

would be short lived," seems to be open to the same criticism that applies to the last part of the first point—that is, exactly the same suggestions can be made in regard to the present program. Certainly our present cotton allotments have value to the extent that they result in increasing the income of the holder of the allotment. These advantages can be transferred by sale of the land under the present law just as truly as under a direct payment. As a matter of fact, they have been incorporated into the capitalization of farm values. This is particularly true of tobacco allotments. I can see no way where it can be fairly argued that direct payments would change this threat unless it is admitted that the direct payments would be more advantageous to the farmer and therefore more valuable. If that is true—and I think it is—it seems to me to be a good argument for using the direct payments.

The seventh and last criticism of course relates only to those programs that involve payments on the domestic portion of production. The bill I have introduced ap-

plies to all cotton grown regardless of where it is sold. I don't think it makes a great deal of difference to the producer where his cotton finally goes. What he wants to know is what he is going to get for it. I might, however, point out that spokesmen for the American Farm Bureau Federation have repeatedly urged the payment of a direct subsidy on all cotton that is exported. Certainly this involves a much more serious basis for criticism as dumping than would the payment of subsidies at home, and it does not put the money where I think it should go—that is, into the pockets of the farmers.

I have gone into a considerable amount of detail, discussing the effect of this program and the objections that the pamphlet you enclosed has made because I know that you are seriously and sincerely interested as cotton producers, and I believe that you should hear both sides of this argument. I may have overlooked some important points. If I have, I will be glad for you to suggest them to me. On the other hand, if I have been able to answer any of the points raised

by the opponents of this bill, I hope that the Ellis County Farm Bureau will avail itself of the much advertised democracy of the Farm Bureau system and express your local views in favor of the program that will be of the greatest benefit to Ellis County cotton producers. If you don't agree that that is a direct payment program, ask yourself what system will better serve your needs. If you find a better program, support it and let me know what it is. I want to support it too. And finally, carefully note that the unsigned author of the pamphlet did not suggest anything better. It, therefore, seems to me that as far as this article is concerned, all you have to choose from is the production payment plan, or a continuation of the present program with low supports, reducing farm income, high priced, and consequently noncompetitive, cotton, reducing the market for cotton at home and a direct subsidy system for the benefit of foreign purchasers.

Thanking you, and with best wishes, I am,
Yours sincerely,

W. R. POAGE,
Congressman.

SENATE

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 12, 1959

The Senate met at 10:30 a.m.

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

O Thou Master of all good workmen, we come this day to honor one through whose deeds and lips in an anguished day Thou didst speak—a universal man warmed with all laughter, tempered with all tears—whose sad and care-lined face mirrored the fearful struggle he led for the preservation of the Union as one and indivisible.

On this anniversary of his lowly birth we would that—

"Our children shall behold his fame.

The kindly, earnest, brave, foreseeing man
Sagacious, patient, dreading praise, not blame."

In these days that test and try men's souls anew we would turn to Thee with the dauntless faith which Thy servant Abraham Lincoln proclaimed his own, as he said, "I recognize the sublime truth announced in the Holy Scripture and proved by all history that those nations are blessed whose God is the Lord. I believe that the will of God prevails. Without Him all human reliance is vain. Without the assistance of that Divine Being I cannot succeed—with that assistance I cannot fail."

We come to Thee, his God and ours, with the sound of a great amen in our hearts to that creed by which he lived and we live as we lift our prayer to Thee.

In the Redeemer's name. Amen.

ATTENDANCE OF A SENATOR

RICHARD L. NEUBERGER, a Senator from the State of Oregon, appeared in his seat today.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading

of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, February 9, 1959, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

INCREASED RESOURCES OF INTERNATIONAL MONETARY FUND AND INTERNATIONAL BANK FOR RECONSTRUCTION AND DEVELOPMENT — MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 77)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, which, with an accompanying special report of the National Advisory Council on International Monetary and Financial Problems, was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(For President's message see House proceedings for today.)

Mr. ROBERTSON subsequently said: Mr. President, earlier in the day the Senate received a message from the President recommending that the Congress increase its subscription to the stock of the International Bank for Rehabilitation and the International Monetary Fund.

A question has arisen as to the proper reference of that message. In 1947, when the then senior Senator from Michigan, Mr. Vandenberg, was both President pro tempore of the Senate and chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, he requested that legislation of this character be referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, where such legislation has been handled for the past 12 years, particularly by the Subcommittee on International Finance, of which the former chairman of the full committee [Mr. FULBRIGHT] was chairman.

The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] has brought to the attention of the present chairman of that com-

mittee the wording of the Reorganization Act of 1946 which clearly gives jurisdiction to the Committee on Foreign Relations of legislation affecting international finance.

Therefore, the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency this morning indicated to our distinguished majority leader that he would have no objection to referring the message of the President to the Committee on Foreign Relations. As a matter of fact, the reference of such a message to the committee would be quite appropriate, because it handles authorizations for foreign aid and also handles work relating to the International Bank and Monetary Fund, as a part of our international program.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, notified the Senate that, pursuant to the provisions of section 5, Public Law 115, 78th Congress, and House Resolution 165, 86th Congress, the Speaker had appointed Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey and Mr. CURTIN, of Pennsylvania, as members of the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers, on the part of the House.

The message announced that the House had agreed to a resolution (H. Res. 164) electing members of the following joint committees of Congress, on the part of the House:

Joint Committee on Printing: Mr. BURLERSON, of Texas; Mr. HAYS, of Ohio; and Mr. SCHENCK, of Ohio.

Joint Committee of Congress on the Library: Mr. BURLERSON, of Texas; Mr.

JONES, of Missouri; Mr. SMITH, of Mississippi; Mr. SCHENCK, of Ohio; and Mr. CORBETT, of Pennsylvania.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (S. 961) fixing the representation of the majority and minority membership of the Joint Economic Committee, and it was signed by the President pro tempore.

PROGRAM FOR THE DAY

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I announce that shortly Members of the Senate will proceed to the House of Representatives for a joint session, according to the previous plan.

Let me say to all Senators that they will have ample opportunity to make insertions in the Record and transact routine business when the Senate returns to its Chamber. It is expected that the able Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] will address the Senate after it returns from the joint session. The authorities of the House have asked us to be present at 10:40 o'clock a.m. I hope to suggest the absence of a quorum in order that Members may be called to the Chamber and leave for the Hall of the House of Representatives before 10:40.

Mr. President, the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] plans to make an extended statement when the Senate returns to its Chamber after the joint session. Therefore, at this time, I suggest the absence of a quorum, and announce that as soon as a quorum is obtained, the Senate will proceed to the Hall of the House of Representatives.

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

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

JOINT SESSION OF THE TWO HOUSES TO CELEBRATE THE ABRAHAM LINCOLN SESQUICENTENNIAL

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, pursuant to House Concurrent Resolution 57, previously agreed to, I move that the Senate proceed to the Hall of the House of Representatives for the joint session.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 10 o'clock and 46 minutes a.m.) the Senate, preceded by its Secretary (Felton M. Johnston), its Sergeant at Arms (Joseph C. Duke), the Vice President, and the President pro tempore, proceeded to the Hall of the House of Representatives.

Upon the conclusion of the ceremonies in the House of Representatives, the joint session was dissolved; and, at 12:07 p.m., the Senate returned to its Chamber, and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

RETURN OF SENATOR NEUBERGER

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas obtained the floor.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I am sure that all other Members of the Senate join me in expressing a very warm welcome and assurance of our sincere pleasure over the fact that my colleague [Mr. NEUBERGER] has returned to the Senate in such apparent good health. I think he knows that he has our prayers and our best wishes for a complete recovery from the illness from which he has been suffering. It is very good to have him back with us.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the statement made by the senior Senator from Oregon. I had intended to make such a statement until he asked me to yield to him.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, we are very happy to see the junior Senator from Oregon back in his seat, and especially to see that he looks so well. Notwithstanding all the news to the contrary, apparently he is 100 percent recovered. That is good news.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I wish to join the senior Senator from Oregon and my other colleagues in extending a hearty welcome to the returning junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER].

I am particularly happy to join in this welcoming of our able and distinguished colleague because I take a personal pride in his career.

Some 26 years ago, when I was one of the editors of the Nation, a weekly magazine of opinion in New York, I gave DICK NEUBERGER his first opportunity to have an article published in a national magazine. He had just returned from Europe where catastrophic events were taking place in Germany with the rise of Hitler to power. He had observed what was going on at firsthand. I felt that his account was so interesting and important that I asked him to write it, which he did, and this article was then published. This was, as I have said, his first magazine article in a publication of national circulation.

It is a matter of common knowledge that long before he came to the Senate, DICK NEUBERGER had become a distinguished literary figure, uniquely prolific, with the widest range of publications, which included the most diverse magazines and newspapers in our country. From this journalistic career, in which he achieved nationwide repute, he moved into the U.S. Senate without ever abandoning his literary labors, the fruits of which continue to grace our national publications. In two most important fields, therefore—journalism and public service—he has been an important molder of public opinion.

During World War II DICK NEUBERGER was in the Army, assigned to Alaska, and played an important part in connection with the construction of the Alaska Highway. Characteristically, his interest in Alaska has enabled him to serve our long-time Territory and now State in many ways. He led the way to secure

Alaska's partial inclusion in Federal aid highway legislation, from which Alaska had been excluded totally during the first 40 years of the Federal Aid Highway Act.

Along with Representative EDITH GREEN, his colleague in the House, he was instrumental in securing legislation to end the contract system for Alaska's mentally ill which will make possible the care of these unfortunates in Alaska where they can be visited by their relatives.

I could go on almost indefinitely in telling of the many ways in which DICK NEUBERGER's service has been of an inestimable value to Alaska and of course to the Nation. It was a happy coincidence that he was presiding in the Senate on the night of June 30th, last, when the Alaska statehood bill finally passed the Senate—an act for which he had labored so devotedly.

We are all very glad that his health has been restored. I hope he will continue to face this body for years to come. And I would like to add my good wishes to Maurine Neuberger who has been so devoted and able a helpmeet to Dick in both public and private life. Those of us who have known and admired them naturally think of Dick and Maurine as a team. Both have contributed unforgettably to America.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I wish to join with Senators who have expressed appreciation for the return of our distinguished colleague, the junior Senator from Oregon. It was my pleasure to be closely associated with him as a member of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee. He is not only a distinguished Member of this body but a very able one. He is a courageous legislator and has demonstrated this quality on many occasions. He is a kindly man and my association with him has been most pleasant. I am delighted that he is looking so well. I thank God for his return.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I believe I speak for each Senator on this side and on the other side of the aisle when I say that all of us are pleased and, I may say, delighted that our colleague, DICK NEUBERGER, has today returned to the Senate.

DICK NEUBERGER is a good man; he is a kindly man; he is a considerate man; he is a man with strong convictions; and he is one who believes in the Golden Rule—"Do unto others as you would have them do unto you." He is a walking example of one who has the courage to fight back, and who has won. Also, Mr. President, he is an example of the fact that in the days, months, and years that have passed we have had countless demonstrations of the wisdom of the action of the Congress in time and time again increasing the appropriations for basic research in connection with deadly disease.

I wish to welcome back to this Chamber the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER] and tell him how very much it pleases all of us to see him looking so fit and so fine.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield to me?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I should like to join the distinguished majority leader in welcoming back the distinguished junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER], whom we have missed so much this year. We are very happy to know that he is well on the road to full and complete recovery.

I hope that one of the results of his illness will be that greater attention and greater emphasis will be placed on appropriations in the field of medical research, because too many of our Members have felt the effects, not only as of now, but in years gone by, of such diseases. Perhaps with this warning and with this example, we may be able to devote ourselves more to the pressing needs of our time as they affect our people in a medical sense.

I am very happy to join the majority leader in welcoming back Senator NEUBERGER.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield now to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President I would not want to miss this opportunity to add my word of welcome to the distinguished junior Senator from Oregon. During the past 2 years he was my seatmate in the Senate. That fact has given me an opportunity to come to know him well. I have sorely missed him during the past months.

Ten years ago, Mr. President, I was stricken with an illness similar to that which befell the junior Senator from Oregon. As my recovery seems to be complete, so I am confident that his recovery will be complete.

I can assure him how happy I am to see him looking so well, and what pleasure I take in welcoming him back to the Senate.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield now to the junior Senator from Texas.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I desire to associate myself with the remarks of the distinguished majority leader of the Senate in welcoming back our beloved colleague, DICK NEUBERGER, of Oregon.

He represents not only the people of his home State; he represents the people of the Nation. I know there are at least 2½ million outside of his home State who look to him with affection. They are the Federal workers, the civil service workers, the unclassified workers, the post office workers—the entire number of civil service and post office workers who have benefited by his arduous efforts for their benefit.

It has been my privilege to serve with Senator NEUBERGER on the Post Office and Civil Service Committee for nearly 2 years. There has been no one who has exercised greater leadership than he in driving forward in an attempt to see that our Federal officials and servants, who contribute so greatly to the work of the Federal Government, get greater recompense and rewards for the labor they put forth. I know they have been praying for his complete recovery.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield to the acting minority leader, the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, on behalf of the minority, I desire to join my colleagues in extending a welcome to the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER]. Coming from an adjoining State, I am well aware of the high esteem in which he is held by his constituents. I know they have encouraged him to return with a firm determination to continue his service in the Senate.

We extend to him our best wishes for a complete recovery. We hope he may display vigor and enjoy good health in future service to his State and to his Nation.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield now to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I am happy to joint with other colleagues in expressing great gratification that Senator NEUBERGER is back with us. I had the pleasure of knowing Senator and Mrs. Neuberger long before he came to the U.S. Senate. He is a good man. He imparts to the Senate a sense of fairness and kindness. He is always ready and happy to advise and listen to reason with any of us. I think Senator NEUBERGER is one of the most effective and best Members of the Senate.

If I may be permitted to say so, we have also missed Mrs. Neuberger—Maurine. There is no more gracious or charming lady in the Nation's Capital than the lovely wife of Senator NEUBERGER. We are glad to have them both back.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield now to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I desire to join in the words of joy which have been expressed by my colleagues relating to the return of Senator NEUBERGER to the Senate. I do so first because I know, through his presence, that he has regained his health and is well on the way to full recovery.

Primarily, our joy should come from the fact that he has regained his health and, as a citizen, will be able to enjoy that which is dearest to us all. Secondly, I rejoice because I know that we shall have the benefit of his keen mind in analyzing problems that will come before us.

It is not necessary that we agree in the quest for truth and for proper judgment. It is essential that there be analysis and discussion. Our colleague, RICHARD NEUBERGER, has always contributed richly to the making of law, so that the acceptance of the proper course in the service of our country has become simpler.

RICHARD, I am very glad you are back, for you and for Mrs. Neuberger, and for the citizens of your State.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield now to my colleague from Oregon.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I do not know whether I am adequate to the task of replying to the generous things which have been said about me by the majority leader and others of my colleagues here today.

I wish to say first to the majority leader and to my friend the junior Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH] that I have been inspired by their own heroic

recoveries from serious illnesses. I was just starting my service as a Member of the Senate when the majority leader suffered the heart attack from which he has recovered so valiantly and so effectively. I knew of the illness similar to mine which had been suffered a decade ago by Senator CHURCH. I was fortified by his very gallant and reassuring recovery. But, Mr. President, there was another factor that moved me deeply, and that was the knowledge of the great Senators, greater than any of us here, I am sure, who had succumbed to cancer in recent years—Senators like the great Senator McNary, from my State; Senator Vandenberg, who was mentioned a few minutes ago by the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON]; Senator Taft; Senator McMahon; and Senator Neely, who used to sit in the row where my seat is, if I am not mistaken.

I could not help thinking that if it were possible for a Senator to stand here and say to his colleagues, "If it were not for the marvelous discoveries made in medical research, I would not be alive and here today; and who in this body would know when, tomorrow morning or this afternoon, he might be in the same plight?" Perhaps we could emphasize these medical discoveries to some small degree by contrast with the way we emphasize research, for example, into weapons and armaments.

The phrase was used here today of triumphing over cancer. No man or woman alone triumphs over cancer; but valiant, persistent, wise, and trained men and women working in laboratories have been able to triumph over a certain phase of the series of diseases we know as cancer. Other phases are still awaiting discoveries which are yet to come. Fortunately for me, and I think for my good friend FRANK CHURCH, what we suffered came within the realm where medical research has already made fabulous discoveries. What some of our colleagues in the past suffered did not come within that scope; therefore, they are not here so that we can benefit from their wisdom.

I certainly intend to dedicate myself to the cause which the majority leader mentioned, the great cause of widening knowledge in the field of medical research.

I am particularly aware of the fact that cobalt radiation therapy, which has been responsible for my own progress, was discovered in large measure by two great Canadian doctors, so I hope there will never be a boundary line of geography or borders, or of breed or birth, when it comes to medical discoveries which can help all mankind.

I wish to say in conclusion, Mr. President, that the experience I have undergone—and I am certain the majority leader and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH] emerged with the same personal feelings—has given me a new insight and a new perspective on the events which take place in our world, and on the events which take place in my own little private realm around me. I think whatever personal bitterness, jealousy or acrimony I may ever have had—and I am certain I am subject to these human

frailties—will be far less now than ever before. To a person who is grateful to be alive and to be with his wife, family and friends, the trivial matter of personal ambition and personal pride become very unimportant.

I am grateful for the friendship of my colleagues, I am grateful for their wisdom, I am grateful for their patience, and I am particularly grateful for their personal solicitude during the long ordeal which Mrs. Neuberger and I have undergone. I refer to Mrs. Neuberger because she suffered every millimeter of the way with me.

I thought of all my colleagues often. I hoped the day would come when I could return. When my illness was first diagnosed I thought I would never again be here, and certainly did not think I would be able to stand here 16 pounds heavier than when I was in the hospital.

I am particularly grateful to my own doctors and to the long, long decades of medical research behind them.

I wish to thank the majority leader again for his generous comments, and all of my colleagues in the Senate for their equally kind remarks.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

REPORT ON AGREEMENT CONCLUDED UNDER AGRICULTURAL TRADE DEVELOPMENT AND ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1954

A letter from the Acting Administrator, Foreign Agricultural Service, Department of Agriculture, reporting, pursuant to law, on an agreement concluded during January 1959, under title I of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, with the Government of Spain (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

DISPOSAL OF CERTAIN COMMUNICATION FACILITIES IN ALASKA

A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the disposal of the Government-owned long-lines communication facilities in the State of Alaska, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Armed Services.

AUTHORIZATION OF CERTAIN CONSTRUCTION AT MILITARY INSTALLATIONS

A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes (with accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 203 OF CAREER COMPENSATION ACT OF 1949, RELATING TO SPECIAL PAY

A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 203 of the Career Compensation Act of 1949, as amended, to provide for authority to make payments of special pay for certain physicians, dentists, and veterinarians after June 30, 1959 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

PROVISION OF IMPROVED OPPORTUNITY FOR PROMOTION FOR CERTAIN NAVAL OFFICERS

A letter from the Deputy Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide improved opportunity for promotion for certain officers in the naval service, and for other purposes (with ac-

companying papers); to the Committee on Armed Services.

AMENDMENT OF TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, RELATING TO RIGHTS OF CERTAIN EMPLOYEES

A letter from the Deputy Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title 10, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Defense and the Secretaries of the military departments to grant return rights to career and career-conditional employees under certain conditions (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON FACILITIES FOR TRAINING PURPOSES IN NAVAL SELECTIVE RESERVE PROGRAM

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense, reporting, pursuant to law, on projects to provide berthing facilities and dock-side power services required for destroyer escorts to be used for training purposes in the Naval Selective Reserve program (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON THE MERCURY INDUSTRY

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the competitive effects of the Defense Production Act programs to assist the mercury industry, dated February 9, 1959 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

DEPLETION RATE FOR CERTAIN CLAYS AND TREATMENT PROCESSES CONSIDERED AS MINING

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to specify processes which shall be considered mining for the purpose of computing percentage depletion in the case of minerals and ores, and to revise the depletion rates with respect to certain clays when used to make common brick and tile products (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Finance.

REPORT OF U.S. TARIFF COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Tariff Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Commission for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1958 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Finance.

REPORT ON OPERATIONS UNDER SALINE WATER ACT OF 1952

A letter from the Under Secretary of the Interior, reporting, pursuant to law, on the operations of that Department, during fiscal year 1958, under the Saline Water Act of 1952; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT ON CERTAIN CONTRACTS NEGOTIATED BY BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on certain contracts negotiated by the Bureau of Indian Affairs, for the fiscal year 1958, pursuant to the provisions of section 4 of the act of June 4, 1936 (49 Stat. 1458, 1459) (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT ON CONTRACTS TO FACILITATE NATIONAL DEFENSE

A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, reporting, pursuant to law, that, during the calendar year 1958, no transactions had occurred on contracts to facilitate the national defense; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AMENDMENT OF BANKRUPTCY ACT RELATING TO CONSOLIDATION OF REFEREES' SALARY AND EXPENSE FUNDS

A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation

to amend the Bankruptcy Act so as to consolidate the referees' salary and expense funds (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AMENDMENT OF BANKRUPTCY ACT RELATING TO AUTOMATIC ADJUDICATION AND REFERENCE IN CERTAIN CASES

A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend sections 1, 18, 22, 331, and 631 of the Bankruptcy Act (11 U.S.C. 1, 41, 45, 731, and 1031) to provide for automatic adjudication and reference in certain cases (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF ALIENS—WITHDRAWAL OF NAMES

Two letters from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, withdrawing the names of Young Chiu, and Cecil Gladstone Ashby from reports relating to aliens whose deportation has been suspended, transmitted to the Senate on July 1, 1958, and January 15, 1958, respectively; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

DRAFTS OF PROPOSED LEGISLATION

A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting two drafts of proposed legislation, as follows:

A bill to authorize a 5-year program of assistance to school districts in meeting the debt service on loans for construction of urgently needed elementary or secondary public school facilities, and for other purposes; and

A bill to assist institutions of higher education to market and retire bonds issued by them to finance the construction of college facilities (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

INTERNATIONAL LABOR ORGANIZATION CONVENTION 105, RELATING TO ABOLITION OF FORCED LABOR

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of State, transmitting, for the information of the Senate, a copy of the International Labor Organization convention No. 105, concerning the abolition of forced labor, adopted at Geneva on June 25, 1957 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

RECOVERY OF COSTS OF BUILDING SPACE UTILIZED BY VETERANS' CANTEEN SERVICE

A letter from the Deputy Administrator, Veterans' Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the recovery of costs of building space utilized by the Veterans' Canteen Service in the Veterans' Administration (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

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

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Idaho; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

"HOUSE JOINT MEMORIAL 1

"Joint memorial to the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled

"We, your memorialists, the Legislature of the State of Idaho, respectfully represents that—

"Whereas the Minidoka Wildlife Refuge, located in the counties of Minidoka, Cassia, and Power, in the State of Idaho, has placed an unnecessary restraint on the use of the recreational facilities presently existing in

the backwaters of Minidoka Dam on the Snake River; and

"Whereas the demand for use of these recreational facilities have increased immensely in the past few years; and

"Whereas the rules and regulations of the Federal Fish and Wildlife Service pertaining to said refuge prohibit the use of said refuge for proper and necessary recreational purposes, consisting primarily of sport fishing and boating; and

"Whereas proper management of the refuge could be such that fishing and boating could be enjoyed without harm to waterfowl or impairing the use of the refuge as a resting area for waterfowl; and

"Whereas proper recreational development of the refuge could best be served by abolishing the Minidoka Wildlife Refuge and transferring management of the said refuge to the Department of Fish and Game of the State of Idaho; Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives, State of Idaho (the Senate concurring), That we most respectfully urge upon the Congress of the United States of America that the Minidoka Wildlife Refuge be abolished, and that the management of said refuge be transferred to the Department of Fish and Game of the State of Idaho; be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of state of the State of Idaho be authorized, and he is hereby directed, to immediately forward certified copies of this memorial to the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States of America, the Secretary of the Interior, and to the Senators and the Representatives in Congress from this State.

"ARNOLD WILLIAMS,
"Secretary of State."

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

"ASSEMBLY JOINT RESOLUTION 2

"Joint resolution relative to statehood for Hawaii

"Whereas the Territory of Hawaii has for many years sought to become a State of the United States with full privileges of statehood and first-class citizenship for its peoples; and

"Whereas this recognition was recently granted to Alaska, and both political parties have recognized that every consideration of fairness demands that the people of Hawaii receive the same status in our Nation; and

"Whereas Hawaii has long since fulfilled all the requirements for statehood, and no valid reason remains for postponing its entry into the brotherhood of the United States; and

"Whereas the people of California feel especially sympathetic to this proposal of statehood for the islands, because of the volume of travel and commerce between the west coast and Hawaii which has so increased in recent years; Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of California (jointly), That the Congress and the President of the United States are respectfully memorialized to enact at this session of Congress such laws as are necessary for the admission of the Territory of Hawaii to statehood in the United States; and be it further

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

A resolution adopted at a mass meeting of Americans of Lithuanian Descent, at Racine, Wis., expressing gratitude to this Government for its efforts to aid all people seeking freedom from communism; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A letter from the Greater Hartford (Conn.) Junior Chamber of Commerce, Inc., embodying a resolution adopted by that organization, favoring the enactment of legislation providing statehood for Hawaii; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

A letter, in the nature of a memorial, from R. Kenneth Busbice, of Monroe, La., remonstrating against the employment of Communists by the Federal Government; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by Schwandt-Goodman Post 9050, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Enderlin, N. Dak., favoring the establishment of a Veterans' Committee in the Senate; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. CHURCH:

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

"HOUSE JOINT MEMORIAL 5

"Joint memorial to the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled

"We, your memorialists, the Legislature of the State of Idaho, do respectfully represent, that—

"Whereas the existence of a large farm surplus of certain commodities is burdensome to our national economy; and

"Whereas the necessity to provide revenue for public assistance to needy persons is also burdensome to our national economy; and

"Whereas many of the recipients of public assistance and members of low-income groups have need for certain of the very commodities which are now surplus and cannot be disposed of in the common market without disrupting our farm economy; and

"Whereas the food-stamp plan which was in operation prior to World War II worked satisfactorily both in relieving the surplus problem and in aiding in providing subsistence for needy persons; and

"Whereas the present plan, now in operation, is very unsatisfactory to the smaller communities; and

"Whereas the State of Idaho is a large producer of farm products and the disposal of surplus agricultural products is a matter of great concern to the people of the State of Idaho; Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives, State of Idaho (the Senate concurring), That we most respectfully urge upon the Congress of the United States of America that a food-stamp plan, similar to the one used prior to World War II, and one that is workable and fair to all concerned, be enacted into law as soon as possible; be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of state of the State of Idaho be authorized and he is hereby directed to immediately forward certified copies of this memorial to the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States of America, the Secretary of Agriculture, and to the Senators and Representatives in Congress from this State.

"ARNOLD WILLIAMS,
"Secretary of State."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION OF TEXAS LEGISLATURE

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I present a concurrent resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Texas on January 28, and ask that it be referred to the appropriate committee of the Senate. The concurrent resolution expresses the opposition of the

Texas Legislature to further increases in the gasoline taxes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The concurrent resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, under the rule, the concurrent resolution will be printed in the RECORD.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 9

Whereas the President has recommended that Congress increase the Federal tax on gasoline by 1½ cents per gallon; and

Whereas the Federal Government is annually diverting more than \$1½ billion of Federal highway user taxes into nonhighway channels; and

Whereas it has been estimated that the addition of the 1½ cents to the present 3-cent Federal tax on gasoline would result in Texans sending \$137 million more in highway user taxes per year to Washington than would be returned to the State for highway purposes under the present aid formula: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of Texas (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress be respectfully requested to oppose further Federal invasion of this gasoline tax which should be reserved for the use of the States, and that the use of such present highway user taxes be restricted to highway purposes only; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be mailed to each member of the Texas delegation in Congress.

BEN RAMSEY,
President of the Senate,
WAGGONER CARR,
Speaker of the House.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,
The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

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

Philip W. Bonsal, of the District of Columbia, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Cuba, vice Earl E. T. Smith;

Raymond A. Hare, of West Virginia, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, now Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the United Arab Republic, to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary to the Kingdom of Yemen;

Phillip K. Crowe, of Maryland, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the Union of South Africa, vice Henry A. Byroade;

Sheldon T. Mills, of Oregon, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan; and

William C. Trimble, of Maryland, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the Kingdom of Cambodia, vice Carl W. Strom.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. WILEY:
S. 1021. A bill to amend the act providing aid for the States in wildlife restoration

projects with respect to the apportionment of such aid; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

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

By Mr. ROBERTSON (by request):

S. 1022. A bill to repeal obsolete provisions of law relating to the mints and assay offices; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MCGEE (by request):

S. 1023. A bill for the relief of Donald Gene Sherwood; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HARTKE:

S. 1024. A bill to provide that the Secretary of the Interior shall investigate and report to the Congress as to the advisability of establishing as national monuments the Nancy Hanks Memorial and the Lincoln State Park in Spencer County, Ind.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

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

By Mr. DODD:

S. 1025. A bill to provide for the coverage of physicians by the insurance system established by title II of the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Finance.

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

By Mr. JOHNSON of Texas:

S. 1026. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, rehabilitate, operate, and maintain the lower Rio Grande rehabilitation project, Texas, La Feria division; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 1027. A bill to amend titles 10 and 32, United States Code, to provide Federal support for defense forces established under section 109 (c) of title 32; to the Committee on Armed Services.

(See the remarks of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas when he introduced the first above-mentioned bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

S. 1028. A bill to authorize the Atomic Energy Commission to construct a modern administration and office building at Oak Ridge, Tenn.; and

S. 1029. A bill to amend the Atomic Energy Community Act of 1955 in order to authorize the Atomic Energy Commission to dispose of certain property for college purposes; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

S. 1030. A bill for the relief of Walter Hedley Huthnance; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOSS:

S. 1031. A bill to amend sections 522 and 545 of title 38 of the United States Code to increase the income limitations applicable to the payment of pension for non-service-connected disability or death to \$2,000 and \$4,000; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 1032. A bill to amend the act of June 14, 1926, as amended, to provide that lands conveyed under such act for State park purposes shall not be subject to the 640-acre limitation contained in such act, and to provide that conveyances for such purposes shall be without consideration; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

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

By Mr. CHURCH:

S. 1033. A bill for the relief of certain aliens;

S. 1034. A bill for the relief of Asae Nishimoto; and

S. 1035. A bill for the relief of Debra Susan Duffy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YARBOROUGH:

S. 1036. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to include Texas among the States which are permitted to divide their

retirement systems into two parts so as to obtain social security coverage, under State agreement, for only those State and local employees who desire such coverage; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 1037. A bill for the relief of Jesse Isobel Foster; and

S. 1038. A bill for the relief of Wong Gar Wah; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

By Mr. SPARKMAN:

S. 1039. A bill to amend sections 4081 and 4082 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to include wholesale distributors within the definition of "producers" of gasoline, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MURRAY:

S. 1040. A bill to amend the act of August 21, 1935, to provide for a determination of whether certain sites, buildings, or other objects, such as the historic State, War, Navy, Building, the San Francisco Mint, and the Morristown National Historical Park, are of national historical significance in order to successfully save those sites, buildings, and objects which are of great national value and which are now being destroyed or are being threatened with destruction by the Federal Government as well as by private interests; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HOLLAND (for himself and Mr. SMATHERS):

S.J. Res. 48. Joint resolution to provide for the designation of the week of Whitsunday of each year as "Hernando de Soto Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

CONGRESSIONAL RECOGNITION OF NATIONAL RAILROAD MUSEUM, GREEN BAY, WIS.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I submit for appropriate reference a concurrent resolution to grant congressional recognition to the National Railroad Museum at Green Bay, Wis.

The approval of the concurrent resolution would help to make the dream of a National Railroad Museum for Green Bay a reality.

The museum, presenting a panoramic picture of the history of American railroading will, of course, be of great significance for the railroad industry.

The purpose of the museum, of course, is to tell the dramatic story of the tremendous contribution of the railroad to the development of our great country. Among other things, it will:

Portray the development of the railroad industry and its contribution to our progress;

Provide exhibits, including rare locomotives—that is, steam, woodburners, electric, diesel—to give the public an authentic picture of the development;

Serve as an educational institution; displaying printed material, photographs, models, and other information;

Present a chronology of the lives of inventors, investors, managers, and workers who made outstanding contributions to the progress of the railroad industry;

Of course, there will be many more significant features of the museum.

I want to emphasize that the museum will not require Federal appropriations.

Initially, the exhibits will be financed by public subscription. Once established, the program is designed to make the museum self-sufficient. For example, there will be a modest admission fee; supplemented possibly by sales of souvenirs.

These minimum costs to the public, of course, will be more than amply repaid by the educational and historical value of the exhibits in the museum.

The museum was the brain child of Maj. Gen. Carl R. Gray. During World War II, General Gray served with distinction as Director of the Military Railway Service. Following his retirement, he had planned to dedicate the rest of his life to organizing a national railroad museum. Unfortunately, he met an untimely death in 1955. In respect to his outstanding contributions in this field, this project will be dedicated to his memory.

This great historical, educational, and cultural museum would benefit not only the people of Wisconsin, but of the entire Nation.

Granting congressional approval to this concurrent resolution would give justified recognition to this fine project. I respectfully urge that it be favorably acted upon as early as possible.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 10) was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Whereas the American railroad has been of incalculable importance to the growth and development of our Nation in time of peace and a major factor in her defense in time of war; and

Whereas there has been established at Green Bay, Wis., the National Railroad Museum whose purpose is to afford recognition in perpetuity to the role of the American railroad in our Nation's early history by preserving the railroad rolling stock and other memorabilia of the age of steam; and

Whereas the city of Green Bay has donated a site for the buildings and exhibits to be erected as part of the National Railroad Museum, and the State Historical Society of Wisconsin, an official State agency, has undertaken the responsibility of developing and operating the National Railroad Museum; and

Whereas there has been donated or pledged to the National Railroad Museum early and rare steam locomotives, other rolling stock, printed material, photographs, broadsides and ephemera, including the Carl R. Gray, Jr., collection, thus insuring its place as a center for the preservation of significant physical evidence of American railroading's early history; and

Whereas the National Railroad Museum, as an educational institution of major significance to all Americans in its portrayal of the development of the American railroad and the lives of the inventors, managers, investors, and workers who created the ties of steel that bind our country together, is of national interest: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring). That the Congress hereby recognizes the National Railroad Museum as a memorial to the individuals who built and ran our early American railroads and as a fitting and valuable institution for the collection and preservation of the memorabilia of the age of steam locomotion.

ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE FOR UNDERDEVELOPED COUNTRIES

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senator from

Utah [Mr. Moss], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGEE], the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE], the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. McCARTHY], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG], the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], the junior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD], and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], I send to the desk a resolution and ask that it be appropriately referred.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The resolution (S. Res. 78), submitted by Mr. KEFAUVER for himself and other Senators, was received and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

Whereas the United States and other nations of the free world, acting independently, have been engaged in carrying out programs of economic assistance to less developed nations; and

Whereas, although a great deal has been accomplished through these programs, much remains to be done if the allegiances of uncommitted nations are to be won to and retained by the free world; and

Whereas the coordination of the efforts of the separate free nations into one sustained, comprehensive, and coherent program would enable them to achieve the desired results more effectively and economically by (1) avoiding costly duplication of effort and thereby working less of a burden on the taxpayers of any one nation, (2) joining the uncommitted nations of the world to the free world, rather than to one member, (3) encouraging greater effort on the part of the free nations to work as a harmonious economic force; and

Whereas such a unified program would answer the challenge of Soviet Russia, which recently announced an increased foreign assistance program as a means of strengthening its political alignments in underdeveloped areas of the world: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Senate urges the Executive to seek to work out agreements with other nations of the free world looking toward consolidation of the various national programs of economic assistance to the less developed nations into a single unified program, participated in by the United States and other nations of the free world.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, the countries of the Atlantic Community of Peoples are agreed that economic assistance for the technologically underdeveloped countries—

First. Meets the humanitarian ideals of the western world;

Second. Is of practical good to themselves through enhanced trade, and allied friendship on the military front in an emergency; and

Third. Is a deterrent to the attempts to move these countries into the Soviet bloc.

Most countries of the free world are now giving economic help of one kind or

another to the underdeveloped countries. It is my belief that help could be much more effective if all these countries immediately coordinated their national programs of economic assistance to the underdeveloped countries.

At a working party of Western World magazine, which I attended this past November in Rome, I was more than ever convinced of the need for this cooperation. More than 100 of the leading political and economic thinkers of the free world expressed their urgency for the West to stay in the vanguard of technical and economical progress, and the front lines were very definitely in the underdeveloped countries.

I would like to present some of these views for your information:

Paul Henri-Spaak, Secretary General of NATO, was emphatic in his recommendation that aid to underdeveloped countries by the free world must be considered in relation to the Soviet challenge. He pointed out that the Soviets make no mystery of their efforts toward political and ideological supremacy. He said political dividends are to be expected from concerted Western action. The resources of the West are limited. A choice would have to be made among the people to be helped.

Giuseppe Togni, Italian Minister of Public Works, warned that the free world must not only be zealous but united in its zeal. Former Italian Premier Amintore Fanfani said that an awareness of the advantages derived by the U.S.S.R. from its unity should lead the Western World to a better organization of its strength.

Prof. Arthur Wauters, professor at the University of Brussels and former Belgian Ambassador in Moscow, prepared a special study on this subject which was presented to all members of the working party several weeks before the meeting. The special theme discussed was—How could and should the West meet the economic challenge of the U.S.S.R. in the various parts of the world? And what inferences have to be drawn from this with regard to the collaboration between the Western countries and with regard to the relations between the West and the underdeveloped countries?

He said most emphatically that the Communists have not given up their theory of the collapse of capitalism. They expect to speed up this collapse by driving the West from its positions in the rest of the world and depriving it of its sources of raw materials. The underdeveloped countries are, therefore, the main stakes in the struggle between East and West and Western unity of action is a necessary condition for any counteroffensive.

Andre Philip, French delegate to the GATT pointed out that the backward countries were falling further and further behind, becoming more and more pauperized. He warned that the conditions of aid from the West were not always satisfactory, and that the West both as an investor and as a purchaser must offer greater advantages to the underdeveloped countries. He said the

Soviet has shown far greater skill, particularly in opening markets for the sale of products from the backward areas.

The Right Honorable J. K. Vaughn-Morgan, Minister of State—Board of Trade, United Kingdom—cautioned the West to play its cards very skillfully in dealing with the underdeveloped countries. He said the Soviet had played some dirty economic pool with a number of the underdeveloped countries in certain cement and tin deals, and said this made it even more important that the Western World carefully examine the channeling of its economic aid.

Jacques Oudiette, manager of the Banque Nationale pour le Commerce et l'Industrie, Paris, quoted Indian Prime Minister Nehru's rhetorical question if the real Iron Curtain might not be that which separate the industrialized from the underdeveloped areas.

Prof. Robert Bowie, head of Harvard University's International Studies Department, suggested that the West might make joint use of the International Development Association, new project of the World Bank for channeling their aid.

Denis Healey, British Labor Party, Member of Parliament, suggested that these backward areas must be helped not solely for humanitarian purposes or for any desire to provoke gratitude, but simply because the whole world would profit by their development.

Dr. Sante Astaldi, vice president of the Associazione Nazionale Costruttori Edili—building and public works—asked for rapid action, and Louis Kawan, secretary of the Belgian Committee for the Study of Trade with the East, suggested the creation of organizations at national or regional levels, empowered to direct investments in which private capital could participate.

Ernest Friedlaender, West German columnist, proposed a long-term plan which could be carried out by the OEEC countries in cooperation with the United States and Canada. Etienne Hirsch, Commissioner General of the French plan, agreed that a program of aid to underdeveloped areas required at the very least a plan and precise aims among the industrial countries.

Here, Mr. President, you have a cross section of distinguished political, journalistic, and scholarly opinion all pointing not only to the need for Western aid to underdeveloped countries, but that it be channeled more effectively through a concerted free world effort. And, Mr. President, this should be done now, not next year, or the year after. The Soviet is in there pitching, their rate of production is moving along at a fast clip.

They are courting the underdeveloped countries with economic aid of one kind or another, as are the individual countries of the free world. But with increased aid to offer as the months move on, and a "oneness" of channeling, the Soviet may gain an edge on the free world, if we do not get together on this.

I am therefore proposing to you a resolution which I believe is urgent that the

Senate of the United States adopt immediately:

I ask unanimous consent that the resolution may lie on the desk until Monday for other cosponsors.

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

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I also wish to add that our colleague, the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], serving on the Economic Committee at the last NATO Parliamentarians Association meeting, submitted a challenging report on the necessity of a unified effort by the NATO nations in their mutual aid program, particularly so far as helping underdeveloped nations is concerned.

The resolution merely asks that the President of the United States and the Secretary of State use their best offices toward trying to work out with any other free nation willing to participate, a unified effort for giving aid to the underdeveloped nations, in order that we may avoid duplication, and that we should not only meet the Russian challenge, but for our own good try to have a more stable economic basis in that connection.

APPORTIONMENT OF AID TO STATES IN WILDLIFE-RESTORATION PROJECTS

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill designed to assure fair distribution of funds for wildlife restoration and management projects under the Pittman-Robertson Act. I ask unanimous consent that the bill, together with a brief statement, prepared by me, relating to this matter, be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1021) to amend the act providing aid for the States in wildlife-restoration projects with respect to the apportionment of such aid, introduced by Mr. WILEY, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 4 of the Act entitled "An Act to provide that the United States shall aid the States in wildlife restoration projects, and for other purposes", approved September 2, 1937, as amended (16 U.S.C. 669c), is amended by striking out "one-half in the ratio which the number of paid hunting-license holders of each State in the preceding fiscal year, as certified to said Secretary by the State fish and game departments, bears to the total number of paid hunting-license holders of all the States", and inserting in lieu thereof "one-half in the ratio which the number of paid hunting licenses issued by each State in the preceding fiscal year, as certified to said Secretary by the State fish and game departments, bears to the total number of paid hunting licenses issued by all the States, and in the determination of the number of hunting licenses issued, more than one license issued by a State to the same individual for hunting small game

(including birds) shall be counted as only one license and more than one license issued by a State to the same individual for hunting large game shall be counted as only one license".

The statement presented by Mr. WILEY is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY

The maintenance, protection, and improvement of wildlife projects is a real challenge that must be met—if we are to preserve our outdoor heritage.

To assist in State development of wildlife projects, the program under the Pittman-Robertson Act provides that States match Federal funds (obtained by collection of an excise tax on firearms and ammunition) on a 25 percent basis, to carry on acquisition, maintenance, and restoration of wildlife projects. After deducting administrative costs and certain statutory aids to Territories, the money is reapportioned to the States.

For over 20 years, funds have been allocated to the States according to a formula generally based on records of number of licenses issued. Recently, the Department of Interior proposed to change the formula and allocate funds on the basis of license-holders. If this occurred, I believe there would be unfair distribution of funds which, incidentally, would result in tremendous loss for our Badger State.

Wisconsin, as well as other States, has a variety of big and small game birds and animals. To help maintain an adequate supply, separate programs are necessary. If the new formula were adopted, it would fail to recognize this factor, and, as a result, a number of the fine projects now maintained in our Wisconsin conservation projects, and other States, would suffer.

We realize, of course, that there is a need for a common-sense approach to this situation. We don't want to start a license war by the States—that is, encourage States to issue a great number of unnecessary licenses, just to be eligible for more Federal funds.

To deal more effectively with the situation, the following—and, I think reasonable—approach, would provide, under the Pittman-Robertson Act, that the funds—

(1) Be allocated according to record of licenses issued; provided, however, that—

(2) Not more than one big game and one small game license in a series be included in computing a State's eligibility for funds.

If the change being considered by the Department of Interior were put into effect—that is, simply using the number of license-holders instead of the record of licenses issued it would have the following undesirable results:

(1) An unfair distribution of funds—severely reducing funds for Wisconsin and other States, since the money would be distributed without regard for the costs of maintaining separate programs—e.g., for big and small game.

(2) Require a costly survey—estimated at \$15,000–\$25,000 for a survey of licenseholders.

During the 85th Congress, I introduced similar legislation and urged that action by the Department of Interior be held up until Congress, the conservation interests, fish and game commissioners, and others, could evaluate the effects on the program by the proposed change.

A series of conferences were held. A consensus of the findings is in preparation. To attempt to head off the Department's jumping the gun by making the proposed change without benefit of the findings, I am dropping the bill in the hopper.

I respectfully urge early and favorable consideration by the Committee on Interior

and Insular Affairs of this legislation. Meanwhile, I shall again contact the Department of Interior to urge that action on the proposed changes be held in abeyance until Congress has had a chance to take a new look at the program.

ADVISABILITY OF ESTABLISHING AS NATIONAL MONUMENTS THE NANCY HANKS MEMORIAL AND LINCOLN STATE PARK, IND.

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, it is my privilege to have been born and reared in that portion of southwestern Indiana which has become known as Lincoln country.

It is in this section of our beloved Hoosier State that the great Emancipator, Abraham Lincoln, spent his formative years.

In Spencer County, Ind., lies the original 160 acres of the Thomas Lincoln farm which contains the grave of Nancy Hanks Lincoln.

There, also, is the site of Lincoln's Ohio River ferry operation.

In this section, the State of Indiana has established the Nancy Hanks Lincoln Memorial and the Lincoln State Park.

While these facilities offer a measure of tribute in memory of President Lincoln, who lived one-fourth of his life in that area, they are far from adequate.

Therefore, Mr. President, on this 150th anniversary of the birth of Abraham Lincoln, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill providing for a study of the feasibility of establishing a national park or shrine in his honor in Spencer County, Ind., a move which has the endorsement of Lincoln scholars throughout Indiana.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1024) to provide that the Secretary of the Interior shall investigate and report to the Congress as to the advisability of establishing as national monuments the Nancy Hanks Memorial and the Lincoln State Park in Spencer County, Ind., introduced by Mr. HARTKE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

COVERAGE OF PHYSICIANS UNDER TITLE II OF SOCIAL SECURITY ACT

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to provide for the coverage of physicians under the insurance system established by title 2 of the Social Security Act.

We all know of doctors who devote their lives to caring for the health and security of others, but make little provision for their own welfare.

We know of doctors who, at the close of a career of service and self-sacrifice, find themselves without adequate security for their final years. And we know of doctors who, because of the strains and tensions of their work, are stricken in the prime of life, without opportunity to provide sufficiently for their wives and children.

The great majority of doctors want social security coverage. Wherever they have been given an opportunity to indicate their opinion on this question, they have voted overwhelmingly in favor of being included. I feel it is only their preoccupation with their heavy duties and responsibilities that prevented them from demanding long ago the same kind of protection that all other groups enjoy.

I am aware that in the past some medical organizations, purporting to speak for all doctors, have opposed this extension of coverage. But a study of the reasons for this opposition reveals that these organizations are opposed not primarily to social security for doctors, but to social security for anyone. They oppose the basic principle of this program.

The Nation long ago decided in favor of social security. The overwhelming majority of doctors have also decided in its favor. Therefore, I urge the Senate to close the last gap in our social security system by extending coverage to the doctors of this country. This will be accomplished by passage of the bill that I introduce today.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1025) to provide for the coverage of physicians by the insurance system established by title II of the Social Security Act, introduced by Mr. Dobb, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

REHABILITATION OF LA FERIA WATER CONTROL AND IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT, TEXAS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference, a bill authorizing the rehabilitation and betterment of the La Feria Water Control and Improvement District in Cameron County, Tex. The district is part of the lower Rio Grande rehabilitation project.

In the spring of 1957, the Commissioner of Reclamation found this project economically justified. The water users of the district are now ready to enter into a repayment contract with the Government, by which the cost of these improvements can be repaid in a 35-year period.

By approving this bill, Congress will be authorizing the lining of canals and laterals, the cleaning of unlined canals, the placing of new laterals and drains, the repair of pumping installations, and the provision of a new storage basin. La Feria District serves about 27,000 acres of irrigable land in the Rio Grande Valley west of Brownsville.

Mr. President, I call attention to the extremely favorable benefit-cost ratio of these improvements. The Department of Interior estimates that ratio at 5 to 1. And I repeat that the total cost of \$5,750,000 is to be repaid by the users.

My good friend JOE KILGORE has introduced an identical bill in the House of Representatives. I commend this legislation to my colleagues, Mr. President, as eminently sound and justified.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1026) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, rehabilitate, operate, and maintain the lower Rio Grande rehabilitation project, Texas, La Feria division, introduced by Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PROPOSED INCREASE OF PERMITTED ANNUAL EARNINGS UNDER VETERANS' COMPENSATION AND PENSION LAWS

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to increase the maximum annual earnings limit permitted under title 38 of the United States Code, otherwise known as the veterans' compensation and pension laws. In effect, this bill would increase by \$600 the amount of money a single disabled veteran could earn, and by \$1,300 the amount a married disabled veteran could earn, without forfeiting their pension rights.

It has been 6 years since an adjustment was made in the amount of outside income a disabled veteran can earn and still receive his pension. Since that time both the cost of living and the general wage level have risen considerably. In fact, the cost of living has skyrocketed to its highest point in history. It is obvious that the present annual maximum earnings ceiling for disabled veterans is antiquated and unrealistic, and should be raised.

I should like to point out that enactment of this measure will not cost the Government any money. Its passage is a matter of simple justice for disabled veterans and their families.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1031) to amend sections 522 and 545 of title 38 of the United States Code to increase the income limitations applicable to the payment of pension for non-service-connected disability or death to \$2,000 and \$4,000, introduced by Mr. MOSS, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

DEVELOPMENT OF STATE PARK SYSTEM IN PUBLIC LAND STATES

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill which has for its purpose the further development of the State park system in the public lands States. The measure I have prepared would amend Public Law 387, 83d Congress—found in Sixty-eighth Statutes at Large, page 173—the Recreation Act—in two respects:

First. It would remove the 640-acre limitation on the transfer of Federal lands to the States when the lands are to be used for State park purposes; and

Second. It would provide that such conveyances for park purposes would be without monetary consideration.

The recreation law already provides that lands for historic monuments may be conveyed without cost to the State, and my bill would place State park lands in the same status.

At the present time the Bureau of Land Management is administering over 176 million acres in 26 States in continental United States, and 298 million acres in our new State of Alaska. The Bureau has no program to preserve historical sites, scenic areas or unique features on the lands which it is administering. It seems no more than right that if the States are willing to take over these areas and manage, protect, and develop them, the Federal Government should make them available. Many of our great recreational, and scenic and historic features are being damaged and destroyed. We must do something about them, or within a few years they will lose their value.

Mr. President, the need for legislation such as I propose is highlighted by the situation in my own State. Utah, which is one of the largest States in the Nation, has a total of 52,701,440 acres. Some 74 percent of it is federally owned. Federal holdings include two national parks, eight national monuments and seven national forests. However, some of the State's finest scenic, geologic, archeological, and historic sites are on the 24,679,361 acres administered by the Bureau of Land Management, and there is no recreation program for them. The Utah State Park and Recreation Commission has included 1,646,174 acres of Bureau of Land Management land in its projected State park program. While the Bureau of Land Management is cooperating in assisting in the purchase and transference of some BLM acreage to Utah for State park use, the acreage limitations must be removed, as my bill would do, if many desirable areas are to be acquired.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1032) to amend the act of June 14, 1926, as amended, to provide that lands conveyed under such act for State park purposes shall not be subject to the 640-acre limitation contained in such act, and to provide that conveyances for such purposes shall be without consideration, introduced by Mr. MOSS, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

SOCIAL SECURITY BENEFITS FOR TEXAS TEACHERS

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill which will allow the members of Texas teachers retirement systems to decide whether they want to have social security added on top of the protection they enjoy under their own retirement systems. The bill I have introduced would add Texas to the list of States that have the option to extend coverage under the so-called split provision. Under this procedure present teachers under the retirement system could make their individual decision as

to whether they wished coverage or not. Coverage, however, would be on a compulsory basis for teachers who subsequently came under the retirement system. The decision as to whether this option could be exercised would still be left up to the State and the coverage could be effectuated on a school district by school district basis.

In the last 2 years over 700,000 State and local employees under retirement systems in other States have gained social security coverage under the split provision. I believe that the State of Texas and its subdivisions should have this option and my bill, if enacted, will make this possible.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1036) to amend title II of the Social Security Act to include Texas among the States which are permitted to divide their retirement systems into two parts so as to obtain social security coverage, under State agreement, for only those State and local employees who desire such coverage, introduced by Mr. YARBOROUGH, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

DESIGNATION OF WEEK OF WHITSUNDAY OF EACH YEAR AS "HERNANDO DE SOTO WEEK"

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, for myself and my junior colleague the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] I send to the desk, and ask that it be appropriately referred, a joint resolution to provide for the designation of the week of Whitsunday of each year as "Hernando de Soto Week".

Each year a "De Soto Pageant," featuring an authentic duplication of the landing of De Soto, is staged at the De Soto National Memorial on the shore of Tampa Bay, 5 miles west of Bradenton, Fla. The memorial was established in 1949 by the National Park Service of the U.S. Department of the Interior in tribute to Hernando de Soto and his fellow Spanish explorers.

We feel it is fitting and proper that the people of the United States observe the anniversary of the De Soto expedition, which was the first European penetration into the interior of what is now southern United States, and in order to encourage them to do so, we introduce this joint resolution which would authorize the President to designate the week beginning with Whitsunday of each year, beginning with the year 1959, as "Hernando de Soto Week" and to issue a proclamation calling upon the people of the United States to observe such week with appropriate ceremonies.

The story of De Soto's exploration is indeed fascinating, and in order that Senators may read this story, I ask to have printed in the RECORD, at this point, as a part of my remarks, excerpts from a publication of the National Park Service describing this adventure in some detail, and the text of the resolution.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without ob-

jection, the excerpts will be printed in the RECORD, at this point.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 48) to provide for the designation of the week of Whitsunday of each year as "Hernando de Soto Week," introduced by Mr. HOLLAND (for himself and Mr. SMATHERS), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The excerpts presented by Mr. HOLLAND and the resolution are as follows:

Whereas on Whitsunday, 1539, Don Hernando de Soto cast anchor off the west coast of Florida and on May 30, 1539, landed on the shore of Tampa Bay five miles west of Bradenton, Florida, with a large flotilla and an army of some seven hundred volunteers; and

Whereas the De Soto expedition was the first European penetration into what is now the Southern United States, crossing four thousand miles of wilderness in the area which now comprises the States of Florida, Georgia, South Carolina, North Carolina, Tennessee, Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, Arkansas, and Texas; and

Whereas on August 5, 1949, a national memorial was established at Shaw's Point, Bradenton, Florida, commemorating De Soto's landing and exploration: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the President is authorized and requested to designate the week beginning with Whitsunday of each year, beginning with the year 1959, as "Hernando de Soto Week" and to issue a proclamation calling upon the people of the United States to observe such week with appropriate ceremonies.

The De Soto Expedition, a typical instance of organized Spanish exploration, was the first European penetration into what is now Southern United States. Crossing 4,000 miles of wilderness, the explorers earned for Spain a broad knowledge of the interior lands and peoples and recorded priceless information on native American life of the 1500's.

THE CONQUISTADORES (THE CONQUERORS)

Columbus had given Spain an early claim to the New World and its wealth, and her warrior nobles penetrated the new-found continents with amazing rapidity. Hardy and courageous men, loyal to King and Church, they had built some 200 permanent towns in the Americas long before Raleigh landed in Carolina.

While Cortés was still having difficulty with the Aztecs, Spanish explorers were moving out from the West Indies. In 1513, Ponce de León discovered Florida; by 1519, the gulf coast was charted; by 1525, navigators had probed Atlantic shores from Cape Horn to Newfoundland. In 1526, Ayllón set ashore a short-lived colony, believed to have been at or near South Carolina's Pee Dee River. Two years later Narváez landed on Florida's west coast. His sole survivors were the resourceful Cabeza de Vaca and a trio of companions. Still the vast North American interior lay mysterious and untouched, rumored to be "the richest land of any which until then had been discovered."

HERNANDO DE SOTO

Don Hernando De Soto, Knight of Santiago, "a gentleman by all four descents" (i.e., by all four grandparents), was a typical conquistador. Born in Spain about 1500, he achieved wealth and a brilliant career in Nicaragua and Peru. Charles V appointed him Governor of Cuba and Adelantado (Leader) to "conquer, pacify, and populate" the northern continent.

On April 7, 1538, trumpets sounded and cannon thundered as the flotilla left San

Lúcar, Spain, with about 700 volunteers abroad. The winds were favorable, and De Soto's bride was at his side.

LANDING IN FLORIDA

In Havana, on May 18, 1539, De Soto bade farewell to his Doña Isabel and set sail for Florida. On May 30, the army landed on the west coast, apparently at Tampa Bay. A few ruined pearls lay in the dust at the deserted Indian village where they camped, and the Spaniards believed themselves at the threshold of fortune. So Narváez had thought, when he chanced upon a single golden ornament.

Spanish scouts found the lost Juan Ortiz, who had come to Florida with Narváez and had been saved by a native princess from death at the stake. For 10 years Ortiz had been a slave of the Indians, and, while he had seen no riches, he had heard wonderful reports of the interior land. De Soto assigned 100 men to guard the camp and sent the ships back to Cuba for supplies. The march through 4,000 miles of unknown land began on July 15, 1539.

INTO THE WILDERNESS

De Soto led 600 or more disciplined veterans who averaged—and sometimes doubled—a steady 10 miles a day on the march. Counting the Indian carriers drafted as they went along, the expedition must often have numbered up to 1,000 people. About 200 horses mounted the lancers. There were about 300 crossbowmen and harquebusiers, a dozen priests, a physician, and workmen to build boats and bridges or repair weapons and rivet the slave chains.

As they pushed northward, heat and hunger plagued them; hidden natives rained arrows upon them. De Soto followed the practice of seizing village chieftains and forcing them to supply food, carriers, and guides. Once beyond Ocale (in what is now Florida), Indians gathered to rescue their chief, but the Spaniards moved first, driving the warriors into nearby lakes.

De Soto continued onward. Then from winter quarters in the hostile Apalachee farmlands (now northern Florida, near Apalachee Bay), he summoned the men left at the landing site, while to Havana he sent a present of 20 Indian women for Doña Isabel. Meanwhile, his scouts discovered Pensacola Bay; others saw the bleached bones of Narváez' horses at Apalachee Bay.

SEARCH FOR TREASURE CONTINUED

In the spring of 1540, they marched toward the Savannah River, where the comely chieftainess of Coftachequi, an Indian village, bestowed her pearl necklace upon Don Hernando. Another 200 pounds of pearls were dug from the burial mounds. But the Adelantado pushed onward. If no richer land were found, they could always return.

Some were lame and sick by the time they reached a region called Xuala in what is now western South Carolina, but here they saw "more indications of gold mines than in all the country they had traversed." Up into what is now North Carolina, then across the Smokies into Tennessee they went. Mulberries, nuts, maize, and turkeys the natives gave willingly, as the army pressed southward toward Coosa, in central Alabama, still searching for treasure.

THE TRAGEDY OF MABILA

Powerful Tascalusa, lord of the Mobile Indians, hid his anger when the Spaniards seized him, and agreed to furnish 400 carriers as soon as they reached the town of Mabila. But warriors—not carriers—surrounded De Soto in Mabila. The Spaniards fought free in a fierce day-long battle, burned the Indian town, and slaughtered 3,000 Indians. De Soto suffered crippling losses in this battle; 20 men killed, including a brother-in-law and a nephew; a number of horses killed;

most of the expedition's supplies and property destroyed; and the wounded comprised all the men of most worth and honor in the army.

De Soto had planned to meet supply ships on the coast and send the pearls of Cofitachequi to Havana. But the pearls were lost at Mabila. Some of his disillusioned men, naked under their rusty mail, planned to sail with the ships. To prevent this, De Soto again turned his face from the coast.

A RIVER LARGER THAN THE DANUBE

The expedition almost ended in the spring of 1541, when the Chickasaw Indians made a surprise dawn attack on the northern Mississippi camp. Fortunately, the Indians mistook stampeding horses for cavalry and withdrew; yet a dozen Spaniards lost their lives, and 50 horses were killed. Clothing, saddles, and weapons were burned. Shaking with cold, the men covered themselves with grass mats, while they fashioned new saddles and lances.

On May 8, 1541, De Soto saw the great river, so wide that "If a man stood still on the other side, it could not be discerned whether he were a man or no." Beyond the Mississippi lay the rumored wealth of Pacaha Province, so the artisans built barges and the army crossed for the march into Arkansas to the mouth of the St. Francis. Finding no gold, they turned west, then south, to winter on the west bank of the Ouachita River, near what is now Camden, Ark. Here, the interpreter Juan Ortiz died, a great loss.

THE DEATH OF DE SOTO

Even De Soto was discouraged. He went back to the Mississippi, planning to settle at a seaport and refit for a westward advance, but the scouts found no news of the sea. To terrorize the populous country and keep the Indians from uniting against him, De Soto ordered the destruction of the Anilco village in what is now Louisiana. The fighting was left to his lieutenants, for De Soto, called by his men "one of the best lances who have passed to the New World," was burning with fever. A few days later, on May 21, 1542, Hernando de Soto died.

Not all mourned his passing, for he was a stern man. Yet, skill and courage demanded respect, and his concern for his men won devotion. Secretly, they buried their knight within the village walls, telling the Indians that the "Child of the Sun" had ascended to his father. When the natives saw the loosened earth and whispered, the Spaniards dug up the body, weighted it in an oaken casket, and sank it in the dark bosom of the Father of Waters, as the Indians called the Mississippi.

RETURN TO CIVILIZATION

Luis De Moscoso, De Soto's appointed successor, after a futile try to reach Mexico through what is now Texas, led the tired band again to the Mississippi, where they spent the winter building seven little ships. Before the fleet sailed downstream on July 2, 1543, most of the remaining 50 horses, which had been used in battle, were slaughtered for meat.

Running a gauntlet of arrows, the ships found the gulf 19 days later. On September 10 some 300 Spaniards and 100 Indians reached Mexico Pánuco River. There, haggard and worn, they found a warm welcome.

That fall, a ship took the news of De Soto's death to Doña Isabel.

FLORIDA AND THE SPANISH EMPIRE

Heartbreak and hardship failed to destroy the golden myth of Florida. Moscoso and his tattered comrades, safe once more, painted glowing pictures of the north country. Around the Caribbean, however, Spain had precious metals, and docile natives, so North American furs and forests held little attraction. Florida was merely a dangerous coast on the treasure fleet route. After the

martyrdom of Fray Luis Cancer by the Indians, and the unsuccessful colonies of Luna and Villafañe, the Crown prohibited Florida projects.

Then, in 1564, the French Colony at Fort Caroline, on Florida's St. John River, threatened the treasure fleets. The founding of St. Augustine was Spain's inevitable answer.

ELIMINATION OF CERTAIN CLAIMS OF IMMUNITY FROM STATE AND LOCAL TAXES—ADDITIONAL CO-SPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the senior Senator from California I introduced, on January 29, the bill (S. 815) to eliminate claims of immunity from State and local taxes based on the contracts of the United States or its agencies and instrumentalities. I ask unanimous consent that the name of the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT] be added as a cosponsor of the bill, and that his name be added on subsequent printings of the bill.

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

ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE TO AMERICAN INDIANS—ADDITIONAL CO-SPONSOR OF BILL

Under authority of the order of the Senate of February 5, 1959, the name of Mr. CASE of South Dakota was added as an additional cosponsor of the bill (S. 953) to provide economic assistance to the American Indians, introduced by Mr. LANGER (for himself, Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. MUNDT, Mr. CHURCH, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. KERR, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. ANDERSON, and Mr. MCGEE) on February 5, 1959.

PROPOSED CIVIL RIGHTS LEGISLATION—ADDITIONAL CO-SPONSORS OF BILLS

Under authority of the order of the Senate of February 5, 1959, the names of Senators BUSH, ALLOTT, BEALL, CARLSON, CASE of New Jersey, and SCOTT were added as additional cosponsors of the following bills, introduced by Mr. DIRKSEN (for himself, Mr. KEATING, Mr. SALTONSTALL, and Mr. JAVITS), on February 5, 1959:

S. 955. A bill to amend chapter 73 of title 18, United States Code, with respect to obstruction of court orders;

S. 956. A bill to amend chapter 49 of title 18, United States Code, to punish flight to avoid prosecution for unlawful destruction of educational or religious structures;

S. 957. A bill to provide for the retention and preservation of Federal election records and to authorize the Attorney General to compel the production of such records;

S. 958. A bill to assist in meeting the costs of special professional services needed in carrying out public school desegregation programs, and for other purposes;

S. 959. A bill to amend Public Laws 815 and 874, 81st Congress, to provide for the education of children of members of the Armed Forces in communities in which the public schools are closed; and

S. 960. A bill to amend the Civil Rights Act of 1957 to afford the Civil Rights Com-

mission an additional 2 years within which to submit its final report, and for other purposes.

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

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

By Mr. GRUENING:

Address entitled "The Businessman in Public Affairs," delivered by Senator RANDOLPH, of West Virginia, at the annual dinner meeting of the Weirton Chamber of Commerce.

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

Statement by him to Bluefield (W. Va.) Automobile Club for Worldwide Travel Show, February 17, 1959.

By Mr. NEUBERGER:

Interviews with Senator NEUBERGER by Deseret News of Salt Lake City, on alcohol and tobacco education.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS BY THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON PRODUCTION AND STABILIZATION, SENATE COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], chairman of the Subcommittee on Production and Stabilization, Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, I desire to give notice of hearings on legislative proposals relating to area redevelopment, or depressed areas, beginning on February 25, 1959, and continuing February 26 and 27.

All persons who wish to appear and testify at these hearings are requested to notify, as soon as possible, Mr. J. H. Yingling, chief of staff, Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, room 303 Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C., telephone Capitol 4-3121, extension 3923.

The bills presently pending before the subcommittee are S. 268, introduced by the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT], and S. 722, introduced by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], for himself and 38 other Senators. This notice, however, is intended to cover any other such legislation as may be pending before the subcommittee at the time of the hearings.

LINCOLNESQUE PRINCIPLE TO MEET SPACE AGE CHALLENGES

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, today we observe the Lincoln Sesquicentennial—the 150th anniversary of the birth of Abraham Lincoln.

As we pay homage to our 16th President—emancipator, humanitarian, statesman, and humble soul—we find that to a large degree his principles and forward-looking philosophy have stood the true tests of time; they are as workable today as in the mid-19th century.

As the world stands on the threshold of a new era in a jet-missile-nuclear-space age, we cannot now—of all times—be chained, as Lincoln expressed it, to outworn, outmoded dogmas, ideas, and principles of the past. Rather, we must be realistically dedicated to the needs of

the present and the future, to the "unfinished tasks remaining before us."

Although the hands of the clock of time—150 years after his birth—point to new challenges, we, like Lincoln, face complex problems in many fields. These include recognition of human rights, improvement of economic status of people, maintaining respect for law, promotion of peace, and others.

The observance of the 150th anniversary of Lincoln's birth, by a joint session, is, indeed, a fitting tribute to that great American. The record written indelibly in our pages of history by the Great Emancipator has lived long beyond his untimely death. Indeed, these Halls of Congress, as well as the Nation itself, will—as long as they exist—be influenced by his spirit.

Too, I believe it is particularly fitting that, among others who will pay homage to Lincoln, Carl Sandburg—poet, philosopher, writer—has been invited to address the joint session of Congress.

Mr. Sandburg, winner of the Pulitzer Prize and other numerous awards, represents in his way—as did Lincoln in his day—the image of the thinker.

In the space age, we find all around us the physical symbols of scientific, technological, military, industrial, and other mechanical and materialistic achievements. The marks of materialistic achievement are, indeed, real blessings for which we should be prayerfully grateful.

In our progress, however, let us not forget that it is the thinker, the poet, the sage who helps us find our way in what sometimes seems to be a wilderness, who more clearly defines real and human values, and who aids in better understanding human relationships—the foundation upon which peace, good will, tolerance, and an atmosphere of freedom can best be established.

Particularly in his interpretation of the life of Lincoln, Carl Sandburg has made an important contribution to American thought. I request unanimous consent to have a recent statement on what I feel is the adequacy of Lincoln's principles for meeting the space age challenges printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY

Seven score and 10 years ago, the great, humble Abraham Lincoln's birth heralded for our beloved Nation a new concept of humanitarian statesmanship. In his lifetime, Lincoln attained a philosophy of thought and action that has remained timeless.

As a fine illustration of this outlook, I quote the following: "The dogmas of the quiet past are inadequate to the stormy present. * * * As our case is new, so must we think anew, and act anew."

Today, we stand at a new frontier of outer space. In coping with the complex problems involved, we face the need of thinking anew, of broadening our concepts, of reaching out creatively through science and technology to unveil the mysteries of outer space.

In our observance of Lincoln's Birthday, the magnitude of space-age problems should not, however, obscure the need for emulating

the humanitarian attributes of the Great Emancipator. For today, we too face the challenge of emancipating mankind—from ignorance, fear, poverty, malnutrition, illiteracy.

In the mid-19th century, Lincoln fought to preserve a divided Nation.

In the mid-20th century, we strive to preserve peace in a divided world—part slave to communism, part free. The souls of mankind can never rest quietly until the more than 1 billion people bound with the chains of Communist enslavement gain freedom.

Across the Nation, sesquicentennial (1809-1959) celebrations of Lincoln's Birthday will have their greatest meaning if we, like Lincoln, become rededicated to the "unfinished tasks remaining before us."

What are these tasks?

The most significant, I believe, include maintaining world peace, achieving economic stability and halting inflation, and, above all, preserving our free way of life—of, by, and for our people. The attainment of these goals will help to keep alive the hope in the hearts of men everywhere. To assure that freedom, as well as peace and respect for human dignity "shall not perish from the earth"; but that, for all mankind, these will one day be a reality—not just a dream.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I wish to quote from Carl Sandburg's volume, "The Prairie Years," which gives a very interesting sidelight on the thinking of Lincoln. I had occasion to use these quotations the other day in addressing a group. I can suggest no better reading on this day than the following quotations:

Mrs. Rankin was a friend of the preacher, Peter Cartwright, who ran for Congress against Lincoln; in her house Cartwright was called Uncle Peter. And she had heard that Cartwright claimed Lincoln was no Christian. Yet Lincoln was also a friend of the family. At her house he had borrowed books; there they had reached out kindly hands when he was groping and trying to pierce the silence into which Ann Rutledge had faded. So one evening Mrs. Rankin told him she knew the Cartwright charges against him were false; and yet—there was the question of what his religion really was.

The raising of the question made Lincoln restless; he stood up, crossed the room, rested an elbow on the fireplace mantel, and ran his hand through his hair. He said slowly that he could not discuss the character and religion of Jesus Christ in stump speeches, "That is no place for it."

He mentioned shadows and questionings that came to him at New Salem. "There came into my life sad events and a loss that you were close to; and you knew a great deal about how hard they were for me, for you were, at the time, a mutual friend. Those days of trouble found me tossed amid a sea of questionings. They piled big around me. Through all I groped my way until I found a stronger and higher grasp of thought, one that reached beyond this life with a clearness and satisfaction I had never known before. The Scriptures unfolded before me with a deeper and more logical appeal, through these new experiences, than anything else I could find to turn to, or ever before had found in them. I do not claim that all my doubts were removed then, or since that time have been swept away. They are not.

"Probably it is to be my lot to go on in a twilight, feeling and reasoning my way through life, as questioning, doubting Thomas did. But in my poor, maimed, withered way, I bear with me as I go on a seeking spirit of desire for a faith that was with him

of the olden time, who, in his need, as I in mine, exclaimed, 'Help thou my unbelief.'"

He had by now slowed down from his first restless feeling; he left the fireplace and took his chair again. "I do not see that I am more astray—though perhaps in a different direction—than many others whose points of view differ widely from each other in the sectarian denominations. They all claim to be Christians, and interpret their several creeds as infallible ones. I doubt the possibility, or propriety, of settling the religion of Jesus Christ in the models of man-made creeds and dogmas.

"It was a spirit in the life that He laid stress on and taught if I read aright. I know I see it to be so with me. The fundamental truths reported in the four Gospels as from the lips of Jesus Christ, and that I first heard from the lips of my mother, are settled and fixed moral precepts with me. I have concluded to dismiss from my mind the debatable wranglers that once perplexed me with distractions that stirred up, but never absolutely settled anything. I have tossed them aside with the doubtful differences which divide denominations. I have ceased to follow such discussions or be interested in them. I cannot without mental reservations assent to long and complicated creeds and catechisms.

"If the church would ask simply for assent to the Savior's statement of the substance of the law: 'Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind, and thy neighbor as thyself,'—that church would I gladly unite with."

That was the way Mrs. Rankin remembered Lincoln talking about his religion that evening. She was sure that if she didn't remember all his words exactly as he spoke them she did get his thought clear, because he spoke his words in a slow manner and meant his words to be so clear that his thoughts would be remembered afterward.

UKRAINIAN INDEPENDENCE

Mr. DIRKSEN and Mr. ROBERTSON addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Texas yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield first to the minority leader, and then to the Senator from Virginia. If agreeable to the Senate, I should like to suggest the absence of a quorum. Senators will have all day to insert matters in the RECORD and transact routine business.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a brief statement on Ukrainian independence.

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

It is a source of satisfaction to be able on this anniversary occasion to say something in behalf of the Ukrainian people both abroad and at home.

In their native land they have demonstrated a robustness of spirit and a fidelity to freedom under tribulation and persecution which marks them as a great people in whom the spiritual and moral values stand out like a blazing light.

In the city of Chicago there are an estimated 45,000 Ukrainians or more and it has been my privilege to know them and their leaders and the high principle which activates them. They are solid, rugged, law abiding and epitomize the feelings of the 40 million in their ancestral land who must

carry on under the Red banner until relief from this intolerable condition is afforded.

One great attribute which constantly stands out in my mind is the way in which they shoulder their own burdens without looking to governmental agencies for assistance. One need not journey to Chicago and note the schools they have built for their children out of their own resources and how proud they are of this achievement to note the rugged individualism which is a hallmark of their efforts.

Still another outstanding attribute is the constancy of their faith and their devotion to the church. Here they find inspiration and assurance. It fortifies the spirit to overcome all obstacles and to cheerfully meet every burden.

Another experience that stands out in my mind is the Ukrainian outdoor picnic which I was privileged to attend several years ago when nearly 25,000 of their people gathered in a park in Chicago for an anniversary celebration. As I looked into their intent faces, I wondered what I could say that would strike home. I thought of blue skies over endless yellow wheat fields in their ancestral home and how appropriate the blue and yellow flag really was. It made an appropriate theme on which to spin some observations, and I noticed how deeply this reminder struck, for there were tears on many faces that afternoon. These were not tears that were particularly responsive to any words of mine but rather to the remembrances of their own people who were still denied the benefits of freedom. We can be thankful for this leaven in our own population because the durability of their devotion to freedom's cause will be a constant reminder to us of how priceless this boon of liberty really is.

They deserve the fullest encouragement as they carry on in this spirit until that day when an equal degree of liberty and independence shall be restored to the Ukrainian people in the Soviet Union.

INTEGRATION IN SCHOOLS

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Conformity by Coercion," written by David Lawrence, and published in the U.S. News & World Report of July 6, 1956. The editorial is even more pertinent today than it was when it was published 2½ years ago. It is in full conformity with the views of that great statesman, Abraham Lincoln, whose anniversary we are today celebrating.

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

CONFORMITY BY COERCION?

(By David Lawrence)

I

It is necessary to come to grips with the issue of enforced integration in the Nation's schools. It is a legal issue, a moral issue, a sociological issue, and a political issue.

Yet all these diverse approaches only accentuate the real question—conformity or nonconformity in organized society. It is an issue that for generations has confronted mankind.

The perennial conflict fundamentally is between theoretical equality and actual equality.

Government usually is concerned with theoretical equality. But too often, in the passion for uniformity, obstacles arise to the practical application of the law. Sooner or later revision is found necessary. An adjustment to realistic conditions becomes inevitable.

Obedience to law is a precept with which few will disagree, but disrespect for a law written by agents of the people in contradiction to the real will of the people leads to disobedience, disregard, or repeal.

Conformity itself is a dangerous dogma when dependent solely on coercion. It is a device by which freedom often has been destroyed and totalitarianism substituted. Conformity of thought imposed by law is the tool of despots.

Conformity means that everybody must think alike, act alike, and obey the edicts of a central authority.

Our Constitution was built upon the fundamental principle that government derives its just powers from the consent of the governed.

Realizing that our Republic was founded by groups with conflicting interests, often widely separated by big distances, our forefathers conceived the idea of separate States. Each State was to be sovereign—endowed with the right to govern itself within its own area. Only in the case of infringement upon other States was the national authority to be invoked.

The Founding Fathers, to be sure, realized that they could not apply a rule of conformity over the people of a vast territory. So they delegated to the several States the right to deal with their own sociological problems. This is why education, for example, has always been a local problem. It is also one of the reasons why the maintenance of law and order has been primarily a State and city responsibility.

Conformity cannot be successfully compelled where the customs and morals of the people are in conflict with statutory law. It has often been truly said that government cannot legislate morals.

Perhaps the best demonstration of this in recent years was the experience of the Nation with the 18th amendment. For decades there had been attempts to solve the prohibition problem. Many States had passed dry laws. Congress tried to regulate the liquor traffic across State lines. The Federal courts, while upholding the interstate aspects, were careful to refrain from imposing upon each individual State an obligation to conform to a moral code which specified that people must not drink intoxicating liquors.

When the 18th amendment, however, was ratified in 1920 as a part of the Constitution, the entire Nation was asked to conform to a formula which forbade the manufacture and sale of intoxicating beverages anywhere in the United States. This meant that the will of a State was superseded entirely by national law.

What was the result? The effort to produce conformity failed. This was because the evils which came in the wake of the 18th amendment proved to be far greater than the evils which the amendment sought to correct. Disobedience of law became widespread.

Bootlegging, which began to thrive immediately after the amendment was adopted, brought in its wake vice and crime and organized gangs. Some of these gangs which had their origin at that time have not been entirely eradicated from our communities to this day.

It will be recalled that, while the 18th amendment was a part of the Constitution for nearly 14 years, it took less than 10 months during the year 1933 to get it repealed by the States after Congress submitted it to them.

This did not happen because public thinking on the use of intoxicating beverages had actually undergone any substantial change. Many people continue to think that the sale of intoxicating beverages was harmful to the community and that the manufacture of such products should be prohibited. Sev-

eral States still have prohibition laws, varying according to local conditions. But the Nation voted for repeal because of a general condition—the American people found that, despite vigorous efforts to enforce the law, the illicit manufacture and distribution of liquor had intensified.

Historical experience should have taught us that there is a distinct difference between the theory of equal rights and the conditions sometimes provoked by the application of laws which go counter to public sentiment in a community.

But, while we profess to believe in the right of a community to govern itself, do we always apply the doctrine in practice? We have tried in America to give city and State communities the right to govern themselves. Yet we interpose a Federal authority sometimes and virtually disregard local self-government. Thus we impair a great principle—the right of self-government.

We have, for example, said in effect that, because the people in the northern, eastern, and western parts of the United States constitute a numerical majority their will must prevail over the people in southern communities.

What we are attempting to do today in America is to compel the minority in the South to conform to the supposed will of the majority in the North. Do we aim thereby to wipe out State autonomy altogether?

There are basic rules to which both minorities and majorities will give their support. Thus, individual rights of association—the practice of religion, the right to educate children in accordance with local custom or tradition, and the right of the minority, even though living in the same community with the majority, to pursue its own racial or religious customs—have all been recognized as just principles in organized society.

The theory of equal rights means that there can be no denial of any public rights to citizens. Thus, the right to vote is a public right. The right to hold office is a public right. The right to own property is a public right. The right to obtain an education in a city or county school is a public right.

There are, to be sure, certain public utilities, such as conveyances, and certain public facilities where rules of limitation should not be imposed by the majority which would put the minority at a physical disadvantage.

But this is a far cry from requiring that each community must compel conformity in the educational process.

If education were entirely an impersonal affair and there were no social life at all in the schools, we would be dealing with a different problem.

But majority as well as minority groups have an equal right to freedom of association or nonassociation. Voluntarism is the key.

If one individual, for example, does the same work as another, he is entitled to equal pay, irrespective of race or creed or color. In some occupations where majorities object to working alongside of minorities, a problem of adjustment presents itself which in many instances can be solved by patience and some physical rearrangement of locker rooms and personal facilities so as to remove barriers to employment.

But attempts to impose conformity by coercion, whether in the legal or economic or social sphere, usually produce conditions not unlike those which followed the attempt to enforce the 18th amendment.

We already hear zealous extremists advocating that troops be sent to enforce the Constitution and compel the South to integrate its public schools.

It is not a problem that will ever be settled by bayonets. Nor will it be settled by exhorting people to forget prejudices bred in them.

II. AN ERA OF FRICTION

We have recently seen evidences of anger and violence in the North and South. We have also witnessed the use of retaliatory measures in communities in the South where the most amicable relations previously had prevailed between the races in the South. Voluntarism had made progress. Talk of coercion now retards progress.

It is an illusion to suppose that, under the threat of law enforcement, these difficulties are going to lessen with the passage of time. For social customs and social life do not function by any rule of conformity. They are bound to continue in the diversity that human nature has provided.

There will inevitably be passive resistance to laws of enforced integration. The public-school systems of the South may even disintegrate so that education in that region may lag behind the rest of the country. It would be a tragic price to pay. But men of determination have been known to pay almost any price for what they consider to be the preservation of their inalienable rights. Prejudice cannot be legislated out of existence by law.

A compromise formula—segregation through equal but separate facilities of education—was first sanctioned in a Northern State. It was upheld by the Supreme Court of the State of Massachusetts in 1849.

For 30 years after the War Between the States, the Supreme Court of the United States wrestled with legal issues growing out of racial conflict and in 1896 ruled that systems of equal facilities even though separate were constitutional. This permitted minorities to live alongside majorities in harmony.

Now, however, 60 years later, the Supreme Court of the United States, having reversed itself, is attempting to impose conformity. It should be noted that the Court in its decision in 1954, did not say the separate educational facilities previously provided had been unequal—indeed, they have at times been even superior for the Negro. The Court took the position that although the facilities were equal they could not be permitted to be separate. Reliance was placed on sociological reasons—not legal precedents. The basic argument accepted was that a psychological impact of an adverse nature had occurred—that Negro children felt themselves inferior wherever segregation was legalized. It was the act of discrimination itself which the Court held to be illegal.

Now, as a consequence, however, a counter-conflict on the sociological front has arisen. White parents in the South are arguing that the impact of integration will prove harmful to their children. Will the Court now give equal weight to this plea, or tell the white parents to send their children to private schools, which so many citizens cannot afford?

III. SOCIAL RELATIONSHIPS

So we are back again in the realm of the sociological—how can we get majorities and minorities to live harmoniously in the same community?

But it will be asked whether the right to attend a public school does not include the right to attend any public school. The right of assignment of pupils is a local—not a national—function. Even today, the most ardent exponent of equal rights would not deny that it is within the power of the State to set up schools in which there is segregation by reason of sex—all girls in one school and all boys in another school, irrespective of color.

If, for sociological reasons, it is deemed desirable to separate the sexes in the schools, there would be no constitutional barrier against this even though one State chooses to adopt the plan and another State does not. For we usually recognize as absolute the right of each State community to regulate its social life provided there is no denial to anyone of the right to public education itself.

The States can, moreover, if they wish, subsidize private schools—provided they do not discriminate as between individuals in allocating funds.

The question before the country today is whether communities are free to adjust their school systems to meet their own local conditions and local sentiment. Those States which desire to integrate their schools ought to have the sovereign right to do so and those which desire to operate mixed schools in some counties and separate their schools in other counties, either by color, or by sex, or by intelligence tests, should have the same sovereign right.

It is argued, on the other hand, that, since the public schools are tax supported and because tax receipts come from all citizens, all public schools must be opened to all citizens. But the same point—equality of participation—could be made with respect to admission to church organizations, private clubs, and private schools. They, too, are supported by all taxpayers because an exemption from State and Federal income taxes is given them as non-profit-making institutions.

Theoretically, wherever the Government confers its favors, there rests authority to regulate—to withdraw those favors unless the regulation which imposes conformity is accepted. Today the President's Commission on Interracial Discrimination has adopted this principle as the genesis of its power. The Executive order under which the Commission functions provides that whoever benefits from any Government contract must conform to its requirements against discrimination in employment if based on race, creed, color, or national origin.

The central issue in the school question, however, is one of social relationships. Rooted in the minds of many people in the South is a fear that personal associations begun in the elementary schools will lead to a state of mind among youth that will bring more intermarriage of races.

If intermarriage became widespread, it seems certain that communities would insist upon some other way of preventing them—either by ostracism or by curtailing economic opportunities in the community to those who deviate from custom.

If there were only a few intermarriages in a given State, they probably would not attract much attention. But once they became numerous, the local communities would frown upon them. Public sentiment sometimes is stronger than law in bringing about a reform or change which the law itself could never impose.

What are the limits of conformity? Conformity in theory is justified, especially when the entire national interest is involved—in times of national peril. Thus, in theory, we are not supposed to recognize any distinctions when it comes to military service. But actually we do discriminate here, too. Even the conscientious objector is allowed to refrain from participation in active combat. Able-bodied women are not compelled to fight in the front lines though women have equal rights of citizenship. Equality has its exceptions.

At most it must be said that the problem is not going to be solved if there is a failure to analyze studiously the viewpoints of the opposing groups. It is a situation that ultimately will have to bow to the enlightened principle that majorities and minorities each have a right to regulate their own lives and their own customs.

Thus, treaties signed at the end of World War I established an obligation upon some of the new governments in central Europe to allocate public funds for educational, religious and charitable purposes to racial, religious, or linguistic minorities within their borders. The League of Nations was

given the task of guaranteeing the observance of these minority rights.

The more we examine the formulas that have been developed throughout the world to permit minorities to get along with majorities, the more we will find that adjustments precisely of this nature have been conducive to conditions of harmonious living.

IV. IS THE 14TH AMENDMENT VALID?

We hear the argument, "But it's the law of the land." There is a grave question whether the 14th amendment, under which integration is ordered, was ever legally submitted to the States and legally ratified. The specific point has never been passed upon by the Supreme Court, though the public has taken it for granted for years that the 14th amendment is an integral part of the Constitution.

What are the facts? It is necessary as an initial step for any amendment to the Constitution to be passed by a two-thirds vote of both Houses of Congress. Yet, in June 1866, when the 14th amendment was voted upon in Congress, each House had excluded all persons appearing with credentials in the first instance as Senators or Representatives from the 10 Southern States of Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Florida, Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, Arkansas, and Texas. If these Southern States had been permitted to vote in Congress, the amendment would not have passed.

Then, when the amendment was submitted to the legislatures of the several States, it needed to be ratified by 28 States, which was three-fourths of the 37 States then in the Union. Ten States, therefore, were able to block ratification.

But the 14th amendment was never ratified by California, and was rejected at the time by Kentucky, Delaware, and Maryland. It was rejected during the latter part of 1866 and the early part of 1867 also by the legislatures of the 10 Southern States. For the 14th amendment had in it many objectionable clauses. Apart from its provision requiring States to guarantee "equal protection of the laws," the amendment sought to punish former Confederate soldiers by forbidding them to hold office even in their own States unless Congress by a two-thirds vote removed the disability.

It was argued, moreover, in those days that the State governments in the South were not legal governments but were merely rebel States. Yet these States at the time had already received Presidential recognition, and when the same Southern legislatures in 1865 had ratified the 13th amendment—which abolished slavery—their action was accepted as legal by the Secretary of State. For the South had, by its vote, made possible the three-fourths vote of the States necessary for the adoption of the 13th amendment.

Furthermore, in the Reconstruction Act of 1867 Congress arrogantly proclaimed that self-rule would be restored to the States and they would be permitted representation in Congress once more only when they adopted the 14th amendment. It was so stipulated in the law which had been passed over the veto of President Andrew Johnson. He emphasized its injustices and unconstitutional aspects, and denounced it as "a bill of attainder against 9 million people."

Here is what Senator Doolittle, of Wisconsin, a conservative Republican of the North, said about the proposal on the floor of the Senate:

"My friend has said what has been said all around me, what is said every day: the people of the South have rejected the constitutional amendment, and therefore we will march upon them and force them to adopt it at the point of the bayonet, and establish military power over them until they do adopt it."

This was a flagrant case of conformity by coercion. The act of Congress was a direct violation of the letter of the Constitution. For Congress has no power to coerce the States when they pass upon the question of whether or not they will ratify or reject proposed constitutional amendments.

Puppet governments established in the Southern States did finally ratify the 14th amendment in 1868 but only under duress—with registration of voters being supervised by military commanders from the North and with millions of white voters deliberately disenfranchised by the Reconstruction Act because they had fought in the war against the Union. Ohio and New Jersey attempted unsuccessfully that same year to withdraw their acts of ratification before the Secretary of State formally proclaimed the amendment as adopted. Doubt was expressed at the time by the President as to the validity of the alleged ratification.

Can it be said that all this action was in accord with the spirit of American fairplay? Will this record stand up as constitutional—as the "consent of the governed"? Would we say today that the people in any place under military occupation are able freely to exercise their sovereign rights? The Reconstruction Act for many years deprived the Southern States of their powers of governmental autonomy. They recovered these powers only after a long and tragic era of military compulsion.

Should not the Supreme Court today re-examine the validity of the 14th amendment? If an important decision of 1896 can be reopened and reversed by the Supreme Court in 1954, is it not logical to resurvey the doubtful procedure whereby the 14th amendment itself was forced into the Constitution? The present Court has shown itself quite solicitous lately that persons in our midst charged with disloyalty be given the protection of due process. Cases involving Communists have, on the slightest pretext of technicality, been ordered for retrial. Can't we give the same consideration to the States which have demonstrated their loyalty to the Union?

If it were presented anew today, there would not be a two-thirds vote of both Houses of Congress to approve the 14th amendment unless a specific reservation were made on the points now at issue.

The reason is clear. More than a third of the membership of both Houses at present feel that the 14th amendment was itself amended by the Supreme Court in 1954 and that, as long as this new legislative action by the Court stands as the official interpretation, it makes the original language of the 14th amendment inadequate.

V. THE PHILOSOPHICAL APPROACH

What do the philosophers of history say about conformity?

George Santayana in "Dominations and Powers" (1951)—a work sometimes referred to as comparable to Plato's "Republic" or to the "Ethics" of Aristotle—makes this pertinent comment:

"This ideal of a perfect ultimate democracy rests on two assumptions: that human nature in all men is essentially similar, and that consequently mankind could not fully develop its vital liberty without coming to a unanimous vision of the world and a cooperative exercise of the same virtues. I think this is a biological error, and that what is identical in all life is only its germ, from which all plants and animals have developed centrifugally, as circumstances have allowed them to develop. * * *

"The uniformity in American principles, as proclaimed publicly and as genuinely felt by most people, is no index to a natural unity in the vital forces at work among them. The proof appears if we consider a notorious fact: the Constitution of the United States,

since the Civil War, establishes the equality of all citizens, irrespective of race, color, or previous condition of servitude.' And this is not merely a constitutional sham, like so many of the provisions in paper constitutions in other countries. It expresses an earnest conviction, dearly defended, by a great part of the people.

"Nevertheless whenever a difference of race, color, religion, or breeding is not so overcome in the rush of common work or duty as to pass unnoticed or even unknown, if an attempt is made to ignore it in comradeship, society, marriage, or place of residence, the real difference in the soul is instantly recognized and an irresistible impulse causes the groups to segregate.

"This is set down by democratic doctrinaires to prejudice or snobbery. They do not perceive that contrast of character and taste can be ignored when people are engaged in some instrumental action, to which their moral diversity is irrelevant, but that as soon as the labor is over and the liberal life of play, art, affection, and worship begins, both sides equally require moral comprehension and are equally chilled, bored, and rendered sterile when comprehension is absent.

"That a white man ought to hobnob with a Negro because otherwise he would not be Christian or unselfish involves a flagrant assumption of superiority. The Negro, if he is not a fool, loves his own inspirations and expands in the society of his own people. Vital liberty differentiates. Only vacant freedom leaves all in the same anonymous crowd."

G. K. Chesterton, in his famous work, "Orthodox," wrote in 1908:

"In modern ideal conceptions of society there are some desires that are possibly not attainable, but there are some desires that are not desirable. That all men should live in equally beautiful houses is a dream that may or may not be attained. But that all men should live in the same beautiful house is not a dream at all; it is a nightmare."

Alexis de Tocqueville, of France, a renowned philosopher, who visited America in the 1830's and compared it with the systems of government in vogue from ancient days, expressed himself vehemently on the subject of tyrannical majorities—the effort by law to impose upon the minority certain customs and rules that did not have universal sanction.

Yet De Tocqueville was hopeful about America's future, little realizing the grave conflicts that were to come in later years because of the abuse of the very principles about which he wrote in 1835:

"But in the United States, the majority, which so frequently displays the tastes and the propensities of a despot, is still destitute of the most perfect instrument of tyranny.

"In the American Republics the Central Government has never as yet busied itself except with a small number of objects sufficiently prominent to attract its attention. The secondary affairs of society have never been regulated by its authority, and nothing has hitherto betrayed its desire of even interfering in them.

"The majority has become more and more absolute, but has not increased the prerogatives of the Central Government; those great prerogatives have been confined to a certain sphere and although the despotism of the majority may be galling upon one point, it can not be said to extend to all. However, the predominant party in the Nation may be carried away by its passions, however ardent it may be in the pursuit of its projects, it cannot oblige all the citizens to comply with its desires in the same manner and at the same time throughout the country.

"When the Central Government which represents that majority has issued a decree, it must entrust the execution of its will to agents over whom it frequently has no control and whom it cannot perpetually direct.

"If an oppressive law were passed, liberty would still be protected by the mode of executing that law; the majority cannot descend to the details and what may be called the puerilities of administrative tyranny. It does not even imagine that it can do so, for it has not a full consciousness of its authority."

Perhaps it is in recognition of these very difficulties that Robert Morrison MacIver, whose name means as much to modern sociology as does that of John Dewey to philosophy, gives some pointed advice in his book, "The More Perfect Union." He offers a program for the control of intergroup discrimination. It is definitely sympathetic to integration. Yet he gives this word of caution:

"Discrimination and its evils are likely to be exacerbated by any changes that increase tensions or promote crises in a society, no matter what their source, whether economic, political, ideological, or any other. On the other hand discrimination is likely to be diminished by any changes that make for the general well-being of a society or that provide more constructive outlets for the aggressive tendencies of its groups."

VI. LINCOLN ON SOCIAL EQUALITY

It is sometimes asserted, though mistakenly, that, once the Supreme Court has ruled upon a subject, there is no appeal—not even to public opinion. Lincoln didn't think so. He denounced the Supreme Court for its decision in the Dred Scott case. He was outspoken against social equality.

When Lincoln argued against slavery he pointed to the impairment of personal freedom within the community—the individual had been deprived of his liberty—the right to make his own life. But Lincoln said this did not mean enforced association between the races. Debating in Illinois with Stephen Douglas, in September 1858, Lincoln said:

"I will say then that I am not, nor ever have been, in favor of bringing about in any way the social and political equality of the white and black races—that I am not, nor ever have been, in favor of making voters or jurors of Negroes, nor of qualifying them to hold office, nor to intermarry with white people; and I will say in addition to this that there is a physical difference between the white and black races which, I believe, will forever forbid the two races living together on terms of social and political equality. And inasmuch as they cannot so live, while they do remain together there must be the position of superior and inferior, and I as much as any other man am in favor of having the superior position assigned to the white race."

But it is insisted: "The Supreme Court has spoken." De Tocqueville's eloquent answer may be applied to the issue today. He wrote:

"When I refuse to obey an unjust law, I do not contest the right of the majority to command, but I simply appeal from the sovereignty of the people to the sovereignty of mankind. Some have not feared to assert that a people can never outstep the boundaries of justice and reason in those affairs which are peculiarly its own; and that consequently full power may be given to the majority by which it is represented. But this is the language of a slave.

"A majority taken collectively is only an individual, whose opinions, and frequently whose interests, are opposed to those of another individual, who is styled a minority. If it be admitted that a man possessing absolute power may misuse that power by wronging his adversaries, why should not a majority be liable to the same reproach? Men do not change their characters by uniting with one another; nor does their patience in the presence of obstacles increase with their strength. * * *

"When an individual or a party is wronged in the United States, to whom can he apply for redress? If to public opinion, public opinion constitutes the majority; if to the legislature, it represents the majority and implicitly obeys it; if to the executive power, it is appointed by the majority and serves as a passive tool in its hands. The public force consists of the majority under arms; the jury is the majority invested with the right of hearing judicial cases; and in certain States even the judges are elected by the majority. However iniquitous or absurd the measure of which you complain, you must submit to it as well as you can."

VII. JEFFERSON ON JUDICIAL TYRANNY

Thomas Jefferson warned against the tyranny of judges. He wrote in 1804:

"But the opinion which gives to the judges the right to decide what laws are constitutional, and what not, not only for themselves in their own sphere of action, but for the legislature and executive also, in their spheres, would make the judiciary a despotic branch."

Then, long after Jefferson left the Presidency, he wrote in 1820 and 1821:

"It is a misnomer to call a government republican, in which a branch of the supreme power is independent of the Nation. * * *

"A judiciary independent of a king or executive alone, is a good thing; but independence of the will of the nation is a solecism, at least in a republican government. * * *

"To consider the judges as the ultimate arbiters of all constitutional questions (is) a very dangerous doctrine indeed, and one which would place us under the despotism of an oligarchy. * * * The Constitution has erected no such single tribunal. * * *

"The great object of my fear is the Federal judiciary. That body, like gravity, ever acting, with noiseless foot, and unalarming advance * * * is engulfing insidiously the special governments into the jaws of that which feeds them."

How much this is like the doctrines of Thomas Hobbes. In his famous work, "Leviathan," he wrote in 1651:

"Princes succeed one another; and one judge passeth, another cometh; nay, heaven and earth shall pass; but not one tittle of the law of Nature shall pass, for it is the eternal law of God. Therefore all the sentences of precedent judges that have ever been cannot altogether make a law contrary to natural equity."

A modern writer—Walter Lippmann—in his book, "The Public Philosophy" (1955), says:

"There is a hiatus between the highest wisdom and the actual perplexities with which men must deal. An encyclopedia of all that the prophets and the philosophers have taught will not tell a man clearly and definitely how to make laws, how to govern a State, how to educate his children—how, in fact, to decide the problems that the priest encounters in the confessional, the doctor with his patients, the lawyer with his clients, the judge with the litigants, the man of affairs in his business."

VIII. FACING THE REAL ISSUE

Many people today are urging caution with respect to the integration problem—an approach that has come to be known as "gradualism." Its fallacy lies in the belief that what cannot be resolved now will be resolved by postponement. It assumes that equality is a natural right in the community and that all forms of discrimination can be abolished by the passage of time.

The fetish of conformity, however, has demoralized the life of many nations in the world through the centuries. Where minorities have been suppressed and the right to pursue their own lives and customs has been impaired, there has been discontent and, at times, eruptions of violence.

We see today in the island of Cyprus a bloody war because nobody has yet devised a plan whereby the Turkish minority can live alongside the Greek majority. We see the same tragedy in Algeria—as between the French minority and the native majority.

Self-determination does not mean the delegation of power to a tyrannical majority. It means adjustment of minorities alongside of majorities. In no other way can there be a maintenance of equity for all concerned.

Can we not in America find a way whereby majorities and minorities may get along with one another in peace? The Constitution of the United States provided for separate but not equal States. There was no provision that each State must be equal to the other in voting for President or in choosing members of the House of Representatives. Equality of representation was provided only in the Senate.

Theoretically, all men are created equal. It is a doctrine that could mean that all wealth in the community must be divided equally between all citizens. The Communists believe in such a doctrine. There have been men in America who have argued for the redistribution of wealth. Do any of us honestly believe that harmonious society can ever be achieved by a law that requires all incomes to be equal, or that the possession of property should be equalized between all citizens?

Equality is a theoretical goal. Its application will depend always on the mores of the community. Even in our day some of the loudest voices declaiming against discrimination are men who in their business and social relationships are practicing discriminations of various kinds. It is common knowledge that membership in some of the principal clubs and organizations in many of our large cities and in the fraternities in almost all of our colleges is barred to persons of certain races or religions, as the case may be. It is common knowledge also that employers in the North, for the most part, give preference to applicants of certain ethnic origins or races as against others. There is, therefore, continuously applied a doctrine of discrimination which negates the theory of equality.

One need not agree at all with the reasons given for such discriminations—indeed, one may be offended by their practice. But if we are to rely on theory, there is as much right to discrimination as there is to non-discrimination. It is really the misguided attempt to override these separate and distinct rights of the individual by public law that causes the conflict of today.

Conformity by coercion is not liberalism. The answer is to be found in voluntarism—freedom's greatest vehicle of progress. It offers us the only solution to the vexatious problems of sociology in our Republic.

RUSSIA AS SEEN BY L. D. WEBSTER

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, a distinguished Texan, Mr. L. D. Webster, vice president of public relations and advertising for the Lone Star Steel Co. in Dallas, Tex., recently returned from an extensive tour of the Soviet Union.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD his account of this tour "I Saw Russia," which gives an enlightened view of the Soviet Union as seen through the eyes of a highly respected businessman and an able journalist.

Straightforward and uncolored reporting of this kind can contribute much toward a better understanding between the United States and the Soviet Union.

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

I SAW RUSSIA

From the pressurized cabin of a DC-7C, pride of the Sabena Seven Seas flagships, I looked 4 miles down on a seemingly never-ending forest and tried to convince myself it was no different. Land looks much the same when viewed from 24,000 feet up. You see a general pattern, but not the height of hills nor the depth of valleys. Only to the trained observer are these things apparent.

Below me was a sweeping expanse of timberland that might have been the hills of east Texas, or the Big Thicket, or any one of a dozen other similar areas I had flown over. But it wasn't any of them and no matter how hard I tried to brush away the thought that there was something peculiarly ominous about this woody country below, I knew it was different. Down there, partially shrouded in a smoky, cloud-flecked haze was the Soviet Union, home of the Communists, Red Russia.

I had vowed that no sense of apprehension would be mine when the time came to go behind the Iron Curtain. At that very instant, I had felt no particular misgivings because it happened quickly. The big airliner had lifted easily from the Brussels airport, and for a time had flown over the North Sea to Denmark. Then the ship veered to the east and shadowed the Baltic Sea while skirting Germany and Poland. With limited visibility straight ahead, we suddenly approached a land mass. Boring straight in, one instant we were over the Baltic; the next second the Iron Curtain had opened and we had skittered through.

On Red soil

As the Baltic quickly faded away, the full impact of the situation hit me. Here I was, after weeks of preparation, beyond the Iron Curtain, over Russia, and in a short time I would set foot on the Red soil of the Moscow airport.

"Why," I asked myself, "was I here?" The question of why had been asked me dozens of times by friends after they learned I was going to Russia.

And now, in spite of the dozens of answers I had so flippantly palmed off on my friends, I found myself asking the same question.

Travel is easy

In the first place, going to Russia is almost too easy. Since 1955, the Government has made the issuance of passports for travel in Russia almost routine. You go to the Federal building, ask the district clerk for an application, fill it out, attach a check for \$9, and before you know it, your passport is in hand. In the meantime, you file through your travel agent, applications for visas in the lands you wish to see. In my case, I obtained Russian and Czech visas, merely a matter of filling out an application, handing over \$10 or \$12, and in about a month your visas come right along and you're all set.

I went to Russia as a member of a group of industrial editors and public relations executives. The tour was sponsored by the International Council of Industrial Editors, and although approval for 30 members had been obtained, we finally wound up with only 21 brave souls who had an answer to the "Why Go to Russia?" bit that was strong enough to produce action instead of wishful thinking.

I went to Russia because I wanted to see for myself what is taking place in this strange land. I've been an avid reader on the subject, and there were many conflicting impressions. One writer brushes the whole thing off as a huge joke. Another is certain the Russkies will someday rule the world. One chides the Muscovites for their atrocious

table manners, another sings the praises of their scientists. How could Paul Robeson and his gifted voice fall so completely under the spell of the Red banner, and how could a lean, lanky Texas piano player, Van Cliburn, invade Moscow and, unheralded, sweep the entire nation before him? How much of the stuff in the newspapers and magazines is State Department-inspired, and how much of the copy written behind the Iron Curtain is censored by the Russians?

I saw it

The answers to these questions I wanted to dig out for myself. These answers I wanted to bring back to my friends and say, "Here is the straight dope. I saw it with my own eyes." I wanted to spend a few hours en route at the World's Fair and to see for myself if the American exhibit is as good or as bad as our writers say it is. I wanted to see a real, flesh-and-blood Russian. I wanted to talk to hundreds of them—and I did. I wanted to talk to card-carrying members of the Communist Party. I did. I wanted to see the vaunted Russian education system. I did, from day nursery through grammar and high schools, and finally, the palatial University of Moscow. I wanted to amble over a Russian farm, to inspect a Russian factory, to talk to Russian writers and publishers, to see a Russian church. I did all of these and more.

In the fading light of an Indian summer day, the four engines of the Seven Seas flagship hummed monotonously as the miles sped by. In little more than an hour, the giant bird would glide to a halt at the Moscow airport and I would be at the end of one trail, the beginning of another that would carry me more than 5,000 miles across the land of the Communists, to the four principal cities of the Soviet Union, to small towns, on rivers, by train, by car, and by plane.

In the full realization of the opportunity ahead of me, I resolved that I would spend night and day probing and asking, searching and seeking, listening and looking for the answers to my questions. Is Russia all it's cracked up to be, or is the red paint peeling? As a sort of afterthought, I took it for granted that no one would censor my report to you.

Nobody has.

CHAPTER II. THE FACE OF MOSCOW

As the big four-engined DC7C plowed on toward Moscow I allayed my growing apprehension by recalling my initial visit with a homegrown, dyed-in-the-pink Communist. It had happened at the World's Fair in Brussels, and my first brush with a Red leader was not at all displeasing.

Arriving at the fair, our group was informed that the director general of the huge Russian exhibit would be pleased to have us stop at his office. We went directly to the suite of Mr. Mikhail Choumaiev, who was at once friendly, personable, and warmly appreciative toward our visit to his country.

Making us welcome to the exhibit, he ordered out the vodka and drank to our good health and a pleasant visit to Russia. It fell my lot to respond, and after several toasts, I handed Mr. Choumaiev one of my business cards printed in Russian. This pleased him no little, but his enthusiasm skyrocketed when I gave him a copy of Gov. Price Daniel's letter of introduction, translated and printed in Russian. From that instant on, he was at my side constantly.

The reason for his attentiveness became apparent when, as we posed for a picture, he asked, "When you return to the States would you please send me a copy of this picture? It makes my people in Moscow very happy for me to be photographed with important people." Governor Daniel's letter had turned the trick, even as it was to open many doors later on that otherwise might have remained closed.

As the plane rumbled on into the growing dusk, the first inkling of our nearness to Moscow came when the stewardess gathered up all newspapers and magazines. Then she passed a tray containing hard candies. The seat belt light flashed on, and below, the night-shrouded earth began to twinkle ever so little.

Moscow is gloomy

My first glimpse of the Russian capital was a far cry from the garish extravaganzas of dazzling white lights and multicolor neons that characterize American cities at night. Moscow was more like a sleepy midwestern town at 4 a.m., when only a scattering of street lights continue to burn, when highways and streets are shorn of the lacy ribbons of automobile headlights. Moscow looked gloomy and darkly forbidding. There was a mottled effect given off by yellowish clumps of lights which I later learned were housing projects concentrated around factories. There is no broad sweep, such as an American residential district presents. Russian housing generally doesn't consist of individual homes. Instead, hundreds of families reside in huge workers flats.

As the pilot circled for a landing I could hardly believe that we were over a city variously estimated to have a population of 6 to 8 millions. There just weren't enough lights for that many folk, and as the flagship of the Seven Seas probed the night sky nowhere could I see any set of lights that would mean an airport. Even as the engines were cut and the big bird reluctantly settled for the landing, I could see nothing that resembled a big-city airport. As the wheels touched down, at the edge of the runway could be seen the pale blue marker lights that guided our pilot.

No inspection

Going through the Moscow customs was no problem at all, nor was it to be anywhere. Not a bag was opened for inspection at any time during my trip except at New York's Idlewild. Even there inspection was casual, with the inspector evidencing little more than personal curiosity toward some of the items I brought back.

In Russia, all tourists are met at the airport by a representative of the Intourist organization, official agent of the Government. Intourist looks after hotel rooms, meals, transportation, and furnishes guides and interpreters. The Intourist agent in charge of our group was Tamara, a plump, blue-eyed, not unattractive woman of about 30. She later turned the party over to Irene, flaxen-haired bundle of energy who knew how to snap her little busy fingers and get prompt action. Irene's assistant was Galena, plumpish, methodical mother of a small daughter and wife of an engineer.

Our hotel, the Ukraine, is imposing in the grand manner. It has 25 stories, consisting of a center tower crested by a neon red star, with smaller towers on the 2 front corners. It covers something more than a city block, and has half a dozen dining rooms. The lobby is remarkably plain for marble construction but the lofty dome in the lobby provides a breathtaking mural (they are in practically all Russian buildings of any size) depicting Soviet progress. Here, as almost everywhere else, gaudy brass and glass chandeliers look very elegant but provide miserable light.

Rooms at the Ukraine would drive an American hotel man out of his mind. On each floor is a spacious lounge (never used), My single quarters consisted of the following: entrance foyer with closets, the whole being as large as some American rooms I've occupied; parlor, with radio, television, desk, several chairs, a sofa, and table with cut-glass water pitcher and glasses; bedroom with twin beds, each having two 3-foot-square pillows, organdie spreads, gold velvet drapes, night stands, and dressing table;

bathroom with outer closet space, the bath having a king-sized tub with shower but no curtain.

Crazy-quilt floors

The Russians have a peculiar idea about floor construction. They use pieces of hardwood measuring 15 inches by 2 inches. These are laid in all sorts of patterns, with the joints being rough. The floors are virtually unfinished (I actually stuck a splinter in a toe) with no paint, no wax, no polish. The floors in the bath were roughly installed, and I got the idea that even though the Ukraine was less than 2 years old, much of the material might easily have been salvaged from war-torn areas.

The Ukraine, despite its castellike exterior and its newness, looked to be 25 years old. This is true of all Russian construction: The front side is frilled up like a museum, the inside is thrown together in a haphazard fashion with only certain items, such as chandeliers and drapes, being used to carry out the theme of grandeur.

Moscow is a sprawling city that covers about 125 square miles. Its principal streets are unusually wide, and for the most part are cobblestones. Its sidewalks are mosaic patterns accomplished with varicolored marble or granite pieces about 2 inches square. Streets and sidewalks in all of the cities I visited—Moscow, Leningrad, Kiev, Kharkov, and Prague—were monotonously the same.

The face of Moscow is tired, dirty, bedraggled, and when too many faces are jammed into too little space, the odor becomes distressingly repulsive. In the streets you see old women carefully sweeping with brooms made of a handful of twigs tied to a long stick, yet if you slide through an archway into the inevitable courtyard back of the buildings the scene is one of dirt, filth, and complete confusion.

CHAPTER III. PAWNS OF TYRANNY

How does a street in Moscow—or any other Russian city—look in the broad, general view? Well, let's take a typical block in Dallas and by the weirdest application of imagination, try to convert it into a Russian block.

Take Dallas' Main Street, for instance, extending from Akard to Ervay. Here are buildings ranging from two or three stories to skyscrapers. Russian style, this street would be about four times as broad. It would have a set of rattling streetcars, and also buses, quite similar to ours. The street-level doors would open into shops, such as a bakery, a bookstore, a meat market (no refrigeration), a clothing store, a drugstore, etc. These stores would be relatively small, and in the cases of the food shops, probably would have lines of customers extending out the door and onto the sidewalk.

Above all these stores would be the flats of workers. On the sidewalks would be vendors operating from rather crude wooden booths. One would be selling watermelons, another squash, another ice cream, another books, and at the curbside would be a peddler of lottery tickets, the prize being perhaps an automobile, or a motor scooter.

Cars copied

At the corners of our model block would be a state policeman, smartly clad in blue uniform with red trim. He would be wearing typical black Russian boots, and would be handling his black and white nightstick in precise, well-defined instructions to traffic. Occasionally a large black car would speed by. This would be a Zis or a Zim (copied exactly, except for the nameplate, from our Buick or Packard of 6 or 8 years back). More often, trucks would whizz by. These would be exact replicas of a Chevrolet for the lighter models, an International for medium weight, or a Mack for the big jobs.

In Moscow, driving is the wackiest business you ever saw. There are no speed lim-

its and a pedestrian crosses a street at his own risk. I actually saw drivers skimming along at 60 miles an hour make passes at pedestrians who were a little tardy in scampering to the safety of the sidewalk. And there was no warning because it is illegal to honk a horn in Moscow except in extreme emergencies. I heard a horn—just a tap in each case—only twice. It is also illegal to operate a car on the streets of Moscow if it is dirty, so you see drivers wiping and polishing between trips. At night, cars operate with only their parking lights on, and it is common practice to do a lot of coasting. Drivers say it is more economical to whip up a speed of 60 miles an hour, cut the engine, step on the clutch and coast almost to a stop. Then they turn the key, let out the clutch and give 'er the gas to get back up to 60 again so they can coast some more. Automatic transmissions are unknown, and practically all vehicles are Government owned. Few ordinary Russians can afford so much as a motor scooter, let alone a car. Horse-drawn carts and wagons, the horse wearing the high wooden collar above his withers, are fairly common.

What I have just described is a typical city scene. In Moscow, however, there are unusual and outstanding sites. The subway, *Metropole*, is one. The station I visited was the epitome of cleanliness. Its escalators were the steepest and the fastest I ever saw. On one level, six-car trains operated in both north and south directions and on a 1-minute schedule. On a lower level, in the same station, trains operated east and west. For a few cents you can ride all day on the big M.

Tale of tomb

The Kremlin is a show in itself, because the Kremlin must also include Red Square outside the wall, as well as the Lenin-Stalin mausoleum. Cathedrals, now overhauled as museums, are part of the Kremlin package.

I walked the length of Red Square on a 50°, windy, drizzly day. Four or five blocks from the mausoleum, perhaps for a greater distance into a park, a line of people, four abreast, waited to look at the earthly remains of Lenin and Stalin. Most of these were visitors to Moscow, pilgrims to Mecca, so to speak, whose visit would not have been complete without silently passing the biers of the bearded Lenin and the beribboned Stalin.

The mausoleum is a square, squat block of red and black granite, as austere as it is uninviting. Fresh flowers are always present, and facing each other in the narrow doorway are Russian soldiers, as immobile as the rock house, as expressionless as the gray sky overhead. The honor guard is changed on the hour, a fresh set of young men carrying bayoneted rifles goosestepping into place with stomping feet and swinging arms.

Our guide took us to the head of the line. We moved in, and descended to a basement. The plainness was in sharp contrast to the gaudiness usually evident in Russian decor. The black and wine-red granite gave a somber backdrop to the glass-enclosed bodies. There was Lenin first. He was remarkably well preserved for his 30-odd years on the slab. Dressed in a very plain and severe black suit, his lone decoration was a small red ribbon. A dim, yellow spotlight accentuated the pallor of Lenin's face, but sparkled off the knuckles of his hands, the only evidence I could see that the figure might be wax.

Never so good

As for old Joe, he probably never looked so good in real life. He wore an array of ribbons that extended from well above the breast pocket down to the beltline of his beautifully tailored military jacket. The old boy looked like he had simply stretched out for a nap.

Strolling through the courtyard back of the tomb, I saw the graves of revolutionary heroes. High on the massive wall of the Kremlin were little bronze plaques. Behind these were the urns containing ashes of other lesser Red heroes. In this setting of quiet dignity, I pondered the diabolical scheme perpetrated upon millions of hapless men and women by these two pawns of tyranny—Lenin, the planner, Stalin, the executioner—and wondered what it would take to lure the millions away from their godless shrine.

In a flash it occurred to me, and my capitalistic self muttered: "How I'd like to have the concession of showing a 1959 Thunderbird right across the street from Lenin and company." That, I was certain, "would make the Russians throw rocks at a couple of mummies named Lenin and Stalin."

And it would.

CHAPTER IV. ISLAND OF FREEDOM

Regardless of the friendly attitude of the Russian people toward American tourists (they like us better than any other visitors because we are more sincere) a country boy can't help feeling that he is hemmed in, constantly under observation, liable to run afoul of the law and find himself thrown into a dungeon beneath the Kremlin and from there shipped off to a Siberian salt mine without the slightest indication ever being given of his ultimate fate. Maybe such things don't happen since the days of Stalin and Beria, but one never knows when the unpredictable Russians will revert to their old ways and once again grease the gates to the big deep freeze. As this is written, the United States is trying vainly to get word about the crew members of a plane forced down in the Soviet. The Commies have advised us that six of the crew died. No word has leaked out regarding the other 11.

During my stay in Moscow, I visited the American Embassy several times, and each time I left, I felt certain I was followed. As you leave the nondescript building, the Russian police standing at the door nod a friendly "Dosvedanya," and may even give you a snappy salute. As your car pulls away, the inevitable shadow moves behind you until your car reaches its destination. This seems to satisfy everybody concerned that you're going somewhere and regardless of your destination, you're followed no more until you once again visit the Embassy.

Moscow's little island of freedom is a ramshackle three-story building in the outskirts of the main business district. A brass nameplate identifies the old brick structure as "the American House."

Jukebox on guard

The American House is simply the dormitory where single employees at the Embassy reside. The second floor is given over to bedrooms. Each man has a room of his own furnished in the simplest fashion with the decorations being dependent upon the occupant's imagination. There is a messhall, and on the third floor, an auditorium with about 150 chairs. On several week nights, an American movie is shown. Bingo is the pastime each Thursday night. Saturday night is dance night. A small bar serving American beer and other drinks is available. Boys residing in the dormitory operate the movie equipment (which is pretty well worn out with new equipment being hard to come by) and the bar. In a corner is a jukebox, and this little item is a sort of watchdog for the fellows who call this pitiful little island of freedom their home.

The jukebox is a Russian detector, and it works in this way: When a Russian tries to crash the party (and they occasionally do) they give themselves away the instant they walk into the room. When anyone from one of the free world's embassies enters the room he immediately goes to the bar

for a drink and to get acquainted. A Russian can't stand passing up a jukebox, so he first stops there and plays a few tunes before going to the bar—if he lasts that long. Usually, they're spotted immediately and invited to leave before they ever get around to the drinking point.

Our group visited the American House and it was the only time in Russia we felt unrestrained and free to say what we pleased. We exchanged ideas freely with the American boys living there. We met some swell Britishers, like Sam Hardwicke, of the Royal Air Force, and even some people we couldn't understand, nor did they savvy English, but somehow, when free people get together, there is a common understanding reached even if you have to do it with sign language.

Fair is standout

Perhaps the most notable attraction in Moscow is the National Industrial and Agricultural Fair. It is a local counterpart, although on a much larger scale, of the Russian exhibit at the World's Fair in Brussels. After seeing the latter, and observing the very complete manner in which the Commies clobbered the U.S. exhibit with the sheer weight of quantity, I was not at all surprised by the magnitude of the Moscow fairgrounds.

The showpiece of the Soviet Empire consists of 21 "pavilions," which are not pavilions at all but full-sized exhibition halls quite comparable to the Hall of State or the general exhibits structures at the Texas Fair. The entire grounds are beautifully landscaped, and if the Russians can't do anything else in big-league fashion you have to credit them with the ability to grow flower gardens of breathtaking beauty.

The contents of the 21 buildings offer a cross section of life throughout the Soviet Union. Close to 60,000 exhibits are on hand, including more than 4,000 pieces of machinery ranging from all sorts of mobile vehicles to a completely equipped drilling rig, machine-tool equipment, office machines, medical equipment, livestock, furs, clothes, farm produce—which is kept fresh by daily replacements.

Sputnik Displayed

At the national fair, as in Brussels, the Russkies resort to some pretty fancy showmanship. They make a terrific display of material objects. They fill in the voids with masterful mockups and scale models. By the time you have seen so many bright and shiny products there is little reason for you to believe they aren't actually making the items or building the projects illustrated by models. Sputnik was there, so why think they didn't have a continuous casting steel mill, shown by models? A shiny 1958 model car was there, so why think it wasn't in production? Well, maybe the stupid oafs from Outer Mongolia went for that stuff, but I looked for myself, and nowhere, but nowhere, in the four principal cities of Russia did I see a car even closely resembling those on display.

Leaving Moscow was like shedding a dirty shirt. When we headed for the railroad station for our first jaunt by rail, it was like washing your hands with a bar of good American soap—and in hot water.

The Red Arrow Express pulls out of Moscow at midnight and arrives in Leningrad at 9 a.m. It is quite the pushiest train I ever rode. Russians will tell you that it is Soviet built, and since I saw no other evidence anywhere in the country that the Russians were capable or willing to build a vehicle like this one, I had to go along with the popular belief that the Red Arrow is in reality Hitler's old personal train obtained in war reparations.

The only diesel engine I saw in Russia—saw a miniature in Kharkov—pulled the Red Arrow. It had speed aplenty, and I imagine unusual comfort for a rough roadbed.

Midnight snack

Mid red velvet drapes, beautifully lacquered woodwork, glistening brass fittings, we settled down as the express pulled out. Then in walked a fat and squatty Russian woman with caviar, sausage and cheese sandwiches, beer or champagne, and rolls. Moscow was lost in the darkness, and ahead was Leningrad.

Daylight found me up, camera unfolded, and shooting everything through an open window. At the start of our trip, the Russian guides told us we were not to take pictures from an airplane or train, or of airports and bridges. They promptly forgot the admonition and we shot anything we wanted to.

Leningrad was important because it was here that we felt the distinct lessening of Communist domination, at least, outwardly. As we moved further from Moscow, this became more and more pronounced. By the time we reached Prague, Czechoslovakia, leading satellite of the Russians, it had practically disappeared. The Communies were in control, no doubt of it, but on the surface there was beginning to appear little sparks of state pride, of individual thinking, of an esprit de corps whose symbol was not the hammer and sickle, nor the portrait of Lenin, but instead, a wisp of freedom that might someday bloom into a canopy of liberty.

CHAPTER V. RUSSIAN EDUCATION BLIND MAN'S BLUFF

Before visiting the Soviet Union, I had read much about the Reds' educational system, and as a result, had gained a certain respect for a program that was reported to be turning out engineers and scientists like an old dominicker hen hatches chicks. In my mind's eye, the Russians had scientists and engineers growing on trees.

I paid particular attention to education in the Soviet, from nursery to college, and I think each phase is worthy of comment.

Ninety percent of Russian women are workers. They are employed in every type of job from mixing concrete to repairing streetcar tracks, from painting to running a machine, from driving a bus to following a plow. I saw them in all of these occupations—and more.

Start early

The Communists take over almost from the instant a child is born. As quickly as possible, a mother gets back to her job. If she works in a bank, or a bakery, or a factory, her employer furnishes a day nursery. These nurseries are well equipped and staffed by qualified people. The mother may choose to take her baby to and from work each day, leaving the child in the nursery. Or she may elect to place the child in another type nursery which permits her to take the youngster home on weekends. There is still another type of nursery school in which the child becomes a full-time resident and student. In this institution, the parents visit the child periodically, and for all good purposes, hand over all responsibility for the child's future to someone else.

I asked a young mother who had her youngster only on weekends if she didn't feel she was shirking a responsibility, if she didn't feel she was losing much of the pleasure attached to having babies of her own.

"No," she replied, "I think my child is being cared for much better than I can care for her. The people in charge of the nursery are experts and are far better qualified to train a child than I am."

By the time Russian kids are 6 or 7 years of age, they usually become members of the Young Pioneers, a pre-Communist outfit which corresponds to the age groups we have in the Cub Scouts and Brownies. Next, there comes membership in the Young Communist League, and after that, membership

in the party proper if it is sought and the candidate is politically desirable. By this time, a Russian youngster is in his or her twenties, and oddly enough, not too much importance is attached to becoming a full-fledged member of the party.

No revolution

Many top Russians, while they go along with party principles completely, are not members simply because they do not want to go to the extra trouble and work that membership requires. Party leaders are not concerned with a certain degree of laxity by the people on this score. "Why should we worry now?" one top Commie asked, "We've had them for more than 20 years and if they're not Communists at heart, mere membership won't change their attitude." Most Russians, after 20 or more years of having the party line drummed into their senses at every turn, are Communists at heart, and it is my firm conviction that revolution in Russia is as farfetched as it would be in the United States.

I visited public school No. 57 in Kiev. This city is the capital of the rich Ukraine, often called the breadbasket of Russia. Here, people are friendlier than in Moscow. They seem to be a happier lot, and somewhat removed from the constant pressure of party activities which characterizes Moscow. This atmosphere was predominant in public school No. 57, an old school located in a better section of Kiev.

The school was almost totally destroyed by the Germans, and the administrator, Mrs. Olga Matsinchuk, mother of three daughters, discussed the rebuilding of the school by its teachers with a touch of bitterness toward the Germans creeping into her remarks. She said what the invaders didn't ruin, they stole, so the school had to be rebuilt from the ground up.

Poorly equipped

There was a sort of stiff dignity clearly visible on every hand. As I moved from one classroom to another, the girls curtsied, the boys snapped to attention and bowed stiffly. I saw a physics and chemistry classroom. There was hardly more equipment than bunsen burners and test tubes. In the mechanical shop, there was a worn drill press, a small lathe, several grinding wheels, a few vises, files, and miscellaneous small handtools. By the time I finished my trip through the school, I had a pretty low opinion of Russian education. Later, I met Dr. Rosella Linskie, a former SMU teacher who is still in Russia with a group of American teachers studying in detail the entire Soviet school system.

Dr. Linskie confirmed what I had suspected: The so-called advanced Russian science student is not even the equal of an American high school general science student.

Public school No. 57 had 930 pupils in 10 grades generally coinciding with our elementary and high schools. There were 50 teachers handling 23 classes. All pupils study Russian and mathematics for 10 years. Seventy percent of them study English. The school administrator earns 2,900 rubles per month, or at 4 to 1, about \$700 per month, which is unusually high when compared with similar responsibilities in other activities. Teachers are paid by the hour, 8 to 15 rubles per teaching hour, depending upon the subject. Average teacher earnings are from 1,000 to 1,800 rubles or from \$250 to \$450 per month.

Lenin everywhere

Lenin's pictures and busts were all over the place. Huge green plants lined the halls. On the walls were bronze plaques setting forth the rules of conduct. One room in particular impressed me. This was the headquarters of the Young Pioneers. Here the organization's leaders met to study and to virtually worship before the shrine of a former student, a teenage girl who fought and was killed during the war. In glass cases were some of her clothes, books, and pictures.

Moscow University, when compared on a realistic basis with our big American colleges, was no more impressive than public school No. 57. But for bigness, the grand manner, the flamboyant, it is something to behold. The central tower of the massive structure is almost 800 feet high. Four smaller towers adorn the corners of the building. There are 20 lecture rooms accommodating 600 students each, and our guide made much of the fact that each lecture is tape-recorded and filed in the library. No less than 113 speedy elevators serve the 17,000 students, 6,000 of whom reside in the main building. The dormitory areas are very plain. Each student is assigned a cubicle amounting to 8 square meters. This is something like a room 9 by 9 feet. The room is comfortable, and down the hall is a community kitchen where meals may be prepared. Otherwise a cafeteria is available.

Students are paid 300 rubles (\$75) per month in their first year. The second year they receive 350 rubles a month, and from there on, bonuses may allow a student to receive as much as 800 rubles per month.

Busy summer

Since I visited the university during the vacation period, I cannot assume to know very much about the courses. During the summer, however, the school is a beehive of activity with all sorts of special meetings. On the day I was there, the Fourth International Congress on Slavic Languages was in session. Other special sessions included a Congress on Refrigeration, and a Congress on Astronomy.

My low estimate of the entire Russian school system is the result of observation and numerous discussions with Russian and American teachers and students. I got the idea the "Russkies" are playing a sort of blindman's buff, and that back of highly publicized facades of higher learning there are numerous gaps. The Russians, as I learned in many other activities, are past masters at playing hop-skip-and-jump. Education is no exception, witness an incident I experienced in Kiev where I met a young woman medical student. She spoke halting English but she finally got across the idea that on the following Monday she would be leaving school for 2 months to go to a nearby collective farm to help get the harvest in. Her entire class was going to forget the scalpel and pick up the scythe for a time. How many of our young doctors would condone such a practice, and how many of us would want or expect them to?

CHAPTER VI. THE UNBURIED CORPSE

To understand the death sentence imposed upon Christianity in Russia by the Communists, one must realize that the party has been in power something over 40 years. For a person to remember anything at all of the land or its customs prior to the revolution, he would have to be something like 50 years of age. A prerevolution Christian, therefore, would be somewhere near 60. This accounts for the fact that practically all people you see at a church service are elderly.

Religion in Russia, although existing under a reprieve at the moment, is destined to go the way of political freedom in the Soviet. True, the Russians are permitted to worship God, but for the first 20 years or so of a Russian's life, he has little opportunity to be exposed to anything, certainly not religion, except communism—and communism makes a mockery of Christ.

When the present elderly generation passes into the shadows, religion will go with it unless a miracle occurs to give the youth of Russia an opportunity to know about Christianity.

Making no gains

A Russian clergyman told me that religion is not making any gains. Aside from the

Government attitude of surface toleration but undercover opposition, the acute housing situation forestalls any effort to increase church accommodations. A materialistic government refuses to recognize spiritual needs while placing all emphasis on the sheltering of physical bodies. As an example, the Baptist Church in Moscow is the country's leading Protestant institution. This is a congregation of 4,000 members.

There are three Sunday services and three during the week. At each service, two preachers deliver two sermons, a 2-hour program during which several hundred stand in the cramped quarters.

The minister, Michael Zhidkov, was partially trained at a Baptist school in London. He said there are a half-million Baptists in Russia using 5,300 churches. He said the Moscow church has operated continuously for 80 years. There is an excellent choir of 100 voices. On the subject of government opposition, Minister Zhidkov admitted that the Soviet Union teaches against religion, and that you cannot be a Baptist and party member, too, as far as the party is concerned. Reverend Zhidkov professed to be a Christian in every sense of the word, yet when asked about his feelings toward communism, he said he was in complete accord with the party. Whether this was true, or he simply said so to prevent rousing the wrath of the Commies, was debatable.

On the bus one day, during a lull in the conversation, I bluntly asked our feminine guide, "Galena, do you believe in God?"

"No," she quickly replied. I drew another negative answer when I asked if her mother had been a Christian. "But my grandmother believes in God," she added. Galena said she had never read the Bible. But I could detect a trace of curiosity in this genial young woman of good education. Finally, she had to come out with it.

"What does your God look like?" Galena asked.

What a question for a layman to ponder when it is asked by an adult of intelligence and honest intent.

I might have satisfied a child for the moment, but not this young woman. While I groped for a proper explanation she hit me with this one: "Where does your God live, up in the sky?"

Answer needed

I thought about Bob Goodrich and McLain Smith and Tom Shipp, and wished that one of those stalwarts could have been there to back me up. I sure needed it—and this girl so desperately needed an answer she could understand and believe.

The situation in Czechoslovakia is not nearly so gloomy. But there, nothing is nearly as dismal as in Russia. A responsible Czech Catholic told me she believed the church was holding its own despite the fact that Communist government was standing the expense of church and cathedral overhaul and paying the salaries of the preachers. But how can a preacher or a priest be really free if the Commies pay him?

Yes, barring a miracle, religion is doomed in the land of the Reds. The oldsters are taking the remaining vestiges with them, and there is no second team of youngsters.

Russia in retrospect

After this series of articles was started, the shortage of manpower became more evident in Premier Khrushchev's modification of the educational system. Full-time schooling will now last only 7 or 8 years, with high school students doing most of their learning at night after working during the day. A scant handful of high school graduates known to be politically desirable will go to college, and there, all but the very elite will be required to hold full-time jobs on the outside. Result: Most Russian boys and girls will go to work when they are 14 or 15 and forget schooling.

Savings gamble

Banking: Russian banks promote a unique savings activity. Depositors agree to pool their 3 percent interest, and at the end of the year, hold a lottery on the pool—possible to earn 100 percent on deposits if you're lucky. A 3-percent bond issue recently matured but was deferred for 20 years with no interest, a bank president told me. Reason: The workers elected to leave the money in the Government so that more new housing could be built. There has never been a bank holdup or robbery in Communist Russia. Reason: Nothing to spend the money for, and if there was, everybody knows what each other makes and any unusual spending would cause a man's neighbors to report him.

Divorce: In Leningrad, posting of divorce intent is 4 years behind. I ran across one family of four. A divorce would be granted if the husband could find living quarters elsewhere. That was 3 years ago. The four still live in two rooms, and he's still looking.

Jobs: A Russian can change jobs simply by filing a 2 weeks' notice. Few do, however, because lack of transportation makes it imperative that a fellow stay put when he has living quarters within walking distance of his job. Practically all production jobs pay a standard wage plus piecework incentives. Promotions are based on ability, not seniority. Trade unions demand production, often beyond rated capacity, and management is not too keen for this because it hampers maintenance shifts and increases breakdowns. Doctors are permitted to accept private patients in addition to carrying on their socialized practice.

Few aircraft

The military: Nowhere did I see a military plane in the air. There were 8 or 10 jets on the Moscow parking ramp. Jets, DC-7's, etc., are pulled out on the grass to wooden workbenches where they are serviced without protection from the elements. Countless Russians told me, "Tell your Government not to bomb us. We want no more war, only peace." I saw five halftracks dragging shrouded artillery through Red Square, the only evidence of military might observed in 5,000 miles of travel.

Conclusion: Russia is growing in spite of its unwieldy, ponderous, wasteful and inefficient system. It bears continuous watching while we keep our own house in order. Sputnik? The Germans did it for the Russians even as they played important roles in developing the American version. Afraid? Never, and I'm convinced that the time is now for the free world to draw the line against communism—and hold it.

TRIBUTE TO ABRAHAM LINCOLN AND TO HIS MOTHER, NANCY HANKS, WHO WAS BORN IN WEST VIRGINIA

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President and Members of the Senate, in listening a few minutes ago to the meaningful tribute by Carl Sandburg to the memory of Abraham Lincoln, I was made aware of the peculiar significance of Lincoln in the State of West Virginia.

Over a span of 14 years I had the privilege of representing the congressional district of West Virginia in which Nancy Hanks, the mother of Abraham Lincoln, was born. Her birthplace near Antioch, in Mineral County, is revered as one of our State's historic landmarks.

I am reminded of a quotation from a column of the late Arthur Brisbane, published on Lincoln's birth anniversary on February 12, 1936, in which he wrote:

Without Nancy Hanks there would have been no Abraham Lincoln. This, his birth-

day, is a good day to honor him and his mother.

Indeed, Mr. President, it is appropriate to remark that mothers have been the inspiration of American leaders throughout our country's history. Mothers have too often been the unappreciated molders of men. They ask nothing for themselves, and in the making of this comment I am thinking now of the modest marker there on a hillside in West Virginia, where the mother of Lincoln was born.

At the foot of another West Virginia mountain not many miles away lies the town of Hendricks where lived Karl Myers, a poet laureate of my State—then a young man who was crippled and unable to walk. He composed and sent me in 1936, when I was a Member of the House of Representatives, truly touching and moving lines of Abraham Lincoln. His is verse which causes us not to think of the yesterdays, but for a moment to picture Lincoln as if he were a part of the restless times in which we live.

The poem, called "If Abraham Lincoln Could Talk to You," is quoted as follows:

If Abraham Lincoln could talk to you
Over the radiophone tonight,
Could for a moment the veil step through,
Out of the silence and far skies bright,

Gentle and great as of old—what then,
Think you, the theme of his speech would be?

Preachings, perchance, to the sons of man,
Muddled and restless, beyond the sea?

Haply a word on affairs of state,
Out of his storehouse of wisdom rare?
Maby a fling at the low birth rate?
Pleas for the virtues of days that were?

Making orations inspired and grave,
Think you the seconds he'd speed away,
Casting his pearls on the wireless wave
Unto all people and nations? Nay.

Somehow I fancy him standing here,
Knowing the heart of the world is sad,
Spinning a yarn of the yesteryear,
Telling a story to make us glad.

In this expressive poem, the late Karl Myers caught the ever-living spirit of a great American—one who was great not so much because of the brilliance of his mind but because of his gentleness, his depth of understanding, his capacity for service, his humility of heart, and his guidance of those who needed a helping hand.

PROPOSED CLOSING OF ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION'S URANIUM PROCESSING MILL AT MONTICELLO, UTAH

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, frugality in Government has become the current crusade in the Eisenhower administration. The President talks about it constantly in his messages to Congress and at his press conferences. His lieutenants never lose an opportunity to echo his sentiment. The size of the price tag on any commodity the Government buys—whether it is national survival or airport safety—seems more important than what's inside the package.

I am not going to argue the soundness of the administration's economic philosophy here. No one is more interested

than I in reducing Government expenditures or in assuring that the American taxpayer gets value received for every dollar spent. But in view of the administration's dollar-counting-above-all-else attitude, I want to call the attention of this body to an impending waste in tax dollars by the executive branch of the Government in my State of Utah which I feel is indefensible.

As you know, Utah has been a center for some years of a booming uranium industry. At the time the Government was seeking every ounce of uranium available, the Atomic Energy Commission went into the uranium milling business. One of the mills it erected was at Monticello, Utah, which is located in San Juan County, in the heart of the uranium fields, and not far from the famous four corners where Utah, Colorado, Arizona, and New Mexico meet.

The mill became a leader in ore processing and assembled a staff well qualified to handle an economic operation. The town of Monticello assumed a heavy bonded indebtedness to provide the necessary facilities for the men, and their families, who came to work in the mill, and others who were attracted into the area because of the uranium boom, believing that a significant portion of the repayment would come from the taxes of new residents.

Suddenly the Atomic Energy Commission has decided to get out of the uranium milling business to turn it over to private industry. I certainly do not disagree with this objective—if private industry can do the job, it certainly should be given the chance.

But—and here is where my quarrel is—the Atomic Energy Commission has now proposed to close the Monticello mill in about 6 months, despite the fact that the Standard Uranium Co., a private concern with a uranium mine near Monticello, wants to buy the plant. Its offer to buy is conditioned upon an agreement with the AEC for purchase of an adequate quantity of the company's ore to justify an economic operation. Of course, the AEC is the only customer who legally may buy. The Commission has been unwilling so far to sell the Monticello mill on these terms, and salvage for the taxpayer as many of the dollars which went into its construction as possible, arguing that previous commitments make it impossible to give the company the necessary uranium oxide contracts.

This is surprising to me, because the AEC is constantly signing new contracts with other mills built recently, or which are now under construction or expanding. Nine new uranium mills, built by private companies which hold Atomic Energy Commission contracts for the delivery of concentrates, went into delivery in 1958. Other new mills are now being built in Nevada, New Mexico, and Wyoming.

This is hard for the people of Monticello to understand. It is even harder for them to follow the line of AEC reasoning which results in the type of story which appeared in the Salt Lake Tribune

on February 5. An official of the Lucky Mc Uranium Corp. announced that the Atomic Energy Commission would shortly modify its agreement with the company, and increase from 833 tons to 1,000 tons a day the amount of uranium oxide it is buying from its Lucky Mc mill in Wyoming.

Nor, with the millmen about to lose their jobs, and the city fathers and business concerns deeply concerned about the impact on the city's economy of the loss of a substantial slice of the city's buying power, can the people of Monticello read without wincing, reports such as the one carried in the Salt Lake Tribune on February 4 about the contracts the Government has signed with South Africa to buy uranium concentrates from that area through 1966 or 1967.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point copies of two columns by Robert W. Bernick in the Salt Lake Tribune which relate to the comments I have just made.

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

[From the Salt Lake Tribune, Feb. 4, 1959]

WEST MINERS HEAR DARK U-ORE NEWS

(By Robert W. Bernick)

The western miner can quit worrying about whether the U.S. Government has irrevocably obligated itself to buy uranium concentrates from South Africa past March 31, 1962, while starving exploration in this country.

It has.

In fact, the fantastic deal handed the big gold producers in South Africa for their uranium all but beggars description.

And it has laid the groundwork for a huge complex of uranium production based on byproducts recovery from gold mining which with native labor will produce the world's lowest cost fissionable material.

That these fissionable materials will one day come back to haunt not only the domestic mine's struggles for a free market but becomes a lever in international politics seems inevitable.

According to Canada's Northern Miner, the United States guarantees purchase of uranium concentrates from South African sources through contracts which extend through 1966 and 1967.

It is interesting, but hardly unusual on the part of Washington, D.C., these days, that the American government offers foreigners contracts for a longer period than that offered its own tax-paying citizens.

(We are now paying \$11.75 a pound for South African uranium concentrates against an average price of \$9.66 a pound for uranium produced in Western United States. The price for U.S. producers after March 31, 1962, is \$8 a pound. AEC has never told the American people what price it will pay for concentrates from South Africa. But as the existing contracts run through 1967, there's reason to believe the price-cost disparity will increase, rather than decrease.)

The United States and British Governments not only have issued the long term, high priced guarantees to the gold producers for their uranium.

Through loans from these two Governments, the big British and South African controlled gold firms have built some 67 million pounds (sterling) worth of plants (17 separate ones), including a 9 million pounds

sulphuric acid plant used in reduction of uranium.

With Monticello uranium mill closing, exploration ended in the domestic fields and the AEC demanding lower costs and lower prices in the United States for reason of "economy," there is but one word for the foreign program of the Commission: Tragedy.

[From the Salt Lake Tribune, Feb. 8, 1959]

LUCKY MC RECORDS WYOMING U-GAINS

(By Robert W. Bernick)

The Lucky Mc Uranium Corp. Wednesday reported \$3,161,482 net profit on sales of \$9,115,438 in uranium concentrates from its Gas Hills District, Wyoming, uranium mill for 6 months ended December 31, 1958.

Allen D. Christensen, San Francisco, president, said in an interim report to shareholders:

"We expect to announce shortly a modification of our agreement with the Atomic Energy Commission for sale of uranium oxide through the year 1966, which will require the operation of the Lucky Mc mill at the rate of approximately 1,000 tons daily.

"Our present contract calls for an operating rate of 833 tons a day through March 31, 1962. Successful conclusion of the contract modification will assure continued earnings of the corporation through 1966.

In the interim financial statement, the executive disclosed that in the last quarter 1958, Lucky Mc paid \$1,148,000 on bank loans (for construction of the mill, etc.), reducing the outstanding balance to \$7,352,000.

The net profit figures are after estimated taxes and operating costs but before depletion. They include application of previous year's loss (start up) of one and six-tenths million dollars.

Mr. Christensen said the "operating results" during the term of the report were "gratifying, with sales and profits exceeding the previous quarter's results, due primarily to a combination of processing higher grade ores and achieving improved metallurgical recoveries."

"Although the tonnage of ores fed to processing decreased 7 percent when compared to the previous quarter, the production of uranium oxide contained in concentrate increased 12 percent with 550,000 pounds of U²³⁵ shipped."

Because of contract modifications imposed during 1958, he estimated that third quarter production should be off about 25 percent from second quarter rate.

Mr. MOSS. I also ask unanimous consent to have printed a letter I directed to Hon. John A. McCone, Chairman of the Joint Atomic Energy Commission, on this matter, as it gives considerably more information on it, particularly on the impact of the Monticello economy of the closing of the uranium processing mill, and on the very minor adjustments in the AEC buying programs which would be required to accommodate the relatively small Monticello operation.

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

FEBRUARY 2, 1959.

HON. JOHN A. MCCONE,
Chairman, Atomic Energy Commission,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CHAIRMAN MCCONE: I am writing in further reference to the proposed closing of the Commission's uranium processing mill at Monticello, Utah.

I have been informed that the Standard Uranium Co., with headquarters at Monticello, has reaffirmed its offer to purchase the

Government-owned mill if the AEC will agree to contract for an adequate quantity of the company's ore to justify the operation economically. Since the Monticello mill is a small one, and contributes only a minor percentage of the uranium concentrate which the Commission buys (2 percent of the total domestic and foreign U²³⁵ purchased in 1958 and an anticipated 1 percent in 1959) it would require only a slight readjustment in the present purchase programs to keep the Monticello mill in operation. Surely there is enough elasticity in these programs to allow for an adjustment of this type.

It is very difficult to understand all aspects of the administration of the uranium-milling and ore-buying programs. The Commission appears to have taken the position that it is time for the Government to get out of the uranium business, and that private industry should take it over. I do not quarrel with this position—I commend it. But I do quarrel most emphatically with a policy which assures contracts to the many new private uranium processing mills which are being constructed throughout the West while at the same time the Commission contemplates closing a mill now in smooth operation which private industry wants to buy, and the purchase of which would return to the U.S. Treasury thousands of taxpayers' dollars.

In view of the announced closing of the Monticello mill because of decreased need I was somewhat surprised to read a statement made recently by Mr. Allan E. Jones, manager of the AEC Grand Junction office, at a meeting of industry leaders there, and reported in the Daily Sentinel, of Grand Junction, Colo. Mr. Jones declared that the most urgent job before the AEC was to proceed with milling contracts for the final expansions in Wyoming, Texas, the Colorado Front Range, and the Dakota lignites.

I understand that AEC has promised contracts to new mills in these areas because people there have relied on AEC announcements. It seems to me that the people of Monticello, Utah, are entitled to the same consideration. The Monticello mill is a leader in the field of ore processing and has well-qualified personnel to continue economical operations. Standard Uranium has over a million tons of ore in the area ready for milling.

Completely apart from the responsibility the Commission has to keep a well-established mill in operation and to realize the most to the taxpayers for each tax dollar spent, the Federal Government has a responsibility to the citizens of Monticello. With no intimation that their uranium-processing mill was to be closed down, the city has undertaken a heavy bonded indebtedness and incurred other obligations in an effort to expand facilities for the growing population brought into this area by the uranium boom generally and the ore-processing mill specifically. Loss of the mill employees and their families, their purchasing power, and their tax money, will impose an extra financial burden on the remainder of the community. I am also very much concerned about the individual problems of the men who will lose their jobs, and of their wives and families.

I feel very strongly, therefore, that the Commission should give full and sympathetic consideration to the offer from the Standard Uranium Co. to purchase the Monticello uranium-processing mill.

Sincerely,

FRANK E. MOSS.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, Monticello is a small city in a sparsely settled sec-

tion of Utah, but if the closing of its uranium mill is typical of the brand of economy this administration is practicing, then I believe this body has a right to question the soundness—and the sincerity—of that economy program.

TWELVE KEY DATES IN OREGON HISTORY AS STATE CELEBRATES 100 YEARS OF STATEHOOD

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, on Saturday, Oregon celebrates 100 years of statehood. Centennial observances will take place throughout the State on February 14, 1959. These festivities mark more than a local holiday. They are recognition of the growth and achievement of a people drawn together originally by the invisible line of a political boundary and held together by the common purpose of a better life.

Oregon's history is studded with significant dates—important to the State and to the Nation. Today, I wish to list 12 periods in the chronology of our country in which Oregon played a vital role. Selection of these years was made for me by Thomas Vaughan, scholarly and able executive director of the Oregon Historical Society and editor of our Oregon Historical Quarterly.

This brief timetable—covering nearly 200 years—cannot reveal the great depth of Oregon's contribution to the strengthening of the Union. The dates are merely historical headstones—recording, but not evaluating progress. During the forthcoming centennial year, I intend to speak further in the Senate regarding my State's rich social heritage and its liberal leadership in political reform.

Mr. President, I am proud to serve the people of Oregon as a U.S. Senator. These events—which reveal my native State's development from wilderness to complex agricultural and industrial society—are one essential reason for that pride.

First, 1778, Capt. James Cook sailed along the northwest coast to the Arctic Ocean and entered Nootka Harbor—Vancouver Island. He and his men purchased sea otter furs from Indians which brought great returns in China, and word spread by mouth and by publication of his journals after the expedition's return to England.

Second, 1792, Robert Gray, out of Boston, entered the Columbia River and named it for his ship *Columbia*; George Vancouver, British commander then off coast to settle the Nootka controversy, received Gray's map of entrance to the river from the Spanish commander, Quadra, and sent Broughton to explore the river. The latter reached a point just east of Troutdale, discovering the mouth of the Willamette.

Third, 1803-06, Louisiana Purchase, 1803, and Lewis and Clark exploring expedition, 1804 to 1806, sent to explore overland for first commercial route to Pacific Ocean by President Thomas Jefferson.

Fourth, 1811-12, establishment of Fort Astoria, Astor's fur-trading post at

the mouth of the Columbia, by a sea party arriving on the *Tonquin*; arrival of overland party under Wilson Price Hunt; dispatches sent from Astoria carried by Robert Stuart over most of Oregon Trail route, including South Pass, 1812.

Fifth, 1834, Nathaniel Wyeth's second expedition to the Oregon country, for the purpose of establishing a trade in furs, salmon, supplies; built Fort Hall, later an important stop on the Oregon Trail. Accompanying Wyeth to Oregon on this trip were Jason Lee and other missionary helpers who established a mission in the Willamette Valley, an important focal point for American interest in settlement.

Sixth, 1843-45, provisional government established by American settlers in Willamette Valley.

Seventh, 1846, treaty between the United States and Great Britain settled northern boundary of Oregon country at 49°, including Columbia River mouth and Puget Sound.

Eighth, 1848-49, bill creating Oregon Territory, passed by Congress in 1848, went into effect in Oregon in 1849 with arrival of Gov. Joseph Lane in March. Gold discovered in California in 1848 was important in stimulating interest in the west coast and in bringing prosperity and medium of exchange to Oregon farmers and merchants, economic independence of the Hudson's Bay Co.

Ninth, 1859, Oregon became 33d State of the Union on eve of Civil War.

Tenth, 1883, with the completion of the Northern Pacific Railroad, by the Columbia water-grade route to Portland, Ore., and the rest of the Pacific Northwest obtained first direct transcontinental railroad connection.

Eleventh, 1902-12, passage of various parts of "Oregon System" including initiative and referendum, recall, direct election of U.S. Senators, and so forth.

Twelfth, 1937, Bonneville Dam, first step in harnessing of the great Columbia River, completed with unique facilities to provide for valuable migratory salmon.

On February 14, 1959, the State with this rich tradition and history achieves the centennial of its statehood in the American Union.

I should like to add that I am particularly grateful there are present in the Chamber today distinguished Senators from such States as Montana and Idaho which at the time of the creation of the Oregon country were included in parts of this great area known as Oregon.

DEATH OF GEN. WILLIAM J. DONOVAN

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, America has lost one of its most dedicated Americans in the passing of Maj. Gen. William J. Donovan.

I knew General Donovan, and visited in his offices many times. His briefings for Senators and Representatives were always patient and helpful.

His record of service to his country is a proud chapter in our history. He was truly a soldier statesman, a kind man, but firm in his beliefs and decisions.

Most newspapers published thoughtful editorials relative to the life, character, and achievements of General Donovan. I ask unanimous consent that one of these editorials, entitled "General Donovan's Distinguished Career," published in the New York Herald Tribune of February 9, 1959, be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

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

GENERAL DONOVAN'S DISTINGUISHED CAREER

"Wild Bill" Donovan gained his nickname by reason of his courage as a major with the Fighting 69th in World War I. It stuck with him all through his life, even when he was a distinguished lawyer, arguing cases before the Supreme Court of the United States. Republican candidate for Governor of New York; commander of the Office of Strategic Services during World War II; Ambassador to Thailand at a critical time in southeast Asia; or performing any of his other almost countless public services under five Presidents. His death in Washington at 76 ends a career whose variety was surpassed only by its usefulness.

Gen. William J. Donovan's contributions to his country can be measured in the fact that he was the only man to have held the Medal of Honor, the Distinguished Service Cross, the Distinguished Service Medal, and the National Security Medal, which may be accounted as the Nation's four highest decorations. Yet deep though his patriotism ran, it never ran narrow. He was one of the first Americans of national stature to sense the growing menace of fascism, and he went to Ethiopia in 1932 and to Spain in 1937 to observe its march at firsthand. In the same way, he became a stalwart in the battle against the advances of international communism; in 1956 he organized one of the most successful campaigns for financial aid to Hungarians who had rebelled against the Soviets.

Probably it was as head of the OSS that most of his countrymen knew General Donovan. Yet this was only the summit of a career that had already seen important services as an Assistant Attorney General, a candidate for high office, a diplomatic observer, and a famous lawyer. In the OSS he organized a secret army which performed vital intelligence, analytical, and espionage functions that contributed mightily to the Allied victory. Much of the OSS story is still untold, but it is not too much to say that General Donovan created America's first worldwide secret intelligence force.

A warm friend as well as a devoted citizen, General Donovan could look back as few men can upon years of aspiration matched by achievement. Winston Churchill, commenting upon a factfinding trip by General Donovan in the Balkans and the Middle East in 1940, summed up the man when he said, "He has carried with him throughout an animating, heartwarming flame." It was a flame that burned brightly throughout his life.

PARTICIPATION IN PUBLIC AFFAIRS

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I am very grateful for the expression of my colleague, the distinguished Senator

from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING] by inserting my speech in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on the subject of "The Business Man in Public Affairs." In thinking of the participation of people generally in public affairs, I should like to ask my colleagues to listen for a few minutes as I recall that during the 1958 campaign I visited a friend who was 97 years of age. He is Charles L. Watkins, who had been an active businessman until 8 or 9 years prior to my having been privileged to visit him last year. He is a semi-invalid. When I talked with Mr. Watkins, he told me that he had never failed to cast his ballot. In other words, he had voted consecutively for 76 years, never missing an election and the use of his franchise of freedom in municipal, county, State, and Federal elections.

I feel that we have a symbol of the finest citizenship in Charles L. Watkins, a man now almost 98, who told me—and I repeat it to my colleagues now: "It has been a privilege to participate in the processes of government."

Yes; I shall always remember that he said: "If the weather is good on primary election day I'll roll myself in this wheelchair to the polling place. If the weather is bad, I'll do what I once did, I'll call the ambulance but I'll be there with my ballot."

We shall never lose our democracy by default as long as we have citizens such as Charles Watkins.

THE DOMESTIC MINERALS INDUSTRY

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, on Saturday, February 7, the distinguished junior Senator from Utah [Mr. Moss] was the principal speaker at the 62d annual National Western Mining Conference, held in Denver, Colo.

The Senator pointed out the basic fallacy in the administration's program, or, more accurately, lack of program, for the mining industry. This administration program for mining, as is everything else, is an abject obeisance to the concept of a balanced budget. The administration does not take into account the fact that if there are no mines operating, there will be no taxes paid by the mining industry, and hence a balanced budget is a dangerous fallacy with respect to sustaining our country's self-sufficiency in the basic minerals so necessary to our security in both peace and war.

At the same time, the junior Senator from Utah set forth the broad outline of an affirmative plan to sustain our domestic minerals industry and to give it the necessary stability. His program was reported in some detail by the two Denver newspapers, the Post and the Rocky Mountain News.

In view of the fact that legislation putting into effect the program proposed by the Senator from Utah will shortly be introduced, I ask unanimous consent that these reports of the Senator's remarks appear in the body of the RECORD at this point.

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

[From the Rocky Mountain News, Feb. 8, 1959]

SENATOR MOSS ASKS PLAN AIDING FALTERING MINING INDUSTRY

A proposal to stabilize the economics of the mining industry by special legislation similar to the Sugar Act, which sets up both domestic and foreign import quotas, is under study in Washington.

U.S. Senator FRANK E. MOSS, Democrat Utah, main speaker at the annual "Sowbelly Dinner" of the National Western Mining Conference at the Shirley-Savoy Hotel, told about the plan Saturday night.

Moss said he has discussed the plan with U.S. Senator JAMES A. MURRAY, Democrat, Montana, chairman of the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, and added:

"Chairman MURRAY and I are in agreement that there should be, in the interest of national security, in the interest of employment in the metal and mineral mines of this Nation, and in the interest of the mining industry in general," a staff study on the plan.

Moss said Congressmen are concerned that metals lost ground in 1958, and charged the administration is more concerned with income and a balanced budget than it is with helping a sick industry.

"The outlook is discouraging, but the future is not entirely hopeless," he declared.

[From the Denver Post, Feb. 8, 1959]

UTAH SENATOR URGES SUBSIDY FOR U.S. MINES

(By Jim Ritchie)

Senator FRANK E. MOSS (Democrat, of Utah), told the 62d annual National Western Mining Conference in Denver, Saturday night, that the Eisenhower administration is more interested in balancing the budget than helping the distressed mining industry.

Moss spoke to more than 1,300 miners who ate pork and beans at the annual Sowbelly Dinner, which traditionally is the closing event of the 3-day mining meeting.

Gov. Steve McNichols, Mayor Will F. Nicholson, Senator GORDON ALLOTT (Republican, of Colorado), Representatives WAYNE ASPINALL (Democrat), and J. EDGAR CHENOWETH (Republican), both of Colorado, and STEWART L. UDALL (Democrat, of Arizona), were among the dignitaries attending.

URGES OFFICIAL STUDY

Moss told the meeting he will urge Congress to study legislation to grant direct subsidies to the domestic mining industry. "A study of such legislation would be in the national interest," he said.

"The peacetime economy cannot be healthy without a plentiful supply of minerals at a reasonable price," he said.

He attacked a speech Friday in which Elmer Bennett, Under Secretary of the Interior, told the convention that the most important problem facing the Nation was inflation. To prevent inflation the United States must maintain a balanced budget, Bennett contended.

Moss charged that Bennett implied that if the budget was to be kept balanced "then there is little or no aid to be given to the sick mineral industry."

"I fervently agree with the commendable objective of balancing the budget, but I must point out that a sick mining industry, paying little or no income tax to the Federal Government is not in a very good position to help keep Federal revenues up," Moss said.

He recommended a study to determine if it is advisable for Congress to enact legislation patterned after the Sugar Act to assure

at all times domestic production of major minerals and metals.

SUGAR ACT CITED

The Sugar Act provides for Government payments to domestic producers as an effort to maintain a sugar industry in the United States.

During 1958, the mining industry lost ground, and the future outlook is "discouraging, but not entirely hopeless," Moss told the miners. He said that last year production of copper was down 10 percent, lead and zinc were off 23 percent, and gold and silver reached the lowest production level since 1946.

"We must dedicate ourselves to a course of action that will bring employment out of unemployment, profits out of red ink, and smiles out of despair in the mining industry," Moss said.

While the miners were staging their stag dinner at the Lincoln Room of the Shirley-Savoy Hotel, their wives held the annual "Sour Belle" dinner at the Brown Palace Hotel.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR GREEN

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, 1 week ago many of his colleagues rose in the Senate to praise the senior Senator from Rhode Island, THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN, and to express their admiration for his wisdom and strength of character in relinquishing the chairmanship of the Foreign Relations Committee.

On Wednesday, February 11, 1959, the Providence Journal, a Rhode Island newspaper, published a letter to the editor entitled "An Associate Praises Senator GREEN's Resignation."

The author of the letter, Mr. Gordon F. Harrison, chief clerk and counsel of the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration, has written a stirring and beautiful tribute recounting the selfless, courageous, and continuing service and loyalty the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island has given to his State and to his country.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, at the conclusion of my remarks, the letter which was printed in the Providence Journal.

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

AN ASSOCIATE PRAISES SENATOR GREEN'S RESIGNATION

I have been a friend and associate of Senator GREEN throughout my life—first as a neighbor on John Street, then in the Rhode Island State House, next as his legislative assistant during his first 4 years as a Senator in Washington, and eventually in my present capacity as chief clerk and counsel of the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration, which began under his chairmanship.

I have had a unique opportunity to evaluate this truly distinguished statesman. On countless past occasions he has, by word and act, proven himself more than worthy of the confidence, esteem, and affection of the people of Rhode Island.

On Friday, January 30, however, he reached a summit. It is in the focus of my long association that the real significance of his resignation as chairman of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations gains perspective. I would like to indulge this brief opportunity to share with you and your readers my impressions of that incident.

It is unnecessary to detail the tremendous workload and awesome responsibilities which beset the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations amid the international complexities of today's world. Indeed, from the very inception of the Senate itself, the committee's influence has placed it in a rank second to none. Membership on the committee is a coveted honor, and almost never has a Senator gained a place thereon early in his legislative career.

Senator GREEN is an exception. Within a year of his coming to Washington, by reason of his broad background of foreign travel, languages, and interests, he was appointed to membership. In the two decades which followed—through war and peace—he devotedly applied himself to every committee assignment. It was only natural that he should entertain the hope of one day being chairman. No one ever deserved the elevation in greater degree. Perhaps no one ever worked harder to obtain it, or desired it more. It is only in that perspective that the quality of his action in resigning can best be appreciated.

I remember when, a few months ago, Senator GREEN found it necessary to wear a hearing aid for the first time. He adopted the appendage reluctantly but cheerfully. When, last fall, he underwent eye surgery to remove an impairment to his vision, he realized the added handicap he would bring to his arduous labors as chairman. It was back then that he set the course which, in his wisdom, he knew he would follow.

If I have learned anything from a lifetime of association with Senator GREEN it is that he keeps his own counsel, makes his own decisions, and has the fortitude to stand by them. In so doing he is swayed neither by the banal bleatings of sycophants nor by the spurious dribble of detractors.

Therefore, let there be no mistake about Senator GREEN's motivation for resigning his chairmanship. In the simple, straightforward eloquence of his letter of resignation he made it clear that he based his decision on what "would be best for my country, for the United States Senate, and for the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations itself."

While it is true that the chairmanships of Senate committees sometimes go to older and less vigorous Senators under the time-honored seniority rule—chairmen do not resign! It is one apart from all the rest who can graciously assess the proportion of bodily frailties and the demands of duty and then relinquish the position that he, through long years of dedicated accomplishments, had rightly earned.

To relinquish its powers and prestige, to leave when for 24 hours the leader of the Senate and the entire membership of your committee have entreated you to stay, to step aside when the decision is yours alone—takes rare humility and heroic courage. It is the type of decision that makes a man first seek counsel with his Creator and then make the judgment entirely by himself. Senator GREEN's choice was hard and lonesome. Lesser men would have succumbed to stubbornness, vanity or self-deception.

On January 30 an act of undiluted statesmanship took place in the Nation's Capitol. If any in the huge crowd gathered in the corridor outside the louvered doors of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee room came to see the exit of a tired old man, they stayed to see instead the majestic emergence of a mighty patriot. In the warm smile he displayed for the avid photographers, in the gentle candor of his answer to the leaders of the Nation's press there assembled, in the dignity and selflessness of his person—Senator GREEN stood a tall American! Rhode Islanders can be very proud of their senior

Senator. On Friday, January 30, he touched the fringe of immortality!

GORDON F. HARRISON,
Chief Clerk and Counsel, Senate Committee on Rules and Administration.

WASHINGTON, D. C.

HISTORY OF THE EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF WASHINGTON

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, today marks the 25th anniversary of the founding of the Export-Import Bank of Washington and in recognition of that fact I ask unanimous consent to have published at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, a press release prepared by the Bank reviewing its history.

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

The Export-Import Bank of Washington today completed 25 years of operations in support of United States overseas trade.

While providing direct assistance to U.S. exporters in cooperation with private banks and financial institutions, the Bank became the first public agency, either national or international, to arrange credits for large-scale economic development throughout the world.

The Bank was founded February 12, 1934, with a capitalization of \$11 million. Today it is authorized to have loans and guarantees outstanding at any one time of \$7 billion.

In 25 years the Bank has authorized over \$10 billion in some 1,600 individual credits; disbursed over \$6.6 billion (an additional \$1.6 billion is committed for disbursements); collected \$3.3 billion in repayments; earned gross profit of \$997.6 million; paid \$438 million to the U.S. Treasury as interest and dividends; paid all administrative expenses out of earnings; charged off losses of \$2.9 million; retained net profits of \$536 million as reserves; and encouraged more than \$1 billion in private investment abroad.

The Export-Import Bank made its first credits for economic development abroad in the late 1930's and has continued making these credits, either to private borrowers or to governments, for more than 20 years. Most of the various programs for economic development have followed in general the path pioneered originally by the Export-Import Bank.

In Africa, Asia, Europe, Latin America, and Oceania, the Bank has assisted the development of steel mills; iron, copper, nitrate, manganese, and uranium mining; electric power installations; cement mills; fertilizer plants; chemical plants; innumerable types of industrial plants; large-scale irrigation projects; highways; ports; and public works. The immediate result of these credits has been to provide hundreds of thousands of orders for U.S. industries throughout the country and many millions of hours of employment for American workers. In addition, these projects have resulted in economic growth abroad which has permanently expanded U.S. overseas markets.

Throughout its 25 years the Bank has maintained a flexible lending policy designed to meet changing conditions of world trade incident to a world economic depression, a world war, and a period of reconstruction and development. It has done so within the three basic concepts which Congress has written into its governing statutes: To "aid in financing and to facilitate exports and imports and exchange of commodities" between the United States and other countries; to "supplement and encourage and not compete with private capital"; and to make loans

that shall "in the judgment of the Board of Directors offer reasonable assurance of repayment."

In addition to its loans running into billions for economic development projects, the Bank has made hundreds of small loans to assist sales abroad of individual pieces of equipment, has lent approximately \$1 billion

to finance export sales of U.S. cotton (among other commodities), and has made various types of balance of payments credits to assist other governments in maintaining essential trade relations with the United States.

The Export-Import Bank has actively encouraged new private investment abroad. Since 1952, the earliest year for which com-

plete statistics are available, credits by the Bank have resulted in concurrent loans and participations and equity investment by U.S. private interests in excess of \$880 million without guarantee from Eximbank.

A summary of the Bank's lending operations from February 12, 1934, through February 11, 1959, inclusive, follows:

Export-Import Bank of Washington—Summary of loans Feb. 12, 1934—Feb. 11, 1959, inclusive

	Africa	Asia	Canada	Europe	Latin America	Oceania	Other	Total
Authorized.....	\$235,631,715.41	\$2,016,503,910.63	\$375,738,000.00	\$3,735,772,518.55	\$3,668,469,351.76	\$23,932,775.03	\$13,157,098.73	\$10,069,205,370.11
Taken over by others at their own risk.....	3,742,535.59	127,105,498.07	187,796,590.56	233,850,177.34	35,601,012.25	—	—	354,245,636.47
Canceled.....	8,421,999.25	311,030,503.86	192,556,563.89	2,764,682,432.77	673,039,759.82	4,750,000.00	8,775,000.00	1,432,424,004.16
Disbursed.....	196,172,434.71	1,122,988,296.56	183,181,436.11	1,341,525,230.85	2,366,118,350.44	19,073,253.15	4,382,098.73	6,656,593,302.47
Repaid.....	59,874,679.04	601,478,968.19	183,163,582.11	1,423,157,201.92	1,009,710,795.59	6,575,583.25	4,382,098.73	3,296,710,937.76
Outstanding loans.....	136,297,755.67	431,509,328.37	17,854.00	549,443,317.88	1,356,407,554.85	12,497,669.90	—	3,359,887,364.71
Undisbursed authorizations.....	27,294,745.86	455,379,612.14	—	—	593,710,220.25	109,521.88	—	1,025,937,427.01
Undisbursed authorizations plus outstanding loans.....	163,592,501.53	886,888,940.51	17,854.00	1,972,000,519.80	1,950,117,784.10	12,607,191.78	—	4,985,824,791.72

NOTE.—Amounts are cumulative from establishment of Bank, Feb. 12, 1934. "Other" denotes rest of world and credits which cannot be identified with any particular area.

RECAPITULATION OF LENDING AUTHORITY

Undisbursed authorizations plus outstanding loans.....	\$4,985,824,791.72
Lending authority assigned to insurance program.....	150,000,000.00
Balance uncommitted lending authority of Bank.....	1,964,175,208.28
Total lending authority of Bank.....	7,000,000,000.00
\$2,535,110.	

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, has morning business been concluded?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Moss in the chair). Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is concluded.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

ILLNESS OF SECRETARY OF STATE DULLES

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, before I proceed to the remarks which I intend to make on the German situation, I wish to say that I am deeply distressed by the news of the illness of the Secretary of State.

The duties of the Secretary of State are just about the most exacting and strenuous in the Government, not excluding the Presidency. The intellectual demands of the job are enormous. The physical demands are appalling. For years, Secretary Dulles has borne up under them without complaint. His stamina and durability have been little short of incredible. However, in the Secretary, as in other men, there is a physical limit. His total personal dedication to the service of the Nation has taken its toll of his health. As one doctor put it, the Secretary is worn out. It is a shame, Mr. President, that the Nation has required so much of one man. And it is to the Nation's detriment, moreover, that he has had to push himself beyond the limit.

We can ill afford to lose his services at any time. We can spare them least at this moment. Secretary Dulles is needed as never before to complete the very delicate negotiations on Berlin and

Germany which he had just begun so auspiciously.

Mr. Dulles has capable associates in the Department of State. With all due respect to them, however, the Secretary will be sorely missed in the weeks ahead. The Nation needs his great experience, his balance, his strength, his ability to decide.

I share with the President and the Nation the feeling of distress which the Secretary's illness brings. I know the Senate joins with me in wishing Mr. Dulles a full recovery and a prompt return to his key role in the search for a secure peace.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I endorse everything that has been said by the distinguished Senator from Montana concerning the illness of Secretary of State Dulles and the work which he has been doing. I have often marveled, as I am certain many other persons have, at his stamina. I recall reading in the press recently that during the time Mr. Dulles has been Secretary of State, he has traveled more than 500,000 miles. He has made many long journeys, and often after his return, perhaps within a day or two, he would be off on another long trip.

I first knew Mr. Dulles when he served for a short time in the United States Senate. But I came to know him better when I served with him in the United Nations as a delegate in 1950 and, subsequent to that time, for the ensuing 12 months.

On September 8, 1950, at about 12 o'clock noon, President Truman called Mr. Dulles to the White House. Mr. Dulles at that time was an assistant in the Department of State under the then Secretary of State Acheson. President Truman asked Mr. Dulles on that day if he would be willing to assume the responsibility of formulating the Japanese Peace Treaty, and in getting the two score or more nations which would be

parties to the conference to agree to its general terms.

If an assignment can be imagined which was more difficult and more complex than that of bringing together some 40 nations of the world which were greatly concerned about the terms of the Japanese peace treaty, I cannot conceive of it. But Mr. Dulles undertook to do the job. Mr. Dulles told me later that President Truman asked him at the time how long it would take. Mr. Dulles replied that he thought it would take a year. Mr. Truman then said, "I will give you one year in which to finish the job."

At that time I was the chairman of the Subcommittee on Far Eastern Affairs of the Committee on Foreign Relations. I became a member of the committee in January 1951. Naturally, I had a close relationship with Mr. Dulles in his work during the entire year 1951. I was in conference frequently with him, because this was a Far Eastern question. The subcommittee and our assistants met with Mr. Dulles at all times of the day, sometimes in the morning, sometimes at lunch, sometimes in the afternoons or evenings. I feel quite certain that during the time the treaty was being formulated, the Subcommittee on Far Eastern Affairs, Mr. Dulles, and his associates had probably 100 different meetings. I have often said it was one of the most remarkable jobs I ever saw any man perform. It was not easy to bring together the British, on one hand, and the Nationalist Chinese, on the other. It was not easy to bring together the southeast Asia nations and the central European nations. But gradually Mr. Dulles wove a plan under which all nations were at least willing to attend a conference.

The conference was held in the San Francisco Opera House. It ended on September 8, 1951. Just before we left the Opera House, I said to Mr. Dulles, "This is the anniversary of the day you undertook to do this work. At what time of the day did President Truman assign it to you?" Mr. Dulles replied that it was at 12 o'clock noon. I looked

at my watch, and, making allowance for the difference in time between Washington and California, I said to him, "You have 8 minutes to spare." In other words, the time lacked 8 minutes of being 1 year from the time Mr. Dulles had undertaken to do the work.

Following the conference, former Senator Smith, of New Jersey; Mr. Dulles, acting for Mr. Truman and Secretary of State Acheson; and I visited a number of the Far Eastern countries. We spent several weeks in Japan, working with the different groups there in arriving at understandings, as best we could, and working on the rather difficult problem involving Nationalist China, particularly, and the whole China problem, as well.

It was then that I came to admire Mr. Dulles. I admired his tenacity, his power of intellect, and his skill in negotiating. One of the great services he has performed as Secretary of State has been in the field of negotiating between nations which had differences and problems which were most difficult to solve.

I share the feeling which has been expressed by my good friend, the Senator from Montana, as to the need for Mr. Dulles at present to deal with the particular problem about which the Senator from Montana will speak to us today. I am delighted to know that since Mr. Dulles' physical condition is such that his doctors advise his taking leave and entering a hospital, he has acted on that advice. I hope he will remain away from his work for as much time as will be necessary to result in a complete restoration of his health, which I am confident will take place, because I know something of the physical stamina of the man.

I wish him a speedy recovery and a return to his position as Secretary of State just as soon as he is able to do so. I feel certain that his influence will be felt in the negotiations in the various conferences which will be held in the future. I know that his assistants in the Department of State who have worked with him for so long and so well will be able to carry on. I am sure they will support Mr. Dulles, and that his negotiating ability will be felt in the conferences, and will continue to be helpful even in his absence.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I have been very happy to hear the expressions of good will toward Secretary Dulles which have been spoken today. I wish to join in them.

I have been a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations only 4 years, and have not been so closely associated with the work of Mr. Dulles as has the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], for instance, who has just concluded his very fine statement.

I think few men in public life have given so much of their time during so many years of their lives to the formulation and administration of foreign policy as has Secretary Dulles. I know the Nation is grateful to him for his accomplishments. I know ours is a bipartisan gratefulness, also, as the Senator from Alabama has well expressed.

I do not suppose that all of Mr. Dulles' plans have materialized as he hoped they would. But we must recall that he has been serving as Secretary of State and as adviser to the Secretary of State during one of the most critical periods of history, and many of the most difficult problems the world has faced have come before him for solution. We have seen the solution of some situations which were considered virtually insoluble—for instance, the situation in Trieste. I know all of us are happy to learn that there are prospects of permanent peace and harmony in the Island of Cyprus, where the Turks and the Greeks have come to an agreement.

I believe the whole world owes a considerable debt to Mr. Dulles. I wish to join my colleagues in hoping that Mr. Dulles will have a speedy recovery, following his trip to the hospital, and soon will again be back at work. Even though everything may not have gone as he hoped it would, yet I know of no one who could have achieved a larger percentage of success than he has over these troublesome years.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I thank the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Montana yield to the Senator from Kansas?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. I appreciate very much the opportunity to associate myself with the remarks of the acting majority leader [Mr. MANSFIELD], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], in regard to the Secretary of State, Mr. Dulles.

It seems to me that at this time, which seems to be one of our greatest international crises, our Nation and the other nations of the world can ill afford to spare the services of this most able man.

Secretary Dulles has demonstrated not only his ability, but, it seems to me, a peculiar temperament for working in this field. I think he gets that temperament and that background from being a great Christian layman. His interests are in people. I believe that is what we need during this period in the world's history. I think that one of our problems at the present time is to learn how to live with other people. Our generation has not done so well; as a matter of fact, we have fought about three wars in one generation. Somehow, in some way, our young people, the coming generation, must learn how to live with other people. When we learn to do that, I believe we shall be able to accomplish much in bringing about the peace and the economic conditions that all of us are praying and hoping for.

I wish for the Secretary of State a most speedy recovery. We need him. I know he will receive the best of care that doctors and medical skill can provide. So we look forward to his return to service.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I thank the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, a radio commentary by Jack Jurey on February 10, 1959, the evening of the announcement of the leave of absence for the Secretary of State.

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

This is Jack Jurey with the WTOP comment for tonight.

The newest illness of Secretary of State Dulles should cause us all to join President Eisenhower in extending best wishes to this dedicated official who, however much one may disagree with his policies, has worked so tirelessly on behalf of the United States.

We long ago lost track of the total mileage logged by Mr. Dulles in his peripatetic quest for peace, or the number of stops he has made, or the number of officials to whom he has talked in virtually all quarters of the globe.

But we do know this: that John Foster Dulles since 1953 has expended his energies and health at a reckless rate, at a time of life when most of us would be resigned to settling down with pipe and slippers. Especially since his operation for cancer, he has displayed an uncommon devotion to duty.

This newsman recalls particularly that after his next-to-last illness, a bout with diverticulitis, Mr. Dulles apologized to a news conference for not having seen reporters for a period of several weeks. Such an apology was not only unusual in an administration which sometimes seems to take a lackadaisical attitude toward newsmen, but was expressive of the inner stuff of this unusually gifted man. In many respects he is a far better public servant than some of his critics would have us believe.

Speaking of critics, it seems an appropriate time to mention that many Americans may not comprehend what has happened in the last decade to the office which Mr. Dulles holds.

For well over a century and a half, a Secretary of State was, for the most part a Cabinet official subjected only to comparatively minor strains, for the reason that the United States considered itself (and was, for the most part) a remote island in the vast sea of international troubles. In the occasional period when the Nation was confronted by brutal world realities, it was often the President himself who bore the brunt: Jefferson, Madison, Lincoln, Wilson, Franklin Roosevelt.

The post-World War II years, however, have seen an evolution and elevation of the Secretary of State's duties, to the point where this single man, whether he be George Marshall, Dean Acheson, or Dulles, has day-to-day responsibilities unparalleled in American history.

The reason, of course, is this country's reluctant emergence as a massive world power, with all the trials and tribulations that such a status implies. The world struggle with communism, conducted on multidimensional levels, is enough to strain the strength, patience, and resources of any man, and certainly one who, like Secretary Dulles, must carry with him the burdens of advanced age and the demands of an active Christian conscience.

We are among those who believe that, on occasion, Mr. Dulles has been mistaken. We consider, for example, that in some respects he has failed to demonstrate the resiliency of mind that new circumstances demand, although this criticism does not, for a moment, deny the intellectual qualifications that he brings to his task.

We who criticize, of course, could be wrong: only history will tell. But the fact that we demur on occasion does not diminish

our respect for the man himself, one who carries a very heavy load indeed.

Nor does criticism obscure the undeniable fact that in this moment of history, with the Reds pounding on the door of West Berlin, Secretary Dulles is very nearly an indispensable man to his country. It would be a matter of great concern should he not regain his health and not be able to resume his duties at the State Department.

For both personal and national reasons we express the hope that Secretary Dulles will have a quick recuperation and will be able soon again to shoulder the full weight of his office.

And that's tonight's WTOP comment. This is Jack Jurey.

THE COMING CRISIS IN GERMANY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, let me preface my remarks with this assurance to the Senate: I am not an alarmist. I measure most carefully the words I am about to speak. In that context, I express to the Senate my belief that just ahead lies the most critical period which the United States will have had to face since the conflict in Korea.

The crisis, Mr. President, is coming in Germany. Specifically, it is coming in Berlin. Indeed, it may have already begun. For years now, the seeds of that crisis have lain dormant in a divided Germany. They have been held in check only by a kind of mutual acquiescence. The Western Powers have not wished to disturb the seeming stability in Germany. Since the Berlin blockade, the Soviet Union has not seriously threatened it. A few years ago, uprisings of East Germans shook the stability, but did not break it.

Those who have thought at all about the German situation have known for a long time that the surface calm would not last. The existence of two German authorities in what is one Germany has been, from the end of World War II, a makeshift arrangement. The Western Powers have recognized it. The Soviet Union has acknowledged it. The German leaders know it.

The key question has never been, Will Germany be unified? The question has long been, When and how will Germany be unified? Those of us who have urged an initiative in American policy with respect to Germany have been aware of this distinction. When I addressed myself to this subject in the Senate in May 1958, I had the distinction very much in mind. Because I did, I tried to deal in the specifics of an American initiative. In suggesting, last May, alternatives to present policy, my thought was that when the status quo gave way, as surely it must, the changes ought at least to hold promise of leading to the strengthening of freedom in a peaceful Germany.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President will the Senator from Montana yield to me?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I am delighted to yield to my distinguished friend from Idaho.

Mr. CHURCH. I wish to apologize for interrupting so soon the remarks of the Senator from Montana, because I believe that the address he is delivering will be a most significant one. But I wish to say that, characteristically, in his opening remarks the Senator from

Montana has pierced to the nub of the issue. Conditions in Germany are going to change. Germany will not indefinitely remain divided against itself. Germany will not indefinitely continue to be garrisoned by foreign troops.

It seems to me that those who say our foreign policy must be inflexible overlook the fact that ours is not a static world.

Therefore, Mr. President, I think the Senator from Montana rendered us a service when, a year ago, he emphasized the fact that conditions in Germany would be changing, and that we must be prepared to face up to those changes if we are to cope effectively with them. Flexibility in our foreign policy is a must. A steel blade bends. Pig iron breaks.

I wish to thank the Senator from Montana for coming forward at this stage in the developing Berlin crisis with a speech which will be helpful in giving guidance to all of us, to the President, and to the Secretary of State, in our common effort to solve that crisis for the benefit of the free world.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I thank my friend from Idaho.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, at this point will the Senator from Montana yield briefly to me?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I am delighted to yield.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, we have just returned to this Chamber from a most impressive joint session with the other body, in connection with the celebration of the 150th anniversary of the birth of Abraham Lincoln. At the joint session, during a brilliant address by the great writer and poet, Carl Sandburg, he had occasion to quote a sentence from Abraham Lincoln, which I believe is pertinent today in connection with the splendid address which my friend, the Senator from Montana, is making on the German question. Lincoln said:

The dogmas of the quiet past are inadequate for the stormy present.

I wish to congratulate my friend, the Senator from Montana, for the fine address he is making on the German problem.

However, I would not be true to myself if I did not register a slight dissent from some of the comments which have been made with respect to the Secretary of State.

It is unpleasant and unrewarding to say unkind things about a man who is in physical pain, who has shown great physical courage, who is unquestionably a patriot, who is a man of great dedication to the public interest; but I would feel untrue to myself if I did not register on the floor of the Senate a dissent to the statement that he is indispensable to the conduct of our foreign policy in the immediate future. I call attention to what I have said on other occasions with respect to this matter.

I hope that these comments will be taken in good part, and that it will be understood that I make them only because I cannot remain silent when it might be indicated that I was in accord with what has been said.

I thank the Senator for yielding.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I appreciate what the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania has just said. I commend him for his honesty and his integrity. Of course, I recognize that it is not a new viewpoint on his part, but that he has been consistent in his views in this respect for some time. I would point out, however, that the immediate danger, as I see it, is the Berlin and the German situation. No one knows more about those situations at the present time or is better prepared to lead the allies in meeting them than is the Secretary of State. On that basis, as well as on other bases, I wish him well. I wish him a speedy recovery. I anticipate that in the not too distant future he will resume his duties, and will act, not as his own agent, but as the agent of the President of the United States, in conducting foreign policy.

Mr. CLARK. Obviously, I do not wish to engage in a colloquy of extended duration with my colleague at this time. I should like to be recorded as very much hoping and praying for Mr. Dulles' immediate recovery; but I cannot agree that there are not in the State Department others as well or better qualified than the Secretary to carry on the German negotiations. I appreciate that this is a situation on which the distinguished Senator from Montana and I disagree. I shall desist from further comment on this particular phase.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I shall desist, also. Mr. President, I repeat, in suggesting, last May, alternatives to present policy, my thought was that when the status quo gave way, as surely it must, the changes ought at least to hold promise of leading to the strengthening of freedom in a peaceful Germany.

We did nothing, Mr. President. We took no initiative. We went on in the familiar vacuousness, in the familiar patterns of policy patterns devised years ago, in another setting, under another administration. We did not face the fact that that policy was adequate to maintain a semblance of stability in Germany only so long as all directly concerned acquiesced in the continued division of that nation.

That is water under the bridge. We did not choose to act in a positive fashion to change the status quo. Now, the Russians have chosen to break it. They have chosen to make the break at Berlin. They have said, in effect, that, after the spring of 1959, the situation will no longer be as it has been in that city. They are quite right, Mr. President. Things will no longer be the same in Berlin or anywhere in Germany. If there is any certainty, it is that the situation in Germany at the close of 1959 will be far different from the present situation. We are approaching the beginning of the end, the beginning of the end of two Berlins and of two Germanys.

The question, as I have already observed, was never, Would Germany be unified? It was, When and how would Germany be unified? We may now have begun to comprehend the when; the actual process of unification is likely to begin this year. Only one question remains: How is Germany to be unified?

Will it be by conflict, by negotiation, or by some mixture of the two? That is the question which is impelling us and the rest of the world toward the coming crisis in Germany.

CONSTITUTIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES IN THE
GERMAN CRISIS

The responsibility for establishing binding foreign policies to deal with the impending crisis, the coming change in Germany, rests with the President and his Secretary of State. Let there be no doubt on that score, in this body, at home, in the executive branch, or abroad. It is not for the Senate to direct the President in this matter. The President will have to make his own decisions, with the assistance of the vast resources of the executive branch. When he speaks officially on Germany, however, he will be speaking for all of us, whether or not we agree with what he says. There is no other way under the constitutional system of the United States.

To say that is not to constrain upon the Senate a silence in these matters. On the contrary, since we shall be bound, since the people of the United States shall be bound, by what the President and his Secretary of State do or fail to do in the coming crisis, the obligation of the Senate to debate, to discuss, and to advise is real and it is compelling.

The Senate of the 86th Congress was not constituted so that it might ignore pressing domestic questions. How much less then, can we remain silent on the life-and-death matters of foreign policy? The President and the Secretary of State have given no indication that they would have this body turn its back on the crisis in Germany. On the contrary, I note that the Secretary of State has already sought the counsel of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations [Mr. FULBRIGHT]. I commend the Secretary for his initiative. The brilliant chairman of the committee has much to contribute to the development of policy for the situation in Germany.

If the Senate is to meet its responsibilities, Mr. President, we must form, through debate and discussion, an understanding of the situation as it is, and as it is evolving in Germany. We must also discern clearly the stakes of the people of the United States and of freedom in that situation. We must advance, finally, ideas for consideration in formulating the foreign policies which are to safeguard the vital interests of our people.

These are the thoughts which have led me to these remarks on the coming crisis in Germany. I make them in the spirit of responsible Democratic cooperation with a Republican administration in a matter of vital concern to all the people of the United States.

TWO GERMAN AUTHORITIES IN ONE GERMANY

Let me begin by exploring the significant realities in Germany, as I see them. The basic reality, Mr. President, is that there are two political authorities in one Germany. That is a contradiction which cannot and will not stand. There is one Germany. And there are compelling historic and practical reasons which require that the unity of that nation begin to emerge without delay if

there is to be peace in Europe and in the world.

I stress the point, Mr. President, that when we speak of the two Germanies we are really speaking not of two nations but of two political authorities. Each of these authorities presumes that it is the wave of the future in all Germany. Each seeks to draw the whole of the German people into its orbit.

To be sure, there are profound differences between the West German government in Bonn and the East German Communist regime in Pankow. The Bonn government is based upon principles and practices of democracy which are consonant with those of other Western nations and are expressly supported by the inhabitants of West Germany. The Pankow regime exists by the methods of authoritarianism which come from the East. Its source of authority lies in the will to power of those who wield the authority and the acquiescence—however sullen—of the repressed people of East Germany. Its survival depends, to a far greater degree than anything we know in the Western democracies, on military and police power—its own and the Soviet Union's.

The West German democratic government exists. It is there, at Bonn, and the Communists are not going to wish it away or subvert it away. It is going to stay as long as the people in that zone sustain it and as long as the Western nations remain committed to its protection against military aggression from the East. We cannot ignore the fact, however, that the East German regime also exists. It is there at Pankow, and German communists run it, even though Russians may pull the strings from behind the curtain. Unfortunately, I see no evidence that the Western nations are going to wish away or subvert away that East German political authority in the practicable future.

If neither side can be wished away, or subverted away, how then is the division of Germany going to be made to disappear? How is a unified Germany, this essential Germany, this inevitable Germany, going to emerge? There was a time, perhaps, when it might have been reasonable to hope that the Russians and German Communists would soon find it too costly to maintain their control in East Germany. For years we have waited for this promised development. We have waited for the Russians and their campfollowers to fold their tents and steal away.

What we must ask ourselves now is whether there is any realistic basis for hoping that this development will come about in the practicable future? I regret to say that such public indications as there are suggest that the Pankow regime, with Soviet support, is consolidating its position, that its authoritarian hold on East Germany is, if anything, more secure today than it was a few years ago.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. With respect to the last thought expressed, the Senator from Montana has stated that the authoritarian hold on East Germany is now

greater than it was before. Will the Senator deal a little more in detail with that, and state whether the hold is the result of the power of the Communists, or whether it is the will of the people that they be held by the Communists?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I should be delighted to try to answer my distinguished friend from Ohio. I can say, of course, without equivocation that the present status is not the desire or the will of the people. The source of my statement is the U.S. News & World Report, the issue of February 13, 1959.

I read from page 67, at the bottom:

East Germany's Communist government has just published official figures on its planned expenditures for 1959.

Before I read further I wish to say that all the information I have in my presentation has appeared in the public print. There is nothing secret or official about what I am saying, and it simply represents one Senator's opinion as to what I think is the most difficult and dangerous question of today.

I continue with the quotation from the U.S. News & World Report:

West German financial experts, looking into the Reds' figures, in the budget and out of it, made a startling discovery.

Military spending by the East German Reds in 1959 is to be 30 percent higher than military spending planned by West Germany. Yet the Reds say that West Germany is threatening the peace of the world.

That is what I mean when I say that the Pankow regime is more secure, not in a political sense but in a military sense. They have been strengthening themselves on a military and paramilitary basis. Of course, the 22 to 23 Soviet divisions are still in East Germany.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I agree with the Senator. My inclination would be to believe that the people of East Germany, if they had the opportunity, would unshackle themselves of the hold which the Soviet has upon them.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator is absolutely correct. I have been told that the figure would run as high as 95 to 96 percent of the East Germans who, if they had the opportunity to vote, would vote against the present Ulbricht regime.

Mr. LAUSCHE. But the fact is that the Soviets and those of East Berlin who agree with the Soviets are applying constantly heavier pressure in the development of the military?

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator is correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I thank the Senator very much.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, it is all very well to hope, as a general principle, for the disappearance of totalitarianism. We have held that principle for decades, but we have also had to live in a world which has contained since its beginning and still contains many totalitarian regimes.

No, Mr. President, a valid policy on Germany, now, must be built on more than the hope of the eventual disappearance of German totalitarianism. It can only be built on the premise that Germany, in one way or another, is going to unify and it is going to begin to unify soon. Further, it can only be built on

the premise that that unity in Germany, if it is to come in peace, is likely to fall short of the ultimate goals set for it by both the Communist nations and the free nations—the goal, on the one hand, of a Communist totalitarian Germany, and the goal, on the other, of a fully representative democracy in all Germany.

Until a few months ago there might have been a possibility of evading that reality for a while longer by assuming that the status quo of division in Germany might go on indefinitely. But the prospect of evasion is now narrowing rapidly in the wake of Mr. Khrushchev's announcement of the coming Soviet withdrawal from Berlin. The blunt fact is that soon either negotiations leading to German unification in peace shall begin in earnest or there shall begin in earnest the use of force to that end.

BERLIN—THE CORE OF THE COMING CRISIS

This brings me to a second matter which we must explore, Mr. President, if we are to see our way clearly in the impending crisis. That is the question of Berlin. It is at Berlin, divided Berlin, and along the western routes of access to the city, that the first indications of the conflict leading to war or the success of negotiations leading to stable peace are likely to appear in the coming months.

I shall not take the time of the Senate to review the historic circumstances surrounding the present difficulties of the Western position in Berlin. It is simple enough to find fault with what was done or not done by political and military leaders years ago. It is as easy, as it is pompous, to pass angry judgments on others, with the prop of hindsight. That process will serve no useful purpose in this situation.

Nor shall I take the time of the Senate to review the legal status of our position in Berlin. Some may find solace for our difficulties in legalism. Even the Russians sought justification for their actions in it. But legalism is at best a dubious way to deal with an explosive situation, when there are, as there are in this situation, two opposing judges, two opposing judgments, and two opposing instruments of mass destruction for enforcing the judgments.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I wish the Senator from Montana would discuss in a little greater detail the element of legalism being introduced. I have my own understanding of it. I think we are advocating the proposition that there are certain legal obligations rooted in agreements which we have made in the past, and that in making our demands we insist upon adherence to those obligations. Does the Senator mind discussing that question?

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator from Ohio is correct. References have been made to the agreements made at Potsdam relative to the occupation of Berlin.

References have been made to the agreement entered into by Gen. Lucius Clay, at that time commander of our forces in Germany, with the Soviet authorities, by means of which we were

guaranteed by the Soviet authorities access by rail, by road, and by air, from the western zones in Germany into the western sectors of Berlin.

Then, as I recall—and I believe the Senator will corroborate me on this—some sort of agreement was made by Mr. Phillip Jessup and a Russian representative whose name I cannot recall at the moment, which agreement Mayor Willy Brandt brought to our attention at the luncheon held in the Foreign Relations Committee room the other day. If I remember correctly, he stated that out of these Jessup-Russian consultations and agreements, which brought an end to the need for the allied airlift into Berlin, also came an agreement that we be allowed continued access. He suggested that we look into the agreement to which he referred as the agreement of 1949. Unfortunately I have not had an opportunity to do so yet.

But there are these agreements, or alleged agreements, which give us the right to go in and to maintain access between the western zones and the west sector of Berlin.

The Russians predicate their claims on similar agreements, which they say were made at Potsdam and elsewhere.

Mr. LAUSCHE. It is the position of the Senator from Montana, then, that the problem is more involved and far graver in its possible consequences to world peace than mere adherence to those agreements would justify. We must go beyond that.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator is absolutely correct, because in my opinion the potentials involved in this situation are terrible and tremendous.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MANSFIELD. It does not much matter now how we got to Berlin, or why the Russians have no legal right to ask us to leave. What does matter, Mr. President, is why we need to stay in Berlin, as stay there we must. We are, bluntly, in a highly difficult and dangerous position in Berlin. Great sacrifices may be entailed in remaining. We had better understand clearly now the significance of maintaining our position there. We had better understand now what is vital and what is not vital in that position to the people of the United States and to freedom.

The administration has responded to the Russian proposals on Berlin by reiterating a long-standing view of the Nation. It has said, as the Democratic administration before it said, that we will not be driven from the city. The position of this Government, to stand firm in Berlin, has been endorsed by the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. It is supported by Democrats and Republicans alike in the Senate.

It is a sound position. Only it is not enough. It is not enough to say, Mr. President, that we are standing fast in Berlin. That is a slogan, not a policy. Nor is it enough, Mr. President, to stand fast merely to demonstrate our determination to maintain our legal interpretation of the situation as against the Soviet Union's.

Nor is it enough to say that we stand fast in Berlin so that we may continue

to demonstrate in the heart of Communist Germany the material superiority of freedom or free enterprise over Communist collectivism. To be sure, there is a striking contrast between West Berlin and East Berlin, but I doubt very much that the people of the United States will countenance the sacrifice of a single human life for the purposes of propagandistic demonstrations in Berlin. And before this year is out many lives may have been spent in Berlin.

No, Mr. President, it is not for reasons of legalism or propaganda that we stand fast in Berlin. The Western nations are in Berlin because Berlin belongs neither to East Germany nor West Germany; it belongs to all the German people. We are in Berlin because some Germans may now look to Bonn and others to Pankow for leadership, but all Germans will soon look to Berlin. We are in Berlin to see to it that when that city is once again the capital of all Germany, as it surely will be, the concept of freedom in peace will not be absent from the scene. If that concept were to disappear from Berlin, the citadel of German nationalism, sooner or later it would disappear from all Germany. Then, sooner or later, the torch would be lit in Germany, whether by German hands or some others, to set Europe and the world aflame once again. That torch was lit twice in Berlin in the past, and twice the world has paid an enormous human price. To see that it is not lit again is in the essential, the vital interest of this generation and future generations of the people of the United States.

That, Mr. President, is the reason which beyond all others, justifies the taking of the great risks which we may soon be called upon to take at Berlin and along the western routes to the city. We are in Berlin in order to get out, but to get out only on condition that the German political forces which stand for freedom in peace have a sure footing and equal chance to survive and to grow on their merits in the future capital of all Germany.

I support fully the position of this administration on the necessity of standing fast in Berlin. I question, however, the adequacy with which we have related that position to the changing situation in Germany. I question a policy which provides that not only do we stand fast in Berlin, but also implores or demands that the Russians stand fast. After years of trying to get the Russians out of the innumerable places into which they sprawled after World War II, it is indeed strange to hear that we are insisting that the Russians must not, indeed, cannot, leave Berlin. That is a most peculiar position to say the least; and the Russians obviously have no intention of obliging us by remaining.

It is clear what is afoot there. In a few months hence, the Russians will leave East Berlin despite our demands or urgings to the contrary. East Berlin will then be, once again, a German city—Communist, to be sure—but nevertheless German. By contrast, West Berlin will retain the appearance it now has, the appearance of a Western enclave in the heart of Germany, for there are thousands of Allied officials and military per-

sonnel in the area. The contrast will not be lost on German nationalists in East or West Germany.

Further, Mr. President, if we are to hold this enclave without struggle, it will be at the sufferance of the East German Communist authorities. If they do not choose to accommodate us, then we shall in all probability have to fight our way through to Berlin, not against Russians, but against Germans. Even if this course does not lead to a great conflict, the repercussions in Germany will be profound. Among Germans, as among others, blood may prove thicker than ideologies.

As I said, there can be no quarrel with the need to stand fast in Berlin. I do question, however, a policy which does not anticipate the developments which I have just outlined and fails to take steps to mitigate them.

I question, too, a policy which presumes as our policy does that the Great Powers of World War II—the Soviet Union, the United Kingdom, France, and the United States—can bring about German unification. There may have been a time when such a course was possible. If it ever existed, however, it was years ago when Germany lay devastated and prostrate. It was years ago, in the freshness of the common sacrifices of World War II and in the measure of mutual respect and tolerance which these sacrifices engendered.

Those years are gone. The time is not today. Today, there is little respect between this Nation and the Soviet Union except the fearful respect which the military power of the one may generate in the other. Today, Germany is neither devastated nor prostrate; it has become once again the most dynamic nation in Western Europe.

No, Mr. President, the erstwhile Allies, the divided Allies of World War II, are not in a position to ordain a unification in peace for a revitalized Germany. At most, they may be able to contribute to that unification by rethinking their own security needs in anticipation of its inevitable development. At most, they may be able to contribute to unification by exercising such influence as they may possess to encourage the Germans themselves to reach a reasonable procedure on unification and by sanctioning that procedure if it is sound. It is the Germans, themselves, however, who will make the decisive decisions on unification, if they are to be made in peace.

FREE ALL-GERMAN ELECTIONS

Further, Mr. President, I question, in present circumstances, a policy which presumes to lead to the peaceful unification of Germany solely on the basis of free, all-German elections. I say now what I said last May on this point, only with more emphasis. Events have moved a long way since this policy was devised and the bell no longer has an altogether recognizable sound when it is rung over and over again in the same fashion. A German political authority has emerged in the West. Another political structure has appeared in the East which is manned by Germans, even if it is not directed by them. Whatever we may think of this structure, there is no re-

liable indication that it is going to go away peacefully, of its own accord.

There are now military and paramilitary German forces in both East and West Germany. How are these forces to be integrated in peace? Is this a problem that can be solved by free, all-German elections, at least without extensive preparations by the Germans who officer these opposing forces?

There are differing economic and social structures functioning in Western and Eastern Germany. How are these structures to be fused in peace? Can they be harmonized by free, all-German elections, at least without extensive preparations by those Germans who operate them?

I cite these problems as examples. There are no doubt others of a similar nature. A policy which advances no thought on how they are to be met does not begin to meet the realities of the German situation. If the unification of Germany is essential and inevitable and if it is neither our responsibility nor in the interest of this Nation to seek that unity by force, then I submit that a policy which merely clings to an unrealizable slogan of free all-German elections, which does not pursue German unification by other means, is no policy at all. It is a straitjacket. It is an excuse for immobility. It may well lead down the blind alley of an unnecessary conflict or disastrous diplomatic retreat.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I take it, from what the Senator has stated, that the efforts to procure an overall election of citizens of East and West Germany have thus far proved to be futile.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator is correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The East Germans will not consent to have an election under which their people can give expression to the type of government they want. Based upon the fact that that objective is an unrealizable objective, an overall free election, the Senator from Montana suggests that other means should be explored to procure a solution of the problem. I wish the Senator would comment on that point.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I believe that the position of the Western Powers on the question of all-German elections is one which stands no possibility in the immediate future, and perhaps in the indefinite future, of achieving any degree of success. Therefore we should try to work out other means.

As I shall indicate in the course of my speech, there are contacts in existence between the East German Government and the West German Government. These contacts are made on an interzonal basis, and are tied up with commercial intercourse and trade commitments. I would hope that in considering the idea of elections, we might be able to explore, perhaps, ideas other than all-German elections, even though they are the most desirable, and I should like to see them come to pass, and we might try to break it down—and the sooner the better—so that the East Germans could express themselves at the

polls, perhaps just in East Germany, and declare to the world where they want to go. In that way they might get out from under the yoke of the Ulbricht government, which is exercising despotic and complete control over 17 million Germans in East Germany.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The Senator from Montana clarifies my mind on the subject. In other words, all of us want a free election under which the people themselves would decide the type of government they desire to have.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Absolutely.

Mr. LAUSCHE. However, every effort in that direction has been rebuffed, and it is therefore necessary to find other means of trying to reach an agreement.

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is the idea. The Senator is correct. Every effort to achieve an all-German election has failed because of the insistent and dogmatic "nyet" of the Soviet Union.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Do I understand correctly the position of the Senator from Montana to be that, while he adheres to what we have advocated so long, that is, free elections for all of Germany, and the idea of a unified Germany, he recognizes the very practical difficulty of having that under present conditions? Therefore he says that perhaps we ought to make ourselves more flexible and start exploring some other way, and that there might be held a separate election in East Germany and a separate election in West Germany, and thus perhaps there could be agreement upon some kind of independent government in each of the two areas, with the idea that eventually, as he says, because blood is thicker than water, with teamwork the two temporary Germanys will combine themselves into one overall united Germany some time in the future, even though we know not how far in the future.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The purpose of my speech today is to suggest, respectfully and constructively, some possible alternative which may be of value to the Department of State, or out of which may come ideas which would be worthwhile toward the bringing about of a solution to this most difficult problem.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I should like to propound a question to the Senator from Montana. He spoke about the rigidity of our position in the past. Undoubtedly it has been rather rigid, so rigid that perhaps our country, as well as a great part of the world, was rather shocked recently when Secretary Dulles suggested there might be more flexibility than we have given to the idea, and when he suggested there might be methods other than free elections for the solution of the problem. Is it not true, and would not the Senator agree with me in this, that perhaps we have oversimplified the matter in assuming that a reunification could be easily brought about between the two Germanys?

I may say that about 3 years ago I had the pleasure of attending an international conference at Garmisch in Germany. The conference was made up of

people from all the NATO countries, representatives of governments, officials, business people, economists, members of Parliament, and so on, and one of the German Ministers with whom I had quite a long talk made the point to me, the first time I had ever heard it mentioned, that reunification is not a simple matter. As has been pointed out by the Senator from Montana, it might have been a relatively simple matter several years ago, right after the war. But since that time the two Germanys have grown away from the conditions which the Senator has so well described in his speech. They have grown away from some of the incentives which might have pushed them together.

Furthermore, different enactments have taken place. For instance, the Minister of the Bonn government said to me, "This may sound strange, coming from me, but East Germany has a social security system which in many respects is better than ours."

Mr. MANSFIELD. It also antedates our own.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes. Although I was speaking of the social security of West Germany, it is also true that theirs antedates ours, too.

East Germany has a system which is in many respects better than that in West Germany, so the East Germans could not be asked to give up their system of social security, workmen's compensation, and land reform.

The Senator from Montana, I believe, heard me ask the mayor of West Berlin the other day that very question, and he heard the mayor's comments, to the effect that to bring the two Germanys together, whenever it may be done, will necessitate the resolving of differences and the making of allowances between the two governments. As I understand, that is exactly what the Senator is talking about. He is speaking of the necessity on the part of those concerned to be ready to consider and to negotiate with reference to all the changes which have taken place throughout the years.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator is correct.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I commend the Senator from Montana for making this very able speech and calling to our attention a matter which is not only of tremendous importance but also of great timeliness. After all, the ultimatum will expire on May 28, which is not far off. It has been suggested since the ultimatum was made that perhaps there will not be absolute adherence to that exact date. Nevertheless, we are approaching the day when Russia will leave Berlin.

I think the Senator is correct in saying that Russia will leave, and that the United States will be placed in a rather ridiculous position if we try to keep Russia there, when, as a matter of fact, we have been saying to the world for many years that she should get out of the different countries which she occupies.

Mr. MANSFIELD. As a matter of fact, the Soviet Union has already withdrawn some of its troops and a considerable number of the dependents of those troops. So it does not appear that Russia was fooling when it delivered its ulti-

matum. I hope that the United States will do, as I feel certain we are doing, everything possible to develop alternatives and to consider ways and means to meet the situation, if and when it arises, when the deadline occurs, as the Senator from Alabama has pointed out, on May 27.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I think the Senator from Montana is exactly correct. Certainly we should be exploring all the alternatives. I think the Senator will agree with me that we ought not simply, easily, and quickly reject any proposal which is made, but that we should be willing to let the world know that we are willing to sit down and negotiate concerning every proposal which may come from either side.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes. I hope both the Soviet Union and the United States will get away from the automatic reactions of the proposals which one country makes to the other. Usually the answer is an automatic "No." Once in a while a "maybe" or a "perhaps" and occasionally a "yes" would be useful. I think in that way we might begin, at least on the marginal level, to do away with some of the differences. If we can do that, perhaps we can work our way upward to an eventual solution of the bigger problems.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The other day, in the talk with the mayor of West Berlin, I was greatly encouraged by his reasonableness in wanting to explore every avenue which might lead us out of darkness into the light and to an assured peace for those people. May I ask the Senator from Montana if he has given any consideration to the ability of the Soviet Union, after it has once withdrawn its troops, to jump in again because of its closeness to this area of East Berlin?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I have, indeed. If the Senator will bear with me, I shall discuss that subject briefly when I come to the ninth point in my recommendation.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I thank the Senator from Montana.

MILITARY WITHDRAWAL IN GERMANY AND CENTRAL EUROPE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Finally, Mr. President, I question a policy which appears to regard as sacrosanct present military arrangements in Germany and central Europe. I can understand, I can accept, I can support the concept that Western Germany's ties with Western Europe are essential to the peace of Europe and they must not be broken. Within that concept, however, I cannot comprehend a view which seems to hold inflexibly to the present form and extent of German rearmament. We have accepted and even encouraged rises in the German military contribution to NATO in certain circumstances in the past. I do not see that we cannot accept and encourage declines in that contribution in other circumstances in the future.

Security needs are ever-changing needs. Western German rearmament is not an end in itself. It is for the pur-

pose of the defense of German freedom in common with the defense of the freedom of the Western community. It is not for the purpose of keeping rigid the tables of organization and the projections of presumed needs by the military command of NATO. These projections, in any event, have not been met for years and the world has not yet come to an end.

The nature and extent of German rearmament and of non-German armaments on German soil, in short, is one area of the problem of unification in which reasonable proposals for negotiation, wherever they may originate, ought not to be rejected out of hand. That is especially the case if these proposals are related to the reduction of military power throughout central Europe. I know full well that the Russians may have no intention of withdrawing from the Eastern European States in any circumstances. Nevertheless, I can see no reason to make it easier for them to justify their remaining by a seeming intransigence on our part. I cannot see that the road to the eventual freedom of states like Poland and Czechoslovakia is made easier by such a process.

RUSSIAN ROLE IN THE COMING CRISIS

Mr. President, let me turn now to the question of Russian intentions in the coming crisis in Germany. In this matter there is only one certain course. Whatever they may do, we must assume that the Russians are acting to enhance the position of the Soviet Union and that of totalitarian communism throughout Germany and Europe. We must also assume that they will use whatever methods they believe will lead to these ends, not excluding aggressive war. The Russians may blow hot or they may blow cold. They may down a plane on their border one day. They may release a blocked convoy the next. We cannot know with certainty why they act as they act at any given moment.

We cannot know with certainty the purport of Mr. Mikoyan's recent visit to the United States. We cannot know with certainty the meaning of Mr. Khrushchev's comments on a thaw in the cold war. They may be meant to provide a setting for successful negotiations. They may be meant simply to confuse or beguile.

If they do confuse, if they do beguile, however, we shall have no one to blame but ourselves. We ought to be able by this time, years after the ill-fated Geneva Conference of 1955, to distinguish between the conciliatory gesture and the act of conciliation. Those of us who come from the cold country have learned through bitter experience that winter thaws can be followed by summer frosts. The promise of spring in February is not the same as the coming of spring in May.

There is, as I say, no way of knowing with certainty what some particular Soviet gesture or other signifies. What we can know, Mr. President, is that they are all, good or bad, peripheral to the crisis which is coming in Germany. Mr. Mikoyan's visit is not going to free us from that crisis. Mr. Khrushchev's thaws will

not do it. Increased Soviet-American trade has little relation to it.

If we are to be prepared to face this crisis in Germany it will be best not to become distracted or obsessed by the twists and turns of Soviet behavior. It will be best to keep our eyes on Germany. The fundamental question of policy for us is not so much what the Russians are looking for in Germany. We know what they are looking for; and they may very well seize it while we amuse or fascinate ourselves by trying to interpret the charades of Russian behavior.

No, Mr. President; more important, far more important, to us is to know what we ourselves are seeking in Germany. We must bring to this crisis not only courage, but also conviction. We must bring to it a positive and understandable policy which meets our essential national needs and the essential needs of freedom.

THE ESSENTIALS OF A WESTERN POLICY IN THE
COMING CRISIS

As I noted earlier in my remarks, it is not for the Senate to direct the President and the Secretary of State in the conduct of the foreign relations of the United States. But it is a responsibility of Senators to try to contribute constructively—and I wish to repeat the word “constructively”—to the policies which govern those relations. It is in that sense, Mr. President, that I seek, in these final comments, to express the thoughts which this exploration suggests—thoughts on the essentials of a sound Western policy for the coming crisis in Germany. I have no crystal ball. I have no secret information. I have not been coached by anyone, nor have I been asked by anyone to deliver this speech. What I suggest may not be valid in the light of the greater understanding of others. It is one Senator's views, based upon what he has read, what he has heard, what he has tried to reason. It is, in short, the course which suggests itself to me on the basis of the understanding which I have been able to draw out of the confusion and complexity of the German situation. I can be—and may well be—wrong; and I stand ready to accept a better illumination of the problem through discussion and debate in the Senate. For whatever they may be worth, however, I outline the following points as essentials of a sound Western policy on Germany.

First. It is essential, Mr. President, that forces representing the concept of freedom in peace not be driven out of Berlin. They need, at the least, to remain on a basis of equality with the forces of totalitarian communism in the future capital of Germany. If those forces are to have a chance to remain in peace, a Western initiative for peace is essential.

Second. It is time to call upon German leaders of the two Berlin communities—East and West—to begin serious efforts to unify the municipal government and public services of that city.

Third. To that end, Mr. President, it would be helpful to enlist the conciliatory services of the Secretary-General of the United Nations. If agreement can be reached by East Germany and West Germany to establish an all-Berlin

government, then it will be desirable to replace both Soviet and Allied forces with a United Nations interim police force composed of contingents from nations not directly involved. That force might supervise the agreement, and might see to it that all the routes of access to the city remain open until Berlin once again becomes the capital of a peaceful, unified Germany. It may be that in the Berlin microcosm there may evolve patterns of unification which will be applicable to the larger problem of all-German unification.

Fourth. If this approach or some such approach to a unified, neutralized Berlin fails, Mr. President, then it is essential that the forces representing the concept of freedom in peace in Berlin remain in Berlin, regardless of whether the Russians leave. Let them go, if they will. I would not wish to see this country a party to any insistence that they stay.

Fifth. At the same time, however, the forces representing freedom in Berlin must be Germanized as rapidly as possible. It is time to think seriously of replacing the thousands of allied military personnel in Berlin with German militia, fully supported by NATO guarantees.

Sixth. Some may regard discussions between Germans of the West and Germans of the East as tantamount to recognition of the East German Communist regime. Some who regard as appeasement not only talk, but even thought, which apparently is alien to them, on the serious problems of the Nation, may even go so far as to label with this stamp of political chicanery any proposals of meetings between East and West Germans. Let them do it, Mr. President; it is their privilege.

But let me say this: If talk constitutes recognition or appeasement, then we have appeased and recognized Communist China, because a representative of this Government has been talking on its behalf, on and off, for years, with a Chinese Communist representative in Geneva and Warsaw. If talk constitutes recognition or appeasement, then the West Germans have recognized and appeased Pankow for years. The fact is that East Germans and West Germans have worked out practical agreements of various kinds between the two zones of Germany. As early as 1957, West Germany's exports to East Germany for the year totaled \$201 million. During the first half of 1958, \$125 million in trade moved in each direction. That kind of trade, Mr. President, does not take place without talk.

I do not know what the theory of international law may be. I do not know whether talk is tantamount to recognition. I do know that, as a practical matter, we have talked with, but have not recognized, Communist China. West Germans have talked with and traded with, but have not recognized, Pankow. What is involved in the coming crisis in Germany is not a classroom problem on the theory of international law. It is the life or death problem of peace or war. The stake is the lives of tens of millions of human beings, Americans included.

I cannot see that there is going to be any peaceful solution of this problem without a great deal of talk—between Germans who are in authority in the Federal Republic and Germans who purport to be in authority in the Eastern zone. It seems to me essential, moreover, that this talk cover the whole range of problems of unification of the two zones, the whole range of problems involving the harmonizing of the political, economic, and military systems of the two zones.

Seventh. There is a point beyond which the search for peace can lead to the jeopardizing of freedom. Regardless of whatever agreements emerge, it seems to me essential that the people of East Germany have some genuine choice in the form of control which is exercised over them. There must be provision for the protection of the rights of all peaceful political forces in all Germany. All-German elections may not be essential—although I think them highly desirable—but at least there must be a chance for men and women of Eastern Germany, as well as those of Western Germany, to express themselves and their political preferences and to participate in political affairs without the threat of terror.

Whatever may be the details of the fusion of the two zones, they are best left to the Germans of the two zones. The Germans are likely to know better than anyone else what will suit them and what is possible among them. Furthermore, it is inconceivable that at this late date the erstwhile allies of World War II can work out these details on their behalf.

Eighth. The contribution which the Western allies, as well as the Soviet Union, need to make, if there is to be peace, is to guarantee, for a period of time, the kind of unified Germany which may emerge from discussions among the Germans. What the former allies need to do is to see to it that a unified Germany neither is subjected to military pressures from its neighbors, nor becomes a source of military pressure to its neighbors.

Ninth. To that end, Mr. President, it is essential to include within the scope of our policy the search for agreements which, while they do not compel a severance of West Germany's numerous ties with Western Europe, may lead to limitations of armaments throughout Germany and central Europe. Also needed are agreements which will pull back the so-called ultimate weapons and the armed forces of both East and West from the points of imminent contact in Germany and in central Europe. In short, Mr. President, it seems to me essential that our policy, NATO's policies, do not exclude a careful consideration of the Rapacki plan, the Eden plan for a demilitarized zone in middle Europe, or similar proposals in connection with the unification of Germany. Perhaps the best way to consider these matters would be to predicate them on reasonable agreements which may emerge from the Geneva Conferences on Surprise Attacks and the Suspension of Nuclear Tests.

Now getting back to what the distinguished senior Senator from Ohio [Mr.

LAUSCHE] mentioned a while ago, he asked, I believe, if I recognized the significance of a pullback and how it would benefit the Soviet Union. I do recognize that in some kinds of pullback the Western Powers would receive the worst of it, but I think we ought to recognize also that if there is to be any possibility of peace, we shall have to make some concessions; this might be one of them. We need to recognize that in so doing, if a withdrawal, based on a reasonable solution were brought about, we would be the ones who would take a loss in position, since the Soviet divisions, in going back to the heartland, would be in striking distance and would be better prepared than we would be to carry on any military activity in that area. But we have to develop give and take, by starting from the bottom and working upward. If we do not get out of the position of rigidity, I believe the situation in Berlin and in Germany will become worse, and the bases on which there can be peace will become fewer and fewer.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I agree with the statement of the Senator. In my opinion, there is a condition existing in which, if the Soviet Government continues to dictate to the government of East Berlin, it will be impossible to bring about a reconciliation of East and West Berlin. Soviet Russia will not tolerate it. Based upon the adamant position of Soviet Russia, and based upon the rigidity of the situation as described by the Senator from Montana, while the matters about which I have spoken are highly desirable, I agree we should look for other avenues to escape the great holocaust which seems to be threatening us in the future. I, for one—and I believe confirmation has been given to this view by the mayor of West Berlin—would want every avenue explored, talks had, continued talks, in the hope that some solution may be found.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator is correct.

Mr. President, I have taken a great deal of the Senate's time today. I have tried not to take it lightly. I have done so because it is clear that this administration, following the example of its predecessor, has committed the Nation to stand fast at Berlin.

It is a resolve well taken. Since we cannot yet perceive to what extremity of sacrifice it may lead in the months ahead, I have felt it essential to try to set forth for the consideration of the Senate my understanding of what is involved in the coming crisis in Germany. I am grateful that in this crucial time the Senate's principal Member in these matters, the outstanding Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] is a man with such a deep understanding and intelligent grasp of the international forces that play on the Nation. I hope that he will make his voice heard; I am sure that the President and the Secretary of State will listen most carefully. I would hope, further, that between them

will evolve a policy that all of us, as Americans, will be glad to support.

Most important, Mr. President, I hope that the President of the United States, his Secretary of State, and the Congress will fortify the resolve to stand fast in Berlin with the conviction which only a positive policy for peace can give it. The Secretary of State has spoken of mutual concessions. Those are calm and wise words for this moment in time, with the clouds of radioactive death waiting to envelop the earth. I hope, deeply, that they will lead to a positive policy for peace. It is that kind of a policy for which rational men everywhere are waiting. It is that kind of a policy which they will be able to comprehend and to which, if need be, they will be able willingly to consecrate their lives.

The policy has yet to be formed. It needs to be formed soon. If it is formed, the concept of freedom in peace will not perish in Berlin, in Germany, or in the world.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. It has been a treat to be privileged to hear an excellent speech, such as the one which has just been concluded by a great man. The distinguished Senator from Montana has made many contributions to the cause of peace in the world, but none more important than his forceful statement today. Always responsible, always constructive, we his colleagues in the Senate take great pride in serving with him.

On behalf of the State which I represent, I wish to say to the State from which he comes that the world is a better world because of MIKE MANSFIELD, and that the suggestions he has made today, predicated upon the great philosophy of Isaiah's advice, "Come now, let us reason together," should be heard around the world.

I thank the Senator for his constructive contribution. I feel very humble to be able to sit in his presence.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I thank the distinguished Senator from Texas.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I was given a copy of the fine address which the distinguished Senator from Montana delivered today. I read it, and I have heard part of the address today.

I agree very much with the very fine encomium paid by the distinguished majority leader to the Senator from Montana. As many folks have said, "MIKE MANSFIELD is a real guy." I agree with that statement.

I can agree with much the Senator from Montana has stated. I particularly agree about the need for us in this Chamber to discuss responsibly and constructively not only foreign policies but also all measures in that manner. Full and free debate was and is an essential element of a bipartisan approach.

I wish to say to the very able Senator, there is no need for the Senator to reassure the Senate regarding his serious purpose and his careful choice of words. I and my colleagues on this side of the aisle always are confident the Senator will give sober, intelligent and construc-

tive addresses on any subject, foreign policy or anything else. He is "that sort of guy," as someone has said. The Senator has set high standards for himself, and I congratulate him.

I should like to record my agreement with the Senator concerning the seriousness of the Berlin situation and the need for all of us to maintain open minds and the utmost of flexibility, in considering possible avenues for a possible resolution of the problem, in accord with the free world interest. Indeed, I think we have been given a sound account of the background of the situation in Germany, as well as a number of clues—I hesitate to call them all essentials—toward finding the peaceful solution we seek.

However, I should also like to state my belief that at least two main elements in the current German scene have been barely mentioned in my colleague's notable speech.

The first missing ingredient concerns the past and continuing requirement that the United States consult with and move in concert with its allies, especially France, Great Britain, and West Germany. There is no question that the Soviet Union, acting only in its own interests, in the very nature of things has been able to represent itself as ostensibly more flexible than the West in propaganda and diplomatic approaches to central European problems.

We must remember that the West German Government itself has been a foremost exponent of firmness in dealing with the U.S.S.R. This point gains in importance when we recall the remarks made by the Senator about the unification question being one for action by the Germans themselves.

We know who holds the strings in East Germany. We know who controls East Germany. We might as well look that fact in the face. They not only control East Germany, but they also control Czechoslovakia, Bulgaria, Rumania, and all the Baltic States. It is not a question of the East Germans and the West Germans getting together.

We were told the other day by Willy Brandt, a statesman, which was confirmed to me personally by Mr. Adenauer, that if the East Germans had their own way 95 percent of them would join with the West.

In fact, I could not help feeling that the address of my distinguished colleague had a slight tone in it which was hard to understand. The Senator seemed to alternate back and forth between giving us and the Germans primary responsibility for taking the initiative. I do not complain, for this is a natural consequence of the great complexity of the issues at stake. More important, I do not complain of any sacrifice of flexibility which may be inherent in our need to act in agreement with our allies, for I am certain that we can all agree the Western alliance is the cornerstone of the free world security.

The second missing ingredient, in my view, is the lack of recognition accorded to the efforts of our Government and to the efforts of our allies over the years, to say nothing of the recent concentrated work over the past weeks and months,

toward finding ways to negotiate this extremely serious problem. In fact, the headlines this morning contain news of Western willingness to widen the scope of envisaged negotiations, which confirms the activities of Mr. Dulles and his European counterparts. Clearly, our policy has not put us in a straitjacket.

I think it is also clear that my colleague has, in the fashion of Don Quixote, been doing a little tilting at a stone wall, and that stone wall is the Kremlin, not the East Germans.

Despite these few difficulties I have encountered so far, I thank the distinguished Senator from Montana, in all seriousness, for a highly illuminating presentation of the crux of the Berlin problem. I am not prepared to comment in depth on his useful address, because I have not had time for that. However, as frequently happens, Mr. Walter Lippmann's column of this morning contains some thoughts which I consider extremely pertinent to this subject, so I ask unanimous consent that there may be printed at this point in my discussion the comments of Walter Lippmann in his article of this morning.

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

MR. DULLES IS NEEDED

There is no reason to doubt that John Foster Dulles will once again come out on top, carried through his ordeal not only by his stamina, which is fabulous, but also by the knowledge that he is at this moment the indispensable man. There have been times in the past when things were at the end of a chapter, and he could with grace and dignity have made way for a younger man. But not just now. This is a period when things are moving toward a climax, after which the world may be very different, and he, himself, is at the climax of his career.

There is no one else in the Western World who has authority, comparable with his, to lead the enormously complex negotiations about Germany and about Europe which in one way or another are now unavoidable and imperative. If the West moves, as it must, from a policy of standing pat, to one of negotiation and compromise, his personal leadership will be the best guarantee that flexibility is not flabbiness and that a strong and tough hand is in charge. The Russians will make no dangerous mistakes while he is there, and our allies will be much less apprehensive.

There is one question which, if we knew the answer to it, would light up the whole situation. Why is it that Moscow has opened up Berlin and the German question now rather than, let us say, 2 years hence? The Russians know quite well that German opinion is evolving, and that Dr. Adenauer's refusal to negotiate on a realistic basis will not be held to by his successors. In 2 years, Mr. Dulles will be out of office, and until very recently there was no difference between his position and Dr. Adenauer's. In 2 years, moreover, there will be—if the Russians believe what Senator SYMINGTON and others say—a marked shift in the balance of power.

Why, then, are they in such a hurry now? My own guess, which rests only on hints and inferences, is that they regard the position in Eastern Germany, and perhaps also in Eastern Europe, as precarious and potentially explosive. They are deeply concerned, as everyone knows, about West German rearmament, which will have been achieved in about 2 years. Why are they so concerned about it when they themselves have a very much bigger army and are also themselves

a first-class nuclear power? When I asked some of the people I saw in Moscow why they worried so much about West German rearmament when they could annihilate West Germany with their intermediate-range missiles, the stock answer was that they feared an armed Germany backed by the United States.

But I do not think that this is the whole explanation of their fear, or, rather, I do not think that it spells out the nature of their fear. My guess is that they have no illusions about the discontent of the East Germans, and that what they fear is that the East Germans, when they see a strong West German army less than 2 hours away, may be sorely tempted to start an uprising in cahoots with officers of the West German army. If that happened, the fat would be in the fire and both the United States and the U.S.S.R. would be involved.

Something of this sort is, I feel sure, the crux of the German problem today. There is an ever-present and growing danger of revolt in Eastern Europe which would entail Soviet intervention in the Hungarian manner and would unavoidably bring about a great war. The Russians are undoubtedly worried about this, and truly responsible men in all the Western capitals are equally worried about it. Only those who have more emotion than they have imagination and foresight take the view that an East European uprising would be wonderful and just what the free world wants.

It is the impending danger in Eastern Europe which makes it imperative to move toward German negotiations. For the best, and perhaps the only, way to avert the danger is to move toward the beginnings of the reunification of the two Germans. We should make the Kremlin understand that we approach the coming negotiations, not with intent to provoke an uprising in Eastern Europe, but in order to find an alternative to it.

The Russian problem in Germany and Europe is not how to conquer and absorb Western Europe. This is away beyond anything that is within their reach. The Russian problem is how they can disengage themselves in Eastern Europe without jeopardizing their own security. How can the satellites become, not their violent enemies, but neutrals? At bottom the problem is how to let go without falling off and being run over.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I have gone over these points which the distinguished Senator from Montana has made. The Senator places great emphasis on the fact that ultimate unification of Germany is inevitable, and that we should have recognized it and should have done more about it.

Exactly what should we have done? When we are faced against the Kremlin, which has taken 500 million human beings into its orbit, and when the United States has placed, as it were, its iron curtain against the approach onto West Germany and onto France and the Lowlands—what should we have done? Let us consider. The fact is that the inevitability of the ultimate reunification of Germany has been recognized by the Western countries since the end of World War II. That has been common talk. Germany has to be brought together. Unification has to come.

We have not only recognized that fact, but we have also recognized that a divided Germany constitutes a serious threat to the peace. Willy Brandt was quoted by the newspapers yesterday, after he had had a talk with the President, as saying that definitely the President said we are not going out of Ber-

lin. We are sticking. We are there with the purposes we have always had. That, in substance, was the remark.

We have not only recognized this fact, but we have recognized that a divided Germany constitutes a threat to the peace. Both the Republican and Democratic administrations since 1945 and 1946 have made unrelenting efforts to bring the four zones together. I remember the efforts which have been made time after time.

We actually got an agreement at the Geneva Conference in 1955 for a reunification of Germany and for free elections. What happened? Of course, the Russians broke the agreement wide open. The Russians reneged on the agreement. All of the subsequent efforts to achieve reunification, including the notes we sent last fall, have failed. We have been working at this a long time.

I desire to give credit where credit is due. I do not care to say simply that we are at fault if we cannot get a government to reason with us and to work with us. That is what has happened, so far as the Kremlin is concerned, but we have been on the job.

As I have said, in Geneva we obtained an agreement for free elections. Who pushed that agreement? We did. Afterward it went out the window. The reason the West Germans have been rebuffed is that the Soviets have been unwilling to agree to any plan of reunification which would not guarantee the bolshevism of Western Germany and its annexation to Eastern Germany.

This is not the first time in world history that we have been unable to obtain agreements that were valid, and that would be kept by the other party. Out of 52 agreements we made with the Kremlin, the Kremlin broke 50 of them. That is the situation we are meeting. We must recognize the simple fact that the Soviets have a clutch hold on Eastern Germany. The Germans are not free. They are running out—400 a day, according to Willy Brandt. When we look that fact in the face, we begin to realize what the trouble is.

The Senator from Montana suggests that the way to work toward reunification would be to start by having the West Germans and the East Germans talk among themselves and attempt to negotiate the unification of the two divisions of Berlin. I heard that talk on the floor today. That is a consummation devoutly to be wished, but we cannot make an agreement with the slave when the master has the slave under his thumb. That is the situation. We might as well recognize it. That is what we have been trying to break down. If the master were to allow the slave freedom to work out his own salvation, 95 percent of the East Germans would vote for reunification.

It is difficult to see how the attempt to work out reunification could be any more successful than our past efforts with the Russians. We have tried to get the Russians to agree. The East Germans are not free to negotiate on their own. That is the big point. They are controlled by the Russians, and therefore they would continue to reflect the Russian control.

In effect, the Senator is saying in his speech that the West Germans should be more flexible; they should enter into negotiations with the East Germans. This is something that the West German Government, up to date, has refused to do. The West German Government is an independent nation. It claims that East Germany is a part of Germany. The contention is made that the United States can make the West Germans change their position and become more flexible.

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

Mr. WILEY. Let me finish this paragraph.

The fact is that West Germany is a proud and powerful ally of the United States. As an ally, it has a mind of its own, and we cannot dictate to it, as the Russians are dictating to the East Germans. The West Germans are the ablest people in Europe. They know the situation; and when they take the position they have taken, they take it with their eyes open. They realize that they are under the thumb of the Russians, or the East Germans, and they realize that they cannot even negotiate with the people who are the serfs.

I now yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I believe that there should be called to the Senator's attention the fact that relationships exist at the present time between the East German Government and the West German Government. Such relationships have existed for some years. Those relationships are based upon interzonal agreements. The result is that trade amounting to hundreds of millions of dollars is generated between the two areas.

The Senator also makes the point that I seem to be advocating an American initiative. What I have been trying to advocate is a Western initiative, including all the allies, and including West Germany. I do not think we can maintain a petrified policy, because we know that there is no prospect of going forward on that basis.

We are facing a deadline, May 27, 1959, at which time the Soviet Union has indicated it will have all its troops and dependent personnel withdrawn from the eastern sector of the city. I think we must come up with something in the way of alternatives. I was very pleased when Secretary Dulles came back and said that he would be willing to consider concessions on a quid pro quo basis. I was delighted with the degree of success the Secretary had achieved among our allies, Dr. Adenauer, General DeGaulle, and Prime Minister Macmillan.

So I do not quite get the point the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin has in mind, because, as I recall the speech I made, there seems to be very little difference between us.

I expressed the hope that those in the State Department would give some consideration to the speech made today, not because of any personal interest I have in it, but because of the fact that some suggestions are being made, and perhaps out of those suggestions, or others which

may be generated, will come a degree of success in meeting the difficulties which confront us in the German and Berlin situation, and out of which, perhaps, may come unification of the two Berlins and the two Germanys at an earlier date than any of us can anticipate at the moment.

I thank the Senator for yielding to me and giving me an opportunity to answer him in part.

Mr. WILEY. Did the Senator wish to address any particular question to me? In what direction did he desire to direct my thought?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I wished to bring to the attention of the Senator the fact that I understood him to say that I was advocating American initiative. I was advocating Western initiative, which would include all Allied Powers, and also Dr. Adenauer.

Mr. WILEY. I do not think we are very far apart.

The only thing I disagree with is the implication that there has been no initiative. In my opinion the executive department, whose function it is to handle foreign relations, has done a great job. As I said the other day, the situation is similar to that of the man who has an ornery jackass. He can talk to him and talk to him, but he had better not get too close to him, or he may be kicked.

The Secretary of State and his assistants have worked diligently at this problem; and because they cannot get the jackass to agree, they are to blame. That is the sort of implication which I do not like to have go out to the country. I want the country definitely to understand my figure of speech.

We are continually in the midst of a political picture. I say, give credit where credit is due. Later, as I conclude my remarks, I shall have something to say about the distinguished Secretary of State. He served under Acheson. When I was chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, I saw his work. I observed his work as a servant of the Democratic Party. I have seen him serve for 6 years under President Eisenhower. I have seen him get acquainted with this globe, as was indicated by a distinguished columnist this morning, as no other man in history has done. He knows every neighborhood. He knows all the peoples. He knows the problems. He has dealt with them.

Because we could not get the divergent interests to agree, he is to blame. That is what I am objecting to. Such an implication is absolutely unfair. Undoubtedly it has had much to do with sending Secretary Dulles to the hospital. He is only human.

My next point is that the Senator from Montana, in his speech, asks that not only the West Germans, but the United States, take a more flexible approach to the problem of German and European security. The Senator from Montana mentioned the Rapacki plan and the Eden plan, and said we should explore both of them. We not only explored the Eden plan, but put it forward as a Western proposal at the Geneva Summit Conference. We have constantly been con-

sidering all kinds of possible European security plans. We have agreed that we must keep an open mind on this subject.

On the other hand, all these plans involve a general withdrawal of Western strength from Western Europe; and we must be careful not to engage in too much loose talk about the seeming retreat type of policy unless we have reason to believe that the Soviets are disposed to initiate a pullback toward their borders. As the Senator from Montana stated a few minutes ago, they would get out of East Berlin; but they would be on the line where troops would be ready to march in and take over West Berlin.

Our people are not blind. They recognize the fact that they are dealing with some of the most efficient—if I might call them that—international Machiavellians in history. In doing so they are going to protect the interests of the West and of America.

We agree that we must keep an open mind on this subject. On the other hand, all these plans involve a general withdrawal of Western strength from Western Europe and we must be careful that we do not engage in too much loose talk about this seemingly retreat type of policy unless we have reason to believe that the Soviets are disposed to initiate a simultaneous pullback of their forces toward their borders. Nothing in the present situation gives us hope that the Soviets are, in fact, willing to carry out a meaningful pullback of their forces. Too much general talk regarding neutral zones in withdrawal or thinning out of our forces at this time, therefore, could give the impression of softness on our part and weakening of our resolve to stand firm in this situation.

Finally, the distinguished Senator from Montana says that standing firm in Berlin is a slogan and not a policy.

The fact is that standing firm is the bedrock of our policy. It is quite true that, having taken this decision, the problem of how we implement the stand in the face of the many variations in which the threat can actually present itself to us must be worked out. That is exactly what the executive branch has been exploring ever since the crisis developed and it was the primary reason that Secretary Dulles undertook his recent trip. We, and our allies, are all aware that we must not only be agreed on the fundamental concept of standing firm; but that we must also be agreed on the details of implementing this policy. It was to help work out a common agreement on these details that the Secretary undertook this trip to London, Paris, and Bonn.

In other words, the Senator from Montana knows very well that the executive branch here, as well as the governments of our allies, knows that we must agree on the detailed implementation of the policy in that we are all working now to get agreement on these details.

When we do get agreements, what good are they? What does experience teach us? Fifty out of fifty-two agreements were not worth the paper they were written on. The Kaiser said something like that before. He spoke about a

treaty being a scrap of paper. We are dealing with a people whose philosophy and morality in connection with international affairs is very low.

My overall reaction to the speech of the Senator from Montana, however, is that it is a great deal more reasonable than many one has to listen to, and there are a number of sections, as I have indicated, in the speech which make pretty good sense.

I do want to make very clear that, as the distinguished Senator has said, when the Executive is "in the saddle" and has the responsibility to deal with crises, and that because the solution which one has hoped for is not forthcoming, that that is no reason to criticize the executive branch of our Government. The Executive has had to deal with the representatives of the Kremlin for many years.

Our past experience, as I indicated, shows what agreements with the Kremlin are worth.

I want to make it clear also, that in my humble opinion, the executive department has done everything that it can do to bring about a settlement of the German issue, as well as a settlement on the wider scale of world tensions, of which the Kremlin is the source.

In my opinion the Berlin crisis in connection with the May date is merely another indication of what we have had in the past, particularly some months ago in Formosa. It is the purpose of the Kremlin to get our attention on one point on this little globe, and then do its nefarious work at another point. The executive department is keeping its eye on the whole show, so to speak, not merely on the Kremlin, and it recognizes that this is just a part of the world-dominating influence and philosophy of the Kremlin.

Mr. President, when I heard the other evening that John Foster Dulles had gone to the hospital once again, I issued a release, and I shall read that release at this point. I said:

All Americans and many in far-off lands heard with sorrow of the hospitalization of John Foster Dulles. Countless thousands will pray for his recovery.

When I think of him, Burke's definition of a statesman comes to my mind: He possessed "a disposition to preserve, an ability to improve."

He has always been "a friend to truth; in action faithful, and in honor clear; who broke no promises, served no private end." These words of Pope characterize this great public servant.

Let us hope that during his convalescence the carping voices will cease.

In my opinion no American in the last 50 years has given of himself more unstintingly and dedicated himself more to preserve America than Foster Dulles. When others threw bricks at him, he smiled and kept on working for the general welfare. No man in American history has become so well acquainted with this now neighborhood world and its problems.

So we join with the countless thousands who wish him a speedy recovery. His country needs him.

As the President and Walter Lippmann have said, the country needs him.

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

Mr. WILEY. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I have listened with a great deal of interest to the extremely able address by my good friend from Wisconsin in defense of the State Department.

Mr. WILEY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. CLARK. I should like to ask my good friend this question. Earlier in his remarks he offered for the RECORD the column written by Walter Lippmann published in the Washington Post this morning. My question is whether he agrees with that column.

Mr. WILEY. I took the column from the paper, and the part that I read I agreed with. However, I shall have to go over it very closely, because the implication is that I am not aware of something in the article. I have not read it closely, because I have been waiting for the Senator from Montana to conclude his remarks, so that I may obtain the floor.

Mr. CLARK. I would be happy to have my good friend review Mr. Lippmann's column, which I personally believe is a sound one, but which, it seems to me, is rather inconsistent with the point of view which my friend from Wisconsin has been so ably expounding.

I should like to call to his attention the parts of the column I have in mind, and I should like to ask him whether he agrees that the principal point Mr. Lippmann makes is that the Russians are frightened by the situation in Eastern Europe and that they fear an explosion or revolution, and that such an explosion or revolution might require them to repeat what they did in Hungary; that if they did it in Eastern Germany what they did in Hungary it would bring about the great danger of starting world war III, because we would be unlikely to permit East Germany to go down the drain the way we let Hungary go. Mr. Lippmann suggests that the problem is how we can prevent a revolution in a satellite country and how we can maintain a situation in which the Russians can get out of satellite countries and the satellite countries can remain neutral and Berlin and Germany can still be free.

I suspect that what Mr. Lippmann says makes good sense and is pretty much the essence of the brilliant address made by the Senator from Montana, with his nine points that he urges upon the administration in that address. I do hope that the Senator from Wisconsin will take another look at the Walter Lippmann column, and I hope to find that he is in agreement with it.

Mr. WILEY. I shall be happy to read it again very closely, because I am always interested in what the statesman Lippmann—and I would call him that—has to say.

When he speaks about the ferment in Europe, that is only a part of the story. There is no question that there is a ferment all over the world. One of the problems which is confusing the Russians and giving them much trouble at present, as the Senator probably knows, is the attitude of the Chinese. There are 650 million Chinese who may be "on the go." All these matters have had the consideration of the Department of State. The Committee on For-

eign Relations has had this testimony before it.

Willy Brandt, the mayor of West Berlin, was asked the other day whether the people in Poland, Rumania, Bulgaria, and the Baltic States had fallen asleep and were satisfied with their rulers. The answer, in his judgment, was, "No." Of course, that gives trouble to the Kremlin. That is a part of the Russian problem.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. I have no intention of attempting to engage in a debate concerning whether the action of the State Department in the past has been right or wrong. I think the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] was very wise, indeed, in avoiding that pitfall, which it would be so easy to fall into.

I suggest to the Senator from Wisconsin that we cannot solve this problem in the interest of peace and freedom merely by saying over and over again that the Russians have broken 50 out of 52 agreements, and that therefore it does not do any good to talk to them. I suggest that we must talk and talk and live with them, or else we will die with them.

There are such things as self-executing agreements, particularly with respect to the withdrawal of forces, which are enforceable, and this regardless of the effect of the written word. It has been my feeling that to have a more flexible policy toward negotiation is highly desirable.

I think the Senator from Montana has rendered a distinct service, because in many ways he is sending word to the State Department and to the country that, at least so far as a majority of the U.S. Senate is concerned, we are ready right now to negotiate a meaningful agreement.

We do not dismiss from our minds plans which were ridiculed when they were first brought forward 2 years ago by Mr. Kennan, Mr. Gaitskill, and Mr. Rapacki, and others. We will talk about anything in the interest of getting a workable agreement toward peace. We are not afraid to negotiate. We do not trust the Russians any more than some of our friends in the State Department do. But that is no reason for not sitting down at the table and talking with them.

Mr. WILEY. Again, the Senator from Pennsylvania has made an implied attack on the other branch of the Government.

The Senator talks about flexibility. Why does he not talk about flexibility with the people who are most concerned with it, instead of making a general statement? That is the point I am making. When I tried lawsuits, I tried to arrive at conclusions on the facts, not on implications, not on rumors. That was my only point in raising this particular issue.

The Senator refers to the breaking by the Russians of 50 out of 52 agreements. Let me tell the Senator that it was in the days before Pearl Harbor that this Chamber was asleep; the President was asleep; the people were asleep; the

Army, the Navy, and the Air Force were asleep. They said it could not happen. It did. That was the only reason I referred to the breaking by the Russians of 50 out of 52 agreements. I do not want to have this country go to sleep on the generality that it is possible to deal with a skunk or someone who does not keep faith.

Mr. CLARK. I think what the Senator from Wisconsin has said and what I have said will appear accurately in the RECORD, as our good friends, the Official Reporters, will write it out. I have no intention of engaging in further colloquy, other than to say that I implied nothing. It was not I who spoke of the breaking of 50 out of 52 agreements; it was my good friend, the Senator from Wisconsin, who did so. I am content to let the RECORD stand as it will appear in print tomorrow morning.

Mr. WILEY. I agree that I made the statement. I did so for the simple reason that men like the Senator from Pennsylvania were here at the time of Pearl Harbor and had said it could not happen. I do not want the breaking of 50 out of 52 agreements to be forgotten by the Senator from Pennsylvania either.

Mr. CLARK. At the time of Pearl Harbor, I was in the uniform of my country, and not on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. WILEY. Oh, yes. But other Senators were talking as the Senator from Pennsylvania is now speaking. That is the only point I am making.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, at the very beginning, I commend the Senator from Montana for the study which he has given to the problem he discussed today. Speaking for myself, I want the Soviet Union to know that the Senators of the United States are intently desirous of obtaining peace for the people of the world. While I may see some difficulties in carrying out the plans suggested by the Senator from Montana, and projecting themselves over his talk, I see a fervent purpose and desire to bring about peace in the world. That is the light in which I wish the people of Europe and the people of the world would understand the intention and the purpose of the U.S. Senate today.

What are some of the weaknesses which I see in the proposal made by the Senator from Montana? The Soviet says: "We will withdraw from East Berlin." The question is, how far will they withdraw? In what posture will they be after they have withdrawn? In what position would we be if we withdrew from West Berlin and moved a distance of, say, 120 miles to the west?

My query would be: Based upon the past conduct of the Soviet Union, could we rely upon their word that they have withdrawn and would stay withdrawn? Or would there be the necessity of negotiating in a manner which would preclude the possibility of their abandoning their word and moving immediately back into the area out of which they came if conditions developed which were unsatisfactory.

Second, for the people of West Berlin and East Berlin to negotiate would be simple. I think it is generally agreed

that 95 percent of them would subscribe to the philosophy of the West and would repudiate that of the East. If there were a unification of the government of West Berlin and the government of the Soviet and Communism in East Berlin, my query is: What type of government would result? I cannot forget what happened in China when a coalition government was formed. I cannot forget what happened in Yugoslavia when a coalition government was formed, and Mikhailovitch, the spirit of the fight for freedom, was scuttled. The result of that coalition government was that the Communists took control.

Nor can I forget what happened in Poland when the Soviet Union proposed a coalition government. The coalition government was created, the Red troops were there, they took control and gave orders, and soon the government of Poland became a Communist government.

But in this situation there is one gleam of light which would cause me to analyze the East Berlin and the West Berlin situation in the belief that it might be distinguished from the Yugoslavia situation, the China situation, and the Poland situation. In China, the Soviet troops were in the northern part of that country, and they dictated what was to happen. A similar situation existed in Poland. In Yugoslavia, the word which came from Britain and from the United States was that Mikhailovitch should be abandoned and Tito should be accepted.

What would happen in East Berlin and in West Berlin if those governments combined and if the Soviet would stay back? In all the other countries I have mentioned, conditions were fertile for the overthrow of those who wanted freedom and for the installation of those who wanted dictatorship. But that condition would not prevail in Germany. As we have said, in Germany 95 percent of the people would stand by the governments of the free West.

But despite my belief that these dangers are connected with the suggestions which have been made by the Senator from Montana, I believe it is the responsibility of the executive branch of our Government and of this legislative branch to explore every means of reaching an agreement, restricted only by the proposition that we maintain our honor and that we do not fall into a pit which would leave us weaker, after we negotiated, than we were before we began to negotiate.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

A CHALLENGE TO THE TEXTILE INDUSTRY

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the reception of the report of the special subcommittee for the study of the domestic textile industry which was submitted to the Senate on February 4 is most encouraging. Both news articles and editorials in the national press have been most favorable. The most encouraging aspect of the reception given this report is shown by the round of wage increases currently being announced by the textile industry.

As an example of the influence of this report, I should like to quote from the statement of the J. P. Stevens Co., announcing a general wage increase:

In its statement of a week ago the Stevens Co., pointed out the dangerous situation created by textile imports. Since that time, the report of the Pastore subcommittee, as approved by the full Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, has been published. This official document of the U.S. Senate recognizes the danger of unrestricted textile imports from cheap labor foreign countries. This inspiring expression from high legislative channels encourages us to go ahead with upward wage adjustments in our various plants, even in the face of constantly increasing threats to the cotton, synthetic and woolen industries from overseas. The Pastore subcommittee report leads us to believe that something affirmative will be done to arrest the decline of U.S. textile manufacturing in recent years.

As a splendid example of the same sentiments, I ask unanimous consent that an excellent editorial from the Greenville News of Greenville, S.C., which was published on February 9, 1959, be inserted in the body of the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

A CHALLENGE TO THE TEXTILE INDUSTRY

Two developments of tremendous importance to the textile industry, foundation of the economy of this area, occurred in the past few days.

First, a special U.S. Senate Subcommittee reported on the series of hearings it had conducted into the problems facing the industry.

And, second, the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization officially recognized the industry as being essential to the security of the Nation.

Taken together, the two constitute the first official recognition of the fact that the textile industry is in difficulty and that a successful solution to its problems is vital to the entire country.

This, of course, is what textile executives and others have been saying for some time. Until now, however, they have received scant attention from the public generally or from Members of Congress representing nontextile producing constituencies.

The report of the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization, for example, is not exactly news either to textile producers or to military leaders. It may seem incongruous, and doubtless has to many persons, but textiles have frequently been said to be second only to steel production in terms of importance to national defense.

This has an entirely practical meaning. For, because of many factors, textile production has been declining for many years in proportion to other industries. According to the OCDM, in the cotton and rayon broad woven industry, requirements and capacity are almost completely in balance, and further displacement of U.S. capacity could pose a serious mobilization problem.

The OCDM promises to watch this situation carefully. It should. One can easily imagine the frantic efforts that would be made at the national level if a similar situation existed with reference to steel or chemical production. In view of the acknowledged importance of textiles, no less an effort is mandatory in its behalf.

Of more immediate promise are the report and recommendations of the special subcommittee of the Senate Interstate Commerce Committee. This group, headed by Senator JOHN O. PASTORE, of Rhode Island, and including South Carolina's Senator

STROM THURMOND, has performed an outstanding job. It has compiled statistics demonstrating beyond doubt the present weakness of the industry; it has uncovered the factors responsible for its decline, and it has pointed the way toward removal, or at least amelioration, of those disturbing elements.

Not the least of the services rendered by the subcommittee is the fact that it makes clear the responsibility of the Federal Government in this field. For not only is the future of the textile industry of vital importance to the Government (witness the OCDM statement), but also the Government itself is responsible for erecting some of the roadblocks in the way of the industry's prosperity and growth.

The report points to several Federal programs which have proved especially damaging. Among them are the price-support system which has made it possible for foreign textile producers to buy American cotton cheaper than American textile mill operators; the foreign trade policy which has opened our doors to cheap labor textile products, and the foreign aid program which has spent American money to build textile mills abroad.

As in the case of the OCDM statement, this is not news to the people of this area. But it is to many others and the subcommittee has made a notable contribution by spelling it out and compiling an arresting array of figures to prove it.

Additionally, the subcommittee recommended a 10-point program to aid the industry. This includes setting up of inter-agency advisory committees; revision of some tax laws; a more flexible administration of the foreign trade and aid programs to recognize the importance of the domestic industry; the elimination of the two-price system on cotton or the increasing of tariffs on imported cotton products; and an expanded textile research program.

The subcommittee's recommendations are sound and should receive the immediate and sympathetic consideration of the Congress.

The subcommittee's report is not, and does not pretend to be, exhaustive. For one thing, it lacked time to make the kind of study that could have given a completely clear picture of the ills that threaten domestic textile production. And, for another, there are many problems that are the responsibility of management and not of the Government.

And it is to management that the challenge now must go. The Senate subcommittee has done its job of initial spadework; presumably, Congress will follow through. The Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization has promised its assistance.

If all these groups fulfill their promises of recent weeks—and we see no reason why they should not—then it will be up to the textile industry itself to prove that it can continue to perform the services the Nation so clearly needs.

We are confident that it will do so.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, Congress and the administration must act expeditiously to implement the recommendations of this report in order that the confidence reposed in the report can be merited, as it has resulted in this well-deserved increase in wages for faithful and hard-working textile employees.

AN INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT ASSOCIATION

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, interest in an International Development Association, which the Senate last year asked the executive branch to study, having in mind the idea of United States

participation, has continued to be lively and widespread.

Because I was sponsor of the resolution outlining the possibilities of a fresh approach to this country's policies regarding economic aid to underdeveloped areas of the world, I have received numerous requests to speak and to write on the subject, as well as to discuss the proposal with callers from all parts of this country and from many foreign nations. I have spoken to religious groups, college students, and a variety of organizations interested in economic progress and international relations who have indicated interest.

The winter issue of World Affairs, quarterly publication of the American Peace Society, which is distributed throughout the world, included an article entitled "The Senate Resolution for an International Development Association," with my byline. For help in preparation of the article—which I intended as a brief, but full, outline of the purposes and possibilities of an International Development Association—I am much indebted to Mr. Robert A. Wallace, staff director of the full Banking and Currency Committee. Throughout the committee hearings and the Senate debate on this resolution, Mr. Wallace gave to me, to the International Finance Subcommittee, and to the full committee the kind of professional assistance which all of us hope to find in the committees of Congress. I want to commend him and to thank him, especially for his help with this article, which I would like to place in the RECORD at this point, if I may have the unanimous consent of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

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

THE SENATE RESOLUTION FOR AN INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT ASSOCIATION

(By U.S. Senator A. S. MIKE MONRONEY)

The United States, with other nations of the world, must recognize that the patchwork-quilt approach to economic problems of underdeveloped areas can and should be supplanted very quickly by a long-term program, operated on a banking basis.

Since capital is the scarce ingredient in most of the emerging nations seeking economic progress, varied banking facilities are needed to finance development on terms which meet these nations' special needs.

With this in mind, I introduced Senate Resolution 264 early this year recommending that prompt study be given to establishing an International Development Association to make multilateral development loans at terms more liberal than those currently available. The proposed IDA would be an affiliate of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (World Bank). The Senate passed the resolution last summer by an overwhelming vote. In October, at the request of President Eisenhower, U.S. Secretary of the Treasury Robert B. Anderson recommended its study to the members of the World Bank during its meeting in New Delhi as one of three major U.S. recommendations.

The Senate enacted the resolution in order to explore the possibilities of providing a new source of multilateral development loans for the less industrialized nations. These loans would differ from those offered under existing programs in that they would—

1. Encourage more countries to contribute capital for international development;
2. Promote greater use of foreign currencies received by the United States from the sale of farm surpluses;
3. Be made for longer periods of time;
4. Carry lower rates of interest;
5. Be repayable partly in local currencies; and
6. Provide a separate fund for subordinate loans to supplement the World Bank's lending activities.

Few needs are more compelling than economic development of the less industrialized nations. Events in many areas of the world are demonstrating the inadequacy of present programs to achieve stability and safety for newly independent nations. Thoughtful Americans and citizens of other industrialized nations are becoming increasingly convinced that sponsoring military buildup in an effort to discourage external attack provides a hollow shell of strength, unable to withstand the mounting pressures from within these nations.

These pressures are being generated by what Adlai Stevenson has called the revolution of rising expectations. Around the globe captive peoples are in revolt—in revolt against the captivity of poverty, of social immobility, of disease, of national inferiority. Their demands for an equitable share of the world's goods and recognition as a significant force in the world's culture constitute the basic reality of our age—more basic and more pervasive than atoms, or sputniks, or political alliances.

America is one of the main fountains of these aspirations. We, above all other nations of the world, should have nothing to fear from this revolution. We must, however, recognize that our safety, and the peace of the world, require that we strive, with others, to fulfill these aspirations. It is our responsibility to take the lead in fashioning the instruments and the institutions through which the hopes of the world's captive peoples may be realized, and this must be done in an environment of self-respect and mutual help.

The programs of nonmilitary economic aid conducted by the United States since World War II have been addressed to two separate problems: The first was the economic reconstruction of industrial nations which were ravaged by the war. The second problem to be met was the economic development of the agrarian countries of Asia, Latin America, and Africa, for whom any appreciable industrialization has remained mostly a dream for the future. In each case we had political as well as humanitarian and economic motives—to provide an alternative to the achievement of reconstruction or development by totalitarian methods.

Our efforts were focused first on the reconstruction of Europe under the Marshall plan. These were a brilliant success. More recently we have attempted to apply essentially the same methods in the underdeveloped areas. Our goals remain the same: To provide for economic development by democratic rather than by totalitarian methods.

The necessity for foreign capital to supplement the meager accumulation which is possible from the resources of these new nations is obvious. It is a need which Americans, especially, should be able to understand because we, too, faced it as a young nation. Now we are a primary source of capital on which the less developed nations must depend, for ours is the economy which provides half of the world's goods. We must help to develop a mechanism to provide the additional capital they require.

How do our efforts need to be strengthened?

On today's economic frontiers the economic significance of the United States aid dollar has been obscured by its political symbolism. New independence is independence

of the most hypersensitive variety. Acceptance of unilateral foreign aid has been represented by extremist political groups within the underdeveloped countries as implying a political commitment to support every position taken by the United States in its cold war with the Soviet Union. Such representations are false, but in the midst of misleading propaganda, these commitments are often taken as a betrayal of the aspirations for independence of action common to these newly independent states. Thus that which is an economic necessity has become a political liability.

The other side of the same coin has been equally difficult. Unfriendly countries charge that our aid imposes an unacceptable obligation on the recipient, but on the other hand, the recipients of our aid sometimes tend to assume that the obligation is on the giver—that political support in the cold war entitles them as a matter of vested right to share in the bounty of our foreign-aid program. The whole relationship militates against the easy friendship of sovereign states.

The next development was of course inevitable—a competitive Soviet aid program, with the more cynical uncommitted countries happily encouraging the bidding. In other words, they have pitted the West against the East in bargaining for aid at special prices, on special terms, or for special commitments. The danger here is that a competitive situation will develop, in which aid will become merely a football in the power struggle between the East and the West.

I believe a conviction is growing in the U.S. Congress that our economic-aid programs have sometimes produced, not friendship and confidence, but rather increased animosity and distrust. While most of us here might agree that popularity was not our primary objective, many Americans have serious doubts as to the success of further foreign aid.

There is also a growing conviction that other nations, many of which were restored to economic health by our earlier Marshall plan, should begin to bear an increased portion of the common burden and responsibility for the progress of underdeveloped areas.

It was in this general environment that the evolution of our assistance to underdeveloped countries began last year with the creation of the Development Loan Fund. This marked the transition from grants to loans. Moreover, it marked a shift away from the country program approach to economic assistance, and toward the project developed by the country itself.

Certainly the Development Loan Fund was an improvement, but it is not a final solution to the basic problems which afflict our economic development programs. I submit that the final solution of the problems requires that we provide economic assistance to underdeveloped areas through an international economic institution.

Senate Resolution 264 which recommends study of establishing an International Development Association, proposes that such study include consideration of the following objectives:

First. Providing a source of long-term loans available at a reasonable rate of interest and repayable in local currencies—or partly in local currencies—to supplement International Bank lending activities and thereby permit the prompt completion of worthwhile development projects which could not otherwise go forward.

Second. Facilitating in connection with such loans, the use of local and other foreign currencies, including those available to the United States through the sale of agricultural surpluses and through other programs.

Third. Insuring that funds for international economic development can be made

available by a process which would encourage multilateral contributions for this purpose. The resolution contemplates that a companion institution to the World Bank be created to perform a related but distinct lending function. It would be designed to provide long-term loans at low rates of interest for basic economic development projects.

I proposed this particular approach for several reasons:

First. By organizing this new institution as an affiliate of the World Bank, we can take advantage of the very high regard in which the Bank is held, both at home and abroad, and greatly increase the likelihood of the acceptance of the new institution.

Second. By organizing it as an affiliate of the Bank we can take advantage of the tremendous talent and experience which are represented in the staff of the Bank, and can put the new organization into operation with the minimum of delay.

Third. The closest possible cooperation between the World Bank and the proposed association would be essential. Today the World Bank must refuse loans for many worthwhile projects which will not pay out. It could, however, finance a substantial part of the cost of these projects if some second-mortgage money, frequently in very small amounts, was available from the International Development Association.

Fourth. By following a pattern of organization similar to that of the World Bank, with control based on stock ownership, we could provide the necessary international character and still could insure that the Bank would be operated by those providing the funds, rather than by the borrowers.

I believe this study will indicate that such an association would require a minimum initial capital of \$1 billion in hard currencies to be provided on the same percentage basis as that of the World Bank, to which the United States has subscribed 34 percent of the total capitalization. It should be emphasized, however, that the amount of the initial capitalization is a matter which would require detailed exploration at the time of the actual organization of such an association.

It has been suggested that additional funds, over and above the subscription to the capital stock of the association probably must be made available for lending by the United States. I do not believe this represents any insurmountable problem. Certain amounts of fixed income—for example, the interest received on our previous foreign loans—might be earmarked over a long term for the purchase of debentures of the association. In this way, additional funds could be put up by the United States without disturbing the multinational nature of stock ownership.

An international organization tends to denationalize loan transactions; and it is for this reason that many governments prefer to borrow from the World Bank or a similar international agency, rather than from a single country.

There is not now an international organization to make long-term low-interest loans for economic development repayable partly in local currencies. Nor is there an international program for subordinate development loans. Nor is there an international mechanism for encouraging third-country loans with local currencies. The feasibility of making such loans through the creation of an International Development Association should be most carefully studied.

There are definite advantages to raising development capital among as many nations as possible. First, because the advantages of development accrue to all members of the international political community, it seems only fair to share the cost of the development program among all who can participate. Second, a lending institution including both debtors and creditors gives a greater

measure of assurance that the loans will be repaid. Third, governments may sometimes prefer international loans because they remove any possible implication of political interference in internal affairs.

IDA requires study, which is why the Senate acted first with a resolution rather than with legislation. It would be no panacea. It would promise no cheap and easy solutions to the hard problems of economic development. It would in my judgment, however, place one more valuable tool in the hands of those who seek progress without subjugation.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, the New York Times reported in a front page article in December that the proposed International Development Association is very much alive; and the Times quoted top U.S. officials close to the international negotiations aimed at establishing the new agency. In an Associated Press article in the Evening Star, which was published on January 7, we were informed that Canada, in a communique issued after discussions among Cabinet members of our two Nations, announced it would study the American proposal to set up an International Development Association affiliated with the World Bank. I ask unanimous consent that both articles be inserted at this point in the RECORD.

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

[From the New York Times, Dec. 8, 1958]

NEW WORLD BANK FOR SOFT CREDIT IS GAINING FAVOR—UNITED STATES PUSHES MONRONEY PLAN FOR LOANS TO BE REPAYED IN LOCAL CURRENCIES

(By Edwin L. Dale, Jr.)

WASHINGTON, December 7.—The proposed International Development Association, considered a few months ago to have dim prospects, is very much alive.

This was the report today of top U.S. officials close to the international negotiations aimed at establishing the new agency. Taking into account developments over the past few weeks, they now consider the odds are that the new agency will come into being.

The agency was proposed this year by the United States as a subsidiary of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development to make loans in soft—not freely convertible—currencies to underdeveloped countries.

The idea first came from Senator MIKE MONRONEY, Democrat of Oklahoma. In September, President Eisenhower instructed the Secretary of the Treasury, Robert B. Anderson, to sound out other countries.

FIRST REACTIONS UNFAVORABLE

The first foreign reactions were lukewarm or negative. This emerged from comments at the New Delhi meetings in October of the bank and the International Monetary Fund. For differing reasons, both advanced and underdeveloped countries had reservations.

The change has come gradually over the last two months, beginning with conversations at New Delhi and shortly thereafter. Enough countries have now resolved their doubts to make officials confident that the agency will be established.

Some even hope that its charter will be agreed in time for submission to the next session of Congress, though it would be late in the session.

SOME FEATURES ARE NEW

The agency would have these main features, all new in international lending.

Its loans would be on easy terms and repayable in local currencies. Thus it would

finance "nonbankable" projects that the world bank cannot consider.

It would involve major participation by all the main countries of the West, and presumably Japan, in supplying the basic resources for lending. Most European currencies are now about as hard as the dollar and would be difficult for underdeveloped countries to repay. The scheme will stand or fall on the willingness of such nations as Britain and West Germany to supply capital.

Wherever possible the loans would also make use of soft currencies acquired by the United States, and to a lesser extent by other countries in such operations as sale of farm surpluses. Thus a loan to Ceylon might include Indian rupees accumulated by the United States, to the extent that India could supply needed items, and was looking for a market.

The job of Secretary Anderson in selling the plan has been twofold. He has had to persuade underdeveloped countries to permit the United States to revise the agreements under which their currencies have been accumulated, to free them for the new operation.

SEEKS EUROPE'S AID

And he has had to convince the European nations that the plan would work and that it could make a major contribution toward solution of a problem that all recognize is serious—the problem of achieving economic development in the less advanced lands.

Mr. Anderson, it is understood, is trying to win agreement from the underdeveloped countries first before he presents a formal plan, with specific contributions, to the Western nations.

Under his plan, even the underdeveloped countries will have to put up at least a token contribution in gold or dollars or other hard currencies—possibly the same contribution as that required by the World Bank, 2 percent of a nation's quota. Even that small sum will be difficult for some underdeveloped countries to raise.

UNITED STATES MAY PUT UP 34 PERCENT

It is understood Mr. Anderson's plan envisages that the United States put up about 34 percent of the capital of the new agency, the same as it contributed to the World Bank. He also feels that the organization should be given a reasonably large initial capital, with no specific provision for replenishment.

The replenishment issue may be important, because of the soft nature of the agency's transactions. The World Bank regularly raises new capital funds by floating its bonds on the Western World's money markets. It can sell the bonds because its loans are hard and repaid in dollars.

When the new agency runs out of dollars and other usable currencies, it will presumably have to stop lending until the members decide to put up more capital.

A major selling point with Congress is expected to be the fact that other advanced countries will be participating in the lending—something many members have long advocated.

[From the Washington Evening Star,
Jan. 7, 1959]

UNITED STATES AND CANADA AGREE ON CLOSER TRADE TIES

OTTAWA, January 7.—The United States and Canada have agreed to consult more closely on issues that can hurt each other's trade. They have called on Europe to speed up reduction of barriers to imports from North America.

Ending 24 hours of talks between Cabinet members of the two neighbors, a 1,500-word communique last night announced:

1. Wheat experts of the two countries will meet every 3 months in attempts to resolve Canadian complaints that subsidized dis-

posal of American surplus wheat cuts into Canada's commercial markets.

2. More talks will take place on U.S. restrictions on import of Canadian oil. There was joint agreement that continued oil exploration and development are necessary on defense grounds.

LEAD, ZINC CURBS

The United States expressed hope it could withdraw its import curbs on lead and zinc once some international agreement is reached among major suppliers and buyers. The curbs were imposed last September. An international study now is under way.

4. Cabinet spokesmen, probably Canadian Justice Minister E. D. Fulton and U.S. Attorney General William Rogers, will hold talks on U.S. prosecution of three big electronic companies whose subsidiaries operate a patent pool in Canada. Canada wants the suit dropped. The United States said it has no intention of infringing on Canadian sovereignty.

5. Canada agreed to consult with the United States before it applies its tough new antidumping laws, which the Americans claim violate Canada's international trade obligations. Canada gave assurances it does not intend to use the legislation in a discriminatory or arbitrary manner.

6. Canada also will consult on the impact of recent Canadian food import curbs, particularly on turkeys and frozen peas. Most of the curbs are linked with Federal price-support programs.

7. Canada will study an American proposal to set up an international development association affiliated with the World Bank.

The association would provide underdeveloped countries with long-term loans on more generous terms than the World Bank gives.

OTHER STEPS URGED

The two delegations agreed that recent European currency convertibility moves should be followed by other steps to open more European markets for North American exporters.

The ministers said:

"Convertibility has removed the financial justification for discriminating against dollar supplies and should be followed by further moves by the countries concerned to provide nondiscriminatory access to their markets for goods from the United States, Canada, and other countries."

Specifically they want Europe to speed up elimination of import curbs against North American goods.

ATMOSPHERE OF HARMONY

Canadian Finance Minister Donald Fleming said the talks were held in an atmosphere of utmost harmony. However, United States objection to the wording of the communique delayed its issuance for several hours.

The talks were on the fourth biannual meeting of the joint Canada-United States Committee on Trade and Economic Affairs, set up in 1953 to iron out problems between the two countries before they develop into embarrassing public situations.

The United States was represented by Treasury Secretary Robert Anderson, Interior Secretary Fred Seaton, Commerce Secretary Lewis Strauss and Under Secretary of State Douglas Dillon, representing ailing Secretary Dulles.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, in addition to the large number of editorials in newspapers all over the Nation which were inserted in the RECORD by various Senators when we were considering the resolution, during the adjournment of Congress there were published a number of other editorials and many articles which I should like to call to the

attention of my colleagues. I ask unanimous consent for the insertion of some of them in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

[From the St. Petersburg (Fla.) Times,
Jan. 11, 1959]

A BOLD PROGRAM FOR LATIN AMERICA

Dr. Milton Eisenhower, brother of the President, has presented a report to the President on U.S. relations with Latin America with recommendations for a series of moves to improve these relations.

But while Dr. Eisenhower was preparing his report, the State Department was pouring cold water on plans of an Inter-American Conference of Foreign Ministers to do some of the things Dr. Eisenhower recommends.

Long an expert of the U.S. Agriculture Department and now president of Johns Hopkins University, Dr. Eisenhower is quite a top authority on Latin America. He has represented the President several times on Latin American tours. A few months after Vice President NIXON made his highly publicized and highly controversial trip to South America last spring, Dr. Eisenhower made a factfinding tour of Central America that hardly drew any public notice.

As a result of this trip the President's brother made three specific recommendations in his report. They are:

Establishment of an Inter-American Development Institution to assist the American Republics in planning their development.

Creation of an Inter-American Bank to coordinate activities of the World Bank, U.S. lending agencies and private lending agencies in providing capital for Latin American development.

Cooperation with the five nations of Central America in the establishment of a regional common market that might serve as a model for all Latin America.

In short, what Dr. Eisenhower proposes is an adaptation for the underdeveloped nations of Latin America of the ideas of the Marshall plan, through which the United States helped to rehabilitate the highly developed industries of Europe.

But when the idea of an Inter-American Bank was first proposed at a conference of finance ministers in Buenos Aires a year ago, the United States greeted it with an attitude of "Let's not do anything now."

When the idea was adopted at a meeting of American Foreign Ministers at Washington in September, Secretary of State Dulles barely took time off from his world travels to deliver a routine speech that was nothing more than an oratorical greeting card.

In his recommendations for U.S. support of an Inter-American Bank, Dr. Eisenhower backs a proposal which Senator A. S. MIKE MONRONEY, Democrat of Oklahoma, has suggested on a world scale. It is the granting of second mortgage loans that can be repaid in the soft currencies of the aided nations, rather than in the hard currency of American dollars.

In addition to his specific recommendations, Dr. Eisenhower proposes the establishment, in all the Republics of the hemisphere, of national commissions to develop public interest in inter-American affairs. He suggests that a U.S. commission should promote the background material on Latin America from U.S. correspondents in the other Americas.

Dr. Eisenhower also suggests that the activities of the U.S. Information Agency in telling the American story be increased in Latin America.

All the things Dr. Eisenhower proposes have long needed to be done for the hemispheric good of the United States as well as

its neighbors. The Latin American nations have made a good start on their own and the prestige of Dr. Eisenhower should give high hopes for U.S. participation.

But these recommendations come at a time when the President is highly critical of spenders and is committed to the idea of balancing the budget. It will be difficult to reconcile these ideas with an adequate foreign aid program in Latin America or anywhere else.

Dr. Eisenhower has long been known to have been highly influential in the thinking of his presidential brother. Maybe it's time that he exert some of his influence again.

Thanks to the enormous reserve of goodwill inherited by the Eisenhower regime in 1953, even with the shocking neglect of Latin America by this administration, with little trouble we could reestablish relations so solidly that we would have an immensely strong bulwark in this hemisphere.

As the President told Congress Friday, "There can be no such thing as a fortress America." On the other hand, Latin America suspicious and surly toward us could be a fatal weakness.

[From the Kansas City (Mo.) Star,
Dec. 6, 1958]

IDA MAY BE A SYMBOL OF NEW BIPARTISANSHIP

Secretary Anderson, of the Treasury, has apparently done a better selling job on the proposed International Development Association than anyone thought. At the World Bank meeting in New Delhi this fall the idea went over with a dull thud. Now, however, the New York Times reports that the poor man's World Bank has a better than even chance of seeing daylight.

Some critics of Senator MONRONEY's IDA point out that it would simply be another addition to the tremendously complex machinery of international banking and mutual security. The Washington joke describes the new philosophy, "A bank a day keeps the Russians away." Certainly we're not in favor of adding leaven to bureaucracy at either the national or international level. Nevertheless, the Monroney bank could fill a gap in the lineup. It would make use of the soft currencies of the world, such as the Indian rupee and the Brazilian cruzeiro. It would make loans to underdeveloped countries on somewhat easier terms than can the World Bank.

From the point of view of our own foreign policy, IDA is a new concept that would call, as does the World Bank, for the full participation of the other free nations. It emphasizes loans. Once it is in business, with repayments being made, it might ease some of the burden on the American taxpayer. Equally important for the taxpayer, it involves multilateral loans. We regard that approach as tremendously important for establishing a united front against the Communist economic drive.

Senator MONRONEY, an Oklahoma Democrat, made a rare contribution with a new and fresh idea of mutual security. We are glad to see that the administration has recovered from its first cool reaction and is apparently pushing IDA with all the persuasiveness it can muster. Under the circumstances, the proposal bears the bipartisan stamp that we would like to see on more and more departments of our foreign policy.

[From the St. Petersburg (Fla.) Times,
Dec. 15, 1958]

MAKING THE MOST OF FOREIGN AID

After complicated international discussions, the United States is reported ready to go ahead with the establishment of an International Development Association which may broaden the whole concept of aid to underdeveloped nations.

Under the association plan, the United States and its allies with money to invest,

principally Britain and West Germany, will be able to aid underdeveloped nations through use of the aided nation's currencies.

The plan was first proposed during the past session of Congress by Senator A. S. MIKE MONRONEY (Democrat, Oklahoma), President Eisenhower ordered a study of the plan by the Treasury Department in consultation with other countries. A draft of legislation to put the plan into operation is now reportedly being prepared for submission to the new Congress which meets in January.

The Monroney plan envisions a soft money bank, in contrast to the hard money World Bank in which the United States lends money through the United Nations, and the Export-Import Bank through which the United States lends money directly.

In operations of the two hard money banks, loans are made for specific construction purposes and repaid in the hard money currencies handled by the banks.

But some of the underdeveloped countries have accumulated large funds of their own currencies through U.S. military and economic aid. These funds are in soft currencies which are not acceptable in international trade.

Under the Monroney development organization, these soft currencies would be put to use, for example, to pay for local labor on hard currency projects financed by American dollars. Indian rupees, credited to the United States in the sale of farm surpluses, thus could be added to U.S. dollars loaned to India for development projects.

The Monroney plan has been likened to a second mortgage in the financing of aid to underdeveloped countries. In addition to making the most out of U.S. aid, it links U.S. aid with aid from its allies in the countries undergoing development.

The International Development Association would be a counterpart in other parts of the world of the Marshall plan which stimulated the cooperative reconstruction of Europe after the war. But it would broaden the Marshall plan into a cooperative program of the United States and its allies in the development of regions which may become important new allies.

[From the El Reno (Okla.) Daily Tribune,
Nov. 18, 1958]

PLANS NUMEROUS TO SPARK UP INVESTMENTS BY UNITED STATES ABROAD

(By Peter Edson)

WASHINGTON.—Everybody and his brother now seem to be crowding into the act with some new plan for stimulating American investments in the less developed foreign countries.

The Rockefeller Bros. Fund, Committee for Economic Development, National Planning Association, and the semiofficial business advisory council have irons in this fire.

The Government has some plans cooking on this stove, too. John Corson heads up the Business Advisory Council study staff in Department of Commerce. At the Hot Springs, Va., BAC meeting in October, Donald K. David, former dean of Harvard Business School, told the 100 tycoons assembled in closed meeting that the Government should initiate a massive effort to get American business to develop overseas investments, "in return for a reasonable fee" because private enterprise alone wouldn't do it in normal fashion.

In December a House Ways and Means Subcommittee will begin hearings on granting tax concessions to American investors overseas.

The Senate Foreign Relations Committee has run two research studies on Foreign investments by Massachusetts Institute of Technology and University of Chicago.

They have come up with estimates that the world needs \$3.5 billion more credit every

year than is now available through established lending institutions.

Last year U.S. private investments overseas totaled \$4 billion. But \$3.3 billion of this was for oil exploration. Only \$700 million went for nonoil enterprises.

But where there is no much smoke going up there must be some fire of enthusiasm. With so many different planning groups and individuals thinking along the same line, some concrete results should emerge from the next Congress.

Plans put forward so far fall into three main classifications: Expand the lending authority of existing international banking institutions. Create new institutions to fill the gaps in credit lines now available. Make a new approach through regional development banks to meet the needs of specific areas like Latin America, Africa, the Middle East.

The consensus seems to be that only by a combination of these methods can the Russians be beaten off in their attempts to conquer the free world by economic warfare.

Among existing institutions, the World Bank and International Monetary Fund have already voted to increase their capitalization, by amounts still to be determined.

U.S. Development Loan Fund, created by Congress in 1957, is now completing obligation of its first \$400 million and will ask for more money in January.

The United Nations has just approved an expanded special projects fund. It will increase its technical assistance programs from \$30 to \$100 million of it.

The one new idea which shows most promise is Oklahoma Senator A. S. MONRONEY's proposal for an International Development Association. It would be authorized to make hard and soft currency loans for up to 40 years at 2 percent interest. President Eisenhower has instructed Treasury Secretary Robert B. Anderson to investigate its possibilities as a subsidiary to the World Bank.

[From the Milwaukee (Wis.) Journal, Aug. 18, 1958]

UNITED STATES RECOGNIZES SOVIET TRADE THREAT, DOES NOTHING ABOUT IT

To paraphrase Mark Twain's remark about the weather, everyone talks about the Communist economic offensive, but no one does anything about it.

The Soviet bloc's trade with the free world increased by 77 percent between 1952 and 1956. Between 1954 and 1958 the Communists extended nearly \$2 billion in military and economic aid to 14 less-developed countries while their trade with such countries increased 70 percent. Russia has given most of this aid, but Red China and the Soviet satellites have contributed.

In every Red country, foreign trade is a state monopoly. Trade and aid are carefully coordinated within the bloc and used where they will do the most good to the Communist cause.

There is no such coordination or concentration in the free world. In trade it is every nation for itself. The United States dumps surplus wheat even though it damages an ally's economy. West Germany, through governmental subsidies to exporters, cuts other nations out of traditional markets.

Free world nations compete among themselves, with tariffs and embargoes and subsidies, more bitterly than they compete with the Reds. As for economic and technical aid, each large country has its own program and pays little attention to what allies are doing.

There is no lack of pleas and proposals for a united free world economic effort. British leaders have insisted that a joint economic strategy is as essential as unified military and political strategies. They predict disaster if the free nations do not end trade wars,

halt commodity price fluctuations, control recessions and lead the underdeveloped areas to stability and freedom.

The Rockefeller brothers report recently proposed a western hemispheric economic union to work closely with Western Europe's contemplated common market. NATO leaders have proposed that body as a structure for economic unification.

Governor Harriman, of New York, wants this country to lead a cooperative attack, through the United Nations, on problems of the underdeveloped areas. Adlai Stevenson has a parallel proposal. Senator MONRONEY, Democrat, of Oklahoma, has won Senate approval of an international development association which would offer long-term, low-interest loans to new and struggling countries.

Administration leaders admit the peril. Allen Dulles, CIA Director; Douglas Dillon, Under Secretary of State for Economic Affairs; Vice President Nixon; and even Secretary of State Dulles have said that the war without shots is as dangerous for the free world as a shooting war. Yet the administration has opposed, or brushed off, all the proposals that would lead to meaningful unification of the West's economic effort.

The administration has talked a great deal about economic interdependence. But it has done nothing to transform that phrase into fact. It has warned of the challenge of the U.S.S.R. in fields of trade and aid. But it has done little to meet that challenge.

[From the New York Herald Tribune, July 29, 1958]

FANFANI'S PROPOSALS FOR THE MIDEAST

As an economics professor, 50-year-old Amintore Fanfani still manages to get in his lectures at the University of Rome in addition to looking after his bigger job as Prime Minister. Moreover, as a venturesome spirit—his last book was "The Economic History of the Vikings"—he may be expected to have brought along some bold economic ideas in his briefcase for his visit with President Eisenhower and Secretary of State Dulles.

Signor Fanfani believes that the NATO nations should be something more than a military alliance, and prove, by joint economic projects in the Middle East, that they have the welfare of the emerging, underdeveloped nations at heart. One plan, advanced by his predecessor, Prime Minister Pella, proposed that Italy use for such a purpose interest payments due to the United States under its Marshall plan grants. Since then Senator MONRONEY has proposed a billion-dollar fund for a new World Bank which would bank promising loans which cannot meet the World Bank's requirements. President Eugene Black, of the World Bank, also has made proposals for economic assistance to the have-not areas.

Prime Minister Fanfani, in his discussions here, is hopeful of getting some concrete agreement on advancing one or another of these plans, or a compromise among them. Certainly such economic development should have a very high priority among the allies. West Germany has already recognized this in agreeing to join France in a \$500 million project to develop North African economies. As Germaine Tillon has made so clear in her penetrating study, "Algeria," the basic problem there is too many people for too few jobs—and one which grows with a population explosion produced by the wonder drugs and their lowered infant mortality all over the world. The same is certainly true of Egypt, and all the nations where Arab nationalism is an emotional expression of the deep and real deprivations which men like Nasser do very little to remedy. One of the ways the West could show the earnestness of its desire to help the Arab peoples into modern technology would be along the lines Signor Fanfani is advocating. Congress would do well to study his ideas.

TRIBUTE TO AMERICAN MOTION PICTURE INDUSTRY AND JACK L. WARNER

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, in paying tribute to the American motion picture industry and to Jack L. Warner, my colleague, the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], has prepared a statement in which he comments on the achievements of the motion picture industry and on the record of this great man. I ask unanimous consent that my colleague's statement be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HUMPHREY

On many occasions, it has been my pleasure to pay tribute to the patriotic services of various American groups.

In my judgment, there are few industries which have demonstrated their devotion to the American people more abundantly and more continuously than the motion picture industry.

In war and in peace, there have been few, if any, public-spirited causes in which the industry and its leaders have not cooperated.

That is one of the reasons why last week, in appearing on a panel program of the Third Conference on International Exchange of Persons, here in Washington, I was pleased to commend the industry for its latest cooperation in the exchange of films.

Today, however, I should like to draw particular attention to one individual in the industry who has long been one of its greatest figures.

I should like to add my word to that of vast numbers of individuals throughout the land in welcoming back Jack L. Warner, president of Warner Bros. Pictures.

"Welcome back, Jack," is the theme of salutes during an entire week, as observed throughout this land and abroad. This week, States, municipalities, patriotic groups and civic associations are joining the press and the motion picture industry in testimonials to the services and work of Jack L. Warner.

More perhaps than any other living man, Jack L. Warner has contributed to the development and advancement of this great medium.

He is one of its foremost pioneers. Much of the credit for bringing sound to the screen may be attributed to him. But talking pictures represent but one of the technical innovations which he has spearheaded.

The name Warner Brothers symbolizes, as we know, a whole galaxy of unforgettable films which have stirred the American people and which have met with enthusiastic audiences throughout the world.

The notable productions from the Warner Brothers Studio are so numerous that they could hardly be enumerated in this brief word of tribute.

I could not, however, fail to mention such enduring masterpieces as "The Story of Louis Pasteur" and "Dr. Ehrlich's Magic Bullet."

The Warner Brothers special patriotic films, depicting the signing of the Declaration of Independence and highlighting our great American ideals and historical moments are known around the world. Their contribution to the understanding of the American tradition of liberty is beyond calculation.

Mr. Warner, through the production of films based on the lives of great Americans, has dramatized for all the world to see the achievements made possible by freedom.

The crisis which came with World War II found him, as usual, ready and eager to serve his country. During the war, he not only dedicated the resources of his studio to the national effort but personally took on the uniform of his country the more effectively to serve.

Jack L. Warner's good citizenship has won for him many accolades but his dedication to service goes beyond national boundaries. He sees and uses the screen as a dynamic medium to advance understanding and foster good relations among all peoples of good will.

This dedication to service has brought him well-deserved recognition in many awards, a few of which are: The United States Medal for Merit, the French Legion of Honor, a scroll of tribute from free China, Mexico's Order of the Aztec Eagle, the Gold Distinguished Service Medal from the Disabled American Veterans, the Italian Order of Solidarity, First Class; United States Treasury Department Distinguished Service Citation.

He has been honored with many more awards * * * too many to recite here. But I am confident that high among them all, he will cherish a current tribute which comes not alone from the industry with which he is so eminently associated, but from the worldwide public that the industry serves.

It is a privilege, therefore, to join the citizens of the United States and the peoples of the free world in rendering this acknowledgement to Jack L. Warner on the occasion of Jack L. Warner Week.

The past is but prologue to the further contributions which we know he is going to make to his industry and to this country.

TWENTY-FIFTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE EXPORT-IMPORT BANK

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, today there has appeared in the Wall Street Journal an article entitled "Export-Import Bank Turns 25 Today, Has Earned Over \$700 Million for Uncle Sam."

The Export-Import Bank is a Government agency which has done an extremely fine job during the 25 years it has been in existence, and I believe it quite appropriate that that fact be called to the attention of the Senate.

During these 25 years of its operations, the Export-Import Bank has, according to the article, approved over \$10 billion of credits in some 1,600 transactions. Only \$6,600,000,000 of those credits have actually been disbursed. Many of them have been repaid; the rest have been held back for one reason or another. At the present time the bank has \$1,600,000,000 committed but undisbursed.

During this period of time the bank has made profits of \$732 million. Of this amount, \$196 million has been paid into the Treasury, over the years, as dividends on a \$1 billion stock investment in the bank. The bank keeps the other \$536 million as reserves.

The bank operates by borrowing money from the Treasury. Over this period of time, it has paid the Treasury a total of \$242 million in interest paid by those who have borrowed. The bank makes a profit, because it obtains its funds from the Treasury at the going rate of interest which the Government has to pay for money, and lends out the money at a higher rate of interest.

Mr. President, I may say that although the Export-Import Bank itself does not

like to be referred to as a foreign-aid agency, it has been one of the most potent agencies in our foreign-aid programs, in making repayable or bank loans to various governments, various agencies, and various companies throughout the world.

During this period of time the bank has sustained losses amounting to a total of only \$2,900,000. Of course, some of the loans now outstanding certainly are less good than some of the others; but, as a whole, the agency has operated in a very sound manner.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, the very informative article which was published today in the Wall Street Journal.

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

EXPORT-IMPORT BANK TURNS 25 TODAY, HAS EARNED OVER \$700 MILLION FOR UNCLE SAM

(By John R. Gibson)

WASHINGTON.—The granddaddy of Uncle Sam's foreign-aid agencies, the Export-Import Bank, turns 25 years old today with the unusual record of having earned over \$700 million in profits for the Government.

In fact, the Eisenhower administration considers the earnings picture is good enough that the bank's own borrowings could be financed on the public securities market, rather than from the U.S. Treasury. This, of course, would help President Eisenhower keep his budget for next fiscal year balanced at \$77 billion, since the bank's lending of funds from the Treasury count as Government spending.

It is understood, however, that Bank officials are leery about the idea. For one thing, it would likely mean slightly higher interest costs for the Bank, which currently gets its money at the average rate of interest paid by the Treasury on the money it borrows. The Bank would certainly have a less favorable credit rating than the entire U.S. Government. Furthermore, such borrowings, even though handled by the Treasury, would add more red tape to the Bank's operations.

BORN DURING DEPRESSION

Depression born, the Bank lends most of its money to finance exports by U.S. companies. It also makes loans to poorer countries for economic development, but many of these must also be spent in the United States for American-made goods.

Through its loans, the Bank has since February 12, 1934, become one of the country's chief dispensers of foreign aid—even though its officials quarrel with that description of their activities. Its first loan, however, would be considered a form of foreign aid today: that was a credit to Cuba to finance the minting of silver coins in the United States.

But no matter how one describes their work, Bank officials, headed by President Samuel Waugh, are proud of their profit-making record.

An up-to-date report by the Bank shows it has made \$732 million in profits. Of this, \$196 million has been paid to the Treasury over the years as dividends on a \$1 billion stock investment in the Bank. The Bank keeps the other \$536 million as reserves.

Business is getting better, too. President Eisenhower's January budget predicts the agency will show net income of \$82 million this fiscal year and \$88 million in fiscal 1960, starting July 1, compared with \$67 million in the fiscal 1958.

The Bank has paid the Treasury an additional \$242 million in interest on borrowings over the 25 years, the Bank said in its

birthday report. It has authority from Congress to borrow up to \$6 billion from the Treasury on a revolving basis. It relends the cash, making its profits by charging a higher interest rate than the Treasury must pay to borrow money itself.

Altogether, the bank figures it has approved over \$10 billion of credits in some 1,600 transactions over the years. Only \$6.6 billion of these credits have actually been disbursed—many of them repaid—with the rest held back for one reason or another.

At present, the bank has \$1.6 billion committed but undisbursed. Britain, for instance, is paying 1 percent interest on \$250 million of credit it got during the 1956-57 Suez War but never picked up. London must decide by the end of February whether to continue the standby arrangement or not.

LOSSES ONLY \$2,900,000

Loan losses have totaled only \$2,900,000. But several other credits are known to be shaky in Nationalist China, Bolivia, and Haiti.

The bank figures it has encouraged more than \$1 billion in U.S. private investment abroad through its loans and loan guaranties.

Now in its busiest year, other than fiscal 1957, when it made its big credit to Britain, the Export-Import agency figures to make about \$1.2 billion of credit commitments. The President's budget projects fiscal 1960 loans and guaranties at about the same mark, compared with the \$857 million of fiscal 1958.

However, not everyone agrees the bank does everything right. From time to time, for instance, the Export-Import agency and the completely separate 68-nation World Bank tangle over credit projects. These differences usually come when the World Bank thinks a certain country should be denied international loans until it curbs inflation or otherwise puts its economic house in order. Often in such instances the Export-Import Bank won't see things quite that way because a credit would be to the advantage of U.S. foreign policy or to a hard-pressed U.S. industry.

OREGON'S 100TH ANNIVERSARY

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, Saturday, February 14, 1959, is a day of many meanings. To some, to the schoolchild, to the young in heart, whatever be their chronological age, or to the florists and candymakers, it commemorates a Roman martyr of the third century who by the ironic usage and the strange alchemy of history has become transformed into a romantic symbol. There are a few, and I hope only a few, to whom the day is but another Saturday, and if they mark it at all they do so in anticipation of the holiday which follows.

However, Mr. President, my colleagues from Oregon on this day join with our friends in the Congress from the great State of Arizona in celebrating yet a third type of anniversary. It was on Valentine's Day, 1859, that Oregon was admitted to the Union. Oregon, the 33d State, added to the Union a broad and fertile expanse of wheatfields, snow-capped mountains, verdant forests, wide rivers, and rugged coast.

Mr. President, I am proud and happy to announce that to help us celebrate the historic occasion of our 100th birthday Senate Majority Leader LYNDON JOHNSON and Speaker SAM RAYBURN of the House of Representatives will join a gathering of Oregonians in the Senate

restaurant tomorrow to cut a 100-candle birthday cake.

On behalf of all of us who call Oregon home, I wish to express my heartfelt thanks to these two Texas colleagues of the Oregon delegation in Congress for their interest in joining us in our celebration.

Oregon enters its second century with an illustrious history of a first century of progress and achievement.

It is in connection with this anniversary celebration that I offer on behalf of the Oregon delegation to the most distinguished President pro tempore and all the citizens of his State the heartiest of congratulations on this anniversary of the admittance of the State of Arizona to the imperishable Union. Arizona, like Oregon, has been called the Valentine State because its birthday is February 14. On that day in 1912 it became a sovereign State.

So, too, Mr. President, it is fitting that for a moment I digress from my theme to pay tribute to the youngest of our sister States. As the representative of a centennial State, I welcome with gladness the entry of our sister to the far north into the family of our great Nation. At the same time, I express the fervent hope that 1959, marked as it is with so many events, will be remembered in history by the Oregon centennial and the admission of the great State of Alaska as an equal partner among the United States, and I hope, by the addition of a 50th State, Hawaii. So, Mr. President, as a representative of the 33d State, I pay my respects to the 48th and 49th States. We are bound together, not alone by the strong bands of the Union, but, in addition, by ties of friendship and the sharing of historic memories brought to mind by the coincidence of date and year.

The centennial celebration in Oregon which is continuing through this year, and which will be formally opened at the State capitol in Salem this coming Saturday, permits Oregonians to pause for a moment to reflect upon that which has gone before and to take inventory of the present in order that we may plan soberly for the future. It is, as it were, a summit in time from which eminence we can scan the route we have traveled and look westward into the valleys of the future. Thus, the observance of a centennial, over and above the advertisement it affords for our God-given beauties of farm, field, river, forge, and coastline, permits also a look at the spiritual geography which, as much as the physical, shapes our destinies.

Few would deny that the political geography of Oregon is marked by such achievements as the direct primary, the initiative, and the referendum. These are landmarks of democracy as awe-inspiring, each in its own way, as is Tillamook Head, the Gorge of the Columbia, Crater Lake, or the majestic crests of Mount Hood and Mount Jefferson in the realm of nature's masterpieces.

The monumental political developments mentioned a moment ago have social parallels. Dr. Domenico Gagliardo, in his "American Social Insurance," a standard text used in graduate courses,

has this to say about medical insurance plans:

In this country the first medical prepayment plans developed in the mining and lumbering regions of Washington and Oregon, where settlements were small and usually far removed from large urban centers.

After making a footnote reference to a claim of Tampa, Fla., to early activity in this area, Dr. Gagliardo goes on to say:

Employers contracted with doctors and hospitals to care for workers injured in the course of their employment, sharing the cost with the workers. Later those States required by law that employers and employees contribute to the cost of medical care for industrial accidents covered by their workmen's compensation acts. Contracts were made by employers with hospital associations, commercial clinics, and later with medical society service bureaus, to care for the industrially injured. Many employers and employee groups then increased their contributions in order to provide themselves and their dependents with medical care for nonindustrial illness and injury as well. The movement spread slowly to other areas.

He also stated at another point:

Medical society plans in Washington and Oregon are the most liberal of all private plans in regard to benefits.

In the field of progressive social action the legislation passed under the administration of Gov. Oswald West, to preserve forever in the public interest free access to the matchless Oregon beaches by making the entire length of Oregon coast a public highway, shows a foresight in the conservation of natural beauty for recreational purposes which few, if any, of our sister States can claim to equal.

In the field of labor legislation, Mr. President, the record speaks for itself. To document it for the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks pages 274-276 of the "1959-60 Oregon Blue Book," a publication of the State of Oregon.

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

LABOR—OREGON'S PROGRESSIVE LEGISLATION LEADS NATION: SAFETY, WAGE, HOUR, WOMEN, CHILD LABOR, CIVIL RIGHTS LAWS

No other State gives a better deal to its citizens who work for a living than Oregon.

It has been part of the traditional policy of this State that industrial efficiency for the most part, stems from the proper treatment of workers. True to this belief Oregon has been a leader in progressive labor legislation for more than a half-century—with net gain that her workers are prosperous and happy and that she has had less industrial discord than most States.

LABOR PEACE MAPPED

Oregon laid the basis for her peaceful industrial scene over 50 years ago when her wage earners numbered no more than 30,000 in population of a half-million. Although living in a primarily agricultural economy, Oregonians of that time were aware that their young State through her water, timber, and other natural resources had a huge industrial potential that some day would be utilized to the hilt. They were fearful that an undesirable factory system with its attendant strife between management and labor would come into being. An Oregon

Governor of the era, George E. Chamberlain, expressed the concern of most Oregonians in his message to the legislature of 1903: "A spirit of toleration has existed between employers and employees," he said and "it is to be desired that the friendly relations which have existed between these great forces in Oregon may continue for all time. . ."

Oregon voters figured that progressive labor laws would achieve such harmony and they backed creation of a State labor department whose main job would be: (1) to assess changing economic and social conditions; and (2) to collect facts and figures on both management and labor activities so that intelligent legislation could be enacted and then enforced in a quiet and peaceable manner.

SAFETY FIRST IN FACTORIES

The resulting code of labor laws accumulated over five decades placed Oregon among the Nation's leaders in constructive legislation affecting the worker.

Oregon's first concern was to introduce the safety first principle into her expanding factories. An early-day program of industrial safety education made her factories and workshops safe and sanitary places to work, and brought on a workman's compensation act which today is among the best and most comprehensive of its kind in the Nation.

The comprehensive inspection of electrical installations and of elevator installations and material, and the inspection of boilers, unfired pressure vessels, and liquid petroleum gas tanks have resulted in an excellent safety record in these fields. Highway advertising was brought under regulation in 1955 for both safety and esthetic reasons.

In the protection of working women and girls, Oregon has attained preeminence among the 48 States. Oregon passed the first enforceable wage and hour act in the country. In 1913, through a special wage and hour commission, she set a minimum wage and maximum working hours for women—the first ruling of its kind ever made by a commission in America. The commission presently regulates employment of women through industrial orders setting maximum work hours, minimum wages, and other working conditions.

CHILD LABOR REGULATED

Child workers under 18 come in for their share of protection. The State of Oregon, for more than 50 years, has hewed to the dictum laid down by the Oregon Supreme Court that the regulation of children's working conditions is necessary if they are to be mentally and physically capable of performing the duties and relations of adult life. With the State closely supervising the wages, hours, and general working conditions of its young workers under 18, and with a school law which requires their attendance at school until the 12th grade is passed, the evils of child labor are practically nonexistent in Oregon.

Busy with the protection of today's industrial worker the State does not neglect the training of tomorrow's industrial worker. Oregon has a plan of on-the-job apprenticeship training, coupled with supplementary classwork, which prepares young men and women for the dual responsibilities of citizenship and craftsmanship.

No one ever questions the right of a worker to the wages he has earned, yet thousands of workers across the Nation each year are unable to collect the wages due them. Oregon is one of 17 States in the Union which, on request of the worker, will collect his overdue wages, by court action if necessary.

LABOR DISPUTES FEW

Labor disputes in the Beaver State have been relatively few, and this holds true for those great periods of nationwide turbulence and industrial activity.

An official report on State industrial conditions for two such periods is enlightening. An official report for the 1920 era states: "There have been fewer strikes and lockouts in Oregon than in any other State of the Union," and in 1945, a report on World War II conditions, a period of population growth and construction of new industrial plants, noted: "No other State had a lower percentage of man-days idle as a result of industrial disputes."

State employment records reveal only one out of 787 of the State's wage earners has been involved in labor disputes over the past 12 years. Oregon's tradition of settling disputes by calm, judicial proceedings rather than by battles, clubs, and violence has reaped its tangible reward.

UNIONS PRECEDED STATEHOOD

Organized labor in Oregon along all industrial lines has increased steadily, and its relations with the public and with management are generally good. Unions are not Johnny-come-latelies to the Oregon scene. Labor organizers came across the plains in the covered wagon.

THE FIRST CRAFT UNION

More than 100 years ago the first craft union, the printers, was formed in 1853 before Oregon became a State. Oregonians held that unions which were correctly conducted, were evidences of good citizenship, and benefited not only working men and women, but the public and management as well. The fact that for several years responsible management and organized labor have been meeting successfully at an annual industrial forum, sponsored by the University of Oregon, shows the respect responsible management and organized labor hold for one another. Here, general problems affecting both groups are threshed out in public discussion.

The problem of the migrant worker is felt to some extent in certain areas of Oregon. While crops are harvested in the main by local residents, between 18,000 and 20,000 migrant workers enter the State during the peak harvest months of June and August.

EQUAL PAY FOR EQUAL WORK

In 1955, it became unlawful for an employer to discriminate between the sexes in the payment of wages for work of comparable character, the performance of which requires comparable skills; thus another discriminatory practice was made a violation of the law.

SIXTH WITH CIVIL RIGHTS

In 1949, still true to her traditional policy of fair treatment for all workers, Oregon became the sixth State in the Nation to pass a Fair Employment Practices Act in which it was declared that the opportunity to obtain employment without discrimination because of race, religion, color, or national origin is a civil right. In ensuing years, civil rights legislation has been extended to prohibit such discrimination in places of public accommodation, resort or amusement, in publicly assisted housing, and in private vocational, professional, or trade schools.

If Oregon sticks to her traditional labor policy, she will continue to be a good and reasonable place for the laboring man and woman to work and raise a family.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the effect of physical geography upon a people has been studied by many an historian. Today I wish to touch for a moment upon the effect of moral or spiritual geography upon the politics of a people. Unless a people have vision it will perish. Unless a people establish goals which are worthy and unselfish it deserves to perish.

Daniel B. Stahl, AO3057149.
 Duane G. Teuscher, AO3051193.
 Thomas G. Tobin, AO3050663.
 Eugene H. Unruh, AO3058777.
 Matthew B. Wallace, AO3028808.
 Bertil W. Wallin, AO3057092.
 Alford M. White, Jr., AO3048012.
 Harry D. White, Jr., AO3028468.
 Richard K. Whitney, AO3051137.
 Joseph E. Wildt, AO3058911.
 John R. Wajahn, AO3058053.
 Bernard J. Zajkowski, AO3058779.

TO BE SECOND LIEUTENANT—DISTINGUISHED
 AVIATION CADET GRADUATE

Larimer J. Lenhardt, AO3081803.

IN THE COAST GUARD

The following-named persons to be chief warrant officers, W-4, in the U.S. Coast Guard:

Cecil M. Thomas	Oscar D. Diel
John Needham	Peter S. Fredriksen, Jr.
Arva S. Alexander	George W. Tanghe
Robert J. Mohr	Roy L. Dalsey
Frank P. Coffin	Cecil L. James
Wesley R. Hansberry	Charles E. Mueller
Gerard A. Hearn	Thomas E. Harwell
Peter Majkut	Joseph M. McGahee
Raymond E. Holley	Arthur N. Colona
William M. Parker	John E. Rowe

The following-named persons to be chief warrant officers, W-3, in the U.S. Coast Guard:

Arlo F. Jensen	Victor M. Adams
"A" "Z" Shows	Charles I. Carpenter
Charles H. Sanders	Jack S. Breschini
Richard G. Degnan	Ferdinand J. Selissen
Louis W. Stanley	Ernest T. Bittman
Jack D. Rodgers	Julian R. Sherman
Marshall K. Phillips	Leo V. Walsh, Jr.
Artel B. Crowley, Jr.	Adrian Fulcher
Gordon R. Campbell	Shelbert P. Creech
Martin F. Groff	George J. McKinlock
Ronald McClellan	Glenn N. Nelson
Lloyd T. Twiford	David A. Smith
Millard W. Johnson	Walter S. Yeagain
Daniel W. Cluff	Elmer L. Alban
Robert C. Ashdon	George D. Miller, Jr.
George W. Hupper	Frederick D. Mann
Harry J. Backman	James W. Berry
Henry O. Aeschliman	William F. Brock
Morris J. Marshall	Dolly Fulcher
William E. Hughes	Merle S. Wilson
Joseph L. Richardson	Finis L. McClanahan
Norman R. Hundwin	Robert F. Konrad
John T. Mears, Jr.	Cornelius A. Johnson
George D. Doll	Palmer F. Guarente
Earl W. Skinner	Clinton O. Gregory
Lester G. Quarles	Francis C. McCracken
Stanley Thoroughman	Howard A. Carande

The following-named persons to be chief warrant officers, W-2, in the U.S. Coast Guard:

Frederick J. Alles	William F. Kortlang
Edward J. Fraser	William E. Woodman
Thomas A. Gauld	Robert E. Bonville
Melvin C. Mize	Robert L. Williams, Jr.
Paul P. Sherrill	Neil H. Endsley
Timothy J. Crowley	Charles O. Franklin
John H. DeBoe	

U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE

John G. Tucker, of Texas, to be U.S. district judge for the eastern district of Texas, vice Lamar Cecil, deceased.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 12, 1959

The House met at 10:30 o'clock a.m. The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Judges 18: 5: *Ask counsel of God, that we may know whether our way, which we go, shall be prosperous.*

Eternal God, our Father, who art always seeking to draw us within the compass and circuit of Thy divine fellowship, grant that we may be eager to accept and acclaim the overtures of Thy friendship and love.

We acknowledge humbly that we greatly need Thy counsel and companionship in order that we may be equal to all the tasks and responsibilities which are far beyond our finite wisdom and strength.

Inspire our souls to lay hold confidently and courageously of those principles of truth and righteousness, good will and brotherhood which Thou hast ordained for the building of a nobler civilization.

May glory and majesty, dominion, and power, through Jesus Christ, our Lord, be Thine forever and ever. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Ratchford, one of his secretaries.

INTERNATIONAL MONETARY FUND AND INTERNATIONAL BANK FOR RECONSTRUCTION AND DEVELOPMENT—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 77)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read by the Clerk and, together with accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

In the Bretton Woods Agreements Act of 1945 Congress authorized the participation of the United States in the International Monetary Fund and in the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development.

This act of leadership on the part of the Government of the United States made it possible to bring these two great international institutions into being and to launch a major effort among the nations of the free world designed to establish an effective and continuing system of international cooperation in the fields of monetary and exchange policy and economic development.

Since their foundation 12 years ago, the United States has given vigorous support to the Bank and the Fund.

The two institutions have been outstandingly successful.

The Bank has assisted on an increasing scale the economic growth of the less developed countries through well-conceived and intelligently executed development projects. The Fund, through the provision of wise counsel and timely financial assistance to member countries faced with balance-of-payments difficulties, has successfully promoted the adoption of sound fiscal, monetary and foreign exchange policies in member countries.

The international standing achieved by the Bank and Fund is such that the international economic system of today cannot successfully function without them. They are indeed vital to the continued economic growth and cohesion of the entire free world.

The National Advisory Council on International Monetary and Financial Problems, which is responsible for advising me with respect to United States relationships with the Bank and Fund, has now recommended that the resources of the Bank and Fund be increased.

I strongly concur in this recommendation. Accordingly, I ask that Congress, in accordance with the provisions of the Bretton Woods Agreements Act, authorize the U.S. Governor of the International Monetary Fund to request and consent to an increase of 50 percent in the quota of the United States in the International Monetary Fund, and authorize the U.S. Governor of the International Bank to vote for an increase of 110 percent in the capital stock of the Bank, and, subject to said increase becoming effective, subscribe on behalf of the United States to 31,750 additional shares of stock of the Bank, amounting to a doubling of the United States subscription.

The recommended increase is necessary to enable the two institutions to continue to operate successfully over the years ahead. Our subscriptions are the only financial support we are required to give these institutions. Within the framework of their capital structure, they are self-supporting and do not require additional periodic contributions.

INTERNATIONAL MONETARY FUND

The International Monetary Fund has two primary tasks. It promotes international monetary cooperation and sound foreign exchange practices which are vital to the balanced growth of world trade and development. It also provides short-term financial assistance to member countries to help them stabilize their currencies, maintain or move toward convertibility, and overcome temporary balance-of-payments problems without resorting to restrictions or other practices which may be harmful to international cooperation. In its financial operations, the Fund utilizes the gold and currencies which have been provided to it by the member countries on the basis of their quotas. These operations consist of advances or drawings repayable in not more than 3 to 5 years.

Since the beginning of its operations, the Fund has made available about \$4.1 billion to 36 countries. Of this sum \$3.2 billion was actually drawn in cash; commitments of over \$800 million under standby arrangements or lines of credit are still outstanding; and \$100 million in such credits were allowed to expire unused. Approximately two-thirds of the total was provided during the past 2 years, and the total amount of drawings and unused standby commitments outstanding on December 31, 1958, was \$2.6 billion. On that date, the Fund's holdings of gold and U.S. dollars available for new advances or commitments were \$1.4 billion, compared with \$3.5 billion at the end of 1956. In the light of past

experience, this amount would not be adequate if calls on the fund comparable to those of recent years were made. The fund must maintain sufficient liquid resources to constitute a second line of reserves to which its members can turn with assurance at any time.

The proposed general increase of 50 percent in the resources of the Fund, together with larger increases requested by a few countries, will meet this need. These increases will raise the resources of the fund by approximately \$5 billion, of which gold and dollars will amount to some \$2.3 billion. If these new resources are made available, the free world can have full confidence in the capacity of the Fund to perform its tasks in the coming years.

Under the articles of agreements of the Fund, when a quota is increased, the member must pay 25 percent of the increase in gold, and the balance in its currency. In our case, this means a payment of approximately \$344 million in gold and \$1,031 million in dollars. The latter will be held in non-interest-bearing notes to be utilized only at such time as the Fund may need cash to meet drawings by its members.

I should like to stress the cooperative nature of this proposed increase in fund resources. Three-fourths of the gold to be paid to the fund will come from other countries. Moreover, the additional holdings of other leading currencies will be increasingly useful to the fund, particularly in view of the recent extension of the convertibility of major European currencies. This increase in resources on a very broad base is assured by the provision that the increase will not become effective until members having 75 percent of present fund quotas have consented to quota increases.

INTERNATIONAL BANK FOR RECONSTRUCTION AND DEVELOPMENT

The International Bank for Reconstruction and Development has, in its 12 years of operations, made loans of over \$4 billion in 49 different countries and territories. The Bank's reconstruction loans were made in 1947, and since then the Bank has made loans of some \$3.6 billion for productive development projects. Loans by the Bank are currently running at the rate of about \$700 million per year. Most of these loans have been made to the underdeveloped areas of the world. The Bank's own financing and technical assistance activities have increased the pace of economic growth all over the free world. The Bank has also been able to act as a conduit and stimulant to the flow of private capital into less developed areas.

Under the charter of the International Bank, only a small part of its authorized capital is available for lending, and the Bank obtains its funds primarily through borrowings in the financial markets of the world. Most of its authorized capital is, in effect, a guarantee for these borrowings. The Bank has raised the equivalent of more than \$2 billion through issuance of its bonds in several different currencies. Approximately \$1.8 billion of such bonds are currently outstanding. These bonds are recognized throughout the world as high qual-

ity securities. Both because of the member countries' guarantees and because of the outstanding character of its record, the Bank has been able to borrow large sums of money at frequent intervals at rates of interest comparable to those on high-grade Government securities. This permits the Bank to fix interest rates on its own loans that do not impose undue burdens on the borrowing countries.

At present, and in the foreseeable future, the ability of the Bank to raise funds in the capital market of the United States will depend largely upon the guarantee inherent in this country's subscription. Under the current rate of Bank borrowing, the present amount of this guarantee will be exceeded in the next 2 years. If the Bank is to continue to play its full part in raising productivity and living standards, additional capital far beyond the amount covered by the existing U.S. subscription will be needed.

The proposed increase of 110 percent in the total capital of the Bank and of 100 percent in the U.S. subscription will permit the Bank to meet its needs for borrowed funds for a substantial period of time. No part of the increase in our subscription would be required to be paid in except to meet defaults on the Bank's obligations. There is no reason to believe that this contingent liability will become a real one.

As in the case of the Fund, the proposed increase in the capital of the Bank will not become effective until subscriptions have been received for approximately 75 percent of the existing capital. This will assure a wide participation by the member countries.

The Special Report of the National Advisory Council, which describes in detail the proposal to increase the resources of the Bank and Fund, is attached.

The entire free world needs sound currencies and orderly exchange systems to foster trade and economic growth and it needs capital which will support rising living standards and accelerate the pace of economic development in all of the member countries. The International Monetary Fund and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development have achieved outstanding records as effective instruments toward these ends. For the well-being of the free world and in our own interest, it is essential that the proposed increases in the resources of these two institutions take place.

There is real urgency for prompt action. The United States has for many months been taking the lead in this important effort to equip the Bank and Fund to continue their work. The countries of the free world look to the United States, because of our economic strength, to set the pace by acting without delay to take up our subscription in the new stock of the Bank and to pay our quota increase in the Fund. I consider it to be most important for the U.S. Government to maintain the posture of leadership which it now occupies. To this end, I urge the Congress to enact the necessary legislation so that these increases may promptly be made effec-

tive, to insure further progress toward realizing a better life for the peoples of the free world.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.
THE WHITE HOUSE, February 12, 1959.

RECESS

The SPEAKER. The House will stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Thereupon (at 10:34 o'clock a.m.) the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired the House was called to order by the Speaker at 10 o'clock and 48 minutes a.m.

JOINT SESSION OF CONGRESS IN THE HALL OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES HELD PURSUANT TO THE PROVISIONS OF HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 648, 85TH CONGRESS, COMMEMORATING THE 150TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE BIRTH OF ABRAHAM LINCOLN

THE JOINT COMMITTEE ON ARRANGEMENTS,
FRED SCHWENDEL, CHAIRMAN

For the Senate: PAUL H. DOUGLAS, of Illinois; EVERETT M. DIRKSEN, of Illinois; JOHN S. COOPER, of Kentucky; VANCE HARTKE, of Indiana.

For the House: PETER F. MACK, JR., of Illinois; WINFIELD K. DENTON, of Indiana; FRED SCHWENDEL, of Iowa; WILLIAM G. BRAY, of Indiana.

THE PROGRAM FOR THE JOINT SESSION

Prelude.....U.S. Army Band Orchestra
Maj. Hugh J. Curry, leader
Presiding officer.....The Speaker
HON. SAM RAYBURN
Invocation.....Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D.
The Chaplain of the House of Representatives
Distinguished guests presented.
Songs.....The Idlers, Choral Group of Cadets
U.S. Coast Guard Academy
Reading of the Gettysburg address.....
Fredric March
Address.....Carl Sandburg
Benediction.....
Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D.
The Chaplain of the Senate

The Speaker of the House presided.

The Doorkeeper announced the Vice President and Members of the U.S. Senate, who entered the Hall of the House of Representatives, the Vice President taking the chair at the right of the Speaker and the Senators occupying seats in front of the Representatives on the east and west side of the main aisle.

The Doorkeeper announced the following guests:

Former Vice President of the United States Henry A. Wallace.

The assistant heads of departments; heads of independent agencies, offices, and commissions; Lincoln Sesquicentennial Commission, honorary and advisory members, Director and Assistant Director; and Civil War Centennial Commission Director and Assistant Director who occupied seats assigned them on the floor.

The Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff, Chief of Staff of the Army, Chief of Naval Operations, Chief of Staff of the

Air Force, Commandant of the Marine Corps, Commandant of the Coast Guard, generals of the Army, fleet admirals who occupied seats assigned them on the floor.

The Chief Justice of the United States and the Associate Justices of the Supreme Court, who occupied seats on the left of the rostrum.

The Ambassadors, Ministers, and Chargés d'Affaires of foreign governments who occupied seats assigned them on the floor.

The members of the President's Cabinet who occupied seats in front of and on the right of the rostrum.

Mr. Fredric March, escorted by the committee of Senators and Representatives, took his place at the Clerk's desk. [Applause, the Members rising.]

Mr. Carl Sandburg, escorted by the committee of Senators and Representatives, took his place at the Clerk's desk. [Applause, the Members rising.]

The joint session of Congress was called to order by the Speaker.

INVOCATION

The SPEAKER. The invocation will be delivered by the Reverend Bernard Braskamp, D.D., Chaplain of the House of Representatives.

Dr. BRASKAMP. I Corinthians 13: 13: *And now abideth faith, hope, and charity, these three; but the greatest of these is charity.*

Most merciful and gracious God, we have assembled here to pay tribute to the life and character of a great American patriot who stood like a giant among his contemporaries and whose record of heroic service has made an indelible impression upon succeeding generations.

We rejoice that he always kept the windows of his soul open toward the unseen and eternal, whence came his insight and inspiration, his faith and fortitude, his humility and charity.

Grant that his indomitable passion for the preservation of the Union may also inspire our longing to promote and preserve the union and concord of God-fearing men and nations in their search and struggle for peace and freedom.

May our beloved country continue to pray and labor to bring to fulfillment and fruition that blessed day when all the members of the human family shall walk and work together in friendship and fraternity.

Hear us in the name of the Prince of Peace. Amen.

THE U.S. ARMY BAND

The SPEAKER. Members of the Congress, we will now have the pleasure of some renditions by the U.S. Army Band under the direction of Maj. Hugh Curry.

The U.S. Army Band played the following marches: "Adoration," "Spirit of Independence," "Man of the Hour," and "All-American Soldier."

The SPEAKER. Members of the Congress, we will now be entertained by a choral group as known as the Idlers, Cadets of the U.S. Coast Guard Academy.

The Coast Guard Academy Chorus, the Idlers, under the direction of Bandmaster Donald L. Janse, rendered a medley of excerpts from sacred and secular

music: "Lord, Thou Hast Been Our Dwelling Place Forever," "America," "Dixie," "When Johnnie Comes Marching Home," "Tramp, Tramp, Tramp, the Boys Are Marching," "Ora Lee," "Battle Hymn of the Republic," "Taps," and the closing portion of "Lincoln's Gettysburg Address." Arrangement by Bandmaster Janse.

READING OF THE GETTYSBURG ADDRESS

The SPEAKER. Members of the Congress, it is now my great pleasure to present a very famous man who has been heard and seen throughout the country and throughout the world, twice an Academy Award winner, and selected for his present role after consultation with the Motion Picture Association of the United States of America. I take great pleasure, therefore, in presenting to you a distinguished citizen, a fine man, and a great artist, Fredric March. [Applause, the Members rising.]

Mr. March will now read the Gettysburg Address.

Mr. MARCH. Mr. President, Mr. Speaker, Members of the Congress, honored guests:

"Fourscore and seven years ago our fathers brought forth on this continent a new nation, conceived in liberty and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal.

"Now we are engaged in a great civil war, testing whether that nation or any nation so conceived and so dedicated can long endure. We are met on a great battlefield of that war. We have come to dedicate a portion of that field, as a final resting-place for those who here gave their lives that that nation might live. It is altogether fitting and proper that we should do this.

"But, in a larger sense, we cannot dedicate—we cannot consecrate—we cannot hallow—this ground. The brave men, living and dead, who struggled here, have consecrated it, far above our poor power to add or detract. The world will little note, nor long remember what we say here, but it can never forget what they did here. It is for us the living, rather, to be dedicated here to the unfinished work which they who fought here have thus far so nobly advanced. It is rather for us to be here dedicated to the great task remaining before us—that from these honored dead we take increased devotion to that cause for which they gave the last full measure of devotion—that we here highly resolve that these dead shall not have died in vain—that this nation, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom—and that government of the people, by the people, for the people, shall not perish from the earth." [Applause, the Members rising.]

ADDRESS

The SPEAKER. And now it becomes my great pleasure, and I deem it a high privilege, to be able to present to you the man who in all probability knows more about the life, the times, the hopes, and the aspirations of Abraham Lincoln than any other human being. He has studied and has put on paper his conceptions of the towering figure of this great and this good man. I take pleasure and I deem it an honor to be able to

present to you this great writer, this great historian, Carl Sandburg.

[Applause, the Members rising.]

Mr. SANDBURG. Before beginning this prepared address, I must make the remark that this introduction, this reception here calls for humility rather than pride. I am well aware of that.

Not often in the story of mankind does a man arrive on earth who is both steel and velvet, who is as hard as rock and soft as drifting fog, who holds in his heart and mind the paradox of terrible storm and peace unspeakable and perfect. Here and there across centuries come reports of men alleged to have these contrasts. And the incomparable Abraham Lincoln born 150 years ago this day, is an approach if not a perfect realization of this character. In the time of the April lilacs in the year 1865, on his death, the casket with his body was carried north and west a thousand miles; and the American people wept as never before; bells sobbed, cities wore crepe; people stood in tears and with hats off as the railroad burial car paused in the leading cities of seven States ending its journey at Springfield, Ill., the hometown. During the 4 years he was President he at times, especially in the first 3 months, took to himself the powers of a dictator; he commanded the most powerful armies till then assembled in modern warfare; he enforced conscription of soldiers for the first time in American history; under imperative necessity he abolished the right of habeas corpus; he directed politically and spiritually the wild, massive turbulent forces let loose in civil war; he argued and pleaded for compensated emancipation of the slaves. The slaves were property, they were on the tax-books along with horses and cattle, the valuation of each slave written next to his name on the tax assessor's books. Failing to get action on compensated emancipation, as a Chief Executive having war powers he issued the paper by which he declared the slaves to be free under military necessity. In the end nearly \$4 million worth of property was taken away from those who were legal owners of it, property confiscated, wiped out as by fire and turned to ashes, at his instigation and executive direction. Chattel property recognized and lawful for 300 years was expropriated, seized without payment.

In the month the war began he told his secretary, John Hay:

My policy is to have no policy.

Three years later in a letter to a Kentucky friend made public, he confessed plainly:

I have been controlled by events.

His words at Gettysburg were sacred, yet strange with a color of the familiar:

We cannot consecrate—we cannot hallow—this ground. The brave men, living and dead, who struggled here, have consecrated it, far beyond our poor power to add or detract.

He could have said "the brave Union men." Did he have a purpose in omitting the word "Union?" Was he keeping himself and his utterance clear of the passion that would not be good to look

back on when the time came for peace and reconciliation? Did he mean to leave an implication that there were brave Union men and brave Confederate men, living and dead, who had struggled there? We do not know, of a certainty. Was he thinking of the Kentucky father whose two sons died in battle, one in Union blue, the other in Confederate gray, the father inscribing on the stone over their double grave, "God knows which was right"? We do not know. His changing policies from time to time aimed at saving the Union. In the end his armies won and his Nation became a world power. In August of 1864 he wrote a memorandum that he expected in view of the national situation, he expected to lose the next November election. That month of August was so dark. Sudden military victory brought the tide his way; the vote was 2,200,000 for him and 1,800,000 against him. Among his bitter opponents were such figures as Samuel F. B. Morse, inventor of the telegraph, and Cyrus H. McCormick, inventor of the farm reaper. In all its essential propositions the southern Confederacy had the moral support of powerful, respectable elements throughout the North, probably more than a million voters believing in the justice of the southern cause. While the war winds howled he insisted that the Mississippi was one river meant to belong to one country, that railroad connection from coast to coast must be pushed through and the Union Pacific Railroad made a reality. While the luck of war wavered and broke and came again, as generals failed and campaigns were lost, he held enough forces of the north together to raise new armies and supply them, until generals were found who made war as victorious war has always been made, with terror, frightfulness, destruction, and on both sides, North and South, valor and sacrifice past words of man to tell. In the mixed shame and blame of the immense wrongs of two crashing civilizations, often with nothing to say, he said nothing, slept not at all, and on occasions he was seen to weep in a way that made weeping appropriate, decent, majestic. As he rode alone on horseback near Soldiers Home on the edge of Washington one night his hat was shot off; a son he loved died as he watched at the bed; his wife was accused of betraying information to the enemy, until denials from him were necessary. An Indiana man at the White House heard him say, "Voorhees, don't it seem strange to you that I, who could never so much as cut off the head of a chicken, should be elected, or selected, into the midst of all this blood?" He tried to guide General Nathaniel Prentiss Banks, a Democrat, three times Governor of Massachusetts, in the governing of some 17 of the 48 parishes of Louisiana controlled by the Union armies, an area holding a fourth of the slaves of Louisiana. He would like to see the State recognize the emancipation proclamation:

And while she is at it, I think it would not be objectionable for her to adopt some practical system by which the two races could gradually live themselves out of their old relation to each other, and both come out better prepared for the new. Education

for the young blacks should be included in the plan.

To Gov. Michel Hahn, elected in 1864 by a majority of the 11,000 white male voters who had taken the oath of allegiance to the Union, Lincoln wrote:

Now you are about to have a convention which, among other things, will probably define the elective franchise. I barely suggest for your private consideration, whether some of the colored people may not be let in—as for instance the very intelligent and especially those who have fought gallantly in our ranks.

Among the million words in the Lincoln utterance record, he interprets himself with a more keen precision than someone else offering to explain him. His simple opening of the "house divided" speech in 1858 serves for today:

If we could first know where we are, and whither we are tending we could better judge what to do, and how to do it.

To his Kentucky friend, Joshua F. Speed, he wrote in 1855:

Our progress in degeneracy appears to me to be pretty rapid. As a Nation we began by declaring that "all men are created equal, except Negroes." When the know-nothings get control, it will read "all men are created equal except Negroes and foreigners and Catholics." When it comes to this, I shall prefer emigrating to some country where they make no pretense of loving liberty.

Infinitely tender was his word from a White House balcony to a crowd on the White House lawn:

I have not willingly planted a thorn in any man's bosom.

Or to a military Governor:

I shall do nothing through malice; what I deal with is too vast for malice.

He wrote for Congress to read on December 1, 1862:

In times like the present men should utter nothing for which they would not willingly be responsible through time and eternity.

Like an ancient psalmist he warned Congress:

Fellow citizens, we cannot escape history. We will be remembered in spite of ourselves. No personal significance or insignificance can spare one or another of us. The fiery trial through which we pass will light us down in honor or dishonor to the latest generation.

Wanting Congress to break and forget past traditions his words came keen and flashing:

The dogmas of the quiet past are inadequate for the stormy present. We must think anew, we must act anew, we must disenfranchise ourselves.

They are the sort of words that actuated the mind and will of the men who created and navigated that marvel of the sea, the *Nautilus*, and her voyage from Pearl Harbor and under the North Pole icecap.

The people of many other countries take Lincoln now for their own. He belongs to them. He stands for decency, honest dealing, plain talk, and funny stories. "Look where he came from—don't he know all us strugglers and wasn't he a kind of tough struggler all his life right up to the finish?" Something like that you can hear in any neighborhood and across the seas.

Millions there are who take him as a personal treasure. He had something they would like to see spread everywhere over the world. Democracy? We cannot say exactly what it is, but he had it. In his blood and bones he carried it. In the breath of his speeches and writings it is there. Popular government? Republican institutions? Government where the people have the say-so, one way or another telling their elected leaders what they want? He had the idea. It is there in the lights and shadows of his personality, a mystery that can be lived but never fully spoken in words.

Our good friend, the poet and playwright Mark Van Doren, tells us:

To me, Lincoln seems, in some ways, the most interesting man who ever lived. He was gentle but this gentleness was combined with a terrific toughness, an iron strength.

And how did Lincoln say he would like to be remembered? Something of it is in this present occasion, the atmosphere of this room. His beloved friend, Representative Owen Lovejoy, of Illinois, had died in May of 1864, and friends wrote to Lincoln and he replied that the pressure of duties kept him from joining them in efforts for a marble monument to Lovejoy, the last sentence of Lincoln's letter, saying:

Let him have the marble monument along with the well-assured and more enduring one in the hearts of those who love liberty, unselfishly, for all men.

Today we may say, perhaps, that the well-assured and most enduring memorial to Lincoln is invisibly there, today, tomorrow, and for a long time yet to come. It is there in the hearts of lovers of liberty, men and women—this country has always had them in crises—men and women who understand that wherever there is freedom there have been those who fought, toiled, and sacrificed for it.

I thank you. [Applause, the Members rising.]

BENEDICTION

The SPEAKER. The benediction will be pronounced by Dr. Frederick Brown Harris, Chaplain of the U.S. Senate.

Dr. HARRIS. Our Father God, from this national sacrament of gratitude and memory, with the winged words of a prophet of our day lodged in our hearts, with the light of Thy countenance lifted upon us,

Send us forth into this testing, trying time with the faith and patience of Thy servant, Abraham Lincoln—like him—

To be true to all truth the world denies,
Not tongue-tied by its gilded lies;
Not always right in all men's eyes,
But faithful to the light within.

Amen.

RETIREMENT OF DISTINGUISHED GUESTS

The Doorkeeper escorted the distinguished guests from the Chamber in the following order:

The members of the President's Cabinet.

The Chief Justice of the United States and the Associate Justices of the United States Supreme Court.

The ambassadors, ministers, and chargés d'affaires of foreign governments.

The assistant heads of departments; heads of independent agencies, offices, and commissions; Lincoln Sesquicentennial Commission, honorary and advisory members, Director and Assistant Director; and Civil War Centennial Commission Director and Assistant Director.

The Chairman, Joint Chief of Staff, Chief of Staff of the Army, Chief of Naval Operations, Chief of Staff of the Air Force, Commandant of the Marine Corps, Commandant of the Coast Guard, generals of the Army, and fleet admirals.

JOINT SESSION DISSOLVED

The SPEAKER. The Chair declares the joint session of the two Houses dissolved.

Thereupon (at 11 o'clock and 58 minutes a.m.) the joint session of the two Houses of Congress was dissolved.

The Members of the U.S. Senate retired to their Chamber.

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 11 o'clock and 59 minutes p.m.

BIRTHDAY OF A GREAT PATRIOT, LEADER, AND REVOLUTIONARY WAR HERO: THADDEUS KOSCIUSZKO

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and also that any Member who may desire to do so may have 3 legislative days in which to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the life and character of Thaddeus Kosciuszko.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, today, February 12, is the birthday of a great Polish-American patriot. Tadeusz Kosciuszko was one of those unique European statesmen whose thinking was far beyond his contemporary lifetime.

Above all, Kosciuszko was a democrat in the tradition of Jefferson and Lafayette. He implicitly believed in man's desire and ability to grow, develop, and become strong under the democratic form of government. Throughout his long life—February 12, 1746, to April 2, 1817—Kosciuszko devoted his entire energy and talent to furthering this belief in practical form.

Aside from Kosciuszko's leadership in Poland as well as in all of central Europe in the cause of national and individual freedom, this great man played one of the most significant roles of any individual in America's fight for independence. He came to the United States in 1776 as a young man and distinguished himself as a brilliant military strategist, especially in New York and at the battle of Yorktown. As recognition of his services, General Washington promoted Kosciuszko to the rank of colonel of artillery and made him his adjutant. In 1783, after American independence was firmly established, Kosciuszko was rewarded for his services to the cause of U.S. independence with the thanks

of Congress, the privilege of American citizenship, a considerable annual pension with landed estates, and the rank of brigadier general. A year later he returned to his native Poland for many years he led the struggling Polish people in their unending battle for independence. In 1796 he came to the United States for a second visit and lived in Philadelphia until May 1798. Gaining new insights into the democratic process, he returned to Europe and made one last, but fruitless attempt to restore the sovereignty of his homeland at the Congress of Vienna. At length he retired to his estates. His last act before his death on April 2, 1817, was typical of a lifetime devoted to the freedom of the individual and belief in the dignity of man. He freed all the serfs in his care, insisting only on the maintenance of schools on the liberated estates.

Today, with a world so torn with fear and ideological conflict it is well that we in the United States pause to pay tribute to a great military leader, a great statesman, and a great American. His energy, his insight and his unflinching belief in man as a rational political being provide a contemporary lesson for us all. Poland still fights in the name of Kosciuszko. America remembers.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, February 12 marks the 131st anniversary of the birth of Thaddeus Kosciuszko, who contributed greatly to the battle for freedom both in his native Poland and in America.

Born in Poland in 1746 and educated in the military schools of Poland and France, Kosciuszko came to our shores during the dark days of the Revolution and unselfishly devoted his great ability to the establishment of freedom and independence in America.

To the cause of the struggling colonies Kosciuszko brought three things: Scientific knowledge, strength of character, and unwavering enthusiasm for the cause of liberty. His contribution to the struggle for American independence was rivaled only by his fight for the freedom of his native Poland.

Today all the people of America join with Americans of Polish descent in paying tribute to this great Polish patriot. His name will live always in the hearts of all people who believe in justice, freedom, and self-government.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, we have gathered here today in the Halls of the Congress to observe the 150th birthday anniversary of the 16th President and one of the greatest sons of our country, Abraham Lincoln. On this day, also, we commemorate the birthday of a famous adopted son of our country, and a hero of the Revolutionary War, Gen. Tadeusz Kosciuszko.

In their backgrounds, Lincoln and Kosciuszko were far apart. Lincoln was born in a log cabin in Kentucky, received little formal education, and advanced from his humble origin to the highest office in our land.

Kosciuszko, in contrast, was born in Poland, of a well-to-do family, and received excellent education. He was a graduate of the Military Academy in Warsaw and the Military School of Artillery in Paris. Unlike Lincoln, he was principally a soldier.

But in spite of their divergent backgrounds, Lincoln and Kosciuszko were alike in their love of liberty and justice, and in their belief in the dignity and basic equality of men.

It is these convictions which they shared, and for which they lived and died, that have earned them our love, gratitude, and honor.

The lives of these two men, and their achievements, are well known to all of us. I shall not endeavor to repeat them. I would, however, like to bring out one point which seems very significant, and very pertinent to the problems which our Nation, and the rest of the free world, face today.

Both Lincoln and Kosciuszko were involved directly in tremendous struggles to assure the freedom, and the unity, of our Nation. And they both clearly realized, and so indicated in their speeches and writings, that those wars were not fought solely for the sake of the then-living generations. Those wars were fought so that generations to come could enjoy liberty, justice, and progress in a free, democratic, and united nation.

We, too, are involved in a great and terrible conflict: the conflict between the free world and communism. The outcome of this conflict may well determine the survival of our western civilization, and the survival of the priceless heritage which came to us through the efforts and sacrifices of men like Lincoln and Kosciuszko.

We must realize and remember, therefore, as they did so clearly, that what is at stake in this conflict is not only our own future, but also the future of our children and of our children's children for many generations to come. Our actions today will determine the framework of the society in which they will live for decades and even centuries to come.

With God's help, and a firm stand and willingness to sacrifice on our part, we may preserve our heritage and pass it on to our children, so that they too will be able to enjoy liberty and justice.

This is our responsibility. God give us strength that, inspired by the example of Lincoln and Kosciuszko, our Nation today and in the days to come may live up to that responsibility.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, February 12 marks a very special day for all of us who cherish freedom in our hearts. I am proud to join in commemorating the birthday anniversary of Tadeusz Kosciuszko, who fought for freedom on two continents.

Kosciuszko was born in Poland on February 12, 1746. Benefiting from an education in Poland and in France, the 30-year-old captain of artillery joined with the American patriots of 1776 in support of the great moral and political principles set forth in the Declaration of Independence.

A skilled military leader and a tireless fighter for human liberty, he served with distinction at Saratoga, Yorktown, and Charleston. Through his talents he became a brigadier general in the Continental Army.

When it seemed that there was hope for the cause of freedom in his native Poland he returned to join the struggle. Although the small but inspired Polish army fought gallantly against the Russian hordes, defeat was inevitable. After an imprisonment of 2 years in Russia, he returned to America in 1797 for a brief visit. He formed a close friendship with Thomas Jefferson who wrote of him:

I see Kosciuszko often. He is the purest son of liberty among you all that I have ever known.

The next year he returned to Europe to champion once more the cause of Polish independence. He died in exile in Switzerland in 1817.

To Kosciuszko, the gallant fighter for the cause of human freedom, we offer this tribute to perpetuate his memory and our gratitude.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, today, February 12, we commemorate in this country not only the anniversary of one of our great national leaders, the great emancipator, Abraham Lincoln, but also we commemorate the anniversary of a great American Revolutionary War hero and patriot, who came from his native land to help us with the liberty for which we are today so grateful, Thaddeus Kosciuszko.

It is indeed significant that the fight for freedom and democracy which brought about the independence of this country caught fire across the seas and rallied to American standards outstanding men from other countries who shared our sentiments. One of the greatest of these was Kosciuszko, an outstanding military engineer, whose efforts contributed toward the military fortifications at West Point in 1778, and who played a prominent part in the decisive Saratoga and Carolina campaigns of the American Revolution. In recognition of his great service to American independence, Kosciuszko was made a brigadier general in the American Army by Congress on October 13, 1783.

After he returned to Poland, Kosciuszko, with the same spirit of freedom, became one of the great champions of Polish independence, leading his countrymen in uprisings against their Russian and Prussian oppressors.

But the brave Polish fight for independence faced heavy odds from totalitarian aggressors, and General Kosciuszko was driven out of his homeland and died in exile in Switzerland in 1817.

On this anniversary of his birth let us pause today, Mr. Speaker, to pay honor to the memory of a great and gallant Polish officer who left home, friends, and fortunes to serve the cause of freedom in this country. May his memory remind us that the cause of freedom is indivisible, and that when the freedom of any country is menaced the freedom of all men is menaced.

Just as Kosciuszko left home to fight for American freedom, may we in days to come dedicate our energies and resources to the end of restoring freedom from Communist oppressors to the Polish homeland which he loved so well and served so faithfully.

Mr. KOWALSKI. Mr. Speaker, February is the month of heroes. To Americans the greatness of Washington and Lincoln is called to mind. To Lithuanians there are joyful recollections of independence, heroically won, only to be bitterly lost in the tragic recent past, but still celebrated in this month of honor. And to Polish people all over the world there is no date in memory more notable than February 12, the birthday of the great Polish statesman, military engineer extraordinary, democrat and patriot of two continents: Thaddeus Kosciuszko.

Never was there a man more inclined to dream of the impossible, yet at the same time so capable of fulfilling his dreams. Born into the mid-Eighteenth Century world, at a time when Poland was plagued by foreign armies, Kosciuszko grew up burning with the desire to drive the foreigners, once and for all, from Polish soil. Was this a practical dream? Was it practical to expect the people of a nation with no natural boundaries and little in the way of political unity to expel and hold at bay the arms of Europe's mightiest nations? Perhaps not, but Kosciuszko nonetheless conceived this dream and clung to it as long as he lived.

Kosciuszko's role in the American Revolution is legend. No sooner had he entered upon the military scene than his talents at fortification construction earned him wide renown. The defenses erected at Ticonderoga early in the war were his work, and his removal from that post and a revision of the defenses there brought forth an anguished cry from a superior officer, who prophesied disaster unless Kosciuszko returned. The protest was prophetic for, in Kosciuszko's absence, Ticonderoga fell to British assault.

Not wanting to commit the same blunder a second time, the American Army authorities now turned over their main defensive operations to Kosciuszko. At Saratoga he laid out defenses that enabled the Americans to overwhelm the British attack. This victory, in turn, won for America her alliance with France and her recognition as an independent nation by Louis XVI.

Now fully cognizant of the abilities of this engineering genius, the Army appointed Kosciuszko to oversee the defense of the Hudson River, with headquarters at West Point, the so-called Gibraltar of the Hudson. Kosciuszko's work at West Point was the longest and most important of his undertakings in the United States and is inseparably connected in the American mind with his name. Little is now left of his fortifications, but the monument raised in his honor by the American youth, with the inscription: "To the hero of two worlds," remains a grateful tribute to his memory.

That the military students of the United States can look back to West Point as their alma mater is in great measure Kosciuszko's doing. When it was first resolved to found a training school in arms for the young men of the States, Kosciuszko urged that it should be placed at West Point, and suggested the spot where it now stands.

When he sailed from American shores in 1786, Kosciuszko left behind an enviable record. Living up to his constant dream of democratic achievement in the face of heavy odds, he had assisted in the liberation of a colonial people from the yoke of the most powerful military nation in the world. His remuneration had been slight, but that was no matter—a dream had been fulfilled.

Kosciuszko now returned to Poland in the hopes of serving the Polish people as he had served the Americans, and on the occasion of the reorganization of the Polish Army in 1789 he was appointed major general. The stage was now set for the closing drama of his career and his final contribution to the world's awkward struggle for perfection.

The democratic tidal wave generated by the American Revolution was now rushing upon Europe and compelling members of every class and creed to line up, either on the side of the revolutionary doctrine of the rights of man, or in defense of ancient European laissez-faire traditions. When this tidal wave struck Poland in May of 1791, Kosciuszko immediately announced himself as a democrat, calling upon the people to establish constitutional government. He was with the forces that carried the day.

A constitutional and hereditary government was established; burghers were granted equal civic rights with the nobility, and the condition of the peasants was ameliorated. At long last it appeared that political unity had come to Poland; that finally there existed the basis for the growth and success of a Polish state supported by the people. But such a development would deal a death blow to the designs of conquest of those who had fed so long on Polish weakness, including the neighboring state of Russia.

In consequence of this, Russia invaded Poland in May of 1792 and Kosciuszko, for the second time in his career, found himself engaged in the forefront of the world's battle for democracy. But on this occasion the odds were impossible. Notwithstanding Kosciuszko's brilliant generalship, the Polish Army was overwhelmed after two months of some of the most gallant fighting in military history.

When Poland was partitioned following the war, Kosciuszko withdrew from the army and retired to Leipzig. But the next year he was back again, leading an insurrectionary army against the Russians with astonishing success until, once again overcome by the heavy odds, he was defeated for the final time.

What had Kosciuszko's military performance achieved for Poland? The cynical might observe that nothing was accomplished. But life is not so simple as to be governed solely by skirmishes won and lost on a battlefield. Kosciuszko's brilliant, courageous, and idealistic attempt to drive the foreign invader from Polish soil, in the name of democracy, created a tradition, which persists to this day; a tradition that will never be eradicated.

In his zeal for democratic government, Kosciuszko was following in the footsteps of the United States. But that was

not always the order of things. In April 1817, 6 months before he died, he issued a letter of emancipation to the serfs on his estate in Poland. It was to be almost half a century before the United States was able to emulate this departing gesture of one of Europe's truly great democrats, Thaddeus Kosciuszko, the "hero of two worlds."

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, at a time in our history when the emphasis on military and defense requirements is so constant as to be commonplace, it is especially fitting that we pay more than ordinary homage to a great soldier who rendered extraordinary military service to this country at a time when men of his kind were few and far between, and very much in demand.

I speak of course of Gen. Tadeusz Kosciuszko, the great Polish-American hero of the Revolutionary War. Both his exceptional service as a military commander in the Saratoga and Carolina campaigns of the Revolutionary War and his engineering feats as the man who built the fortifications at West Point mark him for greatness.

Today, it is imperative that we recall the great example set by General Kosciuszko for yet another reason. After the Revolution this popular hero returned to his native Poland to champion his own people's fight for independence. This is a fight that is not yet over, a fight that could well benefit from the likes of another Tadeusz Kosciuszko.

Mr. Speaker, it is with a deep sense of gratitude and admiration that I join in this salute to General Kosciuszko on the anniversary of his birth 213 years ago.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the success of the American Revolution was assured by the unrelenting efforts and untold sacrifices made by the people here struggling for their independence. Other peoples, not native to this country, but equally great fighters for the cause of liberty, also contributed significantly to the successful culmination of that historic and glorious event. Tadeusz Kosciuszko of Poland, that intrepid, gallant and gifted soldier of freedom, was one of those whose personal participation in the American Revolution marks him as one of the great heroes of his day.

This great man was born into an impoverished family on February 12, 1746. At the age of 13 he lost his father, but his yearning for education led him to the Royal School at Warsaw in 1765. He was graduated with the rank of captain in 1769, and was awarded a scholarship to France where he studied at the famous military school at Mezieres, specializing in artillery and engineering. In 1776 he was in Paris when he heard of the American Revolution. That stirred his imagination; he saw his chance for action in a good cause, and with borrowed money he sailed for America. He arrived in Philadelphia in August and immediately applied for military service. He was admitted, and charged with the drawing up of plans for fortifying the Delaware River. The immediate success of this work earned him a commission as colonel of engineers in the Continental Army.

In the spring of the following year he joined the Northern Army at Ticonderoga. Later the fortifications he erected at Saratoga contributed greatly to the brilliant victory of our forces there. During the next 2 years he was placed in charge of the building of fortifications at West Point. Subsequently he took part in the Battle of Charleston, and was among the first of the Continentals to enter that city after its evacuation by the British. On October 13, 1783, in recognition of his outstanding services, Congress made him a brigadier general.

Having served this country and its noble cause successfully and brilliantly, in July of 1784 he returned to Poland, hoping to carry on the fight for the freedom of his countrymen there. For more than 20 years he continued his brave but unfortunately futile efforts for Poland's freedom and was fated to die in exile in Switzerland on October 15, 1817.

Today, on the anniversary of his birth, we solemnly honor his memory. We do this not only because he fought for our independence, but also because he was a gallant and unwavering champion of the universal cause of human freedom.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, there is no aspect of human events so mighty in its consequences as militant revolution. Throughout history reformers and pseudoreformers have repeatedly raised the revolutionary banner, inciting insurrection against national governments in the name of liberty. The results have been many and varied, sometimes mighty in their beneficence, sometimes mighty only in their destructiveness, and sometimes productive not of liberty but only of a mightier tyranny than any that existed before.

The people of all nations have strong feelings about revolutionary leaders. To those who profess a love for liberty, yet actually seek only personal gain, the people accord nothing but scorn. Yet to those who actually fight for liberty, the people willingly pay eternal devotion. It is the distinction of the Polish people to honor as one of their revolutionary heroes a man regarded by the freedom-loving citizens of all nations as the outstanding democratic revolutionist of his age and one of the outstanding of all ages: Thaddeus Kosciuszko, universally acclaimed as the hero of two worlds.

Kosciuszko's breadth of vision and ability gave his career a fictional quality. Of noble birth he rose above the narrow outlook of the 18th century Polish nobility to espouse democratic reform. With no prospect of personal gain he crossed an ocean to aid a foreign people in overthrowing British tyranny. Hailed in the New World for his part in the American Revolution he forsook all honors to carry the spirit of revolutionary democracy back to Poland. Defying his own class, the Polish nobility, he campaigned politically in behalf of constitutional government in Poland and when Polish nobles and Russian and Prussian troops sought to thwart the popular will, he took up arms against them. Although achieving fame in the American Revolution as an engineering genius he now appeared in the role of military tactician,

leading a minute Polish Army against the Russian horde in some of the most brilliant defensive military campaigns in history.

Triumphant as a democratic revolutionist in foreign parts, Kosciuszko was defeated in his efforts in Poland's behalf. But only physically and in the short-term sense. Actually, the classic heroism of his actions captured the imagination of the Polish people and of the world at large, and established him as a national symbol—a symbol which stands today, not only representative of Poland's past, but of Poland's future. The democratic dreams generated by Kosciuszko's actions and beliefs have taken permanent hold of the Polish spirit and no temporary tyranny, no foreign ideology is strong enough to snuff them out.

As we in America have seen, democracy is a hardy institution. It can withstand the rigors of devastation and deprivation, and ultimately come back from apparent defeat to overwhelm its enemies. This was the philosophy, the living philosophy, preached by Thaddeus Kosciuszko, and Polish patriots throughout the world have learned it well.

The man we honor on this occasion undoubtedly deserves our tribute for his political and military accomplishments, for in these respects he has few equals. But it is to Kosciuszko the philosopher, the father of democratic Polish thought, to whom we owe our greatest debt, for the fate of Poland's future is still, to this day, in the hands of his spiritual heirs.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, to Polish people all over the world there is no date more worthy of note than February 12, the birthday of the great Polish statesman, military engineer extraordinary, democrat, and patriot of two continents, Thaddeus Kosciuszko.

Revolution in behalf of any cause is a perilous undertaking. Not only does it inflict suffering on the government it assaults, but on the revolutionary party as well, not to mention the thousands of persons not directly involved in the struggle. For this reason history looks with a critical eye upon all revolutionary leaders and observes closely their merits and shortcomings.

Professedly democratic revolutions are no exception to the rule. Far too often self-styled democrats have instigated revolution, overthrown tyranny and then, in a burst of postwar confusion or villainy, established a government as tyrannical as that which it replaced. The world owes nothing to such misguided zeal but contempt, reserving its respect only for the truly democratic result, an all-too-rare occurrence in revolutionary history.

In this country, following our War for Independence, we had the good fortune to come under the guidance of George Washington, a revolutionist of genuinely democratic spirit, and our progress as a Nation is to a large extent the result of that happy occurrence. But Washington was not the only great statesman to emerge from this struggle, nor his democratic outlook peculiar to him alone. Numerous leaders in the American Revolutionary Army were to

become exponents of the democratic dream and one of the most remarkable of these was the man we honored on February 12, Thaddeus Kosciuszko.

No one in history more deserves the title of democrat than Kosciuszko, whose sympathy for the oppressed carried him across the seas to fight for principle on a foreign shore. His participation in the Revolution was vital. A master in the art of fortification construction, he is credited with laying the groundwork for some of the Americans' most outstanding military achievements. And once the war was over and America was free, the people of his adopted land poured honors on Kosciuszko and bid him remain, as a distinguished and respected citizen.

But the ideal of democracy is a moving force, and it would not let Kosciuszko rest. In a few years he was back in his native Poland, campaigning as an apostle of constitutional government. Long subjected to the presence of foreign troops on their soil, the Polish people grasped at the teachings of democracy, and in 1791 rose up to form a constitutional monarchy, in the hope of at last attaining political unity and repelling foreign domination. When the neighboring states of Russia and Prussia combined with certain Polish nobles to quell this democratic demonstration Kosciuszko met them on the battlefield and though initially defeated he returned in 1794 at the head of an insurrectionary army to revive the democratic cause.

For a moment, and for a moment only, Kosciuszko sat at the head of the councils of a free Poland. Temporarily triumphant, the Polish democrats foresaw a glorious future, such as that already spreading before the Americans, and in honor of Kosciuszko's leadership in battle they chose him as President. In this capacity Kosciuszko's attitude was the same as that of the American leader, George Washington. Despite his noble background and militaristic career, he gave to free Poland its first taste of genuine democracy, initiating democratic reforms that were immediately incorporated into the Polish tradition.

Although eventually overcome by the military might of their powerful neighbors, the followers of Kosciuszko realized that they had taken up a cause that could not be suppressed by armies alone or by any other force, and from that time to the present the democratic flame has burned brightly in the Polish heart. The result is directly attributable to Kosciuszko, whose love of democracy kindled that flame. Democratic people the world over have good reason to do him honor. His abilities, his deeds, his courage, and his foresight are unsurpassable. Indeed, among the many heroes of democracy, Thaddeus Kosciuszko ranks second to none.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR NEXT WEEK

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to inquire of the majority leader what the program will be for next week.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the Rules Committee is meeting on Monday. One of the bills that it will consider is a rule on a bill reported by the Committee on Ways and Means relating to the taxation of insurance companies. If a rule is reported out, it is my intention to bring that up on Wednesday.

At this time I know of no other legislation or no other matter that I can program for next week, but I do not by any remark of mine want to be placed in the position where I am foreclosed from assigning any legislation that we can bring up. As usual, and as is my custom, I would give the House, if there is any further program, as much advance notice as possible. Of course, that statement does not include matters going through by unanimous consent where they are very carefully screened by the leadership on both sides of the aisle, including the chairman and the ranking member of the committee, and which require immediate action.

The only bill I know of now that I can announce is the bill relating to the taxation of insurance companies. That will definitely be put down for Wednesday if a rule is reported.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. (Mr. IKARD). The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Will the Chair receive requests to extend remarks in the body of the RECORD at this time?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Speaker announced that the Chair would receive requests for extension of remarks only.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to Mr. DAVIS of Georgia, for 60 minutes, on Thursday, February 19, 1959.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. BRADEMAs.

Mr. FASCELL.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM.

Mr. CARTER (at the request of Mr. McCORMACK) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. McCULLOCH.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 5 minutes p.m.), under

its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, February 16, 1959, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

553. A letter from the Deputy Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation, entitled "A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Defense and the Secretaries of the military departments to grant return rights to career and career-conditional employees under certain conditions"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

554. A letter from the Deputy Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend section 203 of the Career Compensation Act of 1949, as amended, to provide for authority to make payments of special pay for certain physicians, dentists, and veterinarians after June 30, 1959"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

555. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a summary of contracts made by the Bureau of Indian Affairs, for the fiscal year 1958, pursuant to section 4 of the act of June 4, 1936 (49 Stat. 1458, 1459); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

556. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to specify processes which shall be considered mining for the purpose of computing percentage depletion in the case of minerals and ores, and to revise the depletion rates with respect to certain clays when used to make common brick and tile products"; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. JONES of Alabama: Committee on Public Works. H.R. 2228. A bill to provide for the acquisition of additional land along the Mount Vernon Memorial Highway in exchange for certain dredging privileges, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 33). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. SPENCE:

H.R. 4452. A bill to amend the Bretton Woods Agreements Act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. KILBURN:

H.R. 4453. A bill to amend the Bretton Woods Agreements Act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ABERNETHY (by request):

H.R. 4454. A bill to amend the act of March 3, 1901, to eliminate the requirement that certain District of Columbia corporations be managed by not more than 15 trustees; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BROYHILL:

H.R. 4455. A bill relating to the observance of holidays occurring on Saturday; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FASCELL:

H.R. 4456. A bill to amend the National Housing Act to assist in relieving the shortage of housing for elderly persons and to increase the supply of rental housing for elderly persons; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. McCULLOCH:

H.R. 4457. A bill to further secure and protect the civil rights of all persons under the Constitution and laws of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLEMENT W. MILLER:

H.R. 4458. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to increase grants for construction of sewage treatment works; to establish the Office of Water Pollution Control; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MILLS:

H.R. 4459. A bill to amend certain provisions of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to corporate distributions and adjustments; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4460. A bill to rearrange and make technical revisions in subchapter K of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, relating to partners and partnerships; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. OLIVER:

H.R. 4461. A bill to equalize the pay of retired members of the uniformed services; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. RABAUT:

H.R. 4462. A bill 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; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. RAY:

H.R. 4463. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to encourage the establishment of voluntary pension plans by individuals, to promote thrift, and to stimulate expansion of employment through investment; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 4464. A bill to provide relief for veterans erroneously required to reimburse the United States for overpayment on the adjusted-service certificates; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHELLEY:

H.R. 4465. A bill to amend the Federal Airport Act in order to extend the time for making grants under the provisions of such act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 4466. A bill to extend the duration of the Federal air pollution control law, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. TELLER:

H.R. 4467. A bill to amend and revise the laws relating to immigration, naturalization, nationality, and citizenship, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WATTS:

H.R. 4468. A bill to amend the United States Housing Act of 1937 to extend the period during which families of veterans and servicemen may be admitted to public housing without regard to the general requirement that they be displaced or previous residents of substandard housing; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:

H.J. Res. 239. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the

United States relative to the balancing of the budget; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. GRIFFITHS:

H.J. Res. 240. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HALEY:

H.J. Res. 241. Joint resolution to provide for the designation of the week of Whitsunday of each year as Hernando de Soto Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANFUSO:

H. Con. Res. 83. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the President of the United States should take such steps as may be necessary to provide for diplomatic representation of the United States in the Vatican City; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BALDWIN:

H.R. 4469. A bill for the relief of Lucilla Garcia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAVIS of Georgia:

H.R. 4470. A bill for the relief of Riley D. Wooten; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLLAND:

H.R. 4471. A bill for the relief of Janko Tomas Baic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHELLEY:

H.R. 4472. A bill for the relief of Chao Chung Chen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

The Businessman in Public Affairs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ERNEST GRUENING

OF ALASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 12, 1959

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, the address I am about to ask to have inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD was made yesterday by a man who is peculiarly qualified to make it. It is on the subject "The Businessman in Public Affairs," and was made to the Weirton, W. Va., Chamber of Commerce. The speaker was the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH]. He began his activities as a working newspaperman. Then he became, successively, a newspaper editor, a magazine editor, a college professor, and a business executive.

JENNINGS RANDOLPH served with distinction for seven terms in the House of Representatives. In the course of that service, I was privileged to have him, with other members of a House committee, visit us in Alaska, where his interest in its problems was reflected in subsequent legislation.

After his seven terms in the House, JENNINGS RANDOLPH became a business executive again in an industry which is

greatly affected with the public interest, namely, the aviation industry. He is now, I am happy to say, our colleague in the Senate. I ask unanimous consent that his thoughtful and timely address, "The Businessman in Public Affairs," be printed in the RECORD.

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

THE BUSINESSMAN IN PUBLIC AFFAIRS

Mr. Toastmaster, members of the Weirton Chamber of Commerce, and guests, it is a pleasure to be with you and to discuss the role of the businessman in public affairs. This is a question which has long been of interest and personal concern to me—since I have considered myself a businessman as well as one professionally interested in public affairs—and I note that it is a subject which is becoming of increasing regard to your own organization.

During the campaign last fall an incident occurred which I think highlights one aspect of our discussion tonight. As I was walking along the street in my home community of Elkins, talking with the voters and discussing the issues, I was stopped by a citizen who drew me into a doorway to discuss the campaign. After finishing our conversation I asked him why he had drawn me off the street and into the privacy of a doorway. Whereupon he replied: "You know I am in business and I must be very careful of what I do and say."

Though this man may have dramatized his fears somewhat, ladies and gentlemen, he does not represent an isolated state of mind. For, the rule of prudence—the precautionary

attitude against speaking one's mind on controversial issues—has taken seed among too many of us. It is a measure of the failure of the democratic process—a failure in the belief in the great dialogue of democracy—when anyone, businessman, professional man, or teacher, fears to participate in the political process.

Therefore, I am much heartened by the U.S. Chamber of Commerce program of the Aircade and local political workshops to encourage the political activity and participation of businessmen.

However, I would offer a word of caution. For there is some indication that this action is stimulated by the concern within the thinking of some members of the chamber for what is seen as the growing power and political effectiveness of organized labor.

I hope that this view will not dominate the political actions of businessmen. I hope that they will see their role in larger terms—and not merely in opposition to labor. For any action which is cast in terms of protagonist and antagonist limits the freedom of the actors—by limiting the scope of their imagination and perception.

I would digress a moment to illustrate this principle in reference to our own national attitudes toward the Soviet Union. "Russia" has at one and the same time become our national demon and the gage by which we measure our own progress. We are too frequently confronted with such questions as "Are American schools as advanced as those of Russia?" "Do we offer enough support for basic research in science and technology compared with that of Russia?" "Are race relations in the United States strengthening the position of Russia in world opinion?"

Thus, in recent years, we have too frequently approached our problems not in

terms of finding the best possible solutions, but in terms of the cold war with Russia. And to that extent we have fallen increasingly under the dominance of the Kremlin. For the solution to any problem is determined, in large measure, by the questions which one addresses to the problem.

I devoutly hope, therefore, that the political actions of businessmen will not be thus restricted—that they will ask questions not in terms of whether a particular policy will circumscribe the power of labor, but rather whether it is in the best national interests as well as their own legitimate self interests.

This is only instance, however, of the need to avoid the general tendency of interpreting public problems in terms of opposite solutions. Our political discourse, and hence the solution to political questions, is too often restricted by the use of polar or opposite terms—liberal and conservative, radical and reactionary, labor and management, farmer and consumer, socialist and capitalist, et cetera. The list could be extended. And we are all familiar with the old platitude, "There are two sides to every question."

Such a polarizing of public problems, however, falsifies the realities of political life. For there are, in fact, as many sides to every question as there are parties or interests involved. And the great genius of the democratic process is that it offers a wider variety of solutions than can be encompassed by mere opposites.

Politics in a democracy is the art of the possible—the art of compromise and conciliation. Webster defines "compromise" as "a settlement by arbitration or by consent reached by mutual concessions." This definition offers us a clue as to how the businessman can make one of his chief contributions in the arena of public affairs. For the life of business and commerce is in large measure a life of offering mutual concessions, of arriving at a compromise of interests whereby each party gains some satisfaction.

It was popular at one time in some quarters to state that America needed a sound business Government. Without commenting on the recent record of some businessmen in Government, I suggest that this statement offers an oversimplification of both business and Government. For it assumes that business can be defined solely in terms of dollars and cents and cost accounting. And that the justification of governmental policies should be decided in the same terms. I have called this an oversimplification, first, because it fails to acknowledge the complexity of government in a modern democratic society; and second, because it fails to perceive the cultural significance of business and commerce.

The modern businessman must be more than a mere cost accountant. Wise decisions in business require not only a knowledge of how to conduct a commercial transaction, but knowledge of personal relations, of community relations, and of the whole process of communication. From this point of view, therefore, the businessman, the modern businessman, is peculiarly well gifted to contribute to public affairs.

In this connection, it is appropriate to mention that one of the distinguished guests with us tonight, President Thomas E. Millisop, of National Steel Corp., is not only a man of management, but one who has associated himself with public affairs and has made real contributions to the advancement of community, State, and national interests.

The National Management Association, an organization of 73,000 members in 340 affiliated clubs representing 1,200 companies in 34 States, honored Mr. Millisop by awarding to him its 1958 Management Man of the Year distinction. I am sure that this award was not bestowed upon Tom Millisop simply because of his technical proficiency in the

management field; rather, it was recognition, too, of his broad understanding of and contributions to the public affairs in relationship to the free-enterprise system.

I say in passing, however, that we should not limit the term "public affairs" to the application of government alone. Public affairs, and the role of the businessman therein, imply the whole range of public life and all of our cultural institutions as well as those of the States. This means that the businessman should interest himself not only in politics in the more limited sense, but also in the advancement of our schools, our hospitals, and our institutions of the fine arts, as well as those matters which more immediately affect his own interests, such as tax revisions, fair-trade practices, and the reciprocal trade agreements.

Participation in such affairs can be justified in more than just humanitarian terms as well. It can be justified in terms acceptable to the most hardheaded businessman. For example, we are all well aware of the need to attract a more diversified industry to West Virginia. While we are fortunate in having such basic industries as coal and steel and chemicals, we also need light industries which involve a lower capitalization per man in order to revive our sagging economy and offer jobs to workers who have been displaced by technological developments. And it has been the experience of other States which have sought to attract new industry that modern enlightened management is becoming increasingly concerned with the general cultural conditions in the area in which they seek to locate. While such factors as the tax climate, transportation facilities, and natural resources are perhaps the dominant factors in attracting industry, present day management is aware that its industrial and personnel relations are strongly affected by the surrounding conditions in schools, hospitals, recreational facilities, et cetera. Thus, from a long range point of view, it is equally to the interest of the businessman to engage himself in the development of the general cultural facilities of his area.

This suggests another respect in which the business community can make a genuine contribution to public affairs. Ours is a civilization dominated in large measure by a business ethos—by the values and attitudes of the business world. This condition affords the businessman considerable influence in the molding of public opinion—in the conditioning of cultural attitudes. I would like to see him use this influence on public opinion in raising the cultural status of the expert—the person of achieved excellence.

The American businessman has the reputation of being tough-minded. He is from Missouri. He is hospitable to facts and to the person who is expert in dealing with them. I should like to see him use his influence and his arts of communication to extend this hospitality to the expert throughout the range of public affairs; I should like to see such efforts emerge in a revitalization of the American regard for the expert, for the person who has achieved excellence in whatever field—in the arts, in business, in science, in scholarship, in government administration, as well as in the individual conduct of life in our daily affairs.

We are today, and we have been for some years, faced with what might be called a growing lack of accountability. In an evermore complex society in which individual responsibility becomes lost in the mesh of social relationships, it is too easy to avoid responsibility—too simple to avoid being held accountable for the quality of one's performance. This is what I mean by the lack of accountability.

Thus we have given rise to the glorification of mediocrity and the neglect of excellence. To dispel such a popular attitude and reawaken a public regard for quality perform-

ance may well be one of the greatest contributions the businessman could make to public affairs.

Now after this somewhat philosophical foray, let me turn, in closing, to more concrete matters, to matters which I am confident have occupied a considerable amount of your interest.

I refer to two items of legislation which will soon be presented to the 86th Congress. First, Senate bill 505, introduced by Senator KENNEDY with myself as one of the cosponsors. This is the labor-management reform bill—a revised version of the Kennedy-Ives proposal which passed the Senate in the last session by a vote of 88 to 1. During my campaign I stated that I would support such legislation as that offered by Senators KENNEDY and Ives. As a member of the Subcommittee on Labor of the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee, I have offered myself as cosponsor of the present measure.

I am well aware of the criticism that has been leveled from some quarters. Without taking these criticisms up in detail, and without impugning the motives of any who have criticized the bill, I would like to state briefly its purpose and its provisions. But first I would like to quote from a letter which Senator KENNEDY recently received from former Senator Ives.

Senator Ives wrote, "This bill represents many months of careful study in committee, the collective judgment of the U.S. Senate as expressed in 5 days and nights of debating and voting, and many, many years of collective experience of labor-management legislation.

"Furthermore, it is designed to meet the objectives set forth in the report of the Senate Select Committee on Improper Activities in the Labor or Management Field. It is my firm conviction that this bill not only meets those objectives but does so in a fashion that makes it corrective rather than punitive legislation, a measure which will correct abuses without undermining the rights of working men and women."

First, as Senator KENNEDY has said, it is "a bipartisan measure on a nonpartisan subject." Second, it is stronger and clearer in its terms than was the original Kennedy-Ives bill. It has been revised to make it quite clear that the section on employer reporting does not interfere with normal personnel relations or communications, and that the section on bribes cannot possibly be interpreted to include wage or other normal payments.

And third, it is, as Senator KENNEDY stated, "primarily a labor-management reform bill, dealing with the problems of dishonest racketeering—it is not a bill on industrial relations, dealing with the problems of collective bargaining and economic power." The broad issues of labor-management relations are not involved in this legislation and were not so intended. For these are quite properly divorced from the issues of corruption and racketeering in labor.

I would, therefore, urge each of you to consult the bill yourself and in your own judgment determine if this is not for the best interests for labor and management alike, as well as in the larger national interests.

A question of equal importance to all of you is that of forthcoming legislation on small business. I am pleased that I am also a member of the Senate Committee on Small Business, and will be actively engaged in legislation in this field.

In preface to my remarks on this topic let me state that I am not one to whom big business per se is an evil; there is nothing inherent in the size of any economic structure, nor for that matter in any political or social structure, which makes it either good or evil. It is the uses to which such organizations are placed and the degree of responsibility exercised by those in management

which determine their ultimate benefit to society. In recognizing this we must acknowledge also that bigness has become a permanent and fundamental characteristic of American economic and political institutions—big government, big labor, and big business are here to stay. The problems of capitalizing modern industry and exploring the new frontiers of technology require large units of production. But with this, we must develop and maintain the means and techniques to prevent the individual man and woman from being lost in the shuffle and to insure the continued vitality of small business.

The 85th Congress moved significantly in this direction in establishing the Small Business Administration as a permanent agency, in passing the Small Business Investment Act, and in broadening the lending authority of the Small Business Administration. But much remains to be done.

There are approximately 5 million small businessmen in the United States, roughly the same number as there are farm families. These two groups comprise much of the reservoir of talent and initiative that have brought our Nation to its present greatness. We must see that this reservoir is not drained off by neglect, by inequitable tax laws, and by administrative regulations.

Let me emphasize once again the potential power the businessman has for exerting his influence far beyond the range of the activities of buying and selling and of producing and distributing goods. For the men of commerce and industry are the ones who control the material resources of our society; morally speaking, these resources are held not in fee simple but in stewardship—a stewardship which carries with it the responsibility to see that these material resources are used to assure the widest possible benefit, both materially and spiritually, for a free society. It is within your power if you but will it.

These are times of extreme tension—sometimes of deep doubts about our tomorrows. I close on this positive approach:

There is no room for gloom in the long-term future. Fact and faith must combine in the promise of a further unprecedented era of expansion, creation of new industry, and a more sustained prosperity.

The American people are resourceful. They will realistically meet the challenge of changing world and domestic conditions.

We must see to it that business continues its dynamic development and that our co-operative capitalism, which embraces both employee and employer, be cushioned by reasonable Government regulation and reputable practices within the framework of our private enterprise system.

Ours is a growth country. It is a fallacy to short-sell its future.

Deseret News Discusses Neuberger Bill on Alcohol and Tobacco Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 12, 1959

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, one of the outstanding newspapers in America is the Deseret News, of Salt Lake City. In its weekly supplements for January 17, 1959, and January 24, 1959, the Deseret News has published two comprehensive interviews with me about my legislative proposal to have Federal

matching funds used to encourage courses in our public schools in educating children with respect to the impact on their health of both tobacco and alcohol.

These interviews were written by Mr. George L. Scott, veteran newspaperman, who is correspondent in the Pacific Northwest for the Deseret News.

I ask unanimous consent that these interviews from the Deseret News, of Salt Lake City, be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Salt Lake City Deseret News, Jan. 17, 1959]

OREGON U.S. SENATOR OPPOSES TOBACCO, LIQUOR ADVERTISING

PORTLAND, OREG.—“Glamour advertising of cigarettes and liquor over TV and radio, in magazines and newspapers is aimed at the young—older people are already hooked.”

So declared U.S. Senator RICHARD L. NEUBERGER, of Oregon, as he prepared to reopen his senatorial effort to educate the youth of the Nation on their gamble with health if they use either product.

The Senator said he would reintroduce the bill he placed before the Senate on May 21, 1958. This bill, which did not reach the Senate floor before adjournment, provided Federal grants-in-aid for educational programs to teach schoolchildren about the dangers to health from cigarettes and liquor. He said there would be no substantial change in the measure.

Senator NEUBERGER emphasized that he was not advocating a prohibition in the use of either tobacco or liquor.

“My purpose is to give the States of this Nation a chance to advise their young people on important matters concerning their health,” he said.

“Most of the advertising on tobacco and liquor is beamed at young people.

“They are entitled to know what the facts are. After that, if they want to smoke, it’s up to them. Their own reasoning rather than the pressure of glamorized advertising should prompt them,” he declared.

LAUDS HEALTH EDUCATION

Senator NEUBERGER, who does not smoke nor drink, said his determination to push for health education was intensified following his return from Washington after the last session of Congress.

He underwent surgery for a malignant growth and is still under treatment.

“My own experience,” the Senator said, “has intensified my interest in anything dealing with health.”

He pointed to the Nation’s \$6.8 billion expenditure for research, most of it dealing with nuclear science, while only \$211 million, or 4 percent, was spent on medical research of all diseases.

“Cobalt radiation, now used in the treatment of cancer, is a result of research,” Senator NEUBERGER said. “If my trouble had developed a few years ago my chances would have been much less.

“Look at the children in the past who died of polio, diphtheria and other diseases before medical research made recovery almost certain.”

CHILDREN SHOULD BE INFORMED

“I feel every child is entitled to the right to be informed of dangers ahead. The best place to do this is in school—backed by research and not advertising glamour,” he said.

“In contrast to the questionable advertising which prompts young people to take up smoking at an early age, when they frequently are told to associate this habit with the success of some great baseball star or motion picture queen, is the warning by the Surgeon

General of the United States, Dr. Leroy E. Burney, who said:

“Many independent studies thus have confirmed beyond reasonable doubt that there is a high degree of statistical association between lung cancer and prolonged cigarette smoking * * * while there are naturally differences of opinion in interpreting the data on lung cancer and cigarette smoking, the Public Health Service feels the weight of the evidence is increasingly pointing in one direction—that excessive smoking is one of the causative factors in lung cancer,” the Senator quoted.

[From the Salt Lake City Deseret News, Jan. 24, 1959]

PUBLIC INDIFFERENCE DELAYS HEALTH BILL

PORTLAND, OREG.—Public indifference, advertising power and sectional economy will be major hurdles to clear before the public can be educated on the health hazards surrounding the use of liquor and tobacco.

Senator RICHARD L. NEUBERGER, Democrat, of Oregon, encountered all of these obstacles after he first introduced his bill for Federal aid to States desiring to give their schoolchildren the facts of research concerning the use of cigarettes and alcohol.

He is hopeful there will be an upsurge of support from Senators and the public when he reintroduces his bill sometime in March.

“Any bill that has strong support from public bodies in the States will be brought out of committee for congressional action,” the Senator said.

REACTION TO MEASURE

In dividing first reaction to his measure, Senator NEUBERGER listed the following:

Public: Indifferent, little immediate support in general.

Educators: Some support but far under expectations.

Churches: Good reaction from religious groups, particularly the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, Seventh-day Adventists, and Methodists.

Advertising agencies: Hostile reaction from advertising magazines and publications. Much of their revenues come from tobacco and liquor.

“Only a few Senators gave promise of support,” Senator NEUBERGER said.

“Southern Senators are swayed away from support by the importance of the tobacco crop to the South although they favored education on liquor.

“I realize that it takes time to build up a program but with the aid of such organizations as the American Cancer Society, other health groups, educators, and churches it can be done.

“If the public gives its support you have a chance to pass legislation.

“If indifferent, little chance because of the great amount of legislation facing Congress.”

CHURCH MEMBERS LEND SUPPORT

Senator NEUBERGER said he received many letters from Mormon Church officials and members in Utah, Idaho, and California backing his program.

“The power of liquor and tobacco advertisers is the main hurdle facing the grant-in-aid education program,” Senator NEUBERGER said.

“We leave the field entirely to the liquor and tobacco people who have unlimited capital to support their products.”

The Senator insisted that education is the great hope for everything. He pointed out that the grant-in-aid plan he backs for giving the facts on cigarettes and alcohol respects State’s rights. No State, he said, is required to give such education unless it so desires.

“I don’t believe in prohibition,” he declared, “but I do believe in giving relative facts. If advertisers misdirect the Nation’s

youth, the Government should at least give the fair facts.

U.S. AGENCIES INCONSISTENT

"If ever there was a situation where the left hand knoweth not what the right hand doeth, it is in the policy of the U.S. Government with respect to tobacco and cigarettes. While one agency of Government warns that cigarettes may be a factor in causing cancer, the most terrible disease afflicting the human race, another governmental agency subsidizes and encourages the growth of the product from which cigarettes are made."

Senator NEUBERGER inquired:

"What would be the reaction here in America if we learned that the government of Red China was subsidizing the production of poppies, from which opium is distilled? Would we not raise our voices in righteous scorn and indignation? Then what must the rest of the world think of the fact that in the United States eggs and meat and vegetables are not supported as basic farm crops, but tobacco is?"

The Senator conceded that "a bill is simply a piece of printed paper that can be indefinitely postponed."

"Other things," he said, "cannot be postponed so readily—cancer of the lung, for instance. The doctors and scientists will continue their studies. They will report, and some men in journalism and politics will disseminate the reports. People will smoke cigarettes, and human tissue and protoplasm will react accordingly. Such events as President Eisenhower's account of how he himself overcame the smoking habit are sure to have a mighty effect. Americans will learn the facts about cigarettes and various diseases, and then they will wonder why their Government considers tobacco a basic crop but not the Thanksgiving turkey or baby's milk or the morning baked apple or glass of orange juice.

"When enough Americans wonder about this, my bill will pass," Senator NEUBERGER concluded.

The Federal Budget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 12, 1959

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, this is an appropriate day to recall a statement by Abraham Lincoln which represents one of the guiding principles in his private life and a basic tenet of his approach to government.

In 1843, Mr. Lincoln said:

As an individual who undertakes to live by borrowing soon finds his original means devoured by interest, and next, no one left to borrow from, so it must be with a government.

Certainly no one can dispute the effect of continued borrowing on the finances of an individual. No one can hope to live forever by borrowing, for he will in truth be eaten up by interest.

It is likewise true that governments cannot continue to live by borrowing. We are in our third decade of the era of deficit spending. Since 1930 there have been only 6 years in which the Federal Government has lived within its income. Yet in the recent years this country has recorded unparalleled growth and prosperity, and in such times of record-

breaking income, both individuals and governments must seize the opportunity to retire debts.

We are faced this year with a precariously balanced budget. It is doubtful that the budget will remain balanced in view of the action by Congress on the first few spending bills which have been brought before the two Houses. Many responsible persons in and out of Congress feel that unless there is bold action to balance the budget this year and in the immediate future, there will never again be a balanced budget.

I share the view that we are reaching a financial crisis, that if we are to remain a nation with strong economic policies and a sound dollar—or perhaps I should say a sound 50-cent dollar in view of past inflationary spirals—we must act boldly and strongly.

Accordingly, I am introducing a resolution on this anniversary of Lincoln's birth which would set the wheels in motion for a constitutional amendment to require a balanced budget except in war or other grave emergency.

I do not feel a sense-of-Congress resolution or any other act of Congress can do the job, for it is agreed that an act of one Congress does not necessarily bind succeeding Congresses. We must put this resolve—if the people express their desire for it—in such a way that it cannot be circumvented in future years.

My mail shows a growing concern by persons throughout the country about inflation and deficit spending. I know other Members who also report the same trend. People realize you cannot live forever on borrowed money and they know that Uncle Sam cannot either.

I urge my colleagues to let the people decide through their State legislatures whether they want to continue deficit spending and inflation or whether we will live within our income. Let the people decide and then we will do their bidding.

Extension of the Draft

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN V. CARTER

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 12, 1959

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, I have cast my vote against H.R. 2260, the resolution which proposes to extend the present draft law for a period of 4 years and which was overwhelmingly passed by the House of Representatives. Only 20 Members of the House voted against the bill, although you and I know that there were many more who did not, deep in their hearts, favor the extension of a national conscription. This fact in itself may be indicative of the inordinate amount of influence that the past 20 years of military presence has imposed on our thinking. True, this military presence has been a most necessary one, but one nevertheless that should be continuously reevaluated in the light of these rapidly changing times.

I do not propose, Mr. Speaker, that there is no longer a need for military forces. I think that we all recognize such a need is self-evident. The question is, what kind of military forces do we need? We are constantly told that the Armed Forces need highly professional, highly trained, highly skilled, highly technical, and highly motivated personnel in this age in which we live. Are those the words that describe the draftee? I think we all realize that they are not. Furthermore, I think we all realize that the average draftee never receives the incentives that will convert him into the type of person fitted by these descriptive words. The so-called incentive pay bill of the last Congress was badly misnamed. The only incentive that can be read into this bill is based on the assumption that everyone who enters the Armed Forces is convinced he will become an admiral or a general. We know that such an assumption would be entirely erroneous. Since the flag positions, which were really the only ones to substantially benefit from the incentive pay bill, are usually available only to graduates of the service academies who, presumably, are already provided with necessary incentives, there actually remains little or nothing for the conscriptee or volunteer to entice him to become a career military man.

Mr. Speaker, the draft has been with us for almost 20 years now, far too long. We all know it is not being fairly and impartially administered and is far from universal in its effect. Only one of the three armed services is actually using it to any extent. So the true purpose of the draft is to act as a club to force young men to enter the Armed Forces. Those who volunteer for the Navy and the Air Force are only indicating their desire, not to faithfully serve those particular arms, but rather to avoid the rigors of Army life. Those who wait for the draft are simply saying, in effect, that they want to take the quickest way out. In either instance, the psychological approach of these young men to military service is the exact opposite of what it should be, and what I think it can be. Without the draft, the armed services would be forced to make a military career the attractive thing that it must become in order to get the type of individual they proclaim to be so necessary in this technical era. They would have to look elsewhere for the cooks, sweepers, chauffeurs, and assorted coolie labor for which today's conscripts are being used.

Mr. Speaker, I have been in youth work for a number of years, and I also have two teenage sons. I think we can all recall from our own lives and experiences, as well as those we have observed, the fact that there is a naturally occurring amount of uncertainty and indecision during the years approaching adulthood. Our draft law is simply aggravating this uncertainty and is, in fact, a substantial contributing factor to our national problem of juvenile delinquency. Our destiny and survival may very well rest in the heads and hands of the youth which are today subject to the draft. If the pitched battle for survival comes, it must surely come, it seems, within the

next 30 years, or even sooner. From every quarter, voices cry out that we need scientists, educators, philosophers, artists, and political leaders to revivify the essences and guts of Americanism, and to meet the challenge of communism all over the world. But what do we do to the very number from which these people are to come? We cast over them the dark cloud of frustration and uncertainty in the form of the draft. We discourage, delay, and, in some cases, deny the steps that will lead them to lives of leadership and service in their chosen field and on a high level. Our youth cannot help but wonder why we have huge armies that train and retrain, while Asian, Middle Eastern, and South American nations continue to fall under the influence, if not the domination, of communism. These youth have a vague feeling of uneasiness, to which they are probably unable to give expression in most cases, that perhaps we have here an enemy who must be fought in other ways. They are told that we are engaged in an ideological conflict for men's minds. Yet many of our youth who are sufficiently endowed to prepare themselves for this conflict are conscripted for a period of years, in which they perform menial tasks, and they either lose the impetus or the opportunity to sufficiently prepare themselves for the defense of democracy. A further perplexing factor to our youth is the fact that our Nation's leaders, whom they feel certainly must be wise men, fail to furnish them the opportunities and inspiration, even the example, as to how this enemy should be fought. Could it be that the vistas of our leadership are too limited and too interwoven with the traditional ideas of what constitutes national power to see that we are immolating much of the potential of our youth on the altar of national conscription.

Let us liberate our youth, during that period of unique vitality, to follow whatever constructive paths they may choose. Let one of these choices be a career in an attractive Military Establishment where only the dedicated and proficient volunteer can exist.

It is my sincere hope that we can eliminate these shackles and hindrances which are so repugnant to the basic American concept of individual freedom and initiative, which has always been the keystone of our greatness.

Recognition Is Given to Worldwide Travel Show at Bluefield, W. Va.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 12, 1959

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, next Tuesday, February 17, the Bluefield, W. Va., Automobile Club will open its Worldwide Travel Show in the Bluefield Municipal Auditorium.

Mine has been a lively interest in the beneficial effects of travel, and I was privileged to issue a statement in connection with the forthcoming Bluefield Automobile Club travel show venture.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD my statement to the sponsoring club.

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

I extend my congratulations to the Bluefield Automobile Club and its director of travel, James H. Cowan, for initiating the first Worldwide Travel Show in West Virginia. I am confident of the success of this venture. The Bluefield Automobile Club deserves the gratitude of the citizens of the Mountaineer State for taking this step to attract the attention of American travelers to the charms and beauties of our fair State.

The tourist industry offers one of the chief sources of potential economic development in the State of West Virginia, and the automobile clubs are to be commended for the part they are playing in stimulating its development.

But it is worth noting that the Bluefield Automobile Club Show is not limited by merely State or sectional interests. This exhibition is an appropriate expression of the growing interest of Americans in world travel itself, and it offers another link between us and our neighbors in other lands.

We Americans are a mobile people, and the urge to be somewhere else will hold a continued fascination for innumerable millions of folk during this next record travel year.

The once-popular song words, "I was born to wander, I was born to roam," continue to be lived by vacationers and tourists who are lured "to the far-away places with the strange-sounding names."

We Americans who live and work at such a rapid pace can find in travel refreshment for the body and renewal of the lagging spirit. We may be mindful as well of the inspirational and spiritual values that flow from travel and the act of occasionally drawing away from our daily preoccupations. For it was the Master of all mankind, who, when the pressures from expectant people tapped too deeply His earthly resources, whispered to His disciples: "Come apart, and rest a while."

Travel, however, fulfills more than the needs of the individual alone. For the American traveler has become his country's main diplomat abroad. And as a nation we are in large measure judged by our neighbors in other lands on the basis of the behavior of the American tourist. Thus, the modern conveniences of travel—the jet airliner and the luxury ocean liner—will not alone bring about a world community of neighbors. There must be global-minded people traveling, men and women disposed to appreciate and understand the customs, cultures, and the philosophies of the countries they visit.

The late Irish poet, George Russell, predicted in the 1920's that the United States would have an historic role to play, because "Americans have been the first people to adopt a planetary viewpoint." Though Russell's statement was contested by those who worried about America's apparent drift to extreme isolation, he insisted that he could detect signs that we were preparing to assume planetary responsibilities. He said, "You Americans have a vision about this planet that no other nation has ever had."

We need to understand that our 177 million citizens, comprising only 10 percent of the non-Soviet world, control over half of the world's production of goods. Therefore, our policies and our actions affect not only

our own national destiny, but that of the world at large. We are challenged to thinking in world terms. We have now reached the point where we must assume the same kind of responsibility in world affairs as we are accustomed to assume in our individual affairs. If we falter, the free world falters. If we are firm, the free world is firm.

The 20th Anniversary of Marian Anderson's Concert on the Steps of the Lincoln Memorial

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 12, 1959

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, today Members of Congress have joined in tribute to the man whom many Americans regard as the greatest figure in the history of our country, Abraham Lincoln.

We have heard a distinguished American, Carl Sandburg, speak on the 150th anniversary of the birth of a man who has been described by Walt Whitman as "the grandest figure on the crowded canvas of the drama of the 19th century."

Mr. Sandburg declared just a few days ago that Abraham Lincoln took the word "liberty" as precious, saying in 1858:

Our reliance is in the love of liberty which God has planted in our bosoms. Our defense is in the preservation of the spirit which prizes liberty as the heritage of all men, in all lands, everywhere.

Not only, Mr. Speaker, is 1959 the 150th anniversary of the birth of Abraham Lincoln. It is also just 20 years ago that Lincoln's memory was honored in a concert on the steps of the Lincoln Memorial, a concert given by one of the grandest figures on the crowded canvas of the drama of our century, Miss Marian Anderson.

It seemed to me most fitting that Miss Anderson, one of the world's greatest musicians and one of America's finest citizens, should be invited to sing at the joint session of Congress today when we commemorate the birth of Abraham Lincoln. For this reason, last month I wrote a letter to the chairman of the Committee on Arrangements on the Joint Session urging that Miss Anderson be invited. I am pleased to say that I understand the committee did extend to this great lady an invitation and that only the pressures of the late hour prevented her being with us today.

I wish to insert in the RECORD at this point my letter to the chairman of the committee:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., January 29, 1959.

The Honorable FRED SCHWENDEL,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SCHWENDEL: I am writing to you in your capacity as Chairman of the Committee on Arrangements on the Joint Session of Congress for the commemoration of the 150th anniversary of the birth of Abraham Lincoln.

It is my understanding that your committee has invited former Presidents Herbert

Hoover and Harry S Truman to take part in the ceremonies of February 12, 1959, and that your committee has also arranged for participation in the ceremonies of the distinguished American poet, Mr. Carl Sandburg, and the distinguished American actor, Mr. Fredric March.

I wish to congratulate you and your colleagues on your plans for honoring the memory of this towering figure in our country's history.

I should like to suggest, however, that you invite another distinguished American to take part in the activities of February 12—Miss Marian Anderson, one of the world's greatest musicians and one of America's finest citizens.

I was among those who on May 26, 1957, watched Marian Anderson receive the honorary degree of doctor of laws from the president of St. Mary's College, Notre Dame, Indiana. The degree citation read in part:

Arturo Toscanini said of Marian Anderson that a voice like hers happens once in a hundred years. The distinguished composer Sibellus protested that the roof of his house was too low for her voice * * * Chiefs of state representing their people have celebrated her public triumphs. At the invitation of our own Government, Marian Anderson has sung to honor the visit of royalty, the return of a hero from a war and the inauguration of a President."

Miss Anderson has indeed served our country nobly and in many capacities, most recently as an alternate delegate to the General Assembly of the United Nations. She won much friendship for the United States by her 1956 and 1957 concert tours in Europe and the Far and Near East.

Her accomplishments are many and could be multiplied and, as the President of St. Mary's College said in 1957, "All these achievements Miss Anderson has accomplished in a spirit of profound Christian faith."

It was just 20 years ago, in 1939, that Marian Anderson gave her now legendary Easter concert before 75,000 persons in Washington, D.C. She sang from the steps of the Lincoln Memorial.

I believe it would be most fitting for your committee to invite Miss Anderson once again to sing in the shadow of Lincoln's memory as the Members of both Houses of the Congress of the United States join to pay tribute to the man who is the symbol of America's dedication to freedom.

I hope, sir, that you and your colleagues on the committee will invite Miss Anderson to take part in the ceremonies of February 12, 1959, before the joint session of Congress.

With highest regard and best wishes, I am,
Sincerely yours,

JOHN BRADEMAs,
Member of Congress.

Housing for the Elderly

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 12, 1959

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced today a housing bill which should be of substantial assistance in relieving the shortage of housing for elderly persons and in increasing rental housing and related special health facilities for elderly families. My bill is

directed toward the accomplishment of two objectives:

First, Assistance in obtaining more liberal FHA financing for the construction of rental and sales housing, especially designed in whole or in part for our senior citizens; and

Second, Provision of adequate health and medical facilities as an integral part of such elderly family housing projects.

This bill makes a substantial amendment to the existing FHA program for section 213 cooperative housing, and in addition, provides for an entirely new FHA insured-loan program for elderly family rental housing and for nursing homes. The program for improving the financing of elderly family rental housing is set forth in a new section proposed for inclusion under title II of the National Housing Act, as amended.

This new section, 229, would increase the dollar limits on insured loans for elderly family rental units and provide for insurance of a loan up to the full replacement cost of a project as estimated by FHA. A significant change from existing law is that this bill provides for FHA insurance of loans for both profit corporations and nonprofit organizations. Present law is limited to nonprofit operations.

In my bill, the maximum interest rate would be 4½ percent and a priority of occupancy is assured for elderly persons or families—60 years of age or over. At least 50 percent of the units in such a project would have to be especially designed for occupancy by elderly persons.

By special definition, the mortgage on an elderly family rental project would be able to cover structures and facilities designed for assisting the elderly occupants in the care of their health. These special facilities would be such structures as infirmaries, inpatient or outpatient health facilities, therapeutic facilities or such other facilities as the Commissioner of FHA might approve and deem adequate to serve the elderly occupants of the project.

In addition, my bill amends the existing law on cooperative housing to provide that an FHA section 213 cooperative housing mortgage, for either sale or rental housing, can cover the cost of special facilities which are of the type I have just described. In this way, a cooperative housing project which, in many areas of the country, is an ideal vehicle for the supply of low-cost, liberally financed housing suitable for our senior citizens, will be even more able to serve their needs. Existing law already permits cooperative rental projects to cover needed commercial and community facilities. It makes sense, therefore, to add this further provision and thus make possible in its most beneficial way, the availability of cooperative housing for our elderly families.

In one further way, this bill should prove of real assistance for elderly family housing projects. I have included provisions in this bill which have already received the approval of the other body, covering a new program for the insurance of a loan for the construction of a nursing home especially directed toward

the care of elderly persons. In my bill, I have included in addition, however, a provision directing the FHA to encourage the construction of such nursing homes at or near the site of elderly family housing projects. In particular, I am anxious for the facilities made available by these FHA programs to result in coordinated and integrated projects of most benefit and economical use for our elderly families. Wherever possible, I feel, that projects of housing designed for our senior citizens should be set up so as to become a fully equipped community for their better enjoyment of life.

I would hope in the future that a program can be devised, using private financing and private construction but with the insurance provided under the FHA programs, so that our large, single family housing projects under the basic section 203 of FHA, can be developed as planned communities including the facilities and services, with FHA financing aid, if needed, that seem best suited to the majority of the occupants for which the project is built.

Let me note that the amendments to existing law which are contained in this bill and the provisions of a proposed new program for FHA rental housing, are no burden upon current budget proposals in any manner whatsoever. At the most, in the long distance future, there is, of course, a contingent liability as now exists on all FHA insured loans. Experience has demonstrated conclusively, however, that the security of the construction, coupled with the debenture system of FHA, are more than adequate, together with its very substantial financial reserves, to protect the Government's interest, without drain, in any way, upon taxpayers.

Civil Rights Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM M. McCULLOCH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 12, 1959

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to implement the seven recommendations made by the President in his civil rights message of February 5, 1959.

This proposed Civil Rights Act of 1959 constitutes a moderate, practical, sound, and, I believe, generally acceptable step forward.

First, Title I would make it a criminal offense to interfere with the exercise of rights or the performance of duties under orders of U.S. courts in school desegregation cases.

Second, Title II of the bill would make it a Federal offense to cross State lines to avoid prosecution or confinement for destroying or attempting to destroy by fire or explosive any structure used for educational or religious purposes. This legislation will clarify the authority of the Federal Bureau of Investigation to assist local enforcement authorities to

track down the perpetrators of such offenses.

Third. The President has said that the right to vote is the keystone of democratic self-government. Title III of my bill will require election officers to retain and preserve for 3 years all records and papers which come into their possession relating to elections involving candidates for Federal office. The measure will also authorize the Attorney General to demand their production for examination and copying with recourse to the courts in the event of noncompliance.

Fourth. In establishing the Commission on Civil Rights, the 85th Congress provided that the Commission shall terminate its existence not later than 2 years and 60 days after the date of the enactment of the Civil Rights Act. This would mean that in the absence of an extension the Civil Rights Commission would, at the latest, cease to exist early in November of this year. The President has recommended, and title IV of this bill will accomplish, a 2-year extension in order that the Commission may adequately perform the job for which it was created. The bill also provides for

the President and the Congress to be advised in an interim report to be submitted not later than September 1, 1959, as to Commission activities as of that date.

Fifth. Title V will give legislature stature and independent existence to a Commission on Equal Job Opportunity Under Government Contracts. The 15 member Presidential Commission would be authorized to continue and to expand the work which has been done in recent years to promote equal job opportunity in the performance of Government contracts without regard to race, creed, color, or national origin.

Sixth. Title VI of the bill would appropriately amend Public Laws 815 and 874 of the 81st Congress, which authorize Federal payments to school districts which provide free public education to children whose parents reside or work on Federal property not subject to State or local taxation to include children of members of the Armed Forces whether they reside on Federal property or not. This title will also authorize the acquisition of certain school buildings as rental property, to be used for providing for

children of military personnel education necessitated by the closing of the public schools.

Seventh. The final substantive title, title VII, will authorize the Federal Government to provide technical assistance to States which prior to the Supreme Court decision of May 17, 1954—Brown against Board of Education—maintained segregated schools and which seek to comply with the decision of the Supreme Court. It would accomplish this purpose by making Federal grants available to the States. Also, at the request of the States or local agencies, the Commissioner of Education would be authorized to provide technical assistance and information in the development of desegregation programs and upon request of such officials will initiate or participate in conferences dealing with the educational aspects of problems arising from desegregation of public schools.

As indicated at the outset of this statement, I am convinced that this bill is a sensible, middle course which the Congress should look upon with favor. I sincerely hope it will receive consideration at an early date.

SENATE

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 16, 1959

Rev. John C. Petrauskas, headmaster, Marianapolis Preparatory School, Thompson, Conn., offered the following prayer:

O Lord, as we humbly commend ourselves to Thy omnipresence, we invoke Thy infinite blessings on this august assembly, whose deliberations and decisions reverberate to the farthest ends of the world which Thou hast created.

Imbue our lawmakers, O Lord, with a delicate sense of justice, a burning love of the moral good, an unrelenting opposition to iniquity, and an unswerving trust in Thy inscrutable ways.

As Thou regardest this troubled world, with its emphasis on superlatives, take heed, O Lord, of the plight of small nations. We beseech Thee to look with favor upon Lithuania and her neighboring Baltic States as they mark in mourning a once proudly proclaimed freedom and independence. Banish tyranny and bondage from the face of the earth, and grant that Lithuania and all other captive nations may once again know the blessings of freedom and security, so that they may continue to glorify Thee.

With filial devotion and confidence, we have recourse to Thee, who hast been called our tainted nature's solitary boast, and whose motherly concern embraces the suffering and the oppressed. Instill in mankind a deeper sense of human brotherhood under Thy common motherhood and present to God, the Father of all, our prayerful petition that international justice and peace with honor may endure among nations forever. Amen.

CV—144

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U. S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D. C., February 16, 1959.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. THOMAS J. DODD, a Senator from the State of Connecticut, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

CARL HAYDEN,
President pro tempore.

Mr. DODD 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, February 12, 1959, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on February 12, 1959, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 961) fixing the representation of the majority and minority membership of the Joint Economic Committee.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

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.

JOHN FOSTER DULLES

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the news of the weekend from Walter Reed Hospital weighs heavily upon all of us as we meet here in the Senate today.

A valued American lies ill. Our hearts and the hearts of free men everywhere go out to John Foster Dulles as he begins his fight for health. If tenacity, dedication, and resoluteness of purpose are allies of medicine, then the prognosis is certainly encouraging, for Mr. Dulles has never been lacking in these qualities. In the most difficult and demanding of public duties, he has been tenacious and tireless in pursuit of what he has held to be right. His example of exhausting and unhesitating devotion to duty is one which we both admire and envy.

Over the period of his service as Secretary of State, Mr. Dulles and I have both agreed and disagreed. Yet it has never been difficult to work with him for the best interests of the Nation. I have never had occasion to say anything personal about him in any circumstance, for I have held him in very high regard, and I still do.

Mr. President, as a measure of our feelings for the Secretary of State, John Foster Dulles, I now submit, and send to the desk, a resolution which expresses the sympathy of the Senate for the Secretary of State at this time of his illness, and expresses our prayers and our confidence for his early recovery. I ask unanimous consent that after the resolution is read, it be considered and