

SAFEGUARDING BENEFITS OF INCOMPETENT VETERANS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 6319) to amend chapter 55 of title 38, United States Code, to establish safeguards relative to the accumulation and final disposition of certain benefits in the case of incompetent veterans.

PRODUCTION OF DOCUMENTARY EVIDENCE IN CIVIL INVESTIGATIONS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 446, S. 716.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 716) to authorize the Attorney General to compel the production of documentary evidence required in civil investigations for the enforcement of the antitrust laws, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CANNON in the chair). Let the Chair announce that, pursuant to the agreement which previously has been entered into, during the further consideration of Senate bill 716, the time is subject to the limitation which has been ordered.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, is the Senate still proceeding in the morning hour?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President—
Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the agreement which has been entered, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] be permitted to speak at this time for 7 minutes, as if in the morning hour.

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

EUGENE MEYER

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I should like to have the privilege of joining several of my colleagues in paying tribute to the late Eugene Meyer, chairman of the board of the Washington Post Co.

Mr. Meyer, as publisher of one of the better newspapers in the United States, believed that truth was a most effective instrument against the schemes of those who would distort the practices of good government.

Under his guidance, the Washington Post gained tremendous stature here and throughout the Nation as a newspaper of repute.

I am sure his career will serve as an inspiration to all of us in government, as well as to the newspaper profession

and, indeed, to people in all walks of life who cherish an honest press.

Mr. President—
The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

BRINKMANSHIP IN STEEL

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, the July 17 issue of *Commonweal* has a thoughtful and perceptive editorial entitled "Brinkmanship in Steel." *Commonweal*, which is edited and published by Catholic laymen, is one of the most respected of American periodicals, and is noted for temperance and fairness. It is my belief that the editorial very helpfully summarizes the situation in the controversy between the steel industry and the union. I particularly desire to bring attention to the concluding paragraph, which reads as follows:

If "holding the line" on prices and wages is so crucial, management could show the way by a declaration that capital will also cooperate by foregoing any increase in return on investment and that all profits over the average of the last 3 years will be turned instead into lower prices for steel. Such a policy would improve steel's competitive position in relationship to foreign imports and alternative domestic products, and it would represent an anti-inflationary step that both steelworkers and the public could understand.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD, as a part of my remarks.

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

BRINKMANSHIP IN STEEL

President Eisenhower does not consider the present labor-management deadlock in steel as a "national emergency" in the Taft-Hartley meaning of that phrase, but he is obviously concerned with the effect a strike could have on the national economy and the common good. For weeks it has been reported that high administration officials, including Vice President Nixon and Secretary of Labor Mitchell, have been active behind the scenes in an effort to find a solution acceptable to both sides, even though the Federal Government has not officially intervened in the dispute. And the negotiations continued beyond the original strike deadline only as a result of Mr. Eisenhower's exhortation that both sides "continue to bargain without interruption of production until all the terms and conditions of a new contract are agreed upon."

We share the President's concern. Indeed, we are quite surprised at the equanimity with which some commentators seem to view the prospect of a nationwide strike, just when the economy really seems to be heading upward from the 1958 slump. And we think the public is at this point entitled to ask for some display of statesmanship by management as well as labor.

Significantly, sharp criticism of management's conduct of the current negotiations was recently expressed by *Iron Age*, an influential trade magazine which reflects the views of part of the steel industry itself. This year, said *Iron Age*, the major steel companies are determined to "make up quickly what has been bargained away in the past 18 years." This effort to withdraw concessions previously won by the union over many years represents an exercise in industrial "brinkmanship," the magazine warned, and the results are likely to be "labor

troubles galore" in the months and years immediately ahead.

Enough information is available about the progress of the steel negotiations to indicate that *Iron Age* is hardly exaggerating. The union is not in the strongest position in the world. One hundred thousand jobs have been eliminated by automation, and more will be. Rank-and-file sentiment for a strike is not strong, although a strike call will undoubtedly be honored if it comes. Management officials, on the other hand, seem much more unconcerned about the prospect of a strike—perhaps because advance buying of steel has put them in a very strong position, as indicated by profit figures for the early part of 1959 as compared with 1958. First-quarter profits of United States Steel, for example, were well over \$100 million, as compared with \$62 million last year; Bethlehem doubled last year's \$24 million; and Republic profits went from \$8 million to \$26 million.

The union says wages and benefits can be increased out of current high profits without any rise in prices. Management wants the union to accept the status quo without any increases in wages or fringe benefits; in addition, it wants the union to accept important changes in working agreements and in the provision for a cost-of-living escalator won in previous years. Since these management demands would involve substantial losses, it is hard to believe that management really expects union officials to accept them. When these facts are coupled with management's refusal to continue bargaining with all contract changes to be retroactive to the original deadline, the conclusions drawn by union officials must be clear: their choice is unconditional surrender or strike.

Like *Iron Age*, we think that in these negotiations steel management is making a serious mistake which will have costly consequences for the Nation and, in the years ahead, for the steel industry itself. The haste with which the union seized upon President Eisenhower's face-saving proposal that bargaining be continued indicates how little taste the union has for a strike. If the issue is strike or surrender, we do not doubt that the men will strike. But the issue need not and should not be put in such stark terms for either side.

If "holding the line" on prices and wages is so crucial, management could show the way by a declaration that capital will also cooperate by foregoing any increase in return on investment and that all profits over the average of the last 3 years will be turned instead into lower prices for steel. Such a policy would improve steel's competitive position in relationship to foreign imports and alternative domestic products, and it would represent an anti-inflationary step that both steel workers and the public could understand.

THE STEEL STRIKE DEADLOCK

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, it is probable that the most serious economic problem facing this Nation today is the steel strike deadlock.

Negotiations, mediation, and fact-finding swim around before the public's eye. In full-page advertisements placed by labor and management, each argues that the other is wrong.

In the midst of this impasse, the public interest founders and the consumer wonders.

When the smoke has cleared away, will John Q. Public's pocketbook feel another whack?

Will the prices of paperclips and pots and pans and pumps and power-mowers and everything else that John Q. Public must buy climb another rung on the