropriation of $10,000. He found the money but no cure.

Almost daily, ways are found to give bigger radiation doses more safely to hard-to-reach parts of the body. Examples: cobalt-60 "bombs," a new cesium-137 unit at M. D. Anderson Hospital, higher powered X-ray machines and linear-particle accelerators, ingeniously refined ways of implanting radioisotopes such as iridium 192 and yttrium 90 in tumors.

The one essentially new development in cancer treatment is chemotherapy's advance to the point where it gives relief from pain, and usually longer life, to 60 percent of patients with cancer of the lung, breast, ovary or prostate, as well as leukemia and Hodgkin's disease. From this has come a surge of confidence that increasingly potent drugs can be found that eventually will effect outright cures. So great is this confidence that the Cancer Chemotherapy National Service Center now gets the biggest single bite ($23 million) of NCI's budget, with $18 million going out in grants and contracts for development and screening of new drugs. In addition, almost $4 million goes for testing screened drugs in patients.

FROM POISON GASES

Chemotherapy, broadly defined, got its biggest boost in 1941, when Chicago's Dr. Charles B. Huggins reported that prostate-cancer victims did better and lived longer after castration. The important thing was not the surgery, but the chemistry—removal of the main source of male sex hormones. Similar but less marked benefits resulted from chemical castration by administration of a female hormone. In women, some recurrent breast cancers were retarded by female hormones and others by male hormones. But these treatments relied on natural body chemicals, not synthetic magic.

The transition came in World War II with nitrogen mustard—synthesized for use as a poison gas. Cancer researchers began testing it, found that it killed cells in rough proportion to their rate of reproduction. Though it killed the cancer cells faster than the normal, it was still highly poisonous, could be given (by intravenous injection) only in small doses. And eventually the cancer cells became resistant to it. History has sadly repeated itself with scores of chemicals of this class (technically alkylating agents) developed since. About 20 are credited with definite but limited usefulness.

More ingenious than simply poisoning the cancer cell was the idea that it might be fooled into accepting, instead of a normal food substance (metabolite), an analog (close chemical kin) to fill the metabolite's place but yield no nourishment. First to use antimetabolites this way was Dr. Sidney Farber of Boston Children's Hospital and the Children's Cancer Research Foundation. Knowing that leukemic cells are avid for the vitamin folic acid, he began in 1947 to treat child victims of acute leukemia with analogues of folic acid. Lederle Laboratories sent Dr. Farber two, aminopterin and amethopterin, which soon brought about improvement in most of the children. But after weeks or months, their disease became resistant.

In quick succession came the hormones ACTH and cortisone, which also produced brief remissions in acute leukemia (as in some other cancers of the blood and lymphatic system). Then came another antimetabolite, pioneered by Dr. Joseph H. Burchenal of Memorial Center: 6-mercaptopurine, which interferes with cell nutrition by supplying a counterfeit purine. Physicians treating acute leukemia now ring the changes on these, using one until it loses its effect, then switching to another, sometimes back to the first. No child victims of acute leukemia have yet been saved, but Dr. Farber can report a heartening gain. A dozen years ago, young leukemia patients lived an average of only 3 or 4 months, mostly in misery, after their disease was diagnosed. Now the average is at least a year; some live 2 or 3 years, and a few still longer. During their remissions the children appear healthy, spend most of their time at home playing happily.

MICE AND MEN

Inspired by these gains, researchers decided that no bottle on the chemists' shelves should be left unturned. Under the leadership of Director Cornelius P. Rhoads (Time cover, June 27, 1949) Sloan-Kettering had already begun down-the-line testing, and by now has gone through 20,000 compounds. But 100,000 more are available, and as many more can easily be synthesized or extracted from plants, fungi, and antibiotic "beers." This was a nationwide job for NCI. Along with a score of private institutes and university laboratories, the chemical and drug industries were enlisted: Brooklyn's Charles Pfizer & Co. is at work under a $1,200,000 contract; Indianapolis' Eli Lilly & Co. does its share at its own expense.

Some 40,000 compounds got preliminary testing last year, with about 1 in 1,000 showing enough promise to be worth more trials in man, and the rate is expected soon to hit 60,000 a year. First test for every compound involves at least 18 mice, and the consumption of mice is enormous—more than 2 million last year. All must be of pure, inbred strains. One of Rod Heller's worries is that the supply of these precious mice may not keep pace with the demand.

Perhaps the armies of mice and men could be better employed, because the screening tests now used are admittedly crude and unreliable. Not surprisingly, some chemicals that looked good in mice have failed in man, and a couple that missed in the mouse test show promise in man. But better screening methods are being sought, and some researchers believe that they have already found them.

EFFECTIVE DRUGS

Despite admitted drawbacks, chemotherapy has won a solid foothold. Dr. Charles Gordon Zubrod, 45, NCI's clinical director, responsible for all cancer patients treated in NIH's huge Clinical Center (Time, July 20, 1953), lists eight forms of the disease that can often be set back by drugs, sometimes for as long as 2 or 3 years. These are: acute leukemia in children, chronic lymphocytic and myeloid leukemia in adults. Hodgkin's disease, rhabdomyosarcoma (a rare muscle cancer), Wilms's tumor (in the kidney, present at birth), cancer of the adrenal glands, and choriocarcinoma (mainly in women, and arising from placental material). The list includes four major types of cancer—leukemia, lymphoma, sarcoma, and carcinoma. This offers some hope that drugs effective against all the many forms of cancer can be found.

Most gratifying and surprising was the discovery that amethopterin, after years of use in acute leukemia, was effective against choriocarcinoma. Dr. Min Chiu Li, now at Sloan-Kettering, and Dr. Roy Hertz, head of NCI's hormone research, pioneered in this, starting from the fact that the female reproductive tract's cells need unusually large amounts of folic acid. Also important was the fact that women with this cancer excrete abnormally large amounts of a hormone forbiddingly named chorionic gonadotropin, and the progress or arrest of the tumor can be gaged with high accuracy by measuring the quantity of the hormone in the urine. In four years, Dr. Hertz and colleagues have treated 45 women at the clinical center, and 10 of them now show no sign of cancer either at the original site in the uterus or in the areas to which it had spread. In more than 20 cases, the cancer was slowed for a while but then got out of control. Only one woman showed no benefit.

EXTENDED POWERS

The search for anticancer drugs is no U.S. monopoly. Several have been developed in Britain. From Japan has come an antibiotic, mitomycin C, with dazzling claims; U.S. researchers grant that it is potent in mice, have been baffled by failure to get good results in man. Soviet scientists are screening chemicals by the carload, and the Chinese Reds—with an eye on the propaganda value in underdoctored Asia—are sifting ancient herbal medicines.

In all, more than 100 drugs are being tested on human patients in 150 U.S. hospitals. Some are taken by mouth; others have to be injected in various ways. Some are used alone, others in conjunction with surgery or radiation. Most provocative is an ingenious technique of Drs. Oscar Creech and Edward T. Krementz, worked out at Tulane University. They isolate the bloodflow through a cancerous area with tourniquets, divert it through a heart-lung machine, lace it with some alkylating agent such as nitrogen mustard. The rest of the body is protected against blood-cell destruction caused by the drug, and a far higher dose can be given. Usually, this is an extremity, but with experience the technique is being modified, by its originators and other surgeons, to attack cancers in the shoulder and even the lung or pelvis. Boston's Dr. Farber has found that actinomycin D, a derivative of one of Dr. Selman Waksman's earliest antibiotics, has both anticancer activity of its own and the power to increase the effectiveness of X-rays. So now he uses both in a double-barreled blast against certain children's cancers.

PREVENTION

From all these varied approaches, Dr. Heller is confident, drug treatment will emerge as the equivalent of surgery and radiation, with its powers extended from palliation to actual cure of cancer.

Obviously, the ultimate goal is prevention. Here cancer offers its usual paradoxes. There is no faintest clue as to how most of the commonest forms can be prevented; yet in those cases where trigger mechanisms have been spotted, preventive measures have been more effective than against any other disease. Scrotum cancer of U.S. oil workers, from a wax-pressing process, has been wiped out (as was chimney sweeps' cancer) by keeping the dangerous chemical at a distance. So has bladder cancer in the dye industry. Circumcision and scrupulous cleanliness markedly reduce a man's risk of cancer of the penis, and possibly his wife's risk of cervical cancer.

Biggest question in prevention today is how the rise in lung cancer—virtually confined to heavy-smoking men—can be checked and reversed. Rod Heller, bureaucrat and son of a tobacco-growing State (although he has never smoked), has weighed all the conflicting evidence and arrived at a forthright conclusion: "Statistical evidence, supported by laboratory findings, has shown that excessive cigarette smoking can be a cause of lung cancer, and that the greater the consumption of cigarettes, the greater the risk." Practical Dr. Heller sees little prospect of changing U.S. smoking habits, pins his hopes for lung-cancer prevention on convicting a specific substance in tobacco tars as the guilty agent, then getting rid of it.

FIRSTHAND EXPERIENCE

The field of cancer is so vast, so full of unexplainable contradictions, so stubborn in resisting a decisive, exploitable breakthrough, that the army of investigators deployed in it suffer more frustration than most men on medicine's frontiers. The emotional anguish inseparable from cancer heightens their tension. The result is more than average jealousy and backbiting among cancer fighters. As chief coordinator in this setting, Rod Heller is a near ideal choice. Says

a leading independent cancer specialist: "He doesn't make people mad. He is a diplomat." Says Heller himself: "You could call me a reasonably relaxed person."

Born at what he calls a wide place in the road named Fair Play, S.C. (40 miles southwest of Greenville), Heller is the son and grandson of physicians, had a brother and an uncle with M.D.'s. Yet when he entered Clemson College at 16, Rod went into engineering. He switched to the family tradition in time to get his M.D. from Atlanta's Emory University in 1929. Joining up with the U.S. Public Health Service in 1931, he began hopscotching around on 2-year tours of anti-VD duty. In 1934 Dr. Heller married Susie May Ayres, daughter of a Tennessee banker. John Roderick III was born to the traveling Hellers in Harrisburg, Pa., second son Hanes in New Orleans, third son Winder (rhymes with finder) in Washington. At least one should keep the M.D. line going: Hanes, 19, is a premed student at Yale.

Though NCI was set up in 1937, it never really got rolling until after World War II. Meanwhile, Dr. Heller had become chief of the PHS's VD division, set up rapid-treatment centers around the country. Thanks to these and penicillin, says Heller, "I worked myself out of a job." In 1948 he got the top spot at NCI, but not until 1956 did cancer become a personal matter to him. Then a small growth (basal cell carcinoma) developed at the base of his left nostril. It was removed surgically, and Cancer Fighter Heller rates himself a cured cancer victim.

His relaxed style enables Heller to handle a hodgepodge of administrative duties, keep a balance between jealous scientific factions, attend countless cancer congresses (he was in Lima and Bogotá last month, is in Denver this week), and handle touchy appropriations questions with congressional committees. Dr. Heller is opposed to a crash program, often advocated by laymen with the Manhattan project in mind. There is, he says, not enough fundamental information available to base it on. But he insists: "With an accelerated and orderly effort to find the answers to cancer, we are going to get them. You can't use all the resources of this country—all the things that have conquered worlds—without something giving. If we could find just one cause of one cancer, and show how it operates, we would have our foot in the door of mankind's most terrible killer. I am confident that we will have some success in the next few years."

FLEET ADM. WILLIAM D. LEAHY

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, yesterday, it was my privilege and pleasure to be the guest of Representative ALVIN O'KONSKI at a luncheon in the House Dining Room. What was the occasion for this lunch? There were approximately 40 citizens of the city of Ashland who came to Washington to attend the funeral of Fleet Adm. William D. Leahy. He was a citizen of Ashland and of my State. The fact that 40 of his townspeople came to the funeral indicates in some measure the respect and love the people of that community had for him.

In reading the Christian Science Monitor I noticed an editorial entitled, "Admiral, Ambassador, and Adviser." I personally knew Admiral Leahy and it was my intention yesterday to attend the funeral, but because of the situation on the Senate floor it was impossible for me to go. I ask that this editorial be printed in the RECORD following my remarks together with an editorial entitled "Adm. William D. Leahy," published in the Wisconsin State Journal of July 21, 1959.

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

[From the Christian Science Monitor]

ADMIRAL, AMBASSADOR, AND ADVISER

Fleet Adm. William D. Leahy was a senior among seniors and, although not often in the direct glare of the limelight, his was a towering figure in the World War II era now passing.

Of the general officers given five-star rank near the end of that war Admiral Leahy ranked them all. He had been the only officer in naval history to have served as Chief of the Bureaus of Ordnance, Navigation, and Operations—the latter post being considered the top command in the Navy. And when President Roosevelt named him Chief of Staff to the Commander in Chief his responsibilities broadened beyond any one service. He then represented the White House on the Joint Chiefs of Staff, American and British, which directed the grand strategy of the war.

Admiral Leahy also filled a crucial post in crisis diplomacy. When France collapsed militarily in 1940 the admiral was sent as Ambassador to the Vichy Government of Marshal Henri Philippe Pétain whose respect he earned in his near-impossible assignment of keeping France on the side of the allies. And in his role as Chief of Staff he served as a senior adviser to Presidents Roosevelt and Truman at the great international conferences from 1943 through 1945.

As an officer Admiral Leahy approached the Navy ideal in professional competence. As a diplomat and counselor to Presidents his was the contribution of cool, balanced judgment at critical moments.

[From the Wisconsin State Journal, July 21, 1959]

ADM. WILLIAM D. LEAHY

History one day will place Adm. William D. Leahy on a pedestal of time's Titans where he unquestionably belongs.

The grand old fighter-diplomat is dead at 84. Only a small portion of his profound effect on the course of the world has yet been told.

He is generally credited, though, with having built the U.S. Navy to a point which, had it been any less, would have doomed this Nation after Pearl Harbor.

His was the vision behind Franklin D. Roosevelt's war direction. So quietly that he was hardly then mentioned, he prepared the way for the North African invasion. He remained as Chief of Staff—the key man—at the side of Presidents Roosevelt and Truman during and after World War II.

Though he was a native of Iowa, Wisconsin always claimed him, and with pride. He was a graduate of Ashland (Wis.) High School and a frequent visitor to Madison.

On these visits, the only man who didn't stand in awe of this giant figure was William Leahy. He was the farthest thing from the cartoonist's conception of the bombastic warmaker, a smiling, easygoing, comfortable man.

His memory deserves the grateful thanks of America and the rest of the free world, an appreciation that can be given only in the fullness of time as his story finally unfolds.

SALUTE TO PUERTO RICO ON ITS SEVENTH ANNIVERSARY AS A COMMONWEALTH

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, tomorrow, the self-governing Commonwealth of Puerto Rico celebrates its seventh anniversary.

We recall that, on July 25, 1952, this splendid community of about 2,300,000 U.S. citizens became a Commonwealth within the U.S. democratic system by compact and mutual consent. The constitution adopted by the people of Puerto Rico, and ratified by the U.S. Congress, is in complete harmony with our own Federal institutions—in form, functions, objectives, and spirit.

Within a brief 7-year lifetime, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico has made tremendous strides in providing a better life for its people.

An industrialization program—correctly labeled "Operation Bootstrap" by Gov. Luis Muñoz Marín—has created new factories, office buildings and houses, new dams and hydroelectric plants, schools and hospitals, roads, hotels and tourist facilities, and other marks of progress.

As a result, the citizens of Puerto Rico enjoy better standards of living, new opportunities in education, extension of life expectancy through public health programs, construction of safe water supply and sewage disposal systems, and similar projects, and a generally improved outlook for the future.

The month of July—marking our own national anniversary of independence—too, is particularly significant in Puerto Rican history. In addition to commemorating its anniversary as a Commonwealth on July 25, the Puero Ricans also have dedicated this whole year in centennial celebration for the birth, on July 17, 1859, of Luis Muñoz Rivera—often called by island patriots the "George Washington of Puerto Rico."

In paying tribute to this record of splendid progress, we might do well, I believe, to take a look at the problems that arise among ourselves and all our Latin American neighbors. First of all, just how significant is Latin America?

For comparison, the U.S. population today is about 177 million. The people of the 21 Republics of Latin America total more than 180 million; and this population is expected to rise to about 500 million by the year 2000—more than double that of the United States. Too, these nations are rich in natural resources, essential for progress and defense.

To assure the kind of close-knit cooperation and coordination that we, and the majority of our Latin American neighbors, feel is essential to progress and security, we must have constructive, forward-looking programs.

Overall, I believe the United States can, and should, continue—and as necessary expand—its cooperation with Latin American countries to help achieve the following objectives:

First. Wipe out poverty, disease, illiteracy;

Second. Develop industrialization and agriculture in less developed areas—through, for example, greater technical assistance to enable these nations to stand on their own feet economically;

Third. Correct the "taken for granted" attitude that has all too often marked our policy as it relates to Latin America;

Fourth. Provide economic assistance preferably in the forms of loans, rather

than grants and particularly to encourage private enterprise to invest and provide adequate protection of those investments;

Fifth. More effectively handle the economic problems arising from competition, tariffs, quotas, and other barriers to trade and exchange of goods—the lifeblood of the inter-American economy;

Sixth. Coordinate more closely to counter the Communist efforts at penetration of Latin America;

Seventh. Improve channels of communication and understanding between countries and people, so that we can better resolve mutual problems.

Today, the Organization of American States, for example, is making a constructive contribution toward dealing with these difficulties and ironing out these problems.

However, the United States today cannot afford to overlook the value of a solid front of anti-Communist states in the Western Hemisphere. Instead, we need to make every effort, not only to counter the Communist offensive, but also to strengthen the economic and political foundations upon which to build a better future for the American States.

The progress demonstrated by Puerto Rico—upon which we congratulate the Commonwealth on its seventh anniversary—represents, I sincerely hope, a movement forward toward a better life, not only for Puerto Rico but for all the people of the Americas.

Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin.

FAVORABLE POLITICAL CLIMATE IN INDONESIA

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I have prepared an article on the subject of "Favorable Political Climate in Indonesia." I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the RECORD at this point, together with an article entitled "A Gamble on Guided Democracy," from the Reporter for July 23, 1959.

The particular article to which I refer tells the story of how, in Indonesia, American foreign policy has moved forward. It has benefited those people and that country. It is well that our missions abroad and the people at home keep in mind the facts outlined in the article.

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

Quite often the question is raised as to whether our foreign military and economic aid programs actually accomplish what they set out to do. "Do we really help the cause of freedom?" "Do we help to answer the real local needs?" "Do we make friends for America?" These are some of the questions that we are asked. And it must be admitted that, despite the tremendous achievements of the Marshall plan and of our close cooperation with the NATO countries, we have also seen some of our programs produce very meager results.

The Washington papers recently carried rather discouraging news of the U.S. aid program in Vietnam. And despite many efforts on our part in other areas, local instability, disturbances, and anti-American campaigns could not be totally prevented.

But what we must remember is that, in carrying out a foreign policy, we must exercise some qualities that at times appear to be in short supply: patience and understanding of local needs and aspirations. It is therefore with great interest that I read a recent article in the Reporter magazine describing favorable current developments in Indonesia. I include at this point four paragraphs from this article by Haldore Hanson:

"American economic aid (to Indonesia) has totaled $400 million during the decade of full independence. In fiscal 1959 we gave $10.6 million in technical training, sold $40 million of agricultural surplus for local currency, and allotted about $12 million in various loans for capital projects. Our only aid that was of immediate help in fighting inflation was in the form of rice and other farm products, which were sold for local currency and thus helped absorb the extra money supply.

"Military aid from the United States to neutralist Indonesia began less than a year ago, after the State Department became worried about shipments of Communist arms. Until that time we refused to give or sell arms to Indonesia because they might be used against our Dutch allies. This spring we agreed to supply infantry equipment for 20 battalions and a number of planes at a cost of several tens of millions of dollars.

"The United States is enjoying a honeymoon here that would have been unimaginable a few years ago. Ambassador Howard Jones is doing an extraordinary job, and the Embassy staff is also one of the ablest missions in Asia. Certainly the 1,400 Indonesian officers trained in the United States since 1950 have been partly responsible for the change in climate.

"The Communists have also helped our standing. The Chinese Communist behavior in Tibet was not lost on any Asian country. And Sukarno has not forgotten that the Communist Party of Indonesia increased its vote from a fourth to a third in the Java local elections of 1957 at the expense of his own Nationalist Party. He was becoming a Communist prisoner and could use closer American relations."

What is the lesson to be learned from these developments in Indonesia? I should like to summarize the lesson in four simple points:

1. In dealing with our friends in some of the new and restless lands we must remember that national pride there is high and that they will resent any insinuation that their friendship can be bought. Therefore, American assistance and cooperation must be directed toward long-term friendship and understanding, and not always toward immediate gains.

2. One of the most effective ways of creating better understanding with other peoples is through educational and scientific exchange. The Indonesian officers trained in the United States since 1950 are a definite example in point. The Indonesian Army is a young institution and lacks the training and tradition provided by the British to the Indian and Pakistani Armies. But now, out of 20,000 Indonesian officers who command the local troops, 1,400 are American trained. It is these officers, who came here and saw American life, that are best qualified to translate and interpret it for local use.

3. Patience is a most necessary element in our dealing with new nations that have social, economic, and political background totally different from our own. We must not lose our patience merely because local developments are not always according to our own schemes and time tables. And we must remember that we cannot expect these people to erect exact replicas of our own institutions. We must realize that our own concepts of freedom, the worth of the individual and democratic processes must be translated to fit local needs.

4. As this article points out—often times it is the Communists that provide us with the best ammunition. For their infiltration, aggression, and deceit—although well-camouflaged, do finally become apparent; and at that time we must be ready to demonstrate the difference between our type of cooperation and theirs.

It is well that our missions abroad, and also the people at home, keep these facts in mind and conduct our affairs accordingly. It is only after we realize these facts that we can fully appreciate the complex and tremendous jobs before us; and it is only then that our efforts will meet with more success. Indonesia has provided an excellent lesson—let us not fail to learn it.

A GAMBLE ON GUIDED DEMOCRACY

(By Haldore Hanson)

DJAKARTA.—During my month's stay in Indonesia it became obvious that a shift of power was taking place that would affect the future of these 3,000 islands and 86 million people. An odd political partnership was emerging between 58-year-old President Sukarno and the 40-year-old Sumatran chief of staff, Abdul Haris Nasution. The older man is an opportunist who once seemed to welcome Communist support. The younger man was responsible for the liquidation of all Moscow-trained agents in the Battle of Madium, a decisive anti-Communist action in 1948. These two men are now launching a new version of guided democracy that could produce a marked shift in the cold war, favorable to the West.

Walking down Merdeka Square on the day of my arrival, I heard the sirens for the first time, and had barely looked over my shoulder when traffic pulled to the curb and an impressive motorcade moved past. First came eight motorcycle officers in white helmets, riding four abreast; then eight jeeps running two abreast, tops down, each vehicle carrying four steel-helmeted police with Sten guns across their laps; then a long black Chrysler with a solitary passenger, followed by two army staff cars of orderlies; and bringing up the rear, a jeepful of officers, also white-helmeted, flying a 10-foot flag for the Presidential bodyguard. This is the way President Sukarno drives about in his own capital.

By contrast to the President's love of crowd appeal, Nasution is almost unknown to the public, makes few speeches, rarely holds a press conference. He has no popular following. Sukarno and his second wife live elegantly in the palace, or rather in any one of five palaces he inherited as chief of state from the Dutch Governor. Nasution's residence is a modest bungalow in a Djakarta suburb where his wife does her own grocery shopping. The Nasutions are devout Moslems with no apparent wealth. Sukarno dislikes administration, and minding the store has never been one of his strong points. Nasution is a gifted organizer, a 70-hour-a-week worker.

EXPERIMENT IN GOVERNMENT

For Sukarno the new partnership may be expedient. Ever since the President advanced his "guided democracy" proposal in 1957, involving at that time a coalition government with fellow travelers, his position at the top of the unstable political structure in Indonesia has seemed to deteriorate. By the beginning of 1958 the Communists were considered strong enough to win that year's elections in Java, and the West seemed ready to write off both Sukarno and Java.

All this has changed in 1959. The rebellions in Sumatra and Celebes enabled General Nasution to strengthen his faction-torn army by transferring or eliminating unreliable officers, and he has put an effective military force into the field. Meanwhile President Sukarno, despite his injured pride,

emerged from the rebellions still far and away the strongest man in Indonesia, in effective control of the government.

It was against this background that Sukarno rewrote his plan for guided democracy, this time in partnership with the army. Appearing last April 22 in the historic hall at Bandung, scene of the Afro-Asian Conference, he asked the Constituent Assembly for three important charges: First, a shift from the British-type parliamentary cabinet to an American-type 5-year presidency; second, power for the President to nominate about half the members of future parliaments as representatives of labor, peasants, and other functional groups; third, emergency powers to control political parties.

The role that Nasution's army will play under this new version of guided democracy has never been described publicly, but several highly placed officials felt free to discuss it. The army will receive a block of seats in parliament, generally stated to be 35, and a number of ministerships in the new cabinet, possibly one-half to two-thirds. Thus, by a roundabout route, Indonesia will arrive at an army-directed government not so different from those of Burma and Pakistan. Local newspapermen in Djakarta have called this the army's creeping coup.

The scheme received a temporary setback in June when the Constituent Assembly rejected the proposals for guided democracy. But on July 5, the president dissolved the Constituent Assembly, abolished the parliament-oriented 1950 constitution, and reinstated the 1945 constitution under which his own powers are practically unlimited, thus preparing the way for his experiment in government.

The most immediate threat to this venture is not the opposition of political parties but the acute economic crisis that has tightened around the nation's windpipe.

One day a young economist in the Bank of Indonesia leaned against the canteen bar, a Coke in his hand, and spoke bitterly to me about hard times in Djakarta: "My family has never known such trouble. Rice in the bazaar costs more than during the revolution in 1948. The rice we eat from Communist China is full of weevils and makes my children nauseated. My cost of living is twice what it was in 1958 and three times higher than in 1956. All my friends in the civil service are spending at least twice their basic salaries. We have to take two jobs or put our wives to work. Unless this problem is solved, I don't see how the Government can rely upon the police and army for security, or on the civil service for economic controls."

The immediate cause of the trouble is printing-press money, issued by the Government to meet its obligations. But behind the paper money are deeper rooted problems—the costly rebellions of 1958; the loss of Dutch managers and technicians in the great exodus of 19 months ago; and the inability of the coalition Cabinet to make tough economic decisions.

By no means everyone in the country suffers from inflation. Four out of five people in Indonesia live in villages that are self-sufficient in food and relatively little affected by city prices. This rural economy somehow slows down the inflation in the cities. This is a dual economy, with one sector sick, the other enjoying reasonably good health. But the sick sector happens to include, as the young banker observed, the groups that are vital to the survival of government—the police, army, and civil service.

THE DUTCH EXODUS

The departure of the Dutch during the West Irian (Netherlands New Guinea) affair is one cause of the crisis. President Sukarno tried to rally the Indonesians behind him in 1957 by stepping up an old propaganda campaign against the Dutch for retaining West Irian under colonial rule. This campaign was intended as a diversion, but it got out of hand. Public opinion was whipped to such a fever that anti-Dutch street demonstrations broke out, forty-six thousand Dutch went home (leaving fewer than two thousand), and the Indonesian Army took over $1.5 billion worth of Dutch enterprises. Sukarno may have achieved his propaganda goal, but the country lost most of its experienced executives and technicians.

The greatest immediate setback from the Dutch exodus was the loss of the KPM, the Dutch shipping firm, which carried trade between the islands. When the KPM was nationalized by Indonesia in 1957, a British insurance firm recovered the 103 ships for the Dutch owners. So Indonesia was left with greatly weakened control over trade. Japanese, Russian, and American aid programs are all helping to replace the Dutch ships, but it will be 1962 or later before such a fleet can be reassembled. That means a five-year gap during which it will be difficult to suppress illegal trade.

There are other breakdowns in government controls that cannot be attributed to the Dutch, as a stroll down one of the main shopping streets of Djakarta will demonstrate. A black-market money salesman will approach the visitor even at the gate of Sukarno's Merdeka Palace, holding out a roll of thousand-rupiah notes with no fear of the palace guards. His rate has recently gone as high as 210 rupiahs to the dollar, against the official trading rate of thirty. Shop windows contain Scotch whisky, Dutch cigars, English biscuits, and Danish cheese, all banned from the import list, but these are smuggled goods.

The word "smuggled" is misleading, since the goods entered the country under the nose of a customs officer who received a gratuity. And this customs officer is one of those suffering from inflation. One automobile show window displays a 1959 Chevrolet Bel Air at an asking price of 12,000 U.S. dollars. It is illegal to import American automobiles for resale, but this dealer assures you he can get a license plate for the car.

Since much of the economic problem stems from a lack of integrity and discipline in government, it is a fair question whether army partnership in guided democracy offers some hope. There is already a considerable army record from which to judge.

ARMY OF ALL TRADES

The Indonesian Army is a young institution, dating from the Japanese occupation period. During 340 years of occupation the Dutch used mainly their own security forces and left behind no senior corps of local officers as the British did in India and Pakistan. Among the 20,000 officers who command the 200,000 troops, most of the senior officers are aged 30 to 35, and have had an education of senior high school or less. There are virtually no college graduates, such as distinguish the army leadership in Burma and Pakistan.

The core of disciplined officers around Nasution were trained in the United States. In 1951 the U.S. Army attaché at Djakarta began sending 10 Indonesians a year for training in our army academies, and the number steadily increased to 20, 50, and now 90 a year. Some 350 Indonesians had returned from this training by the time of the rebellions last year, and not surprisingly, American-trained officers were made responsible for the amphibious landing of 20,000 government troops on Sumatra, an operation highly praised by Western military observers.

As administrator of martial law since 1957, Nasution has had an opportunity to show his abilities. But the performance of his regional martial-law administrators has not been impressive. Attempts to enforce price control by raiding shops with armed troops proved worse than useless. The army's arrest of hundreds of rebel sympathizers, while necessary, was no better than a political police operation. Censorship of the press by army administrators has angered most newspapermen. The army has not distinguished itself so far in a drive against corruption or smuggling or black marketing, as the armies in Burma and Pakistan did. In fact, Nasution's martial-law administration is best described as a fire-brigade operation, except for his calculated oppression of Communists. He banned all mass meetings, even the regular meetings of Communist-dominated unions, and effectively eliminated Communist wall scribblings and posters, an important Communist technique.

On the other hand, in its administration of the Dutch properties—the hundreds of estates and factories, plus a few banks and trading companies—the army has shown more capacity than most Western observers had predicted. The more than 300 Dutch estates are each managed by three army officers, and their output still accounts for nearly 50 percent of the total agricultural exports. Army officers in groups of three have also been assigned to each of the banks, trading companies, and industrial plants. On the basis of their performance to date, there seems little doubt that selected Indonesian officers can do a better job of administration than the prevailing level of civil-service administration here. Nasution now has more than 4,000 army officers engaged in various civil jobs, and has established a school in the National Planning Bureau to give special training for officers assigned to economic enterprises. Apparently the army has no early intention of withdrawing from the economic field.

The substantial aid programs Indonesia is receiving from the Communist bloc and the United States have been little help in solving the immediate economic crisis. Most aid is earmarked for new development projects and Indonesia must provide the local currency. This arrangement actualy increases the amount of money in circulation, thereby aggravating the inflation.

The Soviet Union offered Indonesia a credit of $100 million in 1956 and during the last 2 years offered additional aid that would bring the total to about $500 million. Much of it is still unused. A Soviet road-building program in Borneo requires Moscow to furnish only road machinery, while Indonesia puts up three times as much for local labor. The Soviet loan of $12.5 million to build a new Djakarta stadium for the Asian games in 1962 must be matched by $12.5 million in rupiahs. A senior Foreign Office official remarked that Soviet textiles under the aid agreement were priced at 20 percent above the world market and that ships the Russians sold to the Indonesian merchant marine were antiquated lend-lease vessels not worth the price. A Czech tire factory erected under the aid program is standing idle for lack of essential equipment omitted from the original contract.

Communist military aid has included the 75 MIG jets that buzz the capital daily and the 40-man Czech training mission attached to the air force. The infantry arms which General Nasution used in the Sumatra affair were purchased in part from the Communists. ("Just get the hardware," Nasution is supposed to have instructed the negotiators. "We are not interested in the politics.")

THE AMERICAN HONEYMOON

American economic aid has totaled $400 million during the decade of full independence. In fiscal 1959 we gave $10.6 million in technical training, sold $40 million of agricultural surplus for local currency, and allotted about $12 million in various loans for capital projects. Our only aid that was of immediate help in fighting inflation was in the form of rice and other farm products,

which were sold for local currency and thus helped absorb the extra money supply.

Military aid from the United States to neutralist Indonesia began less than a year ago, after the State Department became worried about shipments of Communist arms. Until that time we refused to give or sell arms to Indonesia because they might be used against our Dutch allies. This spring we agreed to supply infantry equipment for 20 battalions and a number of planes at a cost of several tens of millions of dollars.

The United States is enjoying a honeymoon here that would have been unimaginable a few years ago. Ambassador Howard Jones is doing an extraordinary job, and the embassy staff is also one of the ablest missions in Asia. Certainly the 1,400 Indonesian officers trained in the United States since 1950 have been partly responsible for the change in climate.

The Communists have also helped our standing. The Chinese Communist behavior in Tibet was not lost on any Asian country. And Sukarno has not forgotten that the Communist Party of Indonesia increased its vote from a fourth to a third in the Java local elections of 1957 at the expense of his own Nationalist Party. He was becoming a Communist prisoner and could use closer American relations.

The Communist Party of Indonesia, incidentally, with only 1.5 million members, still controls 80 percent of the labor unions and has a strong chain of peasant organizations on Java. Its executive secretary, Aidit, has made three trips to Moscow in the last 6 months. It will not be possible for a guided democracy, even with the help of Nasution's army, to disband so formidable an organization by edict.

Many Americans gag at the concept of an army in civil government, but our political theories are based upon a Western society in which the norm is government by competent civil executives, democratically controlled. Some Asian governments have concluded, after a decade of independence, that they do not have this alternative, that free elections have brought them nothing better than fragmented authority and government paralysis.

One of the most respected Indonesian editors, a man educated in England, declared to me: "I would rather live under a government which is half police state and half elected than in the confusion we have endured, and I hope nobody is in a hurry to go back to party rule. It isn't that guided democracy offers any panacea. The army knows little about economics and less about a social program. But we need to get some firm anchors under us. This is why I want to give Sukarno's authoritarian government a try. It's a gamble, of course. But what else is there for us to do?"

PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH CONDEMNS RIGHT-TO-WORK LAWS

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I should like to call attention to the recent action by the 171st general assembly of the United Presbyterian Church in the United States in condemning so-called right-to-work laws and upholding the democratic processes of collective bargaining between management and labor as the path to industrial peace.

I believe this eminent church, which speaks for nearly 4 million Presbyterians in our Nation, has taken a position on this issue which represents the best interests and welfare of the great majority of our citizens.

This is the latest in a series of pronouncements by church groups against the so-called right-to-work laws that have included the Catholic Church, the Episcopal Church, the Methodist Church, the National Council of Churches, the Congregational Church, and the Jewish faith. All have condemned these anti-collective bargaining laws as being against the welfare of a majority of our people.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the portion of the text of the United Presbyterian Church report, as adopted, which deals with the right of management and labor to agree to a union shop through the democratic processes of collective bargaining.

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

EXCERPT FROM REPORT OF THE STANDING COMMITTEE ON SOCIAL EDUCATION AND ACTION TO THE 171ST GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE UNITED PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA DEALING WITH COLLECTIVE BARGAINING

The 171st general assembly expresses its confidence in collective bargaining as the most responsible and democratic way of resolving issues in labor-management relations; believes that union membership as a basis of continued employment should be neither required by law nor forbidden by law; urges that the question of a union shop or other maintenance-of-membership arrangements should be settled by collective bargaining which meets the basic requirements for responsible and democratic negotiation; condemns unequivocally violence and threats of violence in labor disputes; urges Federal legislation to insure the honest use of union funds and to guarantee the right of appeal, and the right of secret ballot; calls upon individual Presbyterian union members to take a responsible part in the activities of their unions; and calls upon the department of social education and action to continue its study of present issues in industrial relations (such as the effects of automation, the reclassification of jobs and the need for retaining workers, the problems of women in industry, the influence of economic power groups, the present role of Government in the economy, the new power and problems of organized labor, and the cultural implications of new technology) and to bring appropriate recommendations to the 172d general assembly.

Respectfully submitted.

HAROLD L. BOWMAN,
Chairman.

MEMBERS OF THE STANDING COMMITTEE ON SOCIAL EDUCATION AND ACTION, REV. HAROLD L. BOWMAN, CHAIRMAN, CHICAGO PRESBYTERY

Ministers and Presbytery

Charles E. Carlston, Ph. D., Northeast Iowa.
James V. Coleman, Chaplain, U.S. Army, Los Angeles.
Howard B. Day, Jr., Baltimore.
Raymond E. Little, Newton.
Salvatore Migliore, Pittsburgh.
Richard E. Moore, Cincinnati.
John C. Purdy, Milwaukee.
Eldon L. Seamons, Arkansas Valley.
Robert Lloyd Shirer, Westchester.
John R. Waser, Nebraska City.
Ralph H. Weeks, Yukon.

Elders and occupation

Mrs. George M. Creasy, Jr., New York, homemaker.
N. Victor Fetzner, Saginaw, grocer.
David A. Funk, Wooster, attorney.
J. Fletcher Goss, Peoria, plant supervisor.
Mrs. William J. Nichol, Donegal, homemaker.
Wilbur Nolte, Rio Grande, accountant.
Charlie F. Scarbrough, Knoxville, city health officer.
Gene Shumate, Kendall, radio station owner.
Charles A. Smith, Huntington, tool engineer.
A. T. Van Dyk, Red River, superintendent of parks.
William Verbridge, Geneva-Lyons, recreation instructor.

IMPACT OF THE STEEL STRIKE ON STEELWORKERS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the New York Times of this morning contains a very informative roundup of the impact thus far of the steel strike on the steelworkers.

At the present time, paychecks for work done before the strike started are still going out to many of the half million workers. At best, this could delay hard times for only a couple of weeks.

It is only a matter of time until the workers are faced with the prospects of living off relief checks and on pickup jobs in communities where such jobs will not readily be available.

This will be a great tragedy. It will represent a loss to the workers themselves which will spread ultimately to other sectors of the economy.

Mr. President, I hope—and I believe every American hopes—that action can be taken to bring about genuine collective bargaining so that an honest and just settlement can be reached before this tragedy strikes.

I ask unanimous consent that the article by Mr. Peter Kihss be printed in the body of the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

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

PAYCHECKS AND SAVINGS HELP DELAY THE IMPACT OF STRIKE ON MOST STEEL WORKERS—NO RUSH IS LIKELY FOR RELIEF SOON—MANY STATES BAR JOBLESS AID—MERCHANTS EXTEND CREDIT TO UNIONISTS

(By Peter Kihss)

Paychecks for work done before the steel strike started are still going out to many of the 500,000 workers.

With savings put away against the threat of a prolonged tieup, the checks have helped delay the impact for strikers and their communities. But spending is being cut down with the end of payrolls normally approximating $50 million a week.

As the strike goes into its 10th day today, a survey by correspondents of the New York Times indicated that the steelworkers generally were at least 2 weeks or more away from any rush for relief rolls or other emergency welfare aid.

There was one burst of bitterness reported from Morrisville, Pa. Fifty-two hundred United States Steel Corp. strikers there failed yesterday to get their scheduled checks for 2 weeks' pay. The management asserted that only clerks now on strike could make up the payroll. The union said supervisors could have done it.

A spokesman for the striking United Steelworkers of America said here that the industry generally had a 2-week time lag in issuing paychecks. Some workers might still get checks as late as mid-August, he said. Most will receive their last checks in the first week of August, and many did so this week.

The union has no formal system of paying strike benefits to all striking members, either at the international or local union level. However, the spokesman here said that locals

did have emergency welfare committees to help individual hardship cases.

The union spokesman said George Meany, president of the American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations, and Walter P. Reuther, president of the United Automobile Workers and head of the federation's Industrial Union Department, had pledged the financial and moral support of their organizations to the strikers. Thus far, no specific sum has been mentioned.

In addition, the spokesman said that "throughout the strike cities, merchants, and businesmen are extending to anyone involved in the dispute unlimited credit."

In many cases, he said, purchases are being offered without downpayments, and payments may be deferred until 2 months after work has resumed.

AID MAY BE LIMITED

Public aid is likely to be extremely limited. Most States refuse unemployment insurance benefits to strikers, although New York State, which has 30,000 affected in the Buffalo area alone, will pay benefits after 7 weeks.

Relief applications face many restrictions. Only 5 of the 82,000 strikers in the Pittsburgh area filed such petitions in the first week of the strike. The Allegheny County Board of Assistance there estimated the peak bids would come in the sixth week of the strike, with perhaps 3,200 strikes eventually getting on relief rolls.

In the Cleveland area of Ohio, Cuyahoga County expected relief demands to aggravate an already difficult financial situation. Relief payments had already been cut to present recipients by 10 percent in recent weeks, and all single persons capable of working have been dropped from the rolls.

In Maryland, strikers are ineligible for public relief under State law. There and elsewhere, they may share in Federal surplus food distribution.

Whether strikers could draw scheduled vacation pay varied in different areas.

The reports showed no break in union solidarity. Strikers were seeking temporary employment. They were doing household chores, fishing, or just loafing.

Following are the reports by Times correspondents on the impact of the steel strike.

FIRST RELIEF CHECK

PITTSBURGH, July 23.—The first public relief check to a striking steelworker was written here Wednesday by George P. Mills, executive director of the Allegheny County Board of Assistance.

It went to a blast furnace laborer and his wife and three children who were already hungry and destitute. Along with 82,000 other strikers in Allegheny County, this worker received his last 2-week pay check only the week before. But his take-home pay was only $2.85. The rest was withheld as part payment of a department store debt incurred during the recession last year.

This case was unusual. Most steelworkers will not feel the pinch for 2 or 3 more weeks.

At the end of the first week of the strike Mr. Mills had received only five applications from steelworkers. The big rush for relief will not come until early August, Mr. Mills believed with applications reaching a peak during the sixth week of the strike.

Like almost everyone in Pittsburgh, Mr. Mills expects a long strike. He forecasts that 7,300 strikers in this country will try to meet the rigid qualifications for public relief demanded by the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. Perhaps 3,200 of them will get on the relief rolls, he said. They will represent about 11,500 persons.

Apart from the public assistance program, about the only relief available to strikers will come in the form of surplus food distribution and help from private welfare agencies, notably the Salvation Army. The latter paid out about $25,000 in food vouchers in Allegheny County during the 1956 strike.

So far, the strike has had slight impact on retail business. Hardware store report heavy sales of paint, garden implements and do-it-yourself tools, indicating that the strikers are busy with household painting and repairs and are expanding their backyard vegetable patches.

FISHING IN PROSPECT

BETHLEHEM, PA., July 23.—When the weather clears, the trout and bass in well stocked nearby Pocono Mountain lakes and streams will become innocent victims of the steel strike.

Many of the 15,000 idle employees of the Bethlehem Steel Co. have made ready their fishing gear. When the waters clear and the fish start biting, they will be prepared.

Fishing will be a favorite pastime, with loafing a close second, the strikers agree. Many are engaged in do-it-yourself projects from home improvements to car overhauling. Some have taken odd jobs and a few have found temporary employment in other industries.

At the headquarters of the union's three Bethlehem locals, a $530,000 structure built and paid for in 1953, and at the picket lines, the men are taking the strike in stride.

"We've gone through strikes before," John Wadolny observed. He is chairman of the strike committee and president of local 2599, which has a membership in excess of 7,000. He said the Bethlehem workers and their wives too, "are 100 percent behind the national leadership and are determined to win."

The steel company announced it had mailed 15,500 pay checks yesterday and today. Union officials believe these checks would carry their members through the next week or two before they would have to resort to reserve funds.

Those who worked Sunday, Monday, or Tuesday before the strike began will receive additional checks for 1, 2, or 3 days pay on August 5.

Bethlehem Steel also postponed all vacations for members of the United Steelworkers of America. Arrangements for vacations missed during the strike will be made after the dispute is settled, a company spokesman said.

Bethlehem banks and loan companies reported the strike had not caused a flurry of applications for new loans or extension of old ones yet. In fact, they expect none before the end of the month at the earliest.

NO PAY AT FAIRLESS

MORRISVILLE, PA., July 23.—For the strikers at the Fairless Works of the United States Steel Corp. the mailman had no backpay checks today.

The "payless payday" served to embitter the unionists at the giant $500 million plant on the banks of the Delaware River.

The United Steelworkers of America blamed management, contending the companies had had sufficient supervisory personnel inside the gates to make up the 2-week payroll.

A management spokesman contended that the payroll was entirely too complicated for anyone except the regular payroll clerks to handle. The clerks are on strike, too, being members of one of four steelworkers' locals at the plant.

This dispute added fuel to the bitterness that has prevailed among the 5,200 strikers at the Fairless Works and at the corporation's National Tube Division, also within the gates of the plant.

In addition to the usual things, such as "do-it-yourself" projects, fishing, picketing, and overnight holiday trips to nearby resorts, some of the strikers, a union official said, "are off on trips back to where they came from." The official, Russell Thompson, president of local 4889, which has a membership of 4,200, said some of them had found temporary jobs in their hometowns.

"There have been no hardship cases as a direct result of the strike as yet," he reported. "We have no strike fund and neither does the international, but we'll find a way to take care of our own."

Many of the small food stores and other merchants are extending credit to the strikers. One chain operator—Bargain City, U.S.A.—has provided the union with credit applications and, a union spokesman said, "no payments will be due until 30 days after the strike ends."

The 146,000 striking steelworkers in Pennsylvania are not eligible for unemployment compensation, but they can draw public assistance benefits if they have no funds and otherwise qualify.

C. M. Young, vice president of the Morrisville bank, said:

"Loans will be held in abeyance until the strikers get back to work. There will be no late charges on past due loans.

"Those who can't meet mortgage payments will be permitted to pay the interest and catch up later on the principal."

WAGE LOSS IS HIGH

BUFFALO, July 23.—Idle steelworkers in the Buffalo area are losing about $2,325,000 a week in wages.

Nearly 25,000 steelworkers and 5,000 employees in related industries have been made idle by the steel walkout.

Many of the strikers are still saddled with debts incurred during lengthy layoffs in 1958. For them and their families, the prospect of a long strike poses major financial problems.

With part-time work at a premium because of the high rate of unemployment in the Buffalo district, strikers without cash reserves will be forced to apply for welfare.

During the 1956 steel strike the Erie County Welfare Department caseload increased by about 1,000. But the rise in caseloads during the current strike is expected to be considerably greater. Welfare officials cited lower cash reserves among steelworkers because of layoffs in the steel industry last year.

However, strikers will have to meet rigid requirements to qualify for cash assistance from the welfare department.

State unemployment benefits will not be available to strikers until the start of the ninth week of the walkout. State law fixes a 7-week penalty period on strikers before they can apply for unemployment benefits, which amount to $45 a week. In addition, there is a 1-week, normal waiting period before the first unemployment check is dispersed.

The 19,000 workers at Bethlehem's Lackawanna plant still have 2 or 3 days' wages to collect. The back wages, which amount to nearly $1 million, were to be paid tomorrow. But the company announced today they would not be paid.

"Since payroll clerks are on strike, checks for work done prior to the strike last week could not be drafted and will not be available this Friday," the company said in a brief statement.

There was no indication by the company when the back wages would be paid.

LONG STRIKE FEARED

CLEVELAND, July 23.—Steelworkers in the Cleveland-Lorain area are tightening their belts, slashing expenditures, seeking extension of overdue bills and digging in for a long strike.

About 26,500 of the 28,000 employed by area steel mills when the strike started at midnight July 15 have received pay checks averaging slightly under $200 in the last

week. An estimated total of 20,000 will receive checks ranging from $100 to $150 in the next week for work up to July 15, according to steel plant officials.

After that steelworkers' income will stop completely except in case of those who had vacations scheduled after July 15.

Approximately 30 percent of the strikers, idle for several months during the 1958 recession, have not caught up with debts incurred in that period. They concede they will be in serious financial trouble if the strikes lasts more than a month.

A survey of stores revealed that few strikers had asked for extended credit. Banks reported that the idle steelworkers had not as yet defaulted on mortgage or loan payments.

Asked what policy they expected to follow in the event strikers defaulted on payments, bank officials said:

"We will defer that decision until the steelworkers tell us they are unable to make payment."

Officials of several banks declared it was probable that their institutions would agree to waive for a temporary period, provided interest payment were made.

Few strikers can expect any help from their union, which will not provide assistance except in cases of extreme emergency.

Ohio rules prohibit the payment of unemployment compensation to employees in a strike.

Cuyahoga County officials are worried over what the strike will do to the financially faltering relief program. They expect to feel the strike's impact in 2 weeks.

Welfare Director John J. Schaffer has conferred with union representatives to set up procedures for strikers who will need help.

In recent weeks the welfare department has been forced to reduce relief payments by 10 percent and drop from the rolls all single persons capable of working. The same rules will be applied to steel strikers, Mr. Schaffer said.

Under the procedure set up needy strikers will report to their union hall for a screening interview. Those who qualify will be referred to county welfare.

Windfall in Ohio

YOUNGSTOWN, July 23.—A $15 million windfall resulting from the payment of retroactive supplemental unemployment benefits will help Ohio's steelworkers survive the strike.

The funds were held in escrow during a 3-year fight by the steelworkers' union against a Republican State administration's insistence that the benefits were part of wages and should be deducted from unemployment compensation.

The fight was won in March when the new Democratic regime led by Gov. Michael V. Di Salle, authorized simultaneous payment of supplemental unemployment benefits and State unemployment compensation.

The retroactive benefits now being paid to more than half of the 40,000 idle steelworkers in the Youngstown district run from $200 to $1,200.

A. E. Adams, Jr., an official of the Union National Bank, said a surprising number of benefit checks had been deposited in savings accounts.

Isidore L. Feuer, welfare director of Mahoning County (Youngstown), said there had been no early rush of strikers to apply for relief. He expected an increase of 1,800 to 2,000 families on relief by the end of August.

Meanwhile, the municipal golf course swarms with strikers playing 18 holes. There has been a big increase in fishing, and the sale of worms and other bait is on the upturn.

Busy at Chores

DETROIT, July 23.—This is a bad summer for weeds in the back yards of Ecorse, Trenton, Wyandotte, and River Rouge, Mich.

Throughout these downriver communities, a 10-mile stretch of factory towns lining the Detroit River just below here, some 15,000 striking steel workers with time on their hands are busy at household chores.

They are cleaning out the basements of their frame homes, puttering in the garden, fussing over the family car. Paint stores report a modest boom in sales. Many strikers are getting ready for a vacation, or trips to Wisconsin or Pennsylvania to visit relatives.

Steelworkers here got their last full pay check in the mail Tuesday. After deductions, the checks ran from about $130 to $200 for 2 weeks of work. There will be another small check on August 4, $30 to $50 for the last 2 days before the strike began.

After that there will be no more money coming in until 2 weeks after its all over.

This week at least, the strikers and their wives did not seem to be troubled about finances.

"It's too soon for that," said William J. Daley, a rigger with 28 years of experience at Great Lakes Steel Corp. "Nobody I talked to seems very worried. They all seem to have laid something aside."

William Fink, a head hooker at Great Lakes Steel, has $750 in the bank.

"I knew this was coming," said Mr. Fink, who has a wife and two sons to support. "I've been putting money aside since February. I figure we can last on that for about 3 months."

Strikers who are steady customers at family-owned neighborhood grocery stores say they expected little trouble getting credit if they need it. Supermarkets, however, have no credit policy.

Officials at the First Federal Savings & Loan Association, largest in the Detroit area, say they doubted if many strikers would default on house payments.

"We can always work it out with these fellows," said C. W. Moffatt, vice president in charge of mortgage service. "We're used to strikes."

Strikers in Michigan can look for little assistance outside their own resources. They are ineligible for State unemployment compensation. Local unions say they have no emergency funds to tide their members over.

Strikers are eligible for welfare assistance the same as any other needy person, but only after they have exhausted almost all other resources.

Belts Tightened

CHICAGO, July 23.—Belt tightening in preparation for a long ordeal was the general reaction among the 90,000 idle workers in the Chicago area's vast steel industry today.

A few continued to profess glee over the opportunity to go fishing or engage in other recreational pursuits. But far more frequent were somber reflections on their stringent economic experiences in other walkouts and their expectation that this one would be no different.

Most of those reached today grimly remembered the unpaid bills, cupboards skimped of food, time payments that could not be met and other hardships during the 1956 strike. Even so, the general attitude now is resignation, and an air of "what can we do?"

There is no hardship yet, and there will not be any if the strike ends soon. But the strikers know they are on their own, that they can expect virtually no help from other sources except in cases of the most dire need.

Asked what he considered the strikers' prospects in the next 2 months, if their idleness continued that long, Joseph Germano, district director of the United Steelworkers, said:

"Bad."

He continued:

"It's a lot of baloney that our workers have savings and good bank accounts to carry them through. The only thing they can do is tighten their belts and live like they did in depression days. But they're willing to do it."

The three main sources of monetary aid to the unemployed have closed the gates on such help to the steel strikers. Spokesmen for the union reiterated it was not the union's policy to pay weekly strike benefits to its members. And steel company officials said strikers were not eligible for company-paid supplementary unemployment benefits.

State directors of unemployment in Illinois and Indiana have said the steelworkers were not eligible for State unemployment benefits while on strike.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business today, it stand adjourned until noon on Monday next.

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

THE WHITE FLEET OF MERCY SHIPS

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, it is an honor to join in cosponsoring Senate Concurrent Resolution 66, introduced Tuesday by the distinguished senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] calling on the President to take steps to establish a White Fleet of mercy ships to give emergency assistance in times of disaster and to render continuing technical assistance to the developing nations of the world.

This resolution, along with the Health for Peace Act which has already been passed by the Senate, could be one of the most meaningful acts of this session.

It will provide the world with a practical and understandable demonstration of the spirit and the humanity which is the way of life of free men everywhere.

The White Fleet will help thousands of people in Asia, Africa, and South America. It will also help this country, for it will prove, I am sure, to be one of the wisest investments in the cold war that we could make. We will receive ample return in creating a better and more accurate image of America—above all, a human image, in terms that all can understand.

We often hear that one of our failings among the peoples of the world has been our inability to communicate. We often try to sell our way of life by pointing out how many bathrooms, how many telephones or how many miles of paved road we have. To a person who has never seen a tub or a telephone and will never own an automobile, this of course is meaningless. And, even worse, it sometimes sounds like bragging.

But to a person in need of a proper diet or a few inoculations to ward off an epidemic, or to a mother whose child may go blind for lack of simple medication, the White Fleet could have deep meaning.

We all know of examples of the effectiveness of medical missionaries. A fine one has been the work of a young Missourian, Dr. Thomas Dooley, who has done wonderful work with thousands of unfortunate people in southeast Asia. He first served there as a naval doctor and then returned as a civilian, with a sort of White Fleet of his own to bring the benefits of American medical science to those who need it most.

The distinguished Senator from Minnesota ably outlined what the White Fleet would cost and what its practical effect would be in the areas which it visited.

But we should not overlook its value to this country as well. The White Fleet will be a dramatic and effective step toward demonstrating to the world the real meaning of democracy. The image of America in the eyes of the underdeveloped areas will be that of a doctor or a relief worker or a nurse. Wherever the caricatured pictures of Uncle Sam brandishing an atom bomb have been circulated, the arrival of the white ships of mercy will give a lie to the false propaganda of our enemies.

I strongly urge prompt Senate consideration of this important resolution.

REPUBLICAN PARTNERSHIP PROPOSAL ON TRINITY RIVER PROJECT BAD BUSINESS DEAL FOR UNCLE SAM

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, recent issues of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD have been filled with insertions by my Republican friends in the House of Representatives on the so-called partnership proposal of this administration on the Trinity River project in California. These are a rehash of the old and hackneyed arguments which have been made in behalf of the proposal since it was first suggested in 1954. The fact of the matter is that the so-called partnership proposal would be a bad deal for the Federal Government. The Federal Government can use all the power that will come from the Trinity River project. The question is whether or not we should sell these powerhouses to the Pacific Gas & Electric Co., a private utility, and then turn around and buy the power back from the P. G. & E. at a fat profit to that company, to use the power to operate the Central Valley project pumps and supply power to Federal installations in California. The obvious answer is that putting a middleman in this picture makes no sense at all.

I made a statement today before the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, in which I discuss this matter more fully. I ask unanimous consent that this statement be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

STATEMENT OF SENATOR CLAIR ENGLE, OF CALIFORNIA, BEFORE IRRIGATION AND RECLAMATION SUBCOMMITTEE OF HOUSE COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS ON H.R. 5499 AND H.R. 5521, TRINITY RIVER PROJECT, JULY 24, 1959

Mr. Chairman, I am sure that my position on this issue is rather well known to you and the committee members. The purpose of my statement today is to reaffirm my conviction that the Trinity partnership scheme is unwise and not basically changed by the recapture proviso added to the present bills, and to urge that you reject H.R. 5499 and H.R. 5521. If you do promptly reject these bills, it will be the signal to the Appropriations Committee conferees to approve the $2,415,000 for Federal construction of Trinity power which the Senate voted earlier this month, and we will thereby dispose of this old partnership fogy once and for all.

I don't think the Trinity River project is essentially a question of public versus private power. Since the Federal Government itself will be the principal customer for Trinity power, it is a question of whether a middleman's profit should be taken out between Federal production and Federal consumption of this commodity. Your committee has to decide whether it is good Government business to build Trinity Dam and the other water control features for public use, sell off the power privileges to a third party, and then buy the electric energy back at double the selling price for use by defense plants and for irrigation pumping on the Federal Central Valley project.

Let me list for you the Federal agencies that now rely on Central Valley project power, many of them in need of more power whenever it may become available. First of all there is, of course, the Bureau of Reclamation itself which requires a fair share of the Central Valley project output to supply the Tracy pumping plant, second largest in the world, as well as the Contra Costa pumping plants, and which will require Trinity power to operate the San Luis pumping plants for the new irrigation unit that this committee this year has approved as an addition to the Central Valley project. Then there are numerous defense plants and military bases, including the following:

Ames Laboratory of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics.
Mare Island Naval Shipyard.
Port Chicago Naval Magazine.
Stockton Naval Supply Annex.
Moffett Field Naval Air Station.
Sharpe General Depot at Tracy.
Sharpe General Depot at Lathrop.
Camp Stoneman.
Benicia Arsenal.
Mather Air Force Base.
Camp Beale Air Force Base.
Castle Air Force Base.
Travis Air Force Base.
Parks Air Force Base.

All of these installations are getting Central Valley project power under contracts executed from 1951 to 1955. No more Federal contracts have been executed since then simply because no more Central Valley project power is available, and won't be until and unless Trinity is built as a Federal power development. In the meantime, the Government's own requirements are growing in California, as you well know.

For example, the President has requested authority for the Atomic Energy Commission to build a $105 million linear electron accelerator, planned to be operated on the campus of Stanford University in conjunction with the Stanford division of research. Its initial size would be 10 billion electron-volts; its ultimate size might be 45 billion electron-volts. To operate just the smaller size accelerator will require approximately 60,000 kilowatts of firm electric power. Here is another prospective official preference customer for Central Valley project power. Almost certainly the power will come from Trinity. Will the Atomic Energy Commission be able to buy it directly from the Bureau of Reclamation? Or will it have to buy it from the Pacific Gas and Electric Co., at a premium price, as a result of partnership? These questions illustrate precisely the issue now before your committee.

The proponents of partnership allege that it is a good deal for the people, because the Pacific Gas & Electric will take over the responsibility of building and operating the Trinity power facilities and pay the Government a handsome fee for the privilege. They argue that this is wonderful because Trinity isn't really a very good power project, and, in fact, they say, if built by the Government it will be a financial burden on the Central Valley project.

Why is it, Mr. Chairman, that Trinity power is such a questionable deal for the Government but such a good deal for the Pacific Gas & Electric? Why is it that the Pacific Gas & Electric is so willing to take over this costly development and remove the burden from the backs of the taxpayers? The answer to each of these questions is simply that Trinity power, although obviously more expensive at today's prices than Shasta power developed at 1938 prices, still is a good profitable project for whoever builds and operates it. It would be an especially fine prize for the Pacific Gas & Electric if this private corporation can get the Government to build and pay for the dams and tunnels at a cost of over $200 million, and leave to the Pacific Gas & Electric the responsibility of building the moneymaking power facilities at a capital cost of about $60 million.

Mr. Chairman, I don't blame the Pacific Gas & Electric for coveting this arrangement. I can well understand why they want to make this power investment themselves instead of having the Government do it. And I have due concern and interest in the prosperity of the Pacific Gas & Electric stockholders, many of whom are my good California constituents. But I have an even greater concern for the welfare of the Federal taxpayers of California and all other States, who, even under partnership, would be putting up most of the money for this project, and who should not be deprived, through partnership, of the long-term benefits of the Federal investment that will accrue to the Central Valley project and the Federal agencies that operate on Central Valley project power.

THE YOUTH CONSERVATION CORPS—WHAT IT CAN DO FOR CONSERVATION

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, shortly I hope that the Senate will be taking up Senate bill 812 to create a Youth Conservation Corps. This bill draws upon the experience of the Civilian Conservation Corps.

I am disappointed that the Secretaries of Agriculture and Interior, our two basic conservation Departments, are opposed to this bill—as in fact is the Eisenhower administration.

The Department of Agriculture says we do not need the corps now. The Department of Interior says that the acceleration of existing conservation programs is neither necessary nor desirable.

These are disturbing views, especially when measured against the known conservation needs of our Nation. It becomes increasingly difficult to understand the rationale of an administration which simply declares that we cannot make the sacrifices necessary to pass on to the future a resource on which we have repaired the ravages of the past.

I devoutly believe we can do this. The bill the Labor and Public Welfare Committee has reported permits the recreation of the CCC program on a gradually increasing, soundly conceived basis.

Today I wish to outline for the Senate a few of the accomplishments of the old

CCC program and to define what I believe are the signal conservation contributions that the Youth Conservation Corps can make.

During its history the CCC boys made this record:

First. Planted 2 billion trees.

Second. Did rodent and predator control work on 40 million acres.

Third. Treated 21 million acres for tree and plant diseases and insect pest control.

Fourth. Pruned, thinned, and otherwise improved 4 million forested acres.

Fifth. Spent 6 million man-days on fire-prevention work.

Sixth. Spent 6 million man-days putting out forest and range fires.

Seventh. Constructed 6 million erosion check dams.

Eighth. Developed 24,000 new water holes for livestock on the range.

Ninth. Constructed 82,000 miles of livestock range fence.

Tenth. Put 85,000 miles of telephone lines through the forest.

Eleventh. Aided in constructing 122,000 miles of minor protection roads and trails plus 38,000 small bridges.

Twelfth. Constructed numerous public forest campgrounds with rustic picnic tables, fireplaces, sanitary facilities, water and swimming facilities.

This is a record of real accomplishment, but it only did part of the conservation job. In addition, the paucity of appropriations during the war years permitted many of these sound investments to deteriorate due to lack of maintenance. In the case of others time and use has taken its toll.

The accomplishments of the past are typical of the work that still needs to be done. This list of jobs gives an idea of the range and real conservation needs. I do not desire to have this listing be interpreted as a priority list.

First. Plant 4 billion trees.

Second. Thin young forest stands to improve growth.

Third. Clean up old logging slash.

Fourth. Remove logging debris from clogged streams.

Fifth. Construct small erosion check dams in the headwaters of streams.

Sixth. Check sheet erosion and stabilize forest road cuts.

Seventh. Engage in fire prevention work.

Eighth. Serve on firefighting crews.

Ninth. Help control white pine blister rust and other forest and insect pests and diseases.

Tenth. Revegetate and restore overgrazed range land.

Eleventh. Construct range fences.

Twelfth. Construct stub watering facilities.

Thirteenth. Improve wildlife habitat.

Fourteenth. Construct forest trails.

Fifteenth. Construct telephone lines.

Sixteenth. Construct waterholes in forest areas to provide firefighting water supplies.

Seventeenth. Assist in land surveys and boundary marking on public lands.

Eighteenth. Develop recreational facilities for outdoor recreation: (a) Picnic areas, (b) tables, (c) fireplaces, (d) drinking water, (e) sanitary facilities, (f) swimming and boating opportunities, (g) simple shelters, (h) parking and trailer facilities.

I submit that each and every one of these jobs is a conservation job which needs to be done. I ask any who wish to speak in opposition to this bill to define any one of these conservation jobs that is unnecessary. If anyone can successfully do so I, for one, will join with him in seeking a floor amendment to vote on whether this work is of the "leaf raking" type. I point out that each and every job is one now being done in various but sometimes extremely limited amounts on our forests, parks and public lands. If the work is not essential perhaps we will want to consider eliminating it from the regular programs of our conservation agencies.

Mr. President, I have studied the hearings on the Youth Conservation Corps. Except for administration opposition, the testimony is virtually unanimously in favor of it.

What, then, leads the administration to oppose this legislation? At a charitable best, I can only conclude that their position reflects a difference over the quantity of conservation work which should be done on publicly owned lands.

The bill provides that the number of enrollees shall not exceed 50,000 in the first year, 100,000 in the second year, and 150,000 in the third year.

Certainly, then, it cannot be argued that there is a floor on the number of enrollees and that 50,000 is a first year minimum. It is the maximum. The administration can start out with 10,000 boys if it wants, or even 1,000 boys. It can invite the States to submit estimates of the number of boys it can productively use on State lands and thereby provide the benefits to 50,000 boys at the cost of putting 25,000 on Federal land.

This bill not only permits conservation work to go forward but as its title suggests—youth conservation to be promoted. The bill is flexible as to the level of enrollment thus the cost can be tailored to the most exacting budgetary criteria.

As an initial cosponsor of this bill I commend the Labor and Welfare Committee and in particular the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] for the constructive and, if I may say, with all the meaning of this word—the conservative job they have done. With this bill they have given the administration an opportunity to reflect on better ways to meet problems we face as a Nation. I hope when the bill is before us—and when the bill reaches the President—those who now are in opposition will reflect and consider what the Congress has done to improve on a good idea.

STANDARDS OF CONDUCT FOR GOVERNMENT AGENCY PROCEEDINGS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The junior Senator from Colorado.

Mr. CARROLL. I ask unanimous consent, notwithstanding the 3 minute rule, that I may proceed for 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none. The Senator may proceed.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, yesterday the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] appeared on the floor and issued a statement about a matter which is before the Judiciary Subcommittee on Administrative Practice and Procedure of which I am chairman. On page 12882 of the RECORD this statement was made by the distinguished Senator from Illinois:

> Mr. President, that is the first implication of this issue. The reason for my talking about it today is to forestall this kind of legislation.

Ours is a new subcommittee just formed.

The junior Senator from Colorado introduced a bill at request of the American Bar Association, which was referred to the new subcommittee. This bill is S. 2374. It would establish standards of conduct for agency hearing proceedings.

As I stated in my opening remarks at the very beginning of the hearing, while my name was attached to the bill, I was not bound by the terms of the bill, and the bill was only introduced so that witnesses could be called.

Distinguished lawyers from the American Bar Association testified on the bill.

But when I find that a member of the subcommittee appears before this body and says, "The reason for my talking about it today is to forestall this kind of legislation," let me repeat that the new subcommittee is just getting under way, and the very purpose of calling the witnesses is to find out whether the bill is a desirable proposal.

What is the purport of the bill? The bill provides a criminal penalty for any person including persons in the executive branch of the Government or the legislative branch of the Government who goes through the back door, so to speak, in quasi-judicial proceedings, otherwise known as adversary proceedings.

The purpose of this proposed legislation is to meet a situation which has developed within the past 2 or 3 years. Through the press, through TV, radio, and various publications, the American people now know that something is wrong in the field of administrative law in Washington, D.C.

I want to be fair. The criticism of influence does not extend to all departments, agencies, and commissions. In these agencies there are many fine, dedicated public servants. Nevertheless a cloud hovers over the field of administrative law in Washington, D.C. Mr. President, when it is suggested that this kind of legislation be forestalled, let me say that the courts have already acted in this field.

I see the distinguished junior Senator from Illinois on the floor and I should like to have his attention because this has to do with his remarks of yesterday.

An issue I would like to settle today is what is an adversary proceeding. I noticed yesterday in the RECORD the distinguished senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] appeared to have joined in with the remarks of the junior

Senator from Illinois, but when I called the Senator from Washington this morning on the telephone he said he did not understand that the issue was one of adversary proceedings. Here is the chairman of one of the most powerful committees in Congress who says that never in all of his experience has he ever tried to influence a decision in an adversary proceeding.

I think that some of the Representatives and Members of the Senate were misled yesterday because they did not really understand what the issue was. I do not think a Member of the Senate or a Member of the House can justify a position whereby they can arrogate to themselves the power by a back door process to influence an agency decision. I do not believe for one minute that that is done. I think what they do mean is that in representing their constituency they have a perfect right to ask for status reports and expediting of constituency cases in some of the agencies, and that is true and it makes no difference whether it be the Veterans' Bureau, the Department of Agriculture, or the Interstate Commerce Commission. There are some 102 agencies of Government exercising rulemaking and adjudicatory functions.

Does the bill suggest that a Member of Congress may not properly represent his constituency? Of course he can do so; but when it becomes an adversary proceeding, I think we ought to understand now what the law is because it has been changed recently by a circuit court of appeals decision.

In an adversary proceeding, before a Government agency, which is the same as a proceeding in a Federal court, no Member of Congress has a right to telephone an agency member to try to influence his decision. If he did so in the case of a Federal judge, the court might cite him for contempt. If he were a lawyer the court could refer the matter to the grievance committee. But above all things the judge himself—and this is basic in our Anglo-Saxon history—does not permit himself to be influenced while he is sitting in judgment on a case.

What have the courts done here recently? The Members of Congress and the members of the executive branch as well as private citizens must know that quasi-judicial adversary proceedings are the same in basic judicial concept as a proceeding in court. That means that there cannot be any influence. There can be no back door approaches. It means that no one can pick up the telephone and call a member of a commission about a case, at this stage of the proceeding.

But one can always appear on the record publicly, which is, you might say, approaching through the front door.

This is very important, but it is not generally understood.

In the Sangamon Valley Television case there had been some private ex parte communications, and because of this the court threw the case back to the Commission and ordered it reopened for further hearings. Does the Senate know what will happen if this decision stands?

In cases where illegal ex parte communications have been made, the decisions will be vitiated and set aside.

So it seems to me that every Member of Congress should know that if he interferes privately on behalf of a constituent in an adversary or quasi-judicial proceeding his action may jeopardize the very rights of the constituent before the agency because if such interference is ever brought to light, the constituent's case may be thrown out.

This is a very important matter which is now being considered. In my opinion, this doctrine will be extended by the courts.

One of the real problems in this whole issue as raised by the American Bar Association, is not the doctrine itself but rather whether or not there should be a criminal penalty for ex parte, private communications.

I observe the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] in the Chamber. I read his remarks in the RECORD yesterday. I do not want the Democratic leadership or Democratic Members of the Senate to agree with the statements made yesterday unless they clearly understand the basic legal issue involved. I want to restate it very clearly.

No Member of Congress, no member of the executive branch, no private person or association of persons, under recent court decisions, has a right to privately talk to any agency commissioner or to any trial examiner or decisional personnel to attempt to influence a decision in an adversary proceeding. If he does so, it will invalidate that decision and the courts have so held.

The American Bar Association proposed the bill to our committee. They seek to apply a criminal penalty to such attempts to influence adversary proceedings. I do not know whether that is a good idea or not. But I do know that it is a good idea to prevent the executive branch and the legislative branch and private groups from exerting influence in what are called adversary proceedings. In principle, such activities are not conducive to a fair and impartial hearing. There is only one way in which adversary proceedings should be determined, and that is upon the record. The function of the court is to hear the testimony, receive the evidence, get the facts, and to render decisions upon the record alone; not upon political influence, whether it comes from the executive branch, the legislative branch, or from any other source.

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

Mr. CARROLL. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator from Colorado has referred to the colloquy in which the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE], and I engaged with the minority leader, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], yesterday. At that time I stated that if a mandate were placed in a bill which in effect sought to prevent me or any other Member of Congress from appearing before an executive agency, I would be opposed to it. I stated that, in my opinion, it was not only my duty, but also my responsibility, to represent the people of my State to the best of my capacity to do so, because in all too many instances when they write to us they are, in effect, writing to a court of last resort.

I do not refer to the regular courts of the Nation, in which I do not believe any Member of Congress would want to interfere in any way, either by the front door or the back door. But, so far as the quasi-judicial agencies of the Government are concerned—and some of them have court rules, I understand—I think it is a part of my responsibility in behalf of my constituents to appear before such agencies, to call them up, and to do what I can to see to it that my constituents get a fair deal; that their requests are given legitimate consideration. In no way do I state or imply that any pressure of any kind is resorted to.

I say again that, so far as the regular courts are concerned, we should not interfere in any way, either through the front door or the back door; and, so far as the quasi-judicial agencies of the Government are concerned, certainly we should not try to carry our cases to them through the back door. As a matter of fact, I am willing to have every instance in which I have contacted a Federal agency, under both Democratic and Republican administrations, in my 17 years as a Member of Congress, made a part of the public record, because everything which has been done, so far as I am concerned—and I am certain that this will apply to all other Members of the House and Senate—has been aboveboard and has been in behalf of our constituents whom we are supposed to represent to the best of our ability.

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

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for another 5 minutes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Colorado may proceed for 10 minutes, because this is an important subject.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Colorado is recognized for an additional 10 minutes.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, this is a very important issue. I appreciate what the Senator from Montana said. I know that in his wholly forthright attitude on all issues, he would move only on the record. But when we talk about private, ex parte communications, they are not made on the record. That is why I think there was a misapprehension yesterday. I cast no aspersions on the distinguished Senator from Illinois, because I felt that sometimes he did not understand the issues which were being presented by the able lawyers of the American Bar Association.

I want to clear up one thing. I should like the Senator from Montana to listen to me very closely, because we are dealing now with a new field of law. The Senator from Montana seeks to make a distinction between the Federal courts and quasi-judicial bodies in adversary proceedings. But I say to the Senator

from Montana that there is no distinction in law. I should like to read from the statement of Acting Assistant Attorney General Robert A. Bicks when he appeared before the Subcommittee on Administrative Practice and Procedure of the Committee on the Judiciary last Tuesday, July 21:

> The fact that the Federal agency proceedings may involve the public interest rather than private rights alone makes such disqualification all the more imperative.

Mr. Bicks was talking about private, ex parte proceedings. He quoted from the case of Federal Trade Commission against Ruberoid Co., as follows:

> The rise of administrative bodies probably has been the most significant legal trend of the last century and perhaps more values today are affected by their decisions than by those of all the courts.

I say to the Senator from Montana that ours is a new subcommittee. We are conducting an investigation into a new and different field. It is estimated that today more than 100 agencies are conducting adversary proceedings. More than half of all the cases in the District of Columbia Court of Appeals which involve the Federal Government arise from decisions made by quasi-judicial agencies.

The last quotation, on the Ruberoid case, was from a decision of the Supreme Court of the United States and shows the importance of such cases and how the courts now look upon them.

I read from the case of *Morgan* v. *United States,* 304 U.S. 1, 22:

> All the more reason, therefore, that such agencies, as the courts have done, "must accredit themselves by acting in accordance with the cherished judicial tradition embodying the basic concepts of fair play."

Mr. Bicks said:

> Any applicant that seeks "favored treatment" through ex parte pleas to Commissioners must be unmistakably told that "the doors of the [agency] are closed" to him.

Mr. Bicks was quoting from the case of *Root Refining Company* v. *Universal Oil Products Company,* 169 Fed. 2d 514.

That was what happened in the Sangamon case. One of the agencies—it is not important which one—had a rule-making case. Private persons were coming to the agency building and going from door to door, talking to the Commissioners, taking them out to lunch, or perhaps meeting them at cocktail parties. The court indicated that such activities had invalidated the decision of the Commission. Soon the courts may do more than invalidate them. They may completely bar the parties involved from ever again making application before the Commission.

Therefore, when a client comes to one of us to represent him in an adversary proceeding, we had better say to him, "You had better put your case on the record." If he puts it on the record, he had better be certain why he puts it on the record. Remember, his Member of Congress is not his lawyer, and therefore has no standing in court. I am talking about adversary proceedings, in which there are vested rights. In some cases, those rights run into the millions of dollars. In many cases they run into hundreds of millions of dollars.

Therefore, how can we say of a Federal court that its judicial process is any different than an adversary proceeding in a quasi-judicial agency? Both are based on due process.

What is due process? It consists of notice, hearing, evidence, decision, according to the Anglo-Saxon common law, upon which our own American tradition is built.

How can there be a fair and impartial hearing if the Senator from Illinois enters by one door and the junior Senator from Colorado—I will put myself into the case—enters through the other door? The question then becomes, how many Senators can be loaded on this side of a case, and how many can be loaded on the other side? That is not conducive to due process. That is not the way to determine decisions in adversary proceedings.

The court has spoken. We are not dealing in a vacuum.

The American Bar Association has proposed a piece of legislation. Our committee has not yet accepted it; I do not know whether it is sound or unsound. It seeks to impose a criminal penalty upon any person who uses a private, ex parte communication to influence the decision of a commissioner in an adversary proceeding. Why? Because he sits in judgment. I must say that the Federal statutes in regard to attempts to influence a judge are most severe.

But in this instance the field of administrative law is involved. That is why the proposed bills are before our subcommittee. They have been worked on carefully for months by the American Bar Association and others.

My able friend, the Senator from Illinois, has been a Member of the Senate for a long time; but I do not think he really meant what he seemed to say.

For instance, suppose a proceeding before the Federal Power Commission had been hanging fire for 3 or 4 years, and suppose it affected the public in my part of the country. Would not I have a right to write a letter to the Commission and ask, "Why are you holding up the case?" Such a letter would be on the record.

I think that is what the Senator from Montana meant when he said it would be on the record, and would "come through the front door," and therefore would not be an ex parte communication, but would be a public communication.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HART in the chair). Does the Senator from Colorado yield to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. CARROLL. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I do not recall having appeared before the Federal Communications Commission in behalf of any radio or television case affecting the State of Montana. But I do recall appearing before the Civil Aeronautics Board, last September, in an attempt to get the Montana local service case overruled. The examiner had made a finding which indicated that in his opinion he did not think the huge area known as the Hi-Line, in northern Montana, should be entitled to feeder service, for which Frontier Airlines was the applicant at that time.

I asked the Board if it would hear me in rebuttal to that initial finding. The Board graciously consented to do so. People came back to Washington from Montana; and all of us went before the Board; we appeared before the Board members. They heard us. The result was that they overruled the decision of the examiner; and, at long last, after 15 years of trying, northern Montana is going to get feeder service to take care of the transportation needs in that part of the State. That was done in an open and aboveboard manner.

I understand that that agency is a quasi-judicial one. Those who appear before it have to stand up and present their testimony. That is what I mean when I say that because of the importance of representing the people of my State in connection with a matter which is of interest to them, I would be opposed to any mandate which would prevent me from doing so—either for Frontier Airlines, let us say, or for an individual.

Insofar as the regular courts are concerned, I do not think any Member of Congress has a right under any circumstances to interfere, to plead, or to do anything which would tend to influence the judgment of a regular court.

But in the case of these quasi-judicial agencies, I think we have a responsibility. If the Senator from Colorado will permit me to do so, I should like to repeat what I said in this Chamber yesterday. My statement then was very short, as follows:

> I feel no compunction whatever about calling an agency downtown on behalf of a constituent of mine who has a legitimate request or complaint. I do not exert any pressure. I have been treated very favorably and fairly by those who administer the agencies and this applies to both Democratic and Republican administrations.
>
> I would be remiss in my duty if I did not try to do for my constituents everything I possibly could to comply with their legitimate requests. I certainly think this is a part of the job of being a Senator. I would be opposed to having any inhibition placed upon us in the carrying out of our functions in this respect, because in all too many instances we are in effect a court of last resort, and our constituents have no one else to whom to turn.

I think that statement sums up my position.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, this matter is very important, and Members of Congress must understand it. Some of us are not talking about the same thing. These regulatory agencies have both a legislative function and a judicial function.

I do not mean to say that the Senator from Montana could not properly make his presentation in behalf of the Frontier Airlines. I did the same thing. The court decision which has been rendered does not mean that we cannot do that; neither does it mean that we cannot make a presentation in regard to the relief of abuses. The decision relates only to what are called adversary pro-

ceedings. In this instance, I am talking about case law, because the courts have spoken. If a constituent prevailed upon a Senator to privately intercede in an adversary proceeding, the Senator by so interceding would be doing that constituent a disservice because, under the court decision which has been handed down, if a license were involved, the existing license would be invalidated if it were found that the Senator had made such a contact. In fact, not only would such an appearance result in invalidation of an existing license, but it might forever bar the applicant from all future application for such a license.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I rise to point out that the Senate is still proceeding in the morning hour, subject to the 3-minute limitation.

I am very fond of the Senator from Colorado; but if he wishes to continue, I hope before he does, he will yield briefly to me.

Mr. CARROLL. I appreciate the situation, Mr. President. But yesterday the Senator from Illinois, the minority leader, took the same opportunity. I wish to state this matter for the RECORD, because it is of vital importance. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for another 5 minutes. If I have not completed at the end of that time, I shall yield then to the Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Senator from Colorado.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, this matter is a very technical one. So I ask all Senators please, to keep an open mind about it. When I read the remarks made yesterday by the Senator from Illinois and the stated purpose of them I could not believe that he was attempting to pull the rug out from under the committee before it got started.

The purpose of the hearing is to take evidence. The American Bar Association has been engaging in careful research on this matter for months, and they have testified this week.

Yesterday, we heard from the Attorney General. He has given us a very comprehensive brief.

We are not talking about little issues in connection with which Senators must, from time to time, go to the Veterans' Bureau or the Department of Agriculture. Certainly Senators are entitled to represent their constituencies.

However, in this case I am talking about adversary proceedings, which in law are identical with court hearings. I do not really believe that the Senator from Montana understands the difference between the two.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Certainly I am not a lawyer.

Mr. CARROLL. They are identical in law, in principle, because they involve litigated property rights. Therefore, there can be no private, ex parte communication in either instance.

The situation is different when rulemaking or other matters, which are brought to the attention of a Member of Congress, in connection with his representation of his constituency, are concerned. In such a case, a Senator can make an appearance—as we did in the Frontier case—and can make an argument. Some persons may not like it; but at least Members of Congress can do that. In such a case, all the cards are on the table, and we proceed through the front door, so to speak.

I know that the Senator from Montana would agree with me if he understood the issues.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I am not a lawyer; but I have great respect for the Senator from Colorado, who is a lawyer and is a man of great reputation.

I am glad he is making it clear that the duties and responsibilities which Members of Congress have assumed during all their years of service in either this or the other body are legitimate, provided Senators or Members of the House go through the front door and lay everything on the table for everyone to see.

Mr. CARROLL. That is correct. When I explained the situation this morning to the distinguished Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] who is chairman of a powerful committee, he said, "Of course, I agree with you." But that was not the impression he left yesterday. I do not want members of my party or any Members of Congress led down a blind alley, and have the impression left that they are always doing something undercover for constituents, when there has been no such charge made against Members of Congress. We know of only one or two cases which have arisen and they have been in the executive branch. Why put the onus on the Congress, which has no such burden to carry?

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is what I was getting at, because legislation was proposed in the Legislative Oversight Committee of the other body that we be forbidden to discuss matters pertaining to our constituents with quasi-judicial agencies.

Mr. CARROLL. I can say the proposal places the same restrictions on us as are placed on any other citizens with respect to adversary proceedings. Yesterday I asked one witness to explain the number of different adversary proceedings, and that I wanted to know more about the subject. We have just begun hearings, and I do not want a committee which has been newly created torpedoed before it hears the evidence. Members of Congress are very jealous of their prerogatives of power. I do not want them to come before the committee and say, "You are trying to cut down our power and say we cannot go to an agency." The bill we are considering will only cut down the power of those who move through the back door, where they should not be in the first place.

The reason I speak today is to make an appeal that we not prejudge legislation of this type until we have had adequate hearings and committee action. This is why I have undertaken to explain it this morning.

Mr. President, these are the only comments I wanted to make today. I thank the Senator from Montana. We do not know whether we are going to come forth with a bill. There is a similar proposal in the House of Representatives in the bill (H.R. 6774) introduced by Congressman HARRIS. Representative HARRIS is an able legislator. He is not about to take legitimate powers away from Members of Congress. But we have a critical situation. People have lost confidence in the agencies and think something underhanded is going on. We have the legislative responsibility of restoring public confidence in the administration of Government agencies.

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

Mr. CARROLL. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. I have found the address of the able junior Senator from Colorado exceedingly challenging. It should be challenging, in my view, to the entire Senate. It is not a small matter with which he has dealt. It is not a matter which can be dismissed with ridicule or sarcasm. It is a question which tests justice in our system in a very large number of instances, and in a growing number of instances.

I express my appreciation to the able junior Senator from Colorado not only for his efforts today, but for his determination to explore this important, though relatively new, field.

Mr. CARROLL. I thank the Senator from Tennessee. I have only this one observation to make to my friend from Montana. Under the bill, which we have only begun to explore, it has been called to my attention that the minute a Member of Congress has his letter or communication in the public file, he would be relieved of the obligation under the proposed act.

So it would reach only a few cases, and I know of no Member of Congress it would reach, and only a few in the executive branch. We know of only a few Commissioners who have been so involved. But we are going to stamp out this trouble one way or another. The courts have spoken out against it. I merely want my colleagues to withhold judgment until we make a full study of the question. We may not report a bill. The problem may be solved in another way.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I understand the bill was introduced by request, and certainly the hearings will continue; but I think we ought to guard our responsibilities and maintain our sense of responsibility in looking after the best interests of the people who sent us to Congress to represent them. I agree with the Senator that inquiries should be made always through the front door, and the facts should always be on the table for all to see.

Mr. CARROLL. We do that as we protect our constituents' interests, within the framework of what we call law and order and constitutional procedures. I think everyone will agree with that statement. I thank the Senator from Montana again for his interest.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I want to associate myself with the position taken by the Senator from Montana. I think it is the duty of every one of us to do all we can to help our people back home

when they have immigration cases, or when they have inadequate air service, as is true now in my area, or when proposals are made to weaken television service to our people, or when there is a question of granting certain wavelengths to State police, for example, or a business firm that must have it in a hurry.

So long as I am in Congress, I am going to do all I can to help our people back home straighten out matters which they are unable to do by themselves. I frequently call agencies of the Government. I do not care if they record what I say, because I never say anything I am not willing to make public. I do not tell them what decision to make. I merely ask that the agency may bring a certain case from the bottom of the pack to the top and go to work on it.

Our people may be excused if they regard this so-called ethical drive which seems to be underway as an effort to force people back home to hire lawyers. I get a lot of inquiries from local attorneys. I suppose some of them charge their clients for what I do for them, and more of them do not. But when it comes to the question of forcing everybody back home who has a matter in Washington to hire a Washington law firm or any other law firm to communicate with agencies of Government for them or be shown around, and to pay out a lot of money for this representation, I shall fight such a proposal to the best of my ability. I stand with the Senator from Montana. I am not going to be a party to any proposal of this kind. If any Senator acts illegally, he should be treated accordingly, but if he looks after the interests of his State and his people in a legal and ethical manner, he is merely doing his duty.

We want to be careful that in undertaking to correct one possible injustice we do not commit a vastly greater one.

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

Mr. AIKEN. Yes; but I have only 3 minutes.

Mr. CARROLL. I agree with what the Senator from Vermont has said, but we are not talking about the sort of cases the Senator from Vermont is talking about. We are talking about what are called under law adversary proceedings. Does the Senator think he would have a right to go into a Federal court and talk about a proceeding pending there?

Mr. AIKEN. I do not want to go into a Federal court and discuss a proceeding there. I would not even go into an agency of Government and suggest to it the decision it ought to make.

Mr. CARROLL. Of course, the Senator would not.

Mr. AIKEN. But the impression given to people at home is that it is wrong for them to try to get anything accomplished in Washington through their Senators or Representatives. They are being led to believe that they must hire lawyers to do it for them, and many of them cannot afford to pay the $2,000, $3,000, or $5,000 retainer fees charged by some lawyers or Washington representatives who can be found within 10 miles of the Capitol. Whatever is intended, I want this drive to be clarified so it will be represented to the public for what it is. I did not say I suspected it was a drive to get people to hire lawyers. I said it might be interpreted by some as being such a drive.

U.S. AGREEMENTS TO EXCHANGE NUCLEAR INFORMATION AND MATERIALS WITH CERTAIN ALLIES

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 6 minutes.

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

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, on Sunday, July 26, the second series of agreements involving the exchange of nuclear information and materials with five of our Western allies will go into effect pursuant to the Atomic Energy Exchange Act of 1958. Similar agreements with Great Britain and France became effective on July 19, and another with Greece will become effective on August 11, 1959.

During the past few weeks both Houses of Congress could have invalidated any one or all of these transactions by passage of a concurrent resolution. Thousands of my constituents from New York have written to me, and many have come to see me, to express serious disquiet at the possibility that these agreements through the dispersal of nuclear weapons components among our allies will hamper us in attaining some vital U.S. foreign policy objectives. It is stated, for instance, that the Geneva negotiations for inspection and control of the testing of atomic weapons and future negotiations against surprise attack or for nuclear disarmament generally may be prejudiced. Also, they expressed concern that our position on reunification of Germany be free elections and the securing of our occupation rights in Berlin may be compromised.

Many people have especially emphasized the dangers of the agreement with the German Federal Republic of West Germany. But the effective security of West Germany is the key to the security of free Europe and of NATO. We certainly must be alert to any regression of free institutions in the German Federal Republic, but at the same time we must recognize the role of the German Federal Republic in the integration of its people into Europe, of which so vital a part is their participation in the NATO alliance. We have all known for a long time that the more the Germans are integrated with other Europeans the less danger there will be of a recurrence of German militarism.

Mr. President, carrying out my duty as a Member of the Senate carefully to examine each one of these nuclear agreements—a responsibility specifically outlined in the Atomic Energy Act—I have come to the conclusion that these agreements are aimed at strengthening substantially our military defense posture and that of our allies, and they are not incompatible with U.S. foreign policy efforts to gain international agreements on the cessation of nuclear weapons tests and the control of nuclear armaments and on surprise attack. However, the intense discussion and the grave concern that these nuclear exchanges have precipitated among laymen and among the most distinguished members of our scientific community is readily understandable, and I sympathize with the grave concern expressed by many over exchanging any kind of nuclear weapons information, even though limited in scope, with the Federal Republic of Germany, although this compact is meant to better integrate West Germany's defense effort with that of the NATO countries. Although I see no such danger at present, I do believe that each one of us must follow with the most scrupulous attention developments under these agreements for such developments may lead us into dangerous and prejudicial positions if they extend along the lines some fear. I pledge myself to act as such a vigilant sentinel.

My distinguished colleague, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], who has analyzed this subject very carefully, takes pretty much the same position I do. The Senator from Minnesota has raised several important issues involving the ultimate impact of such agreements, in a recent speech on the Senate floor. Now, virtually on the eve of the day when the second series goes into effect, I think we should review the nature of the exchanges themselves.

In the case of the compacts with the Governments of West Germany, the Netherlands, Turkey, and Greece, they provide for the exchange of certain classified information and equipment necessary to improve the state of training and operational readiness of the armed forces of those nations.

The proposed agreements do not involve the transfer of atomic weapons, nonnuclear parts of atomic weapons or nuclear material, nor the communication of information that will permit a nation to improve its atomic weapon design, development, or fabrication capability. They also do not involve the communication or exchange of classified information concerning research, development, or design of military reactors.

The proposed agreements provide that the United States will exchange with each country classified information necessary to the development of defense plans; the training of personnel in the employment of and defense against atomic weapons and other military applications of atomic energy; the evaluation of the capabilities of potential enemies in the employment of atomic weapons and other military applications of atomic energy; and the development of delivery systems capable to carry atomic weapons. In addition the proposed agreements provide that the United States will transfer to each country nonnuclear parts of atomic weapons not integral to the weapon itself.

In the case of Canada, the agreement is the same, but what is added is the exchange of classified information relative to research, development, and design of military reactors to the extent and by such means as may be agreed.

The United States will retain effective and full control of nuclear materials, according to the report of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

The agreement with France was restricted to the transfer of fuel for a land-based prototype of a nuclear submarine.

Under the agreement with Great Britain, nonnuclear parts of atomic weapons integral to the weapon itself will be made available to this ally, but no complete nuclear weapons will be exchanged. It is well known that Britain has one of the world's most advanced atomic and nuclear energy research programs, and has made marked progress in the development of such weapons. Thus, the Joint Committee concluded and the Congress concurred that these agreements would not, insofar as we can now predict, expand the membership in the nuclear club. But that opinion does not negate the necessity of following closely the development of any independent nuclear weapons capability in these recipient countries, particularly, because of its increased prowess, West Germany.

The effect of these NATO agreements with the progress of the disarmament conference at Geneva must also be carefully gaged. In 1957, in the face of the overwhelming numerical superiority of the Soviet military establishment, estimated by the NATO countries then to consist of 22 divisions in the Russian Zone of Germany plus 60 additional divisions in western Russia, and the European captive nations under Communist domination, it was considered essential to increase the firepower of the much smaller NATO forces if they were to function effectively as a deterrent force. Premier Khrushchev's constant saber-rattling during the negotiations in Geneva on the fate of West Berlin and all of Germany have convinced many observers that Soviet troops in the satellite nations already possess considerable nuclear striking power.

However, as the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] pointed out, in retaliation for our nuclear exchange agreements, the Soviets may step up the rate of nuclear weapons stockpiling in these satellite nations bordering our NATO allies, and yet, at the same time, our action, as he pointed out, may make them more anxious to achieve a disarmament agreement which would help relax world tensions. The Soviet's military reaction to our move must be carefully evaluated by our Western defense experts and by us, but it does not relieve us of our duty of providing, by the most effective means, for the defense of the free world.

Until effective control of nuclear weapons testing and disarmament agreements can be agreed to, the United States must continue to strive for a balanced military posture which will include both conventional and nuclear arms protection for our NATO allies, particularly those bordering the Iron Curtain. At the present time, the great majority of us are opposed to giving to countries which do not already possess it—a capability to fight nuclear war by parceling our nuclear weapons to their armed forces. But that does not mean it is not within the realm of possibility that we may be subjected to heavy pressure, should the negotiations in Geneva on West Berlin and Germany break down completely and the Soviets stick to their ultimatum of withdrawal by the United States, the United Kingdom, and France from Berlin; hence the tightening up of NATO defense capabilities requires that, subject to proper precautions, the NATO countries on the Soviet border should not be left incapable of replying to the atomic weapon.

Mr. President, I do not believe what we are doing now will in any way embarrass us in seeking effective control of nuclear weapons testing and effective disarmament in terms of nuclear weapons with proper inspection and control.

I point out that if the Soviet Union wants to use this as a reason for intransigence, or wants to use this as an excuse for increasing its own nuclear armaments with respect to the areas bordering the NATO countries, it can do so. Mr. Khrushchev has demonstrated that by using, the other day, the resolution we passed confirming our solidarity with regard to the captive nations of Europe to embarrass Vice President NIXON. The answer is that if Khrushchev did not use that excuse he would find something else to use. We cannot stop him from doing so. We must examine our own posture. We are not embarrassing ourselves, but are only doing what is needed.

It is for these reasons that I believe the responsibility of every Member of Congress concerning these current nuclear agreements does not end with the date on which they become effective, but actually that responsibility will be heightened in the weeks and months ahead as we follow developments under them.

Finally, Mr. President, toward that end I join in endorsing the proposal of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] that we provide that the Senate Foreign Relations Committee should be consulted regarding all future agreements reported by the Joint Atomic Energy Committee so that every effort will have been made to measure adequately the implication of such pacts on the immediate and long-term foreign policy objectives of the United States for peace, and we may all be better equipped for our role as atomic sentinels.

UTAH HIGHWAY PROGRAM CRIPPLED BY CONGRESSIONAL INACTION ON ROAD FINANCING

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, a national crisis of the first dimension is now squarely in the lap of Congress. The great 41,000-mile interstate highway program launched with such great pride in 1954 and expanded in 1956 and 1958 is about to collapse because of the procrastination of Congress.

Last year Congress practically forced highway money upon the States and ordered them to accelerate their road-building programs as an antirecession measure. The 1958 act handed the States an added $400 million for the ABC road system and then loaned $115 million to the States so they would have enough money to match the expanded Federal contribution. Congress added an extra $200 million to the Interstate Highway program for fiscal year 1959, an extra $300 million for each of fiscal years 1960 and 1961. The 1958 act suspended the pay-as-you-go amendment for fiscal years 1959 and 1960. These steps have all contributed to the complete exhaustion of the Highway Trust Fund.

This critical situation has not arisen overnight. On the contrary, it has been known for months that Congress must act. The President has repeatedly called upon Congress to take action. Congress has not done so. The President proposes but Congress is not disposed. Evidently it was thought some painless solution would spring full-blown, like Minerva, from the brow of Zeus if Congress procrastinated long enough. No such supernatural event has occurred, so immediate action is imperative.

The crisis in Utah is similar to that confronting all of the States. The State director of highways, Elmo R. Morgan, has told me categorically that unless there is some assurance within the next 2 weeks that funds will be available, the State must begin shutting down $20 million worth of construction projects. Delay can only bring increased costs to the State and to private contractors. The State has had to stop all right-of-way procurement. As of September 30, 1959, Utah will have obligations in the form of construction contracts and for operation and maintenance amounting to some $24 million. To liquidate this obligation, the State will have available only $4 million.

I ask unanimous consent that a letter and memorandum from the Utah State Road Commission, documenting the highway crisis, be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks, together with a memorandum showing the financial position of the State as of September 30, 1959, and a list of highway projects which will have to be stopped unless Congress acts. The project list does not include contracts awarded or in process of award since July 1, 1959. These contracts amount to another $6 to $7 million.

Further delay will deal a fearful blow to our economy. Contractors and their employees by the thousands will be taken off their jobs at a time, too, when the weather is the best for road construction. Orders from suppliers will be sharply curtailed. Road commissions will have to fire skilled engineers and other technicians, which will mean the interstate program setbacks will be multiplied. Contractors have obligated themselves, purchased heavy equipment, with the expectation that Congress would honor its commitments.

Congress must immediately face its responsibility and furnish the revenue to continue the highway program as it has obligated itself to do. Deficit financing is intolerable at this time when the prosperity of the Nation is at the highest level in our history. Let us be at least as eager to pay our present bills as we are to authorize future spending programs.

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

STATE ROAD COMMISSION OF UTAH,
Salt Lake City, Utah, July 22, 1959.

Senator WALLACE F. BENNETT,
U.S. Senate,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR BENNETT: Since our previous letters to you on the subject of the effect on Utah's roadbuilding program if Federal funding were suspended, additional complications have arisen. Our commission was informed by Federal highway officials at the Western Association of State Highway Officials Convention in Billings, Mont., June 21–26, that the trust fund would be depleted next spring, perhaps as early as February of 1960. They indicated that from that point on the Bureau of Public Roads would be unable to honor our vouchers even though the work had been programed previously and work was under way.

Rather than place ourselves in an untenable financial dilemma, the commission met and decided that no more Federal aid participating work would be advertised. However, those projects which were advertised prior to the decision and those projects that had progressed through bid opening would proceed as scheduled. It was felt, and careful study of our total financial picture indicated, that those obligations could be met by the commission within the February deadline. Some small State projects requiring no Federal moneys were exempt from these new restrictions.

This announcement met with considerable consternation on the part of the contractors. However, the commission could not see its way clear to any other course of action that was consistent with its imposed legal restrictions and financial responsibilities.

The recent exchange of letters by Mr. A. E. Johnson, executive secretary of American Association of State Highway Officials and Mr. B. D. Tallamy, Federal Highway Administrator, copies of which are enclosed, indicate that the Federal financial picture is even worse than related at the Billings convention about a month ago. Mr. Tallamy states that the depletion of funds and the holding up of our vouchers will begin this fall. A subsequent phone conversation with Mr. Armstrong has led us to believe that October 15 will probably be the termination date for reimbursement of our vouchers. In actual practice this will mean that any expenditure by the contractor after September 1–15 will not be reimbursed. The required procedure requires that the contractor make actual payment for materials and labor and submit vouchers to the road commission in the form of pay estimates and, after checking, receive payment for the amounts shown. The road commission then (and not before) may submit vouchers to the Bureau of Public Roads, supported by evidence that actual payment has been made to the contractor, and in time receive reimbursement. These procedures require at least 30 days and in some cases as much as 60 days. Thus, the dilemma becomes even more critical. Unless there is some assurance within the next 2 weeks that reimbursement can be made after October 15, 1959, we must begin shutting down some $20 million worth of construction projects throughout the State. All of this will be at added cost to the contractor and the State. And all at the time of the year when ideal construction weather prevails.

Since the commission action imposing the first restrictions, already referred to, and the receipt of Mr. Tallamy's letter dated July 13, 1959, we have opened bids of $6,800,000 worth of construction. Only a year or so ago we were working under pressure to get funds obligated that were authorized by Congress to help turn the recession then of concern throughout the country. We met this challenge and achieved the goal. Now we are faced with shutting down about five times as much work as was started during that emergency period. There can be no question about the resulting economic effects. There can be little wonder that many feel we don't know where we are headed in the highway program. We have felt it necessary in the light of this development to inform the contractors of the above projects that they may proceed with the full understanding that it may be necessary for the road commission to order a halt in their construction at any time. We have also found it necessary to practically discontinue all right-of-way procurement in order to obligate as little of the available funding as possible.

The attached sheet, "Estimated financial position as of September 30, 1959," indicates a financial position that is most untenable. As of September 30 we will have obligations in the form of construction contracts and our own personnel for operations and maintenance amounting to some $24 million. To liquidate this obligation we will have only $4 million of our own State money. Thus, if we have no indication of what Congress intends to do within the next 10 days or 2 weeks we must of necessity close down virtually all construction of roads in the State. The attached list shows the projects that will be affected.

Several of the contractors have expressed confidence that Congress is well aware of the position in which all these matters place our road building program and feel sure that some remedial legislation will be enacted. On the basis of this faith, they have suggested to us that we go ahead with normal planning, designing, advertising, and awarding of contracts. Our responsibility to the citizens of the State, however, precludes the possibility of adopting this suggestion since any small chance of failure on the part of Congress to act favorably would essentially bring us to a bankrupt situation, completely unable to meet our contractual obligations. The Bureau of Public Roads is not party to any of these contracts for construction, and the obligations to pay them rest solely with the State road commission. To be sure, the Bureau of Public Roads officials are sympathetic, but they, of course, are bound by the acts of Congress. Sympathy does little to pay off contractual obligations.

However, as a demonstration of our faith in both the validity of the highway program and congressional responsibility toward it, our planning and design departments are continuing on schedule in the preparation of plans to be ready for advertising the minute funds are available.

As already pointed out, the aspect of all this jockeying back and forth on funding that concerns the road commission immediately is that it all comes during the time of year when the weather is most advantageous for construction and we would normally be accelerating rather than halting the awarding of contracts. It cannot help but be a breeder of bad publicity and poor public relations for all agencies associated with the highway program.

There is one other item we must bring to your attention. Mr. Johnson refers to it in his letter as the "contract authority reimbursement assurance" provision. The language in the 1960 Road Appropriation Act as interpreted by Mr. Tallamy would mean that approval of our contracts by the Bureau of Public Roads would not necessarily mean that money was set aside to meet our vouchers as has been the case since the beginning of our joint functions many years ago. This would obligate the road commission for all of its available moneys with nothing available for quite some time to handle maintenance and budgeted functions of the commission. We feel very strongly that a reappraisal must be made of this facet of the legislation. There is no apparent reason discernible to us why the previous method of handling this matter cannot be continued to the mutual benefit of the Bureau of Public Roads, the road commission, and thus to the public in general.

The very fine job you are doing in our behalf is very much appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

ELMO R. MORGAN,
Director of Highways.

EFFECT UPON THE STATE ROAD COMMISSION OF UTAH AND THE FEDERAL AID INTERSTATE PROGRAM IF INTERFUNDING IS SUSPENDED FOR FISCAL YEAR 1959–60

The planning and programing department of the State Road Commission has indicated that anticipated Federal funds available for construction and engineering on interstate projects from July 1959 to June 1960 are $24,500,000.

If these funds are suspended to any degree, the calculations of the total effect on our operations would be based on the following considerations:

(a) One man can design $400,000 on Interstate projects in 1 year—60 percent for roadway design, 40 percent for structural design.

(b) the construction department anticipates the use of 150± men on survey crews for proposed and planned Interstate construction.

Based on the foregoing assumptions a 25 percent reduction in funding would result in an approximate layoff in the three departments (highway design, structural design, highway construction) of 52 men. A 50 percent reduction in funds would mean a layoff of 106 men. A 100 percent reduction of funds would mean a layoff of 211 men.

In addition to the primary effect on these three departments the Commission would also suffer a secondary reduction in operating personnel over the total Commission of a number difficult to estimate (total employment as of March 1, is 1428).

As indicated by the attached sheets of A Tentative Financial Guide for Completion of the Interstate System in Utah, these portions of 1–15 that will serve to put in operation the sections of highway already under construction; i.e., 14th North to 1st South in Salt Lake and 16th North to 16th South in Orem, will be directly affected. This will leave an investment of $7,815,000 the first project, and $4,500,000 second project, sitting idle and unusable until the resumption of funding permits the construction of the connecting links to 24th South in Salt Lake and the connecting links to Provo and Lahl in Utah County.

Other considerations involve the fact that nearly all contractors engaged in road building operations have anticipated this volume of construction and have correspondingly increased their staffs and have made equipment purchases of prime earth movers, gravel crushers, and paving machines; all of which would cause a tremendous financial burden if funding were reduced, temporarily suspended, or discontinued.

List of projects that will be affected by funding suspension—Project description and balance of contractual obligations as of June 30, 1959

INTERSTATE

South Ash Creek Wash-Iron County	$215,446
Iron-Wash County line	-------
Delle-Knolls	99,971
Rattle Snake Pass	331,561
Blue Creek Summit	375,685
	25,241
Anderson Junction-Pintura	650,007
Castle Rock-Wasatch	2,084,109
Pintura North to Ash Creek	137,884

List of projects that will be affected by funding suspension—Project description and balance of contractual obligations as of June 30, 1959—Continued

Cove Fort south to Beaver	$1,845,685
5th north to 13th south, Salt Lake City	10,131 39,168
Snowville Southeast-Tremonton	817,289
Morgan-Devils Slide	528,272
North Across Ash Creek	435,094
North limits Salt Lake urban area	412,404
1st south-14th north, Salt Lake City	1,205,321 18,185
16th south-northwest 16th north, Orem	898,476
400 north and Pages Lane	305,611
Floy-Crescent junction	657,385
Subtotal	11,092,898

PRIMARY

East of Henefer to west of junction State Route 158	$78,898
Keetley to junction U.S. 40 and 189	233,659
Modena Bypass	35,009
4th north and Main, Logan	88,734
Wilbert Wash Bridge	16,639
Greendale North-Flaming Gorge	310,383
13 miles North Monticello-North	116,435
Big Spring Wash-Icelander Wash	35,946
South Carbon-Emery County line north to Price	432,300
Subtotal	1,348,003

SECONDARY

Lehi East to U.S. 91	$15,212
LaSal-Northeast Utah-Colorado line	189,408
Manila west and north to Utah Wyoming line	19,803
West of Nephi-Jericho	97,903
East American Fork to junction West State Route 146, State Route 80 north to Alpine	18,821
Neola-White Rocks Rd	41,865
Moab-Castleton	99,315
Northwest of Beaver-Millard County line	71,506
Blue Creek north-Idaho line	19,822
Ogden River Bridge and approaches	43,478
Utah-Colorado line west to La Sal	114,060
Scofield-Clear Creek	92,875
Hyrum-Blacksmith Fork Canyon	197,765
Hanksville west	122,494
Middleton northeast-Harrisburg Junction	205,423
Montezuma-Aneth Oil Fields	97,701
Bear River Bridge-West Smithfield	149,259
Woodruff southwest 6 miles	188,348
9th East-48th south to 78 south	53,385
Montezuma Creek Bridge	65,044
Salina south-Gooseberry Creek Valley	170,254
Approximately 5 miles west of Henrieville, east	188,484
Subtotal	2,262,225

URBAN

13th south to Simpson Avenue on 7th east SLC	$214,039
Subtotal	214,039

D PROJECT

Manti-Ephraim	29,908
Nye's Corner to 31st Street-Ogden	6,835
Fort Duchesne to Junction State Route 209	378,100
Cat Canyon-Sunnyside junction	142,590 9,677

List of projects that will be affected by funding suspension—Project description and balance of contractual obligations as of June 30, 1959—Continued

4th South Main to 9th East, Salt Lake City	$22,683
Crescent junction-Valley City-Moab	62,929
Levan-Fayette NR County line	194,355
N.T. to 9th North Redwood Road	
21st south to N.I. Redwood Road	
35 south to 21st South Redwood Road	75,061
Orem Bench-9th north 18th south	61,013
7th east-Draper-78th south	53,899
Sunnyside junction to Emery County line	
Carbon-Emery County line southeast	45,028
Blanding-Devil's Canyon-Monticello	17,461
Subtotal	1,099,539

MISCELLANEOUS

Utah-Colorado line west to La Sal	$31,648
Three Lakes-Northwest	43,698
Subtotal	75,346
Grand total	16,092,050

ESTIMATED FINANCIAL POSITION AS OF SEPTEMBER 30, 1959

(Office memorandum, State Road Commission of Utah)

To: Elmo R. Morgan, director of highways.
From: Dean R. Steed, chief accountant.
JULY 21, 1959.

Funds available Sept. 30, 1959, if we continue as planned at present:	
Cash balance as of July 1, 1959	$378,253
Revenue from Bureau of Public Roads July 1, 1959, to Sept. 30, 1959	19,856,360
Additional revenue (other than Federal)	140,000
Estimated gas money July through September	4,851,874
Total revenue	25,226,487
Estimated expenditures, July 1, 1959, to September 30, 1959:	
Federal construction	17,445,255
State construction	1,414,091
Budget	2,232,950
Noncontract items	238,972
Total expenditures	21,331,268
Cash position, Sept. 30, 1959	3,895,219
Obligations as of Sept. 30, 1959:	
Interstate	10,281,831
Primary	4,418,921
Secondary	1,805,059
Urban	26,682
D projects	122,263
State construction	628,062
Subtotal construction	17,282,818
Budget, Oct. 1, 1959, to June 30, 1960	6,698,850
Grand total	23,981,668

VETO OF OMNIBUS HOUSING BILL

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, on July 7, President Eisenhower vetoed the omnibus housing bill passed by the Senate and the House of Representatives. In commenting on the presidential veto, the Minneapolis Morning Tribune of July 9, 1959, pointed out the need of our Nation's metropolitan areas for help in their battle against slums and blight. The editorial comments particularly on the Minneapolis slum clearance and urban renewal programs which have been affected by the presidential veto.

For a time I was concerned about the administration's policy of "no new starts"; but I am more and more concerned about the policy of "more new stops."

I ask unanimous consent that the Tribune editorial be printed in the RECORD at this part as a part of my remarks.

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

THE HOUSING BILL VETO

The vetoproof housing bill which Congress sent to the President has been vetoed, and now three courses remain. Congress can try to override the veto. It can enact a minimum bill which Mr. Eisenhower would be certain to approve. Or it can throw in the sponge and pass no bill at all.

Overriding seems unlikely, since neither House came very close to the required two-third majority when the now-vetoed bill was passed. In more than 6 years, the President has never had a veto overridden. The prospect that this long record will be shattered on the housing issue is not good.

It is hard to believe that Congress would adjourn without passing some sort of housing bill, considering the urgent need for legislation. So compromise may be the best way out of the present impasse.

If this is to be the answer, we do not think Mr. Eisenhower should try to drive too hard a bargain with Congress. The bill he vetoed as excessive and inflationary already had been cut back considerably as a concession to the White House. Perhaps it is now the President's turn to budge a little.

We believe it would be particularly regrettable if there was a drastic reduction of the $900 million which Congress voted for slum clearance and urban renewal during the next 2 years. Mr. Eisenhower had recommended $1,350,000,000 for this purpose over a 6-year period. We think the former figure comes closer to meeting the needs of the Nation's metropolitan areas as they wage their desperate war against slums and blight.

It seems quite probable, too, that the President has underestimated the needs of these areas for low rent public housing. Mr. Eisenhower objected to the authorization of new public housing units while 100,000 previously authorized units remain unconstructed. But cities need to plan well in advance for such facilities and it may not take long to exhaust the present backlog.

In Minneapolis, we have been allocated 1,000 units by the Federal Government, but the money has not yet been made available. Failure of Congress to pass a housing bill now might seriously jeopardize our public housing program, one which will become increasingly important as the freeways and other projects displace thousands of our citizens. The Gateway Center development would not be affected, but other plans for renewing the city's blighted areas might receive a setback if Congress does not act.

Democrats in both House and Senate are already attacking Mr. Eisenhower's veto, and more than a few Republicans are unhappy about it. No doubt it will have political repercussions in the 1960 campaign. But if the veto cannot be overridden, Congress must strive for the best possible substitute bill, putting politics aside.

The plight of our slum and blight infested cities is too serious to be neglected. One way or another, some means must be found for meeting their minimum needs, if nothing more.

THE FEDERAL RESERVE BOARD AND THE CONGRESS

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, article 1, section 8, subparagraph 5 of the Constitution of the United States gives the Congress the power to coin money, regulate the value thereof.

The reported attitude of the Federal Reserve Board seems to be that Congress has forever surrendered that power to the Federal Reserve Board; that the Board, and not the Congress, has the power to regulate the value of money; and that somehow the Constitution has been amended to give the Board such power.

The Federal Reserve Board is reliably reported to be deeply incensed that the Ways and Means Committee is considering a sense-of-Congress resolution that would suggest that when in the Fed's good judgment it is feasible to expand the supply of money, it should do so by buying Government securities.

Mr. President, in a statement issued yesterday the Speaker of the House of Representatives, Mr. RAYBURN, said in part:

I have been forced to the conclusion that the Federal Reserve authorities have reached a point in their thinking where they consider themselves immune to any direction or suggestion by the Congress, let alone a simple expression of the sense of Congress. It appears that the fault of the suggested committee bill was not that the language itself was wrong, but that the Congress dared even to speak to the Federal Reserve, a creature of Congress.

Mr. President, I think the Speaker is absolutely correct. The arrogance of the Federal Reserve Board in this situation is fantastic.

By its very nature as a creature of Congress authorized to carry out a power that the Constitution assigns entirely to the Congress, the Federal Reserve Board is the responsibility of Congress and is wholly and completely independent of the President of the United States. It must be and it should be.

If it insists that the Congress must not pass even a mild sense-of-Congress resolution of the kind that has been proposed—it is clear that the Federal Reserve Board now considers itself independent of the Congress too, and therefore, is taking unto itself absolute, irresponsible power.

This is insufferable. In this democracy no Federal agency should be for an instant above the elected officials of the Republic. When they claim to be it is time that the Congress makes it explicitly and emphatically clear to them that they are not. This is why I enthusiastically applaud the forthright statement of the Speaker of the House.

Mr. President, there is no question that monetary policy is a complex, perplexing, difficult problem. The outstanding economic experts are sharply divided on the issue. What is more even the most expert and competent of the monetary specialists are groping unsurely in a field in which there is a vast gap between policy theory and established, demonstrable practices that have proven themselves. As I expect to show at some length at a later date the influence of monetary policy on inflation for example is at about the same stage as astronomy before Copernicus determined that the earth revolved around the sun instead of vice versa. Under these circumstances the practical, hardheaded judgments of Congress are likely to be a useful guide for practical action, particularly when expressed in a modest sense-of-Congress resolution—as a general policy directive for the Federal Reserve Board.

PROPOSED COAL RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from West Virginia is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, the Senate may, later today, consider House bill 6596, a bill to create a Coal Research and Development Commission. I am very grateful to the leadership for scheduling this measure for possible action today.

The research program which the bill is designed to establish would include the application of science and engineering to the production, transportation, and utilization of coal. The American coal industry, in cooperation with the United Mine Workers of America, has performed magnificently in mechanizing its operations. Further progress, which can come about only through the Government's willingness to participate in this program, is vitally necessary from the standpoint of conservation, safety, and supply.

While wasteful methods of extracting coal from the earth have largely disappeared, the Nation can nevertheless not afford to fail to exhaust every effort toward further development of mining methods that would enable us to mine the maximum tonnage from every valuable vein of coal. This theory should apply to surface mining as well as deep mining. Collaterally, safer mining operations must be a target of an intense research program. My own feeling is that one phase of research that needs to be intensified as soon as possible is in the field of geology. I am convinced that many mine accidents could be prevented if more were known about the vicissitudes of nature which have been a deterrent to safe mining operations since men first went below the surface of the earth to produce the fuel that has provided a predominant amount of America's energy supply.

Moving coal from mine to market constitutes the Nation's foremost hauling job. Whatever can be accomplished in this regard will react to the benefit of both the coal and the transportation industries. I call attention to the fact that testimony in favor of a coal research program has come from representatives of railroads whose revenue relies heavily upon coal freight traffic. My colleagues are no doubt familiar with the coal pipeline that went into operation in eastern Ohio last year. It is moving more than a million tons of coal at the rate of 4 miles an hour from the producing fields near Cadiz to an electric generating station on Lake Erie some 110 miles to the north. Many observers are confident that even more efficient coal transportation can be conducted by rail if sufficient technical talent is made available to the study of the problem. In any case, America needs to find out all it can about getting fuel from rich bituminous and anthracite regions to the energy-hungry industrial centers.

Thousands upon thousands of new uses for coal have been developed by our steel and chemical industries over the years. Plastics, medicines, fertilizers, cosmetics, and a variety of other items are produced from the tars and gases captured in metallurgical ovens. There are scientists who believe that coal will ultimately become an important source of food supply.

These are the possibilities that must be determined through an effective research program. Most important to those of us who live in coal mining areas is the potential market that we are confident will be developed through the bill which the House has already approved and which also has been endorsed by the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. Whether a commercial synthetic fuels industry should make its appearance within the next few years is a matter that could well be decided through the operations of an independent research commission. The feasibility of producing gasoline and oils synthetically from coal has already been established. The price disparity between this production and the output of our great petroleum refineries has been reduced considerably in recent years. Because an adequate coal supply could make the difference between victory and defeat in another world conflict in which the United States would be deprived of its imported crudes and products, we must remain alert to the possibility that liquid fuels by synthesis could be required on a moment's notice. When commercial synthetic plants are placed in operation, employment opportunities will increase in West Virginia and other coal-producing States from the Rocky Mountains to the Appalachians.

Other projects which must be investigated include the development of a coal-burning piston engine as has been proposed from time to time and which has recently achieved at least a modicum of prominence through experiments in Roanoke, Va. A number of tests have been conducted with diesel engines, but only through an intensified research program will the potential of the project be revealed. Needless to say, the coal industry stands to regain a very important market if this fuel is recalled for the chore of providing the power for railroad locomotives.

Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia.

NEED FOR AREA REDEVELOPMENT BILL

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, the Charleston Gazette, Charleston, W. Va., recently printed an editorial which I regard to be an eloquent summation of the continuing need for passage of the area redevelopment bill, S. 722.

The editorial points out that, although much of America's economy is enjoying a healthy upsurge, there are many grievous pockets of unemployment which continue to exist in regions where the economic structure has been upset by rapid technological changes or other factors.

The editorial makes a telling point when it states:

So let's face the truth. If a business upsurge already 14 months old still leaves us with so many soft spots, there is little chance that anything short of help from the outside will erase their problems.

Mr. President, in order to underscore the fact that, despite the current business upturn, America still is in serious need of the Area Redevelopment Act, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial may be printed in the body of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

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

GOP ECONOMIC POLICY IGNORES HUNGER PANGS

Following a custom of long standing the Eisenhower administration has lately been making political capital at the expense of some of our more unfortunate citizens. In the most gleeful and "I told you so" tones, it has been pounding home the theme that business is in a boom the likes of which this Nation has never seen.

It's not our intention here to find fault with what Mr. Eisenhower and his minions have been saying about the more obvious facets of the economy. We are in a period of generalized prosperity. What's more, rarely has confidence in the boom's lasting power been so high among so many experts. But bright though the prospects are, there is a gray side that deserves more attention than it's been getting.

We're speaking of the fact that in spite of high and rising prosperity almost 11 percent of the Nation's employable workers are still without jobs in 179 areas spread across 29 States. West Virginia is one of those States.

Summed up, here's what we find when we look beneath the froth of the administration's pronouncements:

The boom has hardly touched the pockets of joblessness in cities hit by major industrial upheavals or migrations.

A full one-third of the Nation's unemployed are concentrated in such chronically depressed cities as Pittsburgh, Detroit, and Atlantic City.

Many of these cities were depressed even before the 1957–58 slump hit full stride, and it has made an already bad situation worse.

The hardest hit are not fly-by-night towns, dying because of the stupidity, greed, or laziness of their own people. They're communities with proud histories, above-average schools, good cultural and recreational facilities, an established place in the American scheme.

For the most part, they were caught in the backwash of progress itself, and try though they have to improve their lot, technological changes, switches from old to new production techniques, development of new operational methods, new processes, and the like have kept them depressed in spite of prosperity elsewhere.

So let's face the truth. If a business upsurge already 14 months old still leaves us with so many soft spots, there is little chance that anything short of help from the outside will erase their problems.

Let's face this truth also. So many of the jobless in these labor surplus areas are either too old or too short on cash to learn new skills, and their local governments are so sapped by depression that they're not financially able to render the necessary assistance.

What we need under such bleak and oppressing circumstances is a program of technical assistance, financed, in part, at least by the Federal Government, which will again make these people employable and the areas or cities where they live healthy contributors to the Nation's economy.

The Senate has already passed an area redevelopment bill aimed at this objective. It is now awaiting action in the House. But even if it passes there, which it probably will, Mr. Eisenhower is on record as opposing it, as he was a year ago, when today's starving millions were just beginning to feel the pangs of prolonged hunger.

And why does he oppose area redevelopment? It's an old Republican story. Mr. Eisenhower wants more than anything else to keep his big business friends happy.

The status quo rather than hunger is the issue with the Republicans. Let the hungry grow hungrier; the budget must be balanced at all costs.

JIM TATUM

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the untimely death of Jim Tatum, football coach of the University of North Carolina, has shocked the Nation. He was a small-town South Carolina boy who reached the pinnacle in his profession of coaching. South Carolinians everywhere were proud of him. His career, now ended prematurely, should be an inspiration to all Americans.

Jim Tatum was a man among men. He planned it that way, as evidenced by his suggested creed, written by Dean Alfange:

I do not choose to be a common man,
It is my right to be uncommon if I can.
I seek opportunity, not security.
I do not wish to be a kept citizen, humbled and dulled by having the State look after me.
I want to take the calculated risk; to dream and to build, to fail and succeed.
I refuse to barter incentive for a dole,
I prefer the challenge of life to the guaranteed existence;
The thrill of fulfillment to the State
Calm of utopia, I will not trade freedom for beneficence, nor my dignity for a handout.
I will never cower before my master, nor bend to any threat.
It is my heritage to stand erect, proud, and unfraid—
To think and act for myself.
Enjoy the benefit of my creation,
To face the world boldly and say this I have done.
All this is what it means to be an American.

Jim Tatum will be missed by his fellow man, but his life will be enshrined in the hearts of those in the sports world, and of a host of admirers and friends throughout the United States. He was my true friend, and I feel a great personal loss in his passing.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business?

RECOMMITTAL OF S. 819 RELATING TO AFFIDAVITS OF LOYALTY AND ALLEGIANCE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I am much disappointed that the Senate yesterday voted to recommit to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, of which I have the honor to be a member, Senate bill 819, proposing to amend the National Defense Education Act.

But the bill has been recommitted. I now wish to say to the chairman of the committee, and to the chairman of the subcommittee who reported the bill, that in my judgment the committee owes it to the country to proceed without delay to early consideration of this subject matter, and to bring the bill back to the floor of the Senate at a very early date.

I make this statement because I am convinced that the action taken by the Senate yesterday will be greatly misunderstood by the academic world of this country. I think we did a great injury yesterday to American educational processes.

As one who taught in various American universities for 21 years, Mr. President, I say, and I say it respectfully, that yesterday the Senate demonstrated that it does not understand the educational processes of America.

It was a great surprise to me that there was apparently no understanding by opponents of the Kennedy bill that when university administrators and faculties assume the responsibilities entrusted to them under such legislation as the National Defense Education Act, they can be counted on to carry out the objectives and purposes of that act. They do not need the Congress of the United States to be administering the details of the operation of a college or university.

But, beyond that, I think it a shocking thing that anyone should try to make educators, students, and college administrators a part of the national police network. It is the job of the Justice Department and the FBI to seek out and catch Communists; personally, I think they do a good job of it, because that is their business.

It is not a business that should be imposed upon an institution of higher learning.

And the requirement of these oaths cannot be expected to leave any effect upon the Communist conspiracy in America.

It is a requirement that does nothing to stop, hinder, or forestall Communist conspirators. It is nothing more than a statement of suspicion and distrust of the academic world.

I think it is very sad that the Senate yesterday said, in effect, "We are going to single out college people and stigmatize them with suspicion that they are disloyal to the United States unless they take these oaths prior to getting an educational loan."

The report of our committee hearings, which was on the desk of every Senator yesterday, was replete with evidence of the negative reaction of great universities and colleges and educators in this country protesting the kind of stigma the so-called Mundt amendment of a

year ago placed upon the academic world of America.

I also want to comment upon the practice, as represented in these loyalty oaths, of conditioning benefits upon the political beliefs or activities of the applicant. If there is anything wrong with those activities, we should deal with them directly.

Mr. President, it will be recalled that when the struggle was on in 1954 in this body in connection with union members who also were active in Communist, or Communist-front groups, I, along with the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], became a cosponsor of the Humphrey proposal to outlaw the Communist Party and make it a criminal offense for anyone knowingly and intentionally to belong to the Communist Party or its successor. That law is on the books.

As a liberal, I have been the object of a great deal of criticism for the position I took in 1954 in support of the Humphrey proposal outlawing the Communist Party, which became the Communist Control Act of 1954. I knew then we were right. I know now we are right. The sad feature, however, is that apparently the Senate is not fully aware that the law is on the books, not to mention the Smith Act, the Internal Activities Control Act, and the Internal Security Act of 1950.

It is through legislation dealing directly with conspiracy that we should approach this Communist problem, rather than through the kind of action that was attempted yesterday on the floor of the Senate, and which was the cause, in my judgment, of this matter being recommitted to the committee.

Then, as now, I believe that the Communist Party, being a conspiracy against the United States, should itself be illegal and membership in it a crime. I continue to believe that is a much sounder way of dealing with the problem of subversion than to try to prevent persons active in such a group from participating in other activities, particularly when the restriction takes the form of impugning everyone else until they swear otherwise.

I hope that the leadership of this body appreciate the fact that this issue was not pigeonholed yesterday by sending it back to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. The issue is a live one, and I predict today that academic people across this country will express over and over again, and rightly so, their resentment at what I consider the unjustifiable discrimination that was exhibited against them yesterday by the Senate.

It was a sad day for academic freedom yesterday in the Senate. I hope that before we adjourn the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare will bring back a bill based on the same principles discussed before the Senate yesterday, and that we can clear the academic world of America of the kind of unfair discrimination that was heaped upon it when the Mundt amendment was adopted last year.

I wish to make it clear that I shall continue to favor repeal of both the oaths in the National Defense Education Act, just as I did in the committee deliberations on the Kennedy bill.

Antisubversion laws should not be drafted by an education committee, nor do I believe they have a proper place in a law which seeks to improve the education system and expand the education opportunities of our young people.

If there is need for further laws to cope with Communists, let us consider them in the context of the whole Communist movement. College administration should be permitted to run their schools without interference from Congress, and without being asked to become law enforcement agents at the same time.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, has morning business been concluded?

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

Mr. BARTLETT. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

THE AMERICAN EXHIBITION IN MOSCOW

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, today the Vice President of the United States, Mr. RICHARD M. NIXON, officially opened the American National Exhibition in Moscow. I should like to take this occasion to comment on this precedent-shattering exhibition as well as its counterpart in the New York Coliseum which has been in progress for over 3 weeks. Only a few years ago such a prospect would have seemed fantastic.

This exchange of exhibits between the two chief adversaries in the cold war offers both opportunity and temptation, but I am convinced that the opportunities outweigh the risks. If we take the Soviet exhibition at face value or if we imagine that the increased tempo of cultural exchange will melt away the profound political problems that divide us, we will be in for a rude shock. If, on the other hand, we look upon this exchange as an opportunity to move one step toward mutual understanding and as an opportunity for us to raise in the minds of Soviet citizens some disquieting questions, then we can profit by the experience and the cause of international peace and security will be served.

I am pleased that I had a modest role in establishing this exchange of fairs. Senators may recall that in 1956 I coauthored the International Cultural Exchange and Trade Fair Participation Act, popularly known as the Humphrey-Thompson Act, providing for U.S. participation in the World's Fair at Brussels and the present American exhibition at Moscow. Earlier in the present session of Congress, I introduced a bill which would authorize the participation of governments and citizens of other countries in cultural activities in the United States.

In spite of some highly publicized problems which we encountered in setting up our exhibition in Moscow, the final result is a clear window through which Soviet citizens can view an undistorted image of the United States. The 3 million to 4 million Soviet citizens who are expected to visit the exhibit will gain a greater understandng of our people, our material achievements, and our cultural interests.

Mr. President, there is great interest in this exhibition among the Soviet citizenry. Reports which I have received from Americans who have visited the Soviet Union in recent months indicate that the word has spread throughout the entire Soviet Empire about the American exhibition in Moscow.

The Soviet Government has done very little to publicize the fair. As all of us are well aware, there is no such thing as advertising in the Soviet journals which would permit the American Government to bring to the attention of the Soviet people this particular exhibition. Nevertheless, the word has spread. Like some so-called well kept secrets, the best way to get the information around is to make it a secret. Then everybody will know about the exhibit and will spend their time finding out about it.

We have attempted to show the Russians an honest cross-section of American life in this first major exhibit from the United States in the Soviet Union.

The exhibit includes displays on our achievements in science, education, labor, agriculture, economic productivity, health, social science, painting and sculpture.

Many persons have praised the honesty and realism of our display in Moscow. I join in their tribute. But why should we not be honest? We have absolutely nothing to hide from the Russians, and in contrast to them, very little indeed for which to be ashamed.

For 6 full weeks a "corner of America" will be on view in the capital city of the Soviet Union.

Mr. President, I submit that this is, indeed, a history-making opportunity for us. It is an event of great historic importance. It may well signify a change in the cold war. It is one of the great openings in the Iron Curtain. It will give the people of the Soviet Union their first real opportunity to see America at work and at play; America seriously endeavoring to bring about a better world—a world filled with peace and opportunity.

For the first time the Russians will have access to an uncensored and representative slice of life and culture in America. There is abundant evidence that they are hungry for such an opportunity. Their curiosity about things American is excelled only by their efforts to prove the superiority of things Russian.

I saw that with my own eyes when I visited Moscow, Mr. President. I talked to hundreds of students in the elementary and secondary schools, and to young people in universities, as well as to adults who were visiting Moscow from the provinces, and to those who reside in the So-

viet capital. Everywhere I went, and everyone with whom I was privileged to visit had an intense interest in life in America. The widespread interest in the Soviet Union in things American was very evident. In fact, in no other country that I visited in the course of my travels was there greater interest in what is happening in the United States.

AMERICAN ART AT MOSCOW

In passing, Mr. President, I should like to say a word about the American art on exhibit at the Moscow Fair. It will be recalled that several weeks ago certain persons questioned the art selected for the fair, on the ground that the political views of some of the artists were unacceptable. The President himself made an implied criticism of the art selection made by a distinguished committee of American art experts. I said then, and I repeat today, that this type of petty political interference with the artistic judgments of highly respected specialists makes us appear ridiculous before the world.

At that time Representative FRANK THOMPSON, Jr., of New Jersey, and I joined in urging the President to support our proposal to establish a Federal Arts Council. Such a council would enable our Government to deal with a dignity that would merit respect with both domestic and international artistic activities. I am glad to say that the Federal Arts Council bill was reported favorably and unanimously by a subcommittee of the House Education and Labor Committee, but as yet we have not heard from the administration, and no action has yet been taken in the Senate.

THE SOVIET EXHIBIT IN NEW YORK

The Soviet exhibit in New York is a less-than-forthright effort to picture Soviet life and accomplishments. As such, it detracts, I believe, from the values of genuine international cultural exchange. Mr. Max Frankel, of the New York Times, after visiting the exhibit, said that "a visitor can see far more here in 2 hours than this correspondent saw in 2 years in the Soviet Union." In a very real sense, that is true.

However, I should like to add that the Soviet exhibit is, indeed, a very exciting and attractive one; but it emphasizes more of the future in the Soviet Union, rather than the present. That is characteristic of the exhibitions or fairs in Moscow. Those who have visited them note that most of the machinery that is displayed there, for instance, is of a prototype variety to be produced in the future. At the fairs and exhibits in Russia there is much emphasis on the future, and such exhibits constitute strong incentives to the citizens of Russia.

The American exhibit in Russia includes a $13,000, six-room house which is easily within reach of the family of the average worker in the United States. In contrast, the Soviets show us a model apartment of the future, which they attempt to pass off as currently available. They show little interest in portraying how the average worker lives today.

The Soviets have not put price tags on their consumer exhibits, as we have on ours in Moscow. This is understandable, because such price tags would reveal how few Soviet citizens can afford some of the goods displayed.

However, I would add that the Soviets are making a determined effort to improve their distribution of consumer goods, to reduce the prices, and to make larger quantities available.

For example, let us consider the Soviet-made automobiles displayed at the Coliseum exhibit. The large, Packard-like Ziz on exhibit is produced exclusively for the government and party elite in Russia. The small Moskivich, identified as an "economy" car would cost a Russian worker at least a year of wages and many years of waiting.

Not all of the thousands of American visitors to the Soviet exhibit will recognize the futuristic character of what they see. They will not be fully aware that they are exposed to a less than representative or honest slice of Soviet society, although I am convinced that our public press will not let the Russian exhibit be taken at face value.

However, I do not wish these remarks to be regarded as an indication of a lack of appreciation of the quality of the Soviet exhibit, because it is an excellent one. Neither do I want these remarks to be regarded as an indication of a lack of appreciation of the importance of these cultural exchanges, because I believe they have real value. I only ask that we take an attitude of objectivity in regard to what is displayed, and consider the availability of the goods to the citizens of the respective countries.

THE UNITED STATES SHOULD PARTICIPATE IN MORE FAIRS

The values of intercultural exhibitions outweigh the disvalues and I am gratified that our Government was able to arrange this significant exchange with the Soviet Union. I may say that it took considerable time to do so. For almost 2½ years, prior to the agreement on this exhibition, I urged and encouraged such an exchange between ourselves and the U.S.S.R. It may be recalled that there were private negotiations by a private firm in New York with the Soviet Chamber of Commerce in Moscow. For a time it appeared that the private negotiations would be successful; but at that point the U.S. Government stepped in and made arrangements with the Soviet Union for the exchange of exhibits. These negotiations are all a matter of record before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

In fact, Mr. President, I believe we should do far more than we are now doing in this form of cultural exchange.

At the present time, over 160 international fairs are held regularly each year. These include both trade and cultural exhibits. Many more occur on an ad hoc basis. During the past 4 years the U.S. Government has sponsored exhibits in only 65 of these events. This is an average of only 16 a year. During 1959, our Government planned to sponsor exhibits in only 15 international trade fairs. This is less than 10 percent.

For the wealthiest, most productive, most technologically advanced country in the world, this is hardly an admirable record. As one of the foremost democratic nations and as leader of the free world, the United States is neglecting a promising opportunity. We have not taken full advantage of international trade fairs and cultural exhibits to project a true image of America to people in foreign countries. Not only are we failing to put our best foot forward; we are failing to put either foot forward.

THE TWO PURPOSES OF INTERNATIONAL FAIRS

Ever since we inaugurated our present participation in international fairs, in 1954, our Government has had two chief purposes in mind. The first purpose is economic or commercial. And the second purpose is political and cultural. These purposes are, of course, interrelated.

Trade fairs are natural opportunities for American business to expand its oversea market by making its products known. Incidentally, our business leaders can pick up valuable information about the products of other countries. One need only think of the postwar impact of European cars, sewing machines, and typewriters on the quality and style of American-built products.

The response of American business and industrial leaders to the Moscow fair and other exhibits has been extraordinary. Our people are eager to exhibit abroad. There are many things our Government can do to facilitate trade, by encouraging private business to participate in commercial fairs.

The second goal of international fairs is the broader political purpose of presenting a full and fair picture of the United States to peoples abroad, whose image of our character and purposes may be less than adequate. The commercial exhibits tell the story of our great economic productivity and our material success, but this alone gives a distorted picture of American life. This picture of our material success must be rounded out by exhibits which portray our cultural achievements, our political institutions, our democratic ideals, our humanitarian impulses, and, indeed, our problems and how we go about tackling them.

It is primarily in serving this larger political purpose that we have been deficient. We have not participated in a sufficient number of international fairs. We have not spent enough money on the fairs in which we have participated. And we have not spent with sufficient care and imagination the money we have had.

The peoples of the Communist world and of the politically uncommitted areas of Asia and the Middle East do not have a full and fair picture of the material and moral aspects of American life. Their view of how we live and what we believe has been warped by both innocent ignorance and dishonest distortion. To many people, ideals of the Declaration of Independence and the Bill of Rights seem to be in conflict with present realities; and they become confused. They seem to know little of the changing status of the American Negro, the increasing appreciation of the arts throughout the length and breadth of the land, and the great humanitarian

work, at home and abroad, of a multitude of religious, charitable, and endowed institutions.

OPPORTUNITIES OF CULTURAL EXCHANGE

It goes without saying that it is vitally important for our allies, the uncommitted nations, and hostile nations to have a clear image of our character and our purposes. The presentation of such an image to the world is a big job. It is the task of many agencies in our Government, from the ICA to the USIA. It is the task of all overseas Americans, thousands of whom are connected with business, humanitarian, educational, or religious enterprises.

Important in the whole picture is the role of international exhibitions and fairs.

Intercultural exchange, including fairs, is not a magic key to world peace. It is not a substitute for military defense, diplomacy, or foreign economic policies. But, when properly used, intercultural exchange can be a valuable element in our international strategy. It can play an important role in our comprehensive response to the total challenge we face.

As I see it, there are three main values arising from intercultural exchange. First, it helps to present a clearer picture of who we are and what we believe, and in so doing it makes a serious miscalculation on the part of a hostile nation less likely. In this nuclear age such a miscalculation could mean catastrophe.

Second, cultural exchange helps to increase mutual understanding among peoples which may help to lower the voltage in a highly charged international atmosphere. Understanding does not always lower tension or ease hostility. A genuine understanding of what Hitler was up to 2 decades ago increased tension and hostility toward Nazi Germany on the part of the Western democracies. But where there is a will to conciliate differences, certainly exchange of students, educators and ideas will reinforce that will.

Third, cultural exchange presents an opportunity for the United States and other democratic countries to plant fresh ideas in the minds of other people. The sowing of an honest doubt about what the Communists have drummed into their people from childhood will not solve the Berlin crisis or end the cold war. But the seed may take root and bear fruit many years later when the political climate is more favorable. The honest doubt of today may help to make a Pasternak tomorrow.

In recent years some Americans, including some of our political leaders, have become timid about our great heritage. They seem to have forgotten that we believe in and live by certain great ideas which are still only dreams to the masses of mankind. I refer to our ideals of individual liberty, equality under the law, and the right of a people to choose freely its political leaders. These are good ideas. These are contagious ideas. These are ideas with a universal appeal.

The Moscow fair will surely, if quietly, release ideas and doubts which can and may alter the Soviet system.

For these three reasons, Mr. President, I support cultural exchange with other countries and especially with countries that appear to be hostile to us.

But I support cultural exchange with my eyes open and without illusion. We must realize the limitations of exchange programs. Expecting the impossible from any program or any instrument of foreign policy is like buying a one-way ticket to disillusionment.

Cultural understanding alone will not dissipate the profound political differences which divide the United States from the Soviet Union. Person-to-person understanding between Russians and Americans has little immediate impact upon a Soviet Government unresponsive either to the will of its own people or to opinion in the world—but does have long-range, long-term possibilities.

Our Moscow Fair will not convince the leaders in the Kremlin to fulfill their promises of free elections in Germany or the Eastern states or let up on the screws on Berlin. The cold war is not the result of inadvertent misunderstanding between the peoples of Russia and America. The cold war was launched and is sustained by the aggressive ambitions of Soviet communism and its leaders.

Most Americans understand what I am saying. There is little danger that they expect the Bolshoi Ballet in New York or Van Cliburn in Moscow to bridge the yawning political and moral gulf between the U.S.A. and the U.S.S.R.

Yet a minimal level of mutual trust and understanding is a necessary foundation for diplomatic negotiation and bargaining. Person-to-person exchanges help to create such understanding and trust. Exchange helps to throw into clearer perspective the real issues that divide us. A clearer understanding of the problems we confront is a basic prerequisite to grappling with them effectively.

The Moscow Fair is an investment in the future. Like all investments, it involves risks. But the risks of exhibiting a "corner of America" in the heart of the Communist empire are far outweighed by the risks of not availing ourselves of this unique opportunity.

In conclusion, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be inserted at the end of my remarks an article entitled "The American National Exhibition in Moscow," written by Norman K. Winston, who is President Eisenhower's coordinator for the American exhibition in Moscow. This article appeared in the June 1959 Jet Age Airlanes.

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

THE AMERICAN NATIONAL EXHIBITION IN MOSCOW

(By Norman K. Winston)

One mile and a half from the heart of downtown Moscow, beautiful Sokolniki Park is the setting for an amazing event. On July 25, Vice President NIXON will open a 6-week American National Exhibition to the Russian people who eagerly await a glimpse of the wonders and curiosities of our American way of life.

This is not a trade fair. Nothing will be sold. It will emphasize all aspects of American life, and is part of the Lacy-Zaroubin cultural exchange agreement between Russia and the United States. It is an exhibition with a freshness and originality that many Americans would clamor to see.

When Mikoyan, the Soviet's No. 2 man, visited our country last winter he was fascinated by our vending machines which dispense cigarettes, coffee, candy and other foods, and the fact that they were accessible to working people on the job. Plastic dishes caught his attention as substitutes for the heavy clay dishes used by the Russian housewife; so did our lightweight furniture which would be practical in the small rooms of Russia's overcrowded apartments.

The Russian people will see these things for themselves at the Moscow exhibition. They'll see our packaged foods, stacked on shelves where the customer helps himself, collects them in a shopping cart, checks out. These are strange ways to the people of Russia who carry their purchases in paper sacks or newspapers.

They will see American refrigerators, dishwashers, and garbage disposals, brooms, wheelbarrows, fire extinguishers, and the latest do-it-yourself tools. Also automobiles, tractors farm equipment, and the newest in building materials.

They will see American motion pictures, color TV, travelogues, and much more.

The main information and educational center is located in the great geodesic dome building, its aluminum roof tinted a gleaming gold. In it is a section of the famous Palomar Observatory Sky Survey, above the space section where maps, models of high altitude research aircraft, and fantasies of a future world will leave many wondering.

Education, science, and research, art, travel, recreation, and country life—these are the display categories of the exhibition.

There will be a special exhibit devoted to architecture. Perhaps the most meaningful of all the exhibits will be the magnificent collection of 503 photographs assembled in 1955 by Edward Steichen for the Museum of Modern Art and known as "the Family of Man."

Its theme is the oneness of mankind throughout the world. Copies of the photographic collection have been circulated in 28 countries by the U.S. Information Service and have been seen by nearly 4 million people. Its acclaim in those nations has been overwhelming, signifying a deeply felt faith that "if men can only understand each other, they will neither idolize or hate." Steichen will attend the national exhibition in person. In the same spirit of oneness exemplified by "The Family of Man," Carl Sandburg will be present to read his powerful poem, "The People, Yes."

Back in March of this year, Russian laborers with pneumatic drills were cutting deep into the still-frozen ground in Sokolniki Park to lay the foundation of the major buildings. Hundreds of tons of steel, aluminum and construction equipment were carried across the Atlantic by ship to Helsinki, Finland, and then transported by rail to Moscow.

Sokolniki Park, once the hunting ground of the Russian Tzars, devoted to falconry, is a thickly wooded 1,500 acre recreational area. It is a 15-minute ride from the Kremlin by subway, bus, and trolley.

Three to four million people are expected to attend the exhibition. Not all will be Russians. All visitors are welcome. The first step for an American who wishes to go is to obtain a visa application for prepaid days from a Soviet appointed travel agency in this country. Thirty dollars a day is the established price for de luxe travel. It covers food, board, all expenses, and a car with chauffeur for 3 hours. Group tours are scaled to $20 a day, and $10 a day. Cameras may be taken, and the round trip cost by plane from New York is only $750.

Hotel accommodations and the food are generally good. The coffee is not. Moscow's summer climate is about like ours in New England and the Central States.

Weather, because it emphasizes the variety of climates natural to this country, is the theme for the fashion show at the exhibition in which glamorous American models will appear on the runway three times daily for 6 weeks. Just what the American girl wears, where and when, will be demonstrated by contrasts such as shorts on the girl in Florida while her sister in snow-covered Vermont wears galoshes. And the apparel display will include men's, women's, and children's everyday and work clothes as well, modeled by American families.

To ease the language barrier our Government selected 75 young men and women from over 600 applicants to serve as guides. Each speaks fluent Russian, has a knowledge of Soviet affairs, and knows the United States and its Government.

American supervisors will be in charge of youngsters in the children's playground, an area which promises to be a revelation with its modern climbing apparatus, circular slide, magic carpet. Stereophonic high-fidelity music has been piped to it from the glass-steel-aluminum main exhibition hall.

In music, the arts, and literature, there will be the New York Philharmonic Symphony under Leonard Bernstein, paintings and sculpture selected by a jury of distinguished art experts, a library of some 7,000 American books, magazines, and newspapers from all the States.

The American National Exhibition has been made possible by the cooperation of the United States and Soviet Governments and the participation of more than 500 private business companies. Its counterpart is the Soviet exchange-show opening June 30 at the Coliseum in New York.

If the good will behind the scenes in setting up these two shows is an index this experiment in exchange exhibitions may prove one of the most worthwhile events in history in furthering good will and understanding among nations.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, we are all deeply indebted to Mr. Norman K. Winston for his fine work and service in the field of cultural exchange. It has been my privilege to have known Mr. Winston for several years. I recall last year his excellent work in the UNESCO meeting in Paris as one of our representatives.

I also wish to pay my respects to Mr. Harold McClellan, who is administrator of the trade fair and cultural exhibition program. He has done a fine job in developing the Moscow exhibition.

We owe much to the many business firms and industrial establishments, as well as the private groups, that have cooperated so wholeheartedly.

We are indeed indebted to the homebuilding industry and to those in the fields of arts and sciences for their contributions. The U.S. Information Agency likewise has proven itself to be a very competent and sensitive agency in this particular exhibition.

Then too, a word of praise is due the workers who put up the buildings and facilities. Actually, as we know, the buildings and facilities were in the main constructed by the Soviet workers in the Soviet Union. They did a good job, and the Government of the Soviet Union went out of its way to see to it that the exhibition facilities were made available on schedule and in the exact proportions, dimensions, and designs that our Government and its officials had laid down.

Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that there be inserted in the RECORD an article which I wrote which appeared in the July 1959 Film Media entitled "Foreign Policy and the Business-Sponsored Film." This brief article elaborates my views as expressed in the address I have just made on creating an honest picture or image of America abroad.

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

FOREIGN POLICY AND THE BUSINESS-SPONSORED FILM

(By Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, member, Senate Committee on Foreign Relations)

Unquestionably, the impact of photography, and especially motion picture photography, on an audience of non-Americans can be very great. If the printed word carries conviction, how much more so can a recognizably authentic and sincere motion picture that transcends language barriers.

Regrettably, foreign audiences have been frequently exposed to a type of theatrical film which tended not to reflect American society, but to distort it. There is really no way of telling how distorted the image of America has become because of films which in no sense reflected the heart or even the appearance of the America we know.

I do not believe that we should approach decisions in American foreign policy by asking only "what do the other people want to know about us?"

Rather, would it not be better to begin with the premise that we are what we are, and the truth—all the truth—is what we should tell other peoples. Reality is very persuasive. It is extremely difficult to refute, and a patently sincere and truthful statement in word or in picture has an effect far greater, I am convinced, than a consciously distorted propaganda statement—no matter how well-intentioned it may be.

What I am saying is that I do not really feel we need to sell our country in the same way that we sell a commercial product. In fact, I think it can be a self-defeating effort. It is not a precise analogy to say that we can sell the democratic way of life and a free society, as we can sell cigarettes, soap, or automobiles.

I would prefer to see America presented, as Lincoln asked his photographer to present him, "with warts and all."

And is it not true that the most dramatic story one can tell is the triumph over obstacles, the surmounting of difficulties, the conquering of evil? America in ferment—this is the real story we can tell.

To tell this story most accurately and effectively, we must turn to film—to film which truly documents, truly reflects our life and society. Of course, one cannot escape the point of view of the creator of the film, the perspective from which he views life and society; and indeed no effective creative work can be developed without the imprint of the creative mind. But the film must at the least sincerely try to portray reality, if it is to have any usefulness at all in the effort to present American life and culture to other peoples.

The truth of the matter is that people want to know everything about America—not just how many automobiles we can produce or how many telephones or televisions we have or how many schools or hospitals or highway miles we have built. We are more than a collection of production figures. Perhaps what the peoples who know least about America and democratic society need to know is what America can teach them to help them lift themselves from their age-old stagnation, poverty, illiteracy, disease, and hunger—and most important, to accomplish this without subordinating the human spirit. I think they need to see that America has been built by people who are not so very different from themselves, that a functioning productive free society can be built by men and women who are not giants or gods or supermen or geniuses, but just men and women working together, free of artificial barriers, caste systems, and dictatorial parties.

America is not just skyscrapers and automobiles and jet aircraft, as the too-frequently-seen version of America-on-film would allow us to be portrayed. People in the developing countries in the world need to know that there is an America struggling yet to overcome its difficulties and handicaps, striving to improve itself, working to conquer not only poverty but also tyranny.

THE TRUTH CAN'T HURT US

This is the kind of America that we are, and when this is truthfully said and truthfully presented, no amount of propaganda can thereafter seriously distort the image in the minds of the non-Americans who have seen it. Rather, it is when we exaggerate and distort our own society's picture, when we present a one-sided, glossed-over version of America, that we open ourselves up to the pinpricks of the opposition. Exaggeration and hyperbole invite ridicule and humiliation.

We must not pretend to be more, nor should we be content to be presented as less, than we are.

I frankly feel there is far more that the U.S. Government should be doing in forthright documentary film production to carry out this idea.

But I also believe there is a real and vital role to be played by the business-sponsored film. In fact, such film is playing a role, willy-nilly, in foreign policy, simply because it is being shown overseas in increasing numbers and quantities. It is like our tourist traffic abroad—whether we applaud it or deplore it, the American tourist carries abroad with him an image of America that cannot be erased. If he is a good and sensible American, the cause of American foreign policy is advanced. If he is not, of course we suffer another small defeat. Similarly, the American business film goes out as an unofficial "ambassador" from our country.

I would earnestly hope that all such business-sponsored films would be the product of a very great effort to be serious and truthful. The primary job of such films, of course, is to sell a product. But there is much that goes into a film which has peripheral effects. The attitudes of the people in the film, the kind of environment portrayed in the film—these are inescapably impact-producing factors.

I should like to suggest several areas into which I feel business-sponsored films might wish to venture, beyond the point of simply producing selling films. More people, I dare say, know the sponsor of "Louisiana Story" than the sponsor of any single business-sponsored film. Of course, it was a work of genius and it was very expensive. But it was very good for Standard Oil, and it was a wonderful story of one part of America that every human being could understand.

Not every firm can afford to produce a "Louisiana Story," nor can every firm find a Robert Flaherty. But there are many firms who could afford it; many more could afford a less expensive documentary. And there are many men and women in the film business in America who can produce good, sincere, artistic, and even gifted films.

Some of the gaps which seem to exist in the coverage of American life might well be filled in part by the intelligent design and production of business-sponsored films.

One such gap is in the role of business, and particularly smaller business, in the noneconomic life of a community—the intimate day-by-day participation of businessmen in community planning, in charitable works, in the provision of facilities for voluntary organizations. This is a very real area of productive activity which, if understood overseas, could do much to destroy the stereotype of the "money obsessed" American businessman. Another area which could more adequately be dealt with, I think, would be the picturization of the various types of occupation in America—everything from the work of a hod carrier on a construction project to the more esoteric occupations such as glass-blowing and electronics manufacturing. Such films could not only portray the detail of the work, but also some of the character of the American worker and his family.

Broader areas which might be dealt with in film are in the problems which are being overcome in America — slum clearance through urban redevelopment and rural modernization; the succeeding effort to break down racial discrimination in employment; the struggle with transportation bottlenecks; the countrywide efforts to develop greater voter consciousness, to "get out the vote"; the manyfold struggle against juvenile delinquency; the effort to prepare for the future economic and recreational needs of our expanding population through conservation measures and the development of our national and State parks and forests.

These are just a few areas in which business films could help to portray an America struggling with its own problems—an America whose constructive efforts to aid the rest of the world can then be seen in their true perspective—not the condescending aid of a super-society, but the open-hearted and courageous assistance from a nation that with its own many difficulties, refuses to turn its back on a world in even greater distress.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, a large number of Americans will be visiting the exhibit in Moscow. It gives us an opportunity, such as we have never had before, to learn more about the Soviet Union and to let the people of the Soviet Union see Americans as we are.

I hope our fellow Americans will speak to the Soviet citizens honestly and kindly, but at the same time with a sense of pride as to our institutions and the things for which we stand. There is some longtime benefit here, if we but capitalize on it; and not longtime benefits only for us, but for all mankind. The peace of the world today depends on the ability and the capacity of the United States to guide a course which, on the one hand, is not appeasement but which, on the other hand, is not belligerent or arrogant. We need statesmanship which is based upon the most careful application of skillful diplomacy. Yes, diplomacy in depth, in terms of people-to-people, person-to-person type of contact and the cultural exchanges which we see so well exhibited in the fairs in the Coliseum exhibition in New York, and the other exhibition at Moscow.

BURNS CREEK PROJECT, IDAHO

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HART in the chair). The hour of 2 o'clock has arrived; and the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 281) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain a reregulating reservoir and other works at the Burns Creek site in the upper Snake River Valley, Idaho, and for other purposes.

THE CALENDAR

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of measures on the calendar to which there is no objection, starting with Order No. 471, House bill 1219.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Moss in the chair). Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request? The Chair hears none, and the clerk will proceed to call the calendar, beginning with Order No. 471.

AMENDMENT OF INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1954

The bill (H.R. 1219) to amend section 2038 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to revocable transfers) was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ESTATE TAX DEDUCTION FOR CHARITABLE TRANSFERS SUBJECT TO FOREIGN DEATH TAXES

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H.R. 137) to allow a deduction, for Federal estate tax purposes, in the case of certain transfers to charities which are subjected to foreign death taxes, which had been reported from the Committee on Finance, with an amendment, on page 5, line 12, after the word "dying", to strike out "after the date of the enactment of this act" and insert "on or after July 1, 1955."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF JOINT COMMITTEE PRINT ENTITLED "FEDERAL TAX POLICY FOR ECONOMIC GROWTH AND STABILITY"

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 46) authorizing the printing of additional copies of the joint committee print entitled "Federal Tax Policy for Economic Growth and Stability" was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed for the use of the Joint Economic Committee one thousand additional copies of the joint committee print entitled "Federal Tax Policy for Economic Growth and Stability".

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF HEARINGS ON AUTOMATION AND TECHNOLOGICAL CHANGES

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 47) authorizing the printing of additional copies of the hearings on automation and technological changes was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed for the use of the Joint Economic Committee one thousand additional copies of the hearings on automation and technological change held by that committee during the Eighty-fourth Congress.

BILLS PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 1845) to amend title 35 of the United States Code relating to patents was announced as next in order.

Mr. BARTLETT. Over, by request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (H.R. 4538) authorizing El Paso County, Texas, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Rio Grande at or near the city of El Paso, Tex., was announced as next in order.

Mr. BARTLETT. I ask that the bill be passed over. It will be called up by motion later.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

ALLOTMENT OF FUNDS UNDER THE FEDERAL AIRPORT ACT FOR THE STATE OF ALASKA

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2208) to provide equal treatment for the State of Alaska as for other States of the Union with respect to the allotment of funds under the Federal Airport Act, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That paragraph (2) of section 6(b) of the Federal Airport Act (69 Stat. 442, 49 U.S.C. 1105) is amended to read as follows:

"(2) Such discretionary fund shall be available for such approved projects in the several States, Alaska, and Hawaii as the Administrator may deem most appropriate for carrying out the national airport plan, regardless of the location of such projects. The Administrator shall give consideration, in determining the projects for which such fund is to be so used, to the existing airport facilities in the several States, Alaska, and Hawaii, and to the need for or lack of development of airport facilities in the several States, Alaska, and Hawaii."

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, passage of S. 2208 by the Senate is a step in the direction of treating Alaska on the same basis with the other States in respect to the Federal airport program. S. 2208 provides that Alaska will be eligible to receive money for airport improvement from the discretionary fund distributed by the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency.

S. 1, the 2-year extension of the Federal Airport Act which was signed into law on June 29, 1959, had the unfortunate effect of continuing to treat the State of Alaska as a Territory. When the President signed S. 1, he noted this defect and called for its prompt correction.

Because of the controversy surrounding the Airport Act extension, my colleague [Mr. GRUENING] and I did not attempt to amend that legislation after the conference report reached the Senate floor. Instead, we later introduced amendatory legislation which was designed to allow Alaska to share in the funds apportioned to the States on the basis of land area and population.

Subsequent calculations made it apparent, however, that the $63 million a year program would have to be increased by approximately $11 million in order for Alaska to be included without reducing the apportionment to any other States. The administration announced its opposition to any additional expenditure for the airport program.

The Senators from Alaska and the FAA Administrators then agreed that making Alaska eligible to receive money to meet its urgent needs from the discretionary fund would be the best temporary solution.

Mr. President, if S. 2208 is passed by the other body and becomes law, I hope that the FAA will do all that it can to insure that adequate sums of money from the discretionary fund are made available to Alaska. If this is done, the State can undertake the runway extensions urgently needed to bring the Anchorage and Fairbanks international airports up to date with the jet age.

It should be pointed out that Alaska will be required to match any discretionary funds granted to it on the same basis as other public land States—37½ percent State money, 62½ percent Federal money. However, Alaska will continue to match its flat $1,350,000 annual grant on the same basis it did as a Territory—25 percent State money to 75 percent Federal money.

Finally, Mr. President, I wish to emphasize that this is nothing more than a temporary arrangement to give Alaska some measure of equity. When a comprehensive revision of the Federal Airport Act is undertaken in the future, Alaska must be treated on the same basis as the other States.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, the bill which is now under consideration is one which will, in some measure, provide more equitable treatment for the two new States of the Union with respect to the allocation of Federal funds for the improvement of airports. There can be no question as to the need for this legislation.

As the Federal Airport Act is now written, Alaska is denied any chance of receiving Federal airport aid funds which are available to the Federal Aviation Administrator for discretionary allocation to the States for priority projects for which funds are not allocated under other procedures provided by the act. As the Members of the Senate are aware, the discretionary fund which the Administrator may allocate represents 25 percent of the funds authorized for airport grants under the Federal Airport Act.

The State of Alaska had special reasons for disappointment that the recent extension of the Airport Act did not provide for a greater measure of Federal assistance to the States. It was abundantly clear that to avoid a Presidential veto, the bill had to be passed in a drastically reduced form as compared with the excellent bill passed earlier in this session by the Senate. Hence the decision merely to extend the existing act for 2 years. As enacted, Public Law 72 merely extends, for Alaska, the same provisions relating to airport assistance which applied during our Territorial status. The effect of this is to provide, for our State, the amount of $1,350,000 per annum for the next 2 years.

In view of the fact that Alaska uses air transportation to a greater extent than does any other State, it is exceptionally difficult to explain the circumstance that it does not share in airport improvement funds allocated by the Federal Government on the same basis as the other States.

The funds to which our State is entitled under Public Law 72 are far less than those we would have received under any of the other proposals for extension of the Federal Airport Act which were considered at this session of Congress prior to passage of the present law.

These funds are less than the amount which the administration anticipated that Alaska would receive when it recommended transitional grants for the new State which were included in the Alaska Omnibus Act, which was enacted just prior to passage of the Airport Act.

The funds to which Alaska is now entitled are far less than the amounts which are immediately needed to make necessary improvements for the airports at Anchorage and Fairbanks and to improve the safety of other airports which will be transferred to the State under provisions of the Omnibus Act.

It would seem that simple justice requires that Alaska, and Hawaii, too, at least be authorized to share in the discretionary fund of the Federal Aviation Administrator. I believe that the importance of Alaska's airports is such that its priority for funds will certainly be recognized by the Administrator in making allocations from the discretionary fund. In any case, I feel Alaska should be given every chance to share in this fund.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended, so as to read: "A bill to provide that Alaska and Hawaii be eligible for participation in the distribution of discretionary funds under section 6(b) of the Federal Airport Act."

HOSPITAL AND MEDICAL CARE FOR VETERANS RESIDING ABROAD

The bill (S. 1694) to extend the existing authority to provide hospital and medical care for veterans who are U.S. citizens temporarily residing abroad to include those with peacetime service-incurred disabilities was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 624(b) of title 38, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(b) The Administrator may furnish necessary hospital care and medical services to any otherwise eligible veteran for any service-connected disability if the veteran (1) is a citizen of the United States temporarily sojourning or residing abroad, or (2) is in the Republic of the Philippines."

CLARIFICATION OF MEANING OF THE TERM "CHANGE OF PROGRAM OF EDUCATION OR TRAINING"

The bill (S. 906) to amend section 1622 of title 38 of the United States Code in order to clarify the meaning of the term "change of program of education or training" as used in such section was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 1622 of title 38 of the United States Code is amended by adding at the end of such section the following new subsection:

"(c) As used in this section the term 'change of program of education or training' shall not be deemed to include a change from the pursuit of one program to pursuit of another where the first program is prerequisite to, or generally required for, entrance into pursuit of the second."

CONVEYANCE OF LANDS IN THE STATE OF IOWA

The bill (S. 1453) to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to sell and convey lands in the State of Iowa to the city of Keosauqua, was announced as next in order.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, S. 1453 authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to sell and convey approximately an acre of land to the city of Keosauqua, Iowa, at its fair market value.

The city of Keosauqua desires the tract to enlarge its sewage plant and city park. The Secretary of Agriculture states that the land in question is excess to the needs of the Department.

Mr. President, I have no objection, because the bill conforms to the Morse formula.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to sell and convey to the city of Keosauqua, Iowa, by quitclaim deed, at the fair market value as determined by him, and subject to all outstanding rights, all the right, title and interest of the United States in and to that certain tract of land containing ninety-nine and fifty-seven one-hundredths acres, more or less, located in Van Buren County, Iowa, in and adjacent to the city of Keosauqua, conveyed to the United States by the Grand

Lodge of the Ancient Order of United Workmen of North Dakota by deed dated December 10, 1936, and recorded in Van Buren County in book 78 on page 303.

EXTENSION OF AGRICULTURAL TRADE DEVELOPMENT AND ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1954—BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 1748) to extend the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, I ask that the bill go over, since it is not properly calendar business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN LANDS TO THE BETHEL BAPTIST CHURCH OF HENDERSON, TENN.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 669) to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to convey certain lands to the Bethel Baptist Church of Henderson, Tenn., which had been reported from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry with an amendment, on page 1, line 3, after the roman numerals "III", to insert "and title IV", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) notwithstanding the provisions of title III and title IV of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized and directed to convey to the Bethel Baptist Church, Henderson, Tennessee, by quitclaim deed all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to any parcel of land, not to exceed six-tenths of an acre, which may hereafter be conveyed, without consideration, to the United States by the State of Tennessee from lands located in the Chickasaw State Park, Tennessee, and which were previously conveyed by the United States to the State of Tennessee under the provisions of title III of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act.

(b) The conveyance herein authorized to be made by the Secretary shall be conditional upon payment to the United States for the land conveyed of an amount equal to the fair market value of such land as determined by the Secretary; and such conveyance shall be made without reversionary rights in the United States.

SEC. 2. In the event the State of Tennessee fails, within one year after the date of enactment of this Act, to convey a parcel of land to the United States for reconveyance to the Bethel Baptist Church as provided in the first section of this Act, the authority granted by this Act shall terminate and be of no further force or effect.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, S. 669 authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to sell approximately an acre of land to the Bethel Baptist Church in Henderson, Tenn., at the fair market value.

The small tract of land is a part of the former Chickasaw Forest land utilization project conveyed to the State of Tennessee by the Federal Government for public park purposes. The conveyance contained a provision that the land was to be used for public purposes or revert to the United States.

The Baptist Church has expressed an interest in acquiring the parcel in question for a church pastorium. The State indicates a willingness to make the parcel available to the church by declaring the parcel surplus to its needs. It will reconvey to the United States if the Federal Government will agree to convey the property to the church at the fair market value.

In view of the fact that fair market value would be paid for the land, the bill does not violate the Morse formula.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PREVENTION OF WATERFOWL DEPREDATIONS

The bill (S. 2133) to amend the act of July 3, 1956 (70 Stat. 492), entitled "An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to cooperate with Federal and non-Federal agencies in the prevention of waterfowl depredations, and for other purposes," was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Act of July 3, 1956 (70 Stat. 492), entitled "An Act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to cooperate with Federal and non-Federal agencies in the prevention of waterfowl depredations, and for other purposes," is amended by repealing and deleting therefrom section 5.

Mr. MANSFIELD subsequently said: Mr. President, the Senate, during the call of the calendar today, passed Senate bill 2133, amending an act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to cooperate with Federal and non-Federal agencies in the prevention of waterfowl depredations, and for other purposes.

It appears that a companion House bill, H.R. 7631, is in the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, which reported the Senate bill. The bills are identical. In order to expedite the enactment of the legislation, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry be discharged from the consideration of H.R. 7631, and that the Senate immediately proceed to consider the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana that the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry be discharged from the consideration of H.R. 7631? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The clerk will state the House bill by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 7631) to amend the act of July 3, 1956 (70 Stat. 492), entitled "An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to cooperate with Federal and non-Federal agencies in the prevention of waterfowl depredations, and for other purposes."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

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

The bill was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which H.R. 7631 was passed be reconsidered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the vote by which Senate bill 2133 was passed be reconsidered, and that the bill be indefinitely postponed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the vote by which the Senate bill 2133 was passed is reconsidered; and the Senate bill is indefinitely postponed.

CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN INTERESTS IN LANDS COVERED BY PUBLIC LAW 237, 84TH CONGRESS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1110) to amend the act of August 4, 1955 (Public Law 237, 84th Congress), to provide for conveyance of certain interests in the lands covered by such act which had been reported from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, with amendments, on page 1, line 9, after the word "Congress", to strike out "60" and insert "69"; on page 2, after line 2, to strike out:

SEC. 3. (a) Upon application made within the ten-year period which begins on the date of enactment of the Act, and, subject to subsection (c) of this section, all the undivided mineral interests of the United States in the lands which were conveyed by the two deeds described in the first section of this Act shall be conveyed to the Clemson Agricultural College of South Carolina by the Secretary of the Interior upon the payment of an amount equal to the fair market value of such interests, as determined by appraisal or otherwise.

(b) Upon application made within the ten-year period which begins on the date of enactment of this Act, and, subject to subsection (c) of this section, all the undivided mineral interests of the United States in any parcel or tract of land among the lands conveyed by the two deeds described in the first section of this Act may be conveyed to the Clemson Agricultural College of South Carolina by the Secretary of the Interior upon the payment of an amount equal to the fair market value of such interests, as determined by appraisal or otherwise.

And, in lieu thereof, to insert:

SEC. 3. (a) Upon application and subject to subsection (b) of this section, all the undivided mineral interests of the United States in any parcel or tract of land released pursuant to this Act from the said conditions as to such lands may be conveyed to the Clemson Agricultural College of South Carolina by the Secretary of the Interior upon the payment of an amount equal to the fair market value of such interests, as determined by appraisal or otherwise.

And, on page 3, at the beginning of line 6, to strike out "(c)" and insert "(b)", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Act entitled "An Act to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to release on behalf of the United States conditions in two deeds con-

veying certain submarginal lands to Clemson Agricultural College of South Carolina so as to permit such college, subject to certain conditions, to sell, lease, or otherwise dispose of such lands", approved August 4, 1955 (Public Law 237, Eighty-fourth Congress; 69 Stat. 496), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"SEC. 3. (a) Upon application and subject to subsection (b) of this section, all the undivided mineral interests of the United States in any parcel or tract of land released pursuant to this Act from the said conditions as to such lands may be conveyed to the Clemson Agricultural College of South Carolina by the Secretary of the Interior upon the payment of an amount equal to the fair market value of such interests, as determined by appraisal or otherwise.

"(b) This section shall not apply to the mineral interests of the United States in the seven thousand three hundred eighty and one-half acres of land taken by eminent domain in Civil Action 2446 in the United States District Court for the Western District of South Carolina."

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, S. 1110 authorizes the conveyance of reserved mineral interests in certain land in South Carolina to Clemson College at the fair market value.

The lands upon which the mineral rights were reserved were conveyed by the Federal Government to Clemson College in 1954 without consideration, with a public use requirement provision and a minerals right reservation. In 1955 Congress authorized the Secretary of Agriculture to release from the public use requirements 36.62 acres of the land previously conveyed.

S. 1110 provides for the sale of the mineral interests to the college on the 36.62 acreage at the fair market value. According to the committee report, Clemson College desires to acquire the reserved mineral interests so that it can convey these interests should it desire to exchange or sell a portion of the property. Any profits from the sale of the land would be used for the development and improvement of the remaining land or for the acquisition of more suitable property.

In view of the fact that fair market value would be paid for the mineral rights, the bill does not violate the Morse formula.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL CROP INSURANCE ACT

The bill (H.R. 306) to amend the Federal Crop Insurance Act was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. President, the bill just passed (H.R. 306), repeals the existing provision of law which prohibits Federal crop insurance being provided in a county unless 200 farms or one-third of the farms normally producing the commodity apply for such insurance. The provision which is repealed has prevented expansion or continuance of the program where it would have been to the best interest of farmers and the Corporation and is uneconomical, on occasion preventing expansion or continuation of the program in a county after considerable funds have been expended by the Corporation. The Department of Agriculture favors enactment of the bill.

BILLS PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 1282) relating to acreage allotments for durum wheat, was announced as next in order.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, may I ask that either the author of the bill or the chairman of the committee give us an explanation of the bill?

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, I ask that Calendar No. 524, S. 1282, be passed over, by request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Upon request of the Senator from Alaska, the bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 2014) to clarify and amend the Capper-Volstead Act—42 Stat. 388, 7 U.S.C. 291–292—and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. KEATING. Over, Mr. President.

Mr. BARTLETT. Over, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

INSTRUCTION AT U.S. MILITARY ACADEMY OF TWO CITIZENS OF THE KINGDOM OF THAILAND

The resolution (S.J. Res. 24) authorizing the Secretary of the Army to receive for instruction at the U.S. Military Academy at West Point two citizens and subjects of the Kingdom of Thailand was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Army is authorized to permit, within one year after the date of enactment of this joint resolution, two persons, citizens and subjects of the Kingdom of Thailand, to receive instruction at the United States Military Academy at West Point, New York; but the United States shall not be subject to any expense on account of such instruction.

SEC. 2. Except as may be otherwise determined by the Secretary of the Army such persons shall, as a condition to receiving instruction under the provisions of this joint resolution, agree to be subject to the same rules and regulations governing admission, attendance, discipline, resignation, discharge, dismissal, and graduation, as cadets at the United States Military Academy appointed from the United States; but they shall not be entitled to appointment to any office or position in the United States Army by reason of their graduation from the United States Military Academy.

SEC. 3. Nothing in this joint resolution shall be construed to subject such persons to the provisions of section 4346(d) and section 4348 of title 10 of the United States Code.

INSTRUCTION AT U.S. NAVAL ACADEMY OF TWO CITIZENS OF THE KINGDOM OF BELGIUM

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 106) authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to receive for instruction at the U.S. Naval Academy at Annapolis two citizens and subjects of the Kingdom of Belgium was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Navy is authorized to permit, within one year after date of enactment of this joint resolution, two persons, citizens and subjects of the Kingdom of Belgium, to receive instruction at the United States Naval Academy at Annapolis, Maryland; but the United States shall not be subject to any expense on account of such instruction.

SEC. 2. Except as may be otherwise determined by the Secretary of the Navy such persons shall, as a condition to receiving instruction under the provisions of this joint resolution, agree to be subject to the same rules and regulations governing admission, attendance, discipline, resignation, discharge, dismissal, and graduation, as cadets at the United States Naval Academy appointed from the United States; but they shall not be entitled to appointment to any office or position in the United States Navy by reason of their graduation from the United States Naval Academy.

SEC. 3. Nothing in this joint resolution shall be construed to subject such persons to the provisions of section 6959 of title 10 of the United States Code.

ACQUISITION AND TRANSFER OF CERTAIN REAL PROPERTY IN COUNTY OF SOLANO, CALIF.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H.R. 697) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to acquire certain real property in the county of Solano, Calif., to transfer certain real property to the county of Solano, Calif., and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Armed Services, with an amendment on page 6, line 4, after "130+", to strike out "8.26" and insert "78.26".

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN LAND TO THE CITY OF WARNER ROBINS, GA.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H.R. 5927) to authorize the conveyance to the city of Warner Robins, Ga., of about 29 acres of land comprising a part of Robins Air Force Base.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, H.R. 5927 authorizes the Secretary of the Air Force to convey to the city of Warner Robins, Ga., at fair market value, approximately 29 acres of land comprising a part of Robins Air Force Base, including the improvements thereon.

The land and improvements have been declared surplus to the needs of the Air Force and the enactment of the measure will not involve any expenditure of Federal funds.

The Department of Defense and the Bureau of the Budget state that they have no objection to the passage of the bill.

Inasmuch as the fair market value is to be paid, no violation of the Morse formula is involved.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MAINTENANCE OF A CERTAIN DEFENSE HOUSING FACILITY BY THE COAST GUARD AT YORKTOWN, VA.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2153) to authorize the Coast Guard to accept, operate, and maintain a certain defense housing facility at Yorktown, Va., and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, with amendments, on page 1, line 10, after "SEC. 2.", to strike out "Rents" and insert "Until June 30, 1960, rents"; on page 2, line 1, after the word "and", to strike out "maintaining the facility. The excess of amounts collected and not utilized in operating and maintaining the facility" and insert "maintaining the facility, after which date they", and in line 5, after the word "receipts", to strike out "The appropriation 'Operating expenses, Coast Guard'" and insert "Coast Guard appropriations"; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the United States Coast Guard is authorized to accept from the Department of the Navy, without reimbursement, the forty-two unit defense housing facility at Yorktown, Virginia, and to operate and maintain such facility on a rental basis for occupancy by Coast Guard personnel and their dependents pursuant to the provisions of the Act of July 2, 1945 (59 Stat. 316; 37 U.S.C. 111a).

SEC. 2. Until June 30, 1960, rents collected may be utilized in operating and maintaining the facility, after which date they shall be deposited in the Treasury to the credit of miscellaneous receipts. Coast Guard appropriations shall be available for the cost of operating and maintaining the housing facility.

SEC. 3. The administration of the housing facility by the Coast Guard shall, except as provided in section 2, be in conformity with the administration of similar housing projects by the other Armed Forces.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EXCHANGE OF MORTGAGES FOR GOVERNMENT BONDS—RESOLUTION PASSED OVER

The resolution (S. Res. 130) to express the sense of the Senate in an exchange of mortgages held by FNMA for Government bonds was announced as next in order.

Mr. KEATING. Over, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be passed over.

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE COMMISSIONED CORPS PERSONNEL ACT OF 1959

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2220) to strengthen the Commissioned Corps of the Public Health Service through revision and extension of some of the provisions relating to retirement, appointment of personnel, and other related personnel matters, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, with amendments, on page 2, line 4, after the word "has", to insert "had"; on page 5, line 23, after the word "active", to strike out "commissioned"; on page 6, line 21, after the word "services", to strike out the comma and "other than the Coast and Geodetic Survey"; in line 22, after the word "Health", to strike out "service" and insert "Service"; on page 7, line 8, after the word "services", to strike out the comma and "other than the Coast and Geodetic Survey"; on page 9, at the beginning of line 13, to strike out "corps" and insert "Corps"; in line 16, after the word "Regular", to strike out "corps" and insert "Corps"; and in line 21, after the word "Reserve", to strike out "corps" and insert "Corps", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Public Health Service Commissioned Corps Personnel Act of 1959."

LIMITATION ON APPOINTMENT AND CALL TO ACTIVE DOUTY OF OLDER COMMISSIONED OFFICERS

SEC. 2. Section 207(a) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 209(a)) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(3) No individual who has attained the age of forty-four shall be appointed to the Regular Corps, or called to active duty in the Reserve Corps for a period in excess of one year, unless (A) he has a number of years of active service (as defined in section 211 (d) equal to the number of years by which his age exceeds forty-four, or (B) the Surgeon General determines that he possesses exceptional qualifications, not readily available elsewhere in the Commissioned Corps of the Public Health Service, for the performance of special duties with the Service, or (C) in the case of an officer of the Reserve Corps, the Commissioned Corps of the Service has been declared by the President to be a military service."

ADDITIONAL ORIGINAL APPOINTMENTS ABOVE SENIOR ASSISTANT

SEC. 3. Section 207(b) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 209(b)) is amended by inserting "(1)" after "(b)" and by striking out the last sentence and inserting in lieu thereof the following new paragraphs:

"(2) In addition to the number of original appointments to the Regular Corps authorized by paragraph (1) to be made to grades above that of senior assistant, original appointments authorized to be made to the Regular Corps in any year may be made to grades above that of senior assistant, but not above that of director, in the case of any individual who—

"(A) (i) was on active duty in the Reserve Corps on July 1, 1959, (ii) was on such active duty continuously for not less than one year immediately prior to such date, and (iii) applies for appointment to the Regular Corps prior to July 1, 1961; or

"(B) does not come within clause (A) (i) and (ii) but was on active duty in the Reserve Corps continuously for not less than one year immediately prior to his appointment to the Regular Corps and has not served on active duty continuously for a period, occurring after June 30, 1959, of more than three and one-half years prior to applying for such appointment.

"(3) No person shall be appointed pursuant to this subsection unless he meets standards established in accordance with regulations of the President."

RETIREMENT OF COMMISSIONED OFFICERS OF THE REGULAR AND RESERVE CORPS

SEC. 4. Section 211 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 212) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 211. (a) (1) A commissioned officer of the Service shall be retired on the first day of the month following the month in which he attains the age of sixty-four years.

"(2) A commissioned officer of the Service may be retired by the Secretary, and shall be retired if he applies for retirement, on the first day of any month after completion of thirty years of active service.

"(3) Any commissioned officer of the Service who has had less than thirty years of active service may be retired by the Secretary, with or without application by the officer, on the first day of any month after completion of twenty or more years of active service of which not less than ten are years of active commissioned service in any of the uniformed services.

"(4) A commissioned officer retired pursuant to paragraph (1), (2), or (3) who was (in the case of an officer in the Reserve Corps) on active duty with the Service on the day preceding such retirement shall be entitled to receive retired pay at the rate of 2½ per centum of the basic pay of the highest grade held by him as such officer and in which, in the case of a temporary promotion to such grade, he has performed active duty for not less than six months, (A) for each year of active service, or (B) if it results in higher retired pay, for each of the following years:

"(i) his years of active service (determined without regard to subsection (d)) as a member of a uniformed service; plus

"(ii) in the case of a medical or dental officer, four years and, in the case of a medical officer, who has completed one year of medical internship or the equivalent thereof, one additional year, the four years and the one year to be reduced by the period of active service performed during such officer's attendance at medical school or dental school or during his medical internship;

except that (C) in the case of any officer whose retired pay, so computed, is less than 50 per centum of such basic pay, who retires pursuant to paragraph (1) of this subsection, who has not less than twelve whole years of active service (computed without the application of subsection (e)), and who does not use, for purposes of a retirement annuity under the Civil Service Retirement Act, any service which is also creditable in computing his retired pay from the Service, it shall, instead, be 50 per centum of such pay, and (D) the retired pay of an officer shall in no case be more than 75 per centum of such basic pay.

"(5) With the approval of the President, a commissioned officer whose service as Surgeon General, Deputy Surgeon General, or Assistant Surgeon General has totaled four years or more and who has had not less than twenty-five years of active service in the Service may retire voluntarily at any time; and his retired pay shall be at the rate of 75 per centum of the basic pay of the highest grade held by him as such officer.

"(b) For purposes of subsection (a), the basic pay of the highest grade to which a commissioned officer has received a temporary promotion means the basic pay to which he would be entitled if serving on active duty in such grade on the date of his retirement.

"(c) A commissioned officer, retired for reasons other than for failure of promotion to the senior grade, may (1) if an officer of the Regular Corps or an officer of the Reserve Corps entitled to retired pay under

subsection (a), be involuntarily recalled to active duty during such times as the Commissioned Corps constitutes a branch of the land or naval forces of the United States, and (2) if an officer of either the Regular or Reserve Corps, be recalled to active duty at any time with his consent.

"(d) The term 'active service', as used in subsection (a), includes:

"(1) all active service in any of the uniformed services;

"(2) active service with the Public Health Service, other than as a commissioned officer, which the Surgeon General determines is comparable to service performed by commissioned officers of the Service, except that, if there are more than five years of such service only the last five years thereof may be included; and

"(3) all active service (other than service included under the preceding provisions of this subsection) which is creditable for retirement purposes under laws governing the retirement of members of any of the uniformed services.

"(e) For the purpose of determining the number of years by which a percentage of the basic pay of an officer is to be multiplied in computing the amount of his retired pay pursuant to section 210(g)(3) or paragraph (4) of subsection (a) of this section, a part of a year of active service of six months or more shall be counted as a whole year and a part of a year of active service which is less than six months shall be disregarded.

"(f) For purposes of retirement or separation for physical disability under chapter 61 of title 10, United States Code, a commissioner officer of the Service shall be credited, in addition to the service described in section 1208(a)(2) of that title, with active service with the Public Health Service, other than as a commissioned officer, which the Surgeon General determines is comparable to service performed by commissioned officers of the Service, except that, if there are more than five years of such service, only the last five years thereof may be so credited. For such purposes, such section 1208(a)(2) shall be applicable to officers of the Regular or Reserve Corps of the Service."

MISCELLANEOUS AMENDMENTS TO THE PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE ACT

SEC. 5. (a) Section 2 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 201) is amended by striking out "and" at the end of subsection (n), striking out the period at the end of subsection (o) and inserting in lieu thereof "; and", and adding after such subsection (o) the following new subsection:

"(p) The term 'uniformed service' means the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Public Health Service, or Coast and Geodetic Survey."

(b) Section 208(b) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 210(b)) is amended to read as follows:

"(b) In accordance with regulations of the President, commissioned officers on active duty may make allotments from their pay. Such officers, and retired officers entitled to retired pay pursuant to section 210(g)(3), section 211, or section 221(a), shall be permitted to purchase supplies from the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps at the same price as is charged officers thereof."

(c) Section 210(g)(3) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 211(g)(3)) is amended by striking out "of his active duty pay at the time of retirement for each complete year" and inserting in lieu thereof "of the basic pay of the permanent grade held by him at the time of retirement for each year".

(d) Section 326(a) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 253(a)) is amended by striking out ", including those on shore duty and those on detached duty, whether on active duty or retired" in subparagraphs (1) and (2) and inserting in lieu thereof "on active duty, including those on shore duty and those on detached duty", by striking out "or when retired for disability" in subparagraph (1), and by striking out subparagraph (3) and inserting in lieu thereof:

"(3) commissioned officers of the Regular or Reserve Corps of the Public Health Service on active duty;".

COVERAGE UNDER CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT ACT

SEC. 6. (a) Except as provided in subsection (b), service as a commissioned officer in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service prior to July 1, 1959, shall be considered, for purposes of credit under the Civil Service Retirement Act, other than section 3(f) thereof, as civilian service performed by an employee (as defined in such Act), and commissioned officers of the Reserve Corps of the Public Health Service, subject to the Civil Service Retirement Act of June 30, 1959, shall be considered as voluntarily separated on that date, with respect to service as such officers, from civilian positions subject to such Act.

(b) If a commissioned officer of the Regular or Reserve Corps of the Public Health Service is retired after June 30, 1959, and becomes entitled to retired pay from the Public Health Service, all service in the Regular or Reserve Corps of the Public Health Service prior to July 1, 1959, together with any other service which is performed at any time with the Public Health Service, other than as a commissioned officer, and which is credited to the officer for purposes of such retirement, shall be considered as military service for purposes of section 3(b) of the Civil Service Retirement Act; except that, in the case of any such officer who is retired pursuant to subsection (a) of section 211 of the Public Health Service Act, any such service which was performed prior to July 1, 1959, which was subject to the Civil Service Retirement Act, and with respect to which he has not, prior to his retirement, received a refund of deductions under the Civil Service Retirement Act, shall not be considered as military service for purposes of such section 3(b), but only if he waives his right to have such service included for purposes of computing the amount of his retired pay from the Service.

(c) Section 1(r) of the Civil Service Retirement Act is amended by inserting after "Coast Guard of the United States," the phrase "or, after June 30, 1959, in the Regular Corps or Reserve Corps of the Public Health Service,".

ELECTION OF BENEFITS UNDER THE SOCIAL SECURITY ACT AND THE CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT ACT

SEC. 7. Section 215 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 415) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(h)(1) Notwithstanding the provisions of the Civil Service Retirement Act, remuneration paid for service to which the provisions of section 210(m)(1) of this Act are applicable and which is performed by an individual as a commissioned officer of the Reserve Corps of the Public Health Service prior to July 1, 1959, shall not be included in computing entitlement to or the amount of any monthly benefit under this title, on the basis of his wages and self-employment income, for any month after June 1959 and prior to the first month with respect to which the Civil Service Commission certifies to the Secretary that, by reason of a waiver filed as provided in paragraph (2), no further annuity will be paid to him, his wife, and his children, or, if he has died, to his widow and children, under the Civil Service Retirement Act on the basis of such service.

"(2) In the case of a monthly benefit for a month prior to that in which the individual, on whose wages and self-employment income such benefit is based, dies, the waiver must be filed by such individual; and such waiver shall be irrevocable and shall constitute a waiver on behalf of himself, his wife, and his children. If such individual did not file such a waiver before he died, then in the case of a benefit for the month in which he died or any month thereafter, such waiver must be filed by his widow, if any, and by or on behalf of all his children, if any; and such waivers shall be irrevocable. Such a waiver by a child shall be filed by his legal guardian or guardians, or, in the absence thereof, by the person (or persons) who has the child in his care."

EFFECTIVE DATES

SEC. 8. (a) The amendments made by sections 2 and 5(b) shall become effective July 1, 1959.

(b) The amendment made by section 4 shall become effective on the date of enactment of this Act in the case of commissioned officers of the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service, and on July 1, 1959, in the case of commissioned officers of the Reserve Corps of the Public Health Service.

(c) An officer in the Regular Corps on active duty on the date of enactment of this Act may be retired and have his retired pay computed under section 211 of the Public Health Service Act, as amended by this Act, or, if he so elects, under such section as in effect prior to the date of enactment of this Act.

(d) The limitation under subsection (f) of section 211 of the Public Health Service Act, as amended by this Act, on the amount of active service with the Public Health Service, other than as a commissioned officer, which may be counted for purposes of retirement or separation for physical disability, shall not apply in the case of any officer of the Reserve Corps of the Public Health Service on active duty on June 30, 1959.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

YOUTH CONSERVATION ACT OF 1959—BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 812) to authorize the establishment of a Youth Conservation Corps to provide healthful outdoor training and employment for young men and to advance the conservation, development, and management of national resources of timber, soil, and range, and of recreational areas, was announced as next in order.

Mr. KEATING. Over, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

REMOVAL OF ACREAGE LIMITATIONS IN RECREATION ACT OF 1926

The bill (S. 1436) to amend section 1 of the act of June 14, 1926, as amended by the act of June 4, 1954 (68 Stat. 173; 43 U.S.C. 869) was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That subsection (b) of section 1 of the Act of June 14, 1926, as amended by the Act of June 4, 1954 (68 Stat. 173, 174; 43 U.S.C. 869), is further amended to read as follows:

"(b) No more than six hundred and forty acres may be conveyed to any one grantee, other than a State, in any one calendar year: *Provided,* That no more than six hundred and forty acres may be conveyed to a State in any one calendar year for the benefit of

any one State program or of the program in any one State agency: *Provided further,* That there shall be no limitation as to the acreage which may be conveyed to a State or to a State park agency for public park purposes."

EXTENSION OF TIME IN WHICH BOSTON NATIONAL HISTORIC SITES COMMISSION SHALL COMPLETE ITS WORK

The bill (H.R. 4524) extending the time in which the Boston National Historic Sites Commission shall complete its work was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

USE OF GREAT LAKES VESSELS ON THE OCEANS—BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H.R. 4002) to authorize the use of Great Lakes vessels on the oceans, was announced as next in order.

Mr. KEATING. Over, by request, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

WONG GAR WAH

The bill (S. 1038) for the relief of Wong Gar Wah was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Wong Gar Wah shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

ISABEL M. MENZ

The bill (S. 1392) for the relief of Isabel M. Menz was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Isabel M. Menz, of Saint Paul, Minnesota, the sum of $717.95. The payment of such sum shall be in full satisfaction of all her claims against the United States for payment of certain money orders payable to Clifford J. Menz (deceased), which were issued during the period from March 15, 1916, through November 22, 1937, but which due to the illness of the said Clifford J. Menz, were not presented for payment within the period in which they could have been received by the Post Office Department: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary nowithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

MRS. PAULA DEML

The bill (S. 1627) for the relief of Mrs. Paula Deml was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Mrs. Paula Deml shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

JOSEF JAN LOUKOTKA

The bill (S. 1945) for the relief of Josef Jan Loukotka was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Josef Jan Loukotka shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

JULIA MYDLAK

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 464) for the relief of Julia Mydlak, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, on page 1, line 11, after the word "available", to insert a colon and *"Provided,* That a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the said Act.", so as to make the bill read.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Julia Mydlak shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available: *Provided,* That a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the said Act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

RACHEL BORENSTEIN

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1049) for the relief of Rachel Borenstein, which had been reported from the Committee in the Judicary with an amendment in line 7, after the word "Act", to insert a colon and *"Provided,* That a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the said Act: *And provided further,* That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice has knowledge prior to the enactment of this Act.", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, notwithstanding the provision of section 212(a) (4) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Rachel Borenstein may be issued a visa and admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that Act: *Provided,* That a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the said Act: *And provided further,* That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice has knowledge prior to the enactment of this Act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PAGE A. WILSON

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 36) for the relief of Page A. Wilson, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments, on page 1, line 5, after the word "of", where it appears the second time, to strike out "$3,128.03" and insert "$1,718.80"; in the same line, after the word "representing", to insert "the balance as of May 1, 1959,", and on page 2, line 6, after the name "Wilson", to strike out "the sum of any amounts received or withheld from him on account of the overpayments referred to in the first section of this Act" and insert "any sum or amounts received or withheld from him after May 1, 1959, on account of the overpayments referred to in the first section of this Act"; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Page A. Wilson, Major, U.S. Air Force, is hereby relieved of all liability for repayment to the United States of the sum of $1,718.80, representing the balance as of May 1, 1959, of overpayments of longevity pay paid to him as the result of his claiming membership in the Enlisted Reserve Corps of the Army for the period November 17, 1930, to September 8, 1933, which period was disallowed by the Air Force after the said Page A. Wilson had been paid on the basis of such period of over fourteen years, the said Page A. Wilson having believed such period had been verified a short time after it had been originally claimed by him.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise ap-

propriated, to the said Page A. Wilson, any sum or amounts received or withheld from him after May 1, 1959, on account of the overpayments referred to in the first section of this Act.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EXTENSION OF TIME FOR FILING CLAIMS UNDER THE WAR CLAIMS ACT OF 1948

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1650) to extend the period for filing claims under the War Claims Act of 1948, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment, at the beginning of line 6, to strike out "subsequent to August 31, 1955, and" and insert "by Edmund A. Hannay, of Clarksdale, Mississippi,", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, notwithstanding any time limitation contained in section 15 of the War Claims Act of 1948 (62 Stat. 1240), as amended, any claim for benefits under such section filed by Edmund A. Hannay, of Clarksdale, Mississippi, within one year after the date of the enactment of this Act shall be considered in accordance with the provisions of the War Claims Act of 1948.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended, so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Edmund A. Hannay."

JOSEPH B. KANE, JR.

The bill (H.R. 1631) for the relief of Joseph B. Kane, Jr., was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

DORMAN WILLIAM WHITTOM

The bill (H.R. 2846) for the relief of Dorman William Whittom was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ALBERT J. HICKS

The bill (H.R. 3117) for the relief of Albert J. Hicks was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

WILLIAM S. SCOTT

The bill (H.R. 3249) for the relief of William S. Scott was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SUITS AGAINST MILLER ACT PAYMENT BONDS

The bill (H.R. 4060) to eliminate all responsibility of the Government for fixing dates on which the period of limitation for filing suits against Miller Act payment bonds commences to run was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MAINTENANCE AND TRAVEL EXPENSES OF JUDGES

The Senate proceeded to consider the the bill (H.R. 2909) relating to the maintenance and travel expenses of judges, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the first paragraph of section 456 of title 28, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"Each Justice or judge of the United States and each retired Justice or judge recalled or designated and assigned to active duty, while attending court or transacting official business at a place other than his official station, shall, upon his certificate, be paid by the Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts all necessary traveling expenses, and also a per diem allowance in lieu of actual expenses of subsistence (as defined in the Travel Expense Act of 1949, as amended, 63 Stat. 166; 5 U.S.C. 835) at the per diem rate provided for by the Travel Expense Act of 1949, as amended, or, in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts with the approval of the Judicial Conference of the United States, reimbursement for his actual expenses of subsistence not in excess of the maximum amount fixed by the Travel Expense Act of 1949, as amended."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

ABRAHAM FYE

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H.R. 6714) for the relief of Abraham Fye, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That subsection (d) of section 16 of the War Claims Act of 1948 and section 105 of the War Claims Act amendments of 1954 are each hereby waived in favor of Abraham Fye, of Brooklyn, New York, and his claim for benefits under section 16 of the War Claims Act of 1948 is hereby authorized and directed to be acted upon under the remaining provisions of the War Claims Act of 1948, if he files claim for such benefits with the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission within the six-month period which begins on the date of enactment of this Act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

ROBERT N. ANTHONY

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H.R. 6717) for the relief of Robert N. Anthony, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mrs. Kathrene LeTang, of Baltimore, Maryland, the sum of $3,500. Such sum represents the amount of a judgment for which Specialist Fifth Class Robert N. Anthony, RA13407928, United States Army, was held liable to the said Mrs. Kathrene LeTang on January 30, 1959, in a civil action in the Circuit Court of Baltimore County, Maryland. This civil action was the result of an accident which occurred on the Baltimore-Washington Parkway, approximately eight miles south of Baltimore, Maryland, on January 9, 1956, and which involved a United States Army ambulance being driven by the said Robert N. Anthony, acting within the scope of his military duties in the interest of the Government. Such sum shall be paid only on the condition that the said Mrs. Kathrene LeTang shall execute and file a satisfaction of judgment in full in said court and cause: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered to Mrs. Kathrene LeTang in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

The title was amended, so as to read: "An Act for the relief of Mrs. Kathrene LeTang."

FILLING OF REFEREE VACANCIES

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H.R. 4340) to amend sections 43 and 34 of the Bankruptcy Act (11 U.S.C. 71, 62) to simplify the filling of referee vacancies, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments, on page 1, line 5, after the word "filled", to strike out "on the existing basis" and insert "without any changes in the salary or arrangements"; in line 9, after the word "the", to strike out "existing", and on page 2, line 4, after the word "amended", to insert "by striking the word 'senior' and inserting in the place thereof the word 'chief' and".

The amendments were agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

RELIEF OF CERTAIN ALIENS

The Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 354) for the relief of certain aliens, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments, on page 3, line 4, after the name "Wong", to insert "Sirijo Tanfara and Zee Yung Wong", and in line 11, after the word "by", to strike out "one" and insert "three."

The amendments were agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the joint resolution to be read a third time.

The joint resolution was read the third time and passed.

COMPENSATION FOR PERSONS INJURED BY EXPLOSION OF MUNITIONS TRUCK IN NORTH CAROLINA

The bill (H.R. 2594) for the relief of certain claimant against the United States who suffered personal injuries, property damage, or other loss as a result of the explosion of a munitions truck between Smithfield and Selma, N.C., on March 7, 1942, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SALLIE B. DICKENS

The bill (H.R. 6955) for the relief of Sallie B. Dickens was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H.R. 6596) to encourage and stimulate the production and conservation of coal in the United States through research and development by creating a Coal Research and Development Commission, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, over, by request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

AMENDMENT OF IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY ACT

The bill (H.R. 3088) to amend sections 353 and 354 of the Immigration and Nationality Act was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an explanation of the bill just passed.

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

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill is to amend certain provisions of the Immigration and Nationality Act which specify the exemptions from its provisions relating to the loss of U.S. citizenship by naturalized citizens.

STATEMENT

Under existing law an automatic loss of U.S. citizenship occurs in the case of a naturalized citizen who establishes residence abroad—

(1) For 3 years in a foreign state of which he was formerly a national or in which the place of his birth is situated; or

(2) For 5 years in any other foreign state or states.

There are several exemptions from this general rule, such as residence abroad for the purpose of maintaining certain specified types of employment or for the purpose of pursuing a full course of study or for other reasons specified in sections 353 and 354 of the Act.

One of the exemptions from both the 3- and 5-year rule applies to the spouse or child of an American citizen who is accompanying such citizen for the purpose of remaining with him while he has his residence abroad for reasons specified in the law. Section 1 of the bill will add to the exempted class the parent of a U.S. citizen residing abroad for such specified reasons.

Among persons exempted from the automatic loss of citizenship pursuant to the 5-year rule are veterans of the Spanish-American War, World War I, and World War II (and their spouses, children, and dependent parents). The American Legion has for several years advocated the inclusion among the exempted class of the honorably discharged veterans who served during the Korean conflict. A resolution petitioning Congress to provide for such change in the law was passed by the national convention of the American Legion in 1957 and readopted by the national executive committee of the American Legion on April 29, 1959. Section 2 of this bill is designed to achieve this purpose.

Naturalized citizens of the United States, regardless of their age, who have had continuous residence in the United States for 25 years subsequent to their naturalization, are exempted from loss of citizenship under the 5-year rule. No such exemption is provided if residence is established in the country of their birth or former nationality under the 3-year rule, unless they have attained 60 years of age when such foreign residence is established.

The steadily increasing activities of American citizens abroad justify the reduction of the 25-year residence requirement to 15 in the case of naturalized citizens subject to the 5-year rule.

Similarly, naturalized U.S. citizens who entered the United States in their early youth, prior to their sixth birthday, and thus spent their formative years in this country, should have all of their residence in the United States, prior to attaining 21 years of age, counted within that residential requirement which would exempt them from loss of U.S. citizenship. Section 3 of this bill provides for such an amendment, but limits its applicability to naturalized citizens who do not reside in the country of their birth or former nationality.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I feel that these are worthy steps in the further liberalization of our immigration laws.

JOINT RESOLUTION AND BILL PASSED OVER

The resolution (S.J. Res. 39) to amend the Constitution to authorize Governors to fill temporary vacancies in the House of Representatives, was announced as next in order.

Mr. KEATING. Over, Mr. President, as not properly calendar business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On request, the resolution will be passed over.

The bill (S. 2424) to amend the Communications Act of 1934 in order to provide that the equal-time provisions with respect to candidates for public office shall not apply to news and other similar programs, was announced as next in order.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, I ask that the bill go over, because it is not properly calendar business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On request, the bill will be passed over.

INSURANCE BENEFITS AND DISABILITY PAYMENTS TO SEAMEN

The bill (S. 2334) to transfer from the Department of Commerce to the Department of Labor certain functions in respect to insurance benefits and disability payments to seamen for World War II service-connected injuries, death, or disability, and for other purposes was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of Commerce shall certify to the Secretary of Labor amounts payable under crew life and injury and second seamen's war risk insurance policies issued under authority of subtitle "Insurance" of title II of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, extended, and supplemented (Act of June 29, 1940, section 222 (54 Stat. 689); Act of March 6, 1942 (56 Stat. 140); Act of April 11, 1942 (56 Stat. 214); Act of March 24, 1943, section 2 (57 Stat. 45); Act of September 30, 1944 (58 Stat. 758); Act of August 8, 1946 (60 Stat. 937)). Payments of such amounts so certified shall be made by the Secretary of Labor from the Employees' Compensation Fund established under the Federal Employees' Compensation Act of September 7, 1916, as amended (5 U.S.C. 751, 785).

SEC. 2. The powers, duties, and functions of the Secretary of Commerce in respect of permanent total or partial disability benefits (allowable upon exhaustion of insurance benefits referred to in section 1 hereof) under section 2(c) of the Act of March 24, 1943 (Public Law 17, Seventy-eighth Congress; 57 Stat. 45), as amended by the Act of September 30, 1944 (Public Law 449, Seventy-eighth Congress; 58 Stat. 758), are hereby transferred to the Secretary of Labor. Payments of such benefits, including costs and payments on account of medical care authorized by the Secretary of Labor, shall be made by him from the Employees' Compensation Fund as established under the Federal Employees' Compensation Act of September 7, 1916, as amended (5 U.S.C. 751, 785). The Secretary of Commerce shall furnish to the Secretary of Labor such information, data, and reports and certifications in respect of cases within the purview of this section as the Secretary of Labor may request. Nothing in this section shall be construed to authorize any appeal to, or review or redetermination by, the Secretary of Labor from any order, finding, determination, or adjudication in respect of eligibility for benefits made by the Secretary of Commerce in force on the effective date of this Act, except upon a showing to the satisfaction of the Secretary of Labor of a change in the nature and extent of the disability for which benefits were approved for payment in accordance with the provisions of such Act.

SEC. 3. The Secretary of Labor is authorized to make such rules and regulations as he may deem necessary or appropriate to carry out the provisions of this Act and the functions vested in him by this Act.

SEC. 4. This Act shall become effective as of July 1, 1959.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the call of the calendar be terminated with Calendar No. 561, Senate bill 2334, because reports are not available for the bills which follow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Alaska? The Chair hears none;

and, without objection, the call of the calendar will be terminated at this time.

BURNS CREEK PROJECT, IDAHO

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 281) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain a reregulating reservoir and other works at the Burns Creek site in the upper Snake River Valley, Idaho, and for other purposes.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, a little more than 2 years ago, when I took this floor on behalf of a bill to authorize the construction of Hells Canyon Dam, I expressed my sorrow that this worthy project had so bitterly divided the people of Idaho. "Would that my cause were not torn by controversy at home," I said, "so that I might feel strengthened in the knowledge that my advocacy enjoyed the undivided support and general approbation of my beloved State."

Today no such concern attends my effort. I speak for a project which enjoys the general approbation of my State. I am glad that this is so.

My distinguished senior colleague [Mr. DWORSHAK] and I sponsor the bill now before the Senate, S. 281, which would authorize the Burns Creek Dam and reregulating project. We were cosponsors of a similar bill which passed the Senate in the 85th Congress, but died in the other body.

This bill has been recommended by the administration, through the Department of the Interior and the Department of Agriculture, and it is approved by the Bureau of the Budget.

It is noteworthy that the Burns Creek Dam should draw support from such diverse sources. What manner of project is it to be so favored?

I. IRRIGATION AND RECLAMATION

The answer is that this is a genuine multipurpose project, notwithstanding the fact that, on its face, it would seem to be a power project.

In order to understand this properly, the physical characteristics of the upper Snake River area in Idaho must be described, and the history of reclamation in Idaho, reviewed. For the convenient reference of the Senate, I have had a map of the irrigated southern section of my State prepared and set up, and I will try also to speak the matter clearly for the RECORD.

The Burns Creek Dam is proposed at a stage of water resource development which has been reached after more than half a century of continuous growth and improvement in the facilities to control and use the water of the Snake River.

Irrigation development in Idaho's Upper Snake River Valley began about 1879, when the water was supplied to hay lands by simple diversions from the river. Irrigation development then progressed, and, by 1900, more than 300,000 acres of land were under irrigation. This rapid expansion continued during the first years of the present century. Most of the land irrigated from surface waters above Milner Dam, situated near the midline of southern Idaho, were under cultivation before 1920. The most significant change since then, as will be hereafter pointed out, has been the rapid recent expansion of areas irrigated by pumping, from underground water.

Until 1900, the Carey Act was the congressional vehicle for much of the irrigation development. It authorized homestead grants as an aid to reclamation. But these were purely individual and local cooperative irrigation projects.

The Carey of the Carey Act was Senator Joseph M. Carey, of Wyoming, one of the great names in Western reclamation. He and such other Senators after him as Francis G. Newlands, of Nevada, and Henry Clay Hansbrough, of North Dakota, had the wisdom to champion a program for reclamation that has made a mockery of Daniel Webster's contemptuous description of the West. It was Webster who said:

> What do we want with this vast worthless area—this region of savages and wild beasts, of deserts, of shifting sands and whirlwinds of dust, of cactus and prairie dogs? To what use could we ever hope to put these great deserts and these endless mountain ranges, impenetrable and covered to their base with eternal snow? What can we ever hope to do with the western coast, a coast of 3,000 miles, rockbound, cheerless, and uninviting, and not a harbor in it?

Mr. President, what we in Idaho have always wanted out of our section of "this region of savages and wild beasts" is only a livelihood so that we may be lucky enough to stay there.

Irrigated agriculture is the economic foundation of the Upper Snake River Basin. Cereals, forage crops, and cash row crops—potatoes, beans, and sugar beets—and various livestock enterprises characterize the economy. Ninety percent of the famed Idaho potatoes come from this area.

In 1950, 143,000 people lived there, with practically all of this population associated with the irrigated plain.

But the Carey Act and the Desert Land Entry Act and local efforts under them did not furnish an adequate answer to the challenge of the arid West. Large storage dams were needed.

Acrimony and constitutional arguments marked a decade of struggle for the Reclamation Act of 1902. This landmark legislation added to the law the concept that the Federal Government properly could provide for storage. In the words of Francis G. Newlands, then the Representative of Wyoming:

> It becomes necessary * * * in order to bring larger areas of land within cultivation, to resort to this system of storage, of establishing artificial reservoirs * * * and of constructing canals and ditches at great expense, covering large areas of land by a comprehensive plan.
>
> * * * * *
>
> The limit of reclamation and settlement has been reached unless the Federal Government, acting, as it can, without regard to State lines, makes a scientific study of each river and its tributaries and so stores the water as to prevent the torrential flow in the spring and to increase the scanty flow in the summer.

President Theodore Roosevelt, when he asked the Congress for the Reclamation Act of 1902, said:

> The reclamation and settlement of the arid lands will enrich every portion of our country * * *. The increased demand for manufactured articles will stimulate industrial production * * *. Indeed, the products of irrigation will be consumed chiefly in upbuilding local centers of mining and other industries, which would otherwise not come into existence.

By the time the Reclamation Act of 1902 was passed, as we have seen, the initial development of the greater part of the Upper Snake River Basin in Idaho, irrigated by gravity flow, had been completed. These lands did not have the benefit of storage. Consequently, in this area, the primary function of the Reclamation Act of 1902 has been to provide storage for supplemental water for 90 percent of the irrigated lands, rather than to open new lands.

The first big project under this act was the Minidoka. The first storage at Lake Walcott, behind Milner Dam, was completed in 1909. By 1927, eight other storage reservoirs had been added in the Upper Snake River Basin.

It was in 1927 that the huge, 1,700,000 acre-feet project at American Falls was completed. The gratification of the waterusers was boundless. Enough storage had been provided at American Falls, it was said, to assure adequate water for Minidoka project lands for all time to come.

But nature makes puny the works of man, and her inexorable ways are sometimes ironic. Only 3 years later, in 1930, a 5-year drought started which caused a crop loss which, in today's dollars, would pay more than half the cost of the Burns Creek Dam.

Palisades Reservoir was the answer to this further demonstration of the need for storage. Completed in 1957, Palisades increased the supply of stored water on the main stem of the Snake by 1,400,000 acre-feet, providing supplemental water for 650,000 acres of the land already irrigated, while furnishing a primary water supply to only 48,000 acres of new land.

Since Palisades stored supplemental water for land irrigated under water rights long established, it was necessary to allocate the water equitably. The various irrigation districts and individual users sought more water than Palisades could store, so the water users agreed to the inclusion in their Palisades contracts of a standard provision to guarantee that subsequently constructed storage should be treated as though it had identical priority with that in Palisades. Thus, even before Palisades had been completed, the need for added storage was recognized. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks one such subscription provision, extracted from a typical contract.

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

> If the United States, under the Federal reclamation laws, hereafter constructs storage facilities on the Snake River or its tributaries above Milner Dam in addition to those now constructed or authorized to be constructed to provide water for irrigation purposes, the district hereby agrees that, notwithstanding the establishment of a storage right for such additional facilities with a priority subsequent to that assigned to Palisades Dam and Reservoir, the United States may hereafter contract with water

users organizations which then have storage rights in Palisades Reservoir, to operate not to exceed 300,000 acre-feet of such capacity for the storage of water for irrigation for the benefit of such organizations as though that capacity had a storage right of identical priority with that held for Palisades Dam and Reservoir.[1]

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, the Burns Creek Dam which this bill would authorize would impound a 234,000 acre-foot reservoir. Of this, 100,000 acre-feet would be long-term irrigation storage. This storage, as we have seen, would be accorded equal priority rights to that contained in Palisades Reservoir.

This long-term holdover storage would provide insurance water to be used only during periods of extreme drought, and would be paid for by the water users on the same terms as Palisades storage.

Because Burns Creek insurance water might be needed only two or three times in a 50-year period, it does not follow that the dam confers only "a minor irrigation benefit." The water users of Idaho understand the fallacy of this argument. They know that insurance water is not unlike fire insurance on a building—the policy is justified even though a fire is a rare occurrence.

The waterusers know the ways of the river. They know that they will collect on the "Burns Creek policy." It is only a question of time. When they collect, they know that the margin of water supplied by Burns Creek Dam may well represent the difference between a crop, and no crop. This is why they urgently recommend the project.

The latest action of the irrigators was last month, when the managing group of the water users, the Committee of Nine, met on this bill. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks the minutes of their meeting of June 6, 1959, and a letter I recently received from J. H. Silbaugh, one of the members and president of the North Side Canal Co.

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

MINUTES OF MEETING OF COMMITTEE OF NINE OF SNAKE RIVER WATER USERS, IDAHO FALLS, IDAHO, JUNE 6, 1959

Committee members present: Leonard Graham, chairman; J. H. Silbaugh, Al Peters, Leo Murdock, David W. Dick, Cy Young, Frank Redfield, C. N. Scoresby, Willis Walker. Advisory member Merle Tillery; former chairman N. V. Sharp, Lynn Crandall, Harold Nelson, Glenn Simmons, Henry Eagle, and several other water users.

Lynn Crandall discussed the proposed Burns Creek bill as amended. He stated that the amendment worked out by Senators O'MAHONEY and CHURCH provided that the installation of the power-generating facilities be scheduled by the Secretary on the basis of providing for the additional power requirements of preference customers rather than all facilities being installed at once.

The meeting called today is for the purpose of obtaining an expression of opinion of the water users on the amended bill. Mr. Crandall pointed out some of the benefits that Burns Creek will provide to all water users on Snake River. Burns Creek is the last site on Snake River in Idaho above Milner Dam where any irrigation storage can be made available.

Mr. Nelson stated that the amendment to bill would in no way affect the provision that the power revenues from Palisades-Burns Creek would assume one-third of the annual costs of winter water savings at Minidoka now paid by water users. Demand for Government power is increasing faster than can be taken care of by addition of Burns Creek. He stated that the effect of the proposed amendment for delayed installation of all the power units would not extend the power payout period more than 1 year.

The following resolution was presented:

"Whereas the Snake River water users at their two last annual meetings have unanimously approved the Burns Creek project, and

"Whereas at a recent meeting of the Senate subcommittee on irrigation and reclamation of the Senate Interior Committee certain amendments were added to the original bill S. 281: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Committee of Nine, representing the Snake River water users, That we approve the bill as amended and request the members of Idaho's congressional delegation to give the amended bill their full support."

Moved by Silbaugh, second by Walker, that the resolution be adopted. Carried unanimously.

There was further discussion regarding opposition of power companies to Burns Creek and the 150-day shutoff of canals for winter water savings.

Meeting adjourned at 2:30 p.m.

C. N. SCORESBY,
Secretary.

NORTH SIDE CANAL CO., LTD.,
Jerome, Idaho, July 13, 1959.

The Honorable FRANK CHURCH,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: As president of the North Side Canal Co., I would like you to know how much we appreciate the efforts that you have been putting in on the Burns Creek project bill.

As you have already noticed from the resolution passed by the committee of nine (which are the directors of district No. 36), they also appreciate your efforts in getting this bill and its amendments approved.

Yours very truly,

J. H. SILBAUGH,
President.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, the Post-Register, a conservative newspaper in Idaho Falls, Idaho, emphasized the reclamation aspects of the Burns Creek Dam in an editorial which appeared in its edition of April 26, 1959. I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

BURNS CREEK, WHY NOT?

Objections by the Utah Power & Light Co. and the Idaho Power Co. to the proposed Burns Creek Dam on the Snake River do not take into account two pivotal points—the value of the supplemental irrigation water and the value of upstream storage.

The utilities principally contend that the Burns Creek Dam is essentially a power structure which is not only unnecessary but unnecessarily expensive.

While it is true that Burns Creek's 100,000 acre-feet of irrigation storage is not a large block of supplemental water, it could very well become the difference between crop failure and crop harvest in a lean water year. And that is the whole purpose of this irrigation storage at Burns Creek. At the tail end of the irrigation season, it could be this extra water that makes the crop.

It should also be pointed out that economically desirable multipurpose damsites in the upstream stretches of watersheds are receding. Every effort should be made to capitalize on these where there feasibility can be demonstrated, even if the feasibility is slightly less than the previous project. Hydroelectric power at such a project is still cheaper than that from conventional fuels. The Palisades Dam cost some $67 million. Burns Creek is expected to be at least $20 million cheaper—but will double the power capabilities when the two dams are operated together. Should such a power dividend be dismissed? Burns Creek can be considered an integral part of the Palisades Dam program.

Reclamation in this day and age has to go forward with the aid of power. Repayment costs on irrigation storage is still a big factor with the east Idaho water user who is naturally disposed kindly to the lift he gains at Burns Creek.

Moreover, the principle of upstream storage, storing the water at upper reaches where runoff can be effectively collected, should still be in the forefront of reclamation planning. Only two major upstream sites appear left on the upper Snake River—at Burns Creek and at the narrows site in Wyoming. In the reaching out of both the farm and the industrial economy of southern Idaho, power needs are bound to be taxed. The city of Idaho Falls, for one, will be needing considerably more power in the years ahead if its dynamic growth continues as expected.

Whether Burns Creek is a legitimate battleground for the public versus private power issue is questionable. Our information indicates that it will not remove present customers from the objecting utilities. It is more than likely that rural electric co-ops and other preference customers not now in the service orb of the utilities, will absorb the additional firm power marketable from Burns Creek.

The principle, of course, is still valid that Government should not provide power or services if private utilities can perform this service and meet the development needs. But the unusual Burns Creek dividend in power and irrigation, it appears to us, is one which can logically be placed outside this premise.

The power companies did not object to the Palisades Dam project. Burns Creek appeals to us as a cogent extension of Palisades.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, at the convention of the Idaho State AFL–CIO, held in Lewiston, Idaho, this year, the labor union organizations of the State adopted a resolution endorsing the Burns Creek Dam, which I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

Whereas labor in Idaho has in the past been favorable toward any project which would mean the development of the State of Idaho; and

Whereas upon the completion of Palisades Dam in eastern Idaho, it was found that the water users of the upper Snake River Valley had over subscribed the storage capacity of Palisades Reservoir; and

Whereas with the normal developments in eastern Idaho, there is evidence of a need for additional electrical power: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That this convention go on record as favoring the building of the Burns Creek Dam as eastern Idaho already is in need of the additional 100,000 acre-feet of

[1] Extracted from a typical contract to be made with a company or district diverting from Snake River above American Falls Dam. Form A.

water storage this dam will provide and by completion date will need the additional power this dam will make available; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this be sent our Senators and Representatives in Congress and also that we inform the United Mine Workers of our action and the reason for same.

Mr. CHURCH. Graphic proof that the water users do not consider the irrigation benefit either minimal or unimportant is found in their response to a circular letter asking them to indicate their needs for additional space in the proposed Burns Creek Reservoir.

This inquiry was made by Lynn Crandall, who, in 40 years—from 1919 until last year when he retired—had been elected and relected as watermaster for the distribution of natural flow of the Snake River. He served during this period as district engineer of the U.S. Geological Survey and also as special deputy to the Idaho Commissioner of Reclamation with similar duties. He supervised the allocations of Palisades space.

For the proposed Burns Creek Dam, applications were received representing 141 percent of the available space, a total of 141,740 acre-feet. Fifty-three canal companies, irrigation districts, and individuals in this way indicated that they want and need the irrigation benefit of this project.

I ask unanimous consent that this list of applicants be printed in the RECORD, at this point in my remarks.

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

BURNS CREEK RESERVOIR

IDAHO FALLS, IDAHO,
November 24, 1958.

A circular letter was sent October 8, 1958, to holders of Palisades Reservoir space asking that those who desire additional space in the proposed Burns Creek Reservoir file their applications for same. Replies have been received to date from 53 canal companies, irrigation districts, and individuals, making application for a total of 141,740 acre-feet in the Burns Creek Reservoir. Inasmuch as there is only 100,000 acre-feet of available space it will be necessary for the Bureau of Reclamation to appoint an allocation committee to allot the available space in accordance with the greatest needs of the applicants.

The following applications have been received:

	Acre-feet
C. Warren Blakely, Route 2, Rigby	250
Marion Blakely, Ririe	800
Jay, Keith & Garth B. Bramwell, Star Route, Roberts	1,700
Butler Island Canal Co., Rigby	1,200
Melvin Danielson, Route 4, Idaho Falls	100
Danskin Ditch Co., Moreland	1,000
Dilts Irrigation Co., Ltd., Lorenzo	200
Enterprise Canal Co., Ltd., Rigby	20,000
Farmers Friend Irrigation Co., Idaho Falls	8,500
Harry Fell, Route 2, Rigby	300
Lee L. Frodsham, Route 2, Burley	900
Chester W. Geisler, Lorenzo	100
D. V. Hagenbarth, Island Park	320
Howard Hatfield, Box 625, Palisades	200
A. O. Hogan, Star Route, Ririe	300
Idaho Irrigation District, Idaho Falls	21,200
Island Irrigation Co., Lorenzo	2,500
Thomas W. Jackson, Route 1, Roberts	200
J. W. Jones, Route 2, Rigby	100
Vance C. Koon, Thornton	780
Labelle Irrigation Co., Rigby	800
Liberty Park Irrigation Co., Rexburg	1,000
Ralph O. Lounsbury, Route 2, Rigby	300
Lowder Slough Irrigation Co	1,000
Lee Marshall & Sons, Route 5, Idaho Falls	100
W. A. Miller, Box 154, Rigby	200
Milner Low Lift Irrigation District, Murtaugh	15,500
B. D. Murdock, Roberts	120
North Side Canal Co., Ltd., Jerome	16,600
Parks & Lewisville Irrigation Co., Rigby	6,000
Parsons Ditch Co., Blackfoot	300
Progressive Irrigation District, Idaho Falls	10,000
Reid Canal Co., Thornton	1,000
D. F. Richards, Idaho Falls	1,000
Rigby Canal & Irrigating Co., Inc., Rigby	1,700
Frederick J. Roth, Lorenzo	200
Richard Roth, Route 1, Thornton	100
Rudy Irrigation Canal Co., Rigby	800
H. Allen Sellers, Route 2, Rigby	500
Shattuck Irrigation Co., Idaho Falls	1,100
Ervin B. Smith, Thornton	200
Snake River Valley Irrigation District, Shelley	9,700
Francis Stoltenberg, Swan Valley	200
Sunnydell Irrigation District, Thornton	5,000
Texas Slough Irrigating Canal Co., Rexburg	1,000
H. W. Tomchak, Roberts	20
Utah-Idaho Sugar Co., Idaho Falls	4,000
Watson Slough Ditch & Irrigation Co., Blackfoot	650
Avery A. Weeks, Swan Valley	400
Ivan R. Weeks, Swan Valley	200
Virgil Rutledge, Lorenzo (White Ditch)	200
Lloyd Wilkins, Star Route, Ririe	100
Woodville Canal Co., Idaho Falls	1,100
Total	141,740

LYNN CRANDALL,
Watermaster.

Mr. CHURCH. So it is evident, Mr. President, that the Burns Creek Dam will serve the interests of multiple-purpose development of the upper Snake River. Its contribution directly to irrigation, in furnishing insurance water—long-term holdover storage—is not only in line with the historic pattern of reclamation development in the area, but also meets a real and felt need of the irrigators themselves.

II. POWER

But notwithstandng the important irrigation benefit it confers, the fact remains that power revenues will pay for 98 percent of the cost of the Burns Creek Dam.

Can we conclude from this fact, as has been charged, that this is purely a commercial power project in disguise; that it is being built only to add another block of Federal power to compete with the private utility companies in the area?

Indeed we cannot. The evidence is otherwise.

In this regard, Mr. President, we must remember that in Idaho, from the beginning, there has always been a close connection between power generated at Government dams and reclamation. The report covering the first Federal reclamation project in Idaho, the Minidoka project, not only provided for storage for gravity-flow irrigation, but also recognized that the electric power that could be generated, by reason of the existence of the storage reservoir, had an equally direct connection with irrigation.

It is possible—

The report affirmed—

to generate over 10,000 horsepower, which can be used to pump and supply water to about 53,000 acres above the gravity canals.

Application of the storage reservoir to the generation of electricity to pump water onto land lying higher than that which can be served by gravity, has been an integral part of reclamation development in Idaho ever since that time.

When the Palisades Dam was reauthorized in 1950, the dual concept of insurance water, plus the use of the reservoir to provide low-cost pumping power for irrigation, was again recognized. In the planning for Palisades, $9 million of the anticipated $76 million cost was allocated to irrigation pumping power, and of the actual cost, which was only $63 million, $8,223,000 was allocated to this purpose.

The electric power generated at Government dams in southern Idaho has furthered irrigation in several ways. In some cases, it has been used to lift water to the higher lands forming part of the reclamation project being developed; in other cases, it has been sold to electrical cooperatives, preference customers serving the pumping needs of farmers who irrigate from their own wells. Much of the power to be generated at Burns Creek would be utilized by irrigators for pumping.

In conjunction with its general reclamation program, the Bureau of Reclamation now operates five hydroelectric plants in southern Idaho, with a total installed capacity of 163,900 kilowatts. I ask unanimous consent that a list of these powerplants, their respective capabilities, and the gross revenues realized from them in 1957, be inserted in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

Plant	River	Rating (kilowatt)	Maximum capability (kilowatt)	Minimum capability (kilowatt)	Initial operation
Minidoka project: Minidoka	Snake	13,400	15,000	15,000	May 1909.
Boise project:					
Diversion Dam	Boise	1,500	2,000	2,000	May 1912.
Black Canyon	Payette	8,000	10,000	10,000	December 1925.
Anderson Ranch	Boise	27,000	34,500	16,500	December 1950.
Palisades project: Palisades	Snake	114,000	[1] 114,000	58,000	February 1957.
Total		163,900	175,500	101,500	

[1] Maximum capability not yet established by tests and experience.

NOTE.—The calendar year 1957 sales from these powerplants amounted to $2,066,421 for 651,061,832 kilowatt-hours. The overall average revenue was 3.16 mills per kilowatt-hour.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, once the Federal Government began to build large storage dams, it soon became obvious that single-purpose dams were extravagant and wasteful. The multiple-purpose dam, designed to most efficiently utilize the water resource at the site, for maximum irrigation, flood control, power, navigation, recreation, and wildlife benefits, was demanded. The multiple-purpose dam meant that more power could often be generated at the project site than was necessary for the immediate needs of the project. This excess power could be marketed, and revenues realized from its sale could repay the Government, with interest, for an allocated portion of the project cost. Thus the irrigators would not have to bear the whole cost of a project, but it could be apportioned among the various interests benefiting from it. This is still another—and a most important—way that public power serves the ends of reclamation.

Congress has long ago established the policy which governs the marketing of public power. The excess power developed by the Government plants in southern Idaho is sold in accordance with the Reclamation Act of 1939, which reads in part as follows:

> Preference shall be given to municipalities and other public corporations or agencies; and also to cooperatives and other nonprofit organizations financed in whole or in part by loans made pursuant to the Rural Electrification Act of 1936.

It was the REA program, of course, that brought electricity to the countryside, to the farmer, to the mountaineer, to the people that the private utility companies were not willing to reach out and serve. The rural electrical cooperatives in southern Idaho were made possible by REA loans, through which their distribution facilities were constructed, and by their preference right to obtain firm power at modest rates from the Government dams.

These co-ops themselves have become an instrument for reclamation. The hydraulic pattern of electrical generation at irrigation dams in Idaho makes blocs of seasonal firm power for irrigation available at cheap rates, so the co-ops have been able to secure and supply power for pumping water onto arid land beyond the boundaries of Federal projects. Here is still another way that power is directly related to reclamation in Idaho.

The marketing of Federal power is confined to wholesale customers. There are 20 preference customers presently purchasing power from the Bureau of Reclamation in southern Idaho. I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point a list of the customers having contracts with the Bureau, showing the contract rate of delivery and the demand of each.

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

Commercial power contracts

	Contract rate of delivery, kilowatts		Highest recent maximum demand, kilowatts			
	Winter	Summer	Winter		Summer	
Boise project: Prairie Power Co-op	250	250	October 1956	292	August 1957	372
Palisades project:						
City of Idaho Falls	18,000	16,000	January 1958	17,073	May 1957	12,933
Fall River REA	1,900	3,100	December 1952	1,052	September 1957	2,747
Lost River REA	3,500	4,100	March 1957	2,581	June 1957	2,305
Lower Valley REA	2,600	2,300	January 1958	2,592	August 1957	2,700
Subtotal	26,000	25,500				
Minidoka project:						
Albion	460	310	January 1958	352	May 1956	272
Burley	7,600	5,900	November 1957	5,600	do	4,400
Declo	240	170	January 1956	216	September 1957	202
Heyburn	640	440	January 1958	620	do	400
Minidoka	250	200	do	130	do	98
Rupert	5,400	4,000	January 1957	4,000	do	3,100
East End Mutual Electric Co	570	440	February 1956	452	do	356
Farmers Electric Co	320	240	February 1957	219	do	210
Raft River Rural Electric Co	1,050	7,000	October 1956	3,086	July 1957	9,100
Riverside Electric Co	440	390	February 1958	356	September 1957	328
Rural Electric Co	1,800	1,800	February 1957	1,422	September 1956	1,422
South Side Electric Co	800	1,900	January 1958	676	do	1,376
Unity Light & Power Co	2,320	1,990	do	1,908	September 1957	1,684
Walcott Electric	150	130	February 1957	108	do	89
Paul Electric Co	1,550	1,150	November 1957	1,376	do	1,024
Subtotal	23,590	26,060				
Total	49,840	51,810				

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, exclusive of the municipalities, preference customers serve 18,000 customers in southern Idaho from power secured from the Federal Government. Under contracts which they made when they obtained their loans from REA, those cooperatives are bound to carry a full utility responsibility in the areas they serve. Consequently they have been subject to the same growth factors which affect the use of electricity nationwide.

But in addition to the steadily rising loads from new deep freezers, television, electric dryers, air conditioners, and the myriad of conveniences available to all America, these customers of the Government have had, so to speak, to make up for lost time. Their rate of growth has been double the national average.

Consequently, in southern Idaho, since about 1953, there has been a recurrent crisis in the power supply of the preference customers. Palisades Dam went on the line barely in time to meet their burgeoning demand.

Naturally there are some who would like to see the cooperatives starved out. REA cooperatives in Idaho have not the resources to install generating facilities of their own, and if Burns Creek Dam, which would double the firm power capability of Palisades, can be defeated, they will eventually be thrown upon the mercy of the private power companies, with predictable results.

The benefits of the preference clause do not result in a monopoly in the federally generated power for the preference customers. The principles of wise management of the power resource prevent the Bureau of Reclamation from contracting to such customers any power beyond the amounts which the river's fluctuations will permit it to deliver dependably. The preference customers get all of the firm power of the Federal dams, but the firm power is by no means all that the dams generate.

The two biggest customers of the Government at Palisades happen not to be cooperatives or other preference customers, but the Utah Power & Light Co. and the Idaho Power Co., the two private utilities which operate in southern Idaho. Seasonal and dump energy from Palisades totaling a third of a billion kilowatt-hours, out of a total of a little more than half a billion, was sold to these private utilities in 1958.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the schedules printed in the RECORD.

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

Palisades power sales, year 1958

Customer	Energy (kilowatt-hour)	Revenue
Idaho Power Co	193,541,000	$522,244
Utah Power & Light Co	144,129,000	325,744
City of Idaho Falls	66,587,000	338,046
Fall River REA	8,002,000	40,985
Lost River REA	11,640,000	53,660
Lower Valley REA (Wyoming-Idaho)	7,300,000	44,782
Michaud project pumping	4,859,000	14,982
Minidoka North Side pumping	72,454,000	226,504
Milner low lift pumping	2,891,000	8,672
Minidoka power system	17,307,000	84,175
Total	528,710,000	1,689,794

The above figures do not include miscellaneous uses at Palisades Dam of 1,618,000 kilowatt-hours and $8,057. Included in the 1958 sales to the Idaho Power Co. and Utah Power & Light Co. are 103,749,000 kilowatt-hours and $311,247 reserved for future loads and sales to preference customers of the United States but not required for such loads in 1958.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, the need for the Burns Creek Dam cannot be questioned. Already the preference customers in southern Idaho consume all of the firm power produced for sale by the Bureau of Reclamation at its existing dams.

It takes several years from the time a project is authorized until it is on the line, and needs must be forecast. In southern Idaho, the load growth of the preference customers has consistently outstripped forecasts.

In 1955, the sum of the contract rates of delivery of power to preference customers had grown beyond the Bureau's ability to supply the power, and the Bureau arranged temporarily to secure power from the Idaho Power Co. to make up the shortage, until Palisades could be completed.

Although Palisades ameliorated this situation, as long ago as April 1957 the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, Fred G. Aandahl, wrote to me that:

It is anticipated that by 1963 all dependable seasonal power other than 14,000 kilowatts will be needed by irrigation loads for pumping, thus limiting the seasonal firm power available to the Minidoka project to 14,000 kilowatts.

In his letter, he further said:

Obviously, the Bureau cannot do more until additional Federal powerplants are constructed in this area. The potential Burns Creek development which has been forwarded by this Department to the Congress would develop needed power.

As examples of the growing demand for power of the separate customers, I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to have printed at this point in the RECORD, two letters I received earlier this year, one from the mayor of Burley, Idaho, the other from the manager of the Fall River Rural Electric Cooperative.

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

CITY OF BURLEY,
Burley, Idaho, February 27, 1959.

Hon. FRANK CHURCH,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR CHURCH: Recently I read in the newspaper where you and Senator DWORSHAK had jointly introduced another bill to authorize Burns Creek.

This is good news since the shortage of power is still with us, and the demand for electric energy is increasing steadily. The city of Burley alone used 1,000 more kilowatts last year than was used the previous year.

There is still no opposition to Burns Creek in Idaho that I am aware of. Therefore, it is hoped you will again be successful in obtaining favorable action by the Senate.

The good work you are doing is very much appreciated by all of us, and if there is anything that can be done to help out from this end, please do not hesitate to call upon us.

Respectfully yours,

J. L. SALMON, *Mayor.*

FALL RIVER RURAL
ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE, INC.,
Ashton, Idaho, April 11, 1959.

Senator FRANK CHURCH,
U.S. Senator, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR CHURCH: I have been reading in the newspapers about the opposition the Burns Creek project has run into with the Utah Power & Light Co. and UMC. I also note that Idaho Power Co. is joining in the opposition. In reading your remarks in the newspaper, I cannot add much to your knowledge regarding the Burns Creek project. However, I feel I should write to let you know the power problem of the Fall River Rural Electric Cooperative, Inc.

We have contracted for a peak of 3,100 kilowatts of power from the Palisades project this year; based on the average increase per year over the past 10 years, our peak requirement will reach 3,465 kilowatts. We have applications from prospective members for an additional 450 kilowatts. According to the Utah Power & Light Co. assertions that there is ample power in the area, they evidently expect us to buy from them. They bled us for 18 years. They would like to do it again.

Prior to Palisades power the Utah Power Co. could not keep the voltage high enough during our peak load to keep our members satisfied. We contacted the plant superintendent, who advised that they were doing all they could to help the voltage situation. It wasn't corrected until Palisades came on the line.

We cannot promote the use of power until we have power to sell.

I also want to point out that this cooperative, to the best of my knowledge, has the highest rate of any power supplier in the State of Idaho. The only way we can cut our rates down in comparison to other companies is by the use of power. It cannot be done if we are priced out of the market.

I wish to thank you for the time and effort spent in support of the Burns Creek project. I am sure if this drive is continued we are bound to win.

Yours very truly,

E. W. ROBERTS,
Manager.

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

Mr. CHURCH. I yield.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I wanted the Senator to develop a little further his argument for more power; that is why I did not interrupt him earlier.

As I understand, the title of the bill reads:

To authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain a reregulating reservoir and other works at the Burns Creek site in the upper Snake River Valley, Idaho, and for other purposes.

I read that from the bill, so I know the Senator will agree with me that it is correct.

My question of the Senator from Idaho is: Is there a power shortage in this general area of Idaho?

Mr. CHURCH. The testimony before the committee, in my opinion, clearly demonstrated that there is presently a severe power shortage for the preference customers served by the Bureau of Reclamation dams in southern Idaho, and that this shortage will grow to the point of serious crisis for all the cooperatives if the Burns Creek Dam is not constructed.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Am I not correct in stating that the Utah Power & Light Co. has plans to build in this general area a steamplant to generate 300,000 kilowatts?

Mr. CHURCH. The Senator is correct. The Utah Power & Light Co. not only has plans for but is committed to the construction of a thermal plant of that capacity at Kemmerer, Wyo.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Then I ask the Senator from Idaho why the Federal Government should spend the money of the taxpayers to provide an additional 90,000 kilowatts, when private firms are willing to spend much more money to build a 300,000-kilowatt-capacity plant? I should like to have that question answered. I think all Senators would be interested in the answer. Why should the Federal Government spend the money of the taxpayers for something private firms not only are able and willing to provide, but are going to provide?

Mr. CHURCH. In the first place, I would say to the Senator from Arizona that the customers who would be served by the Burns Creek Dam are not presently customers of the Utah Power & Light Co.

In the second place, the testimony presented before the committee made clear that the plans of the Utah Power & Light Co. were not dependent in any way upon construction of the Burns Creek Dam. So it is evident that the private company, in planning for its own market expansion, sees the need for the thermal plant at Kemmerer, Wyo., even though Burns Creek were built. It is my belief that the Burns Creek Dam is quite unrelated to plans for market expansion by the Utah Power & Light Co. The bill specifically provides that the generators cannot be installed at the Burns Creek Dam in any way which could possibly constitute a threat to the market of the Utah Power & Light Co.

Therefore, I regard the two propositions as quite separate from one another; and evidently the Utah Power & Light Co. thinks its own market demands will expand sufficiently to justify its investment in the thermal plant at Kemmerer, Wyo., quite unrelated to whether or not the Burns Creek Dam is built.

Mr. GOLDWATER. That brings us to a very interesting point. I think all Senators should be fully aware of it. The point is that in this instance it is proposed to depart in a rather dangerous way from the accepted use of reclamation law, for by means of this bill it is proposed that there be constructed a project which will have about 1½ percent of its cost chargeable to reclamation, and all the rest of its cost chargeable to power.

Where—with the exception of the Tennessee Valley Authority—can the Senator from Idaho find for me any statement of responsibility on the part of the Federal Government that, once having built a power project, it is proper to continue to expand it as the needs of its customers grow?

In fact, I would refer the junior Senator from Idaho to my minority views on the Burns Creek project. In those views, I quote Mr. Aandahl. I believe he speaks for the Department of the Interior; and it is my recollection that what he stated has historically been the attitude of the Department, during both administrations. Mr. Aandahl stated:

Mr. AANDAHL. I think it is incumbent on the Federal Government to encourage a maximum of local responsibility in meeting the growing power needs of the Nation. Because of that fact, we have tried to emphasize in all of our Federal power marketing during the period that I have been in my present position that the responsibility for total needs rests with local entities. We will be just as helpful as we can with the Federal power that is available from these multipurpose projects, and we know that power is of great economic advantage to the local people, and particularly to the preference customers. We do feel that it would be very unwise for us, as the marketing agent for all Federal power except that which is in

the Tennessee Valley, to try to establish a total utility responsibility for any group of customers. We would be committing the Congress to expenditures of immeasurable amounts of money if we were to establish a policy of that kind. I think we would be derelict in our duty if we did (hearings on Federal power marketing problems, p. 261).

In view of that, I should like to ask my friend, the Senator from Idaho, just what authority he thinks the Federal Government has for continuing to supply power to preference customers, as the preference customer list grows?

Mr. CHURCH. I reply by saying I believe it is a misconception to characterize the Burns Creek Dam as purely a power project. I say that because the reregulating function of the Burns Creek Dam, and its hydraulic, electrical, and fiscal integration with the Palisades project are such that it can be fully understood and justified only in connection with the Palisades development. If the Senator from Arizona has reviewed the Palisades bill, he will know that the Palisades Dam and Reservoir have very large flood control and reclamation benefits, as well as power benefits, and unquestionably they constitute a multiple-purpose development under the terms of the reclamation law.

The reason why the administration, the Department of the Interior, and the Bureau of the Budget have placed their stamps of approval upon the Burns Creek Dam is that, as a reregulating reservoir integrated with the Palisades project, the Burns Creek Dam will make it possible for the public to obtain the most for its money from the Palisades project; and taken together, the two constitute a multiple-purpose development in every sense of the word.

The fact of the matter is that without the Burns Creek Dam, it is not possible to utilize the full potential of the generators already in place at Palisades, or the full potential of the great reservoir there, because that reservoir cannot be used for peaking purposes without fluctuating the flow of the river below the dam to such an extent as to interfere with the irrigation. The Burns Creek Dam will provide the reregulation that will make it possible for the full value of the public investment at Palisades to be realized; and, therefore, the Burns Creek Dam must be considered as a satellite project which is integrally a part of its parent project, the Palisades Reservoir. When the Burns Creek Dam is considered in its true light, I think it meets all the tests of the reclamation law for multiple-purpose development.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, the Senator from Idaho still has not answered my question, which is this: What authority or what responsibility has the Federal Government, after it once has provided power for preference customers, to continue to supply that market as it grows? I should like to have that question answered first. I know that authority can be provided by passing a law to that effect; but that is not the customary procedure.

So I should like to have the Senator's answer to that question.

Mr. CHURCH. My answer is that the Federal Government can with complete propriety construct projects which are multiple-purpose in nature, within the meaning of the reclamation laws; and the Burns Creek Dam is certainly such a project. If, in doing so, additional power to be supplied to the preference customers can be realized, that is neither contrary to good public policy nor contrary to the law.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I may say to the Senate that in this case it is not proposed to build a reclamation dam. This project calls for the construction of a power dam. Of the total cost of the project, $47,872,000 would be allocated to power; and only $849,000—or approximately 1.75 percent—would be allocated to reclamation. That constitutes a very unusual switch. I wish to call particular attention to this fact. I will go along with the Senator from Idaho in regard to a regulating dam; but a regulating dam would cost only approximately $7 million or $8 million, and would have no power facilities.

I might say, too, that if we are going to get the full benefit of Burns Creek, before we are through we will have to install a regulating dam on the stream. But if the effort is made to justify the project by the argument that we need regulation of the river for Palisades, then let us consider a $7 million or $8 million project, which will fall entirely within the purview of the Reclamation Act and the westerner's conception of reclamation.

I still cannot understand why the Federal Government should build a dam costing in excess of $48 million whose major purpose is to supply power. If the Senator from Idaho can satisfy the Senator from Arizona as to why he thinks it is necessary for the Federal Government to supply an expanding market, perhaps I will change my mind, but, frankly, I doubt it.

Mr. CHURCH. I am doubtful, too, that anything I might say on the floor concerning the project would have the effect of changing the position the Senator from Arizona has taken. However, I would merely repeat briefly that this project, if it is to be properly conceived, has to be considered as a part of the Palisades project, and when so considered, it is a multiple-purpose project within the meaning of the reclamation laws. It gives an added value to the public investment in the Palisades project by making it possible to utilize the full potential of that project; and, integrated as a part of that project it is perfecting in accord with the pattern of traditional reclamation development in southern Idaho.

I see nothing distinctive about it. I see nothing alien to the pattern which is already familiar and has obtained in southern Idaho for 50 years. Therefore, I cannot agree with the Senator from Arizona, and I think he gets only a distorted image when he takes a satellite reregulating project, which is a part of a larger multiple-purpose development, and insists on seeing it as if the larger multiple-purpose project were not there. I think it cannot be so regarded.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I think the Senator used a good word when he said "distorted," because coming from a reclamation State, as I do, I have a great and deep regard for reclamation, and I do not want to see anything happen that might destroy its future.

Now, we are talking about building a dam for power purposes—period. Take the period out, and agree that there is some regulating value in the dam. If the Senator wants to argue about regulation, I will go along with him and vote with him on a bill to build a regulating dam for $7 million or $8 million; but I do not think it is proper to sell this project under the guise of a reclamation project by saying it completes a multipurpose project downstream.

If we extend that argument to its ultimate conclusion, the result may be to run the private power industry out of business.

It would be easy to justify the construction of a Federal power dam on any stream in the West by saying, "Well, we have more preference customers now, so we have to serve them." That is the big objection to the Tennessee Valley Authority. It will be the objection to many valley developments, because they will involve the Federal Government more and more in the business of power development.

Mr. President, I shall develop this argument a little later, but I want Senators to know these things. Power from Burns Creek would have to sell, if it stood alone, at 5.27 mills per kilowatt-hour. It is being suggested that it be sold at the same rate at which power at the Palisades Dam is sold, which is on an average of 3.67 mills. Actually, what we are going to do is to drag out the payoff period of Palisades by hanging on its back a losing project. Power from a project cannot be sold below cost with the exception that such a project will stand on its own, so it is hooked to Palisades Dam power, which is sold at a lower price, and the payback period of Palisades is dragged out.

I wish I could agree with the Senator from Idaho, because I have a great regard for him, and I have a great affection for the State of Idaho; but I do not want to see public power increased in this country, particularly where next door private industry is spending millions of dollars to provide 300,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity.

If the people in the vicinity of the Palisades Dam and in that general area need more power, I suggest that they can buy additional power from private sources, and the difference in cost would not be great.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President will the Senator from Idaho yield?

Mr. CHURCH. Before I do so, let me say to the Senator from Arizona that later in my address I shall touch on the very points the Senator from Arizona has raised. Therefore, in the interest of saving time, and in order to answer these points in an orderly fashion, I would prefer to continue with the argument I was developing at the time the Senator from Arizona raised the question.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I thank the Senator. I think the distinguished minority leader had some questions he wanted to propound.

Mr. CHURCH. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, mainly for the RECORD, I wonder if I can get brief answers to some very simple questions. The first question is this: Is it a fact that 98 percent of the estimated cost of this project goes to power purposes?

Mr. CHURCH. It is a fact that under the bill 98 percent of the cost of the project will be repaid from power revenues.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I do not think that answer is quite responsive to my question.

Mr. CHURCH. The bill provides that 98 percent of the total cost of the project, over the statutory repayment period, shall be allocated to power, and will be repaid from power revenues.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Then I would be correct in stating that a very fractional percentage would go to reclamation purposes, something less than $900,000 for reclamation purposes, and in the neighborhood of nearly $48 million would be allocated to power purposes?

Mr. CHURCH. That is correct.

Mr. DIRKSEN. There has been some discussion to the effect that the project is necessary as a satellite for reregulation of water levels. I assume that is because of the fluctuation of the water levels in the Palisades project. Is that correct?

Mr. CHURCH. The dam does have a very definite and very important reregulatory function.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Is it true that Mr. Bennett testified before the committee that a reregulating dam could be built for $6 million?

Mr. GOLDWATER. For $7 million or $8 million.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I thought the testimony was it would be about $6 million.

Mr. CHURCH. There was some testimony as to a different kind of dam which could be built. If my recollection serves me correctly, there was some testimony that it could be built at a cost of $9 million or thereabouts. That is my best recollection of the figure.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Is it true that no new land will come into cultivation as a result of this project?

Mr. CHURCH. It is true that this project is not designed to reclaim new lands, and thus will not contribute in any way to the very serious surplus crop problem that plagues the country.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Is it further true that the project would provide about 100,000 acre-feet of what in the irrigation country is referred to as secondary water?

I am afraid I am not so familiar with secondary water, as distinguished from primary storage.

Mr. CHURCH. Earlier in my remarks this afternoon, I will say to the distinguished minority leader, I explained the function of the 100,000 acre-feet of supplementary storage this dam would provide. It is insurance water. It has already been 141 percent oversubscribed by the irrigators themselves.

Mr. DIRKSEN. What is the total storage in the upper Snake River area? My understanding is that it is about 4 million acre-feet. Is that correct?

Mr. CHURCH. The storage at Palisades, above Burns Creek Dam, is 1.4 million acre-feet.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Of course, there are other projects which provide for additional storage.

Mr. CHURCH. There are smaller and older projects in the area, yes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Would it aggregate about 4 million acre-feet?

Mr. CHURCH. I think the total storage in the Upper Snake River Basin is about 4 million acre-feet.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Would the Senator call that primary water as distinguished from secondary water, which we are now discussing?

Mr. CHURCH. A great deal of it is supplementary water. This has been the pattern of the development in southern Idaho.

As I explained before the distinguished Senator came into the Chamber, the principal function of the Reclamation Act of 1902 in the Upper Snake River Basin has not been to provide new water for new land but has been to provide storage water and supplemental water for lands which were irrigated prior to the time the Reclamation Act was passed by the Congress.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Would it be a fair inference that 100,000 acre-feet of secondary water is a rather insignificant amount compared to the storage in that area at the present time?

Mr. CHURCH. It depends, I will say to the Senator, entirely upon the approach one takes to the question. The irrigators who are actually dependent upon the storage water in southeastern Idaho have evidenced a great interest in this additional 100,000 acre-feet, because they remember very vividly years of water shortage, resulting in devastating crop failures when the water gave out. They know from their experience with the river that the 100,000 acre-feet of supplemental storage could be the difference in drought years, between a crop and no crop at all. When a crop failure occurs the losses are immense. Therefore, the irrigators feel this project is not only important, but that they have a need for it. They have already oversubscribed the additional storage.

Mr. DIRKSEN. How long ago was it that the condition to which the Senator referred developed?

Mr. CHURCH. The last serious drought?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I understood that was about 30 years ago.

Mr. CHURCH. The last serious drought period was in the middle 1930's.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That was about 25 years ago.

Mr. CHURCH. It was about 25 years ago when the last very serious drought occurred. This year has been a low-water year. There is some concern that another drought cycle may be coming in southern Idaho.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The distinguished Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] shows me a memorandum from the United Mine Workers in that area which indicates that only two or three times in a 50-year period would such secondary water be used.

Mr. CHURCH. It may be that the water will not be needed except at rare intervals when drought conditions obtain. As the Senator well knows, insurance water, like a fire insurance policy, is well justified even though a fire rarely occurs. A life raft is rarely used when one travels on a passenger liner, but when one's life is at stake, at a time of disaster, it is most important to have the life raft aboard.

In the last drought period in eastern Idaho the crop losses, measured in today's dollars, amounted to more than half the estimated construction cost of the Burns Creek Dam itself.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Is it not true that the Palisades project has been built since that time?

Mr. CHURCH. The Palisades project has been built since that time.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I have one other question. When we refer to reregulation as a result of variations in streamflow, if the same water goes through Palisades and Burns Creek, what would be done about reregulation below the Burns Creek Dam? Would that be another problem for some future time?

Mr. CHURCH. I will say to the distinguished minority leader that I know of no plan, and I have heard of no proposal on the part of the Bureau of Reclamation, which would indicate the belief that there is any need for further reregulation below Burns Creek. It happens to be true that the Palisades project is a very large project. It involves a large public investment, and we would like to utilize the generators to the full potential, so that the public can get its money's worth. To do this a reregulating dam of the Burns Creek type is needed. Indeed, when the Palisades bill was originally before the Congress, the need for a reregulating project was then contemplated. Some proposed at that time to make it a part of the original Palisades bill.

Mr. DIRKSEN. If the distinguished Senator will permit, I have finished my questions, but I should like to make one observation to materialize my own conclusions.

It occurs to me it is a fair assumption that this is a dam almost completely for power; that the irrigation aspects are secondary, as indicated by the fact that the bill provides for only 100,000 acre-feet of secondary water; and that no real need has been demonstrated for this, so far as I can observe.

Notwithstanding the fact that I recognize the project does have clearance by the Bureau of the Budget and also by the Department of Interior, I would be very reluctant to give a vote of approval to this project under the circumstances as I see them. Certainly I do not pretend to be an expert in this field, and I am glad to see that those who live in these areas are giving this proposal abundant attention.

I thank the Senator from Idaho.

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

Mr. CHURCH. I am happy to yield to my distinguished colleague from Idaho.

Mr. DWORSHAK. The senior Senator from Illinois mentioned the fact that there is some question about the feasibility of the dam. I had intended to invite attention to the fact that both the Department of the Interior and the Bureau of the Budget have given approval. In the past few years, not only with regard to one project but also with regard to dozens and scores of projects, there have been projects initiated in almost every State of the Union without approval of the Bureau of the Budget.

In this case, when my esteemed distinguished minority leader, from the State of Illinois, takes a position in disagreement with the Bureau of the Budget, I am a little bit disturbed, because I have usually tried to follow his leadership in supporting the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Will my friend yield for an observation?

Mr. CHURCH. I am happy to yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The fact of the matter is that the minority leader queried the Department of the Interior nearly 3 or 4 weeks ago about this matter, because it came to his attention that no clear need had been established for the project.

I wanted to make sure on my own responsibility, quite aside from the testimony, whether the project did have the approval of the Department of the Interior. I learned from the Department that the project did have approval.

But that does not keep the minority leader from exercising his own judgment on the facts and determining for himself whether he believes there should be an authorization for a project and a commitment of the credit of the Government, and its money, for something the need of which he has some clear and present doubt.

Mr. DWORSHAK and Mr. GOLDWATER addressed the Chair.

Mr. CHURCH. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for an observation?

Mr. DWORSHAK. I do not have the floor.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Will the Senator permit me to make an observation?

Mr. CHURCH. I yield.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I think it is important that we keep this matter in proper perspective. I shall not argue the feasibility or the nonfeasibility of the project. This project will pay itself out. It will do so because Palisades can extend itself much longer than is necessary in order to carry what we will call this "weak sister." But this is a power project. It is not a reclamation project.

I have voted for reclamation projects all over the West, and I shall continue to do so; but this is a power project, and we must keep that fact in mind. If we wish to discuss the reclamation aspects of the project, we must talk about the amount of money which is not even included in the cost of the project for reregulating purposes. So I want the picture to be correct, that it is a power project—98.25 percent for power and the rest, 1.75 percent, for reclamation.

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

Mr. CHURCH. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. I am happy to have the Senator from Arizona raise the question of a power dam. It gives me an opportunity to assure him that when Parker Dam—a power dam—was constructed, there was not this objection to it. It was used to complete and round out a system. I am sure the Senator from Arizona would be the first to admit that Parker Dam is an important dam, and serves a very important purpose.

Mr. GOLDWATER. If I recall correctly, the Arizona National Guard went over with machineguns to prevent Parker Dam from being built. We never have wanted it. It takes water from the Colorado and feeds it into the hungry mouths of California people. The Senator says that we are for Parker Dam. We are, for fishing purposes, but that is about all.

Mr. ANDERSON. I have seen plenty of current from Parker Dam happily utilized by the people of Arizona. They may have sent some National Guard troopers in for a while, but they have accepted the situation very happily, and the system works very well. It was approved by the Senate of the United States.

The reason I wish to interject here is that I am happy to see unity in the sponsorship of this bill. The bill came first to the Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation in two different versions, one by the senior Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK] and the other by the junior Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH]. There was a substantial difference between them in phraseology, but there was not much difference between them in purpose.

I commend the two Senators from Idaho for resolving their difficulties and coming before us with a bill sponsored by the senior Senator from Idaho, joined by the junior Senator from Idaho. They succeeded not only in composing their differences, but in bringing together all the users of water in the area.

There was a slight difference of opinion over an amendment a short time ago. coming before us with a bill sponsored that they canvass the situation. I again commend both the senior Senator from Idaho and the junior Senator from Idaho for solving the problem, so that the State is pleased with the outcome. I believe that the project will be a good one.

Mr. GOLDWATER. To keep the record straight, I made the statement that this dam is a power dam. The Senator from New Mexico referred to Parker Dam. Its primary purpose was to store water for the metropolitan water district, and to some extent regulate the lower Colorado River, though it was not needed for that purpose. Power was developed, we might say, as a secondary function of the dam. I do not believe we can compare Parker Dam with the proposed dam.

I am trying to use my memory to see if I can recall a single instance of a purely power project being built under the guise of a reclamation project. The Senator from New Mexico has intimate knowledge of this subject. Perhaps he can refresh my memory, for which I shall be deeply grateful.

Power has always been a secondary purpose of reclamation. It is true that the great project on which I live, the Salt River Valley project, has been paid off largely through the sale of electricity; but long before it was thought of as a power dam, it was thought of in terms of storage for water. If this project could be justified as a reclamation project, I would be most happy to go along with it; but when we find that more than 98 percent of the money is to be used to develop power, this little Western boy must leave one of his pet subjects, namely, reclamation. I think we are misusing the term "reclamation" and trying to hide behind it, public power.

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

Mr. CHURCH. I yield.

Mr. DWORSHAK. The Senator has studied all the aspects of the proposal. I am sure he can tell us whether, ever since the Palisades Dam was constructed, the office of the Bureau of Reclamation at Boise, Idaho, considered that the Burns Creek Dam should have been originally a very vital part of the Palisades development. The Bureau has concentrated its efforts for the past 5 years to have the Burns Creek project authorized, because it would bring greater stability and feasibility to the Palisades Dam. Is that correct?

Mr. CHURCH. I will say to my colleague that I think it is a fair statement that from the beginning the Bureau of Reclamation has conceived of the Palisades and Burns Creek Dams as two parts of one development. In doing so, they not only stayed fully within the purview of the reclamation law, but they have taken what logically is the position which must be taken, once all the facts are assembled.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, may I interrupt at this point?

Mr. CHURCH. I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. ANDERSON. I suggest to the Senator from Arizona that my memory may be wrong, but I think he will find that the Hungry Horse Dam in Montana is almost entirely a power project. In the complex in the Northwest, several dams were constructed almost entirely for power, so this is not a new concept at all. When a power dam is constructed, it may not irrigate new ground, but it helps to regulate the stream for the benefit of the people who desire to use water for irrigation, and, at the same time, by the contribution of power, it helps to pay its way.

Let me say to my friend from Arizona, who has been one of the fine friends of reclamation, that I am sure he will find many dams other than Hungry Horse so constructed.

Mr. GOLDWATER. In this case only 7 percent of the water to be stored is to

be used for regulating purposes. If the Senators from Idaho wish to amend the bill so as to provide for a regulation dam to cost between $6 million and $8 million, the junior Senator from Arizona will join in support of the bill. But I cannot, in consonance with my lifelong devotion to reclamation, allow a bill to go through this body wearing the clean robes of reclamation, under which is hidden the rather black body of public power.

I do not see any reason why the taxpayers of Arizona, New Jersey or Georgia should pay money for a power dam in Idaho which has no other function except the production of power, with the exception of 7 percent, which will be used for regulating purposes. So small is this regulating function of the entire project that I cannot find one penny allocated to that purpose.

I repeat, let us keep the picture in the proper perspective. This is not a reclamation project, by any stretch of the imagination. It is purely and simply public power.

Mr. CHURCH. When I have had an opportunity to complete my statement concerning the project, I think it will be demonstrated to be a project which meets all the requirements of the reclamation law, and is a multiple-purpose project in every sense of the term.

Mr. President, the greatest demand for power in southern Idaho is in the summer, to serve the irrigation pumping load. Downstream, in Washington and Oregon, the greatest demand is in the winter. Upstream, the water is stored to be emptied into the canals and through the power generators in the summer; downstream, the opposite pattern prevails. The hope that this matching pattern might be better utilized caused me, early in 1958, to request the chairman of the Interior Committee to call a hearing on Columbia basin power problems, where all the relevant data were brought forward by the Bonneville Power Administration, the Bureau of Reclamation, and by the preference customers of southern Idaho who knew that they had to find additional power to meet their growing needs, before Burns Creek could be built.

The Bureau of Reclamation told the committee that it was possible to get a considerable block of additional firm power without the addition of any new facilities, by integrating with downstream plants, and that it would begin and pursue vigorouly negotiations with Idaho Power Co. toward this end.

It is gratifying to me that as of this time, the form of a contract has been agreed upon which has the effect of firming up an additional 30,000 kilowatts of output from the Bureau's plants in Idaho, which will be made available to the Bureau's preference customers.

This contract was near enough to execution, when the hearings on this bill were held, for this additional block of power to be taken into account in projecting the power supply-demand curve for southern Idaho.

At these hearings an annual growth rate of 8 percent was forecast. Based on this assumption, and taking into account the integration contract with Idaho Power Co., demand would catch up with supply in 1964. Burns Creek, if ready by then, would be fully utilized by 1966.

After the hearings, the regional director went back to Boise, instructed by the committee to recheck the load-growth projections. He has reported subsequently that they were too conservative. On July 10 of this year, in a memorandum, he reported that the Bureau's preference customers have now furnished load estimates which indicate that the Bureau's firm power supply will be inadequate for their requirements beginning with the summer of 1963. In his words, "It is now more than ever apparent that Burns Creek power will be required for preference-customer loads as soon as it can be constructed."

Mr. President, the upper Snake River basin is an area I am proud to represent. Its thriving economy is a healthy bastion of independent, private enterprise in this country. There the family farm still predominates.

In the cities, like Idaho Falls and Burley, beautiful parks and well-lit streets hide the fact that this was once bleak desert. The independent businessman is the typical member of the chambers of commerce and service clubs—not the local representatives of absentee businesses.

This thriving area is a monument to the wisdom of past Congresses. Think what an effort it must have been when the West was a week away from Washington, for a small band of western visionaries in Congress to pursuade their colleagues, accustomed only to common law concepts of riparian rights, of the propriety of the western doctrine of appropriation of water to beneficial use, and the principle that the Government ought to provide storage in order to fully utilize the precious water of the arid West.

The idea that electric power could contribute to irrigation by pumping water was a giant stride forward in the history of reclamation.

The assistance of loans and the right to purchase Federal power in the rural electrification program has done as much for the well-being of rural families as any policy ever adopted by Congress.

This is no time to turn the clock back. The Burns Creek Dam, which would be authorized with the passage of the pending bill, is not a radical innovation. It is the next step forward in a self-supporting program which has brought the area to its present levels of productivity, and will carry it to new heights. It is in the best tradition of multiple-purpose development which has permitted the West to bloom and prosper.

III. BURNS CREEK: A LOGICAL EXTENSION OF PALISADES

Physically, Burns Creek Dam would be located 30 miles downstream from Palisades Dam. The Bureau of Reclamation in 1957 recommended that a dam, powerplant, and reservoir should be built at this downstream site to provide the means for more fully utilizing the capabilities of the power generators at Palisades, by permitting an unrestricted peaking operation there, leaving to Burns Creek the function of reregulating the storage for irrigation.

In other words, Palisades is the parent, and Burns Creek is the satellite. Because the irrigators have the right to a steady flow, it has not been possible to operate Palisades generators to the full extent of their potential.

If the water released at Palisades can be checked at Burns Creek to meet the irrigation water commitments, the resulting improvement enables the combination of Palisades with the smaller plant at Burns Creek to turn out twice as much total energy, and more than 2½ times as much critically important firm power as Palisades now provides alone.

I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point in my remarks a table showing the average amount and classification of energy expected to be available for the two plants, as compared to Palisades alone.

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

TABLE 3.—*Sales and revenues, Burns Creek (90,000 kilowatts) and Palisades (114,000 kilowatts)*

Class of energy	Sales (million kilowatt-hours per year)	Annual revenue
Firm	466.2	$2,152,900
Federal project use	130.9	392,700
Seasonal nonfirm	136.8	410,400
Dump	287.1	574,200
Total	1,021.0	3,530,200

TABLE 4.—*Sales and revenues, Palisades (114,000 kilowatts)*

Class of energy	Sales (million kilowatt-hours per year)	Annual revenue
Firm	168.0	$782,300
Federal project use	130.9	392,700
Seasonal nonfirm	95.0	285,000
Dump	184.0	368,000
Total	577.9	1,828,000

Mr. CHURCH. Burns Creek Dam is a part of Palisades electrically and hydraulically by virtue of the physical characteristics of the river, as I have described them. It is a part of the Palisades project financially as a matter of common sense, and prudent governmental policy.

Here is what the committee reported:

DESCRIPTION OF BURNS CREEK DAM, RESERVOIR, AND POWERPLANT, PALISADES PROJECT, IDAHO

The Burns Creek development would be located on the Snake River in Bonneville County, Idaho, about 30 miles downstream from the Palisades Dam of the Bureau of Reclamation. It would be integrated electrically, hydraulically, and financially with the existing Palisades project.

The prime purpose is reregulation of releases from the Palisades Reservoir to prevent undesirable fluctuations in river stages and thus would result in more efficient use of the Palisades project. At site power production, holdover storage for irrigation, recreation,

and the preservation and propagation of fish and wildlife are other purposes of the Burns Creek development.

The proposed plan is to construct a 176-foot high-rolled earth-filled dam to form a 234,000 acre-foot reservoir. In addition to use of reservoir capacity to reregulate Palisades releases and maintain power head for the proposed 90,000-kilowatt powerplant, 100,000 acre-feet of capacity will be available for long-term holdover irrigation storage purposes.

The most effective use of both the Palisades and Burns Creek developments would be obtained through their combined operation. Without downstream regulation, for instance, the operation of Palisades powerplant would be limited by restrictions on streamflow fluctuations below Palisades Dam. The integrated or combined operations would permit the prime power output from the Palisades powerplant alone to be more than doubled.

Mr. President, notwithstanding the fact that this project enjoys general approval in my State, from the water users, the REA co-ops, municipalities, and the public, as a sound extension of the Palisades project, the Idaho Power Co. has announced against it, and the Utah Power & Light Co. appeared before the committee to actively oppose it.

What are their arguments, and what are the answers to them?

IV. POWER COMPANY OPPOSITION—A. IRRIGATION A MINOR BENEFIT

The power company's spokesman listed as a first objection that "irrigation benefits are very minor."

There are two answers to this objection:

First, as we have seen, the history of the development of irrigation shows conclusively that the concept of holdover storage—insurance water—is the most important irrigation concept in southern Idaho, governing all Federal development since 1920. If this had not been the test, we would have had no storage after American Falls. The fact that you may rarely collect on your insurance policy is no excuse for not having one, and the waterusers of Idaho thoroughly understand this, even though the utility company apparently does not.

The second answer has also been explained in detail—much of the power production of the project will be used for irrigation pumping.

The average seasonal cost to the Idaho farmer purchasing power generated at Federal hydroelectric plants, to irrigate one acre by pumping is $4.60, as compared to $10.40 per acre at the Utah Power & Light Co.'s rates. As the committee has concluded, much of this land could not be economically served with irrigation pumping at the private utility rate.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator from Idaho yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from Texas?

Mr. CHURCH. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I ask unanimous consent that there may be 1 hour of debate on the bill, to be equally divided between the proponents of the bill and the opponents of the bill, as designated by the minority leader.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I should like to get some idea of the time situation.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. There would be a half hour for the junior Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH] and the senior Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK]; and a half hour for the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] and the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT].

Mr. GOLDWATER. The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] wishes to speak. The Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] wishes to speak on this question. I have a speech which will be very short, if I can stick to it. I do not know if the time proposed will be sufficient.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Let us make it 1 hour and 10 minutes, to be equally divided. That will take care of the needs expressed by all of the Senators.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Beginning when?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Now.

Mr. GOLDWATER. May I ask the junior Senator from Idaho how much more time he expects to take?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. He would have 15 minutes under this proposed allotment. There would be an hour and 10 minutes, to be equally divided.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Texas? The Chair hears none, and the agreement is entered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. There will be an hour and 10 minutes, half of the time to be allotted to the junior Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH] and the senior Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK].

Mr. BENNETT. Is that an hour and 10 minutes to be divided equally?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. An hour and 10 minutes.

Mr. BENNETT. An hour and 10 minutes, equally divided between the opponents and the proponents.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. If it is agreeable, inasmuch as the junior Senator from Idaho has the floor, we ought to add 30 minutes for the proponents and 40 minutes for the opponents. Is that agreeable?

Mr. CHURCH. That is agreeable.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none. Without objection, it is so ordered. The junior Senator from Idaho has the floor. Thirty minutes is allotted to the proponents, and 40 minutes to the opponents.

How much time does the Senator allot himself?

Mr. CHURCH. I allot myself 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator may proceed.

B. FEASIBILITY

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, the second major objection urged is that this is not a feasible project.

Determination of feasibility, under the provisions of section 9(a) of the Reclamation Act of 1939, which imposed statutory standards, is the responsibility of the Bureau of Reclamation. In addition to satisfying their own lawyers, the Bureau's administrators must secure the concurrence of the Bureau of the Budget, under the Budget Circular A-47.

The committee thoroughly reviewed all the arguments adduced by the power company and concluded that the Bureau of Reclamation had acted in accordance with the law and applicable regulations in making the requisite determination of economic feasibility.

Neither the committee nor the Senate is in a position to get into the complexities of payout data, allocations, and the like. What the committee did do was require the company's spokesmen and the Bureau officials to take their differing computations into the conference room and come out with agreement, if possible, on the mathematics. On the basis that the interest-bearing debts were repaid first, the Bureau and the company wound up in close agreement on lengths of the various repayment periods.

The Congress gave the Bureau the duty of determining feasibility under specific criteria. The Bureau has certified that the project is feasible within these standards.

Nevertheless, it may be worthwhile to point out the fallacy of the company's argument that Burns Creek should not be considered as an integral part of Palisades.

The reasons why Burns Creek was investigated, designed, and proposed on the basis of hydraulic, electrical, and financial integration with Palisades have already been discussed. If a manufacturer should decide that adding a smaller unit to his main plant would more than double his production, it is doubtful that he would waste his time on the academic question of what his unit cost of production at the second plant would be if the first plant did not exist. We have seen that Palisades is already there, and that Burns Creek and Palisades together will more than double the output of Palisades alone. It is less than businesslike to ask the Government to be so unrealistic as to ignore the existence of Palisades, the parent structure, in calculating costs and benefits of Burns Creek, the reregulating plant.

No business would do it that way. The Utah Power & Light Co. would not calculate the economic desirability of a new steam unit as if the hydro plant with which it was to be integrally operated were not there.

The same thing is true as to the rate structure. Burns Creek power is to be marketed at the Palisades rates. The Bureau of Reclamation cannot be in the position of charging its customers different rates, the determination to be based upon the plant that originates the energy. The Utah Power & Light Co. could not be expected to distinguish between its customers based on whether the energy they consumed came from its hydro plant at Grace, Idaho, where its cost of generation is 1.33 mills per kilowatt-hour, or its steamplant Hale No. 2, where the cost is 4.24 mills, or its diesel plant at Vernal, where its cost is 14.18 mills.

C. NEED FOR REREGULATION

Much the same comments must be made with reference to the objection that the suggested need for reregulation has not been proven, or that it could be provided in any event at an estimated cost of less than $9 million.

The long-term hold-over storage, the power features of Burns Creek in conjunction with Palisades, and all the other benefits have been calculated by the responsible engineers to produce optimum development of the site. This accords with the statutory standards established by Congress for this type of works.

D. THERE IS NO POWER SHORTAGE IN THE AREA

At the hearings, Mr. President, spokesmen for the Utah Power & Light Co. contended there was no power shortage in southern Idaho, and that the Burns Creek Dam threatened somehow to intrude upon the market served by the private utility.

I have already fully documented the incontrovertible facts of the imminent shortage of power facing the very preference customers now purchasing the available firm power output of Palisades and the other Bureau dams. It is not necessary to repeat these facts here. However, neither the committee nor the Bureau of Reclamation has any intention to permit the Burns Creek Dam to intrude upon the market of the Utah Power & Light Co. That it will not do so is borne out by the letter I received from the Department of Interior, dated June 12, 1959, which takes all factors, including the contemplated integration contract with the Idaho Power Co., into account. I ask unanimous consent to have the text of the letter printed at this point in the RECORD:

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

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
BUREAU OF RECLAMATION,
Washington, D.C., June 12, 1959.

Hon. FRANK CHURCH,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR CHURCH: We have made a new repayment study of the proposed Burns Creek development on the basis of deferring the installation of generators to meet anticipated load growth of preference customers. This would be in accord with the last sentence of section 1 of Committee Print No. 2 of June 1, 1959, on S. 281. We are pleased to provide you herein a summary of the results of this study.

The estimated load growth of Bureau of Reclamation commercial loads in south Idaho was discussed during the recent Senate hearings, and the load growth curve is printed on page 98 of the hearings on S. 281, March 16 and May 11, 1959. That curve shows that presently available Federal power is fully utilized and that additional loads up to 1965 were to be met by integration with the Idaho Power Co. After that date Burns Creek was to come on the line to meet future load growth.

The proposed contract with the Idaho Power Co. to obtain 30,000 kilowatts of power is agreeable to both the power company and the Department of the Interior. At the request of Senator MURRAY, execution of the contract has been held in abeyance. Execution of this contract will not affect the feasibility of Burns Creek.

Assuming the contract is executed, and based upon the proposed amendment, the first Burns Creek generator would be installed by the end of fiscal year 1965. To meet further load growth, it is contemplated that the remaining two of the three 30,000-kilowatt Burns Creek generators would be installed by the end of fiscal year 1969.

On the basis of the deferred installation of the generators, the repayment study of the Palisades-Burns Creek combination shows that the repayment period for total costs would be extended 4 years, to fiscal year 2019, from that shown in the study based on all generators being installed in 1 year. There is enclosed a tabulation comparing repayments under the two different procedures.

As shown in the tabulation, the commercial power allocation, under deferred generator installation, would be repaid with interest in the 52d and 44th year, respectively, of the Palisades and Burns Creek repayment periods. Total costs including irrigation assistance would be repaid in the 50th year after the last two Burns Creek generators are installed. We concluded that Burns Creek would be a feasible development on either basis of generator installation.

The question of use of natural gas for irrigation pumping in southern Idaho has been raised. We have looked into this and are enclosing for your information a "Statement on Use and Effect on Burns Creek Generation of Natural Gas for Operation of Irrigation Pumps in Southern Idaho." This statement concludes that pumping by gas, when all costs are considered, generally would be more expensive; therefore, it is not probable that gas would be competitive to electric power from Burns Creek, and no appreciable effect on use of Burns Creek generation is anticipated.

Sincerely yours,

ALFRED R. GOLZÉ,
Acting Commissioner.

Palisades project-Burns Creek combined study, Bureau of Reclamation—Repayment table

Function	Amount		Total repayment year		Year of Palisades payout		Year of Burns Creek payout	
	Deferred generator installation	Generators not deferred	Deferred generator installation	Generators not deferred	Deferred generator installation	Generators not deferred	Deferred generator installation	Generators not deferred
Commercial power [1]	$60,496,462	$60,723,462	2009	2005	52	48	44	40
Irrigation power	[2] 8,214,760	[2] 8,214,760	2013	2009	56	52	48	44
Irrigation	[3] 24,065,600	[3] 24,065,000	[4] 2019	2015	62	58	[4] 54	50

[1] Commercial power repaid with 3 percent interest.
[2] Repaid using surplus power revenues.
[3] Includes Palisades allocation of $19,717,000 plus $4,348,600 in assistance to irrigation on Michaud Flats project and Michaud division of the Fort Hall Indian project. Of the total amount, $10,075,000 is repaid by irrigators and $13,900,000 from surplus power revenues.
[4] 2019 is 50 years after the last 2 Burns Creek generators are installed.

E. CHURCH-O'MAHONEY AMENDMENT

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, there is little doubt that the present preference customers will need the power developed by Burns Creek by the time the project is completed. But it will be seen, in S. 281 and in the foregoing letter, that an amendment has been added to this bill which would require the Secretary of the Interior to schedule installation of generators at Burns Creek, based upon the actual load growth requirements of these preference customers.

The only customers served by Palisades which do not fall in the preference category are the Utah Power and Light Co., and the Idaho Power Co., both of whom get only secondary energy. All of the firm power is committed to the preference customers. Nevertheless, in the effort of the committee absolutely to preclude the possibility of competition between the Bureau and the private utility companies, this amendment, sponsored by the distinguished Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] and myself, was agreed to:

Installation of power generating facilities shall be scheduled by the Secretary on the basis of providing for the additional power requirements of those entitled to preference in the purchase thereof under the Federal reclamation laws.

The committee expressed its view that the preference customers are entitled to look to federally generated power for energy to meet their load growth. This is in accord with long established Federal practice.

It should be noted that of the preference customers in the vicinity of Palisades, only 4 out of the 20 which buy from the Bureau of Reclamation are in the service area claimed by the Utah Power & Light Co. Not one of these is presently buying any power from the Utah Power & Light Co. The Burns Creek Dam, as authorized by this bill, cannot invade the market of the Utah Power & Light Co.

F. OPPOSITION OF COAL INTERESTS

The last subject I want to treat is the opposition of the coal interests in Wyoming.

The objections came first from the United Mine Workers district president. One of these was that the project was uneconomic, and data was presented identical to that theretofore presented by the Utah Power & Light Co. Also, however, it was asserted that hydroelectric plants should not be developed in the face of the unemployment situation in the coal industry.

Committee inquiry in March developed that the real concern of the coal people was the fear that, should Burns Creek be built, the Utah Power & Light Co. would defer its plans to build a steam generating plant at Kemmerer, Wyo.

When the hearings were resumed in May, this matter was clarified. The Utah Power Co. submitted documentary evidence and gave testimony that its plans at Kemmerer were firm and that Burns Creek Dam would not postpone the construction of their Kemmerer plant.

Notwithstanding, the coal company persists in the contention that the coal mine employment will be adversely affected. There is nothing wrong with their arithmetic. The trouble is that it is only arithmetic, for it is merely an arithmetical computation to determine how much coal would be necessary to produce an amount of energy equivalent to that which would be produced by Burns Creek.

The fallacy is, as we have already seen, that a great amount of the energy from Burns Creek is to be used for irrigation pumping loads, at rates possible with hydroelectric generation but not possible with thermal generation. Failure to develop Burns Creek will not divert this load to thermal sources.

The situation of the irrigation pumpers, who can't afford steam-generated electric power, but can afford the hydroelectric power which is produced when the reservoirs are being released to fill the irrigation canals, demonstrates the tiein between power development and reclamation which is the keystone of the development of the arid mountain West.

But this is only part of the story. It is well known that the Northwest, and the country at large, is approaching the end of its hydroelectric capability. Our fast-growing population, and the relatively faster-growing use of electricity, portends that by 1980, even in the bountiful hydro area of the Northwest, a substantial percentage of electric requirements will have to be met with consumable fuels.

In areas like ours these fuels furnish their highest contribution in their ability to level out the fluctuations in energy generation which depends on river flow, and is subordinate to irrigation requirements. Fuels cannot replace the river, but they can supplement it. Taken with the river, these fuels are put to their most efficient use.

To burn coal, oil, or gas while water is falling unchecked toward the sea is a wasting of assets. Coal is and will be required, and in increasing amounts, but to say that primary reliance should be on coal while cheaper hydropower is available, is not only shortsighted and wasteful, but contrary to the management principles the private utility itself follows. It is contrary also to the practices of Congress in the development of the rivers of the West, over the past half century.

CONCLUSION

Mr. President, Burns Creek has claimed longer and more sustained effort on my part than any other single project I have sought since coming to the Senate. Yet, this is a project which has general approval in Idaho, which is recommended by the administration, which is backed by our whole delegation in Congress, and which has a record of favorable action in the committee and in the Senate in the 85th Congress, and favorable action in the Senate committee again in this Congress.

The merits of the project cry out for recognition. The insurance water it will provide may well prevent a crop loss more severe than the cost of the dam. As a natural extension of the Palisades project, Burns Creek Dam will reregulate the flow of the Snake River so that its parent structure may be operated for optimum benefits. Burns Creek will supply urgently needed firm power for the shortage-plagued cooperatives and other preference customers, at pumping rates the irrigators can afford.

Finally, Burns Creek Dam will pay for itself, with interest, in less than 50 years. It is a wise and prudent public investment.

That is why I have so fully reviewed the facts, to place the Burns Creek Dam in its proper perspective in the continuing story of the development of Idaho's greatest artery of life, the Snake River.

Mr. President, 2 years ago, I concluded my presentation to the Senate on the bill to authorize Hells Canyon Dam with words every bit as applicable to the bill now pending before us. I said:

> The issue that underlies this bill is as old as history and as broad as man's experience. All that we really have to sustain us, fundamentally, is the air, the soil, and the water. These are the elemental things of life. Civilizations that ill used the soil and the water, have quickly withered and died, for nature's penalty is inexorable. But proud and prosperous have been the civilizations that understood the Scripture:
>
> "He sendeth the springs into the valleys, which run among the hills * * * He causeth the grass to grow for the cattle, and herb for the service of man."
>
> Those empires that wisely utilized the water endured the test of centuries. Ancient wells, aqueducts, and reservoirs, some still serviceable after two millenniums attest to the lesson well learned.
>
> Mr. President, this bill will put a wondrous water resource to wise and efficient use. It is a bill that serves no interest, save the people's interest. It is a good bill. It should pass.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I yield myself 12 minutes.

As the senior Senator from Utah, a State which pioneered in the field of irrigation and water development, I have consistently supported worthwhile reclamation projects when they have come before the Senate for approval. It is, therefore, an unusual occasion for me today to have to arise in opposition to the Burns Creek project in my neighboring State of Idaho.

NOT A RECLAMATION PROJECT

There are three basic reasons why I cannot support the bill. In the first place, it is not a reclamation project. Even a casual reading of the report relating to this legislation will quickly indicate to the reader that this is a multi-million-dollar public power program brought before the Congress under the venerated and more respected designation as a reclamation project. Although the bill indicates that irrigation is one of the primary reasons for authorizing this project, only 1.7 percent, or $849,000 out of a total estimated construction cost of almost $49 million, would be allocated to irrigation. A total of 98.2 percent, or $47,872,000, is allocated to power and cost of interest during construction. The remaining 0.1 percent, or $49,000, is the estimated recreational or fish and wildlife benefits which might accrue from the project.

According to the statistics furnished by the Bureau of Reclamation, not one new acre of land would be brought under cultivation as a result of construction of the proposed Burns Creek Reservoir. At most, it would provide only 100,000 acre-feet of secondary water which would be stored indefinitely. Testimony of the regional reclamation director indicated that this water might be used only two or three times in a 50-year period. The last serious drought in this area occurred some three decades ago in the early thirties.

BURNS CREEK IS NOT NEEDED

A second reason for my opposition to this project is that there is not a shred of evidence to indicate that this project is needed. Certainly it is not needed for reclamation purposes, because as I previously indicated it does not provide any additional water for application to adjacent lands. The reservoir is not needed for storage purposes because existing facilities provide storage for 4,093,520 acre-feet of water and this is almost equal to the entire average annual flow of the upper Snake River, which is only about 4½ million acre-feet. The reservoir is not needed for river reregulation and this is best borne out by the fact that the Bureau of Reclamation, in apportioning the costs of this project, did not allocate a single dollar for this purpose. If in the future, reregulation of streamflow should become necessary, the Bureau testified that a reregulating dam could be built for $5 million to $6 million, or approximately one-tenth of the estimated cost of the Burns Creek project. I believe the junior Senator from Idaho said $9 million.

The proposed reservoir is not needed for production of electric power—unless the Federal Government is bound and determined to launch forth on an unlimited public power program where the sky is the limit and the taxpayers and corporate investors are left holding the proverbial bag. Adequate electric service is now being provided in the area by private and municipal power companies and REA's. Power needs for future growth can be adequately furnished from facilities at the Palisades Dam, and from a new powerplant to be constructed at Kemmerer, Wyo., which will utilize a coal-steam plant process, thus providing badly needed employment for miners in this depressed area.

This plant, which will be built by the privately owned electric company which has the franchise to serve the area, will ultimately produce 300,000 kilowatts. It will furnish electricity to the same region where Burns Creek power would be marketed, and there is good reason to believe that this private power will be available much sooner than will electricity from the Government-sponsored project. Therefore, it can readily be seen that there is no need to authorize this project to avert any power shortage, because private sources will provide additional electricity quicker and without cost to the taxpayers.

The Bureau of Reclamation admitted in testimony that this power project could only be justified on the basis of the Federal Government assuming an unwarranted obligation of providing preference customers with power to meet

their growing loads. I submit that this is not a valid reason and certainly does not represent my thinking or that of many of my colleagues, and I hope Congress will repudiate any such policy.

Mr. President, I was very much interested in reading in the report a statement made by the Bureau of Reclamation to the effect that "these people now have contracts for power with the Federal Government, and we believe that they should continue to receive from the Federal Government power to meet their growing loads."

Are we now to accept the doctrine that once customers are attached to Federal Government generating stations, they must thereafter be taken care of only in that way, and that private power resources can never again serve them?

PROJECT IS UNECONOMICAL

Mr. President, a third major reason for my opposition to this project is that it is uneconomical from the concept of the ratio of benefits to costs, normally applied to reclamation projects. The Bureau of Reclamation has calculated that the benefit-cost ratio on this project is only 1.26 to 1. Actually, the benefits are probably far less than calculated and the eventual costs will far exceed those indicated in the majority report of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

In making its calculations, the Bureau of Reclamation used a 2½ percent interest rate and a period of 100 years in arriving at the benefit-cost ratio. Assuming an interest rate of 3 percent and a payout period of 50 years, which is the norm on reclamation projects, the benefit-cost ratio would be reduced to 1.06 to 1. This would place the project on the borderline of feasibility, and it would assume that construction costs would remain unchanged, which they will not. Actually, the Bureau of Reclamation calculations are based on data collected in 1955 during feasibility investigations of the project, and construction costs have increased appreciably during the past 4 years. However, the Bureau has never recomputed the benefit-cost ratio on the basis of these increased costs of construction.

This is a power project pure and simple; yet when analyzed on this basis it would produce very high cost power as compared to other hydroelectric projects. Burns Creek power standing alone would cost an average of 5.27 mills, as compared with the 5.48 mills which is estimated to be the cost of privately produced power from a steam generating plant—almost identical. On the other hand, power produced upstream at Palisades costs only 3.67 mills per kilowatt-hour. Using the most optimistic estimates provided by the Bureau, the total annual revenue anticipated from Burns Creek is $1,125,000, which is $311,000 short of meeting the annual interest charges of $1,436,000. Therefore, the Bureau proposes to integrate Burns Creek with the Palisades project, raise the cost of power, postpone the payout on the latter project, and take revenues from Palisades in order to make Burns Creek financially and economically feasible. It is a simple case of taking an unsound and uneconomic project which cannot stand on its own merits and, by combining it with an already approved project, slip it by the careful scrutiny of Congress.

DETRIMENTAL TO COAL INDUSTRY

Mr. President, there is another practical reason why this proposal is not sound. If built, the Burns Creek project can only furnish power in the summertime, and the greater winter needs for power will be supplied by a privately owned, large steam-generating unit now under construction at Kemmerer, Wyo. This will accentuate the seasonal imbalance for the privately owned generator and will displace approximately 250,000 tons of coal per year, representing an annual loss of some 20,000 man shifts for the coal miners, with corresponding losses to local communities in taxes and wages. Employment in the coal-producing industry of this area is already depressed, and this would do it greater damage.

Mr. President, I was very much impressed by the statement made by the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH] that water is a renewable resource and can be used constantly, while coal is a wasting resource.

In Utah, Wyoming, and Colorado we have coal resources which will last, even at the present rate of use, for 400 or 500 years; and if the day is ever to come when coal will be so valuable that it cannot be burned for heating or power, I am afraid that day is far far in the future.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD three telegrams which are representative of many communications which I have received in recent weeks in opposition to the Burns Creek project. They are from Thomas Kennedy, acting president of the United Mine Workers of America; T. J. Canavan, executive secretary of the Utah-Wyoming Coal Operators Association; and Harry Mangus, president of district 22, United Mine Workers of America, Price, Utah. Mr. Mangus' responsibility embraces the Kemmerer coalfields.

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

MARCH 16, 1959.

Hon. WALLACE F. BENNETT,
U.S. Senator, Washington D.C.:

The United Mine Workers of America protests the passage of Senate bill 281 upon which the Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation is presently conducting hearings. Passage of this bill providing for the Burns Creek project will displace 250,000 tons of coal per year and will adversely affect the Utah-Wyoming bituminous coal industry, causing economic chaos and widespread unemployment. No power shortage presently exists in this area which would justify the construction of such hydroelectric facilities, and plans are currently under way to construct facilities for steam-generated power from bituminous coal, which will satisfy future power requirements. We urge that you actively oppose this legislation which will have such a deleterious effect on the coal industry, and we request that this telegram be read at the hearings on Senate bill 281 and be made a part of the record.

THOMAS KENNEDY,
Acting President,
United Mine Workers of America.
WASHINGTON, D.C.

MAY 28, 1959.

Hon. WALLACE F. BENNETT,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

News release in the Salt Lake Tribune, May 26, indicates that Burns Creek (S. 281), which is admittedly a power project, is to be acted favorably upon by Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation on basis of compromise. Suggested compromise—to build Burns Creek but to put in units a year or so apart, depending upon preference customers' need—would be just as detrimental to coal industry in area as original Burns Creek bill. As brought out by Mr. Glaeser in testimony before committee on March 16, Burns Creek generation of one-half billion kilowatt-hours would displace approximately 250,000 tons of coal annually and 20,000 man-shifts of coal miners. Market for 250,000 tons of coal in this area is urgently needed to stabilize employment in the coal mining industry and related industries already depressed, and to improve the economy of the coal mining business. The very insignificant benefits accruing to the State of Idaho compared to the serious detriment imposed on Wyoming and Utah as the result of constructing the Burns Creek power project do not justify proceeding with this project on any basis. We, therefore, urgently request that you give this bill your immediate consideration in order to adequately protect the economy in your State.

T. J. CANAVAN,
Executive Secretary, Utah-Wyoming Coal Operators Association.
SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH.

MAY 29, 1959.

Senator WALLACE F. BENNETT,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

News release in Salt Lake Tribune indicates that Subcommittee on Burns Creek Project, Senate bill 281, has reached agreement on a form of proposal. Wish to advise subcommittee's agreed form is detrimental. As Mine Workers had previously informed you, this project will displace one-fourth million tons coal per year and displace 20,000 man-shifts of labor. You are familiar with coal industry's present situation in States of Wyoming and Utah. Sincerely urge to oppose this bill in present form. Thank you, and you are at liberty to read this telegram in record.

HARRY MANGUS,
President, District 22, United Mine Workers of America.
PRICE, UTAH.

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

Mr. BENNETT. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. The Senator from Utah has presented a very forceful case against the bill. It appears to me to be absolutely ridiculous to call this a reclamation project. It is a distortion of the reclamation law to authorize a project which, right on its face, shows that only 1.75 percent of the cost will be allocated for reclamation.

Also, it is on a completely unsound basis when it provides for a 2½-percent interest rate over a 100-year period. As the Senator has pointed out, if the cost of this project is figured on the basis on which such projects are normally figured it would show a cost-benefit ratio which is about equal. We all know that under such circumstances, such legislation is never enacted.

I hope the effort to push this project will be defeated.

Mr. BENNETT. I appreciate the comments of the Senator from New York.

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

Mr. BENNETT. I yield.

Mr. DWORSHAK. I feel it incumbent upon me to call attention to the unfair comments which were just made by the Senator from New York. I do not think anyone is trying to force this particular bill down the throat of any Member of this body. I am somewhat amazed to find some of my Republican colleagues rise in opposition to this measure, notwithstanding the fact that the Bureau of the Budget, representing the administration and its partnership power program, has endorsed it. I am really amazed to find that some of my Republican colleagues contend that this project is for public power because it is a project in Idaho.

Certainly there are comparable projects—and many of them are not nearly so feasible and desirable—in every State of the Union; and they involve the generation of power at the expense of the Federal Government, but they are not regarded by some as public power projects.

Can the Senator from Utah tell me why such a distinction is made?

I am sure the Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING] does not mean to repudiate the Budget Bureau and the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. I know that many times the committees make mistakes; and I do not always follow the recommendations of our committees, because I think Senators have the responsibility of reaching independent conclusions. Perhaps that is being done in this case.

But I must emphasize that the public works bill which was passed by this body only a few weeks ago appropriated funds for 70 new starts, without the recommendation or the support of the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, from my point of view there is a fundamental difference between projects which are essentially reclamation projects and those which are essentially power producers.

The particular project now under our consideration bothers me, not because it is located in Idaho, but because the power need is already being met by a coal-burning, steam-powered generating plant which is being constructed in the same area. From that point of view, I think the plant now proposed is unnecessary. There is no particular difference between the cost of the power to be generated at the two plants; and I believe that the regulation of the river flow and the amount of reclamation involved could be cared for much more completely by other means.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BYRD of West Virginia in the chair). The time the Senator from Utah has yielded to himself has expired.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 additional minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah is recognized for 1 more minute.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I come now to my conclusions:

CONCLUSIONS

At this critical period in history, when the Federal Government is doing everything possible to cut expenditures and bring about economic stability, it would seem most unwise to authorize this $50 million project. This money could certainly be used more advantageously on other justifiable projects, where an actual need exists.

In my opinion, which is well borne out by facts, this is a poorly conceived, unjustified, and uneconomic project. It will furnish no additional firm water for irrigation purposes. Sufficient electric power is now being supplied to the area, and long-range plans have been made to provide additional power facilities for future growth and expansion. If the project is built, only a few preference customers will receive any benefits, while the taxpayers and private investors will stand to lose another round in the battle against inflation and total public power. If, as proposed, some of the generators were not installed initially, the economic feasibility of the project would be further reduced; and, as previously indicated, the benefit-cost ratio is already very tenuous.

Mr. President, I conclude that this is not a project worthy of congressional approval; and I hope that the Senate will act wisely and will vote against Senate bill 281.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Utah yield some time to me?

Mr. BENNETT. How much time does the Senator from Arizona desire to have?

Mr. GOLDWATER. First, let me ask what the situation in regard to the time is at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Twenty-seven minutes remain.

Mr. BENNETT. Yes. We have used 13 minutes; and 27 minutes remain.

Mr. GOLDWATER. If the Senator from Utah will yield 15 minutes to me, I believe that much time will suffice.

Mr. BENNETT. Very well, Mr. President; I yield 15 minutes to the Senator from Arizona.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I have always been interested in western reclamation. I think all westerners are. I believe we recognize that without reclamation, vast areas in the West which once were deserts would still be deserts, instead of being the lush valleys they are today.

My record in behalf of reclamation has been long, clear, and unbroken. It is because of my interest in reclamation that I opposed the Burns Creek development in committee, and I now rise to oppose it on the Senate floor. I oppose it because it is not a reclamation project. It will not reclaim a single acre of land, and will offer no benefits to existing reclaimed land. In fact, as I shall show, the proposed development would actually be a detriment to reclamation.

But, Mr. President, consider how this piece of proposed legislation is introduced to the Senate of the United States: The preamble states:

> To authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain a reregulating reservoir and other works at the Burns Creek site in the Upper Snake River Valley, Idaho, and for other purposes.

The committee report recommending the project to the Senate repeats the same purpose.

We are busy and it is impossible for each of us to make a detailed study of each piece of proposed legislation that we are asked to decide upon. We are compelled, on many pieces of proposed legislation, to base our decisions on reports from our various committees; and we depend upon them for reliable, factual information.

From reading the preamble of the bill and the first paragraph of the committee report, one would naturally get the impression that this was primarily a reregulating reservoir, and would assume that it was needed for that purpose in connection with a reclamation development. But not 1 cent—I repeat, not 1 cent—of the cost of this project is allocated to reregulation. Ninety-eight and two-tenths percent of the cost of the project is allocated to electric power. So, in every practical sense of the word, this is a hydroelectric power development—nothing more, nothing less.

Mr. President, I may say that I find it difficult to understand how some Senators who fought so bitterly against the Hells Canyon project now find themselves in a position to support a similar project farther upstream.

Mr. President, I wish to say to my reclamation State friends on both sides of the aisle—to those who are sincerely interested in reclamation; and I think most of us are—that if we are to be able to make appropriations for needed reclamation, we are going to have to stick to reclamation projects, at least to projects the major benefits of which are reclamation. Our friends from other States, who have been sympathetic to reclamation, are not going to sit idly by and let us put over just any old project because it may be tagged with a reclamation label. That sort of subterfuge is going to make it more difficult for us to get money for true reclamation projects that are really needed. Besides, when money is allocated to the Bureau of Reclamation to build all-out power projects, just that much less money will be available for true reclamation. That was one of my principal objections to the Hells Canyon project—it was for power, not for reclamation.

Mr. President, I am not going to burden the Senate by attempting to cover all of the details in connection with the Burns Creek project. I covered most of them rather thoroughly in my views which appear on the last four pages of the committee report. I urge my colleagues to read those views before making up their minds on this proposed legislation. Those views are nothing that I dreamed up. All of them are supported by the record. There are, how-

ever, some very salient facts which I want to call to the attention of my colleagues, even at the cost of repetition.

First. The proposed development will not be a reregulating reservoir. The Palisades project has been in operation, and producing power, for 3 years; and the need for reregulation has not been demonstrated. If reregulation is needed, the Burns Creek project will not do the job. The Burns Creek dam is to be situated about 30 miles below the Palisades project; it would have almost as much installed capacity as Palisades project—90,000 kilowatts as against 114,000 kilowatts—and would use the same water. So if reregulation is needed below the Palisades project, it will be needed below the Burns Creek project. Ir reregulation is ever needed, it can be obtained by constructing a small dam downstream of the Palisades project, at a cost of $7 million or $8 million.

Second. The project now proposed would serve no new land, and would offer negligible benefits to land already under irrigation. It would provide 100,000 acre-feet of storage for irrigation which would be needed two or three times in 50 years. Only 1¾ percent of the cost of the project is allocated to reclamation. With such minor benefits to irrigation, could anyone, by any stretch of the imagination, consider this to be a reclamation project?

Third. Although it is a power project, as a power project it is not economically feasible. On reclamation projects, the legal rate of interest on power features is 3 percent; but on this project, which is proposed as a reclamation project, power will not even pay the cost of operations and 2½ percent interest on the investment. I do not know how the 2½ percent-interest rate entered into the argument, but it did; and at that rate, which is below the legal rate, this project is still economically unsound. The Bureau of Reclamation told another committee, "Burns Creek would be impossible, standing alone."

Fourth. The bill alleges the project would be authorized to "assist in the irrigation of arid and semiarid lands." Is there any assistance to a project in making it cost more—in taking a longer time to pay it out? The Palisades project would pay out on its own by 1990, but when it is loaded down by having to help pay out Burns Creek, it will take until the year 2015 to pay it out. The Palisades standing alone will be more than $28 million better off if Burns Creek is never built.

Fifth. Have we ever had a policy of assuming complete utility responsibility on the part of the Federal Government when it has furnished some electric power to someone? If so, I have not heard of it being accepted, with the possible exception of TVA, and I think in that instance we have been wrong. But, Mr. President, that seems to be what we are presented with in the case of Burns Creek. It also seems there is some difference of opinion in the same department.

Mr. Aandahl, Assistant Secretary of Interior, said:

> We do feel that it would be very unwise for us, as the marketing agency for all Federal power, except that which is in the Tennessee Valley, to try to establish a total utility responsibility for any group of customers.

But then Mr. N. B. Bennett, now Assistant Commissioner of Reclamation, who I assume is under Secretary Aandahl, said:

> But these people now have contracts for power with the Federal Government and we believe that they should continue to receive from the Federal Government power to meet their growing loads.

If furnishing power to meet growing loads is not complete utility responsibility, then I do not know what complete utility responsibility is. However, there is one thing I do know, Mr. President: If we are going to accept the complete utility responsibility concept, then we really are stuck. That means that in every place we have had some electric power produced as a byproduct of either reclamation, flood control, or navigation projects, and sold it to someone, we are accepting a utility responsibility to furnish them power for load growth or future requirements. Where does that lead us? In simple terms, it means that the Federal Government is going to be in the business of producing electric power all over the United States, and in unlimited quantities. We will soon exhaust hydroelectric potential, so the Government will have to resort to other means of producing the power to carry out this electric utility concept. That means Federal steam powerplants all over the country.

Mr. President, are we willing to accept such a concept? If we are, let us not chisel in and do the job piecemeal—a little here and a little there—let us get the job done right. Let us tell those we represent that we are going to nationalize the electric power industry and take it over. Let us tell them that we, their representatives, accept socialism; and see how they feel about that. As it is, we have been progressing rather rapidly down the road toward nationalization of the electric industry. Only one generation ago one-half of 1 percent of the power produced in the United States was produced by the Federal Government, and now it is about 15 percent. That is rather rapid progress, in my book. Every time one of these Government power projects comes up we are told there is plenty of room for both Government and private power, but I am going to tell you, Mr. President, the room is running out. At the present rate of progress, within another generation there will not be room for anything but Government power, because that will be all that we shall have. No one will have voted for nationalization of the industry, because we shall never have the opportunity to vote. We shall do it just a little at a time.

Sixth. Since Burns Creek is nothing but a power project, the only legitimate justification for it would be the need for additional power. Nowhere in the record is there any indication of a power shortage or a pending shortage in the area. Quite to the contrary, the area is adequately supplied, and there is every indication that their supply for the future is assured. The only thing that might be running out is tax-subsidized Federal power. The people out there are getting some cheap Federal power now, and I suppose it is natural for them to want some more of it if the rest of us are willing to put up our dollars to subsidize it. They would probably take some free meals too, if the rest of us would pay for them; but it is time to call a halt to these things—in fact, it is long past time—unless we want the enslavement of cradle-to-the-grave security that inevitably comes with the totalitarian state.

Seventh. One other thing I want to bring up before closing, Mr. President, is the coal situation. The power that would be supplied from Burns Creek would replace power that would otherwise be supplied by coal-fired steam plants. One of these days before long we are going to run out of hydroelectric power in the west, and even before that time we are going to find it more important to conserve water for consumptive use than to produce power with it. The answer is we are going to have to look to other sources for our power supply, and coal will be a very important source. We should be encouraging coal production, rather than discouraging it. Mr. President, you do not decide you need coal one day and start producing it. You have to have producers experienced in the business and miners skilled in the art. These people do not crop up over night. In my opinion, it is far more important to encourage development of natural resources, such as coal in the West, than it is to produce a little subsidized Federal power for a few privileged power consumers.

Mr. President, in my opinion, no one who has studied this Burns Creek development could, with conscience, recommend it unless his philosophy is Government power at any price, or unless he is on the receiving end of the gravy train. I have always had a high regard for most of those in the Bureau of Reclamation and find it hard to reconcile their position in recommending this project.

The pending bill should be soundly defeated—in fact, it never should have been introduced.

Mr. President, in the few moments I have left, I wish to put this whole question again in the right perspective. It is not a reclamation project. By no stretch of the imagination of anyone who is acquainted with reclamation could it be said that a project in which not even 1 cent is charged to reregulating, in which only 7 percent of the storage is going to be used for that purpose, could be called a reclamation project. Yet this bill is being presented to the Senate today clothed falsely with the name of reclamation.

My fear, as one who was born in the arid West, who has grown up there, who

realizes the extreme importance of reclamation to all of us in this country, is that if we take this step today to build a power project under the guise of reclamation we may be doing irreparable damage to reclamation projects of the future.

I hope that my colleagues will study this bill in the few moments they have. I regret that more Senators are not on the floor so they can listen to the debate made on both sides of the question, because we are embarking this afternoon on a very, very dangerous step if we build a project which is supposedly a reclamation project, but which in reality is wholly a public power project.

I am going to say once again what I have said many times about the Tennessee Valley Authority. I see absolutely no need to take tax money out of my State or out of the State of any other Senator to build power projects when private money will build them.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BYRD of West Virginia in the chair). The time of the Senator from Arizona has expired.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I am halfway through a sentence. I think I have the right to complete my sentence.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I yield 1 additional minute to the Senator from Arizona.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona is recognized for 1 additional minute.

Mr. GOLDWATER. The Utah Power & Light Co. is ready to build a 300,000-kilowatt plant in this area. Why take the taxpayers' money to build a 90,000-kilowatt plant? I cannot bring myself to accept the philosophy that the Federal Government can do it better than can private industry, and I do not want to be a party to a vote that will take this country 1 more step down the dirty road of socialism.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I would not want the record of this discussion to be filled with allegations that power dams are not built by the Federal Government in the great Northwest grid chain, because we have already done that at various times. In the not too distant past we constructed John Day Dam, Priest Rapids Dam, the Dalles Dam, three dams which are much bigger than the dam under discussion today, and all for the production of power. All these projects have been welcomed by the people of the Northwest. The power they generate finds its way into the grid chains of both public and private powers. We have done a fine job in developing that area.

In the State of South Dakota there is the Oahe Dam, which will cost some $300 million to build. That is a power dam. Nobody stood on the floor of the Senate to vote against it. It was regarded as being a fine thing.

In the State of North Dakota there is the Garrison Dam, which is also a tremendous structure, and is used for the development of power.

Garrison Dam and Oahe Dam are being built by the Army Corps of Engineers, but the Corps of Engineers does not build all of these dams. As I tried to point out to the Senate a while ago, Hungry Horse Dam cost some $90 million, and perhaps more. It is twice as large as the dam presently under contemplation, and it was built by the Reclamation Service frankly as a power dam and nothing else.

In the State of California, there is the Trinity project. I can remember the first proposals with regard to that project. It is a part of an enormous project in the State of California which I am glad is moving along. It was constructed initially as a power dam. In the testimony there were statements that water from it would begin to be used for irrigation to some degree after 20 years, or perhaps after only 15 years, but the dam was originally constructed as a Reclamation Service project solely for the development of power. I think we need to bear that in mind, because it is not an unusual development.

We have under consideration at the present time an effort to tie together an existing project and a new project, both of which might have been authorized simultaneously. The original Palisades project could have well included this project.

I heard the able Senator from Arizona say that there was a plentiful supply of power in this area. The testimony before the committee, repeatedly given, was overwhelming to the effect that there is need for new power; that the area will need all the power which can be developed from this dam, by the time it will be finished, and by the time the generators can be installed. That testimony was given time after time by individuals who came before the committee, and by the people to be served by the dam.

I was tremendously impressed by the testimony of a man who is affectionately referred to as the "grand old man of the Snake River," Mr. Lynn Crandall. He has testified with regard to many projects having to do with the State of Idaho. His testimony has always been sound and has always been supported, in my opinion, by the majority of the people of that area. He testified vigorously in favor of the bill under consideration. He testified as to the need, and he referred to this as being a desirable project. That persuades me that the people of the area have an understanding of what they are being called upon to do, and are happy to do it.

The amount involved, generally speaking, is not a large sum of money. It will be repaid through the sale of power. The Burns Creek project is, to be sure, a project under the Reclamation Act, but it will be handled in such a fashion that it will be tied into the Palisades project, which will provide a far better use of water of the stream. All reregulating that can be done will be done by this project.

I noticed in the report, as I looked at it a few minutes ago, the Department pointed out to us again, as its witnesses did time after time, that this is a project which is necessary if there is to be reregulating on the upper Snake River in that area.

So long as the people in the area understand what they are doing and so long as the Bureau of Reclamation is prepared to build the project, I see no impropriety in using Bureau of Reclamation funds for that purpose. I therefore hope the Senate will vote overwhelmingly in favor of the project which the Senators from Idaho have worked so vigorously to obtain.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President——

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, if the Senator from Oregon will yield, I should like to request the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays have been requested. Is there a sufficient second?

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President——

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I shall be happy to yield to the Senator. How much time does the distinguished Senator desire?

Mr. MORSE. I am sorry; I did not know the Senate was operating under a unanimous-consent agreement.

Mr. CHURCH. There is a unanimous-consent agreement.

Mr. MORSE. Will the Senator yield me 2 minutes?

Mr. CHURCH. I am happy to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I rise not only to support the two Senators from Idaho because of the grand job they are doing on behalf of the Burns Creek project, but also to support the interests of all the people of the Pacific Northwest.

Mr. President, we are dealing with a very sound project, the benefits of which are integrated, in my opinion, into the whole program for river basin development in the Pacific Northwest. As I have said many times, it is important that we have full development of our river basins if we are really to bring to the people of the Northwest and of the country the great potential benefits which the water of that area can bring to them and to the economy of the Nation.

I wish to congratulate the Senators from Idaho for the work they have done on behalf of this very sound project.

The committee report speaks for itself. I think it is an unanswerable report. I sincerely hope the Senate this afternoon will support the bill.

I have only one further comment to make, Mr. President. I am very much disappointed that there is apparently some private utility opposition to the project. I say to the private utilities I think it is important that we try to work out a cooperative program for public projects and private projects which will

inure to the benefit of the economy of our section of the country. In my judgment, the private utilities make a great mistake in seeking to block every worthwhile project such as this, exactly as I think that public power groups make a great mistake when they fail to cooperate with the private utilities in the development of low-head dams at low-head damsites. What we need is a maximum development of both public and private projects, to the end that we may develop the totality of these river basins for the benefit of our section of the country and of the Nation.

It seems to me, I will say to those who oppose the Burns Creek project, that this is a project which is a part of an integrated program which confronts us for the development of the Pacific Northwest. I certainly think we have an opportunity for the public groups and the so-called private utility groups to join forces in a cooperative program for the mutual benefit of each.

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

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does some Senator yield time to the Senator from Pennsylvania?

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I am happy to yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania the time remaining for the opponents, which I understand is 11 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania is recognized for 11 minutes.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I have been sympathetic to the reclamation of lands in our Western States. Although my State is one of the larger sources of Federal taxes and, therefore, one of the heaviest contributors toward the financing of these western reclamation developments, I have always figured that, where they were financially sound, their development would contribute to our national economy and eventually benefit my constituents because of this contribution.

I have suspected, at times, that we have been a little too generous in financing some developments that were not economically justified—projects where the development cost more per acre than the land was worth after the development was completed. But even when the economic feasibility was somewhat in question, some of us have gone along with the project when it was primarily for the reclamation of land.

A great many of the reclamation projects have included a hydroelectric power development incidental to the primary purpose of irrigation. I think that is all right, too, so long as the power can be economically developed and sold at a price which would contribute to the cost of reclaiming the land. But the purpose of the power development was to aid irrigation—not to hinder it.

But, Mr. President, as I have been able to study the Burns Creek report which is before the Senate today, we find the Bureau of Reclamation wanting to build a project which is an all-out power development. To me that, in itself, would be bad enough even if the project were economically feasible.

The Bureau of Reclamation was not created as a power producing agency—its purpose is the reclamation of our western lands. I do not think that the rest of the country should be called upon to develop some electric power for a few preference customers anywhere. I certainly do not want the people of Pennsylvania to have to fork out their hard-pressed tax dollars for any such development.

The more you look at this Burns Creek proposal the worse the situation becomes. This project not only fails to lower the cost of water on the land—it makes it cost more, which is just the reverse of the usual justification that the Bureau of Reclamation uses when proposing a power development along with a reclamation project. It extends the payout period of a sound reclamation project—the Palisades—by some 26 years. It is proposed to sell the power at the existing Bureau rate in the area which is below the cost of power produced at Burns Creek. The project would not irrigate one single acre of new land. It would provide a supplemental supply of water for existing land only two or three times each 50 years, which to say the least is very slim justification for a reclamation project. It verges on subterfuge.

The Bureau of Reclamation has enjoyed rather clear sailing in the past although it has promoted some projects of questionable economics and also of questionable value, and proposed projects that could not be justified in any sense of the word. But, Mr. President, if the Bureau is so hard up for work that it is going to propose such things as this Burns Creek project, which is a detriment instead of an asset to reclamation, then we people in the East who have to put up most of the money for these western developments had better start taking a long, hard look at all of its future proposals.

Mr. President, another thing that strikes me rather forcefully, and I must say as quite a surprise, was the testimony of Mr. N. B. Bennett, now Assistant Commissioner of Reclamation, before the Senate Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation, when he said:

> The people now have contracts for power with the Federal Government and we believe that they should continue to receive from the Federal Government power to meet their growing loads.

What does the Bureau mean by this sort of statement? Does it mean that whenever the Bureau develops some power incidental to irrigation and sells it to some group of people, the Federal Government is assuming a utility responsibility to furnish all future requirements of those people? If that is what is meant, the Bureau will become another Federal Power Agency, and one of these days its reclamation work will become subordinate to its power activities. If that is its position, what is it going to do when it runs out of water developments—start building steamplants?

Mr. President, "reclamation" is a very fine sounding term. It has a great appeal to many of us. But if it is to be used to project the Federal Government further and further into the power business, the term takes on another meaning to us. I do not mind supporting some worthwhile reclamation projects, but I will not assist the Bureau in its efforts to assume a utility responsibility in the electric power field—I will oppose this effort and every similar one it advances.

The power which the Burns Creek development would displace is now being supplied by coal-burning steamplants. I am very sensitive to anything affecting coal, as my State is one of the great coal producing areas in this country. I know the value of coal, especially during times of emergency. It is to the national interest to support coal production and to keep both operators and miners active in producing it. If we are to displace coal production during normal times by spending tax funds to develop such uneconomical waterpower developments as Burns Creek, we may find ourselves in a very hazardous position in times of emergency.

From all I can learn, there is no power shortage in the area. All we have is a few preference customers wanting more Federal power so long as the taxpayers in the rest of the country are willing to subsidize it. We should discourage the attempts of the Bureau of Reclamation to use the reclamation program to develop purely power projects. Any true reclamationist should resent such attempts.

Mr. President, I hope the Senate will see through this attempt on the part of the Bureau to use the reclamation program to develop the unneeded, uneconomical Burns Creek development, and defeat this proposed legislation.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD as a part of my remarks a memorandum on the Burns Creek project.

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

BURNS CREEK PROJECT

1. Cost: $48 million to $50 million.

2. Project introduced under the guise of reclamation, whereas actually it is a power project—98 percent of cost allocated to power. Ninety thousand kilowatts installed capacity will generate one-half billion kilowatt-hours per year.

3. Irrigation benefits are very minor. One hundred thousand acre-feet of stored water which, according to Bureau of Reclamation, would have a use only two or three times in 50 years. Water would be used on present land; no new land would be put under cultivation.

4. Project proposes to supply power in an area where no power shortage exists. Utah Power & Light Co. has ample power to take care of own loads in its area and in the adjacent area to the west. The Idaho Power Co. has just installed 450,000 kilowatts at Brownlee and will have 220,000 kilowatts additional at Oxbow within 2 years. Ample transmission capacity exists into the area of claimed power shortage.

5. Project is economically unfeasible. Burns Creek would not even pay its own interest charges standing alone and, integrated with Palisades as proposed, would postpone the pay out of the Palisades project by about 10 years and Burns Creek would require about 70 years to pay out.

6. Burns Creek would actually hurt reclamation by postponing the time that Palisades revenues could be used to aid worthy reclamation projects.

7. One-half billion kilowatt-hours of generation at the proposed Burns Creek project would be equivalent to approximately 250,000 tons of coal per year or 20,000 man-shifts in the mines.

8. Claimed need for reregulation below Palisades has not yet been proven. But even if such need should be proven in the future, the installation of a 90,000-kilowatt power project is not the solution. Burns Creek would require, at full load, approximately the same water release as Palisades and could be operated in exactly the same manner as Palisades to create downstream the stream fluctuations that the irrigators fear will result from the Palisades operations.

9. Burns Creek is not comparable to the Colorado River storage project. It is true that the Colorado River storage project will generate large amounts of power, but the prime purpose of the Colorado project is to produce power revenues which will be used to finance participating projects to bring Colorado River water to the Upper Basin States. Burns Creek power rates would not even pay the interest charges.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, the opponents will reserve the remainder of their time. May I inquire how much time remains to the opponents?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seven minutes remain.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I yield such part of the remainder of the time allotted to the proponents as my distinguished senior colleague may require.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, I shall not hold this body in session long to explain some of the aspects of the proposed development. I shall devote my efforts to refuting some of the rather unkind remarks which have been made by some of my colleagues.

I am sure that the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], who said that approval of this project would lead us on the road to socialism did not really intend to say that. That carries a sort of sinister warning. I do not think he is justified in calling that to our attention. I can recall that a few years ago, with the majority of Members of this body, I voted to authorize the Colorado River Basin program, which will provide for approximately $1 billion worth of water resource development.

Let us look at four of the major projects in that basin.

First, there is the Glen Canyon project, costing $371 million. That project is being built in the State of Arizona.

Next we have the Flaming Gorge Dam, at a cost of $52 million; then the Curecanti Dam, at a cost of $65 million, or a total of $488 million—all allocated to power.

It is quite significant that at the present time, while the Glen Canyon Dam is under construction, there has not been negotiated a single contract by the Bureau of Reclamation for the sale and distribution of the power generated at that site.

Arizona already has 315,000 kilowatts of Federal power, with transmission lines built by the Federal Government totaling 1,325 miles. Oh, this is not public power. It does not point the way to socialism.

In Idaho the situation is different. There we have about half that much Federal power, and instead of 1,325 miles of transmission lines we have 271 miles.

Mr. President, in Idaho we have 271 miles of Federal transmission powerlines, and in Arizona they have 1,325. I wonder if my colleagues can sense the significance of that comparison.

The Senator from Arizona also called attention to Hells Canyon Dam. I do not think he needed to do that. He is generally fair in debate. He knows that there is a vast distinction between Hells Canyon high dam and the dam currently under consideration by this body. In the instance of the Hells Canyon Dam on the Middle Snake River, a private utility was willing to construct the dams for storage and generation of power.

The Senator mentioned, in connection with Burns Creek Dam, that the Utah Power Co. is willing to build a thermal plant in Wyoming. He did not contend that the Utah Power Co. was willing to build a hydroelectric plant in the vicinity of the Burns Creek Dam, or in that stretch of the Upper Snake River. Consequently, there is no semblance of similarity between the Hells Canyon high dam and the low Burns Creek Dam.

Mr. President, for 20 years I have been a member of the House or Senate Public Lands and Irrigation Committees. I have served 13 years on the Appropriations Subcommittees in the House and Senate, which have handled budgets for the Bureau of Reclamation in the Interior Department. I think I have some comprehension of water resource development.

During the past several years I have served on the subcommittee in the Senate which handles the public works appropriation bill.

As I mentioned previously in this discussion, a bill was recently passed, providing for the initiation of 50 or 60 new starts which had not been approved by the Bureau of the Budget.

I again emphasize that the Burns Creek Dam has been approved by the Budget Bureau. I have watched the Bureau of Reclamation and the Army Engineer Corps for several years, building all kinds of public power, multiple-purpose, and flood-control dams, in virtually every State in the Union. I am amazed at some of the speeches and comments in opposition to this authorization today. They sound the warning that this project involves public power. It is the same kind of power which is generated in every other State in the Union, with one important difference. In many other projects, particularly under the Army Engineer Corps, many dams do not reimburse the Government for the cost of construction; but in the case of the Burns Creek Dam practically every dollar will be repaid to the Government from power revenue.

This leads me to ask whether there is any valid contention or logic in the claim that this is public power, but that in other States such projects do not involve public power. It is quite significant, going back for a moment to the very important Colorado River Basin development, to note the dams being built there. I wonder if the coal miners' union and the private utilities which are opposed to this development were opposed to the authorization of the Colorado Basin water resource program. Mr. President, how will this power be distributed by the Bureau of Reclamation in the Colorado River Basin? Was there a power shortage in that area?

I do not like to be too critical in calling attention to some of the developments in other States. I might mention the Missouri Valley, where several billion dollars' worth of projects are being built for flood control, and for the generation of power for the use of States in the Missouri River Basin.

I might call attention to all of the huge power dams built in the lower Columbia Basin, partially from water which is discharged by the Snake River, which runs through the State of Idaho. I could call attention to many of these other basins where power is generated. Oh, that is not public power; that is not socialism; but in this instance where we have a project which has the approval of the Bureau of the Budget, I wonder why there is so much opposition.

Mr. President, all I am contending for is that we use the same yardstick in the development of water resources in Idaho as in other States. We in Idaho are proud that we have one of the most valuable potential water resources of any State in the Union. There is nothing unreasonable or illogical when we ask that a project like Burns Creek, which has the aproval of the Department of the Interior, of the Bureau of Reclamation, and likewise has the approval of the Budget Bureau in this Republican administration, receive the support of this body and the Congress.

I do not think that is unreasonable. I think Idaho is entitled to the same consideration that the States receive in all of the other basins in various sections of the country. On that basis I rest my case, because I think that Burns Creek is a feasible project, if we can rely upon the recommndations of the Budget Bureau.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I commend my distinguished senior colleague for the fine statement he has made in behalf of this worthy project.

The proponents are now willing to yield back the time remaining to them, provided the opponents are willing to do likewise.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, the opponents are also glad to yield back the remainder of their time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has been exhausted or yielded back.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I ask that the committee amendments be considered and agreed to en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The committee amendments agreed to en bloc are as follows:

On page 1, line 8, after the word "the", to strike out "preservation and propagation" and insert "conservation and development"; on page 2, line 15, after the word "operationally", to insert "Installation of power generating facilities shall be scheduled by the Secretary on the basis of providing for

the additional power requirements of those entitled to preference in the purchase thereof under the Federal reclamation laws."; on page 3, line 17, after the word "agency", to insert a colon and "*Provided*, That all lands within the exterior boundaries of a national forest acquired for project purposes which are not determined by the Secretary of the Interior to be needed for actual use in connection with the project works shall become national forest lands: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of the Interior shall make his determination hereunder within five years after approval of this Act or, in the case of individual tracts of land, within five years after their acquisition by the United States: *And provided further*, That the authority contained in this subsection shall not be exercised by the Secretary of the Interior with respect to national forest lands without the concurrence of the Secretary of Agriculture."; on page 4, line 7, after the word "in", to strike out "the works of" and insert "conenction with"; in line 9, after the word "the", to strike out "Act of August 14, 1946 (60 Stat. 1080, 16 U.S.C. 662)," and insert "Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act (48 Stat. 401, as amended; 16 U.S.C. secs. 661, 662)", and in line 12, after the word "the", to strike out "preservation and propagation" and insert "conservation and development", so as to make the bill read:

"Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That in order to assist in the irrigation of arid and semiarid lands in the upper Snake River Valley, Idaho, to provide facilities for river regulation and the control of floods, to utilize the hydroelectric power opportunities created thereby, and, as incidents to the foregoing purposes, to enhance recreational opportunities and provide for the conservation and development of fish and wildlife, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to construct, operate, and maintain a reregulating reservoir, powerplant, and related facilities at or near the Burns Creek site below Palisades Dam on the Snake River, the reservoir and powerplant to be substantially in accordance with the report of the Secretary of the Interior entitled 'Burns Creek Dam, Powerplant, and Reservoir' dated February 26, 1957. In so doing the Secretary shall be governed by the Federal reclamation laws (Act of June 17, 1902, 32 Stat. 388, and Acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto). The works, including the reservoir, powerplant, and related facilities herein authorized shall be considered as features of the Palisades Dam and Reservoir project (Act of September 30, 1950, 64 Stat. 1083) and shall be integrated therewith financially and operationally. Installation of power generating facilities shall be scheduled by the Secretary on the basis of providing for the additional power requirements of those entitled to preference in the purchase thereof under the Federal reclamation laws.

"SEC. 2. The irrigation storage capacity in Burns Creek Reservoir shall be reserved for subscription by organizations which have storage rights in Palisades Reservoir (the term 'storage rights' being used in the same sense as in the storage contracts heretofore entered into by the Secretary of the Interior with respect to Palisades Reservoir) whether or not under the contract before the date of this Act. And the Secretary may contract with any such organization on the basis of operating plans which, in accordance with the contracts heretofore entered into between the United States and subscribers to Palisades capacity, treat the conservation capacity as having a priority equal to that of the irrigation capacity in Palisades Reservoir. Any Burns Creek irrigation storage capacity which is not so subscribed within six months from the time when funds are first made available for starting construction of the Burns Creek development shall then be made available for use in accordance with the Federal reclamation laws.

"SEC. 3. (a) The Secretary is authorized in connection with the Burns Creek development, to construct minimum basic public recreational facilities and to arrange for the operation and maintenance of the same by an appropriate Federal, State, or local organization or agency: *Provided*, That all lands within the exterior boundaries of a national forest acquired for project purposes which are not determined by the Secretary of the Interior to be needed for actual use in connection with the project works shall become national forest lands: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of the Interior shall make his determination hereunder within five years after approval of this Act or, in the case of individual tracts of land, within five years after their acquisition by the United States: *And provided further*, That the authority contained in this subsection shall not be exercised by the Secretary of the Interior with respect to national forest lands without the concurrence of the Secretary of Agriculture.

"(b) The Secretary may make such reasonable provision in connection with the Burns Creek development as, upon further study in accordance with section 2 of the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act (48 Stat. 401, as amended; 16 U.S.C., secs. 661, 662), he finds to be required for the conservation and development of fish and wildlife. An appropriate portion of the cost of the development shall be allocated as provided in said Act and it, together with the portion of the construction cost allocated to recreation and the operation and maintenance costs allocated to these functions, shall be nonreimbursable and nonreturnable under the reclamation laws.

"(c) So far as the Secretary finds the same to be consistent with safety and with efficient operation for the primary purposes of the development, Burns Creek Reservoir and lands adjacent thereto which are now owned or hereafter acquired by the United States shall be open to free public use for lawful hunting and fishing purposes, and free access thereto for those purposes shall be assured.

"(d) During times when releases for other purposes are less than one thousand cubic feet per second, a release of this amount from Burns Creek Reservoir shall nevertheless be maintained for the benefit of downstream fishlife, but this release may be reduced for brief temporary periods by the Secretary whenever he may find that maintenance thereof is harmful to the primary purposes of the project.

"SEC. 4. (a) To assist in the construction of the works authorized by section 1 of this Act, the Secretary may, notwithstanding the last sentence of section 2 of the Act of September 30, 1950 (64 Stat. 1083), construct all necessary facilities to deliver power to the site of said works. The power-generating and transmission facilities authorized to be constructed by section 1 of this Act shall be subject to the second sentence of section 2 of said Act of September 30, 1950, and shall, to the greatest possible extent consistent with existing contractual obligations, be operated in conjunction with and connected to the facilities covered by such second sentence to the end of producing and marketing the greatest amount of power and energy. Nothing contained in this Act shall be construed to affect adversely the application in aid of irrigation, under sections 2(b), 3(a), and 5 of the Act of August 31, 1954 (68 Stat. 1026), of net power revenues received from the Palisades Reservoir and developments combined therewith for payout purposes under said Act of September 30, 1950.

"(b) The Secretary is authorized to amend contracts heretofore made under the Acts of September 30, 1950, supra, and of August 31, 1954, supra, whereby the water users assumed an obligation for winter power replacement based on the winter water savings program at the Minidoka powerplant to relieve the contractors ratably by one-third of that obligation, and to make new contracts under these Acts on a like basis. To the extent such annual obligations are reduced, the cost thereof shall be included in the cost to be absorbed by the power operations of the Palisades project.

"(c) The actual construction of the facilities herein authorized shall not be undertaken until at least 80 per centum of the conservation capacity in Burns Creek Reservoir is under subscription, nor until negotiations have been undertaken in accordance with the provisions of (b) of this section.

"SEC. 5. Expenditures for the works authorized by section 1 of this Act may be made without regard to the soil survey and land classification proviso of the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1954 (67 Stat. 261, 266, 43 U.S.C. 390a).

"SEC. 6. For a period of ten years from the date of enactment of this Act, no water shall be delivered to any water user for the production on newly irrigated lands of any basic agricultural commodity, as defined in the Agricultural Act of 1949, or any amendment thereof, if the total supply of such commodity for the marketing year in which the bulk of the crop would be normally marketed is in excess of the normal supply as defined in section 301(b)(10) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, unless the Secretary of Agriculture calls for an increase in production of such commodity in the interest of national security.

"SEC. 7. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, and was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass.

The bill (S. 281) was passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the bill was passed be reconsidered.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

YOUTH CONSERVATION CORPS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article which appeared in the Oregon Grange Bulletin of July 20, 1959, by Elmer McClure, in a column entitled "The State Master's Comments," in support of the CCC program, be printed in the RECORD.

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

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

THE STATE MASTER'S COMMENTS

(By Elmer McClure)

Several years ago, the delegates to State Grange set a policy of promoting the passage of Federal legislation establishing a Youth

Conservation Corps to work on public land conservation and development projects. This policy was reaffirmed by the delegates at this year's State Grange session when they adopted that section of the master's address on Youth Conservation which reads:

"At previous sessions we have established a policy of supporting legislation to establish a program patterned after the CCC program that accomplished so very much during the early years of the Roosevelt administration. At that time, our chief concern was unemployment. Today, it is juvenile delinquency. Most authorities in this field agree that one of the most effective means of combating juvenile delinquency is keeping these young people busy at worthwhile work.

"This youth conservation program is still under consideration by the Congress and I believe it would be of tremendous benefit to our youth as well as to our Federal Park System. Therefore, I recommend that we reaffirm our support of this legislation."

I have already informed our Senators and Representatives of the State Grange action and urged their support of this legislation. I have received word that the bill which would establish the YCC within the Department of Labor, S. 812, has cleared its first hurdle. It was reported out of the Senate Labor Committee favorably and is now awaiting Senate action. The more grass roots support we can show for this bill, the better its chance for final passage in this session of the Congress.

We in Oregon have a very special interest in this legislation. With over half of the total area of Oregon still in Federal ownership, a large portion of the YCC work most probably would be done in Oregon, thereby adding greatly to the recreational and economic value of the Federal lands in this State.

There is also a provision in S. 812 that, if the State will provide some matching funds, it can secure YCC services for State-owned lands. Oregon has long been the stepsister among the Pacific Coast States in the matter of Federal appropriations. While there is no point in cataloging our grievances in this field, it might be well to remember a couple of instances. For instance, Oregon has no major Armed Forces installations such as both California and Washington have. It's time Cinderella went to the ball, too.

Tourists and vacationists are Oregon's third largest industry. Our beautiful scenic forests and parks are the main attraction which draws people to our State. Any program to make our scenic and recreational sites more beautiful and more attractive to visitors by adding camping and picnicking facilities, etc., certainly will build up our tourist industry and bolster the economy of our State.

S. 812 is one bill that we in Oregon have every reason to support. Therefore, I urge that you immediately write Oregon's congressional delegation and Senator LYNDON JOHNSON urging early and favorable consideration of this bill.

HOUSING: VICTIM OF CONVENTIONAL WISDOM

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, yesterday the Senate Housing Subcommittee began hearings—for the second time this session—on a housing bill. This legislation is vital to the Nation. I am confident that the subcommittee, headed by the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], will continue to strive for enactment of an efficacious bill—despite the President's veto of S. 57.

In his message to the Senate announcing his veto of S. 57, President Eisenhower declared his disappointment with the act of Congress in approving the authorization contained in that measure.

The President called the bill extravagant and inflationary. He criticized it because it would tend to substitute Federal spending for private investment.

I believe that President Eisenhower's charges are, first, without substantial foundation in fact; and second, indicative of a financial and governmental philosophy which is injurious to the welfare of the United States.

The bill is not extravagant.

An estimated 13 million substandard dwelling units exist in the United States today. Net household formation and destruction of old residential structures create a demand for approximately 1.4 million net units each year. If the Nation's present slums are to be eliminated and current housing needs met, at least 2 million homes a year must be constructed for a period of at least 20 years. Urban renewal and planning funds are needed for this purpose.

SERIOUS NEED EXISTS

Furthermore, serious need exists for housing for the elderly, for cooperative housing, and for college housing.

Total new authorization provided by S. 57 is $1.4 billion. Only an estimated $28.5 million would represent new budget expense for fiscal year 1960.

S. 57 would stimulate construction of about 200,000 new homes to alleviate inadequate and slum housing conditions.

The bill is not inflationary.

Housing is tight in many areas of the United States. Scarcity forces up sales prices and rents. To increase the supply is to force these charges down, not up.

In 1952, total interest charges on a $10,000 GI mortgage, paid off over a 25-year period, amounted to $5,840. Today's interest costs on the same mortgage add up to $8,000, an increase of 37 percent. The unwise financial policies followed by the administration have pushed the price of mortgage money to new heights and contributed far more to inflation in the area of housing than any Federal efforts to stimulate residential construction.

ADMINISTRATION'S POSITION INCONSISTENT

The Senate Appropriations Committee is currently holding hearings on H.R. 7978, a bill to provide supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 1960. The administration originally requested $888 million to supply additional funds for 16 Government agencies. These funds were not included in the balanced budget submitted by the President in January. His request for supplemental appropriations was not accompanied by any proposal for bringing in new revenue equal to the recommended new proposed expenditures. Yet, I do not recall that the President announced his request was inflationary, even though the spending involved is 30 times greater than that connected with the housing bill approved by Congress. I am confident that if the President were asked to explain this inconsistency he would reply that the programs which the supplemental money will finance are needed. So is housing, in my opinion.

Classic inflation—which the President says he is fighting—is considered to be associated with full employment. Today nearly 4 million Americans are without work. S. 57 would create some 500,000 jobs in the housing industry and supporting sectors of the economy.

INFLATION NOT AUTOMATIC

Contrary to the impression created in the President's veto message, it is not true that Government spending is automatically inflationary. The President apparently assumes that cost of the housing program contained in S. 57 will be supported by deficit financing. This need not be the case.

Mr. President, in stating his objections to the housing bill sent him by Congress, President Eisenhower contributed to the strengthening of one of the great fallacies of the folklore of American capitalism—the belief that spending in the public sector of the economy somehow represents a subtraction rather than an addition to our gross national product.

It is probably unnecessary to point out that in a technical sense, Government purchases of goods and services are, by the definition explaining the system of national income accounting utilized by American economists, a part of gross national product. The President's views in this respect are based on philosophy not procedure.

I do not think that we can continue to give automatic sanction to the ancient saw that public spending is always bad and private spending good. What of our schools and roads? Activities are assigned to the public sector because they are essential to the well-being of the Nation, and are inadequately performed by private interests or better performed by government.

ALLOCATION ALTERATION REQUIRED

Our problem today is to allocate sufficient resources to meet our most urgent needs. If this means sacrifice in terms of consumption in the private sector, we must be prepared to make that sacrifice.

However, statistics for the period 1953–57 reveal that instead of attempting to care for the increased responsibilities of the Federal Government created by population growth and the birth of new international and domestic problems, we decreased from 21 to 17 percent the proportion of our gross national product devoted to public service. In relative terms, while the private sector of our economy has become richer, the Federal Government has become poorer.

Mr. President, in his book, "The Affluent Society," Harvard economist John Galbraith creates the concept of "conventional wisdom." He declares that:

> The conservative is led by disposition, not unmixed with pecuniary self-interest, to adhere to the familiar and the established. These underly his test of acceptability. But the liberal brings moral fervor and passion, even a sense of righteousness, to the ideas with which he is most familiar. While the ideas he cherishes are different from those of the conservative, he is not likely to be much less emphatic in making familiarity a test of acceptability. Deviation in the form of

originality is condemned as faithlessness or backsliding. A "good" liberal or a "tried and true" liberal or a "true blue" liberal is one who is adequately predictable. This means that he forswears striving toward originality. In both the United States and Britain, in recent times, liberals and their British counterparts of the left have proclaimed themselves in search of new ideas. To proclaim the need for new ideas has served, in some measure, as a substitute for them.

Thus we may, as necessary, speak of the conventional wisdom of conservatives or the conventional wisdom of liberals.

Mr. President, I believe that President Eisenhower in his veto message on the housing bill is parroting the "conventional wisdom" of the most conservative element of his political party.

But I also believe that some members of my own party are blinded by ideological stereotypes at the other end of the political spectrum, with respect to housing and other needed Federal programs.

Members of the Democratic Party have placed before Congress numerous progressive measures which, if enacted, would greatly strengthen this country. But many Democrats have indicated an unwillingness to push for revenue increases to pay for these new or expanded programs.

As Walter Lippmann and other thoughtful observers of the political scene have pointed out, the economic theoery which justifies deficit spending during recession periods, also states that such financing is to be avoided in periods of general economic health.

ARGUMENT DOUBLE EDGED

The United States, although not enjoying full prosperity, and in vital need of effective programs to eliminate residual and technological unemployment, is at least not currently experiencing a recession situation. Thus, the argument which was utilized to justify deficit spending last year, now cuts the other way.

Mr. President, I believe that in a time of reasonable prosperity and peace, Congress should attempt to balance the budget. But I also believe that the President's budget for 1960 is inadequate and that we should equate revenues and expenditures at a higher level of public service.

In preparing its budget estimates, the administration adopted a far too rigid fiscal framework.

This fact is particularly evident when one views Oregon's participation in Federal programs. The President's suggestions for reduction of Federal support of the home-mortgage market, failure to recommend construction funds for Green Peter Dam, cutback of money for road construction in the national forests, all directly hurt our State.

A similar situation exists with respect to national programs. Budget Director Maurice H. Stans announced recently:

We expect the year 1959 to be a period of the highest prosperity in the history of this country.

NEEDS MUST BE MET

But the administration tells us we do not have enough money to provide minimum health protection for the 15 million Americans over 65 years of age, initiate elimination of the Nation's 13 million substandard dwelling units, or assist in construction of 135,000 elementary and secondary school classrooms required to handle increasing enrollments.

I think that these and other vital needs should be met.

In an economic situation such as the present, I favor tax increases over deficit financing to support additional government services.

Deficit financing, when accomplished through, commercial banking channels, creates a potential source of inflationary credit. Interest and service charges add to the cost of goods and services purchased by the Federal Government. In the past 5 years, stimulated by the administration's tight-money policies, interest costs on the national debt have risen 20 percent. Today interest payments represent 10.5 percent of total budget expenditures—more than we spend on all the Federal functions of commerce and housing, natural resources, and labor and welfare.

INTRODUCED TAX MEASURES

For these reasons, on March 5, 1959, I introduced in the Senate four measures to raise additional Federal revenue. These bills would, first, increase temporarily the Federal highway fuel tax by 1½ cents; second, lower the percent depletion allowance for oil and gas companies from 27½ to 15 percent; third, allow the Post Office Department to set postal rates based on due consideration of cost of both public and nonpublic services; fourth, reinstate the excess profits tax of 1950.

For reasons of revenue adequacy as well as equity, I voted on June 25, 1959, to amend the corporate and excise tax rate extension bill so as to, first, repeal the 4 percent tax credit on dividend income from domestic corporations; second, deny deductions for certain entertainment, gift and travel expenses in connection with a trade or business; third, provide for withholding at their source of income taxes on interest and dividends; fourth, reduce the oil depletion allowance on a graduated basis; fifth, raise the gasoline tax from 3 to 4½ cents until July 1, 1961. I regret that these measures were not approved by Congress and added to the bill finally sent to the President.

REALISTIC RESOURCE DEPLOYMENT VITAL

It seems to me that the basic question posed by the budget for fiscal year 1960 is this: Are we willing to allocate to the public sector of the economy funds necessary to fulfill our domestic and international obligations?

Mr. President, the administration is extremely fond of pointing to our currently rapidly rising gross national product as a symbol of the wisdom of its economic policies. But the President and his advisers frequently appear to be obsessed with productivity not as a means but as an end.

This doctrine is not without bipartisan support. The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD contains daily reports on our underutilization of resources and the danger of losing the production rate race to the Soviet Union. All too seldom is the issue related to its essential corollary: What are we producing?

The drive for higher productivity has taken on a life of its own. It has become for many a force greater than the demand which presumably sustains it. As Admiral Rickover said recently:

We no longer produce to supply what we need; we now consume in order to clear away what the machine produces—a topsy-turvy state of affairs. To dispose of the flood of machine-made goods we have had to create a new industry; a $10 billion industry to service the machine by persuading us to buy its products.

Stimulated by advertising, we begin actually to believe that our 1959 auto will really be obsolete in 1960. Although the mores of society dictate that a government which spends more than it collects in revenue in a 12-month period is ill managed, we back with little question the extension of consumer credit so that more persons may buy cars, washing machines, and backyard swimming pools.

SYNTHETIC GOALS CREATED

Supplying of private wants—however created—assumes a vastly higher priority than public needs. Investment in an autoplant is an unqualified gain. But investment in schools to educate the men who will eventually run this increasingly automated industry is a burden.

The result is that we are rich in private goods but poor in public goods.

The reason that we are poor in governmental services is not because we lack the capacity to supply these needs but because we have succumbed to the continuing campaign to downgrade the value of projects carried out by Government. We have blindly accepted the myth that Government employees are somehow less diligent and capable than their counterparts in private enterprise and that the work they carry out is of less significance.

The public is led to believe that taxes represent a complete loss to the economy, that these funds disappear into some subterranean chamber guarded by bureaucrats—a race hinted to be alien to America—and are never seen again.

Mr. President, taxes are a method for allocating resources between the private and public sector of the economy. Taxes are neither good nor bad. It is what they buy in terms of governmental goods and services to which these judgments should be applied.

SOCIAL IMBALANCE PRESENT

Our primary problem today is not the creation of wealth, but the channeling of our affluence.

As Galbraith points out, we are experiencing a growing social imbalance in the division of resources between public and private goods.

Each consumer credit which will permit Americans to trade-in their chrome-laden auto each year for the latest model is regarded as virtue. This is not deficit spending, the bane of all governments, we are told; it is a contribution to our standard of living.

But if we attempt to provide needed funds for education, we are accused of financial irresponsibility.

Yet what will eventually best advance our Nation: Planned obsolescence of automobiles or a more adequate educational system?

Mr. President, I believe that we must support a rate of economic growth commensurate with capacity. Underemployment of our resources of men and machines is economic waste. The general monetary controls relied upon by the administration as an inflation weapon are not only ineffective in the face of administered prices, but retard growth. More selective methods are required to combat future general price rises.

NEW NEEDS, NEW DEMANDS

Economic growth will in turn automatically boost tax receipts, thus providing moneys for essential public services. But measures required to stimulate certain depressed economic areas are dependent upon provision of funds for such purposes. At the present time I believe such financing should utilize the vehicle of taxation.

The more essential problem, however, is this: Instead of assigning sufficient resources to the public sector to do the job which must be done, we insist in declaring that the job is no greater than the level and rate of resources approved in the past will support. It is time we recognized that there are new needs and, hence, new demands.

Mr. President, the housing bill is only a single, relatively small program in the total list of Federal functions. But the handling which it has received is indicative of much that is wrong with our approach to the activities of the Federal Government today.

The general not the special interest, the nature not the sum, the product not the production—these should be our special concern today as we decide between public and private wants. Until we adopt this attitude, we will continue to be a Nation rich in the soft strength of consumer wealth but poor in the goods and services which represent the true sinews of America as a great country.

CONSTRUCTION OF BRIDGE NEAR EL PASO, TEX.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 512, H.R. 4538.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 4538) authorizing El Paso County, Tex., to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Rio Grande at or near the city of El Paso, Tex.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President I may say in explanation that the bill was reported unanimously by the Committee on Foreign Relations, under the chairmanship of the distinguished Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT].

This Nation has been blessed with many benefits, but I know of none greater than enjoying a continuing friendly relationship with good neighbors to the north and to the south.

This situation—sought by many nations but achieved by few—has been marked by construction of stout bridges of friendship rather than tall walls of discord.

There is now before the Senate a bill sponsored by my good friend Congressman J. T. RUTHERFORD authorizing El Paso County, Tex., to construct, maintain, and operate across the Rio Grande another of these great "bridges of friendship." It is identical with a companion bill introduced by my distinguished colleague, the junior Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH].

This bridge would provide another link between the Republic of Mexico and the United States. It would join the great States of Chihuahua and Texas, and would further cement the peaceful bonds of commerce, culture and friendship uniting the citizens of two cities—Juarez, Mexico, and El Paso, Tex.

The bill would not authorize the appropriation of Federal funds for construction of the bridge.

Construction and operation would be in accordance with the General Bridge Act of 1906. The bridge would be subject to approval by the International Boundary and Water Commission, as well as by the appropriate Mexican authorities.

This project has been proposed by forward-looking leaders on both sides of the international border.

The approval of the bill will open the way to ultimate achievement of many things: It will strengthen the notably friendly relations between the people of the United States and Mexico; a new avenue will be provided for the exchange of commerce, the interchange of culture, and the movement of peace-loving people between two great nations.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the issue before the Senate is the proposed authorization of El Paso County, Tex., to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Rio Grande River at or near the city of El Paso, Tex.

This bill provides for the construction of adequate bridge facilities connecting the progressive, growing cities of El Paso, Tex., and Juarez, Mexico. Approximately 600,000 people live in the two cities—the greatest bilingual international border city area in the Northern Hemisphere—and there are only two bridges to serve them.

Mr. President, 32 years ago, when I first went to El Paso, as a young lawyer, to practice law, those two bridges were there. At that time the population of the two cities was about 150,000. Today, there are still only those two bridges in that area; but today there are approximately 600,000 persons on the two sides of the river, in that small area, which is developing very rapidly. On the entire American-Mexican border, El Paso is the largest city on the American side, and Juarez is the largest city on the Mexican side of the border.

So, Mr. President, construction of the additional bridge, as now proposed, is urgently needed, and will make a most important contribution to the development of the area, particularly as regards the jobs and services performed by those who live on the American side of the border and those who live on the Mexican side.

The bridge planned by the public officials and community leaders in Texas and Mexico is a vital necessity to travel in that region. The bridge will also make a great contribution to the interchange of culture and ideas, jobs, and services, between friends on both sides of the border. Building this bridge will help to build a better good neighbor policy, not only in El Paso, but throughout a great area in the Southwest.

Under the provisions of this bill, the selection of the site for the bridge will be left up to local officials. The local officials plan to finance the work at no expense to the Federal Government. The construction and operation of the bridge will be subject to the approval of the International Boundary and Water Commission of the United States and Mexico, and to the approval of proper authorities in Mexico.

Mr. President, I commend the bill to the favorable consideration of the Senate; and I commend my senior colleague [Mr. JOHNSON] for his efforts in bringing the bill before the Senate, for its consideration, inasmuch as construction of the proposed bridge is so urgently needed in the interest of the development of that area of the country.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KUCHEL in the chair). The bill is open to amendment.

If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill (H.R. 4538) was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the bill was passed be reconsidered.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I move to lay on the table the motion to reconsider.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to lay on the table the motion to reconsider.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

A COAL RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 557, House bill 6596.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be read by title, for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 6596) to encourage and stimulate the production and conservation of coal in the United States through research and development by creating a Coal Research and Development Commission, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill H.R. 6596, to encourage and stimulate the production and conservation of coal in the United States through research and development by creating a Coal Research and Development Commission, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs with amendments.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the bill will not be acted on today; but it will be the unfinished business, and its consideration will begin on Monday.

Previously, an order to have the Senate adjourn from today until Monday has been entered.

SECURITY COVERAGE FOR NONPROFESSIONAL SCHOOL DISTRICT EMPLOYEES

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, let me inquire whether the majority leader expects to have the Senate take up, this evening, Calendar No. 146, House bill 213, to provide additional time within which certain State agreements under section 218 of the Social Security Act may be modified to secure coverage for nonprofessional school district employees.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Yes; just as soon as the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] reaches the Chamber. The Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] will handle the bill when the Senator from Oklahoma arrives.

Mr. CARLSON. I thank the Senator from Texas.

MISGUIDED FOREIGN TRADE POLICIES

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the tragic results of our misguided foreign trade policies continue to come home to haunt us. More and more domestic industries are feeling the impact, and an ever increasing number of American jobs are disappearing. Undoubtedly, the worst is yet to come.

As with almost all national issues, the foreign trade issue appears to the great majority of people as either all black or all white. Any modification of the policy, or criticism of its operation, is considered by the so-called free traders as heresy born in the spirit of isolationism. This attitude has contributed markedly to an almost complete lack of objectivity, which may ultimately destroy our economic system.

A careful examination of the operation of our purportedly "reciprocal" trade program reveals an astounding lack of "reciprocity." This lack of reciprocity, coupled with such factors as our encouragement and subsidies to foreign industrialization, the wage differential existing between our country and foreign countries, and the tax advantages enjoyed by foreign competitors, is continually and increasingly eroding both the foreign and domestic markets of domestic producers.

The ideas that led to the conception of our foreign trade program were undoubtedly sound. Into the statutes that effectuated this program were written procedures for the safeguarding of the markets—particularly the domestic markets—of our domestic producers. The operation of the program, however, has, from the beginning, been at wide variance with the theory underlying its conception. In practice, there has been scarely any utilization of the procedures authorized for preservation of our domestic industry and employment. The pleas of those portions of our domestic economy which have borne the brunt of the first assault have been like a voice in the wilderness, unheard, and unanswered.

For those who are truly interested in the advancement of foreign trade, this should be most alarming. With every plea from a segment of our domestic economy that goes ignored, more fuel is added to the fires of opposition to our trade program in its entirety. For those who lose their jobs or savings on the sacrificial altar of our untouchable trade policy, it is understandably difficult to be objective about the benefits derived from trade with the world community. It is much more characteristic for such a person to be violently and emotionally opposed to foreign trade—in other words, to see nothing but the black side.

Up to the present time only a minority of the American public has been directly affected to the extent that violent opposition to the trade program has been inspired. Only the blind, however, can fail to see that as greater inroads are made on domestic markets of basic industries such as steel, and other bellwether industries such as automobiles, such unalterable opposition will continue to multiply by leaps and bounds. Unless the safety-valve procedures provided in the law are utilized and invoked to perform their intended function, our foreign trade program is doomed to sudden and inglorious death at the hands of an aroused and angry public sentiment, occasioned by the blindness of the program's stanchest defenders.

Some of the safety valves available to make the foreign trade program practically workable on a long term basis are written into the so-called Reciprocal Trade Act itself, such as the peril point and escape clause provisions. Other safety valve features exist, such as that provided in section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, and although they are not an integral part of the Trade Act, their provisions are incorporated into all trade agreements made by our Government with foreign countries. Thus we breach no agreement when we invoke the provisions of the safeguard procedures to insure the preservation of some part of our domestic economy.

Mr. President, I have mentioned some of the competitive disadvantages accruing to domestic producers generally when competing with foreign products, as, for example, wage differentials, less realistic tax depreciation rates, and Government subsidies to foreign competitors. These competitive disadvantages apply in varying degree to any field where domestic industry must compete with its foreign counterpart. Other competitive disadvantages apply to particular segments of our domestic economy to the exclusion of other segments.

The most staggering competitive disadvantage which applies to one particular segment of our domestic industry arises from our two-price system of cotton. On August 1 of this year, the price differential on raw cotton will increase to 8 cents a pound. This means that effective August 1 domestic manufacturers of cotton products will have to pay 8 cents a pound more for their raw material than will their foreign competitors.

To appreciate the full impact of this price disparity in favor of foreign manufacturers, it is necessary to understand that the cost of raw cotton makes up well over half of the average selling price of a yard of gray cloth in the United States. In foreign countries, where the wage level is much less than in the United States, the ratio of cost of raw material to selling price of the manufactured item is presumably much higher.

In order to grasp the extent of the impact of this differential in cost of raw materials, it is essential that we take into account the wage differential to which it is cumulative. The average hourly earning of workers in the textile industry in the United States is $1.58. In Hong Kong, a major source of textile production, the standard textile wage is reliably reported to be 6.8 cents an hour. Even Japan, with its textile wage of approximately 10 cents an hour—and considered to be one of the really low-wage countries—is reportedly finding itself unable to compete with the lower wages being paid in other Asian countries.

Is there any wonder that there is such a growing animosity toward our trade program? Our Government cannot continue to turn a deaf ear to the cries of anguish from domestic producers and workers. Now is the time for an act of good faith by the Government, to restore at least some partial confidence of the American people in the trade program. The opportunity is at hand. A case has been made, and a more deserving case is hard to imagine.

On June 29, the National Cotton Council, representing cotton farmers, ginners, merchants, warehousemen, seed crushers, and spinners, filed with the Secretary of Agriculture a petition for action on cotton textile imports under section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act. Section 22 contains provisions for relief against imports if it is found that they tend to render ineffective or materially interfere with the agriculture program of the Government.

Under section 22, import quotas have been imposed on upland cotton at a level of 30,000 bales under 1⅛ length. The petition of the National Cotton Council is directed at the imports of textiles. I should like briefly to summarize the case made for relief.

The number of bales of cotton imported into the United States in textile form, including yarn, cloth, and fabricated articles, has increased from 37,510, in 1948, to 286,630, in 1958. Lest there be any supposition that the trend has reached a cutoff, Senators should consider that although textile imports from

Hong Kong for any quarter through April of this year have never exceeded 2 million yards of cloth, unimpeachable reports indicate that orders have been placed for future delivery of more than 35 million yards of soft-filled sheetings alone from Hong Kong. It cannot be denied that textile imports, now at an alltime high, are increasing at a terrifically rapid rate.

Now let us turn to the forms of injury to the U.S. cotton program occasioned by these textile imports. These forms of injury may be classified in four categories: First, the immediate effect on the market for U.S. cotton; second, the effect upon the attitude of the domestic textile industry; third, the effect upon the domestic market development; and, fourth, the buildup of future trouble, through delay.

It is self-evident that any substantial decrease in the market for domestic raw cotton materially interferes with our national cotton program. It behooves us, therefore, to examine the recent changes in the market for our domestic raw cotton, both foreign and domestic. It is true that our exports of textiles are larger than our imports, and this often is used as an excuse for our Government's inaction. If, however, we examine the trends of imports and exports together, it is obvious that such an excuse is completely invalid. For example, in 1948, the imports of yarn, cloth, and fabricated products were the equivalent of 38,000 bales, and the exports of cloth and yarn were the equivalent of 689,000 bales, the difference being 651,000 bales. In 1958, the picture had changed materially. Although exports of yarn and cloth in bale equivalent still exceeded imports of yarn, cloth, and fabricated products, the differential had shrunk from the 651,000 bales—equivalent, in 1948, to 76,000 bales—imports of yarn, cloth, and fabricated products having increased from 38,000 to 287,000, and exports of yarn and cloth having decreased from 689,000 to 362,000.

The figures I have just stated are not an isolated example, but are consistent with the entire trend. Other figures illustrate the same trend. For instance, consider the dollar value of cotton goods exported and imported in the form of end products. In 1953, exports amounted to $62,962,000, and imports amounted to $48,228,000, leaving a differential of exports over imports of $14,734,000. In 1958, exports had decreased to $58,664,000, while imports had increased to $109,696,000. The $14,734,000 advantage of exports we enjoyed in 1953 has disappeared, to be replaced by a deficit of more than $55 million.

A few decades ago, the sale and use of domestically grown raw cotton abroad would have offset the trend in manufactured products. It has not been too long since about one-half of all the cotton consumed abroad was imported from the United States. In the last 5 years the situation has become radically different, for the United States has furnished not one-half the cotton for foreign consumption, but only one-seventh. There can be no question, incidentally, that a great portion of the raw cotton market which we have lost has gone to Red China. The U.S. cotton producer is losing the market rapidly. Sales of raw cotton abroad have shrunk materially, as have exports of manufactured cotton products, while at the same time textile imports have multiplied rapidly. The trend of a shrinking market for domestic cotton, at home and oversea, progresses at an even faster rate.

The question of the market for domestic raw cotton cannot be left with a consideration of only the immediate and direct effects of the competitive advantages of foreign competitors, however. There are other—if less direct, certainly just as substantial—effects of a cumulative nature. The attitude of the domestic textile industry is pertinent to this point.

The impact of incredible wage differentials, tax system disadvantages, inducements to oversea investments offered by the U.S. Government, and the disparity between the domestic and world prices of cotton have not been lost on the textile entrepreneur's thinking. As a matter of fact, the confidence of the textile manufacturer in cotton as a source of raw material supply is being undermined, insofar as domestic manufacture is concerned. His thinking is tilted—and logically so, we must admit—in the direction of synthetic fibers. A continuation of such thinking can only result in further losses of a cotton market.

We must also be conscious of the fact that all the pressures are aimed at directing the future capital investment in textiles to foreign lands, with the resultant loss of employment, and ultimately a further loss in market for raw cotton.

Many have pointed to the field of market development, both domestic and foreign, as the most appropriate solution to the problem. I could not agree more thoroughly that an intensive program of market development by the textile and allied industries is essential to the survival of the cotton, and indeed, the entire textile industry. But we must face the practical facts of life. Marketing development involves major capital investments over a long period in such things as market research, scientific research, advertising and promotion, new plant and equipment, and personnel training. Any realist must acknowledge that confidence is a condition precedent to any such major investments. To date, investors have certainly been given little reason for confidence by the only source of relief—the U.S. Government.

The situation in which we find ourselves will brook no delay. The longer action for the correction of competitive disadvantages of domestic producers is postponed, the worse the situation becomes. Textile industries are springing up as the initial effort of undeveloped countries. Earlier comers to the field of textile manufacturers in such places as Japan, Hong Kong, and India continue to strain for expansion of their textile capacity—ever looking toward capture of a larger part of the world, and particularly the American textile market. We are fast approaching a time when this particular facet of our trade program will be beyond salvation. The longer we wait, the more drastic will have to be the remedy, and, therefore, the more difficult it will be to apply.

I submit that it is hard to conceive of a more substantial case for relief than that which exists for the cotton industry under section 22. Even were this the only mishap of our foreign trade program, it would be incomprehensible if relief should be denied.

From an overall standpoint in the interest of the future foreign trade position of our country, however, there is an even more compelling reason why favorable action should be taken on the petition of the National Cotton Council. As I have mentioned earlier, an ever broader segment of the American public is adopting an attitude of adamant, uncompromising opposition to the trade policy of the United States. With each passing day, this segment increases in size. Admittedly, this portion of the American people may still be in the minority. Already, however, the same attitude is having an effect on the Congress. Only last year, substantial changes in the so-called Reciprocal Trade Act, although ultimately defeated, received a broad base of support in Congress, and actually were staved off only by the most vigorous opposition by both the administration and the leadership of the Congress.

If the safety valves provided to remedy the specific hardships that result from the general application of the policy remain tightly sealed, there is certain to be an ultimate explosion. The longer the explosion is delayed without some show of good faith by the Government, the more extreme will be the change when it comes.

The section 22 petition of the National Cotton Council not only makes an unassailable case for relief, but provides an unequalled opportunity for a demonstration that our trade program can be implemented in a practical manner without destroying domestic industry and employment. It is my sincere hope, in which I should be joined by every advocate of expanded world commerce, that the Secretary of Agriculture and the President will act immediately to grant relief to the cotton industry.

APPEAL BY POSTMASTER GENERAL OF COURT RULING IN REGARD TO "LADY CHATTERLEY'S LOVER"

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I note that the distinguished Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] issued a press release today and invited attention to a letter he has written to the Postmaster General, urging him to take immediate action to appeal the ruling of the U.S. district court in New York which asserts that the amazing book "Lady Chatterley's Lover" is mailable through the Post Office. The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] urges the Postmaster General to take immediate action to appeal that ruling and to have the matter determined forthwith.

I quite concur in the sentiments expressed by the Senator from South Carolina, and I invite attention to the fact

that already the publisher of the book in its unexpurgated form evidently is carrying on quite a propaganda endeavor in order to popularize it. I gather from certain information supplied to me it is the No. 2 book on the Nation's best-seller list.

Obviously, there is an attempt to cast the Postmaster General in a role of a censor, when in fact he is merely doing his duty under the law as Congress wrote it. That, in my judgment, becomes the issue.

I have looked over a number of expressions of editorial opinion, and other matters. I do not arrogate to myself the quality of a connoisseur in the literary field, but I believe, because of the vigorous and forthright statements which the Postmaster General has made on this matter, in indicating what he thought was his duty under the law, the appeal will be prosecuted with vigor.

SECURITY COVERAGE FOR NONPROFESSIONAL SCHOOL DISTRICT EMPLOYEES

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the pending business be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 146, H.R. 213.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 213) to provide additional time within which certain State agreements under section 218 of the Social Security Act may be modified to secure coverage for nonprofessional school district employees.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H.R. 213) to provide additional time within which certain State agreements under section 218 of the Social Security Act may be modified to secure coverage for nonprofessional school district employees, which had been reported from the Committee on Finance, with an amendment, after line 5, to insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. 2. Subsection (p) of section 218 of the Social Security Act is amended by inserting "Oklahoma," after "North Carolina," and "Vermont," after "Tennessee,".

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment which I ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. Beginning with "Oklahoma," in line 7, strike out all through "and" in line 8, and at the end of the bill add the following new section:

SEC. 3. Notwithstanding the provisions of subsection (d)(5)(A) of section 218 of the Social Security Act and the references thereto in subsections (d)(1) and (d)(3) of such section 218, the agreement with the State of Oklahoma heretofore entered into pursuant to such section 218 may, at any time prior to 1962, be modified pursuant to subsection (c)(4) of such section 218 so as to apply to services performed by any individual employed by such State (or any political subdivision thereof) in any policeman's position covered by a retirement system in effect on the date of enactment of this Act if (1) in the case of an individual performing such services on such date, such individual is ineligible to become a memebr of such retirement system, or, in the case of an individual who prior to such date has ceased to perform such services, such individual was, on the last day he did perform such services, ineligible to become a member of such retirement system, and (2) such State has, prior to 1959, paid to the Secretary of the Treasury, with respect to any of the services performed by such individual in any such position, the sums prescribed pursuant to subsection (e)(1) of such section 218. Notwithstanding the provisions of subsection (f) of such section 218, such modification shall be effective with respect to (i) all service performed by such individual in any such position on or after the date of enactment of this Act, and (ii) all such services, performed before such date, with respect to which such State has paid to the Secretary of the Treasury the sums prescribed pursuant to subsection (e) of such section 218, at the time or times established pursuant to such subsection.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, the purpose of the amendment to H.R. 213, offered by the senior Senator from Oklahoma, is to validate social security contributions made erroneously by certain employees of municipalities in Oklahoma and the municipalities.

As the Senate well knows, employees of State and local governments already covered by a retirement system are not eligible for social security coverage, unless the Social Security Act is specifically amended to permit it.

It has been brought to the attention of the Senator from Oklahoma that some cities have erroneously extended social security coverage to individual members of their police departments, who have elected not to come under their policemen retirement system because they thought they were covered by social security. They have had social security payments deducted from their wages, and the cities have made employer contributions. However, it has been brought to light that unless the amendment offered by the Senator from Oklahoma is adopted these people will lose their social security benefits. Of course, their contributions will be refunded, but that is of small comfort when we realize they will have no retirement benefits.

The amendment would not apply to any policemen hired in the future and is a temporary measure because the authority to modify the agreement between the Social Security Administration and the State of Oklahoma to cover such employees, expires December 31, 1961.

I ask that the amendment be agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I wish to offer an amendment. At the proper place in section 2, the committee amendment, insert the word "Kansas."

Mr. President, I received a telegram from the Kansas Peace Officers' Association requesting that Kansas be included in the bill with the other States now included under this provision. I ask unanimous consent that the telegram be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

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

WICHITA, KANS., *June 17, 1959.*

Senator FRANK CARLSON,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Kansas Peace Officers Association, through its board of governors, recommend and approve an amendment to House bill 213, Senate Calendar No. 146, permitting police in the State of Kansas to be included under social-security coverage for certain nonprofessional school district employee and police. Present bill covers Oklahoma and Vermont only. Will appreciate your assistance in this matter.

Lt. CHARLES PROWSE,
Wichita Police Department, President,
Kansas Peace Officers Association.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I have discussed this matter with the senior Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL]. We are unanimous in requesting this action.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, I should like to call up my amendment and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 1, line 7, in the committee amendment it is proposed to insert, after the amendment just agreed to, the words "North Dakota."

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I should like to make a few brief comments. I understand this action will make the policemen and firemen of my State eligible for social security benefits. It would not obligate them to accept the program. Each unit would have an opportunity to approve or disapprove.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment to the committee amendment offered by the Senator from North Dakota.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

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

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. KERR. Has the bill been passed?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. No; the bill has not been passed. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment, as amended.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I have an amendment I desire to offer to the amendment.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I offer an amendment to add the word "California" to the list of States recognized in the pending bill.

The objective of this amendment is to include California within those States where the benefits of social security may be extended to policemen and firemen employed by the State or any political subdivision thereof on a voluntary basis.

The State Legislature of California has recently enacted legislation, approved by Governor Brown, to permit this extension of social security to policemen and firemen within our State. My amendment is designed to effectuate this State legislation.

This amendment will be beneficial to all the people of California in ultimately providing uniform and reasonable retirement benefits to those serving the public selflessly. It will not impair any of the rights of those directly affected. Before coverage is extended to any group, a secret vote of the employees involved must be held and a majority must favor inclusion. The law specifically protects any rights already acquired under an existing retirement system.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, following my remarks, a telegram from Gov. Edmund Brown of California, urging the adoption of this amendment.

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

SACRAMENTO, CALIF., *July 22, 1959.*

Hon. THOMAS H. KUCHEL,
U.S. Senator, Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.:

Understand H.R. 213 has reached Senate floor. This bill includes Senate Finance Committee amendment which would make applicable to Oklahoma and Vermont the provision in present law which permits 12 States to extend old-age and survivors insurance coverage to policemen and firemen already covered by local retirement systems. Existing State and Federal laws contain adequate guarantees that even if California is added to H.R. 213, old-age and survivors insurance coverage will be extended only to California policemen and firemen who elect to obtain such coverage. I have just signed assembly bill 1969 which will amend California law to permit social-security coverage to policemen and firemen already covered by local retirement systems provided Federal law is amended to include California in such coverage. I urge you to secure amendment to H.R. 213 to include California in the group of States where such coverage is permitted.

EDMUND G. BROWN,
Governor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, if all the amendments have been acted upon I should like to ask: Is "Vermont" still in the bill in the proper place?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. That is a question properly addressed to the senior Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. KERR. The answer is "Yes."

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, if there should be any grammatical errors in the bill as finally amended, is it in order to request unanimous consent to authorize the Secretary to put the bill in its proper grammatical form?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. It is.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that that be authorized.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Vermont? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment, as amended.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill (H.R. 213) was read the third time and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "An act to provide additional time within which certain State agreements under section 218 of the Social Security Act may be modified to secure coverage for nonprofessional school district employees, and to permit the States of California, Kansas, North Dakota, Oklahoma, and Vermont to obtain social security coverage, under State agreement, for policemen and firemen in positions covered by a retirement system."

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from North Dakota to lay on the table the motion of the Senator from California to reconsider.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

VETERANS' READJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1959

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, for the information of the Senate, an explanation of S. 1138, the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1959, as passed by the Senate, with amendments, on July 21, 1959. The explanation has been prepared by counsel for the Subcommittee on Veterans' Affairs, in consultation with the Senate legislative counsel, and with my study and approval after working with them.

Mr. President, I think the explanation is necessary in view of the rather lengthy amendments agreed to on the floor.

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

GENERAL EXPLANATION AS PASSED BY THE SENATE, WITH AMENDMENTS, ON JULY 21, 1959

The bill (S. 1138), entitled the "Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1959," has as its primary purpose the establishment of a balanced program of readjustment assistance for post-Korean veterans, i.e., persons who first entered on active duty in the Armed Forces after January 31, 1955.

Service in the 6-month Reserve training program does not come within the meaning of "active duty" as that term is used in the bill. Consequently, members of the 6-month Reserve program would not be eligible for benefits provided by the bill.

The basic eligibility period of the bill extends from January 31, 1955, the officially declared termination date for establishing eligibility under the Korean GI bill, to July 1, 1963, the termination date of the compulsory draft law.

The vocational rehabilitation training program provided by the bill is limited to veterans with service-connected disabilities. The eligibility period for this program covers both post-Korean veterans and veterans who first entered military service between the end of World War II and the beginning of the Korean conflict.

Applicable throughout the bill is a requirement that a veteran, to qualify for assistance, must have been discharged under conditions other than dishonorable.

Three major types of readjustment assistance, patterned closely after the forms of assistance provided under the GI bills for veterans of World War II and the Korean conflict, would be available to post-Korean veterans under the provisions of S. 1138. These are—

(1) Education and vocational training assistance.

(2) Vocational rehabilitation training for veterans with service-connected disabilities.

(3) Guarantee and direct loan assistance for the purchase of (a) homes, including homes on farms, and (b) farmlands, livestock, machinery and so forth, to be used in farming operations conducted by the veterans.

EDUCATION AND VOCATIONAL TRAINING (SEC. 2)

Eligibility: To be eligible for educational or vocational training assistance the veteran must have served on active duty between January 31, 1955, and July 1, 1963, for a period of more than 180 days, and must have been discharged under conditions other than dishonorable. In the case of a veteran discharged from service for a disability incurred on active duty the length of his active duty service would not be a factor in establishing basic eligibility.

Length of education or training: The education or vocational training period would be calculated by multiplying 1½ times each day of the veteran's active military service between January 31, 1955, and July 1, 1963, and with respect to a veteran on active duty on June 30, 1963, active military service after such date until his first discharge or release from active service succeeding such date. The maximum education or training period to which a veteran could become entitled is 36 months. In computing a veteran's period of active military service, for purposes of determining his period of education or training, there would be an exclusion of time spent in certain courses of education sponsored by the Armed Forces.

Kinds of training: Eligible veterans may use their educational entitlements to pursue the following kinds of training:

(1) School courses, both at college and below college level. These courses may be

pursued full time, three-fourths time, one-half time, or less than one-half time.

(2) Cooperative courses, combining school and on-the-job training in alternating cycles. All cooperative courses must be pursued on full-time basis.

(3) Correspondence courses and flight training.

(4) On-the-job training: All job training must be pursued on full-time basis.

(5) Institutional on-farm training: All farm training courses must be on full-time basis.

Educational allowances: A monthly allowance, paid directly to the veteran by the Veterans' Administration, is the means by which the veteran is assisted in the pursuit of a program of education. The allowance would be an outright grant or a loan, as explained in the topical heading next below. For a full-time program in an educational institution, the education or training allowance would be as follows: For a veteran without dependents, $110 a month; for a veteran with one dependent, $135 a month; and for a veteran with more than one dependent, $160 a month. Proportionate rates are fixed for allowances concerning less than full-time courses, as well as on-the-job and on-the-farm training. From the education and training allowance, the veteran must meet all of the costs incident to his education—tuition, subsistence, books, supplies, fees, etc.

Grants and loans: Education and training allowances would be on a grant basis for all types of approved courses of education or training other than courses in institutions of higher education. For approved courses in institutions of higher education, the education and training allowances would be on a grant basis for the first school year of the veteran's program of education. After the first school year, such allowances would be on a grant basis for any school year immediately following a school year in which the veteran achieves a scholastic average or scholastic standing that places him in the upper half of his class. For example, a veteran who achieves such scholastic standing for the first school year of his program of higher education, will be entitled to receive education and training allowances on a grant basis for the entirety of his second school year. A veteran who does not place in the upper half of his class for any school year shall be entitled to education and training allowances on a loan basis during the immediately succeeding school year; however, if the veteran, during such immediately succeeding school year, attains the required scholastic average or standing, he shall be entitled to education and training allowances on a grant basis, retroactively, for such immediately succeeding school year. In cases involving retroactive payments of education and training allowances, adjustments, upon application, shall be made by (1) cancellation of the loan, if the veteran elected to obtain a loan for a school year during which he did not qualify for a grant; (2) cancellation of the amount of the loan, if the veteran elected to receive only a part of the loan to which he was entitled during such school year, and payment to the veteran of the difference between such amount and the amount he would have been entitled to receive had he been paid education and training allowances on a grant basis during such school year; and (3) payment of the full amount of the education and training allowances due for such school year, if the veteran elected not to receive any amount of the loan to which he was entitled during such school year. Loans shall be interest free and shall be repaid in equal or graduated periodic installments in accordance with schedules approved by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs. Repayment of loans shall begin 1 year after the veteran ceases to pursue his program of education and shall continue over such period of time as the Administrator shall prescribe, not exceeding 10 years. If a loan is not repaid within the repayment period prescribed by the Administrator, interest shall accrue on the unpaid principal at the rate of 2 percent per annum.

Expiration dates: Veterans must commence education or training under the bill within 3 years after their separation from service and complete their training within 8 years after separation; however, with respect to persons separated from service prior to the date of enactment of the bill, these delimiting periods respecting commencement of training shall begin with the date of enactment of the bill. All education or training ends on June 30, 1973, except that certain career personnel may use their educational entitlements beyond that date and the method of computing the 3- and 8-year delimiting periods in career cases is liberalized so that the last period of service from which they are measured may include brief interruptions in service.

VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION FOR DISABLED VETERANS (SEC. 3)

Eligibility: To be eligible for vocational rehabilitation training, a veteran must have need of such training, as determined by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, to overcome the handicap of a physical or mental disability rated at 10 percent or more of total disability. The disability must be a service-connected disability arising from active military service either between the end of World War II (July 25, 1947) and the beginning of the Korean conflict (June 27, 1950), or subsequent to the end of the Korean conflict (January 31, 1955). Disabilities rated as 30 percent or more enjoy a nonconclusive presumption that training is needed; in cases involving disabilities rated as less than 30 percent the veteran must clearly show that the disability has caused a pronounced employment handicap. The general requirement for a discharge under conditions other than dishonorable would apply.

Length of training: The length of training is dependent upon the needs of the veteran. In general, the period is limited to 4 years; however, upon appropriate findings by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, additional time may be granted.

Kinds of training: The veteran may enroll in an institution offering college training, in an institution below the college level, or in any other type of training which, in the view of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, is designed to lead to the veteran's vocational rehabilitation.

Expiration dates: While there is no overall termination date with respect to the vocational rehabilitation program, there are dates beyond which individual veterans may not receive training. Generally veterans may not receive training more than 9 years after discharge or release from active mililtary service. However, with respect to veterans who become eligible for vocational rehabilitation by virtue of the enactment of this bill, training may be afforded such persons until 9 years after the enactment of the bill or 9 years after discharge or release from service, whichever is later. In addition, in certain hardship situations, the generally applicable expiration dates would be extended for 4 years. The additional 4-year period would be accorded in cases where (1) severe disability prevents training; (2) subsequent changes in discharges provide eligibility for training; and (3) service-connected disabilities are not established in time to begin and complete training before the general expiration dates.

Subsistence: A vocational rehabilitation trainee would receive a minimum subsistence allowance of $65 a month if he has no dependents, or $90 a month if he has one or more dependents; a full-time institutional trainee would receive $75 a month if he has no dependents, $105 a month if he has one dependent, and $120 a month if he has more than one dependent. Operative along with these rates is the following "floor" or combined compensation under the veterans disability laws and the subsistence allowance under this bill: Where the service-connected disability is less than 30 percent, the rate, if the veteran has no dependents, is $105 a month, if he has one dependent, $115 a month, plus $10 for one child and $7 for each additional child, and $15 for a dependent parent. Where the disability is rated at 30 percent of more, the rates for the above classification would be $115, $135, $20 for one child and $15 for each additional child, and $15 for a dependent parent.

HOME AND FARM LOAN ASSISTANCE (SEC. 4)

General statement: This section would make post-Korean veterans eligible for Veterans' Administration guarantee loans and direct loans similar in type to those available to World War II and Korean veterans under existing law. There are, however, several notable distinctions between the proposed loans for post-Korean veterans and those already available to World War II and Korean veterans: First, the loan rights of post-Korean veterans would not extend to the business loans and insured loans which are available to World War II and Korean veterans under sections 1813, 1814, and 1815 of title 38 of the United States Code. Second, there would not be a special direct loan program for post-Korean veterans. Direct loans authorized by this bill for post-Korean veterans would be subject to the present direct loan laws under which no direct loan may be made after July 25, 1960. Third, unlike the loans available to Korean veterans, the proposed loans for post-Korean veterans would be subject to a guarantee fee in a sum not to exceed one-half of 1 percent of the amount of the loan. The guarantee fee is intended to be used in the accumulation of a reserve fund sufficient to cover any losses that might arise under the program, the goal being to make the post-Korean loan program altogether self-sustaining. The amount of the fee may be included in the loan to the veteran and paid from the proceeds thereof. The fee would be deposited in a mortgage guarantee fund which would be used by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to carry out the aforementioned purposes.

Eligibility: To be eligible under the loan provisions of the bill, a veteran must have served on active duty between January 31, 1955, and July 1, 1963, for a period of more than 180 days, and must have been discharged under conditions other than dishonorable. In the case of a veteran discharged from service for a disability incurred on active duty, the length of his active duty service would not be a factor in establishing basic eligibility. The widow of a deceased veteran whose death resulted from active service would also be eligible.

Purpose and conditions of loans: The loans are for the purpose of assisting eligible veterans to purchase (a) homes, including homes on farms, and (b) farmlands, livestock, machinery, and so forth, to be used in farming operations conducted by veterans. Banks or other lending institutions would make the loans, with the Government guaranteeing 60 percent of a loan for residential real estate, or 50 percent of other real estate loans. The Government's guarantee with respect to a real estate home loan could not exceed $7,500, and with respect to other real estate loans could not exceed $4,000, or a prorated portion thereof. Loans of both types, or combinations thereof, would be guaranteed with interest at the rate generally applicable under the loan program for World War II and Korean veterans. (Pres-

ently, the interest rate may not exceed 5¼ percent per annum.) The loans would have maturities of not more than 30 years; except in the case of farm realty the maturities could be for 40 years. Under certain conditions, and in certain rural areas, the Veterans' Administration is authorized to lend up to $13,500 directly to the veteran when private capital is not available for a guaranty loan.

Expiration dates: Loans may be guaranteed if made before July 1, 1973. If a loan report or application for loan guarantee is received by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs before such date, an additional period not to exceed 1 year will be allowed for disbursement of the loan and issuance of evidence of guarantee.

EFFECTIVE DATE OF BILL

The provisions of the bill shall become effective immediately upon its enactment, except that the educational and vocational training provisions of section 2 shall become effective on September 1, 1959. Persons enrolled in courses of education on September 1 would be entitled to educational allowances from that date, although they could not receive payment until after enactment of the bill.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, in reviewing the action of the Senate last Tuesday in passing S. 1138, to aid the veterans of the cold war, and to aid this country by increasing its productive capacity, earning power, and educational level, I am impressed by the very able arguments made in favor of the bill by the distinguished senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA], the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], the junior Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER], the junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS], the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the senior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the junior Senator from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL], the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], and the junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. MCGEE]. So able a panel of Senators, representing every section of the Nation, is in itself a strong endorsement of the basic economic soundness of the bill and its worth to the Nation.

Mr. President, while all the Senate was moved by the eloquence of the junior Senator from Louisiana and the senior Senator from Oklahoma on the Long amendment, I would be remiss in my duty if I failed to pay tribute to those Senators who worked hardest for this measure in subcommittee and committee. In both, the distinguished chairman of the full committee, the senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], was faithful and diligent in attendance, wise in counsel, concerned always with the welfare of the country, patient with opponents of the measure, but firm in his support of a measure that would furnish real readjustment aid.

When efforts were made in the committee to cripple the bill and strip it of any real beneficial effects, the forceful and forthright senior Senator from Oregon was always present, and by his incisive reasoning and complete dedication to the public good, led in the unmasking of the destructive amendments, and their defeat in the committee. In his able argument on the floor of the Senate, the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon with unanswerable logic proved that this bill is the least, not the most, that this country can afford to do for its veterans and for itself.

For those Senators who were not on the floor at the time, and for the public, I recommend a reading of the able, powerful, dynamic, logical argument of the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon in favor of the education of these youths, for, as he expressed it, "the development of the brainpower of America." That argument is on pages 13821 to 13824 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I recommend it for reading.

So many dedicated Americans in and out of the Senate aided in bringing this bill to passage in the Senate that it would be impossible to name them all. I want to here publicly thank all who have aided in passage of this very constructive measure.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at the appropriate place in the RECORD a brief explanation of Senate bill 906, a bill to amend chapter 33 of title 38 of the United States Code, popularly known as the Korean GI bill, or the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1959, so as to eliminate a highly undesirable situation which sometimes occurs under the provision of the act concerning a "change of program" by the Veterans' Administration.

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

EXPLANATION OF S. 906, INTRODUCED BY SENATOR RALPH YARBOROUGH

The bill (S. 906) amends chapter 33 of title 38 of the United States Code, popularly known as the Korean GI bill, so as to eliminate a highly undesirable situation which sometimes occurs under the provisions of the act concerning a "change of program."

An example of the situation arises when a veteran selects as his initial program objective the attainment of a bachelor's degree. If upon completion of the work for a bachelor's degree he desires to obtain a master's degree, he may do so, but the change to the higher objective is considered a change of program. If the veteran then desires to seek a doctor's degree, he cannot do so and receive assistance under the Korean veterans' educational program. The reason for this result is that he has a right to only "one change of program," and that right was exhausted in obtaining his master's degree. Yet, if the veteran had initially specified the doctor's degree as his program objective, the process of obtaining all necessary lesser degrees would not have involved even one change of program.

The bill, S. 906, would correct this situation by providing that, in determining what constitutes a change of program, "a change from the pursuit of one objective or level of education or training to the pursuit of a higher objective or level of education or training in the same field of study or training" will be considered a continuation of the veteran's original program rather than a change to a new program.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, in accordance with the order previously entered, I move that the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 oclock noon on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 32 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned, under the order previously entered, until Monday, July 27, 1959, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate July 24, 1959:

IN THE MARINE CORPS

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for temporary appointment to the grade of brigadier general, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

William T. Fairbourn
Bruno A. Hochmuth
Roy L. Kline
William R. Collins
John C. Miller, Jr.
Louis B. Robertshaw

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate July 24, 1959:

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE

Dudley C. Sharp, of Texas, to be Under Secretary of the Air Force.

IN THE ARMY

The following-named officers for temporary appointment in the Army of the United States to the grades indicated under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3442 and 3447:

To be major generals

Brig. Gen. Thomas James Hartford, O18330, Medical Corps (colonel, Medical Corps, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Albert Frederick Cassevant, O18456, U.S. Army.

Brig. Gen. Ben Harrell, O19276, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig Gen. Frederick William Gibb O19222, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Big Gen. Frank Willoughby Moorman, O19444, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. William Frew Train, O18415, U.S. Army.

Brig. Gen. Harold Keith Johnson, O19187, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Richard Davis Meyer, O18963, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. William Kerr Ghormley, O17674, U.S. Army.

To be brigadier generals

Col. George Merle Powell, O19340, Medical Corps, U.S. Army.

Col. Hallett Daniel Edson, O19541, U.S. Army.

Col. James Alden Norell, O39838, U.S. Army.

Col. Bruce Palmer, Jr., O20117, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Thomas Hogan Hayes, O19556, U.S. Army.

Col. Richard Lee Jewett, O18339, U.S. Army.

Col. Charles Scott Hays, O42534, U.S. Army.

Col. Robert Hawkins Adams, O19474, U.S. Army.

Col. Wilbur Manly Skidmore, O18440, U.S. Army.

Col. William Charles Hall, O18391, U.S. Army.

Col. John Francis Franklin, Jr., O19476, U.S. Army.

Col. George Allen Carver, O19122, U.S. Army.
Col. Evert Spencer Thomas, Jr., O30107, U.S. Army.
Col. Charles Edward Johnson 3d, O19534, U.S. Army.
Col. Orman Goodyear Charles, O29954, U.S. Army.
Col. John Joseph Lane, O19021, U.S. Army.
Col. James Orr Boswell, O19188, U.S. Army.
Col. Louis Alfred Walsh, Jr., O19567, U.S. Army.
Col. John Ramsey Pugh, O18790, U.S. Army.
Col. Raymond Russell Ramsey, O29470, U.S. Army.
Col. Harold Harry Shaller, O29657, U.S. Army.
Col. Franklin Guest Smith, O19154, U.S. Army.

IN THE REGULAR ARMY

The nominations of John E. Aber, and 1,946 other officers, for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3284 and 3299, which were received by the Senate on July 13, 1959, may be found in full in the Senate proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of that date under the caption "Nominations," beginning with the name of John E. Aber, appearing on page 13213, and ending with the name of Robert S. Day, which is shown on page 13220.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Oregon Joins Brucellosis Honor Roll

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, July 24, 1959

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, the State of Oregon pioneered in the testing of cattle for brucellosis in 1928, and it has continued, with Federal cooperation, a long campaign for eradication of this costly livestock disease. I was highly pleased to learn today that, as a result of the success of this long battle, Oregon has been named a Modified Certified Brucellosis State by the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

Oregon now joins 19 other States, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands on the certification honor roll. To be eligible, a State must have no county with more than 1 percent reactor cattle and 5 percent of its herds infected.

I am proud to have supported the $2.5 million increase in Federal funds for the brucellosis eradication program when it passed the Senate last year particularly because of the outstanding example of my own State in this program.

I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the telegram to Oregon's Governor Hatfield from Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson on Oregon's certification be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, together with an article from the Salem Capital Press for July 10, 1959, entitled, "Brucellosis Freedom Battle Accomplished."

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

JULY 23, 1959.

Hon. MARK O. HATFIELD,
Governor of Oregon,
Salem, Oreg.:

Our sincere congratulations to you and all those responsible for Oregon becoming a Modified Certified Brucellosis State. Oregon joins 19 other States, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands that have previously attained this important step toward bovine brucellosis eradication. This is further evidence of the values derived from State-Federal cooperation, demonstrating again the accomplishments possible by State and Federal Governments working together with farmers, dairymen, and livestock producers. We are pleased that through such cooperative effort this significant accomplishment has been made. We look forward to the continuation of Federal-State cooperation for the furtherance of this important program in Oregon.

E. T. BENSON.

BRUCELLOSIS FREEDOM BATTLE ACCOMPLISHED

Oregon's accelerated brucellosis testing program, aimed at statewide certification for the first time in history, ended late July 2, Frank McKennon, State director of agriculture, announced.

Certification for a State means no county with more than 1 percent reactor cattle and 5 percent of the herds infected.

Last reports on the Oregon program will be submitted immediately to the U.S. Department of Agriculture in Washington, D.C., for review.

"We will not know the final outcome of the work here until Washington studies the records," McKennon said.

"If the Federal decision is as we hope, this will mark the end of a battle begun more than 30 years ago," he added.

STATE PIONEERS

McKennon recalled that Oregon pioneered in brucellosis (then termed Bang's disease by which many still know it) testing back in 1928. Varying degrees of testing, first on a voluntary basis and finally on a statewide compulsory basis since 1957, have been in effect since then. Original work was in dairy herds and dairy counties were the first to go after the disease in earnest.

The work was wrapped up in Harney County last week with percentage testing of a 600-cow herd. No reactors were found, the field laboratory reported. (Percentage testing requires the entire herd to be tested if any reactors show on the first 20 percent from which the blood sample is drawn.)

With exception of the one herd in Harney County, testing was completed by the June 30 deadline set more than 2 years ago.

MOP UP RAPIDLY

Twenty-eight of the thirty-six Oregon counties and the Warm Springs Indian Reservation were certified by April 1. In the last 2 months, State and Federal veterinarians, assisted by private veterinarians deputized by the State, have conducted a heavy mopping-up operation in Jackson, Crook, Jefferson, Klamath, Lake, Harney, Gilliam, and Wallowa Counties.

Dr. A. G. Beagle, in charge of Federal veterinarians in Oregon, says "there is no apparent question about any of the county records with exception of Lake County." He anticipates Washington will give this county careful study before making a decision.

"I believe Washington will consider the Oregon work a remarkable record in view of the obstacles placed in the path of the program," Dr. Beagle prophesied. He cited the suit filed by a group of cattlemen, who attacked constitutionality of the 1957 compulsory test act, as a major slowdown to the program. The court decision earlier this year upheld the law.

The contesting cattlemen insisted that calf vaccination alone was sufficient for control in beef operations. Calf vaccination has been in use here since the early forties.

Dr. L. E. Bodenweiser, State veterinarian, and Fred Pope, animal division chief, both with the State department of agriculture, expressed satisfaction and relief at completion of the testing. They said the situation had been "nip and tuck" the last few weeks. They said they would have additional comments when Washington renders its decision. They do not know how soon this will be.

In the meantime, McKennon pointed out that the Bang's program, although long and costly, has reduced Oregon cases of undulant fever—the human aspect of brucellosis—from 183 and 2 deaths as recently as 1945 to virtually no cases today. Nationally, 802 undulant fever cases were reported in 1958.

And Dr. Beagle said, "In my opinion, control of brucellosis through testing and vaccination has raised the average of our range country calf crop from about 50 percent to the present level of between 95 and 100 percent. This has undoubtedly added millions of dollars worth of cattle to the Oregon economy and untold tax dollars to the State."

Between $6 and $7 million have been spent on brucellosis control in Oregon by county, State and Federal governments since 1934, the year the Federal Government started paying indemnities. It was the all-out Federal drive commenced in 1954 which sparked the cleanup program in Oregon and other States.

The 1957 Oregon Legislature gave the final push here in authorizing the compulsory, State-financed program.

Observance of Pioneer Day in State of Idaho

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK CHURCH
OF IDAHO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, July 24, 1959

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement which I have prepared in connection with the annual observance in a great part of Idaho of Pioneer Day—the anniversary of the arrival of Brigham Young and his Mormon pioneers at Salt Lake.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR CHURCH

It is 112 years ago this afternoon that Brigham Young, leading a train of wagons, looked out upon the valley of the great Salt

Lake and told his Latter-Day Saints, "This is the place."

These simple words marked the end of a thousand-mile trek across the Great Plains and the Rocky Mountains, as the Mormons moved away from the persecution they had met in the East, and set out to establish their religious community free from bigotry and hate.

Today, in Utah and many parts of Idaho, communities join in the annual observance of Pioneer Day, commemorating the arrival of the Brigham Young party. Major celebrations are being held, including parades, pageants, dramas, special addresses, and even rodeos. These are proper accolades, for the Mormons did more than found a colony in which they could enjoy their religious freedom.

Brigham Young has been called the greatest colonizer in our country's history, because he sent Mormons into all the areas surrounding the Great Salt Lake, pioneering the agricultural empire that now flourishes where once there was only a vast expanse of sagebrush. Indeed, it was Mormon pioneers who founded the first settlement in my own State of Idaho at Fort Lemhi in 1855—and although it was later abandoned, in 1860, they founded the first permanent settlement in Idaho at Franklin. This frontier village was named for Franklin D. Richards, a distinguished Mormon pioneer. During their first year at Franklin, the settlers built a 3½-mile canal, admitting the waters of Maple Creek to their 10-acre farm tracts, and thus also launched the first major irrigation effort in the State.

Not only, of course, had the Mormons moved in and begun the early development of southeastern Idaho, but they also turned the barren area near the Great Salt Lake into a green and prosperous countryside; here, too, they built one of the most beautiful cities in America. The State of Utah was thus being born.

Today, we in Idaho pay our respects to Brigham Young and his valiant western pioneers, conscious that their decision to attain religious freedom in the untamed wilderness brought civilization and progress to much of our State. The words which Brigham Young spoke as he crossed a mountain range and looked down upon an uninhabited and desolately beautiful land, have rung down through the corridors of time as the epitome of discovery and journey's end. Truly, this was the place.

SENATE

MONDAY, JULY 27, 1959

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

Our Father, God, at the beginning of another week with its solemn responsibilities before us we would step out of the crowds which surround us and in the light of Thy presence face ourselves with the prayer, "Show Me Myself."

Alone with Thee, always a voice penetrates our busy occupations asking, "What shall it profit whatever else we gain if our personal powers, rich in promise, are dwarfed and blasted and we fall far short of Thy pattern for our lives?"

Always in communion with Thee, when all else is shut out, we glimpse the possible splendor that is in us knowing that the greatest thing we bring into the world is just a soul, sensitive to goodness and beauty, rich in possibilities of loving relationships, made for friendship, capable of devotions, obediences, and quiet heroisms, or upon occasion, of flaming sacrifice.

Grant us Thy restraining grace, that at any cost we may keep ourselves true to our high birthright, being perfected through the disciplines and experiences of life, and that we may so number our days that we may apply our hearts unto wisdom.

In the Redeemer's name we ask it. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, July 24, 1959, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H.R. 3460) to amend the Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933, as amended, and for other purposes, and it was signed by the President pro tempore.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the following committee and subcommittee were authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today:

The Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and

The Subcommittee on Housing of the Committee on Banking and Currency.

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.

NUMBER OF ICBM'S IN POSSESSION OF THE SOVIET UNION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I found very disturbing, this morning, an Associated Press story which quotes the Secretary of Defense as stating that the Soviet Union has "fewer than 10 ICBM's capable of hitting our country."

Last January, the Secretary said that the Defense Department did not believe that Russia has an ICBM capable of operating against this country. Now he says that the number is fewer than 10. I hope that a few months from now he will not be saying that the Soviet capability is fewer than 20.

The phrase "fewer than" can be deceptively comforting. I hope we do not comfort ourselves too far, inasmuch as the only assurance that should be satisfying is that the Soviets have fewer than we have.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have a Washington Post article on this subject printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald, July 26, 1959]

SOVIET ICBM CAPABILITY DISCOUNTED BY MCELROY

Secretary of Defense Neil H. McElroy said yesterday that at the most Russia has fewer than 10 intercontinental-range missiles capable of hitting the United States.

"We do not believe that Russia at this time has any important capability of this nature," McElroy said.

At the same time, McElroy said U.S. defense chiefs believe America's overall weapons system "could more than match whatever the Russians will have in intercontinental ballistic missile capability."

McElroy gave this assessment in a television interview with Senator KENNETH B. KEATING (Republican, of New York), filmed for use by New York State stations.

McElroy's statement that the Russians may have a few ICBM's capable of hitting the United States contrasted with his views at a news conference last January 22 when he said:

"We do not believe that Russia has an ICBM capable of operation against this country at this time."

McElroy also said at that time that "as of now, we have no positive evidence that Russia is ahead of us in ICBM's—operational."

Asked by KEATING whether "our situation is improving now or is Russia improving faster than we are," McElroy said:

"We think that we are at least maintaining our relative position, and our relative position is such that we should be always in a position to discourage any attack by the Russians."

At another point, McElroy said if a large number of enemy bombers were sent against a limited number of targets in this country "it would be very likely that some of them would get through."

However, he characterized U.S. air defense as good, and said the cost to the enemy of any bomber attack would be very high.

This country, he said, must retain an ability that, should Russia "attack our country with large weapons, we would be in a position to destroy him. That is our principal basis of defense."

The validity of this policy was attacked on a radio program by Representative CHET HOLIFIELD, Democrat, of California, a member of the Senate-House Atomic Energy Committee.

In the event of a massive surprise attack, HOLIFIELD said, "I do not believe that we could retaliate to the extent that it would