SENATE

MONDAY, MARCH 8, 1954

(Legislative day of Monday, March 1, 1954)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

Rev. Warren E. Mace, associate rector, Church of the Epiphany, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

O Almighty God, the God of this Nation and of all men, we render to Thee our praise for the many blessings bestowed upon our country both in former days and in these times. May we, especially through our leaders, show our gratitude by seeking to know Thy will both for ourselves and for the whole family of nations. Enable us to fulfill it. Be with this body in its deliberations, we humbly beseech Thee, and may we all have a vision of a more perfect society in which there may be peace and unity at home, and mutual regard and respect amongst the nations in our generation. Hear this our prayer, we humbly beseech Thee, O God, our creator and preserver. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D. C., March 8, 1954.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. ROBERT W. UPTON, a Senator from the State of New Hampshire, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

STYLES BRIDGES,
President pro tempore.

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

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. KNOWLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, March 4, 1954, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILL

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on March 6, 1954, the President had approved and signed the act (S. 2175) to amend title VI of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, with respect to the retirement of employees in the legislative branch.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its clerks, returned to the Senate in compliance with its request the bill (S. 1138) for the relief of John Soudas.

The message announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the bill (S. 2714) to increase the borrowing power of Commodity Credit Corporation.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 66) to print for the use of the Committee on the Judiciary additional copies of hearings on Interlocking Subversion in Government Departments.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 666. An act for the relief of Michele Paccione;

H. R. 858. An act for the relief of Kim Mi Hae;

H. R. 1100. An act for the relief of Peter A. Pirogov;

H. R. 1325. An act for the relief of George L. F. Allen;

H. R. 2634. An act for the relief of Charles T. Douds;

H. R. 2636. An act for the relief of George Japhet;

H. R. 2666. An act for the relief of Martin G. Scott and Hanna von Gusmann;

H. R. 3145. An act for the relief of Pravomil Vaclav Maly and Jarmila Maly;

H. R. 3836. An act for the relief of Petra Fumia;

H. R. 4699. An act for the relief of Robert F. Suczek;

H. R. 4735. An act for the relief of Lt. Col. Richard Orme Flinn, Jr.;

H. R. 4996. An act for the relief of Col. Henry M. Denning, and others;

H. R. 5765. An act for the relief of Henry C. Bush and other Foreign Service officers;

H. R. 5772. An act for the relief of Robert E. Leibbrand and Rose Leibbrand;

H. R. 6020. An act for the relief of the estate of James Francis Nicholson;

H. R. 6033. An act for the relief of Albert Vincent, Sr.;

H. R. 6477. An act for the relief of the Columbia Hospital of Richland County, S. C.;

H. R. 6594. An act for the relief of Livio Brianesco;

H. R. 7328. An act to promote the national defense by authorizing the construction of aeronautical research facilities by the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics necessary to the effective prosecution of aeronautical research;

H. R. 7407. An act for the relief of Mrs. Laura Smith Merritt;

H. R. 7559. An act for the relief of Mrs. Madeleine Alice Aquarone; and

H. R. 8067. An act making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, and the United States Information Agency, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the following concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 204) providing for the printing of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 and the report thereon:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there be printed a total of 20,000 copies of the bill entitled "Internal Revenue Code of 1954" for the use of the following: House document room, 13,000 copies; Senate document room, 500 copies; House Committee on Ways and Means, 6,450 copies; Senate Committee on Finance, 50 copies; and that there be printed a total of 20,000 copies of the report thereon submitted by the Committee on Ways and Means for the use of the following: House document room, 13,000 copies; Senate document room, 1,700 copies; House Committee on Ways and Means, 5,000 copies; Senate Committee on Finance, 300 copies.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED DURING RECESS

Pursuant to the order of the Senate of March 5, 1954,

The VICE PRESIDENT announced that on March 5, 1954, he signed the following enrolled bills and joint resolution, which had previously been signed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives:

S. 153. An act for the relief of Wilhelm Engelbert;

S. 303. An act for the relief of Felix S. Schorr and his wife, Lilly Elizabeth Schorr;

S. 502. An act for the relief of the estate of Mrs. Margareth Weigand;

S. 827. An act for the relief of Matthew J. Berckman;

H. R. 1883. An act for the relief of Franklin Jim;

H. R. 1967. An act for the relief of the Stebbins Construction Co.;

H. R. 2326. An act to amend the act of August 3, 1950, as amended, to continue in effect the provisions thereof relating to the authorized personnel strengths of the Armed Forces;

H. R. 2567. An act to amend the act of July 26, 1947 (61 Stat. 493), relating to the relief of certain disbursing officers;

H. R. 3275. An act for the relief of the Bracey-Welsh Co., Inc.; and

H. J. Res. 355. Joint resolution amending title V of the Agricultural Act of 1949.

ORDER FOR TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that immediately following the quorum call there may be the customary morning hour for the transaction of routine business, under the usual 2-minute limitation on speeches.

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

Mr. KNOWLAND. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the call of the roll be rescinded.

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

REPORT ON MUTUAL SECURITY PROGRAM—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 337)

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying report, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

To the Congress of the United States:

I am transmitting herewith the report on the Mutual Security Program covering operations during the 6-month period, June 30, 1953, to December 31, 1953, in furtherance of the purpose of the Mutual Security Act of 1951, as amended.

In this report is factual evidence of valuable progress being made through mutual efforts toward the vital goal of

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

increased security for this Nation and all the free world.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *March 8, 1954.*

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

REPORT ON EXCHANGE STABILIZATION FUND

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the Exchange Stabilization Fund, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1953 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT OF BOARD OF GOVERNORS, FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM

A letter from the Chairman, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Board for the year 1953 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT OF FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman, Federal Power Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Commission, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1953 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

TRANSMISSION AND DISPOSITION OF ELECTRIC ENERGY GENERATED AT FALCON DAM

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the transmission and disposition by the Secretary of the Interior of electric energy generated by Falcon Dam on the Rio Grande (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Public Works.

REPORTS ON REAPPORTIONMENTS OF APPROPRIATIONS

A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, reporting, pursuant to law, that the appropriation to the Department of Justice for "Fees and expenses of witnesses," for the fiscal year 1954, had been reapportioned on a basis which indicates a necessity for a supplemental estimate of appropriation (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations.

A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, reporting, pursuant to law, that the appropriation to the Department of Justice for "Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Prisons," for the fiscal year 1954, had been reapportioned on a basis which indicated a necessity for a supplemental estimate of appropriation (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations.

A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, reporting, pursuant to law, that the appropriation to the Department of Justice for "Support of United States prisoners," for the fiscal year 1954, had been reapportioned on a basis which indicates a necessity for a supplemental estimate of appropriation (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations.

A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, reporting, pursuant to law, that the appropriation to the Farm Credit Administration for "Administrative expenses" for the fiscal year 1954, had been reapportioned on a basis which indicates a necessity for a supplemental estimate of appropriation (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations.

A letter from the Acting Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, reporting, pursuant to law, that the appropriaiton for the administrative expenses authorization for the Commodity Credit Corporation, for the fiscal year 1954, has been reapportioned on a basis which indicates a necessity for a supplemental estimate of administrative expense authorization of greater proportion than was originally estimated (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

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

By the ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A resolution adopted by the Guam Legislature; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"Resolution 129

"Resolution relative to establishing in Guam an Office of the High Commissioner of the Trust Territories

"Be it resolved by the Legislature of the Territory of Guam:

"Whereas it has been proposed that the Office of the High Commissioner of the Trust Territories be moved from Honolulu, T. H., to a location more closely associated with the trust territories; and

"Whereas the Territory of Guam is centrally located within the jurisdiction of the High Commissioner; and

"Whereas facilities are already maintained by the trust territories in Guam, and such facilities are susceptible to such expansion as might be necessary to accommodate the offices of the High Commissioner: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the Congress of the United States, the Secretary of the Interior, and the High Commissioner of the Trust Territories be hereby respectfully memorialized and requested to provide for the establishment of future headquarters for the High Commissioner of the Trust Territories to be established in the Territory of Guam; and be it further

"Resolved, That the executive secretary be and he is hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States, to the Secretary of the Interior, to the High Commissioner of the Trust Territories, and to the Governor of Guam."

A letter in the nature of a petition from the Anacostia Home & School Association, Washington, D. C., signed by Jessie L. Williams, corresponding secretary, endorsing the District of Columbia public works program; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

A resolution adopted by the Board of Supervisors of Erie County, New York, Buffalo, N. Y., favoring the enactment of legislation providing for personal exemptions of $1,200 in lieu of the present $600 for income-tax purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

A resolution adopted by the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, at Miami, Fla., relating to the Federal accelerated tax amortization program; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Telegrams, cablegrams, and letters in the nature of petitions from the Aceitunal Parent-Teachers Association, Camuy, the Teachers of BO Cienaga, Camuy, Parent-Teachers Association, Camuy, Ceferino Cordero Parent-Teachers Association, Camuy, the Anasco Rural Teachers, Anasco, the Elementary Urban School Lunchroom Employees, Camuy, the Anasco Teachers Association, Anasco, the Oddfellow Lodge Luz y Progreso, San Juan, the senior members, Civil Air Patrol, Anasco Squadron, the Teachers of Lopez Sicardo, Rio Piedras, the Local Federal Postal Employees, Ceiba, Teachers of Montana Second Unit, Aguadilla, the Teachers of Eladiovega School, Aguadilla, the Personnel Extension Service, University of Puerto Rico, San Juan, the Rotary Club of Anasco, the Faculty, Salto Arriba Second Unit, Utuado, the Daguao Teaching Staff, Nabuabo, the Parents and Teachers Association of the Elementary School of Naguabo, the Naguabo Secondary School Teachers, Naguabo, the Secondary School Teachers of Naranjito, the Asamblea Municipal of Mayaguez, and the chairman and commissioners of the Puerto Rico Industrial Commission, Department of Labor, San Juan, and students of Elementary Urban School, of Camuy, all in Puerto Rico, condemning the action of certain persons in attempting to assassinate Members of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FERGUSON:

A resolution of the Senate of the State of Michigan; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"Senate Resolution 16

"Resolution paying tribute to the Honorable Fred W. Kaess, Federal district attorney for the eastern district of Michigan, southern division, and his associates, William G. Hundley, William O'Donnell, and Birney McCristy, and the ever-vigilant Federal Bureau of Investigation, for the splendid work done in the conviction of six top Communists

"Whereas Fred W. Kaess, William G. Hundley, and Birney McCristy spent many months in preparation for the trial of six top Communists who were charged with conspiracy to teach and advocate the violent overthrow of the United States Government; and

"Whereas the ever vigilant Federal Bureau of Investigation has spent many tireless hours in securing, evaluating, and correlating evidence to be used at said trial; and

"Whereas the above named able attorneys spent many weeks, almost 4 months, having the full burden and responsibility of presenting the case to the jury; and

"Whereas because of the splendid ability and the outstanding work of said men, working closely with the Federal Bureau of Investigation, said parties brought about a conviction of said six top Communists after a prolonged and difficult conspiracy trial: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the Michigan Senate does hereby pay tribute to the splendid ability and the outstanding work of the following persons, Fred W. Kaess, William G. Hundley, and Birney McCristy, and the Federal Bureau of Investigation, in securing the conviction of said parties; and be it further

"Resolved, That the Federal Bureau of Investigation be commended for its able assistance in securing the conviction of said Communists; and be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to Herbert Brownell, Attorney General of the United States; and be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the Honorable HOMER FERGUSON and the Honorable CHARLES POTTER, United States Senators from Michigan; and be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this resolution also be sent to the Honorable Frank A. Picard, the able jurist before whom said case was tried, and to J. Edgar Hoover of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, at Washington, D. C.; and be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this resolution also be sent to the Honorable Fred W. Kaess, Federal district attorney, and his able assistants.

"Adopted by the senate February 22, 1954.

"FRED I. CHASE,

"Secretary of the Senate."

EMPLOYMENT AT BLACK HILLS ORDNANCE DEPOT — LETTER FROM LODGE 1549, AMERICAN FEDERATION OF GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES, IGLOO, S. DAK.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a letter from Local Lodge 1549, American Federation of Government Employees, Igloo, S. Dak., relating to the employment situation at the Black Hills Ordnance Depot of the Army, at Igloo.

There being no objection, the letter was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICAN FEDERATION OF GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES,
Igloo, S. Dak., February 26, 1954.

The Honorable WILLIAM LANGER,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SENATOR: We, of the Lodge No. 1549, AFGE, of Igloo, S. Dak., are appealing for help on this depot which appears to be fast becoming a disaster area.

People came here with the promise they would have a job. They are now being put on a reduction in force and no place to go and no money to support their families. Jobs are scarce in this area and throughout the whole State of South Dakota. Not one provision of compensation is provided on a United States Government job for those who are laid off out here.

Our members are thoroughly disgusted with this deplorable situation. Children have to suffer for the thoughtlessness of Government practices. They are being taken from school when parents lose their jobs. This deprives them of what is an American privilege—schooling.

Cost of living has gone up tremendously. It is much higher out here than east of us, but wages are not going up accordingly. It is understood wages have now gone up in the States farther east of us.

This depot needs your help desperately.

Yours sincerely,

ALVIN D. VILHAUER,
President No. 1549.

INDEPENDENCE OF ESTONIA—LETTER AND RESOLUTION

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I am in receipt of a letter from Juhan Vasar, president, the Estonian National Committee in the United States, of New York, N. Y., transmitting a resolution adopted by Estonians and friends of Estonia assembled at a meeting in New York, N. Y., on the 36th anniversary of the proclamation of independence of the Republic of Estonia. I ask unanimous consent that the letter and resolution be appropriately referred and printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter and resolution were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE ESTONIAN NATIONAL COMMITTEE IN THE UNITED STATES,
New York, N. Y., March 4, 1954.

The Honorable WILLIAM LANGER,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

SIR: On behalf of Estonians in this country, I take the liberty to bring to your attention the attached resolution.

At the same time I would like to express our hope that you will continue to support our cause, which is aimed at the liberation of Estonia from Soviet tyranny.

Very truly yours,

JUHAN VASAR, *President.*

Estonians and friends of Estonia assembled today at a concert meeting in New York, commemorating the 36th anniversary of the Proclamation of Independence of the Republic of Estonia, have resolved—

To express their gratitude to the Government of the United States for its firm policy of nonrecognition of the absorption of Estonia and the other Baltic nations into the Soviet Union and for its support in their fight for freedom and restoration of their independence.

To extend this expression of gratitude also to the Members of the Congress of the United States, supporting the cause of Estonia and the other Baltic nations, and in particular to the members of the Baltic Committee of the House of Representatives.

To call attention to the plight of Estonians in their home country and to the urgency of their earliest liberation.

Daily, people in Estonia and other Baltic countries continue to be arrested and deported, subjected to mental and physical torture; religious, spiritual, and material values are continuously being tramped on; youth is being corrupted and indoctrinated. If Kremlin's genocidal designs are not to succeed, immediate help is needed.

It is the plea and conviction of those assembled at this commemorative meeting that the great United States, great in power, and great in principles will do its best to accelerate the liberation of the unlucky Estonians and other East European peoples from the unbearable Soviet yoke.

TAXATION OF INTEREST ON CERTAIN TYPES OF MUNICIPAL BOND ISSUES—LETTER AND RESOLUTION OF CITY COUNCIL, GRAND FORKS, N. DAK.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I am in receipt of a letter from R. S. Niles, city auditor of the city of Grand Forks, N. Dak., transmitting a resolution adopted by the City Council of Grand Forks, relating to the proposed tax on the interest on certain types of municipal bond issues. I ask unanimous consent that the letter and resolution be printed in the RECORD, and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the letter and resolution were referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CITY OF GRAND FORKS, N. DAK.,
February 2, 1954.

The Honorable Senator WILLIAM LANGER,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Enclosed herewith find certified copy of a resolution which was adopted by the City Council of the City of Grand Forks, N. Dak., at its regular meeting held on February 1, 1954. Any consideration or help that you may be able to give in calling this matter to the attention of the Ways and Means Committee will be greatly appreciated.

Yours very truly,

R. S. NILES,
City Auditor.

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF GRAND FORKS, N. DAK., ON FEBRUARY 1, 1954

Be it resolved by the City Council of the City of Grand Forks, N. Dak., That the unprecedented action of the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives in approving, without public hearing or opportunity for municipalities to express their views, the proposal to make the interest on certain types of municipal bond issues subject to Federal income tax, should be reconsidered, and that a full opportunity should be given for all municipalities and their representatives to be heard upon this question which involves the entire future of municipal financing.

Be it further resolved that copies of this resolution be sent to the chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee, and to the Members of the congressional delegation from North Dakota.

A true copy.

R. S. NILES,
City Auditor of the City of Grand Forks, N. Dak.

CROP FAILURE AND LACK OF FARM INCOME

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter from Norman W. Cross, manager of the Slope Electric Cooperative, Inc., of New England, N. Dak., enclosing a letter from Mr. and Mrs. Jake Fiedler, of New England, N. Dak. I ask that the two letters be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

SLOPE ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE, INC.,
New England, N. Dak., January 26, 1954.

Senator WILLIAM J. LANGER,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. LANGER: The attached letter was received a few days ago and was brought up at a recent board of directors meeting. The board was very interested in it and hoped that it would not indicate a beginning of a trend.

They also thought that you would be interested in it and might be able to use it as evidence that the farmers of this State are not as prosperous as a lot of people seem to believe.

Yours truly,

NORMAN W. CROSS,
Manager.

JANUARY 16, 1954.

SLOPE ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE,
New England, N. Dak.

DEAR SIR: We have disconnected our hot-water heater—also the refrigerator; hence, the change is our bill for this month. Due to the crop failure and no farm income, we cannot pay the usual $16 to $20 per month bill.

This is by no means a reflection on the REA co-op. Nothing has done more to raise the standard of living for the average farm family, and we deeply appreciate the prompt and courteous service given us the past 5 years that we have received electricity.

We are hoping for the best in the future. Thanking you very kindly, we remain,

Sincerely yours,

Mr. and Mrs. JAKE FIEDLER.

PROPOSED INCREASE IN COMPENSATION OF MEMBERS OF CONGRESS—STATEMENT OF INTERNATIONAL LONGSHOREMEN'S AND WAREHOUSEMEN'S UNION

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter from the secretary-treasurer of the International Long-

shoremen's and Warehousemen's Union, and a statement of policy adopted unanimously at the last quarterly meeting of the international executive board of that union.

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

INTERNATIONAL LONGSHOREMEN'S AND WAREHOUSEMEN'S UNION,
San Francisco, Calif., March 1, 1954.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: The attached resolution adopted unanimously at the last quarterly meeting of the international executive board of this union is sent to you at the direction of the board.

The board felt most strongly that in view of the present economic situation, the cost of living, and the difficulties the average American has to make ends meet, that the proposed 100-percent wage increase for Congressmen is uncalled for. Added to this is the failure on the part of Congress to lift the minimum wage which is presently only 75 cents an hour.

Irrespective of your particular position on a proposed pay raise for Members of Congress we feel sure you will find the statement of interest.

Sincerely,

LOUIS GOLDBLATT,
Secretary-Treasurer.

STATEMENT OF POLICY TO KEEP CONGRESSMEN FROM BREADLINES

More and more Americans are facing real economic problems today.

Unemployment is growing. Minimum wages fixed by Congress are still at 75 cents an hour. Social security is miserably inadequate. Taxes are the highest in history, and are now the greatest single item taken from a worker's pay.

The Congressmen sitting in Washington are in a position to do something about some of these things. But instead they are maintaining the high taxes, beginning to say those who are alarmed at growing unemployment are helping communism, ignoring minimum wage increases, and increasing the workers' payments toward social security. At the same time, by putting more handcuffs on the trade unions, they are further restricting the ability of the workers' own organizations to help their own members economically.

After all this, some Congressmen and Senators have the outright hypocrisy to complain about how tough it is for them to make ends meet on $1,000 a month plus tax-free expenses.

Claiming that they're underpaid because all they get is $12,500 a year plus $2,500 in expenses, legislation is now pending which would double the Congressman's base pay to $25,000 a year—a 100-percent increase. Congressmen now earn more than over 96 percent of American families.

The members of this union should know that Congressmen and Senators get free haircuts, shaves, and shines, in private barbershops right in the Capitol Building. They're free to the free-loaders, but they're paid for by our taxes.

The Senate and House restaurants serve the best food in Washington and at the cheapest prices. But every time a Congressman pays 75 cents for a $2 luncheon, we pick up the tab for the other buck and a quarter.

When any Congressman or member of his family is ill or needs hospitalization he is treated by the finest specialists in the most elaborate hospitals in America—the Army and Navy Medical Centers. For this service he pays a nominal fee. Although they're all members of a fancy, prepaid, preventative medicine program—for themselves of course—these same politicians vote against such medical care for the American people on the ground that it's socialized medicine. And now they're talking about investigating union welfare programs and funds—allegedly in our own interest, of course.

And so it goes. Free office space, free clerical and secretarial help—telephones, telegraph, and mail. Free trips to and from Washington.

They voted off rent controls all over the country, and kept them on in Washington, D. C., where they live.

Their junkets all over the world—at Government expense, of course—have become the laughing stock of the foreign newspapers who report on the latest flying visit by one Congressman or another.

Of course, there are certain trade union leaders who see nothing wrong with the tax policies and the high-income thinking of the Congressmen. These are such men as Dave Beck, labor's first millionaire, or George Meany, who makes $45,000 a year, or Dave McDonald, who takes home as much and more than these money-grubbing politicians.

In view of the poverty stricken condition of the Congressmen and Senators we feel that something should be done for them. To alleviate their plight, the ILWU proposes a program of giveaway to each Congressman—all he and his family can consume from the Government's stockpiles of surplus foods. This would include grain, milk, dried eggs, cheese, peanuts, butter, and potatoes. This would help the Government's dilemma of what to do with these surplus foods.

With these foodbaskets, plus their present $15,000 a year, plus their expenses, plus the wives, family members, sweethearts they place on their payroll as secretaries, etc., they should be able to struggle through the next year without a wage increase of $250 a week.

We further announce that our hearts bleed for these needy cases, and their poverty-stricken plight, and fervently hope many of them will be rescued from their tragic situation by the votes of the people in the next elections.

RESOLUTIONS OF NATIONAL RURAL ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE ASSOCIATION

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD certain resolutions unanimously adopted by the 12th annual meeting of members of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association on January 14, 1954, at Miami, Fla. They were sent to me in a letter from Clyde T. Ellis, executive manager of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association.

I ask unanimous consent that the letter and the resolutions be printed in the RECORD.

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

NATIONAL RURAL ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE ASSOCIATION,
Washington, D. C., February 25, 1954.

To All Members of the United States Senate and House of Representatives:

We are enclosing herewith for your information and consideration resolutions Nos. 21, 25, 26, 27, 29, 14, and 22, which were unanimously adopted by the 12th annual meeting of members of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association on January 14, 1954, at Miami, Fla. Over 5,000 members attended this meeting.

Sincerely,

CLYDE T. ELLIS,
Executive Manager.

RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED BY THE NATIONAL RURAL ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE ASSOCIATION ANNUAL MEETING OF MEMBERS, MIAMI, FLA., JANUARY 14, 1954

RESOLUTION 21

Be it resolved, That funds be made available to the Southeastern Power Administration for construction of transmission lines from Clark Hill Dam to serve preferred customers, and if that is not done, that the proposal of the Georgia Electric Membership Corp. (statewide association) to purchase the entire output of the Georgia side of Clark Hill Dam for distribution to preference customers and commercial power companies in the area to assure greatest benefits to all, be approved by the Department of the Interior, as opposed to the bus-bar sale of the power to the Georgia Power Co., with almost the entire benefit going to that company; and be it further

Resolved, That if a policy of sale at the bus bar is followed by the United States Government in the distribution of electric power generated at Federal hydro projects, the Rural Electrification Administration make available funds for construction of transmission lines by rural electric cooperatives, so that power generated at Federal hydro projects can be made available to preference agencies as directed by the United States Congress in the Flood Control Act of 1944.

RESOLUTION 25

Whereas the pressure continues in intensity against the appropriation of funds for the construction of generating plants and transmission lines; and

Whereas it is felt by the delegates to this annual meeting that the right to construct said generating plants and transmission lines is the lifeblood of the rural-electrification program: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we urge the Members of Congress to do everything within their power to defend the right and opportunity of REA cooperatives and power districts to construct and operate generating plants and transmission lines to serve themselves; and be it further

Resolved, That we urge the Congress to authorize adequate loan funds for this purpose.

RESOLUTION 26

Be it resolved, That this NRECA 12th annual meeting reaffirm its endorsement of the statement of Federal power policy as adopted by the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association on February 1, 1951 (copy attached).

RESOLUTION 27

Whereas research and publications of the Federal Power Commission demonstrate the feasibility of developing electric energy from windpower, and FPC has recommended that Congress authorize further development work and the construction of a demonstration plant; and

Whereas such a development would assist materially in increasing the amounts of power available to the rural systems from Government hydroelectric installations, especially in areas where the low-water season coincides with a high-wind season; and

Whereas Senator MURRAY has introduced a bill, designated S. 160, providing for further development work and the construction of a demonstration plant: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we urge Congress to enact S. 160 and appropriate the funds necessary to carry out the provisions thereof.

RESOLUTION 29

Whereas the Tennessee Valley Authority has been so vitally constructive in providing low-cost electric power and energy to the farmers, home owners, defense industries, other industries, municipalities, and mills in the Tennessee Valley, and improved the general standard of living for farm and home

owners through furnishing power to the rural-electric cooperatives, and to the establishment of industries in its area; and

Whereas the Tennessee Valley Authority has made vast contributions to national defense, including the provision far ahead of schedule of the tremendous needs for power of the atomic-energy program, furnishing this power at rates so low as to save all the taxpayers of the United States millions of dollars; and

Whereas the TVA program is self-liquidating, repaying capital invested by the people of the United States over a 40-year period and will still belong to all the American people after the people of the Tennessee Valley have paid for it; and

Whereas TVA's wholesale rate yardstick has reduced the rates at which all rural electric systems must buy power, thus exercising a restraining influence that diminishes only with the distance from TVA territory: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we commend to the Congress the great economic advancements and contributions to the development of the Southeast made by the TVA, and request that continued appropriations be made to supplement, advance, and continue this great development of our national resources.

RESOLUTION 14

Whereas for years and to the present, many private power companies have flooded America with advertising propaganda palpably designed to prejudice public opinion against the Nation's power-development program and the rural electric cooperatives as well; and

Whereas this maze of propaganda is paid for by the electric consumers of the country in their electric rate schedules, including our own members, and under the present law the cost of such advertising is deductible as business expenses for tax purposes; and

Whereas forcing electric consumers to pay for the cost of spreading propaganda is inimicable to their own interests and repugnant to our whole system of democracy: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we respectfully urge our Senators and Congressmen to enact appropriate legislation amending the internal revenue laws to prohibit the deduction of advertising costs from income before taxes where such advertising is designed for purposes other than legitimate promotion of the sales and services of the companies involved.

RESOLUTION 22

Whereas NRECA has, at its 10th and 11th annual meetings requested the Congress to enact legislation for the development of power on the St. Lawrence River in accordance with the established policy of NRECA relating to public power development as set forth in the statement of Federal power policy, adopted by NRECA February 1, 1951; and

Whereas the Congress has failed to enact such legislation and the Federal Power Commission has granted a license to the Power Authority of the State of New York to develop and market St. Lawrence hydropower, without protection to the consumer through application of the provisions of the preference clause of the Flood Control Act of 1944; and

Whereas legislation is now pending in the Congress to permit the development at Niagara of hydropower by five private companies, with no protection afforded the public: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we do hereby request the Congress to enact positive legislation for the protection of the public in accordance with the established power policy of NRECA in the development of hydropower at the St. Lawrence and Niagara power sites.

PARITY FOR FARM PRODUCTS—LETTER FROM FARMERS UNION LOCAL 103, BLACKDUCK, MINN.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a letter which I have received from Mr. Engberg, chairman of Farmers Union Local 103, Blackduck, Minn., in favor of 90 to 100 percent of parity, be printed in the RECORD.

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

BLACKDUCK, MINN., *March 1, 1954.*

To Hon. Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY.

DEAR MR. HUMPHREY: The Cormant Quiring Farmers Union Local 103 wish to thank you for the fine support you have given to American agriculture, also to inform you that we have gone on record as in favor of 100 percent or not less than 90 percent of parity on all farm products and more adequate loans to REA and RTA and power dams.

Thanking you very much.

Yours truly,

STANLEY ENGBERG,
Chairman, Local 103.

AMENDMENT OF NATURAL GAS ACT—RESOLUTION OF CITY COUNCIL, MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a resolution adopted by the City Council of Minneapolis, Minn., on February 26, concerning the Natural Gas Act, be printed in the RECORD, and appropriately referred.

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

RESOLUTION ENDORSING H. R. 7624-S. 2971, PENDING IN CONGRESS, RELATING TO AN AMENDMENT OF THE NATURAL GAS ACT

Whereas the city of Minneapolis is confronted with the need of protecting the interests of its natural gas rate payers in a number of requests for advances in natural gas rates under the Natural Gas Act; and

Whereas the Natural Gas Act is designed for the regulation of such rates; and

Whereas H. R. 7624-S. 2971 will facilitate and improve that regulation: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the City Council of the City of Minneapolis, That the City Council of the City of Minneapolis endorses the said proposed amendment; be it further

Resolved, That the city council requests the Representatives from Minnesota in the Congress of the United States to exert every effort to secure passage of legislation similar to H. R. 7624-S. 2971; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be transmitted to the Representatives from Minnesota in the Congress of the United States.

Passed February 26, 1954.

W. GLEN WALLACE,
President of the Council.

Approved March 1, 1954.

ERIC G. HOYER,
Mayor.

Attest:

ARLENE R. FINKLE,
City Clerk.

WRIGHT PATMAN, REPRESENTATIVE FROM TEXAS—RESOLUTION OF NATIONAL REHABILITATION COMMISSION OF THE AMERICAN LEGION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I consider it a privilege and an honor to bring to the attention of the Senate a resolution adopted on March 4, 1954, by the National Rehabilitation Commission of the American Legion.

The resolution pays its respects to the splendid services the Honorable WRIGHT PATMAN, of the First Congressional District of Texas, has performed as a supporter of veterans' rights and privileges and as a man in public life constantly committed to the public interest.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed in the body of the RECORD.

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

Whereas Wright Patman Day will be observed March 3, 1954, in Washington, D. C., in honor of Representative WRIGHT PATMAN of the First Congressional District of Texas; and

Whereas this tribute is being tendered in recognition of his 25 years of continuous distinguished service as a United States Congressman; and

Whereas Representative PATMAN has been a stanch supporter of veterans' rights and privileges; and

Whereas he has served honorably during both World Wars and has been a member of long standing and good faith in the American Legion; and

Whereas Representative PATMAN has always been a faithful servant of all the American people; and

Whereas the American Legion's National Rehabilitation Commission is now in annual conference in Washington, D. C.: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the American Legion does give full recognition and commendation to the outstanding works and services of this distinguished Congressman from Texas; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be entered into the official minutes of this conference, and that a copy of this resolution be presented to the Honorable Congressman WRIGHT PATMAN.

PRICE SUPPORTS—PETITIONS, LETTERS, AND NEWSPAPER ADVERTISEMENTS OF MINNESOTA BUSINESSMEN

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, businessmen of Minnesota's many fine rural communities are showing more and more concern about falling farm purchasing power. They want the Congress to know they stand shoulder to shoulder with our farm people, their customers, in insisting upon effective farm price supports, and opposing a downward sliding scale of lower level supports.

Through petitions, newspaper advertisements, and individual letters, they are adding the voice of small business to the voice of the farmer from the great agricultural State of Minnesota.

Many of these petitions and newspaper advertisements have already been called to the attention of the Congress, but more arrive in every mail. As a typical example, I hold in my hand a full-page advertisement from the Lake Park Journal of February 25 asking parity for the farmer, and declaring in part:

The welfare of our rural centers and our agricultural communities go hand in hand. We are interdependent. We will not long remain thriving and healthy if half the

community is prosperous, and the other half is suffering a slump.

It further says that, and I quote:

We realize that any program to deliberately lower farm prices and farm income would be dangerous to our rural communities, and we urge that any such proposals be vigorously opposed.

I ask unanimous consent that this statement appear in full at this point in the body of the RECORD, along with the names of the 30 leading merchants signing it.

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

PARITY FOR THE FARMER

The welfare of our rural centers and our agricultural communities go hand in hand. We are interdependent. We will not long remain thriving and healthy if half the community is prosperous and the other half is suffering a slump.

For this reason we view as serious the continuing farm price slump of the past year and prediction from Federal Reserve Bank authorities that farmers may suffer another 10 percent cut in cash income in 1954.

All of us should work together with farmers to maintain an agricultural program which will enable our family system to continue to function and which will keep our food productive capacity strong.

We believe that it is important for all people to understand that a strong farm price support system which will assure us plentiful food at fair prices is in the best long run interest of all of us, farmers, businessmen and townspeople alike.

We realize that any program to deliberately lower farm prices and farm income would be dangerous to our rural communities and we urge that any such proposals be vigorously opposed.

We therefore recommend that Congress maintain a strong farm support program with a price floor at or near full parity on all major farm production.

Al Grierson, Grierson Chevrolet Co.; Fay Hamilton, Grocery Store; Bob Palmer, Lake Park Hotel; Tory Olsen, Fashion Cleaners; Kenneth Cregan, Cregan's Bar; Dan Halliday, Lake Park Liquor Store; Gordon Martinson, Martinson Cafe; Florence Eilertson, Beauty Shop; M. A. Rogness, State Bank of Lake Park; Bob & Irv's, Standard Station; Art Friese, Friese Implement; Harry Fuglie, Creamery Oil Department; Vigen & Sons, Hardware Store; M. O. Hviding, Independent Oil Co.; S. W. Winjum, Hardware Store; A. J. Haugen, Lake Park Produce; Sanford Lunder, Garage and Car Sales; Jordahl's Store, Grocery Store; Albert Palin, Recreation Parlor; Lake Park Cooperative Creamery; Harry Wiecks, Barber Shop; Stanley Olson, Flo-Mor Cafe; Thorvald Tweed, Tweed's Cafe; E. P. Schulstad, Standard Oil Agent; R. C. Bakken, Big 5 Gas Agent; Winberg & Knutson Garage; Aldric Johnson, Plumber; Elmer Hoeschen, D. H. I. A.; C. B. Knudson, Wilcox Lumber Co.; R. F. Bergeson, Insurance Agent; Elmer Rogness, Lake Park Hardware; Ed Struble.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I also ask consent to have printed in the RECORD a telegram from Edwin Odegard, chairman of the Milaca Chamber of Commerce legislative committee, informing me of that civic body's protest against the sudden reduction of support prices on dairy products.

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

MILACA, MINN., *March 4, 1954.*

Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
United States Senator,
Senate Chambers,
Washington, D. C.:

The Chamber of Commerce of Milaca, Minn., has by resolution directed its legislative committee to advise you that the economic welfare of this community is largely dependent upon the prosperity of the dairy industry and protest the sudden reduction of support prices on butter from 90 percent of parity to 75 percent of parity.

EDWIN ODEGARD,
Chairman, the Milaca Chamber of Commerce Legislative Committee.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, from Harry Wermager, of the Waubun Implement Co. at Waubun, Minn., has come another petition signed by 20 leading businessmen of Waubun, calling upon me to oppose the administration's farm policy. I ask consent for it to appear in the body of the RECORD at this point, together with the signatures attached.

There being no objection, the petition, together with the signatures attached, was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

We, the undersigned businessmen of Waubun, Minn., a community highly dependent upon the basic industry, farming, feel that the farm policy of the present administration is extremely dangerous to our Nation as well as absolutely unfair to the farmer.

Since no man can live without the products of the soil, the tillers of that soil, our farmers, must be treated fairly in order that our Nation may grow stronger and, by its strength, ultimately bring peace to the world.

We feel that the farmers are not asking too much when they ask for fair treatment. Everyone knows that there are many, many minor industries that are absolutely unable to stand on their own feet, but, because of the extremely valuable nature of their services, cannot be allowed to fold, and so are supported by Government subsidies, direct or indirect.

Then, why, when the basic industry, farming, is, so to speak, weak in the knees, should the supports be removed or drastically reduced? Is it to hasten the collapse of the small farm, and the small-business man—the very backbones of the Nation? Perhaps that is not the intention. But that will be the result.

Therefore, we urge your opposition to the administration's farm policy.

Harry Wermager, farm implements; Waubun Market, locker plant and groceries; Norris Peterson, Peterson's beer; T. O. Colgrove, timber products; Orval Fagre, carpenter; Waubun Creamery, creamery; L. J. Avander, garage; Joe Huich, Waubun feed mill; John Carrwinn, lumber company; H. B. Gundens, merchant; E. P. Roering, cafe; Harold Kemper, dray line; Tony Voit, Ray Carlson, repair shop; Pat Chrorey, roadbuilding; Don Donald, hardware; Victor Guatesfson, liquor store; Jack D. Neises, merchant; H. H. Patnode, barber; William Carriveau, manager, factory; John Brehm, trucking; Ben Bement, bulk service station; Earl Herby, manager, grain elevator; A. W. Severine, agent, Soo Line; Dehmar Fleisher, Standard Service; George Malakowsky, shoe shop; Karl Haddeland, Waubun woodwork shop; W. C. Roering, cafe and dance hall; Farmers State Bank.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I have 5 similar petitions from Appleton, Benson, Holloway, Danvers, and Clontarf in Minnesota, signed by a total of 215 businessmen in every line of endeavor. Rather than repeat the petition and list all the names, I ask consent that the body of the petition be printed at this point in the RECORD, with the notation that it was signed by 215 nonfarm people recognizing everybody's stake in a sound farm program.

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

MARCH 1, 1954.

Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SENATOR: We, the undersigned, ask you in all sincerity to vote and fight for farm-support prices of not less than 90 to 100 percent of parity, figured under the old parity formula for all farm products.

We are strictly opposed to any sliding scale and to the use of the new parity formula, as our place of business will suffer tremendously if the sliding scale is forced upon the American farmer. We strongly urge that the Senate and House of the Congress of the United States will not let Secretary of Agriculture Benson's 75-percent parity on dairy products go into effect, but rather reinstate them at not less than 90 percent.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask the RECORD also show that a similar petition has been sent me by Harry Arnold, of Holloway, Minn., signed by 77 farm people of Holloway, Murdock, Benson, Danvers, Willmar, Hancock, Kerkhoven, and Appleton.

REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following reports of a committee were submitted:

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

S. 53. A bill for the relief of Lewis Roland Edwards (Rept. No. 1045);

S. 496. A bill for the relief of Dr. Samson Sol Flores and his wife, the former Cecilia T. Tolentino (Rept. No. 1046);

S. 509. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the United States Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon claims of customs officers and employees to extra compensation for Sunday, holiday, and overtime services performed after August 31, 1931, and not heretofore paid in accordance with existing law (Rept. No. 1047);

S. 587. A bill for the relief of Carlos Fortich, Jr. (Rept. No. 1048);

S. 1352. A bill for the relief of Siegfried Rosenzweig (Rept. No. 1049); and

H. R. 2747. A bill to amend title 17 of the United States Code entitled "Copyrights" with respect to the day for taking action when the last day for taking such action falls on Saturday, Sunday, or a holiday (Rept. No. 1050).

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

S. 203. A bill for the relief of Yvonne Linnea Colcord (Rept. No. 1051);

S. 246. A bill for the relief of Gerrit Been (Rept. No. 1052);

S. 347. A bill for the relief of George Taipale (Rept. No. 1053);

S. 431. A bill for the relief of Joseph Di Pasquale (Rept. No. 1054);

S. 483. A bill for the relief of Miss Elvira Bortolin (Rept. No. 1055);

S. 614. A bill for the relief of Eero and Tina and Karina Waskinen (Rept. No. 1056);

S. 670. A bill for the relief of John Doyle Moclair (Rept. No. 1057); and

S. 2070. A bill for the relief of the estate of Givens Christian (Rept. No. 1058).

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

S. 769. A bill for the relief of Maria E. Laedel (Rept. No. 1059).

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on March 5, 1954, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 153. An act for the relief of Wilhelm Engelbert;

S. 303. An act for the relief of Felix S. Schorr and his wife, Lilly Elizabeth Schorr;

S. 502. An act for the relief of the estate of Mrs. Margareth Weigand; and

S. 827. An act for the relief of Matthew J. Berckman.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. GILLETTE:

S. 3075. A bill to prohibit interstate common-carrier pipelines from transporting commodities in which such carriers have any interest; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

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

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 3076. A bill to provide for the reimbursement of Meadow School District No. 29, Upham, N. Dak., for loss of revenue resulting from the acquisition of certain lands within such school district by the Department of the Interior; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FERGUSON:

S. 3077. A bill for the relief of Gisela Hofmeier; and

S. 3078. A bill for the relief of Marianne Eder and Curt George Eder; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself, Mr. KERR, Mr. LONG, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. MORSE, and Mr. PASTORE):

S. 3079. A bill to provide for improving the Nation's health standards through the issuance of dairy diet dividend certificates to individuals receiving certain welfare or other payments; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

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

By Mr. WATKINS:

S. 3080. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act relating to mining claims located on land with respect to which a permit or lease has been issued, or an application or offer for permit or lease has been made, under the mineral leasing laws, or known to be valuable for minerals subject to disposition under the mineral leasing laws, and for other purposes," approved August 12, 1953; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CASE (by request):

S. 3081. A bill to amend section 1089 of the Code of Law for the District of Columbia so as to dispense with the necessity for a garnishee to answer a writ of attachment under oath; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 3082. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe (Joseph) Barberis; and

S. 3083. A bill for the relief of Luigi (Louis) Rossano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOUGLAS:

S. 3084. A bill for the relief of Elsa Lederer; and

S. 3085. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Helen Stryk; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CASE:

S. J. Res. 136. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to grant representation in the House of Representatives and in the Electoral college to the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOUGLAS (for himself and Mr. HUMPHREY):

S. J. Res. 137. Joint resolution to establish a Joint Committee on Internal Security; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

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

PROHIBITION OF INTERSTATE COMMON-CARRIER PIPELINES FROM TRANSPORTING COMMODITIES IN WHICH THEY HAVE ANY INTEREST

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill which has as its purpose the lowering of the cost to consumers of petroleum fuels transported by oil pipelines.

If this bill is enacted, the people of my State of Iowa alone will be saved annually a sum of at least $18 million on the cost of their gasoline, tractor fuel, kerosene, and fuel oil. Other similarly situated States would benefit proportionately. A legislative error of nearly 50 years' standing would be finally corrected.

The bill prohibits interstate common-carrier pipelines from transporting commodities in which such carriers have any interest. It would effectively place the common-carrier pipelines under the same regulations as those which now govern the railroads, under the so-called commodities clause of the Hepburn Act.

The Interstate Commerce Commission, which was created by Congress in 1887, did not become a vitalized and vigorous agency until after passage of the Hepburn Act in 1906. That act, in its commodities clause, prohibits any railroad from transporting in interstate commerce any commodity, other than timber, which was mined or produced by itself or under its authority, or which it may own in whole or in part, or in which it may have any direct interest.

As passed by the Senate, the original version of the Hepburn bill gave to the Interstate Commerce Commission power to regulate the transportation of oil by pipeline, in the same manner, as the Commission has power to regulate the railroads. If the bill had been finally enacted in that form, there would be no need for the legislation that I now propose. In the conference committee on the bill at that time, however, the commodities clause was amended, so as to make it applicable only to railroads, excluding oil pipelines. As a result, pipelines are common carriers in all respects except that they are not governed by a clause prohibiting them from carrying their own products. Being exempt from this prohibition, the pipelines are operated more or less as plant facilities of their shipper-owners.

The bill I am introducing today is no new proposal. It is almost identical with S. 2181, 1st session, 76th Congress, which was introduced by the late Senator from Idaho, Mr. Borah, with my cosponsorship on April 17, 1939. That bill died in the files of the Committee on the Judiciary, but I resurrect it today in the belief that it provides one way to reduce the cost of living to millions of our people, and particularly the cost of operating motor-driven equipment on our farms.

Crossing my State of Iowa, are several major oil pipelines which have stations where gasoline, kerosene, and fuel oil are taken off, for sale in the State. These are so-called common-carrier pipelines. The cost of shipping petroleum products by pipeline is only about half as much as the cost of shipping them by rail. Yet, because the commodities clause of the Hepburn Act does not apply to oil pipelines, the big oil companies which own these pipelines are able to charge to consumers, for their products, prices which do not reflect the cheaper mode of transportation. Our citizens in Iowa receive no benefit from the cheaper pipeline method of shipping petroleum products. Our farmers, our automobile operators, and our homeowners who heat with oil are still charged the rail freight rate, although the products move into the State through pipelines at a cost to the shipper of substantially one-half the rail freight rate.

The farm industry is by far the greatest consumer of gasoline and other petroleum products of any industry in the country. Farmers face the highest operating costs in history. They and all other motor-vehicle owners are entitled to the fair treatment afforded by this bill.

The following figures show the total number of automotive units on farms in the country as a whole and in the State of Iowa:

	Automobiles	Trucks	Tractors	Total
All United States farms	4,350,000	2,410,000	4,170,000	10,930,000
Iowa farms	236,000	70,000	306,000	575,600

The above figures have graciously been furnished me by the research department of Capper Publications, of Topeka, Kans. They are one indication of the enormous market for petroleum products on the Nation's farms, and they suggest how important a part of the cost of farm operation lies in gas and oil for farm machinery.

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

The bill (S. 3075) to prohibit interstate common-carrier pipelines from transporting commodities in which such carriers have any interest, introduced by Mr. GILLETTE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

NATIONAL DAIRY DIET DIVIDEND ACT

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], I introduce for appropriate reference a bill entitled "National Dairy Diet Dividend Act."

The aim of this measure is twofold:

First. To improve the Nation's health standards; and

Second. To use America's dairy abundance to aid underprivileged families.

Mr. President, for the past year I have insisted repeatedly that the soundest answer to our dairy problem was stimulating outlets for milk and butter—not just cutting prices to the farmer.

Last August 1 I presented to the Senate a comprehensive study showing the diet deficiencies of millions of Americans in health-giving dairy products and proposed adoption of a plan to put dairy products within reach of our aged people, dependent children, blind, and others on public assistance.

I have now placed that proposal in legislative form for the consideration of the Congress. It is a health and welfare measure, not a farm relief measure. Yet, in view of the current dairy crisis in this country, the twofold benefits of stimulating consumption of dairy products at this time appears obvious.

The act I propose calls for issuance of dairy diet dividend certificates to individuals eligible for public-assistance benefits. The certificates would enable them to buy at discount prices the minimum monthly amount of dairy products required to satisfy nutritional needs of a proper diet.

Under provisions of this act—

First. Eligibility would be determined by already established standards for public assistance, including recipients of old-age assistance, aid to dependent children, aid to the blind, aid to permanently and totally disabled, Federal old-age and survivors insurance, unemployment compensation, or public-assistance rolls of any State or subdivision.

Second. Dairy diet dividend certificates would be cashed through normal retail channels of trade.

Third. Existing Federal, State, and county welfare departments would be used to carry out the program, making unnecessary any new bureaucratic machinery.

Fourth. The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to transfer surplus-disposal funds to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to aid in financing the program to stimulate consumption of dairy products among underprivileged groups.

Fifth. Redemption value of certificates would be based on relationship between average public-assistance income and the Nation's average per capita income, for the minimum monthly amount of fluid milk necessary to satisfy average individual nutritional needs.

Sixth. While the formula for determining value of certificates is based on milk requirements, they would be acceptable at face value for the purchase of butter, cheese, buttermilk, cream, evaporated milk, condensed milk, and dried milk, as well as fluid milk.

The benefits of this act would extend to some 12 million people now existing on incomes too meager to permit proper diets.

If the limited assistance proposed only enabled the recipients to get an extra quart of milk and a half-pound of butter per week, it would mean a new outlet for 624 million quarts of milk and 312 million pounds of butter a year, more than wiping out any so-called dairy surplus, and making it unnecessary for heavy Government purchases and storage of such commodities.

This is a constructive, humanitarian measure. Instead of giving away dairy products outright, my bill would raise the purchasing power of our less fortunate citizens for the minimum essentials of a correct diet of dairy products to an equality with the average per capita income in this country, through certificates covering part of the cost of such products

Secretary of Agriculture Benson says there would be no surplus if the American people consumed the amount of milk and butter they should have in their diets.

Why not make it possible for those needing these products most to have them? That is what my Dairy Diet Dividend Act proposes.

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

The bill (S. 3079) to provide for improving the Nation's health standards through the issuance of dairy diet dividend certificates to individuals receiving certain welfare or other payments, introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

REDUCTION OF EXCISE TAXES—AMENDMENT

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 8224) to reduce excise taxes, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed.

PRINTING OF REVIEW OF REPORT ON HARBOR FACILITIES AT ANACORTES, WASH. (S. DOC. NO. 102)

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on Public Works, I present a letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a report dated June 26, 1953, from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a review of report on the Anacortes Harbor in the State of Washington with a view of making improvements in the harbor facilities, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed as a Senate document, with illustrations, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Pennsylvania? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H. R. 666. An act for the relief of Michele Paccione;

H. R. 858. An act for the relief of Kim Mi Hae;

H. R. 1100. An act for the relief of Peter A. Pirogov;

H. R. 1325. An act for the relief of George L. F. Allen;

H. R. 2634. An act for the relief of Charles T. Douds;

H. R. 2636. An act for the relief of George Japhet;

H. R. 2666. An act for the relief of Martin G. Scott and Hanna von Gusmann;

H. R. 3145. An act for the relief of Pravomil Vaclav Maly and Jarmila Maly;

H. R. 3836. An act for the relief of Petra Fumia;

H. R. 4699. An act for the relief of Robert F. Suczek;

H. R. 4735. An act for the relief of Lt. Col. Richard Orme Flinn, Jr.;

H. R. 4996. An act for the relief of Col. Henry M. Denning, and others;

H. R. 5765. An act for the relief of Henry C. Bush and other Foreign Service officers;

H. R. 5772. An act for the relief of Robert E. Leibbrand and Rose Leibbrand;

H. R. 6020. An act for the relief of the estate of James Francis Nicholson;

H. R. 6033. An act for the relief of Albert Vincent, Sr.;

H. R. 6477. An act for the relief of the Columbia Hospital of Richland County, S. C.;

H. R. 6594. An act for the relief of Livio Brianesco;

H. R. 7407. An act for the relief of Mrs. Laura Smith Merritt; and

H. R. 7559. An act for the relief of Mrs. Madeleine Alice Aquarone; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 7328. An act to promote the national defense by authorizing the construction of aeronautical research facilities by the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics necessary to the effective prosecution of aeronautical research; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 8067. An act making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, and the United States Information Agency, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 204) providing for the printing of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 and the report thereon was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

NOTICE OF CHANGE OF DATE OF HEARING ON SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 133, MAKING ANTITRUST LAWS APPLICABLE TO PROFESSIONAL BASEBALL IN CERTAIN CASES

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, on behalf of the Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly Legislation of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that the public hearing scheduled

for Thursday, March 11, 1954, at 9:30 a. m., on Senate Joint Resolution 133, a resolution to make the antitrust laws applicable to professional baseball clubs affiliated with the alcoholic beverage industry, has been rescheduled for Thursday, March 18, 1954, at 9:30 a. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building.

The subcommittee consists of myself, chairman, the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER].

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The ACTING 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.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. LANGER, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Madison B. Graves, of Nevada, to be United States attorney for the district of Nevada; and

Cedric E. Stewart, of Nevada, to be United States marshal for the district of Nevada.

By Mr. KEFAUVER, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Fred Elledge, Jr., of Tennessee, to be United States attorney for the middle district of Tennessee.

By Mr. MILLIKIN, from the Committee on Finance:

Arnold R. Baar, of Illinois, to be a judge of the Tax Court of the United States, vice Samuel B. Hill, retired.

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

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

By Mr. DOUGLAS:

Letter dated February 18, 1954, written by him to the President of the United States, on the subject of an increase in personal income-tax exemptions.

Statement prepared by him relative to ninth anniversary of Communist seizure of Romania.

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

Study by Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress relating to acts of Congress providing benefits for Korean war veterans.

NEW YORK CITY POSTAL SERVICE

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, within the last few days I had an opportunity to read a very interesting article which appeared in the New York Times for Sunday, February 28, 1954, describing a lack of efficiency within the New York postal service. In view of the fact that this article bears upon the pneumatic-tube service for rapid delivery in New York, I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the body of the RECORD.

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

CITY POSTAL SERVICE 50 PERCENT EFFICIENT—FOUR-DAY LOCAL DELIVERY NOT UNUSUAL

(By Richard T. Baker)

Letters posted at random hours and in random places around the metropolitan area, for local delivery, stand only a 50–50 chance of being delivered the following morning. Oftener they will not be delivered until the second morning, and week-ends and holidays can so upset even the 2-day schedule that deliveries 3 or 4 days later are not unusual.

Overnight delivery, which is the goal of local postal service, is what you hope for when you mail a letter. Half the time it will go through, and you couldn't ask for better service.

The other half of the time, however, when play tickets, vehicle license tags, insurance notices, checks, and other vital necessities often seem to be involved, anything can happen.

For the last 3 weeks the New York Times has been criss-crossing the metropolitan area with test mailings to study the quality of the city's postal service.

How long do ordinary letters take to be delivered? Are deliveries in certain areas speedier than in others? When and where and how should a letter be posted to ensure fastest delivery? If the service is slow, what is being done and what can be done to improve it?

These were among the questions that the test sought to answer concerning the largest post office in the world, one that handles a tenth of the Nation's total postal business.

From the study certain facts stand out:

Of the entire test mailing slightly less than 50 percent received overnight delivery, slightly more were delivered in 2 days or more. Letters were posted at all hours of the day and night and in all parts of the area.

Distance inside the metropolitan area made little difference insofar as speed of delivery was concerned. Letters mailed from the Bronx to Staten Island received overnight delivery. Letters mailed across the width of Central Park took 2 days to reach their destination. One which struck a week-end was 4 days on its way.

Special delivery inside the metropolitan area might as well be forgotten. Ordinary letters posted at the same time reached addressees faster.

Time of mailing, while a significant factor inside the post office in relieving peak loads and the 6 to 9 p. m. climax of the postal day, made little difference to the customer. Letters mailed early in the day were received at the same time as letters posted at the peak hour.

ZONE NUMBER ADDS NO SPEED

Similarly, addressing with the use of the postal zone number is a boon to the post office, but in the test showed no results for the user of the mails. Three sets of letters were sent from outside the city to New York addresses. One set used the postal zone number, one did not use the zone number, and the other used an improper zone number. All the letters arrived without exception in the same length of time.

Service was better in certain areas of the city than in others. Business zones, like midtown and the Wall Street area, where 2 and 3 deliveries a day are the rule, showed the promptest mail handling. Residential zones, where one-a-day deliveries prevail, suffered.

A test of first-class and third-class commercial mailings revealed that first class, the queen of the services, received little in the way of preferential handling. Both first-class and third-class letters were delivered in the same mail.

Inadequate service is in part due to antiquated postal organization in the New York area. Brooklyn has a single post office and one postmaster. Queens has four independent post offices. Manhattan and the Bronx have one post office with four dispatching stations, dozens of carrier stations and many more collecting and business offices Around this core are the hundreds of individual suburban post offices.

As population has grown and moved, the post-office structure has merely been adjusted. No basic organizational changes, no major abandonments or consolidation have come to keep pace with the growth of the city and its suburbs.

Postal service within the single metropolitan unity is, therefore, made more difficult rather than helped by the structure of the organization upon which the service depends.

Following are some of the specific findings of the test of mail service in the New York area:

A number of letters, mailed simultaneously from a single box in the Bronx, addressed to scattered points around the city, reflected the general average for local delivery. A few more than half of them took 2 days for delivery. A few less than half arrived the following morning.

One of them, directed to a residential address in a remote area of Staten Island, was delivered the next morning. Another, directed just across the Harlem River to an Upper Manhattan address, took 2 days for delivery. Another, to the lower tip of Manhattan, took 2 days. Another, to a New Jersey suburb, arrived promptly the next morning. Another, to a closer Westchester suburb, took 2 days.

"We don't try to explain it," a postal official said. "We work to keep the mails moving just as fast as possible. But the time comes when a sorter has to stop sorting and make a bundle for dispatching. At that moment 2 identical pieces of mail may be separated, and the difference will show up when the 2 letters are delivered."

Service was conspicuously bad in areas east of Central Park. In fact, for a man to get a billet doux eastward across the park from Central Park West to Fifth Avenue, he might far better walk. Ordinary mail took 2 days, and 1 missive was 4 days on the way.

The reverse was not true, westward across the park, mail took only a day for delivery.

If you live on a residential street in a predominantly business neighborhood or, conversely, yours is a business address in a predominantly residential area, your postal service is apt to suffer. Letters addressed to a residence in one of Manhattan's busiest postal zones were frequently a day late in delivery, a lapse attributed to the fact that in such a zone residential mail was receiving secondary consideration.

Mail went easily overnight from the Bronx to Queens. But, returning from Queens to the Bronx, it took 2 days for delivery.

While postal officials contend that same-day deliveries are not unusual, the test mailings developed not one instance in which a letter was posted, however early, and delivered the same day.

Letters moving north on the East Side showed a tendency to run into snags. Two-day deliveries were more common than with letters moving south.

Mail from Brooklyn to Queens was delivered in 1 day. Mail from Queens to Brooklyn, 2 days.

Normal overnight delivery prevailed across the East River from downtown Manhattan points to Brooklyn.

Mail the length of the city, from the Battery to Riverdale, was more often 2 days in passage than 1. Generally, it took 2 days

to move letters between the Bronx and Brooklyn.

With only 1 exception, letters exchanged inside Queens took 2 days for delivery. The exception was an exchange of letters between two persons across the street from each other. They were delivered overnight in both directions.

An airmail letter from New York to Paris was delivered in 43 elapsed hours. A New York-bound letter from Paris took 60 elapsed hours for delivery.

LONDON, BROOKLYN MAILS ALIKE

Airmail from London was delivered in a Bergen County suburb in 3 days, the same length of time that is customarily taken in delivering an ordinary letter from Brooklyn to the same suburban address. An airmail letter from Hong Kong took only a day longer.

Deteriorated postal service has been complained about by big business users of the mails, by chambers of commerce and by ordinary citizens. A year ago the then Acting Postmaster, Harold Riegelman, admitted that 24-hour delays were not unusual in the city.

Some steps have been taken to improve service and some progress has been made. Within the last year window hours in post offices have been lengthened, and night collection hours in many areas of the city have been extended by as much as 2½ hours.

Local post office officials report that complaints fell off noticeably when the later collection hours went into effect.

Officials are convinced that greater efficiency can be achieved through better systems for sorting the mail and conveying it, and research is under way to improve these systems. Mechanical sorters are still hoped for. Personnel practices are being revised and incentive systems organized for workers. All these, officials hope, will bring better service.

They point out that much depends upon the user of the mails for the kind of service he gets. They urge care in addressing, use of zone numbers and early mailing.

"Don't expect overnight delivery if you mail your letter in a box that is closed for the night," they say.

While tests made by the Times showed no appreciable results from early mailings and use of zone numbers, the post office was quick to point out that if everyone posted late and without proper addresses the results could be chaotic.

Experiments in pre-sorting the mail by users are under way in 52 business buildings of the city today, and postal officials are convinced that the experiments are speeding delivery.

ANNIVERSARY OF BIRTH OF THOMAS G. MASARYK—RESOLUTIONS OF LITHUANIAN AMERICANS OF NEW YORK STATE

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, on yesterday, March 7, our fellow citizens of Czechoslovak descent commemorated the birthday of the great world leader, Thomas G. Masaryk. I feel privileged indeed to be able to join in the observance of his birthday and to express my admiration for the spirit of freedom he symbolized. As long as we remember what men like Masaryk lived for, so long will hope and confidence for the future be part of our lives. We know that in time Czechoslovakia will again be a free nation, rid of Communist domination. There can be no better time than this day for all of us to join in expressing our faith in the future.

Mr. President, the New York Lithuanian-American Council has transmitted to me a copy of resolutions adopted by Lithuanian-American residents of New York State on the 36th anniversary of Lithuania's independence. I ask unanimous consent to have the resolutions printed in the RECORD following my remarks.

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

LITHUANIAN AMERICAN
INFORMATION CENTER,
New York, N. Y., March 1, 1954.

We, loyal Lithuanian Americans and residents of New York State, assembled at Webster Hall, in New York City, this 14th day of February 1954, and gathered to celebrate the 36th anniversary of the restoration of the independent Lithuanian State and having duly noted that—

Whereas during the course of World War II, the Soviet Union in a conspiracy with Nazi Germany invaded Lithuania in violation of all treaties and international commitments binding Soviet Russia, and imposed a Russian Communist regime; and

Whereas the Soviet occupation of Lithuania transformed a once most prosperous and progressive country into a slave state; depleted the native population and exploited the resources of the country for the sole benefit of Russia; and

Whereas the Government of the United States has never recognized the fruits of the Nazi-Soviet conspiracy and aggression and continues to recognize Lithuania as a sovereign state and entitled to a restoration of its untrammeled freedom and membership in the community of sovereign nations; and

Whereas the Congress of the United States created the House Select Baltic Committee to investigate the forced seizure of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia by the Soviet Union and their present situation under a hostile Soviet occupation; and

Whereas the division of Europe, one-half free and one-half slave makes impossible the establishment of a lasting peace based on justice and poses a constant Soviet threat to the free world: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we appeal to the President and Congress of the United States to stand firm in the leadership of the free world and to reject any proposal of expediency which would prejudice the rights and vital interests of the captive nations; and be it further

Resolved, That we thank the Government of the United States for its vigorous policy of liberation and reviving the hopes of freedom in the hearts of the people of Lithuania and the other Baltic States and elsewhere; and be it further

Resolved, That we call upon the Senate of the United States to ratify the Genocide Convention; and be it further

Resolved, That we urge the Government of the United States to promote in the United Nations and in international conferences a dynamic policy tending to alleviate the situation of subjugated peoples in Lithuania and in other captive countries, pending the restoration of their independence, and to call upon the United Nations to investigate genocide in Lithuania and in other captive nations; be it finally

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be transmitted to the President of the United States, to the Secretary of State, Members of Congress, and the Governor of the State of New York.

VYTAUTAS ABRAITIS,
President, New York Lithuanian American Council.
ALBERT OSLAPAS, *Secretary.*

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the anniversary of the birth of Thomas G. Masaryk is a fitting occasion to pay tribute to a man who was a living symbol of the democratic way of life. His great contribution to the creation of Czechoslovakia as President of the Republic will long be remembered, not only by his people, but by the friends of freedom and democracy everywhere. In the turmoil and trouble that beset central Europe between the wars, Thomas Masaryk helped create and lead a government in which peace and stability reigned, a shining example of liberal philosophy and democratic government.

Masaryk's great work was shattered in 1938 as the rest of the world stood idly by. After its recreation in 1945 it was again destroyed in 1948. Today the proconsuls of the Kremlin, the brutal doctrines of Leninism, falsifications of history, and Stalinist pseudoscience have replaced freedom of thought and the teaching of truth. Yet we know that the people of Czechoslovakia will hold fast to the traditions of Thomas and Jan Masaryk. They will remain adherents of the democratic way of life during the period of the Soviet occupation just as they remained adherents of the democratic way of life during the period of the Nazi occupation. The spirit will remain steadfast until freedom and democracy reign once again in Prague and Bratislava.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, today marks the 104th anniversary of the birth of one of the greatest and bravest statesmen of our time: Thomas G. Masaryk, father of Czechoslovak freedom and founder in 1918 of the democratic government of Czechoslovakia.

Through almost inconceivable difficulties and delicate negotiations before and following World War I, Thomas Masaryk steered his people to freedom and set up a model government based upon the great principles of civil rights. America was his home during his years of exile and struggle for freedom. Woodrow Wilson was his confidant and his friend. His courage, his patriotism, and his devotion to democratic principles won him the friendship of this continent, and ultimately the admiration of the world. His son carried on the great tradition of the father.

Though Czechoslovakia today toils under the lash of a Communist dictatorship, and is the slave of Soviet Russia, hope is not lost and patriotism is not dead. The very memory of the great deeds of Thomas Masaryk is a flame that one day will consume Czechoslovakia's Communist torturers. So long as the memory of Masaryk is alive and his great deeds remembered, the Communist dictatorship is sapped and undermined until eventually it will fall and Czechoslovakia will again be free.

I should like to repeat here what I said 4 years ago regarding the Communists' mad efforts to expunge the memory of Thomas Masaryk:

> Is is any wonder that they would try to erase the memory of his life and labors? His very name threatens them. His very name is a summation of all that resists them. So long as a mere spark of his memory is kept alive, it can leap to flame and yet consume them.

Somewhere in Czechoslovakia, unknown to the oppressors, there are other Thomas Masaryks, young men seized

with his fire and ideals, who someday will rise and strike off the tyranny, reasserting the freedom and humanity that their great statesman taught to his people.

EFFECT OF TREATIES ON RIGHTS OF UNITED STATES CITIZENS

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, in the March 10, 1954, issue of the Saturday Evening Post there appeared an editorial entitled "People Want Guaranties Against Any Future Yalta."

The writer of the editorial made reference to the debate and action recently taken in the Senate on the Bricker amendment and the amendments thereto. One matter referred to in the editorial is of telling importance, Mr. President, and in that connection I now read from it:

Getting a formal treaty through the United States Senate is a tough assignment, and the Bricker debate has undoubtedly so aroused that body that in the future the Senate may be expected to go over every proposed treaty with a fine-tooth comb. To be sure, the NATO status of forces treaty, under which American soldiers serving abroad may be tried in foreign courts, did get by, but the sentence of a GI to 5 years in a French jug for stealing an automobile while plastered is already producing a bad reaction to that treaty. The boy's relatives are suing on the ground that the agreement with France deprives him of rights which he was supposed to enjoy under the Constitution.

Mr. President, this matter points to some of the feelings that some of us had with reference to that treaty. I wish to say that the senior Senator from Kansas did not vote for that treaty. I am glad that such a great publication as the Saturday Evening Post is pointing to the importance of having the Senate scrutinize all treaties, and the need for some improvement, as recently argued in this body.

I ask unanimous consent to have the entire editorial printed at this point in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

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

PEOPLE WANT GUARANTIES AGAINST ANY FUTURE YALTA

That great historic debate on the Bricker amendment never really got going for at least two reasons: (1), the country has run out of great constitutional debaters, and (2) it became apparent to all that the real loophole through which treaty law could upset our constitutional balance is not so much in the machinery for making treaties as in the right of the President to make executive agreements without consulting Congress at all.

Getting a formal treaty through the United States Senate is a tough assignment, and the Bricker debate has undoubtedly so aroused that body that in the future the Senate may be expected to go over every proposed treaty with a fine-tooth comb. To be sure, the NATO status of forces treaty, under which American soldiers serving abroad may be tried in foreign courts, did get by, but the sentence of a GI to 5 years in a French jug for stealing an automobile while plastered is already producing a bad reaction to that treaty. The boy's relatives are suing on the ground that the agreement with France deprived him of rights which he was supposed to enjoy under the Constitution.

Fear of hostile congressional reaction has in the past accounted for the rapidly accelerating use of executive agreements to accomplish the purposes usually effected by treaties. The dubious deals at Yalta and Potsdam were made by means of executive agreements. The Eisenhower administration used this device in its agreement with Spain, which was not submitted to the Senate, although it contains items which may well affect the rights or even the security of Americans for a long time. The reasons why the Spanish matter was handled in this way are easy to understand, but there are dangers in the method. The Bricker amendment called for "regulation" of executive agreements, and Senator George's substitute emphasized review of executive agreements rather than treaties.

The Bricker amendment was attacked as an effort to deprive the President of a "free hand" in negotiations with other countries. The executive agreement, rather than the treaty power, already gives him a hand so free that the head of any other nontotalitarian state might well envy him. Sir Winston Churchill, on his return from the United States last year, found out what happens to a British Prime Minister who is even suspected of making agreements with another country before consulting Parliament. Rumors that he had agreed while in Washington in January, 1953, to something which might extend the Korean war and about which Parliament had not been informed, gave the Prime Minister a bad time.

Up to now, few have expressed concern with this phase of the vexing question: How to keep foreign policy in the hands of the people and at the same time leave it sufficiently flexible to meet the quickly shifting gusts of an atomic age. The nearest thing to a workable idea that we have seen came from Mr. David Lawrence in United States News and World Report. Mr. Lawrence thinks that Congress must somehow acquire the right to question the Secretary of State frequently, either in open or secret session, so that any agreements needed with other countries or with the United Nations would have the knowledge and consent of Congress.

This is an approach to the English parliamentary system which is not fully adaptable to the Federal system of the United States, but surely there must be some means of bridging the gap between the Executive and Congress on this vital matter. The main objective, however, is to vaccinate against the possibility that some future irresponsible President might actually assume, through an agreement with foreigners, powers which he could not claim under our Constitution. That this is no merely fancied danger is suggested by a remark by former Ambassador Philip C. Jessup in respect to a case in which the Supreme Court ruled that an executive agreement could supersede the fifth amendment. Wrote Mr. Jessup: "The decision may well mark one of the most far-reaching inroads upon the protection which it was supposed the fifth amendment accorded to private property."

LIFE AND CUSTOMS IN EARLY PENNSYLVANIA

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, frequently I am asked for reliable works on early Pennsylvania life and customs.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a newspaper article of recent date entitled, "References to Pennsylvania Life and Customs," compiled by Dr. Charles M. Steese.

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

REFERENCES TO PENNSYLVANIA LIFE AND CUSTOMS

(Compiled by Dr. Charles M. Steese)

The compiler was recently paid the compliment of being requested by the public library of a midwestern city to prepare a short but select list of publications pertaining to early Pennsylvania life and customs. The list was to be used by those of the library's patrons doing research or writing papers on this subject. After compiling and mailing the list the thought occurred to me that it might be of some use as well to our readers here at home.

The books listed are all very interesting reading material, and if not available at the local library can be procured from the State library in Harrisburg.

The Pennsylvania Dutch, by Frederick Klees.

The Scotch-Irish in Colonial Pennsylvania, by W. F. Dunaway.

The Story of the Mennonites, by Charles Henry Smith.

The Old Order of Amish, by Calvin G. Bachman.

Memorials of the Huguenots, by Rev. Ammon Stapleton.

History of the German Baptist Brethren, by Dr. Martin G. Brumbaugh.

Two Hundred Years of Germans in Pennsylvania, by Walter E. Baum.

Old Time Notes of Pennsylvania, by Alexander K. McClure.

The Making of Pennsylvania, by Sidney George Fisher.

Pennsylvania Agriculture and Country Life, by S. W. Fletcher.

Home Life in Colonial Days, by Alice Morse Earle.

The German and Swiss Settlements of Colonial Pennsylvania, by L. O. Kuhns.

White Servitude in Pennsylvania, by C. A. Herrick.

Rafting Days in Pennsylvania, by J. Herbert Walker.

Pennsylvania Mountain Stories, by Col. Henry W. Shoemaker.

Pennsylvania the Keystone, by Samuel W. Pennypacker.

Folk Art of Rural Pennsylvania, by Francis Lichten.

The Bible in Iron, by Henry C. Mercer.

Pennsylvania German Literature, also Pennsylvania Dutch Stuff, by E. F. Robacker.

The Red Hills, The Blue Hills, The Dutch Country, and The Plenty of Pennsylvania, all by Dr. Cornelius Weygand.

Conrad Weiser, also The Muhlenbergs in Pennsylvania, by Dr. Paul A. W. Wallace.

Of course there have been a great many more fine books published covering Pennsylvania life and custom. The foregoing list contains only those with which the compiler is familiar. They will all be found valuable in preparing club papers or in school work.

VISIT TO THE SENATE BY PANAYOTIS KANELLOPOULOS, MINISTER OF DEFENSE OF GREECE

Mr. GRISWOLD. Mr. President, it is a privilege for me to have the opportunity to introduce to the Senate at this time Mr. Panayotis Kanellopoulos, Minister of Defense of Greece.

During the occupation of Greece by the Germans Mr. Kanellopoulos was a professor at the University of Athens. He served for a time as Prime Minister of that country. He is one of the intellectual and political leaders of the nation.

He is in the United States at this time for a tour of several weeks. He is visit-

ing the Department of Defense as the personal guest of Secretary Wilson.

Mr. Kanellopoulos is now serving as one of the leaders in the Greek Government, and is Minister of Defense at this time. He has been a member of Parliament for 10 years. He was a friend of mine during the year I served in Greece.

I am very happy to have the privilege of introducing to the Senate at this time Mr. Panayotis Kanellopoulos, Minister of Defense of Greece. [Applause.]

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair takes pleasure in welcoming the distinguished visitor to the floor of the Senate.

ALLEGED SUBVERSIVES FROM MEXICO

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, on March 3, the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] repeatedly told the Senate that 100 subversives are daily coming across the Mexican border into the United States. I quote one of the Senator's statements, as found on page 2556 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as follows:

> The Immigration and Naturalization Service, in a statement issued less than 3 weeks ago, said that every day more than 100 subversives were coming across the Mexican border into the United States as wetbacks. Think of it, Mr. President, 100 a day. We are making no effort to stem that tide.

Mr. President, I challenged this statement as a serious and questionable allegation against our neighbor, the Republic of Mexico, and its people, as well as against the officials of the United States of America. I demanded that in all fairness to Mexico and the officials of our own country, the Senator from New York give us what evidence he had in support of the charges.

The only evidence cited by the Senator from New York was a statement alleged to have been made last year in the testimony of Col. Benjamin G. Habberton, Deputy Commissioner of the Immigration and Naturalization Service, before the Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives. I have taken up this matter with Mr. Habberton, and have been assured by him that the statement attributed to him was not correctly interpreted by the Senator from New York. In fact, I have from Deputy Commissioner Habberton a letter on this subject, as follows:

> UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE, IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION SERVICE,
> *Washington, D. C., March 4, 1954.*
>
> Hon. PRICE DANIEL,
> *United States Senate,*
> *Washington, D. C.*
>
> MY DEAR SENATOR DANIEL: You have called to the attention of this Service the fact that it was stated on the floor of the Senate yesterday, in connection with the consideration of the joint resolution relating to the supplying of agricultural workers from the Republic of Mexico, that 100 subversives are coming into the United States from Mexico each day. You advise that it was reported that this statement was based upon a statement of this Service made before the House Committee on Appropriations in connection with the appropriation for this Service.
>
> The statement of the Service referred to was as follows: "It was recently discovered that approximately 100 present and past members of the Communist Party had been crossing daily into the United States in the El Paso area." This statement was contained in this Service's budget justification submitted last December and became a part of the record of the hearing before the House Committee when a member of that committee requested that several pages of these justifications be inserted into the RECORD. The statement was not part of my testimony.
>
> As you undoubtedly know, there are a large number of persons on the Mexican border who cross back and forth into and out of the United States. The Service is continually conducting investigations to determine whether any of these might possibly be inadmissible to the United States and, of course, we are particularly concerned from the subversive standpoint. Some months ago, as a result of information received, we identified a number of individuals as members or former members of the Communist Party of Mexico and of this number we found that some 100 were among those who had been so crossing. Their entry into the United States was, of course, immediately stopped. Continuing investigations undoubtedly will reveal additional such persons and, of course, they likewise will be prevented from entering.
>
> As indicated, the situation described is one which had existed until discovered and corrected a number of months ago.
>
> Sincerely yours,
> BENJAMIN G. HABBERTON,
> *Deputy Commissioner.*

Mr. President, from the letter it is obvious that the Senator from New York was incorrect in saying that each day 100 subversives are now crossing the border from Mexico into the United States. In fact, even as to past conditions, this figure was never used by the Immigration and Naturalization Service as indicating a daily influx of 100 additional subversives crossing this border. Actually the figure was used to show that many months ago it was discovered that a total of 100 past or present members of the Communist Party of Mexico were among the thousands who crossed the border back and forth during the day at El Paso. Only the Rio Grande River and a bridge separate El Paso, a city of over 130,000 people, and the Mexican city of Juarez, with more than 48,000 population. Literally thousands of Americans and Mexicans cross this bridge back and forth each day, most of them in a perfectly legal manner, on the same order that Americans cross the Canadian border at Detroit, Buffalo, and other border cities. Some months ago the Immigration Service found that about 100 members or former members of the Communist Party of Mexico were among the thousands living across the border who had been crossing back and forth at El Paso. Only the same 100 were involved, not an influx of a new 100 every day.

The important thing is that several months ago these 100 Mexican citizens were denied further crossings into the United States. Their entry was immediately stopped. It has not occurred in recent months, and it is not now occurring.

Attorney General Brownell, after a personal visit to the Rio Grande border, recently reported that there was no danger of the entry of subversives from Mexico. As late as February 19, Attorney General Brownell made it clear that he did not agree with the interpretation being placed on earlier statements of the Immigration and Naturalization Service. I refer to a newspaper interview appearing on page 1 of the El Paso Times of February 19, 1954, and I ask unanimous consent that it be placed in the body of the RECORD at this point.

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

> BROWNELL DENIES KNOWLEDGE OF REDS CROSSING BORDER
>
> (By Sarah McClendon)
>
> WASHINGTON.—Attorney General Brownell was asked at a press conference here Thursday if he could coordinate recent statements by the Acting Commissioner of Immigration about the number of Communists crossing the border at Juarez with his own and other immigration officials recent statements to the effect that there was no such danger on the Mexican border.
>
> Brownell appeared surprised. He had not known of any such happenings. First he said he could only be responsible for his own statement. However, the Immigration Service comes under Brownell as Attorney General and head of the Justice Department.
>
> Then Brownell appeared doubtful that Acting Commissioner of Immigration Benjamin G. Habberton on December 10 could have so testified before the House Appropriations subcommittee about Communists presenting a daily threat on the Mexican border when appearing for more annual appropriations for the Immigration Service and Border Patrol. Brownell, however, was told that Habberton's statement appeared in the printed record of the hearings released by the committee and taken down as Habberton testified behind closed doors. These hearings were later made public.
>
> "This is the first I had heard of any influx there at that time," Brownell replied.
>
> Brownell was reminded that early last fall after he returned from an inspection tour of the California border he had said that there was no evidence that aliens entering illegally included Communists.
>
> Brownell was also told that several high-ranking immigration officials, including Ray Farrel, Chief of Investigations Division, Harlon B. Cater, Chief of the Border Patrol, and others had said about December 1 that Communists along the Mexican border presented no threat, that cases of Communists there had been so few as to require no special program of enforcement, no additional training, and only routine security examinations, because Mexicans were not Communists.
>
> "How can you coordinate these statements with that of Mr. Habberton when seeking additional appropriations?" Brownell was asked.
>
> He shook his head.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, I have gone to this trouble to ascertain the true facts in this matter, because I felt that charges of 100 subversives now entering this country daily, from Mexico, were too serious to go unanswered. I am glad to know that they are incorrect, and that no subversives are now entering the United States from Mexico, according to the Immigration and Naturalization Service.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, in view of the statement made today by the Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL], in which he questioned certain figures which I gave on the floor of the Senate a few days ago, I ask unanimous consent to make a brief reply.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Senator from New York may proceed.

Mr. LEHMAN. When I spoke a few days ago I gave figures as to the number of subversives, reported by responsible authority, who had entered this country from Mexico illegally. Those figures appear in the printed record of hearings before a subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives on December 10. They are in the justification given by the Acting Commissioner of Immigration in the presentation of his request for funds. They appear on pages 194 and 195 of the printed record of the hearings.

I quote once more what was stated in the justification of the request for an appropriation at the hearing, in which the Acting Commissioner was the principal witness:

A harvest of dangerous byproducts from the seemingly harmless invasion by illegal aliens is now in the making. Who can say that Communists and subversives do not cross the Rio Grande? As reported elsewhere in these justifications it was recently discovered that approximately 100 present and past members of the Communist Party had been crossing daily into the United States in the El Paso area; also that the number of present and ex-members of the Communist Party residing immediately across the border from El Paso number about 1,500, and it has been established that there exists active liaison between the Communist Party of Mexico and the Communist Party in the United States.

That was on December 10. The record of the hearings was not made public immediately, but on February 10 the New York Times carried an article from which I quote in part:

REDS SLIP INTO UNITED STATES, CONGRESS WARNED—IMMIGRATION SERVICE SAYS 100 PRESENT, EX-MEMBERS SNEAK IN DAILY FROM MEXICO

WASHINGTON, February 9.—The Immigration and Naturalization Service has told Congress that it "recently discovered that approximately 100 present and past members of the Communist Party" have been illegally entering the United States daily from Mexico.

The increasing illegal entries from Mexica, coupled with a similar situation along the Canadian border, "cannot be other than a threat to the security of the United States," the Service told a House Appropriations subcommittee in secret testimony December 10.

The subcommittee made public the Service's statement, which was presented in support of a requested appropriation of $39 million in the administration's 1954–55 budget. This figure is $3,250,000 less than the $42 million appropriated for the current year.

It has been established that there exists active liaison between the Communist Party of Mexico and the Communist Party in the United States, the Service declared.

Communists and former Communists have been entering the United States in the El Paso, Tex., area, the Service said. It declared that present and ex-members of the party residing immediately across the border from El Paso number about 1,500.

EASY AVENUE OF ENTRY

The Service did not explain in its statement how it knew the number of Communists and former Communists who were entering the United States.

"In the midst of a situation where the small border patrol force is being overrun by hordes of illegal aliens," the Service continued, "an easy avenue of entry is provided for almost any number of Communists or foreign agents from Mexico, Guatemala, from Dutch Guiana, and, entry into Mexico being as easy as it is, from any country in the entire world."

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from New York has expired.

Mr. LEHMAN. I ask unanimous consent to make a further statement. I believe I may do so under the order of personal privilege.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from New York? The Chair hears none, and the Senator may proceed.

Mr. LEHMAN. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks matter contained in the record of the hearings before the subcommittee of the House Committee on Appropriations, appearing in the first, second, and third paragraphs on page 194, and in the first paragraph on page 195.

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

CURRENT YEAR PROBLEMS

MASS INVASION BY ILLEGAL ALIENS

The most difficult problem facing the border patrol during the current fiscal year is the necessity for handling appalling numbers of apprehensions. The relatively small force of officers cannot give sufficient attention to the problems of organized smuggling, apprehension of dangerous aliens, and prevention of illegal entry when officers are promptly enmeshed in the many problems associated with the arrest and transportation of thousands of illegal aliens every time they go upon the highways or crossing places. This mass invasion of illegal aliens has reached proportions which are beyond control of the limited force provided to deal with it.

DEVELOPMENT OF BELLIGERENT CHARACTERISTICS AMONG WETBACKS

Results of the mass movement of wetbacks across the border are unemployment of displaced domestic labor, depressed wage scales and living standards, and creation of serious crime, health, and sanitation problems. Complaints at these results and request for remedial action come from all levels of population and local governments. The aliens show a tendency to quit their former attitude of docility and to assume one of defiance, obstruction, and resistance. Farmers fear for the safety of their women and children in isolated farm homes when groups of aliens appear and demand food, where they formerly begged for it. Wetbacks are making heavy contributions to the local jails, public hospitals, and even relief rolls. Their depredations range from harvesting food crops at night for subsistence to robbery and rape. The Los Angeles police department reports that their officers apprehended last year 4,503 aliens who were turned over to the Service for processing as illegal entrants, which figure does not include many wetbacks who were arrested for criminal offenses and prosecuted in the courts instead of being merely booked for this Service. One thriving farm community near Los Angeles reports 4 out of 5 of the defendants in its police court are wetbacks.

THREAT TO INTERNAL SECURITY

A harvest of dangerous byproducts from the seemingly harmless invasion by illegal aliens is now in the making. Who can say that Communists and subversives do not cross the Rio Grande? As reported elsewhere in these justifications, it was recently discovered that approximately 100 present and past members of the Communist Party had been crossing daily into the United States in the El Paso area; also that the number of present and ex-members of the Communist Party residing immediately across the border from El Paso number about 1,500, and it has been established that there exists active liaison between the Communist Party of Mexico and the Communist Party in the United States.

FALSE CLAIMS TO CITIZENSHIP

The wetback invasion began during World War II years. At that time the problem was concerned almost wholly with farmworkers. The average citizen believes or pretends that the wetback comes and goes as does the ocean tide and the harvest moon. Conducive to this concept is the wetback of the Guanajuato-hat and huaracha-sandal class who labors in the open fields. The chronic user of wetback labor would shrink the problem to just this type of alien. However, the not-so-elementary phase of the problem concerns large numbers of aliens working as United States citizens. This alien arrives with and in the same manner as the before-described type, excepting those that may obtain false certificates before leaving Mexico. Arriving in ignorance, many learn that birth certificates can be had through the swearing of dishonest witnesses. Or they secure a copy of a United States citizen's baptismal certificate through whatever church. False identity is strengthened with social-security cards, draft cards, and, in some instances, poll-tax receipts. Even the dead are involved. Illegal aliens take the identity of deceased persons to claim United States citizenship and show the appropriate documents. The Guanajuato straw hat and huaracha sandal are discarded after a sojourn in the border area and the fraudulent citizen is ready to move north into some unsuspecting community where he may join a labor union and take a place as a voter. Under these circumstances, the price of United States citizenship is indeed cheap. Furthermore, there are untold thousands of aliens who first came to this country as wetbacks and were subsequently apprehended and returned several times by the border patrol. In the meantime, these aliens have learned to secure false papers, adopt American mannerisms and clothing, and are now enjoying the benefits of citizenship. They have complete freedom of movement, and indications are that many also exercise the right of the United States citizen at the polls on election day. This problem, while serious enough now, will become more serious as time passes and will create an ever-increasing number of false claims to citizenship.

Mr. LEHMAN. The Acting Commissioner further stated at the same hearing:

Late in the fiscal year the Service was implored by citizens' associations, chambers of commerce, and local peace officers to use all possible resources toward controlling the hordes of illegal aliens flooding the Southwest. Reports of robbery, rape, and pillage by wetbacks in that area provided ample testimony to the fact that the situation was, and remains, serious indeed. In the light of the extreme urgency of the situation on the Mexican border, border-patrol units assigned to seaport work in the Baltimore, Norfolk, and Philadelphia areas, were withdrawn for the purpose of strengthening the force on the southern border. Similar action had been taken earlier in the year as to the border-patrol unit formerly in the New York area. These units had been assigned at seaports initially for the purpose of searching suspect ships and maintaining surveillance of such ships while in port. To the extent that manpower permits, a limited amount of

this work is now being performed by the investigative forces at the seaport areas mentioned.

CURRENT PROBLEMS IN BORDER PATROL

The problems facing the border patrol are tremendous. Pages 78 to 83 of the justifications point up those most pressing. Briefly, they are:

(1) A volume of illegal entries—flagrant violations of the laws of the United States—far beyond the capabilities of the limited force.

(3) Increasing belligerence on the part of wetbacks.

(3) The threat of entries across our borders of Communists or foreign agents.

(4) False claims to citizenship growing out of the ease with which illegal entry can be effected.

(5) An increase in organized smuggling.

It has been authoritatively stated as a conservative estimate that about one and a half million wetbacks come into this country illegally each year just by walking across the Rio Grande. No effective effort is made to stop the influx of illegal immigrants, which numbers from 10 to 15 times as many as the relatively small number of immigrants who come into this country legally from other parts of the world each year.

No effort has been made effectively to strike at the root of this evil. Appropriations have been reduced. Last year the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] and I submitted an amendment which would have made it unlawful and punishable by law for anyone in this country to employ any person who was known to him to be an illegal immigrant. We got nowhere. The amendment was disregarded and as a matter of fact the appropriations for the Border Patrol was actually reduced.

In our effort to stop a few scientists, artists, musicians, authors, and decent workmen from coming to this country we are closing our eyes to the fact that every year at least one and a half million persons come into this country illegally from Mexico. We have little control over them. They compete with our workers. As a result wages paid to American workmen frequently are drastically reduced. The illegal immigrants take jobs away from our workers in many parts of the Nation. They comprise a heavy burden economically, socially and morally on many communities. They are a threat to the security and the safety of the localities in which they live. Yet nothing is being done about it. And in the meantime we allow our officials abroad to refuse on arbitrary grounds, which cannot be appealed, emigration visas to decent hard-working honest applicants who desire to be reunited with their families and who would make valuable citizens of the United States.

A few days ago we passed a bill. There was no hurry about it. Yet we were rushed into it against the opposition of some of us. I understand that an agreement has been reached, or is about to be reached, with the Mexican Government concerning the workers legally to be admitted into this country under supervision of the friendly Mexican Government. What we did the other day unilaterally was a slap at Mexico, a slap at a friendly nation which has always cooperated with us and with which I hope we will always continue to cooperate.

The figures and explanations which the Senator from Texas has given in an effort to refute the arguments which I have made and the figures I have submitted do not refute but instead completely confirm what I stated last week on the floor of the Senate and which I vehemently repeat today.

Mr. DOUGLAS and Mr. DANIEL addressed the Chair.

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

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield first to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I should like to raise a question on several points which have been brought to the attention of the Senate by the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN].

I refer, first, to some correspondence which I had with the Department of Justice on this subject. On the 15th of June, 1953, I addressed a letter to Attorney General Brownell, the text of which is found at page 1304 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for February 4, 1954. In the letter I called the attention of the Attorney General to the large volume of illegal entries into our country, and the many harmful effects of such entries, and I asked for his comments on the dangers to our national security through the entry of enemy agents under cover of the heavy illicit traffic over our southern border.

I did not receive a reply from the Department of Justice until November 20, 1953. The reply was contained in a letter signed by J. Lee Rankin, Assistant Attorney General. In the reply, which will be found at page 1304 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 4, 1954, Mr. Rankin stated:

> Since January 1, 1953, the border patrol of the Immigration Service has apprehended over 880,000 Mexican aliens illegally within the United States.

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Nebraska will state it.

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Is the Senate still transacting routine business under the usual morning hour agreement?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is correct.

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. I should like to know why 1 or 2 Senators are able to occupy so much time when other Members of the Senate have come to the floor to take only a few minutes in order to request insertions in the RECORD, or to present other routine business. I should think that speeches would be booked for delivery at a time after the regular morning hour has been concluded.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, it will take me only a few minutes to complete what I have to say. The Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] obtained unanimous consent to speak on this issue. If the Senator from Nebraska wishes to be technical about it, we on this side of the aisle could also withhold unanimous consent in the future for an extension of time in similar situations. But I hope we may not be constrained to do this.

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. I would object to giving unanimous consent for any remarks exceeding the usual 2-minute limit.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. If the Senator from New York and the Senator from Illinois wish to occupy all the time during the morning hour, they can do so, so far as I am concerned.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I merely ask that I be given no more than 2 minutes to complete my statement.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Michigan will state it.

Mr. FERGUSON. How much time does the Senator from Illinois desire to take?

Mr. DOUGLAS. It is not my intention to occupy all the time of the morning hour. If there is objection raised on the other side of the aisle, we shall abide by the objection.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, how long does the Senator from Illinois desire to take?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Perhaps 2 or 2½ minutes in all.

Mr. FERGUSON. I have no objection.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Illinois may proceed.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Assistant Attorney General in his letter of November 20 to me stated:

> Since January 1, 1953, the border patrol of the Immigration Service has apprehended over 880,000 Mexican aliens illegally within the United States.

He reported that the 880,000 had been apprehended and deported since the first of the year, but he also stated that in his judgment there were 3 more illegal entrants for every 1 deported. He concludes his letter as follows:

> I regret that I am unable to report any exact figures, but the Immigration Service conservatively estimates that for each apprehension, three Mexican aliens cross the border and either return undetected or infiltrate into our northern industrial areas. This means that during 1954 over 4,000,000 persons will have entered the United States illegally from Mexico. The great majority are "braceros," who seek only seasonal employment, but it is apparent that this border is also an easy avenue of entry into our country for almost any number of Communists or foreign agents from Mexico——

I call particular attention to this portion of the letter—

> is also an easy avenue of entry into our country for almost any number of Communists or foreign agents from Mexico, Guatemala, Dutch Guiana, and, entry into Mexico being as easy as it is, from any country in the world. The seriousness of this situation is self-evident; until this border is brought under control our internal security program will remain in jeopardy.

Does not that statement of the Assistant Attorney General bear out what the Senator from New York has stated about the grave dangers to national security in this situation?

Mr. LEHMAN. I thank the Senator from Illinois for his contribution. His remarks and the quotation he has read strongly support everything I have said. I was quite conservative in stating my figures. I referred to a million and a half illegal immigrants from Mexico. Judging by what the Senator from Illinois has quoted from the Justice Department there were probably three and one-half to four million illegal entrants instead of a million and a half.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, the only figures of the Senator from New York I challenged were those with reference to subversives crossing the border at this time at El Paso. He said, "We are making no effort to stem that tide."

I was not referring to aliens illegally entering; I was referring to his charge that subversives are today entering at the rate of 100 a day, and that, in the Senator's words, "we are not making any effort to stem that tide." That statement is not correct.

I have read the letter from the Immigration Service, in which it is stated that such illegal entry has been stopped, and that it was stopped several months ago. I believe it is a very serious charge to make against our officials to say that they are doing nothing to stop this illegal immigration.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the time of the Senator from Texas be extended.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. It there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. DANIEL. I merely desired to complete my statement. The evidence which I have introduced this morning shows that our officials have been very diligent. The officials to whom the Senator from New York has referred have stated that they stopped the illegal immigration as soon as they found out about it. It has not occurred for months, and it is not occurring today.

Therefore, I believe the Senator from New York must admit that his charge, that each day 100 subversives are entering the United States at El Paso, and that we are making no effort to stem the tide, is incorrect.

Mr. LEHMAN. The Senator from Texas knows that the Senator from New York was quoting from a statement made by the Acting Commissioner of Immigration in support of his request for appropriations. That statement was included in the record of the hearings before the subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee of December 10, from which I have read. That statement has never been denied by anyone in the Immigration Service.

Mr. DANIEL. Is the Senator from New York referring to his statement, "We are making no effort to stem that tide"? Are those the words of the Senator from New York or of the Commissioner of Immigration?

Mr. LEHMAN. I said no adequate steps have been taken.

Mr. DANIEL. I beg the Senator's pardon. I am quoting from his own statement in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The Senator from New York stated on the floor of the Senate:

We are making no effort to stem that tide.

I asked him whether those are his words or the words of the Commissioner of Immigration.

Mr. LEHMAN. The Senator from New York read a statement which had been submitted by the acting Commissioner of Immigration on December 10, before a committee of the House of Representatives, in which the Acting Commissioner of Immigration stated that approximately 100 subversives—I cannot quote the exact words, because I do not have them in my hand——

Mr. DANIEL. Had been crossing the Mexican border.

Mr. LEHMAN. Had been crossing the border. It is a very serious charge to make, and I made it. I believe that the statement made by me is borne out by the facts. Whether they are today crossing, I do not know. I said that I could not tell for how many days the statement would hold good. I did make the statement, and no one has ever denied it. The Acting Commissioner of Immigration has not denied it, and I have not heard that he is willing to refute his own statement.

Mr. DANIEL. Does the Senator from New York concede that the official states it has now been stopped?

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. DOUGLAS subsequently said: Mr. President, in view of the discussion which has recently taken place between the Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL] and the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] on the so-called wetback question, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a very carefully written, conservative article entitled "Problem Dimensions of Wetbacks," published recently in the Christian Science Monitor and wisely reprinted in national advertisements as a public service by the International Latex Corp.

Although the article really understates the issue, nevertheless, it is an excellent, brief summary of the problem, and it concludes by saying:

Neither nation nor region can afford entrenchment of a major industry upon outlaw, near-peon labor. Neither can long tolerate the social poisons, the erosion of public morality, and the political hazards inherent in permitting such a system to persist.

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

PROBLEM DIMENSIONS OF WETBACKS

Headline I: "Brownell Plans United States-State Drive on Wetback Problem."

Headline II: "Ranchers Ask Easing of Drive Against Illegal Immigration."

These two headlines bring into focus one of the most serious and baffling problems the American people have faced in many a decade.

What are its dimensions?

The physical dimensions: It is estimated that over 1 million Mexican laborers slip over the Rio Grande or other borders every year in search of jobs. This is in addition to the 180,000 legal entrants who come in under treaty agreement with Mexico.

The economic dimensions: Since these wetbacks are legally fugitives from justice, they are completely at the mercy of a wage level beaten down by competition between their employers and by a competition of desperation between themselves. This could settle an economy on the regions affected based upon peonage rather than upon free labor. Ranchers and processors who use this depressed labor can produce at profits fabulously above those of their competitors in other regions. And labor which must be sold at any price gradually and surely undercuts the wage levels of the free worker.

The social dimensions: Many of the wetbacks go back to Mexico. But many come in again and others with them. The presence of so large a body of usually penniless, unskilled, relatively primitive people, comparable in their status to the masterless men of the Middle Ages, brings with it problems of crime, delinquency, neglected children, and disease. One Texas sociologist estimates the wetback invasion may have set back America's assimilation of its legitimate Spanish-speaking population by two centuries.

The international dimensions: Americans tend to identify all Mexico with the primitive, ignorant wetback; Mexicans tend to judge Americans by their treatment of these helpless Mexican nationals.

The political dimensions: Hundreds of thousands of the wetbacks escape the meager enforcement of the law and remain. Every community and region which has invited and then exploited cheap labor has come to regret its expediency sooner or later.

The moral dimensions: The gradual, tacit acceptance as normal of a traffic in "outlaws," the overwhelming local pressures upon officials to turn their backs or do their duty as the state of the labor market dictates lets loose a corrosive force no nation dare ignore.

What is the remedy? The wetbacks are obvious results of two national economies at vastly different levels living side by side along a thinly guarded border. The poor on one side flow toward the oft-magnified pay on the other as inevitably as water flows over a dam. On the one hand are the tangible, immediate justifications in the situation of ranchers with crops ready to harvest needing a quick, ample, and temporary labor supply and waiting laborers with standards of living which make even such employment attractive; on the other, the intangible but far greater evils which follow from meeting these needs with a species of anarchy.

It is probably more useful at this moment to underline the reasons why answers must be found than attempt to blueprint solutions: Neither nation nor region can afford entrenchment of a major industry upon outlaw, near-peon labor. Neither can long tolerate the social poisons, the erosion of public morality, and the political hazards inherent in permitting such a system to persist.

ECONOMIES IN FEDERAL BUDGET—RECOMMENDATIONS BY SENATOR BYRD

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the body of the RECORD recommendations I am making for economies in the Federal budget.

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

RECOMMENDATIONS BY SENATOR BYRD

We have piled up the Federal debt with deficits in 20 of the last 23 years, and President Eisenhower's first budget proposes to increase the debt still more with another deficit of $2.9 billion.

The longer the administration goes without making good on the President's cardinal campaign promise to balance the budget, the more difficult it will be. It could be done in the fiscal year beginning July 1 with additional expenditure reductions amounting to less than 5 percent of the $65.6 billion expenditure total in the President's budget.

Suggested reductions in the budget expenditure estimates are summarized as follows:

1. Foreign assistance expenditures	$650,000,000
(a) Military	350,000,000
(b) Economic	300,000,000
2. Military expenditures	1,100,000,000
3. Domestic-civilian expenditures	800,000,000
4. Civilian employment expenditures	500,000,000
Total	3,050,000,000

SUGGESTED EXPENDITURE REDUCTIONS

With respect to foreign assistance the suggested reductions would cut aggregate expenditures in the coming year little more than 15 percent under the estimate for the current year. They would leave military assistance expenditures at approximately 93 percent of the current all-time high spending level.

Most of the suggested reductions in military expenditures would merely hold items, where increases are proposed in the budget, to this year's level. Notable exceptions are Army procurement and Air Force procurement where, in each case, increases would be provided even after these reductions.

The suggested expenditure reductions in the domestic-civilian category would fall into two parts. They would eliminate items requiring new program legislation and subsequent budget messages; and in certain Government corporations and so-called business-type programs expenditures would be held to a figure within their own receipts.

Further reductions in civilian employment, at a saving of $500 million a year, would still leave nearly a quarter of a million more employees than were on the payroll at the outbreak of the Korean war.

THE PRESIDENT'S BUDGET

Proposals in the President's budget for next fiscal year, beginning July 1, may be summarized as follows:

[In billions]

Total appropriations and other expenditure authorizations	$143.2
(a) In balances remaining in old appropriations and other spending authority to be carried over	86.9
(b) In new appropriations and other spending authority recommended for enactment in the current session of Congress	56.3
Total expenditures	$65.6
(a) From balances in old appropriations and other spending authority carried over	31.0
(b) From new appropriations and other spending authority recommended for enactment in the current session of Congress	34.6
Total receipts	62.6
Deficit	2.9

(It is the difference between expenditures (not appropriations) and receipts in a fiscal year that determines whether the budget is balanced, or whether there is a deficit or surplus.)

In view of all the circumstances, including the tremendous balances in previously enacted appropriations and other expenditure authorizations which have been allowed to accumulate and remain available for expenditure, it is a relatively tight budget. But, with provisions for no critical emergencies, it still takes us further in debt.

EXPENDITURES—APPROPRIATIONS

It should be noted that the reductions suggested here are in terms of next year's expenditures. Reduction in actual expenditures during the year must be accomplished if the deficit is to be reduced.

Reduction in new appropriations before Congress is equally essential, but in instances where appropriations are for more than 1 year it is possible that the effect of appropriation reduction alone on the deficit in the coming year may be only partial or none at all. Of the $56.3 billion in new appropriations now before Congress, more than 35 percent would be for expenditure in some fiscal year after June 30, 1955.

By the same token, reduction in new appropriations does not curtail expenditures from balances in previously enacted appropriations. Nearly 50 percent of next year's expenditures will be out of old appropriations and authorizations.

Foreign aid appropriations and expenditures

Foreign aid is an example of areas where difficulty is encountered in efforts to cut expenditures in the coming year by reducing new appropriations.

Foreign aid, under the mutual security programs, as proposed in the President's budget, follows:

[In billions]

Foreign aid	Availability of funds			Expenditures		Total
	In old appropriations and authority	In new appropriations and authority	Total	From old appropriations and authority	From new appropriations and authority	
Economic:						
Mutual security economic and technical cooperation	$1.2	$0.9	$2.1	$0.8	$0.3	$1.1
Surplus agricultural commodity disposal	----------	.3	.3	----------	(1.3)	(1.3)
Total, economic	1.2	1.2	2.4	.8	.3	1.1
Military	8.2	2.5	10.7	3.6	.7	4.3
Total, foreign aid	9.4	3.7	13.1	4.4	1.0	5.4

[1] This money would be used by the Government agency handling the program to buy surplus commodities from Commodity Credit Corporation. Actually, it would be an expenditure by one Government agency and a receipt for another. The net effect on the budgetary deficit for the coming year would be zero. The cost of the products to the Commodity Credit Corporation was reflected in its expenditures in the year of original purchase.

Figures in the preceding table show that only $1 out of every $5.40 of mutual security foreign aid next year would be from new appropriations.

For obvious reasons suggestions in this statement for reductions in the deficit next year are in terms of expenditures.

SUGGESTED FOREIGN-AID EXPENDITURE REDUCTIONS

Since World War II, actual expenditures for all foreign aid have totaled $47.6 billion, an average of $5.3 billion a year. The administration has recommended expenditure of $5.4 billion in mutual security foreign aid next year.

Expenditures for all foreign economic aid since World War II have cost American taxpayers $33.7 billion. This year it is estimated that all economic aid expenditures will total $1.6 billion. For the coming year the administration proposes mutual security economic aid expenditures totaling $1.1 billion. Of this total for next year $0.8 billion would be spent from appropriations previously enacted and $0.3 billion would be from new appropriations. The expenditure reduction suggested here for mutual security economic aid would eliminate all expenditures out of new money. This would not impair any spending commitments already made. Expenditures would total more than half of this year's level. The deficit would be reduced by $0.3 billion.

Expenditures for all foreign military aid since World War II have cost American taxpayers $13.9 billion. This year it is estimated that military-aid expenditures will total $4.2 billion. For the coming year the administration proposed military aid expenditures totaling $4.3 billion. Of this total $3.6 billion would be spent from appropriations previously enacted, and $0.7 billion from new appropriations. The expenditure reduction suggested here would cut expenditures from new appropriations 50 percent. This would not impair any spending commitments already made. It would merely taper down spending out of new money. It would reduce military aid expenditures only about 7 percent under the estimate for this year. The deficit would be reduced by $350 million.

Under these expenditure suggestions total mutual security foreign aid would still cost approximately $4½ billion, but the deficit would be reduced by $650 million.

SUGGESTED MILITARY EXPENDITURE REDUCTIONS

Army

Reductions in Army expenditures suggested here, totaling $657 million, follow:

One hundred million dollars in expenditures for Army maintenance and operations. The budget proposes an increase of $100 million in this item over the current year. With reduction in the size of the Army as proposed for next year, it would seem that maintenance and operations costs should not exceed those of this year.

One million dollars in construction expenditures for Reserve components. This could be accomplished without reduction in prior commitments.

Nine million dollars in expenditures for the Reserve Officers Training Corps. This would allow for the current year's level.

Ten million dollars in expenditures for the National Guard. With this reduction out of new money, there would still be an increase of 10 percent in total expenditures over the current year.

Five hundred million dollars in expenditures for Army procurement and production. With this reduction expenditures would still amount to 10 percent more than the estimate for the current year.

Five million dollars reduction in expenditures for acquisition of real property by the Army, and $50 million in expenditures for construction. This would leave nearly $200 million for expenditure during the year.

In summary, it would seem that these reductions would conform with the administration's policy of moderate retrenchment in the Department of the Army.

Navy

Reductions in Navy expenditures suggested here, totaling $64 million, follow:

Twenty million dollars in expenditures for naval aircraft and facilities. This would allow for expenditures at the current year's level.

Twenty million dollars in expenditures for ships and facilities. This would allow "maintenance of the active fleet" at the current year's level.

Two million dollars in expenditures for naval ordnance and facilities. This would allow for expenditures out of new money at the level of the current year, and all that is requested out of prior-year appropriations.

Five million dollars in expenditures for Navy civil engineering. This would allow for expenditures out of new money at virtually the current year's level and all requested out of prior-year appropriations.

Five million dollars in military construction expenditures for naval reserve components. This would allow for expenditures at the current year's level.

Five million dollars in expenditures for naval research, $1 million out of new money and $4 million out of appropriations previously enacted. This would still leave $55 million for naval research expenditure.

Seven million dollars in expenditures for Navy servicewide operations. This would allow for expenditures out of new appropriations at the current year's level and provide all expenditures requested out of appropriations previously made.

In summary, these reductions would appear to conform with the administration's policy for no expansion in the Navy.

Air Force

Reductions in Air Force expenditures suggested here, totaling $292 million, follow:

One hundred and twelve million nine hundred thousand dollars in Air Force expenditures for maintenance and operations. By reducing expenditures for rents and utilities $5.6 million and other contractual services $107.3 million, this reduction would allow expenditures at the current year's level.

One hundred and twenty-nine million dollars in expenditures for acquisition of real property and construction. This would allow expenditures at the current year's level.

Fifty million dollars in expenditures for major Air Force procurement other than aircraft. This would allow a quarter-of-a-billion-dollar increase over the current year's level.

In summary, these reductions would save nearly $300 million in expenditures without impairment of the administration's policy with respect to the Air Force.

Military public works

It is further suggested that the military public works expenditure item of $100 million, proposed for later transmission, be reduced by $50 million. In this connection, military agencies should require greater use of native labor on contract projects overseas. Such a requirement would reduce not only labor costs but also travel costs and overseas emoluments.

SUGGESTED DOMESTIC-CIVILIAN EXPENDITURE REDUCTIONS

The budget contemplates numerous new expenditure items requiring new program legislation, along with others requiring additional budgetary recommendations. The expenditure reductions suggested here would eliminate strictly domestic-civilian items in this category totaling $170 million for the coming fiscal year. Items to be eliminated would include:

$10.8 million in expenditures for Army civil functions;

$3 million in expenditures for Housing and Home Finance Agency advance planning;

$129 million in expenditures for seven Department of Health, Education, and Welfare programs;

$5.4 million in expenditures for Reclamation Bureau construction and rehabilitation projects; and

$21.8 million in expenditures for unemployment compensation grants to States.

In addition, United States Information Agency expenditures should be held to the current year's level, at a saving of $8.7 million. As an example of nonessential expenditures which could be eliminated without impairing the program, the USIA recently telegraphed requests to newspapers around the country for copies of their papers to be exhibited at some future date in England.

Government corporations and so-called business-type agencies for years have been a pipeline from the Federal Treasury to their select clientele. They are into American taxpayers for an amount which, by the nature of their ramified operations and records, is impossible of determination.

With the Federal debt at its statutory limit and reductions in tax revenue, the time has come when these agencies should operate like business-type operations, stop bleeding the Treasury and the taxpayers, and live within their income.

For example, under the President's budget proposals, in the coming year, the net new-money cost to American taxpayers of the six so-called business-type programs listed below would be $0.4 billion. If they were made to live on 75 percent of their income during the coming year, the Federal deficit would be reduced by more than a half-billion dollars.

This would require merely writing expenditure limitations into appropriation bills, the figures to be based on a percentage of their estimated receipts.

In most of these programs large amounts are due and collectable, and in the current condition of the Federal Treasury there is no reason why they should not live on or within their own annual income instead of using more tax money and increasing the debt, except in extreme emergencies.

The six examples of so-called business-type programs in which a half-billion dollars could be saved follow:

Programs and agencies	Estimated expenditures		Estimated receipts, fiscal year 1955	Estimated effect on the budget, 1955	Expenditures, 75 percent of 1955 receipts	Budget savings
	Fiscal year 1954	Fiscal year 1955				
Expansion of defense production (This direct loan and grant program was established to stimulate expansion of war plants for the Korean war. That war is over. A policy of moderate military retrenchment has been adopted. There is no need for continuation of this program at virtually the wartime level)	$561, 607, 671	$546, 048, 448	$238, 422, 919	$307, 625, 529	$168, 817, 119	$377, 231, 329
Reconstruction Finance Corporation production programs (Disposal of these rubber, tin, and fiber plants is under consideration. It is estimated that they will take in more than they spend next year. This is a simple proposal that they spend still less)	348, 959, 759	270, 032, 000	334, 698, 000	−64, 666, 000	251, 023, 500	19, 008, 500
Small Business Administration (This agency is a hangover from the abolished RFC. 75 percent of its estimated income should meet its necessary disaster requirements with some left over)	12, 971, 594	31, 235, 586	6, 178, 981	25, 056, 605	4, 634, 236	26, 601, 350
Housing loans under the Veterans' Administration (This program of direct housing loans for veterans is in addition to the guaranteed veterans loan programs. Limitation on expenditures under it would not affect the guaranteed loan program available to veterans)	108, 515, 307	83, 745, 000	40, 045, 000	43, 700, 000	30, 033, 750	53, 711, 250
Slum clearance and urban redevelopment under Housing and Home Finance Agency (This program has been going on for years in one form or another. There is no new reason why expenditures next year should be 50 percent higher than this year and 300 percent over last year's level)	68, 326, 309	97, 244, 360	49, 654, 500	47, 589, 860	37, 240, 875	60, 003, 485
Educational institutions housing loans under Housing and Home Finance Agency (In the present condition of the Federal Treasury there is no justification for financing construction for State universities and privately endowed institutions beyond absolute minimum commitments)	36, 853, 825	62, 052, 500	4, 343, 500	57, 709, 000	3, 257, 625	58, 794, 875
Total	1, 137, 234, 465	1, 090, 357, 894	673, 342, 900	417, 014, 994	495, 007, 105	595, 350, 789

SUGGESTED CIVILIAN EMPLOYMENT EXPENDITURE REDUCTIONS

When the Korean war started civilian employment by executive agencies of the Federal Government totaled 1,968,400. During the war the number of employees increased to a peak of 2,601,800 in July 1952. The budget estimates the number of employees in the coming fiscal year, beginning July 1, will average 2,353,200.

Despite the reduction of 248,600 from the Korean war peak, Federal civilian employment next year will still average 384,800 above the pre-Korean war level. The budget estimates the payroll in the coming year at an annual rate of approximately $9.7 billion, as compared with $6.8 billion in fiscal year 1950. It is approximately the same as it was in the Korean war peak year of 1952.

If the Federal payroll were reduced by 150,000 employees, it would still be nearly a quarter of a million above the pre-Korean war level. Such a reduction in Federal civilian employment would reduce the deficit next year by at least $500 million.

Additional savings could be made if agencies operating overseas would use foreign nationals living at the scene of the activity, where they can be used more economically. In the coming year there will be between 75,000 and 100,000 American citizens on Federal payrolls working overseas. For those who have families it costs the Federal Treasury, in addition to their salaries, approximately $9,000 to transport the employees, their families, household effects, etc., overseas and back. Experience in the past few years has indicated foreign nationals can be used effectively in many of these jobs at less pay and with no additional transportation costs.

Additional personal service

In addition to the regular employment of 2,353,200 next year, the military agencies will use the service of approximately 400,000 foreign nationals in their overseas activities. Some of these are paid by the German Government for their work in connection with the American occupation forces. But the majority are paid from funds appropriated out of the American Treasury for purposes not designated as personal service. In January this year 175,000 in Japan were employed under labor contracts between the military services and the Japanese Government.

As of January this year these employees, outside the payroll budget, were reported to be as follows:

Country	Total	Army	Navy	Air Force
Germany	117,992	97,206	1,920	18,866
Japan	174,901	115,226	18,374	41,301
Korea	105,893	96,574		9,319
Lybia	199			199
Ryukyus	14,683	11,083		3,600
Saudi Arabia	395			395
Total	414,063	320,089	20,294	73,680

These suggested reductions are made after careful study of the budget, which was found to be tightened up considerably, and greatly improved by comparison with budgets of the past. Among the improvements were:

1. Presentation for the first time of gross expenditure figures. Previously only the net figures were given for Government corporations and so-called business-type activities. Net figures are perfectly proper, but the gross figures present a more accurate picture of the full scope of their operations.

2. Treatment of railroad retirement receipts and expenditures as trust fund transactions, as they should be, outside the budget.

3. Provision for more complete budgetary control over the use of foreign currencies, particularly by the military departments.

4. Development of a compilation and analysis of expenditures for research and development.

5. Presentation for the first time in the Budget Document of summary data on funds still available for expenditure in old appropriations.

It is to be hoped that this data may be expanded in future budgets to show in the same form unexpended balances in old appropriations remaining available for expenditure in each appropriation account. This would give Congress a clearer picture of new appropriation requirements on an itemized basis.

Another worthwhile improvement in future budget documents would be the complete elimination of all reference to the so-called cash budget, whether it is called "payments to and receipts from the public" or something else. In the Budget Document this merely confuses people. If it is necessary, the President's Economic Report would be a better place for it. The budget should be confined to a literal presentation of expenditures to be met by receipts from taxes and other general revenue, or by borrowing.

TAXES AND CONTINGENCIES

The administration is to be commended on both tightening up and improving its budget presentations. But still more is required. It is still loose in many respects, particularly in the contingencies which are treated with budgetary optimism.

As presented by the administration the budget is $2.9 billion out of balance. This is an optimistic deficit estimate because it is based on the following contingencies:

(1) That revenue next year, even after the automatic tax reductions, will be within $2 billion of last year's peak;

(2) that the additional Korean war excise and corporation taxes will be continued;

(3) that postal rates will be increased;

(4) that there will be no Federal pay raises such as the administration is now considering; and

(5) that the annual Federal contribution to the Civil Service Retirement Fund for actuarial soundness will be evaded.

It is possible that unless expenditures are reduced under the administration's budget estimates the deficit will be doubled.

If the full resources of the Government are used in the name of recession, the deficit as estimated in the budget might easily be trebled, for the Government has no resources except your credit and mine.

Meanwhile, there is great agitation for still further tax reduction. If this should occur the deficit-debt situation would be even worse, unless there are commensurate expenditure reductions. It does not make sense to borrow money which must be paid back, after paying interest for generations, to finance temporary tax reduction.

PROGRAM FOR TODAY

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, after consultation with the minority leader, I desire to make a statement for the information of the Senate. It is hoped that after the morning hour has been completed, the Senate may resume the consideration of the bill to provide statehood for Hawaii by taking up the committee amendments and having them acted on today, so that the bill will be in the form as recommended by the committee.

I have had an inquiry from the minority whip, the distinguished Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS], as to whether it might then be possible to recess until tomorrow before taking up the Anderson amendment. I stated that that would be agreeable, provided we could first take up a number of other bills, which I had already mentioned to the minority leader. I felt we would have sufficient work to do to occupy the Senate for the remainder of the afternoon.

The additional bills are Calendar 1045, S. 2548; Calendar 1043, H. R. 5337; Calendar 1046, Senate Resolution 218; and Calendar 1047, S. 2911.

It was my hope that after the Senate had completed its work on the committee amendments to the Hawaiian statehood bill, it would then proceed to the consideration of the four measures I have stated, although not necessarily in the order I have listed them. After that has been done and Senators have had an opportunity to make additional speeches and to request further insertions in the RECORD, if there are any further requests, we would then be prepared to recess until tomorrow, when I hope the Senate will be in a position to move ahead with the debate on the Anderson amendment to the Hawaiian statehood bill.

ENCOURAGEMENT OF DOMESTIC WOOL INDUSTRY

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield, so that I may ask a question of the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], chairman of the Commitee on Agriculture and Forestry?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Is it the opinion of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry that Calendar 1047, S. 2911, the so-called wool bill, is a measure which ought to be taken up on such short notice?

Mr. AIKEN. This bill was reported on March 4 by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. It should be acted upon very soon if it is to apply to the 1954 clip of wool. Both the manufacturers and the wool growers have been urging early action on the bill, and the President referred to it recently in a statement, in which he denied to the wool producers of the United States an additional 10-percent increase in the tariff on wool. In his statement he referred to the bill, S. 2911, and suggested that the wool producers obtain their relief through this proposed legislation rather than through an increase in the tariff.

Mr. CLEMENTS. As the chairman of the committee knows, I am not opposed to the measure.

Mr. AIKEN. I understand.

Mr. CLEMENTS. In my opinion, it is a measure as to the consideration of which longer notice should be given than that given a few minutes ago by the majority leader [Mr. KNOWLAND]. For that reason, I thought the chairman of the committee might suggest that the bill be taken up tomorrow or on another day during the week.

Mr. AIKEN. I am not the majority leader and, therefore, do not have the responsibility to suggest the program.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I believe the chairman of the committee will agree that this bill is considerably more far-reaching than are the other agricultural bills which have been mentioned by the majority leader.

Mr. AIKEN. It is a very important bill and will have a decided long-range effect on the production of wool in the United States and probably indirectly on the national security.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Furthermore, there are some members of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry who, I think, would like to be present at the time the bill is considered, and they will not be able to be present during today.

Mr. AIKEN. I did not know that the bill would be considered this afternoon. In the hearings, as the Senator from Kentucky may recall, the principal objection was made by the Wool Growers' Association of Idaho, which insisted that the best way in which to deal with the situation would be by an increase in the tariff, so that foreign wool could not come into the United States and compete with domestic wool. No other State associations agreed with the Idaho Wool Growers' Association in this matter.

The President since that time has indicated that he is not inclined to raise the tariff on wool. Both the manufacturers who use wool and the producers of wool have, within the last day or two, urged early action on the bill. I do not know that that means this afternoon, but I do know the woolen manufacturers of the Eastern States are anxious to know what is going to happen, and the producers of all the States, particularly of the Western States, want to know

where they stand. The number of sheep in the United States decreased by about 3 million in the last year.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I can assure the Senator from Vermont that the sheepgrowers of Kentucky are interested in having the consideration of the bill expedited. I desire to commend the chairman of the committee for the improvement which has been made in the bill following the hearings on it, but I believe, and I am confident the chairman of the committee shares my belief, that the bill is of such importance that probably it should not be taken up on such short notice.

AMENDMENT OF NATURAL-GAS ACT

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the eminent majority leader yield in order that I may address a question to him?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Some time ago the distinguished majority leader stated that he intended to have considered Calendar No. 821, H. R. 5976, an act to amend section 1 of the Natural-Gas Act. I wonder if the distinguished majority leader would be willing to inform Members of the Senate when it is intended to consider that bill, in order that we may have notice adequately in advance to allow us sufficient time to prepare for debate on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I will say to the Senator from Illinois that we are trying to conform to the normal legislative process in the Senate. I had hoped the Senate could vote on some aspects of the Hawaiian statehood bill this week. The majority leader is trying to accommodate Senators on both sides of the aisle, who, for varying reasons, all of which are perfectly valid, desire that attention be given to bills which were carried over from last Thursday until today. That is true in the Air Force Academy bill. I am perfectly willing, because of the suggestion which has been made, to defer the consideration of the wool bill until tomorrow.

It is hoped that cooperation may be obtained from both sides of the aisle so that during any lapses in the debate on the unfinished business, the Hawaiian statehood bill, we may be able to consider, out of order, some of the bills which are being reported by committees, at least those on which no minority views are filed, and to which, so far as I know, there is no major visible opposition.

I did state last week, with regard to Calendar No. 821, H. R. 5976, to amend section 1 of the Natural Gas Act, that I desired Senators to be on notice that at the earliest opportunity the bill might be considered and voted by the Senate.

Mr. DOUGLAS. What the Senator from Illinois is seeking is assurance from the eminent majority leader that the bill will not be suddenly brought up for action without advance notice of at least some days being served as to when it is the intention of the majority leader to have the bill considered; in other words, that it will not be suddenly sprung upon the Senate.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I am sure the Senator knows that the majority leader is not in the habit of suddenly springing proposed legislation on the Senate.

Mr. DOUGLAS. There was no implication in my statement of an invidious intent.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I remind the distinguished Senator that the bill was reported from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce on July 30, 1953.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I may say that if the eminent leader goes into the question of the legislative history of the bill, I think he will find that it was reported by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, without any hearings, on the very day it passed the House. Therefore, since no hearings were held in committee, I believe the bill deserves thorough discussion on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. KNOWLAND. All the Senator from California is suggesting to the Senator from Illinois is that the bill was reported in July of last year. I understand various State regulatory bodies have been very much concerned with the bill, and generally are in support of it. The majority leader did give notice that it was a bill he hoped to have considered at an early date. I hope the Senator will take this discussion as notice that it will be considered at an early time, and that he will prepare his remarks on it. I can assure the Senator that there will be at least a day's notice in advance of its consideration. In the meantime, the Senator can be gathering his material together in order to prepare remarks on it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. A notice of 1 day will be satisfactory.

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

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

INVESTIGATION OF IMPORTATIONS OF WHEAT CLASSIFIED AS UNFIT FOR HUMAN CONSUMPTION

Mr. CLEMENTS. Is it the majority leader's understanding that Calendar No. 1046, Senate Resolution 218, extending the authority of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry to investigate the importation of wheat classified as unfit for human consumption, will be referred to the Committee on Rules?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Under the rule, I think so.

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

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. I do not know whether the resolution should be referred to the Rules Committee or not. It may be recalled that last summer the Senate appropriated for the use of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry the sum of $15,000 to use in its work in particular reference to the investigation of the possible fraudulent use of imported Canadian wheat and the investigation of other aspects affecting farm programs. The committee spent about $10,000 of that amount of money last year, a part of it on the wheat-investigation program, and a part of it by a subcommittee which was studying the application of the drought-relief program, and probably $4,000 or $5,000 was spent in holding three hearings in the Rocky Mountain region in connection with S. 2548.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. CLEMENTS. There is no disposition on the part of the Senator from Kentucky to delay the committee. But, in order to meet the Hayden formula, it seems to me that Senate Resolution 218 should of necessity be referred to the Committee on Rules.

Mr. AIKEN. That is all right. I have no objection to that course being taken. Strange to say, of the $15,000 appropriated, the committee had left over the sum of $4,000 or $5,000 which it had not spent. Inasmuch as we anticipate lengthy hearings in the next few months, the committee would like to have that $4,000 or $5,000 made available to it.

Mr. CLEMENTS. As a member of the committee of which the Senator is chairman, I am in whole-hearted agreement with that suggestion.

Mr. AIKEN. I know the Senator from Kentucky is.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I move that Senate Resolution 218, Calendar No. 1046, be referred to the Committee on Rules.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCHOEPPEL in the chair). The question is on the motion of the Senator from California.

The motion was agreed to.

STATEHOOD FOR HAWAII

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 49) to enable the people of Hawaii to form a constitution and State government and to be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States.

Mr. CORDON obtained the floor.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield for the purpose of permitting me to suggest the absence of a quorum?

Mr. CORDON. I am happy to yield for that purpose.

Mr. KNOWLAND. 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. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the call of the roll be rescinded.

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

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I now ask that the bill be read for amendment, and that the amendments proposed by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs be first considered, ad seriatim.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The first amendment of the committee will be stated.

The first amendment of the committee was, on page 1, after line 2, where it first occurs, to insert a new heading "Title I"; in line 2, at the beginning of the line, to insert "SECTION 1."; and in

the same line, after the word "the", to strike out "inhabitants of all that part" and insert "citizens."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 1, in line 3, after the word "States", to insert "who are bona fide residents of that part of the United States"; in line 4, after the name "Hawaii", to strike out "as at present described,"; on page 2, at the beginning of line 1, to strike out "aforesaid," and insert " "State of Hawaii" "; and in line 2, after the word "Union", to strike out "and that the said State of Hawaii shall consist of all the territory, now included in the said Territory of Hawaii."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, after line 4, to insert:

The State of Hawaii shall consist of all the islands, together with their appurtenant reefs and territorial waters, now included in the Territory of Hawaii, except the atoll known as Palmyra Island, together with its appurtenant reefs, and territorial waters, but said State shall not be deemed to include the Midway Islands, Johnston Island, Sand Island (offshore from Johnston Island), or Kingman Reef, together with their appurtenant reefs and territorial waters.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection——

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Oregon if it is his interpretation and if he understands it also to be the interpretation of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs that by means of this bill, we shall take into the United States the Territory of Hawaii, with the boundaries it has established, namely, the boundaries which now exist, except for the specific exceptions mentioned in this amendment, namely, "Palmyra Island, together with its appurtenant reefs and territorial waters"; the Midway Islands; Johnston Island; Sand Island; and the others which are specifically mentioned as not being included.

Mr. CORDON. The Senator is correct in his assumption. That is the committee's purpose.

Mr. DANIEL. As the Senator knows, the main point I am driving at is whether or not it is the interpretation of the Senator from Oregon, and if he understands it to be the interpretation of the committee, that whatever the territorial waters of the Hawaiian Islands happen to be, they will be taken into the United States as they now exist.

Mr. CORDON. The Senator is correct.

Mr. DANIEL. For example, as the Senator well knows, in the earlier history of the Hawaiian Islands the King—and subsequently the Territory—claimed certain waters between the main islands as territorial waters, even though they are farther than 3 miles from shore. Do I correctly understand that such claim of a wider territorial limit than 3 miles from shore between the main islands is preserved, or whatever rights already exist are preserved by this proposed legislation?

Mr. CORDON. The Senator from Texas is correct. He will recall that there is a question as to the continuity of that particular claim; but Hawaii would be admitted into the Union as a State, with whatever rights attached by virtue of the organization of the Hawaiian Islands as a Territory, and whatever description the islands had as a republic, except as to the islands, sand spits, and territorial waters expressly excluded by the amendment.

Mr. DANIEL. For example, if the Territory had established under international law an area of territorial waters between the main islands more than 3 miles in width, such area would be taken into the United States by this bill.

Mr. CORDON. The Senator is correct.

Mr. DANIEL. I thank the Senator from Oregon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 2, after line 4.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, line 20, after the word "election," to strike out "and" and insert "of delegates, the"; on page 3, after line 2, to strike out:

In order that the constitutional convention so elected and organized may have an opportunity to consider whether any changes in the constitution and State government so formed are needed by reason of the enactment of this act, the Governor of the Territory of Hawaii, within 20 days after the approval of this act, may, and upon petition by at least one-fifth of the delegates to said convention shall, issue a proclamation directing said convention to reconvene on the day designated by such proclamation, which day shall be not later than 10 days after the issuance of such proclamation.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was on page 4, line 1, after the word "First.", to strike out "That perfect freedom of religious worship shall be secured, and that no inhabitant of said State shall ever be molested in person or property on account of his or her mode of religious wordship." and insert "That no law shall be enacted respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech or of the press, or the right of the people peaceably to assemble and to petition the government for the redress of grievances."; on page 5, at the beginning of line 11, to strike out "original"; in line 14, after the word "impaired", insert "by any such amendment or law"; in line 20 after the word "the", to strike out "original"; in line 24, after the word "from", to strike out "Hawaiian home lands shall be available to said State for use in accordance with the terms of said act" and insert "the available lands", as defined by said act, shall be used only in carrying out the provisions of said act."; on page 7, line 7, after the word "States", to strike out "shall retain title to all the public lands and other public property in Hawaii title to which is in the United States (except as hereafter provided) for a period of 5 years after the enactment of this act. Such land and public property shall continue to be administered in accordance with the laws applicable thereto immediately prior to the admission of said State until otherwise provided by the Congress: *Provided,* That immediately after the enactment of this act an investigation and report shall be made by a joint committee composed of the members of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the Senate and of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the House of Representatives upon the subject of the public lands and other public property in Hawaii and the terms and provisions of the cession and transfer thereof by the Republic of Hawaii, and the Congress shall thereafter make a final determination and disposition of the remaining public lands and other public property. In the event the Congress has made no other disposition thereof within said 5-year period, then title to all the public lands and other public property undisposed of shall thereupon vest in the State of Hawaii absolutely" and insert "hereby grants to the State of Hawaii, effective upon the date of its admission into the Union, the absolute title to all the public lands and other public property in Hawaii title to which is in the United States immediately prior to the admission of such State into the Union, except as otherwise provided in this act: *Provided however,*"; on page 8, line 12, after the word "States", to strike out "or the Territory of Hawaii or a political subdivision thereof"; in line 16, after the word "States", to strike out "or the State of Hawaii or, subject to the constitution and laws of said State, such political subdivision, as the case may be,"; in line 20, after the word "be", to strike out the colon and *"Provided further,* That the provisions of section 91 of the Hawaiian Organic Act, as amended (48 U. S. C., sec. 511), which authorize the President to restore to their previous status lands set aside for the use of the United States, shall not terminate upon the admission of the State of Hawaii into the Union but shall continue in effect until the end of said 5-year period"; and insert "As used in this subsection, the term 'public lands and other public property' means, and is limited to, the lands and other properties that were ceded to the United States by the Republic of Hawaii under the joint resolution of annexation approved July 7, 1898 (30 Stat. 750) or that have been acquired in exchange for lands or other properties so ceded."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 9, after line 7, to strike out "(c) The State of Hawaii, upon the admission to the Union, shall be entitled to select, and the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to issue patents to said State for 180,000 acres of public lands, as that term is defined in section 73 (a) of the Hawaiian Organic Act (42 Stat. 116, 48 U. S. C., sec. 663), within the boundaries of said State. The selection of such lands by the State of Hawaii shall be made and completed within 5 years from the admission of said State into the Union. The lands so selected" and insert "The lands hereby granted"; at the beginning of line 21, to reletter the subsection from "(d)" to "(c)"; in the same line, after the word "lands" to strike out "patented" and insert "granted"; on page 10, line 15, after the

word "lands" to strike out "patented" and insert "granted"; in line 18, to reletter the subsection from "(c)" to "(d)"; at the beginning of line 24, to strike out "(f)" and insert:

(e) The Submerged Lands Act of 1953 (Public Law 31, 83d Cong., 1st sess.; 67 Stat. 29) shall be applicable to the State of Hawaii, and the said State shall have the same rights as do existing States thereunder.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 11, line 3, after "SEC. 4.", to strike out "Section 1 of the" and insert "The"; in line 17, after the numbers "1949", to strike out "is hereby ratified, and the election for which provision is made in said joint resolution of the Territorial Legislature shall be, and is hereby, recognized as the election authorized to be held for the purpose of ratifying or rejecting the constitution and State government formed by said convention" and insert "and of any new constitution framed by such convention in consequence of a rejection of the proposed constitution by the people, is hereby ratified; and the election held on November 7, 1950, pursuant to section 1 of said joint resolution, at which election the people of the Territory of Hawaii ratified the proposed constitution by a majority of the votes cast shall be, and hereby is, recognized as constituting due ratification of said constitution by the people of Hawaii."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 12, after line 4, to strike out:

If said constitutional convention is reconvened pursuant to section 2 of this act, and said convention shall determine that changes in the constitution and State government formed by it are needed by reason of the enactment of this act, the Governor of the Territory of Hawaii, within 30 days after the final adjournment of said convention so reconvened, shall issue a proclamation for an election to be held on a day designated by said proclamation, at which election said constitution, as so changed by the convention, shall be resubmitted to the people of said Territory for ratification, by a majority of the legal votes cast. The day designated for the holding of said election shall be not earlier than 60 nor later than 90 days after the issuance of said proclamation. At such election the qualified voters of said Territory shall vote directly for or against said constitution. Persons possessing the qualifications entitling them to vote for delegate under section 2 of the act of the Territorial Legislature of Hawaii approved May 20, 1949 (Act 334, Session Laws of Hawaii, 1949) shall be entitled to vote on the ratitification or rejection of said constitution, under such rules or regulations as said convention may have prescribed, not in conflict with this act. The returns of said election shall be made by the election officers direct to the secretary of said Territory who, with the clerks of the several counties, shall constitute a canvassing board and they, or any three of them, shall meet at the city of Honolulu, not later than the third Monday after said election, and shall canvass the same.

The said canvassing board shall forthwith certify the result of said election to the Governor of said Territory, together with a statement of the votes cast upon the question of ratification or rejection of said constitution. If a majority of the legal votes cast at said election shall reject the constitution, the Governor of said Territory shall, by proclamation, order the constitutional convention to reassamble at a date not later than 20 days after the receipt by said Governor of the documents showing the rejection of the constitution by the people, and thereafter a new constitution may be formed and the same proceedings shall be taken in regard thereto in like manner as if said constitution were being originally prepared for submission and submitted to the people: *Provided*, That not more than two elections shall be held under the authority of this paragraph and the preceding paragraph.

When said constitution shall have been duly ratified by the people of said Territory, as aforesaid, a certified copy of the same shall be submitted by the Governor of the Territory of Hawaii, through the President of the United States to the Congress for approval, together with a statement of the votes cast thereon. If the Congress approves said constitution, it shall be the duty of the President to certify such approval to the Governor of said Territory. Within 30 days after the receipt of said notification from the President, the Governor shall issue his proclamation for the election, as hereinafter provided, of officers for all elective offices provided for by the constitution and laws of said State, except officers continued in office.

And insert:

A certified copy of said constitution shall be submitted by the Governor of the Territory of Hawaii to the President of the United States. Thereupon the President of the United States shall forthwith submit said constitution to the Congress for its consideration. Should the Congress by a majority vote approve said constitution, it shall be the duty of the President, on or after June 5, and not later than July 4, 1954, to certify such approval to the Governor of the said Territory. Thereupon the Governor, on or after July 5, and not later than August 3, 1954, shall issue his proclamation for the election, as hereinafter provided, of officers for all elective offices provided for.

On page 15, line 2, after the word "shall", to insert "immediately"; in line 9, after the world "if", to strike out "said constitution were being originally prepared for submission and submitted to the people" and insert "the proposed constitution had been rejected by the people and as if the new constitution were being originally submitted to the President for approval by the Congress"; in line 18, after the word "provided", to strike out "an election, or primary and general elections, as may be required by said constitution; shall be held at the time or times named in the proclamation of the Governor of said Territory provided for in the preceding section. Said election shall take place not earlier than sixty days nor later than ninety days after said proclamation by the Governor of said Territory ordering the same, or if a primary election is to be held, then the primary election shall take place not earlier than sixty days nor later than ninety days after said proclamation by the Governor of said Territory, and the general election shall take place within forty days after the primary election" and insert "a primary election shall be held on October 2, 1954, and a general election on November 2, 1954, and said primary and general election dates shall be duly named in the proclamation of the Governor of said Territory provided for in the preceding section"; on page 16, at the beginning of line 9, to strike out "election or"; at the beginning of line 11, to strike out "election or"; in line 16, after the word "prescribe.", to strike out "When said election of said officers above provided for shall be held and the returns thereof made and certified as hereinbefore provided, the Governor of the said Territory shall certify the result of said election as certified as herein provided, to the President of the United States, who thereupon shall immediately issue his proclamation announcing the result of said election so ascertained, and, upon the issuance of said proclamation by the President of the United States, the proposed State of Hawaii shall be deemed admitted by Congress into the Union by virtue of this act, on an equal footing with the other States"; on page 17, after line 2, to insert:

At the general election to be held on November 2, 1954, there shall also be submitted to the electors qualified to vote in said election, for adoption or rejection, the following proposition: "The boundaries of the State of Hawaii shall be as prescribed in the act of Congress providing for the admission of this State into the Union, and all claims of this State to any areas of land or sea outside the boundaries so prescribed are hereby irrevocably relinquished to the United States." In the event the foregoing proposition is adopted at said election by a majority of the legal votes cast, section 1 of article XIII of the proposed constitution of the State of Hawaii, as ratified by the people at the election held on November 7, 1950, and any definition of the boundaries of the State of Hawaii in any new constitution adopted pursuant to this act, shall be deemed amended so as to contain the language of the second paragraph of section 1 of this act, in lieu of any other language. In the event the foregoing proposition is not adopted at said election by a majority of the legal votes cast, the provisions of this act shall thereupon cease to be effective. The Governor of said Territory is hereby authorized and directed to take such action as may be necessary or appropriate to insure the submission of said proposition at the general election on November 2, 1954, and a statement of the votes cast on said proposition shall be included in the returns of said election.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 13, after line 4, to insert:

When the general election provided for in this section shall have been held and the returns thereof made and certified as hereinbefore provided, the Governor of said Territory shall certify the results of said election, as so ascertained, to the President of the United States. Thereupon the President, if he finds that the proposition with respect to boundaries set forth in this section has been duly adopted by the people of Hawaii as hereinbefore provided, shall immediately issue his proclamation announcing the results of said election as so ascertained. Upon the issuance of said proclamation by the President of the United States, the proposed State of Hawaii shall be deemed admitted by Congress into the Union by virtue of this act, on an equal footing with the other States.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 19, at the beginning of line 7, to strike out "and secretary"; after line 22, to strike out:

SEC. 7. That the sum of $200,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, is hereby authorized to be appropriated out of any money in the Treasury of the United States not otherwise appropriated, for defraying the expenses of the elections provided for in this act and the expenses of the convention and for the payment of compensation to the

delegates to said convention. The delegates shall receive for their services, in addition to mileage at the rate of 20 cents a mile each way, the sum of $1,000 each, payable in four equal installments on and after the 1st, 20th, 40th, and 60th days of the convention, excluding Sundays and holidays. The disbursements of the money so appropriated shall be made by the Secretary of the Territory of Hawaii. The Territorial legislature is hereby authorized to appropriate such sum as it may deem advisable for the payment of additional compensation to said delegates and for defraying their expenses and for such other purposes as it may deem necessary.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 20, line 17, to change the section number from "8" to "7"; on page 21, line 15, to change the section number from "9" to "8"; in line 22, to change the section number from "10" to "9"; on page 22, line 12, to change the section number from "11" to "10"; in line 18, after the word "constitution", to strike out "to be thus formed" and insert "of said State"; on page 23, line 18, after the word "such", to strike out "offenses"; and insert "offenses."; in the same line, after the amendment just above stated, to insert "The admission of said State shall effect no change in the substantive or criminal law governing such causes of action and criminal offenses which shall have arisen or been committed;"; on page 24, line 4, to change the section number from "12" to "11"; in line 18, after the word "all", to insert "orders"; on page 25, line 3, change the section number from "13" to "12"; in line 16, after the word "renumbering", to strike out "paragraph" and insert "paragraphs"; in the same line, after "(6)" to insert "and (7)"; in line 17, at the beginning of the line, strike out "paragrraph" and insert "paragraphs"; in the same line, after "(5)" insert "and (6) respectvely"; on page 27, line 7, to change the section number from "14" to "13"; in line 17, to change the section number from "15" to "14"; in the same line, after the amendment just above stated, to insert "(a); on page 28, after line 10, to insert:

(b) Notwithstanding the admission of the State of Hawaii into the Union, authority is reserved in the United States, subject to the proviso hereinafter set forth, for the exercise by the Congress of the United States of the power of exclusive legislation, as provided by article I, section 8, clause 17, of the Constitution of the United States, in all cases whatsoever over such tracts or parcels of land as, immediately prior to the admission of said State, are owned by the United States and held for military, naval, Air Force, or Coast Guard purposes, whether such lands were acquired by cession and transfer to the United States by the Republic of Hawaii and set aside by act of Congress or by Executive order or proclamation of the President or the Governor of Hawaii for the use of the United States, or were acquired by the United States by purchase, condemnation, donation, exchange, or otherwise: *Provided*: (i) That the State of Hawaii shall always have the right to serve civil or criminal process within the said tracts or parcels of land in suits or prosecutions for or on account of rights acquired, obligations incurred, or crimes committed within the said State but outside of the said tracts or parcels of land; (ii) that the reservation of authority in the United States for the exercise by the Congress of the United States of the power of exclusive legislation over the lands aforesaid shall not operate to prevent such lands from being a part of the State of Hawaii, or to prevent the said State from exercising over or upon such lands, concurrently with the United States, any jurisdiction whatsoever which it would have in the absence of such reservation of authority and which is consistent with the laws hereafter enacted by the Congress pursuant to such reservation of authority; and (iii) that such power of exclusive legislation shall vest and remain in the United States only so long as the particular tract or parcel of land involved is owned by the United States and used for military, naval, Air Force, or Coast Guard purposes.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 29, line 21, to change the section number from "16" to "15"; in line 22, after "38 Stat." to strike out "252" and insert "251"; on page 30, line 12, to change the section number from "17" to "16"; at the beginning of line 16, to strike out "ports" and insert "any port"; in line 17, after the word "possessions", to insert "or as conferring on the Interstate Commerce Commission jurisdiction over transportation by water between any such ports", and in line 20, to change the section number from "18" to "17".

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill, as amended, is as follows:

Be it enacted, etc.—

TITLE I

SECTION 1. That the citizens of the United States who are bona fide residents of that part of the United States now constituting the Territory of Hawaii, are hereby authorized to form for themselves a constitution and State Government, with the name "State of Hawaii," which State, when so formed, shall be admitted into the Union, all as hereinafter provided.

The State of Hawaii shall consist of all the islands, together with their appurtenant reefs and territorial waters, now included in the Territory of Hawaii, except the atoll known as Palmyra Island, together with its appurtenant reefs and territorial waters, but said State shall not be deemed to include the Midway Islands, Johnston Island, Sand Island (offshore from Johnston Island), or Kingman Reef, together with their appurtenant reefs and territorial waters.

SEC. 2. Sections 2 and 3 of the act of the Territorial Legislature of Hawaii entitled "An Act to provide for a constitutional convention, the adoption of a State constitution, and the forwarding of the same to the Congress of the United States, and appropriating money therefor," approved May 20, 1949 (act 334, session laws of Hawaii, 1949), which sections provide for the election of delegates, the organization of a constitutional convention and the forming of a constitution and State Government for the proposed State of Hawaii, are hereby ratified, and the convention for which provision is made in said act of the Territorial legislature shall be, and is hereby, recognized as the body authorized to form a constitution and State Government for said proposed State.

The constitution shall be republican in form, shall make no distinction in civil or political rights on account of race or color, shall not be repugnant to the Constitution of the United States and the principles of the Declaration of Independence, and shall provide that no person who advocates, or who aids or belongs to any party, organization, or association which advocates, the overthrow by force or violence of the Government of the State of Hawaii or of the United States shall be qualified to hold any public office of trust or profit under the State constitution. Said constitution shall provide:

First. That no law shall be enacted respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech or of the press, or the right of the people peaceably to assemble and to petition the Government for the redress of grievances.

Second. That provisions shall be made for the establishment and maintenance of a system of public schools which shall be open to all children of said State and free from sectarian control.

Third. That the debts and liabilities of said Territory of Hawaii shall be assumed and paid by said State and all debts owed to said Territory of Hawaii shall be collected by said State.

Fourth. That the State and its people cede to the United States, and disclaim title to, the property in the Territory of Hawaii set aside by act of Congress or by Executive order or proclamation of the President or the Governor of Hawaii for the use of the United States and remaining so set aside immediately prior to the admission of the State of Hawaii into the Union as more particularly provided in the next section of this act.

Fifth. That, as a compact with the United States relating to the management and disposition of the Hawaiian homelands, the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, 1920, as amended, is adopted as a law of said State, subject to amendment or repeal only with the consent of the United States, and in no other manner: *Provided*, That (1) sections 202, 213, 219, 220, 222, 224, and 225 and other provisions relating to administration, and paragraph (2) of section 204, sections 206 and 212, and other provisions relating to the powers and duties of officers other than those charged with the administration of said act, may be amended in the constitution, or in the manner required for ordinary State legislation, but the Hawaiian home-loan fund, the Hawaiian home-operating fund, and the Hawaiian home-development fund shall not be reduced or impaired by any such amendment or law, and the encumbrances authorized to be placed on Hawaiian homelands by officers other than those charged with the administration of said act shall not be increased, except with the consent of the United States; (2) that any amendment to increase the benefits to lessees of Hawaiian homelands may be made in the constitution, or in the manner required for ordinary State legislation, but the qualifications of lessees shall not be changed except with the consent of the United States; and (3) that all proceeds and income from the "available lands," as defined by said act, shall be used only in carrying out the provisions of said act.

Sixth. That the lands and other property belonging to citizens of the United States residing without said State shall never be taxed at a higher rate than the lands and other property belonging to residents thereof.

Seventh. That said State and its people do agree and declare that no taxes shall be imposed by said State upon any lands or property now owned or hereafter acquired by the United States; and that all provisions of this act reserving rights or powers to the United States, as well as those prescribing the terms or conditions of the grants of lands or other property herein made to the said State, are consented to fully by said State and its people.

SEC. 3. (a) The State of Hawaii and its political subdivisions, as the case may be, shall retail all the lands and other public property title to which is in the Territory of Hawaii or a political subdivision thereof, except as herein provided, and all such lands and other property shall remain and be the absolute property of the State of Hawaii

and its political subdivisions, as the case may be, subject to the constitution and laws of said State: *Provided, however,* That as to any such lands or other property heretofore or hereafter set aside by act of Congress or by Executive order or proclamation of the President or the Governor of Hawaii, pursuant to law, for the use of the United States, whether absolutely or subject to limitations, and remaining so set aside immediately prior to the admission of the State of Hawaii into the Union, the United States shall be and become vested with absolute title thereto, or an interest therein conformable to such limitations, as the case may be.

(b) The United States hereby grants to the State of Hawaii, effective upon the date of its admission into the Union, the absolute title to all the public lands and other public property in Hawaii title to which is in the United States immediately prior to the admission of such State into the Union, except as otherwise provided in this act: *Provided, however,* That as to any such lands or other property heretofore or hereafter set aside by act of Congress or by Executive order or proclamation of the President or Governor of Hawaii, pursuant to law, for the use of the United States, whether absolutely or subject to limitations, and remaining so set aside immediately prior to the admission of the State of Hawaii into the Union, the United States shall retain absolute title thereto, or an interest therein conformable to such limitations, as the case may be. As used in this subsection, the term "public lands and other public property" means, and is limited to, the lands and other properties that were ceded to the United States by the Republic of Hawaii under the joint resolution of annexation approved July 7, 1898 (30 Stat. 750) or that have been acquired in exchange for lands or other properties so ceded.

The lands hereby granted shall be in lieu of any and all grants provided for new States by provisions of law other than this act, and such grants shall not extend to the State of Hawaii.

(c) The lands granted to the State of Hawaii pursuant to the preceding subsection, together with the proceeds thereof and the income therefrom, shall be held by said State as a public trust for the support of the public schools and other public educational institutions, for the betterment of the conditions of native Hawaiians, as defined in the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, 1920, as amended, for the development of farm and home ownership on as widespread a basis as possible, for the making of public improvements, and for the provision of lands for public use. Such lands, proceeds, and income shall be managed and disposed of for one or more of the foregoing purposes in such manner as the constitution and laws of said State may provide, and their use for any other object shall consitute a breach of trust for which suit may be brought by the United States. The schools and other educational institutions supported, in whole or in part, out of such public trust shall forever remain under the exclusive control of said State; and no part of the proceeds or income from the lands patented granted under the preceding subsection shall be used for the support of any sectarian or denominational school, college, or university.

(d) Effective upon the admission of the State of Hawaii into the Union all laws of the United States reserving to the United States the free use or enjoyment of property hereinabove vested in the State of Hawaii or its political subdivisions, or the right to alter, amend, or repeal laws relating thereto, are hereby repealed.

(e) The Submerged Lands Act of 1953 (Public Law 31, 83d Cong., 1st sess,; 67 Stat. 29) shall be applicable to the State of Hawaii, and the said State shall have the same rights as do existing States thereunder.

SEC. 4. The joint resolution of the Territorial Legislature of Hawaii entitled "Joint resolution providing for the submission to the people of the Territory of Hawaii of the constitution framed by the convention held pursuant to act 334 of the Session Laws of Hawaii 1949 and in the event of failure of ratification, the framing and submission of a new constitution, and making appropriations therefor," approved October 12, 1950 (Joint Resolution 1, Special Session Laws of Hawaii, 1950), which section provides for the submission to the people of the Territory of Hawaii, for ratification or rejection, of the proposed constitution framed by the constitutional convention held pursuant to sections 2 and 3 of the Act of the Territorial Legislature of Hawaii approved May 20, 1949 (Act 334, Sesssion Laws of Hawaii, 1949), and of any new constitution framed by such convention in consequence of a rejection of the proposed constitution by the people, is hereby ratified; and the election held on November 7, 1950, pursuant to section 1 of said joint resolution, at which election the people of the Territory of Hawaii ratified the proposed constitution by a majority of the votes cast shall be, and hereby is, recognized as constituting due ratification of said constitution by the people of Hawaii.

A certified copy of said constitution shall be submitted by the Governor of the Territory of Hawaii to the President of the United States. Thereupon the President of the United States shall forthwith submit said constitution to the Congress for its consideration. Should the Congress by a majority vote approve said constitution, it shall be the duty of the President, on or after June 5, and not later than July 4, 1954, to certify such approval to the Governor of the said Territory. Thereupon the Governor, on or after July 5, and not later than August 3, 1954, shall issue his proclamation for the election, as hereinafter provided, of officers for all elective offices provided for by the constitution and laws of said State, but the officers so to be elected shall in any event include two Senators and two Representatives in Congress. Until and unless otherwise required by the constitution or laws of said State, said Representatives shall be elected at large.

If the Congress shall disapprove said constitution, such disapproval shall immediately be certified by the President to the Governor of said Territory, with the objections to the proposed constitution; the Governor thereupon by proclamation shall order the constitutional convention to reassemble at a date not later than 20 days after receipt of such notification and thereafter a new constitution may be formed and the same proceedings shall be taken in regard thereto in like manner as if the proposed constitution had been rejected by the people and as if the new constitution were being originally submitted to the President for approval by the Congress: *Provided,* That not more than one election shall be held under the authority of this paragraph.

SEC. 5. In case the Congress approves the constitution duly ratified by the people of said Territory, all as hereinbefore provided, a primary election shall be held on October 2, 1954, and a general election on November 2, 1954, and said primary and general election dates shall be duly named in the proclamation of the Governor of said Territory provided for in the preceding section. At such elections the officers required to be elected as provided in section 4, shall be chosen by the people. Such elections shall be held, and the qualifications of voters thereat shall be, as prescribed by said constitution and the laws of said State for the election of members of the State legislature. The returns thereof shall be made and certified in such manner as the constitution and laws of said State may prescribe.

At the general election to be held on November 2, 1954, there shall also be submitted to the electors qualified to vote in said election, for adoption or rejection, the following proposition: "The boundaries of the State of Hawaii shall be as prescribed in the act of Congress providing for the admission of this State into the Union, and all claims of this State to any areas of land or sea outside the boundaries so prescribed are hereby irrevocably relinquished to the United States." In the event the foregoing proposition is adopted at said election by a majority of the legal votes cast, section 1 of article XIII of the proposed constitution of the State of Hawaii, as ratified by the people at the election held on November 7, 1950, and any definition of the boundaries of the State of Hawaii in any new constitution adopted pursuant to this act, shall be deemed amended so as to contain the language of the second paragraph of section 1 of this act, in lieu of any other language. In the event the foregoing proposition is not adopted at said election by a majority of the legal votes cast, the provisions of this act shall thereupon cease to be effective. The Governor of said Territory is hereby authorized and directed to take such action as may be necessary or appropriate to insure the submission of said proposition at the general election on November 2, 1954, and a statement of the votes cast on said proposition shall be included in the returns of said election.

When the general election provided for in this section shall have been held and the returns thereof made and certified as hereinbefore provided, the Governor of said Territory shall certify the results of said election, as so ascertained, to the President of the United States. Thereupon the President, if he finds that the proposition with respect to boundaries set forth in this section has been duly adopted by the people of Hawaii as hereinbefore provided, shall immediately issue his proclamation announcing the results of said election as so ascertained. Upon the issuance of said proclamation by the President of the United States, the proposed State of Hawaii shall be deemed admitted by Congress into the Union by virtue of this act, on an equal footing with the other States.

Until the said State is so admitted into the Union, the persons holding legislative, executive, and judicial offices in or under or by authority of the government of said Territory, and the Delegate in Congress thereof, shall continue to discharge the duties of their respective offices. Upon the issuance of said proclamation by the President of the United States and the admission of the State of Hawaii into the Union, the officers elected at said election, and qualified under the provisions of the constitution and laws of said State, shall proceed to exercise all the functions pertaining to their offices in or under or by authority of the government of said State, and officers not required to be elected at said initial election shall be selected or continued in office as provided by the constitution and laws of said State. The Governor of said State shall certify the election of the Senators and Representatives in the manner required by law, and the said Senators and Representatives shall be entitled to be admitted to seats in Congress and to all the rights and privileges of Senators and Representatives of other States in the Congress of the United States.

SEC. 6. The State of Hawaii upon its admission into the Union shall be entitled to two Representatives until the taking effect of the next reapportionment, and such Representatives shall be in addition to the membership of the House of Representatives as now prescribed by law: *Provided,* That such temporary increase in the membership of the House of Representatives shall not affect the basis of apportionment established by the act of November 15, 1941 (55 Stat.

761; 2 U. S. C., sec. 2a), for the 83d Congress and each Congress thereafter.

SEC. 7. Effective upon the admission of the State of Hawaii into the Union—

(a) the United States District Court for the District of Hawaii established by and existing under title 28 of the United States Code shall thenceforth be a court of the United States with judicial power derived from article III, section 1, of the Constitution of the United States: *Provided, however,* That the terms of office of the district judges for the District of Hawaii then in office shall terminate upon the effective date of this section and the President, pursuant to sections 133 and 134 of title 28, United States Code, as amended by this act, shall appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, two district judges for the said district who shall hold office during good behavior;

(b) the last paragraph of section 133 of title 28, United States Code, is repealed; and

(c) subsection (a) of section 134 of title 28, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(a) The district judges, except in Puerto Rico, shall hold office during good behavior. The district judge in Puerto Rico shall hold office for the term of 8 years, and until his successor is appointed and qualified."

SEC. 8. Effective upon the admission of the State of Hawaii into the House the second paragraph of section 451 of title 28, United States Code, is amended by striking out the words "including the district courts of the United States for the districts of Hawaii and Puerto Rico," and inserting in lieu thereof the words "including the United States District Court for the District of Puerto Rico,".

SEC. 9. Effective upon the admission of the State of Hawaii into the Union—

(a) the last paragraph of section 501 of title 28, United States Code, is repealed;

(b) the first sentence of subsection (a) of section 504 of title 28, United States Code, is amended by striking out at the end thereof the words ", except in the district of Hawaii, where the term shall be 6 years";

(c) the first sentence of subsection (c) of section 541 of title 28, United States Code, is amended by striking out at the end thereof the words ", except in the district of Hawaii where the term shall be 6 years"; and

(d) subsection (d) of section 541 of title 28, United States Code, is repealed.

SEC. 10. No action, case, proceeding, or matter pending in any court of the Territory of Hawaii, or in the United States District Court for the District of Hawaii shall abate by reason of the admission of said State into the Union, but the same shall be transferred to and proceeded with in such appropriate State courts as shall be established under the constitution of said State, or shall continue in the United States District Court for the District of Hawaii, as the nature of the case may require. And no indictment, action, or proceedings shall abate by reason of any change in the courts, but shall be proceeded with in the State or United States courts according to the laws thereof, respectively. And the appropriate State courts shall be the successors of the courts of the Territory as to all cases arising within the limits embraced within the jurisdiction of such courts, respectively, with full power to proceed with the same, and award mesne or final process therein, and all the files, records, indictments, and proceedings relating to any such cases shall be transferred to such appropriate State courts and the same shall be proceeded with therein in due course of law.

All civil causes of action and all criminal offenses which shall have arisen or been committed prior to the admission of said State, but as to which no suit, action, or prosecution shall be pending at the date of such admission, shall be subject to prosecution in the appropriate State courts or in the United States District Court for the District of Hawaii in like manner, to the same extent, and with like right of appellate review, as if said State had been created and said State courts had been established prior to the accrual of such causes of action or the commission of such offenses. The admission of said State shall effect no change in the substantive or criminal law governing such causes of action and criminal offenses which shall have arisen or been committed; and such of said criminal offenses as shall have been committed against the laws of the Territory shall be tried and punished by the appropriate courts of said State, and such as shall have been committed against the laws of the United States shall be tried and punished in the United States District Court for the District of Hawaii.

SEC. 11. Parties shall have the same rights of appeal from and appellate review of final decisions of the United States District Court for the District of Hawaii or the Supreme Court of the Territory of Hawaii in any case finally decided prior to admission of said State into the Union, whether or not an appeal therefrom shall have been perfected prior to such admission, and the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit and the Supreme Court of the United States shall have the same jurisdiction therein, as by law provided prior to admission of said State into the Union, and any mandate issued subsequent to the admission of said State shall be to the United States District Court for the District of Hawaii or a court of the State, as may be appropriate. Parties shall have the same rights of appeal from and appellate review of all orders, judgments, and decrees of the United States District Court for the District of Hawaii and of the Supreme Court of the State of Hawaii as successor to the Supreme Court of the Territory of Hawaii, in any case pending at the time of admission of said State into the Union, and the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit and the Supreme Court of the United States shall have the same jurisdiction therein, as by law provided in any case arising subsequent to the admission of said State into the Union.

SEC. 12. Effective upon the admission of the State of Hawaii into the Union—

(a) title 28, United States Code, section 1252, is amended by striking out "Hawaii" from the clause relating to courts of record;

(b) title 28, United States Code, section 1293, is amended by striking out the words "First and Ninth Circuits" and by inserting in lieu thereof "First Circuit," and by striking out the words "supreme courts of Puerto Rico and Hawaii, respectively" and inserting in lieu thereof "supreme court of Puerto Rico";

(c) title 28, United States Code, section 1294, is amended by striking out paragraph (5) thereof and by renumbering paragraphs (6) and (7) as paragraphs (5) and (6) respectively;

(d) the first paragraph of section 373 of title 28, United States Code, is amended by striking out the words "United States District Courts for the districts of Hawaii or Puerto Rico," and insertion in lieu thereof the words "United States District Court for the District of Puerto Rico,"; and by striking out the words "and any justice of the Supreme Court of the Territory of Hawaii": *Provided,* That the amendments made by this subsection shall not affect the rights of any judge or justice who may have retired before the effective date of this subsection: *And provided further,* That service as a judge of the District Court for the Territory of Hawaii or as a judge of the United States District Court for the District of Hawaii or as a justice of the Supreme Court of the Territory of Hawaii or as a judge of the circuit courts of the Territory of Hawaii shall be included in computing under section 371, 372, or 373 of title 28, United States Code, the aggregate years of judicial service of any person who is in commission as a district judge for the District of Hawaii on the date of enactment of this act;

(e) section 92 of the act of April 30, 1900 (ch. 339, 31 Stat. 159), as amended, and the act of May 29, 1928 (ch. 904, 45 Stat. 997), are repealed;

(f) section 86 of the act approved April 30, 1900 (ch. 339, 31 Stat. 158), as amended, is repealed;

(g) section 3771 of title 18, United States Code, as heretofore amended, is further amended by striking out from the first paragraph of such section the words "Supreme Courts of Hawaii and Puerto Rico" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "Supreme Court of Puerto Rico"; and

(h) section 3772 of title 18, United States Code, as heretofore amended, is further amended by striking out from the first paragraph of such section the words "Supreme Courts of Hawaii and Puerto Rico" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "Supreme Court of Puerto Rico."

SEC. 13. All Territorial laws in force in the Territory of Hawaii at the time of its admission into the Union shall continue in force in the State of Hawaii, except as modified or changed by this act or by the constitution of the State, and shall be subject to repeal or amendment by the Legislature of the State of Hawaii, except as hereinbefore provided with respect to the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, 1920, as amended; and the laws of the United States shall have the same force and effect within the said State as elsewhere within the United States.

SEC. 14. (a) Notwithstanding the admission of the State of Hawaii into the Union, the United States shall continue to have sole and exclusive jurisdiction over the area which may then or thereafter be included in Hawaii National Park, saving, however, to the State of Hawaii the same rights as are reserved to the Territory of Hawaii by section 1 of the act of April 19, 1930 (46 Stat. 227), and saving, further, to persons then or thereafter residing within such area the right to vote at all elections held within the political subdivisions where they respectively reside. Upon the admission of said State all references to the Territory of Hawaii in said act or in other laws relating to Hawaii National Park shall be deemed to refer to the State of Hawaii. Nothing contained in this act shall be construed to affect the ownership and control by the United States of any lands or other property within Hawaii National Park which may now belong to, or which may hereafter be acquired by, the United States.

(b) Notwithstanding the admission of the State of Hawaii into the Union, authority is reserved in the United States, subject to the proviso hereinafter set forth, for the exercise by the Congress of the United States of the power of exclusive legislation, as provided by article I, section 8, clause 17, of the Constitution of the United States, in all cases whatsoever over such tracts or parcels of land as, immediately prior to the admission of said State, are owned by the United States and held for military, naval, air force, or coast guard purposes, whether such lands were acquired by cession and transfer to the United States by the Republic of Hawaii and set aside by act of Congress or by Executive order or proclamation of the President or the Governor of Hawaii for the use of the United States, or were acquired by the United States by purchase, condemnation; donation, exchange, or otherwise: *Provided,* (i) That the State of Hawaii shall always have the right to serve civil or criminal process within the said tracts or parcels of land in suits or prosecutions for or on account of rights acquired, obligations incurred, or crimes committed within the said State but outside of the said tracts or parcels of land; (ii) that the reservation of authority in the United States for the exercise by the Congress of the United States of the

power of exclusive legislation over the lands aforesaid shall not operate to prevent such lands from being a part of the State of Hawaii, or to prevent the said State from exercising over or upon such lands, concurrently with the United States, any jurisdiction whatsoever which it would have in the absence of such reservation of authority and which is consistent with the laws hereafter enacted by the Congress pursuant to such reservation of authority; and (iii) that such power of exclusive legislation shall vest and remain in the United States only so long as the particular tract or parcel of land involved is owned by the United States and used for military, naval, air force, or coast guard purposes.

SEC. 15. The first paragraph of section 2 of the Federal Reserve Act (38 Stat. 251) is amended by striking out the last sentence thereof and inserting in lieu of such sentence the following: "When any State is hereafter admitted to the Union the Federal Reserve districts shall be readjusted by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System in such manner as to include such State. Every national bank in any State shall, upon commencing business or within 90 days after admission into the Union of the State in which it is located, become a member bank of the Federal Reserve System by subscribing and paying for stock in the Federal Reserve bank of its district in accordance with the provisions of this act and shall thereupon be an insured bank under the Federal Deposit Insurance Act, and failure to do so shall subject such bank to the penalty provided by the sixth paragraph of this section."

SEC. 16. Nothing contained in this or any other act shall be construed as depriving the Federal Maritime Board of the exclusive jurisdiction heretofore conferred on it over common carriers engaged in transportation by water between any port in the State of Hawaii and other ports in the United States, its Territories, or possessions, or as conferring on the Interstate Commerce Commission jurisdiction over transportation by water between any such ports.

SEC. 17. All act or parts of acts in conflict with the provisions of this act, whether passed by the legislature of said Territory or by Congress are hereby repealed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That completes the committee amendments. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Mr. President, I have received from the Honorable Samuel Wilder King, Governor of the Territory of Hawaii, a letter dealing very fully with the Communist problem in Hawaii. It is my hope that every Member of the Senate will read the letter carefully, because it gives a most complete and concise picture of the actual problem. Governor King admits frankly that there still are some known Communists in Hawaii, but he points out the energetic steps which have been taken by the people of Hawaii to bring the Communist threat under control.

For example, he points out that the popularly elected Legislature of Hawaii established a Hawaiian Subversive Activities Commission, with investigatory powers. This is a step which has been taken by very few of the 48 States. The legislature has created a territorial loyalty board, to pass on the personal history and background of all territorial employees. The legislature also took the extraordinary step of calling in the United States House of Representatives Committee on Un-American Activities to investigate the problem, and the people of Hawaii have cooperated fully with the findings of that committee.

All these steps show how fully alert the people of Hawaii are to this problem. It is a record of vigorous action, a record as good or better than that of the existing States. I believe it proves conclusively that the problem of communism is being dealt with as effectively in Hawaii as anywhere else in the United States.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the entire letter from Governor King printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks.

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

TERRITORY OF HAWAII,
EXECUTIVE CHAMBERS,
Honolulu, March 4, 1954.

Senator HUGH BUTLER,
Chairman, Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR BUTLER: I have only now had an opportunity to read the official text of former Gov. Ingram M. Stainback's recent testimony regarding statehood for Hawaii. Although the hearings have been closed, his statements on the influence of communism in Hawaii should not go unchallenged.

Mr. Stainback stated that the Communist movement has increased in Hawaii since 1950 and that the granting of statehood to Hawaii would therefore endanger the national security.

We are in fact a militantly loyal community and have supported every patriotic call beyond the quotas assigned or expected of us, whether in dollars or in manpower.

The charge that a community of this character would tolerate Communist domination shows a lack of faith in the power of our American democracy and is utterly groundless.

The people of Hawaii have lived in close association with all branches of the armed services of the United States for a long period of time. In the case of the Navy this association goes back to the early days of the Kingdom of Hawaii, over 100 years ago.

There are over 50,000 veterans in Hawaii, comprising about 1 in 6 of our entire adult population, male and female. There is hardly a family in the entire Territory that has not had a father, brother, or son in our country's armed service, and hundreds of families have lost near relatives in World War II and in the Korean conflict.

Our veterans' organizations, the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the Disabled American Veterans, and others, are active and influential in civic and public affairs.

Our ROTC units are popular with our youth, and always filled to the limits allowed. Our National Guard and Air National Guard with over 5,500 men enrolled have been officially recognized as among the outstanding units of the Nation.

It is worthy of note that, although there was a large number of men from Hawaii in the forces that fought in Korea and a disproportionately large number of casualties and prisoners among them, no man from Hawaii was among the 21 who turned their backs on the United States to adopt communism at Panmunjom just a few weeks ago.

If I thought for a moment that there was any merit in Mr. Stainback's personal opinion, I would not be an advocate of statehood for Hawaii, nor would the thousands of other patriotic Americans who have been working hard and long to achieve this goal.

Mr. Stainback served as Governor of Hawaii from 1942 to 1951. He himself acknowledged that he was unaware of a Communist movement in Hawaii until so apprised by Gen. John E. Hull in 1947. Prior thereto he had unwittingly advanced Communists in public office and thereafter he vigorously opposed Communists and communism.

It does not appear from his testimony what steps he took, if any, to keep informed about the Communist movement after he ceased to be Governor. The facts elicited from him all relate to periods prior to the time he appeared before the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs in 1950 to state that Hawaii should then be granted immediate statehood and that communism was no bar to this achievement. His present change of heart is not explained by anything that has happened since 1950 with relation to the Communist movement in Hawaii.

The focus of Communist activities in Hawaii is the International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union, with headquarters in San Francisco. We have learned that the effective leaders of this union are Communists or Communist sympathizers, beginning with its head, Harry Bridges, of California, and his appointed regional director in Hawaii, John Wayne Hall, originally of Wisconsin. After many years of effort, the United States Government has not yet succeeded in restraining the activities of Bridges, and Hall is still free to represent his union in collective bargaining under Federal law, despite his conviction of a violation of the Smith Act in 1953. The ILWU is still strong on the west coast, where it was first formed, although its Communist domination has been exposed and although it was expelled from the CIO as a Communist-dominated union in 1951.

On the other hand, the overwhelming majority of the members of the ILWU are loyal to the United States, and there are identified Communist or Communist sympathizers in Hawaii not openly connected with the ILWU. We must also bear in mind that the ILWU is a labor union which has qualified under the provisions of the National Labor Relations Act. Not all of its activities can be dismissed as solely of significance in the Communist movement, and we should not fall into the error of opposing a worthy objective because some Communist has expressed approval of it. The Communist technique of endorsing worthy causes which are likely to be achieved and popular candidates who are likely to be elected is now familiar to everyone.

The usual argument advanced against statehood from the fact of the existence of the ILWU in our midst is that this union controls or can control the economic and political life of Hawaii and would or could therefore turn Hawaii into a Communist-dominated State. The waterfront strike of 1949 and its aftermath, which is generally pointed to as evidence of this argument, in fact proves just the opposite.

On May 1, 1949, the ILWU stevedores went on strike after the long attempt at collective bargaining had failed to result in a contract between the ILWU and local stevedoring companies as to wages and conditions of employment on the waterfront in Hawaii. The commercial ports of Hawaii were effectively sealed. Dependent as we are on seaborne commerce for our existence, the people of Hawaii faced a very serious situation and ultimately there was a very substantial loss to the entire community. Many small businesses were forced into liquidation. Feelings ran high. The strike lasted until October 25, 1949, when the parties directly involved finally reached an agreement with the help of the Federal Conciliation Service of the United States Department of Labor.

Mr. Stainback was Governor at the time. He acted with dispatch in appointing a factfinding committee. The recommendations of the factfinding committee were accepted by the employers and rejected by the union. Thereafter public opinion steadily increased against the union. The final settlement was practically on the basis recommended by the factfinding committee.

As the strike continued, an effort was made to invoke the injunctive procedures of the

Taft-Hartley Act. President Truman did not believe that the situation in Hawaii was encompassed by this act.

An attempt was made to enact special legislation of a national character to meet this problem. Hearings were held before the United States Senate Committee on Labor, but no appropriate legislation could be agreed upon.

In July of 1949, at the request of the holdover committee of our local legislature, Mr. Stainback called a special session of the Hawaiian Legislature. The legislature first urged the employers and the union to reach an agreement. When this failed, the legislature passed a series of acts designed to place the Territorial government in the stevedoring business and to prevent future prolonged waterfront tieups. These acts were vigorously opposed by the ILWU leadership. The employers involved also objected to what they called government interference. Yet in the Senate there was only 1 dissenting vote on 1 of these acts out of 15 members (9 Republicans, 6 Democrats), and in the House there were from 1 to 6 dissenting votes out of 30 members (20 Republicans, 10 Democrats).

These laws were put into effect immediately and resulted in substantial relief to the public.

After this special session it was predicted by some that those legislators who had voted for these acts would be defeated by the ILWU at the next election. The results of the 1950 and 1952 elections did not bear out this prediction. All of those who had taken the lead in the passage of the acts mentioned, both Republicans and Democrats and on all islands were reelected and have since been again reelected.

Earlier in 1950 many of these same legislators and others who had taken a lead in opposing the ILWU position in the stevedoring strike were elected to the State Constitutional Convention. ILWU-supported candidates who sought election to this convention were mostly unsuccessful. Only two ILWU officials were elected. One refused to testify before the House Committee on Un-American Activities which held hearings in Hawaii during the session of the constitutional convention. He was expelled by the convention for this refusal, the other ILWU official being on the committee that unanimously recommended his expulsion.

At the 1950 general elections the constitution framed by this convention was ratified by the people by a vote of more than 3 to 1, although the ILWU opposed the ratification.

The attention given to the ILWU must not blind us to the fact that we also have a strong American Federation of Labor organization in Hawaii which claims 12,000 to 15,000 members and which is vigorously anti-Communist. There are also several independent unions, one of which was formed by a group who left the ILWU because of the ILWU leadership's Communist bent.

The people of Hawaii have done as much as if not more than any other community to expose and combat communism.

In 1941 the Territorial legislature enacted a law requiring a loyalty oath of all Government officers and employees. This law was amended to conform to decisions by the United States Supreme Court as to the permissible scope and effect of such laws and is a permanent part of our statutory law today.

With regard to Government employees, the case of John E. Reinecke in 1948 highlighted the desirability for a loyalty program. Reinecke was a teacher in the public-school system in Hawaii. Upon information being made available that he was a Communist, he was formally charged with a failure to possess the ideals of democracy as required of teachers by Territorial law, and dismissed for that reason after an extended hearing before the Territorial Commissioners of Public Instruction. The present attorney general of Hawaii was chairman of that commission during those hearings.

Because of the difficulty in obtaining usable information from Federal sources, the legislature in 1949 established the Hawaiian Subversive Activities Commission with investigatory powers. This commission has filed two reports on communism in Hawaii, one in 1951 and the latest in 1953, making available for public use all available information on the subject.

The commission is continuously investigating all forms of subversive activity and has been instrumental in advising cognizant authorities of the planned entry of known Communists or Communist sympathizers from the mainland.

On October 4, 1949, the legislature formally petitioned the House Committee on Un-American Activities to hold hearings in Hawaii. This was done in April of 1950, at which time an excellent job of exposing Communist personalities was accomplished. Of the witnesses subpenaed by the committee, 39 refused to testify. One was at the time a delegate to the constitutional convention and, as previously stated, he was expelled from the convention for his refusal. Another delegate to this convention testified as a friendly witness that he had been a member of the Communist Party, but had severed his connection with the Communist Party when he learned that it was not simply a labor party, but was an organization inimical to the United States. After his testimony he voluntarily resigned from the convention to save his fellow delegates embarrassment.

The convention adopted as a proposed part of the constitution for the State of Hawaii, ratified by the people later that year, a provision that reads:

"No person who advocates, or who aids or belongs to any party, organization, or association which advocates, the overthrow by force or violence of the government of this State or of the United States shall be qualified to hold any public office or employment."

Such a provision is unique in the United States.

In 1951 the legislature created a Territorial Loyalty Board with authority to prescribe a personal history statement of all Government officers and employees and to hear cases involving the loyalty of any such persons. To date the Board has not had a single case requiring a loyalty hearing.

In June of 1953, 7 persons including John Wayne Hall were convicted by a Hawaiian jury of violating the Smith Act. All defendants are now out on bail pending the disposition of appeals.

Aside from legislative, judicial and executive action, there have been numerous spontaneous expressions of disapproval of Communism by the people of Hawaii. In 1949 the Hawaii Residents' Association (popularly known as IMUA) was formed to educate the public to the Communist menace, expose Communist personalities, and teach Americanism. This voluntary eleemosynary association has grown in strength over the years. It is now well financed, has a large membership, publishes a weekly newspaper, and produces a radio program which is put on nightly except for weekends.

The Hawaii Bar Association adopted a resolution along the lines proposed by the American Bar Association declaring that membership in the Communist Party was inconsistent with the duties and responsibilities of a licensed attorney and ground for expulsion from the association. The Supreme Court of Hawaii requires an affidavit of all applicants for admission to the bar of Hawaii, relating to the loyalty of the applicants. Failure to satisfy the supreme court in this regard is grounds for denial of admission or for disbarment thereafter.

In 1950 at the local Democratic Party convention, a few of the "reluctant 39" appeared on the floor as precinct delegates. A considerable number of the delegates to the convention was incensed at the appearance of these people and staged a "walkout" which precipitated a strong drive to purge these individuals from the Democratic Party. In the 1952 local Democratic Party convention, the anti-Communists controlled the convention. The responsible leaders of our local Democratic Party have continued since then to guard against the infiltration of the Democratic Party leadership and have succeeded in preventing any further inroads into their ranks. The local Democratic Party even has a loyalty program of its own for this purpose.

The best estimate of the Communist movement in Hawaii is that it reached the peak of its strength in 1946–47 and has subsequently continuously lost ground until today it is not an effective force in the community. The exposure of the meaning of communism and the identification of Communist personalities have had their effect in Hawaii as in the rest of the United States in bringing this alien philosophy and its exponents into disfavor.

Like most good Americans, the people of Hawaii are perhaps a little ahead of their officials in a proper appreciation of the Communist menace.

The future of our country if not of the whole world belongs to the optimists and not to the pessimists. Every past dire prediction questioning future developments in Hawaii has in the event proven to have been false. The fear of Communist influence as an excuse for delaying statehood for Hawaii is not supported by the facts, and is widely interpreted as only a rationalization for some other grounds of opposition.

There is no doubt in my mind that Hawaii as a State would continue to live up to the highest tradition of patriotism and loyalty to the United States and firm opposition to communism.

Mr. Oren E. Long, a Democrat, who succeeded Mr. Stainback as Governor of Hawaii and who was my immediate predecessor in this office, has read this letter and authorized me to say that it is in general agreement with the testimony which he gave before your committee in April of 1953.

With highest personal regards, I am,

Sincerely,

SAMUEL WILDER KING,
Governor of Hawaii.

PROVISION FOR ORDERLY USE, IMPROVEMENT, AND DEVELOPMENT OF NATIONAL FORESTS AND OTHER LANDS

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside, and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar 1045, Senate bill 2548.

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

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 2548) to facilitate the administration of the national forests and other lands under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of Agriculture; to provide for the orderly use, improvement, and development thereof; to stabilize the livestock industry dependent thereon; and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry with amendments.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

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

Aiken	Gillette	Mansfield
Barrett	Goldwater	Martin
Beall	Gore	Maybank
Bennett	Griswold	McClellan
Bricker	Hayden	Millikin
Burke	Hendrickson	Mundt
Bush	Hill	Murray
Butler, Md.	Hoey	Neely
Butler, Nebr.	Holland	Pastore
Byrd	Humphrey	Payne
Capehart	Hunt	Potter
Carlson	Ives	Purtell
Case	Jackson	Robertson
Chavez	Jenner	Russell
Clements	Johnson, Colo.	Saltonstall
Cooper	Johnson, Tex.	Schoeppel
Cordon	Johnston, S. C.	Smith, Maine
Daniel	Kefauver	Smith, N. J.
Dirksen	Kerr	Sparkman
Douglas	Kilgore	Stennis
Duff	Knowland	Symington
Dworshak	Kuchel	Thye
Ellender	Langer	Upton
Ferguson	Lehman	Watkins
Frear	Lennon	Williams
Fulbright	Long	Young
George	Malone	

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY], and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] is absent by leave of the Senate, attending the sessions of the 10th Inter-American Conference at Caracas, Venezuela, as a congressional adviser on the United States delegation.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] is absent by leave of the Senate, attending the sessions of the 10th Inter-American Conference at Caracas, Venezuela, as a congressional adviser on the United States delegation.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS] is absent on official business as a member of a subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

ESTABLISHMENT OF A UNITED STATES AIR FORCE ACADEMY

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I have discussed the situation with the minority leader, and, because of some appointments of the distinguised Senator from Massachusetts, the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services [Mr. SALTONSTALL], and after consultation with the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar 1043, House bill 5337, providing for the establishment of an Air Force Academy.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I should like to make an inquiry of the majority leader. How long does the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services contemplate the consideration of the bill will take? I ask the question for the reason that some of the Members on this side of the aisle are especially interested in the subject. I want to go along with the majority leader and the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, if the Senators to whom the minority leader refers have not come into the Chamber before the Senator from Massachusetts has completed his statement, and if there are no other remarks on the bill, I shall suggest the absence of a quorum so that a vote will not be taken until those Senators arrive.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Clerk will state the bill by title.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 5337) to provide for the establishment of a United States Air Force Academy, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 5337) to provide for the establishment of a United States Air Force Academy, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Armed Services with amendments, on page 1, after line 9, to strike out:

SEC. 3 (a) The Academy shall be located at such place within the United States as the Secretary of the Air Force shall determine. The Secretary of the Air Force is authorized to establish a commission, and to appoint the members thereof, to advise him in connection with the selection of a permanent location for the academy.

And in lieu thereof to insert:

SEC. 3. (a) The Secretary of the Air Force shall determine the location of the academy within the United States in the following manner:

(1) The Secretary of the Air Force shall establish immediately a commission, and appoint five members thereof, to advise him in connection with the selection of a permanent location for the academy. The commission shall make its report to the Secretary as soon as practicable, and in no event later than 45 days from the date of its establishment.

(2) The Secretary shall accept the unanimous decision for a permanent location by such commission. In the event such recommendation is not unanimous, the commission by a majority vote shall submit to the Secretary three sites from which the Secretary shall select one as the permanent location. Within 15 days after the selection, the Secretary shall submit a written report to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives, setting forth the reasons for his selection.

On page 4, line 1, after "SEC. 5." to strike out "(a)"; after line 12, to strike out:

(b) To permit an orderly increase in the number of Air Force cadets during the period ending not more than 6 years after the entrance of the initial class at the Academy, the Secretary of the Air Force may limit the number to be appointed during that period by providing for a competitive examination to be held annually in each State, each Territory, and Puerto Rico among those persons nominated to the Academy by Senators, Representatives in Congress, Delegates from the Territories, and the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico. During the above prescribed period, the number of vacancies allocated to each State, each Territory, and Puerto Rico, shall be proportional to the representation in Congress from that State or Territory or Puerto Rico. Appointments from each State, each Territory, and Puerto Rico shall be made from among qualified candidates in the order of merit established by the examinations. During the same period the vacancies allocated to other sources shall be filled from among qualified candidates in each category in order of merit established by similar competitive examinations and shall not exceed 15 per centum of the total number of appointments authorized.

And in lieu thereof to insert:

SEC. 6. To permit an orderly increase in the number of Air Force cadets during the period ending not more than 4 years after the entrance of the initial class at the Academy, the Secretary of the Air Force may limit the number to be appointed each year during that period in the following manner:

(a) A competitive examination shall be held annually among those persons nominated to the Academy by Senators and Representatives, and the number of vacancies allocated to each State shall be proportional to the representation in Congress from that State. Appointments from each State shall be made from among qualified candidates nominated from that State in the order of merit established by the examinations.

(b) Vacancies allocated to other sources shall be filled from among qualified candidates in each category in order of merit established by similar competitive examinations and shall not exceed 15 per centum of the total number of appointment authorized.

On page 6, line 3, after "SEC." to strike out "6" and insert "7"; after line 7, to insert:

SEC. 8. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, each cadet at the United States Military Academy and the United States Air Force Academy and each midshipman at the United States Naval Academy shall, prior to his graduation from such Academy, be afforded an opportunity to state a preference for appointment as a commissioned officer of the United States Army, the United States Navy, the United States Air Force, or the United States Marine Corps, upon his graduation, and, with the consent of the Secretary of the military department having jurisdiction over the Armed Force in which he prefers appointment, shall, upon his graduation, be accepted for appointment therein, except that not more than 12½ percent of the members of any graduating class of any such Academy shall be appointed as commissioned officer in Armed Forces other than the one administering such Academy. For the purpose of the foregoing limitation, graduates of the United States Naval Academy appointed as commissioned officers in the United States Marine Corps shall not be considered as having been commissioned in Armed Forces other than the United States Navy.

(b) The Secretary of Defense shall by regulation provide for the equitable and fair distribution of appointments made pursuant to this section in the event that more than 12½ percent of a graduating class of any

academy referred to herein expresses a preference to be so appointed.

(c) The provisions of this section shall take effect (1) in the year in which the first class of the United States Air Force Academy graduates, or (2) upon the rescission of the present agreement under which graduates of the United States Military and Naval Academies may volunteer for appointment in the United States Air Force, whichever is earlier.

One page 7, after line 14, to strike out:

SEC. 7. There is authorized to be appropriated, to remain available until expended when so specified in the appropriation act concerned, not to exceed $26 million for the purpose of this act. Of this amount not to exceed $1 million may be utilized for the purpose of section 4 of this act.

And in lieu thereof to insert:

SEC. 9. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated not to exceed the sum of $126 million to carry out the provisions of this act, of which not to exceed $26 million shall be appropriated for any period beginning prior to January 1, 1955. Of the amount so appropriated for any such period, not exceeding $1 million may be utilized for the purpose of section 4 of this act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, there is before the Senate, House bill 5337, providing for the establishment of a United States Air Force Academy. The bill is substantially in the same form as it passed the House, with the exception of a number of amendments which the committee felt would strengthen the bill.

The bill received careful consideration by the Committee on Armed Services. The committee realized, on the one hand, that in authorizing a third military academy this bill would be historic legislation. In 1802 Congress enacted legislation establishing the United States Military Academy at West Point, and in 1845 Congress passed legislation establishing the Naval Academy at Annapolis. Now, it is proposed to establish an Air Force Academy. The need for such an academy has been thoroughly examined, since this institution will cost a considerable amount of money.

The committee was convinced that the Air Force Academy must be established for the basic reason that none of the military services are receiving a sufficient number of Academy-trained regular air officers. At the present time the Military and Naval Academies share their output under an agreement which permits up to 25 percent of each graduating class to volunteer for commissions in the Air Force.

The Army has an annual requirement of 650 Academy graduates.

I might interpolate to say that the armed services prefer to have 50 percent of their officers come from the Military and Naval Academies and 50 percent from the ROTC of the various universities. So when I say the Army has an annual requirement of 650 Academy graduates, it means there are approximately 1,300 new Regular Army lieutenants each year.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE. In line with what the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts, chairman of the Committee on Armed Services has just said, is it not also true that the Air Force feels the need of offering to young men who wish to enter the Air Force an opportunity for career training, so as to create for the Air Force the same traditions and the same career psychology which exist at West Point for the Army and at Annapolis for the Navy?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. What the Senator from South Dakota says is absolutely correct. I shall touch on that in a moment.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. THYE. Does the bill provide that the students who will be admitted to the Air Force Academy will come only from the Naval Academy or the Military Academy as advance or graduate students?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Oh, no.

Mr. THYE. Will they be selected by Members of Congress in the same manner as candidates for the Naval Academy and the Military Academy are now selected?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is correct, after the first 4 years. I shall cover that in my statement, if the Senator will permit me to continue.

Mr. THYE. I thought I detected, from the Senator's statement, a difference in the procedure of selecting candidates for the Air Force Academy. That was what prompted me to make the inquiry.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. No. I am sorry if the Senator received that impression. The procedure will be exactly the same, after the first 4 years, when the Academy personnel is built up.

The Army has an annual requirement of 650 Academy graduates, but because of the sharing arrangement is receiving only about 400; the Navy requires about 800, but is receiving only 600 annually; the Air Force needs about 600 Academy graduates annually, but is receiving from the two military academies only 350 a year. Unless the output of Academy-trained officers is enlarged, the officer personnel structure of the services will be increasingly weakened in the years to come.

The Department of Defense urged a separate Air Force Academy rather than an expansion of existing Academy facilities because of the following reasons:

First. In terms of expense, the cost of building a separate Air Force Academy would be no greater than expanding the existing facilities at Annapolis and West Point.

Second. Each service should have the opportunity for developing in each cadet at the beginning of his military education a tradition and esprit for the service in which he expects to serve; and

Third. Each service has requirements for special training which necessitate separate Academies.

In addition to the committee hearings there is before each Senator, Senate Report No. 1041, which explains in detail the provisions of H. R. 5337, as amended. I shall now summarize the basic features of the bill.

First, as to the permanent site, the bill provides for both a permanent and a temporary site for the Air Force Academy. The temporary site, as I shall explain later, will be at some existing Air Force base, to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force, and will be used for only about 2 years, until construction of the permanent site will permit the Academy to transfer to the permanent location.

With respect to the permanent site, the committee amended section 3 (a) of the bill in order to clarify the role of the Commission which the Secretary of the Air Force is required to appoint in connection with advising him on the permanent location of the Academy. As amended, the bill provides that the permanent site shall be located in the United States and shall be determined in the following manner:

The Secretary of the Air Force must appoint a five-member commission to advise him on the permanent location of the Academy. The commission is required to make its report in no later than 45 days after the date of its establishment. If the recommendation of the Commission is unanimous, the Secretary must accept it. If the Commission does not make a unanimous recommendation, the bill provides that the Commission by majority vote shall submit 3 sites to the Secretary, and that the Secretary shall select 1 of the 3 as the permanent site. Within 15 days after the Secretary selects 1 of the 3 recommended sites of the Commission, he is required to submit a written report to the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives setting forth the reasons for his selection. No report is required in the event of a unanimous recommendation by the Commission.

After the permanent site has been determined, the Secretary of the Air Force is authorized to acquire the necessary land from other Government agencies without cost and with the consent of those agencies. The Secretary is also authorized to purchase the necessary land or receive it by donation. It is also important to point out that the Secretary would not be required to consult with the Congress prior to the selection of the permanent site, since section 3 (b) (2) permits the Secretary to acquire the necessary land without coming into prior agreement with the Senate and House Committees on Armed Services, as required under existing law where the cost is estimated to be in excess of $25,000.

The bill also contains the necessary planning and construction authority.

Second, the temporary site.

In order to permit the Academy to begin operating as soon as possible, section 4 of the bill authorizes the Secretary of the Air Force to erect at some existing Air Force base, as a temporary site, the necessary temporary buildings and facilities.

It should be noted that section 9 of the bill limits the amount of money which can be spent at the temporary site to $1 million.

In other words, only $1 million can be spent on any present site to make it into a temporary Academy site.

The Air Force plans to enter the first class at the temporary site in June 1955, if this bill is passed and the necessary appropriations are made.

In order to provide for the basic provisions of law which will govern the Academy, section 5 of the bill provides that all appropriate provisions of law which now pertain to the United States Military Academy will apply to the Air Force Academy except where those laws are inconsistent with this bill itself. The Air Force intends to comply substantially with all the existing Academy laws except for the provisions relating to organizational and professorial titles, and except for certain provisions which are archaic and are no longer followed by the Military Academy.

Section 6 of the bill provides an explicit exception to the present West Point laws by providing that for not more than 4 years after the entrance of the initial Air Force Academy class, a different system of appointments may prevail from that now existing at the Military Academy. This section, in effect, allots not less than 85 percent of the Air Force cadet vacancies to the 48 States based upon the proportional representation in Congress of each State. The vacancies would be filled as a result of competitive examinations held for the candidates of each State. Only candidates from a particular State will compete for the vacancies allotted to that State. The bill places no limit on the number of nominations for the examinations which each Member of Congress can make. With respect to the Military Academy, however, Members of Congress by custom do not nominate at any one time for each vacancy more than 1 principal and 3 alternates. The Air Force is hopeful that each Member of Congress will make at least 4, but no more than 10, nominations for each Air Academy vacancy. Section 6 was amended in order to clarify the intent of the section, and amounts to a technical amendment.

Next I shall discuss the right of a percentage of the graduates of all academies to volunteer for another military service. I may say that this is new. It is a recommendation on the part of the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], and has been before the committee for a number of years. As one member of the committee, and as its present chairman, I heartily agree with what the amendment proposes to do. The amendment has previously been agreed to in principle by the Senate, but has not been accepted by the House.

Section 8, an amendment, relates to the right of a percentage of the graduates of all academies to volunteer for another military service. At the present time an agreement exists between the military departments which permits up to 25 percent of the graduates of the Military and Naval Academies to volunteer to be commissioned in the Air Force. Testimony before the committee indicated that this arrangement is expected to continue until the year of the first graduating class of the Air Force Academy.

Section 8 would go into effect the year of the first graduating class of the Air Force Academy, or whenever the existing agreement is rescinded, whichever is earlier. This amendment provides that graduates of all the academies will be permitted to state a preference of the four military services—Army, Navy, Air Force, or Marine Corps—in which they desire to be commissioned, and with the consent of the Secretary of the service in which the graduate desires to be commissioned, a number up to 12½ percent of each graduating class will be commissioned in military departments other than the one administering the particular academy.

This section also contains language which excludes the Naval Academy graduates who volunteer for a commission in the Marine Corps from being counted as a part of the 12½ percent. The committee felt that transfers between the Naval Academy and the Marine Corps were in effect internal transfers. Both the Navy and the Marine Corps are under the Secretary of the Navy, and there has been a long and close association between these two organizations. Except for the period between 1890 and 1901, the Naval Academy since 1881 has permitted a limited portion of its graduates to volunteer and be commissioned in the Marine Corps.

AUTHORIZATION FOR APPROPRIATIONS

The authorization for appropriations is contained in section 9 of the bill. As amended, section 9 provides for authorization not to exceed $126 million, of which not to exceed $26 million shall be appropriated for any period beginning prior to January 1, 1955. Of the amount appropriated, not more than $1 million may be utilized for the purpose of establishing a temporary site.

Mr. President, I might say that the top limit of the original appropriation requested was $146 million, and the committee voted to make the top limit $126 million instead of $146 million without serious objection on the part of the Air Force, the theory being that, for the plans, and the purpose of land, equipment, and buildings, the ultimate cost would be no more than $126 million, rather than $146 million.

The committee had two aims in amending this section, first, to establish a total authorization for the Academy in order that Congress would fix in some degree a ceiling on the ultimate cost of the Air Force Academy; and, second, to authorize an immediate appropriation which would enable construction on the Academy to begin as soon as possible.

The Air Force should adapt its construction plans so as not to exceed the $126 million authorization. If the Air Force finds that the Academy cannot be constructed within the authorization, it can request and seek to justify an additional authorization at a later date. It should be emphasized at the same time that the authorization is intended to be a ceiling and not a floor. The total authorization need not be appropriated if at a later date it is found that a lesser amount is sufficient for the Academy construction.

The Air Force schedule calls for completion of the Academy in 5 years after the commencement of construction.

Mr. President, that is a brief explanation of the bill as amended by the committee. I hope it will be passed by the Senate.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, I should like to ask the distinguished chairman of the committee a question.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. HUNT. Referring to the first page of the report, subdivision (2) of section 3, about halfway down in the particular paragraph, reads as follows:

> Within 15 days after the selection, the Secretary shall submit a written report to the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives, setting forth the reasons for his selection.

Is there to be read into that language the idea that the Secretary is not to make his selections known until he has advised the Armed Services Committees of the Senate and the House?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I may say to my colleague on the committee that that is not my understanding. The theory is that the Air Force Secretary shall choose five members of a commission to advise him with reference to the site. If those five agree unanimously, the Secretary must follow their unanimous choice. If they cannot agree unanimously, they shall, by majority vote, select the top three sites. The Secretary must then decide on one of those three sites, then give to the two Armed Services Committees of Congress his reasons for selecting it. That is to say, he will have to justify his selection of one of the three sites.

I assume it was thought that if the committees felt he was wrong in his selection, they could take some action about it; but the Secretary's report would be for our information.

Mr. HUNT. We do not anticipate that the Secretary will go wrong in making the selection, although, as the distinguished chairman knows, I have opposed giving to the Secretary the authority to make the selection. Basically, I think it would be a mistake to give him such authority. I did not quite understand what useful purpose would be served by having the Secretary come to the committees of Congress after he had announced the selection, and tell them about it. However, the explanation of the Senator seems quite ample to justify the provision.

Mr. President, I have one or two more questions. On page 9 of the report, under section 6, the following language appears:

> This section, as amended, provides for a special system for appointments for not more than 4 years after the entrance of the initial Academy class.

It would, then, be 5 years before recommendations would be started to be made by the Congress, would it?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. No; I would not say that statement is strictly correct. The committee changed the time from 6 to 4 years, as my colleague will remember, and for the first 4 years, in order to build up the Academy, a proportion-

ate number will be appointed from each State to each class in the Academy. It will take 4 years to get the full complement of appointments. Those men will be taken from the top of the list. In other words, if the Senator from Wyoming submits 10 names and the Representative from Wyoming submits 10, and 4 of the 10 names submitted by the Senator from Wyoming received the top grade, those 4 men will be chosen from Wyoming. I am assuming that the number would be 4. It may be 2, or any other number. Then after the first 4 years, the same principle which applies to appointments to the Naval and Military Academies at the present time would be followed. If the Senator from Wyoming had one vacancy to fill, he would submit one principal and three alternates.

Mr. HUNT. I appreciate the explanation of the chairman of the committee, but I believe I have to disagree with his statement that the time will be 4 years. From the wording of the report, I am constrained to think it will be 5 years. I shall read the wording:

> This section, as amended, provides for a special system for appointments for not more than 4 years after the entrance of the initial Academy class.

It would seem to me it would be 5 years before appointments would be made by Members of Congress.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The fifth class will be recommended in the ordinary way, if I have not made it clear.

Mr. HUNT. That would mean the time would be 5 years. That was my point.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is my understanding.

Mr. HUNT. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota. Then I should like to ask another question.

Mr. THYE. Did I understand correctly that a Member of the House could make recommendations and a Senator could submit recommendations, and that of the number of recommendations submitted, whether 4, 10, or 16, only four could be selected; and of those four applicants, selections could be made of four which were solely recommended by either the Senator or the Member of the House? Did I correctly understand the explanation made by the chairman of the committee?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Let us take the case of Minnesota——

Mr. THYE. Let us take Massachusetts, so that I may not be involved in the discussion.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Very well. Massachusetts has 14 Representatives and 2 Senators. In the first year Massachusetts would receive eight appointments. In the second year Massachusetts would receive eight appointments.

Mr. THYE. The question I am asking is whether of the 8 appointments, all of them could be made upon the recommendations of 1 Senator. The Senator could recommend a sufficient number of applicants so that all eight appointments could be selected upon his recommendations?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is correct, provided those 8 applicants were the top 8 of those who took the examination.

Mr. THYE. In other words, the Academy will give an examination, and the Academy will grade the examination? Is that a correct understanding?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is correct. The Academy will give the examination, and the examination papers will be graded; and the top men from Massachusetts—to use Massachusetts as an example—will receive appointments.

Mr. THYE. All the top men from Massachusetts may have been nominated by the senior Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Or, let us say, by the minority leader of the House of Representatives, Representative McCORMACK.

Mr. THYE. It matters not as to that; but I understand that all the Representatives from a State and the 2 Senators from a State will be able to submit nominations, and then the Academy will conduct its own examination, and will select, in accordance with its own examination rating, the 4 men who will serve, from that State, in a particular class. Is that correct?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. There will be eight from Massachusetts. The number from Minnesota will be a little different.

Mr. THYE. Minnesota would not have as many, because Minnesota has a lesser number of Members of Congress.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is correct.

Mr. THYE. Nevertheless, Massachusetts is to be allowed eight; is that correct?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Yes.

Mr. THYE. Of the 8, all could be appointed on the recommendation of 1 Member of Congress—either 1 Representative or 1 Senator; is that correct?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is correct.

Mr. THYE. However, such a procedure is not followed in the case of appointments to the Military Academy, at West Point, or to the Naval Academy, at Annapolis; is it?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. No; neither will that system be followed in the case of the Air Force Academy, after the fifth year.

Mr. THYE. I cannot quite understand why this method is proposed to be followed in making the first selections from civilian student applicants.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The purpose is to build up the Academy. In the first year there will be only 1 class; in the second year, 2 classes; in the third year 3 classes; in the fourth year, 4 classes. In that way the Academy will be built up in what we believe to be the fairest way; the best possible men will be obtained, and there will be a proper geographical distribution or balance. For those reasons, this method has been proposed.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I still must say that I believe the purpose could have been achieved in a more equitable manner, by making certain that the appointees would come from nominations by a number of Members of Congress, rather than possibly by only one Member of Congress—for instance, a Member representing the State of Massachusetts. That is my impression in regard to this phase of the matter.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I myself asked the same question. I became convinced that the beginning should be made in the best possible way, so as to obtain the best possible men.

The Senator from Minnesota has inquired about an extreme case. It is not likely that the men nominated by any one Member of Congress would be the top men in grade and would be the ones to be appointed from any particular State. That is my opinion. The case cited by my colleague from Minnesota is, of course, an extreme one.

The method proposed has been suggested for the purpose of obtaining the best-qualified men, and at the same time to be fair from a geographical point of view, and also to be fair in accordance with the representation of the States in Congress.

Mr. THYE. The point of fairness from a geographical basis disturbs me, because the selection proposed is to be made specifically on the basis of qualification, as provided in an examination. I can very readily understand that a well-qualified man would be chosen if any one of the first four in the examination—either the principal or the first three alternates—were to be the one finally appointed. However, all four of them might be rejected.

Therefore, it seems to me there would be greater opportunity for a fair geographical representation if the selections were to be made from the men proposed or nominated by the Members of Congress.

If such a system were followed, I fully appreciate that in the case of any of the first four classes, the men nominated to attend the Academy from a State would be much greater in number than the ones who could actually be appointed.

However, I say there is danger that all the appointees from Massachusetts might come from the city of Boston, for the simple reason that in the case of the appointees from Massachusetts, the 10 highest in the examination would be taken. If the 10 highest were from Boston, and if all 10 had been nominated by one Massachusetts Member of Congress, then the other Members of Congress representing the State of Massachusetts would not have nominated any man who would attend the Academy during that period of time.

So, Mr. President, in considering the manner of selection, that question occurs to me.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. What the Senator from Minnesota suggests is a possibility, of course. However, both the Senate committee and the House committee were faced with the problem of obtaining the fairest method of making the original selections, in order to get the Academy started. We felt that if Minnesota, Wyoming, Colorado, and Massachusetts each were allowed its proportionate share, in proportion to its representation in Congress, then the method of selection throughout the Nation, on a geographical basis, would be fair.

Within each of the States, the effort would be made to obtain the best qualified men. That determination would be arrived at on the basis of tests.

In order to be fair and to carry out an arrangement upon which Congress has properly insisted for a great many years, we propose to return, after the first 4 years, to the method of having nominations made by individual Representatives and Senators.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, once more I should like to invite the attention of the distinguished chairman of the committee to section 6, which reads in part as follows:

(a) A competitive examination shall be held annually among those persons nominated to the Academy by Senators and Representatives, and the number of vacancies allotted to each State shall be proportional to the representation in Congress from that State.

Let me say to the distinguished chairman of the committee that we know that at present the examinations for admission to the existing Academies are held at post offices. For instance, we know that a boy from any part of a State has an opportunity to appear at his post office and take an examination for appointment either to West Point or to Annapolis.

Does the distinguished chairman of the committee think that in the bill we have spelled out sufficiently the method of giving the examinations? As I read the committee amendment on page 5, as proposed, the Air Force would be able to select in my State, let us say, the one city of Cheyenne, located in almost the southeastern corner of the State; and some Wyoming boys would have to travel 400 or 500 miles in order to reach that city. Or perhaps the examination for the entire area might be held in Denver. Such an arrangement would prevent many young men from taking the examination.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Let me call attention to the statement appearing at the bottom of page 10 of the report:

Examining facilities: The Air Force plans to establish approximately 32 examining stations in existing Air Force installations for the purpose of examining young men who have been nominated to take the examination. These sites, according to the Air Force, were carefully selected in order to make them geographically accessible to the greatest number of potential candidates.

Mr. HUNT. But that might preclude all cities in Wyoming except Cheyenne, which is located in the southeastern corner of the State; and, as a result, some Wyoming boys would have to travel 500 miles to get there.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Let me say somewhat facetiously that if they travel with the same agility the Senator from Wyoming travels, they would have no trouble.

Mr. HUNT. Without leaving this particular item entirely, let me say that I hope at the further meetings of our committee we shall discuss this particular point, because I believe that perhaps the Armed Services Committee should make some suggestion to the Air Force with reference to where the examinations should be held.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. As a member of the committee, and its present chairman, I shall be very happy to do that at any time the Senator from Wyoming suggests.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, now let me call attention to page 10 of the report, on which reference is made to the method of selection. I note that Mississippi is mentioned. Mississippi has a population of 2,178,914. I note that Mississippi is to be allocated 1.5 percent.

Further along in the same paragraph the statement is made that—

Each State will receive its correct percentage share.

My rapid arithmetic may be in error, but I am of the opinion——

Mr. SALTONSTALL. If I may interrupt, let me say that Mississippi will receive 4 appointments, or 1.5 percent of the 255 vacancies.

Mr. HUNT. But Mississippi has a population of 2,178,914, whereas my State of Wyoming has a population of 300,000. I wonder whether the distinguished chairman of the committee would object to an amendment to the effect that no State shall be deprived of at least one appointment each year.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I refer the Senator to the chart on page 41 of the hearings, which I shall be glad to show him if he does not have a copy before him. It is my understanding that every State will receive a certain number of appointments each year. Wyoming will get 1 the first year and 2 the second year. Nevada will get 1 the first year and 2 the second year. On the other hand, New York will get 21 the first year and 24 the second year. No State will be left out entirely.

Mr. HUNT. I thank the chairman. That clears up the point.

I should like to make one reference to the method upon which we have decided for selecting the men to enter the Academy. If I may have the attention of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], the committee gave a great deal of thought to the very best possible method of obtaining the best boys for the Air Force. We came to the conclusion that an examination, other than a written examination such as the boys we now appoint take, would be the best method of selection. Although in some instances the boy to receive the appointment might not be the one whom we would recommend, nevertheless, the result would be better qualified young men in the Academy. That was our thought in selecting the method which we chose.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the distinguished chairman of the committee yield for several questions?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator from Massachusetts has yielded the floor. He will be glad to try to answer any questions.

Mr. HOLLAND. The first question is this: Is there any geographic limitation or regulation with reference to the appointment of the Commission of five members?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. There is not.

Mr. HOLLAND. Does the committee have any assurance from the Secretary as to what geographic method, if any, he proposes to follow in naming the Commission members?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Secretary of the Air Force gave us the names of two members of the Commission whom he had already asked to serve. They are in the record. I shall be glad to furnish them to the Senator as they were given to the committee. Beyond that, as chairman of the committee, I asked the Secretary not to furnish any additional names unless members of the committee requested him to do so. He has appointed 4 members, and 1 other person is ready to be appointed if the bill becomes law.

Mr. HOLLAND. The chairman refers, I presume, to General Spaatz and General Harmon?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is correct.

Mr. HOLLAND. Is the Senator from Florida to understand that the membership of the Commission will come entirely from the commissioned personnel of the Air Force?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I distinctly do not so understand.

Mr. HOLLAND. What is the understanding of the distinguished chairman with reference to the distribution of the Commission members as between commissioned officers of the Air Force and civilians?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I cannot answer that question, because no member of the committee wanted the Air Force Secretary, Mr. Talbot, to tell us whom he intended to appoint. We felt that it would be better for him to appoint the best qualified men. We did not want to know who they were, because we felt that if we knew there might be an argument as to whether they were the best men or not. It is his responsibility to choose them. He should choose men whom he believes to be the best possible men to help him.

Mr. HOLLAND. If the Senator from Massachusetts will further yield, I am sure he is aware of the fact that the rumor has been widespread that the selection of the site upon which the academy is to be located has already been made. That rumor has been highly discouraging in some areas of the Nation, in connection with the making of applications, the drafting of brochures, and the submission of claims of those particular areas for consideration. I think the Congress and the general public are entitled to some assurance other than that which has been given, to the effect that there has been no choice, no tentative choice, and no closing of the door to any community in the Nation which feels that it is well qualified to serve as the host community for the Air Force Academy. Every such community should have an opportunity to make its case, with every chance to be heard fairly, and with every chance which is offered to every other community in the Nation.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I will say to my colleague from Florida that an hour and a half ago I telephoned the Secretary of the Air Force, Mr. Talbott. I talked with him personally. I told him that I had heard the rumor to which the Senator refers, and that I wanted him to give me a specific and categorical answer. He

said emphatically that no decision had been made, that he had not made up his mind on any site, and that every site stood the same chance. Let me correct that statement. He did not say exactly that. He said that no site had been selected in any manner, shape, or form. He was very emphatic.

Mr. HOLLAND. I presume the Senators from Florida are in no different situation from that of Senators from other States, in that there are communities within many States which are anxious to be considered. I think the long and satisfactory experience of the Air Force and the Navy air arm in our State indicates that at least there are very great flying advantages in our State which should be considered. The Senators from Florida have received communications not only from the State chamber of commerce but from 10 or 12 cities and areas in our State to the effect that it is understood that the selection has already been made, or has been made tentatively, so as to preclude full and fair consideration of applications from our State. Are we assured by the distinguished Senator, as chairman of his committee, based upon information received by him within the past hour and a half, as he has just stated, that there is no basis of fact whatever behind these rumors, and that each community in the Nation which has a claim to offer will have full and fair opportunity to be heard and have its claim considered?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That was the specific assurance given to me by the Secretary of the Air Force over the telephone an hour and a half ago.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield to me in order that I may further answer the question?

Mr. HOLLAND. I shall be glad to receive an answer from the distinguished Senator from Wyoming to any of my questions.

Mr. HUNT. Let me say to the distinguished Senator from Florida that when Secretary Talbott was asked that question in committee he stated that to a certain extent the area had been narrowed down to seven sites. However, later he stated that 300 sites were under study, and he assured us that every one of them would receive very careful study and consideration.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the distinguished Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I thank the Senator from Wyoming for his helpful remarks.

Mr. HOLLAND. I have one further question to ask. It is addressed to one of the details in the bill which I think is bound to create great confusion instead of giving great assistance in the selection of students for the first 4 years. Am I correct in my understanding that there will be no limit whatsoever upon the number of names submitted by each Senator and each Member of the House during those 4 years?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. There is no legal limit, but it is hoped that no Senator or Representative will submit less than 4 names or more than 10. As I have stated, there is no legal limit.

Mr. HOLLAND. What was the purpose of the distinguished committee in making that provision, which seems to me to be calculated to subserve political objectives by encouraging each Senator or Representative to simply send in his complete list of applicants, without in any sense doing the thing which I think is reasonable, that is, choosing from among them the ones who, from his observation and close knowledge of the situation in his State, would be considered best qualified for appointment?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I can only express my feeling on this subject. My own feeling is that what we want to do is to get the best possible men with whom to start the Air Force Academy. If the Air Force officers are willing to give the examinations in number, and if the boys are willing to go to the places where examinations are to be held, we should give everyone who wishes to take the chance the opportunity to get into the Air Force Academy. We should have the best possible men with whom to start the academy. We must realize that the physical examinations, mental examinations, and other examinations which enter into the selection of a flying officer are extremely stringent. I cannot give the Senator the exact proportion of boys who take such examinations who can be expected to pass, but the figure is very low. I think I can perhaps give the Senator an approximate idea.

Studies made by the Air Force indicate that only about 50 out of each 1,000 of the young male population of the United States at large could be expected to pass all of the examinations necessary to qualify as an Air Force cadet.

Mr. HOLLAND. I am sensible, of course, to the value of trying to select only the very best applicants possible. However, is there any difference in the objective in filling places in the Naval Academy and in the Military Academy from that followed in the case of the proposed Air Force Academy?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator from Florida asks me a very embarrassing question. I am confident he will agree with me that every Senator always chooses the best possible candidates from his State.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts. The Senator from Florida tries to follow that rule, and he believes his friend from Massachusetts does follow it. Furthermore, the Senator from Florida believes that both the Senator from Massachusetts and the Senator from Florida have been of assistance to those two great Academies; and the law applicable to those two Academies contemplates just that.

The Senator from Florida happens to be a former member of the Air Force, as the Senator from Massachusetts knows, and he feels that he would like to render just as much help and in the same measure to those who will establish the Air Academy as he attempts to do in selecting applicants whom he believes to be best equipped to meet the requirements, which are heavy, of the Military Academy and the Naval Academy.

The Senator from Florida does not understand the open invitation to send over all the names. The Senator from Florida had 70 applicants last year from his State. He does not believe that he would be rendering much service to any Academy to merely send over a long list of names.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. No; he can cut down the list to 10, which would help the Air Force to that extent.

Mr. HOLLAND. Yet the Senator from Massachusetts proposes to have written into the law a provision which lets every person within the State know that there is no limitation at all to the number of names which each Senator and each Representative can submit. Is that not correct?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is correct.

Mr. HOLLAND. What happens with reference to the other two service Academies is that every citizen of a State and every citizen of the Nation knows that there is a limitation, and that each Senator and each Representative can submit for each vacancy an original appointment, and a first, second, and third alternate, if they feel that many young men are well qualified for a particular vacancy. The Senator knows that to be correct, does he not?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is correct. However, I would say to my friend that recently, when I tried to fill a vacancy in the Naval Academy, and endeavored to find what I considered to be qualified men who had made marks above 70, I could not supply all the alternate places.

Mr. HOLLAND. I regret to hear that the Senator from Massachusetts was faced with that dilemma. We in Florida have not been faced with such a dilemma. We always have so many young men who make marks above 70 that it becomes a real duty and responsibility on our part to try to choose the young men who are best qualified from the many who apply and make a mark of 70 or better.

Mr. President, my distinguished colleague, the junior Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], is necessarily absent today on public business of very vital importance to our State and, I think, to the Nation.

In the informal division of duties between the two Senators from Florida, which is made as the occasion requires, this particular subject was given largely to the attention of the junior Senator from Florida, who had prepared an able address on the subject. I regret that he is not here, and I am sure he also regrets that he is not here. I wish I could bring to the Senate all of the information he has incorporated in his able address. The very least I can do is to ask unanimous consent to insert the address of my junior colleague at this point in the body of the RECORD, as a part of the debate on the pending measure.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR SMATHERS

The bill before the Senate today, H. R. 5337, 83d Congress, as amended, is a vital step in the preparedness program of this Nation.

Winston Churchill has said, "for good or ill, air mastery is the supreme expression of military power."

This profound observation is more true today than ever before for today airpower is vital to our military strength. It has

been said that airpower is, indeed, the key to our national survival.

The former Chief of Staff of the United States Air Force, Gen. Hoyt S. Vandenberg, once defined airpower as both a shield and a sword. As a shield, he said, it represents the most important single deterrent to an attack upon our country. As a sword, he saw airpower as a dagger poised to strike a swift counterblow at the vitals of any enemy so foolish as to launch an attack upon us.

We are all aware of the terrible impact of airpower in time of war. In World War II, the strategic campaign of the Allied air forces made a substantial contribution to our victory over the Axis. Japan surrendered without the necessity for a single Allied soldier's setting foot on her mainland home soil in the act of invasion, the first time in the history of warfare that a major power had so capitulated. Airpower, cooperating with our sea and landpower, made this possible and, in so doing, saved countless American lives which might have been lost had an invasion of the Japanese homeland been necessary.

Few will disagree that at the beginning of this second 50 years of powered flight airpower has become an indispensable segment of the hard core of any nation's strategic concept—the Soviets as well as our own.

Many persons view airpower in terms of numbers of aircraft, bases, and in terms of productive capacity. Too many of us are prone to stress the machine at the expense of the man.

Airpower is manpower as well as machine power. But a special kind of manpower is required. This manpower must be able to furnish leadership in the highly specialized skills which are fundamental to the existence of airpower.

The thoroughly trained air officer in this modern air age is as important to the concept of airpower as the aircraft which fly at transsonic speeds and where distance is measured in terms of hours rather than miles.

To date we have not faced this fact squarely. We have depended on patriotic motivation and chance to draw qualified men into the United States Air Force, to be trained for leadership.

During World War II the Air Force, then the Air Corps, expanded almost overnight from a small force of only 2,000 officers to the world's greatest air armada of approximately 400,000 officers. At that time young men of this country eagerly volunteered for the wild blue yonder. It is to be noted that these same battle-trained veterans, both Regular and Reserve, who constitute the backbone of our present Air Force, are not getting any younger. Unfortunately, the glamour of flying no longer has the same appeal to American youth that it did a decade ago. This creates a serious problem for the Air Force and the Nation. Recently, so few of our youth have volunteered for flight training it has been necessary for the Air Force to accept young men as flying cadets who possess only a high-school education. Since pilots from this source constitute one of the largest procurement sources, the Air Force has found it necessary to offer them regular commissions in ever-increasing numbers. While these are fine young men, for obvious reasons it would be far more desirable if the men who constitute the backbone of the Air Force—the Regular service—possess broader educational backgrounds.

To alleviate this serious deficiency it is imperative that we establish an Air Force Academy which will attract, train, and motivate outstanding young men for a lifetime of service as career officers in the Air Force.

West Point and Annapolis are so much a part of our Army and Navy that we would not consider being without them. These two academies, over the years, have amortized their investment many times over in leaders furnished to those services. The same should be true for the Air Force, for it has the same need for professional leadership as do the older services.

The great technological advances which have been made during the past few decades have brought about a degree of specialization heretofore unknown in the United States. Our educators recognizing this have patterned the academic courses at our leading universities to follow this trend, with the result that certain engineering schools now specialize in textile engineering, others in electrical engineering, others in petroleum engineering, etc. Schools in the other fields of education have likewise specialized in given fields.

The same degree of specialization is also to be found in our present-day Armed Forces with their ever-increasing complex weapons systems. The day is past when an officer can be expected to fill any position in the service. It is, therefore, no less essential that our officers be afforded the same degree of specialized training as are civilian counterparts.

This specialization is readily apparent when we consider that in World War II a crew of a B-17, of which we trained thousands in our great State of Florida, consisted of 10 officers and men. Today the crew of our new jet superbomber, the B-47, based at our great Air Force base, MacDill Field, in Tampa, Fla., consists solely of three officers, all being supertechnicians in their jobs. The need for these superspecialists is readily apparent when you realize that this crew of three fly a plane which is far larger, more costly, many times faster, and operate equipment far more complex than did their B-17 counterparts who outnumbered them 3 to 1.

I firmly believe that the need for an Air Force Academy where outstanding airminded young men will be molded into Air Force specialists was never more apparent than now.

I have heard the question asked as to why, in the spirit of unification, should we not have one academy for all three services, or why should not the present academies be Armed Forces academies rather than academies for the separate services. As I see it, the reason for this separation is fundamental.

The Army, Navy, including the Marine Corps, and Air Force have distinctive and specialized missions to perform within the Department of Defense. It is by the very nature of these special missions that our future officers must be specialists within their chosen field. Therefore, the amalgamation of the service academies would serve to give the future officers a broad staff concept of the Department of Defense as a whole, but would not train them to be specialists within a given field. There is only so much that a young man can learn at a civilian academic institution in a 4-year period. The same is true for our service academies. In this age of technological warfare it takes 4 years of intensive training to train a young man to be a specialist in the art of land, naval, or aerial warfare and, therefore, there simply is not the time to make him a specialist in all phases of the Armed Forces.

It must be remembered that upon graduation from one of the service academies these young men do not walk into high-level interservice staff jobs, but instead become platoon leaders, copilots, or are given similar type jobs that are assigned to brand-new second lieutenants or ensigns. It is only after years in the field working from the bottom up that these officers will possess sufficient seniority to be assigned to positions where they will deal with the other services on an interservice basis. At this point in an officer's career he is afforded the opportunity to go to one of the service command and staff schools with officers from all three services, where he will be indoctrinated with the latest concepts of interservice relationships.

The service Academies are more than just academic institutions. By their very nature, they are national monuments dedicated to serve the public and as such are under the public's constant surveillance. While I feel strongly on the question of the economic operation of our Federal Government, I believe in this instance it would be false economy if the Air Force Academy were built of second-rate construction. We should see to it that an Air Force Academy is constructed which will be a credit to this great Nation. I feel that the authorization of $126 million contained in H. R. 5337, as amended, affords sufficient funds in this regard. Either we want an Air Force Academy or we do not. If we want it, let us see to it that we get the best and that it is constructed in the most economical manner.

On January 26, 1953, I introduced S. 647, 83d Congress, a bill to establish the United States Air Academy within the State of Florida.

In seeking to have Florida selected as the site for this Academy I felt that with the utmost sincerity I am offering to the United States of America the finest location within our boundaries.

In doing so I mean to cast no reflection upon any of the other 47 States, all of which have their distinctive characteristics and each of which, in some field or another, excels all of their other sister States. For instance, Florida will gracefully yield to California in the superior excellence of its great phenomena—the California giant redwood forests; Floridians would be the first to assert that it has no mountains to rival those of the great and magnificent Rockies of the Western States. Florida does not even claim to rival Vermont for her maple sirup nor Boston in the home State of the distinguished chairman of the Senate's Armed Services Committee for her baked beans.

But Florida is singularly blessed with the finest climate in the Nation and for the most consistent year-around weather which lends itself to regular, continual uninterrupted flying and flight instruction.

That Florida was so high on the lists of States for aviation activity during World War II, and that she is second among the States (and second only to a State several times larger in area) in the postwar military activities program, is no accident, or boondoggle. Florida achieved that high degree of continuous service because Florida has the most to offer.

Florida has the best weather in the Nation, but she also offers many other things—vast available land areas which are flat, or nonmountainous; an eager hospitality of all Florida's people as well as the State and local governments; an attractive year-around recreational program which contributes so much to morale.

Florida is close to the oil supplies; Florida raises and would have immediately at hand a year-round and widely diversified food supply; Florida offers all facilities including economical housing at a price few other States can match. In the training program, the peninsula offers the advantages of flight training either over land or water, or both.

Florida is anxious to be the host State to the Air Academy and I trust will be given genuine, earnest, and sincere consideration.

This is a vital asset to our national security. This is no issue in which should be involved any political "wheeling and dealing."

Inasmuch as section 3a of H. R. 5337 provides for the Secretary of the Air Force to determine the location of the Academy from a site or sites within the United States selected by a five-member Commission to be appointed by him, I hope that due consideration will be given by the Secretary of the Air Force and by this Commission to the State of Florida.

In conclusion, I think every effort should be made to get this bill and the necessary appropriations through the Congress this session in order that the Air Force may start construction of the Air Force Academy without further delay.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. BENNETT. I should like to address a question or two to the distinguished Chairman of the Committee on Armed Services. There are a number of communities in my State which, I assume, are not contained in the list of 300 communities I heard mentioned in the debate. Can the chairman inform the Senate, particularly the Senator from Utah, as to the possibilities existing from this point on by which additional communities may have their requests considered?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I am informed that the Air Force will issue a circular showing how application may be made.

Mr. BENNETT. Will such a circular be specific, with reference to information contained in it, showing how a community may determine pretty well in advance whether it can meet the basic requirements?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I can answer the Senator only by saying we hope so. The best thing for my colleague from Utah to do would be to apprise the Office of the Secretary of the Air Force of his interest and ask that some of the circulars be sent to him.

If the circulars do not contain all the information he desires he can get additional information. If he will come to the Committee on Armed Services we will try to help him get all the information he may desire.

Mr. BENNETT. There is one other question I should like to ask the distinguished chairman. It deals with the time pattern. Did I correctly understand the distinguished chairman to say that if the bill is passed and the Commission is appointed, from that point on there will be only 45 days in which the Commission can act?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is correct. As has been pointed out, a survey was made in the past. Approximately 300 sites are already on record, and a great deal of work has already been done for the Commission to consider when it is appointed. The Air Force is very anxious to get the academy started. That is why the 45-day limit was inserted.

Mr. BENNETT. Then, does the chairman of the committee advise his colleague from Utah that the representatives of the communities in Utah should get busy at once, without awaiting the appointment of the Commission?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. My advice is that they get busy at once, even before the bill is enacted. The House has already passed the bill and, while undoubtedly conferees will be appointed, I believe the bill will be enacted very shortly.

Mr. BENNETT. I was assuming that specifications would be issued. Apparently that is not contemplated.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. If my colleague from Utah will get in touch with Mr. Braswell of the Committee on Armed Services, he will receive every service the committee can render.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. Am I to understand from the statement made by the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts that the studies made by a commission which was appointed some years ago to consider the location of an air academy will be available to the new Commission when it is appointed?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is my understanding.

Mr. CARLSON. On that basis, will it be necessary for the various cities—and there are many in the State of Kansas, as well as in other States, which are interested—to submit additional information, or should they request that the earlier information, already available, be used by the new Commission?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I cannot answer that question authoritatively, but it seems to me it would be wise for such communities to look over their material and to submit up-to-date information. Of course the requirements have changed quite a good deal in the intervening time.

Mr. CARLSON. As the distinguished occupant of the chair [Mr. SCHOEPPEL] will agree, Kansas is the geographical center of the Nation, and has very fine flying weather and excellent terrain for aircraft. We have more good flying days a year than almost any other State in the Union. Moreover, our State has pioneered in the field of aviation.

For that reason I hope the Commission will give some thought to the location of the Academy in the State of Kansas. I might also mention the fact that Glenn Martin is a Kansas product; that Cessna is a Kansas product; that Walter Beech is a Kansas product. We had an aircraft factory in the State of Kansas in 1908, 5 years after the Wright brothers started flying. Therefore, I hope the Commission will give some consideration to the State of Kansas.

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

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I apprehend that the principal concern at this time is with respect to the location of the Academy. I believe I can assuage all concern and dissipate all rumors and resolve all questions if my friend from Massachusetts will agree to amend the bill by striking out the section creating a commission and providing, instead, that the new Air Academy shall be located in the State of Illinois, which is now the center of population of the United States.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I believe the Senator from Illinois is making a statement, not asking a question.

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Mr. President, I am tempted to ask the distinguished chairman of the committee, following the remarks of my good friend from Kansas, if he realizes that Kansas is not the center of the United States. I would also remind him of the fact that Glenn Martin established his factory in Nebraska instead of in Kansas, and that Charles Lindbergh received his first training in Lincoln, Nebr.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I thank the Senator from Nebraska.

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

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I am more concerned with the advisability of creating an Air Force Academy than I am with its location or the manner of filling vacancies. How does the creation of an Air Force Academy fit in with the spirit of unification of the three services?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. It fits in with the policy of getting the best militarily trained youngsters and giving them an opportunity to learn about the services and learn to become good officers. A good officer has to be intellectually trained in the humanities and be well trained in subjects relating to his particular branch of the service.

The Senator from Tennessee will recognize that a very fine amendment has been offered by the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], formerly chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, to the effect that 12½ percent of students can move from one service to another. The theory of the amendment is to permit a man trained in the Air Force Academy to become a good naval officer, or for a naval officer to become a good Air Force officer. The idea is to integrate them to that extent.

Mr. GORE. I am aware of the amendment, and I agree with the sentiment and purpose behind it, because I have felt for a long while that one of the divisive forces in our National Defense Establishment, one of the principal causes of interservice rivalry, is the antagonistic spirit developed in the academies. I wonder if it would not be more in the spirit of unification to consolidate the two academies we have rather than to create a third one?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I am confident my colleague from Tennessee has served on some of the committees appointed to visit the several academies. If he has not, I may say that if he will study the curriculum of the Naval Academy, as I have, and ask questions regarding it, as I have attempted to do, he will see that much of the training has to be in special subjects. If we combined all the subjects in one school, a man designated to serve in the Navy would not have the necessary basic training of a good naval officer, with all the knowledge of seamanship, gunnery, radar, and all the other subjects a good naval officer has to have, including higher mathematics and technical engineering skills which are necessary. An Air Force officer, in addition to his technical training, has to have a knowledge of English history, Greek history, and all the other branches of learning that go to make up an educated man. He must also specialize. When we say that 12½ percent can be transferred from one Academy to another——

Mr. GORE. It seems to me the Senator has made a rather persuasive argument against the establishment of a separate academy. True, these young men, whether they serve in the Air Force, the

Navy, or the Army, need to be trained in geometry, in English, in history, and many other subjects; but we do not need to have three separate academies in order to provide that kind of training. Of course, specialized training is needed for service in all branches, but it would seem to me to be far more practical to place these young men together so that they may acquire the spirit of national defense and a proper idea of the unification of the services, and then let them go into the fields of special training which their aptitudes may indicate.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Again, I can only reply by saying that, in addition to training in the humanities and in the other subjects which any educated man receive there are different technical subjects pertinent to each branch of the service which must be mastered. I invite attention to the fact that the young men in the Naval Academy must study the drafting of plans for ships, where to place the engines, the amount of power required, the size of propellers, and things of that technical nature. An Air Force student must learn about the shape of airplane wings, how a ship is propelled through the air with the least amount of resistance——

Mr. GORE. Under the terms of the bill, 12½ percent of the men who are trained to build a ship and how to navigate through difficult waters, may be going into the Air Force.

Why would it not be better to have one national defense academy in which these young men would receive their training in the humanities, and, during the course of their studies, their aptitude and their desires could be ascertained? Then, instead of training young men who want to go into the Air Force how to operate a submarine and how to draft the plans and specifications for ships, a better result would be brought about by concentrating on aerodynamic specifics.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. When the Senator asks that question he goes to the whole basic foundation of the educational system of the military. If it is desired to change the whole system and have preliminary general studies and then an advanced school in each of the three services, before a man can become an officer, that is one thing. What is done now is to give them special training in the various subjects for which they are qualified, so as to make them officers in the various services.

Mr. GORE. Under the terms of the pending bill, 37½ percent of them can change to services for which they have not been qualified or trained.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I may say to my friend from Tennessee that I should be delighted at some time to argue the question with him, if he is going to argue against an Air Force Academy for that reason. I shall be delighted to debate the question with him and shall try to get more information so as to be more convincing.

Mr. GORE. That would be an academic debate indeed, after the bill is passed. The time to discuss it is now.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is correct. We now have 2 Academies, and, if the idea of the Senator from Tennessee were adopted it would mean building up additional facilities in 1 place and then establishing advanced schools in another place. It is a very fundamental question. I think the system which the President and the present Secretary of Defense favor is a better system. There will be 3 football games instead of 2 football games. [Laughter.]

Mr. GORE. That is the strongest argument I have heard in favor of the bill.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I have given considerable thought to the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Tennessee. I was a member of the board of visitors to the Naval Academy. The Naval Academy is limited in the extent to which it can expand. I would say that we should take into consideration the hazard of something happening to the Academy from a national standpoint.

Therefore, I would be heartily in favor of establishing the Air Force Academy somewhere else in the Nation, geographically speaking, than either at West Point or at Annapolis.

Second, I think the flying aspects must be taken into consideration in connection with the location of the Air Force Academy. We could not hope to have at Annapolis or West Point the facilities which are necessary to accommodate an Air Force Academy, so I certainly would be opposed to expanding or increasing the size of the Academies either at West Point or at Annapolis.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I thank the Senator from Minnesota.

I now yield to the Senator from Florida, who has been seeking recognition.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I shall defer to the Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL], who has been called from the floor, so that he may propound a question.

Mr. DANIEL. I thank the Senator from Florida.

I came into the Chamber late, and did not hear the discussion on the question of the location of the Academy. The two Senators from Texas not having been on the floor, I merely wish to be certain that no location has as yet been decided upon. I did not hear completely the assurances of the Senator from Massachusetts, but I desire to be certain that I understood him correctly to say that the Secretary of the Air Force had told the Committee on Armed Services that no decision had as yet been made as to the location, or that no locations had been decided against. Is that correct?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator is correct. I may say to the Senator from Texas that within the past 2 hours I have talked personally with Secretary Talbott, who gave me every assurance that there had been no selection of and no decision as to a site.

Mr. DANIEL. I thank the Senator from Massachusetts.

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

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. First, I wish to agree with the position taken by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Armed Services in his colloquy with my friend, the distinguished Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE]. But there is one ground supporting the creation of an Air Force Academy which I think is completely and fundamentally important in the debate, and which I have not heard mentioned, namely, that young men, chosen and trained as they are now, to be pilots—and that seems to be the main thing people think about—do not necessarily have any familiarity at all with military law, military procedure, military administration, military discipline, or anything that constitutes the special understanding of the problems of the military operation.

I think the establishment of an academy for the Air Force is more necessary to afford a constant flow of officers who have such basic information and basic doctrine than for any other purpose.

It has been my feeling, throughout the years since the Air Force was established as a separate functioning body, that the greatest weakness of the Air Force has been in its administrative performance. I know that view is shared by many members of the Armed Services Committee and by many other Senators, and it seems to me that we would be making a great mistake if we thought of the matter in terms of mere development of pilots and other specialists, because the Air Force has now become our largest arm. It handles our most expensive equipment and facilities, and it must be able to function more efficiently from the administrative point of view, it seems to me, than has been the case up to this time.

I wish to ask the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Armed Services if he would be agreeable to the adoption of an amendment which would occur on page 5, line 22, and would follow immediately paragraph (a) of section 6, the amendment to be in these words:

> Each Senator and each Representative may submit not more than 10 nominations each year.

This would get away from the fact that under the system proposed in the bill the public would be advised that Senators and Representatives had no function at all that was selective, which probably would result in literally thousands of nominations being sent in by Members of Congress each year, many of them being of young men who, it was believed by Senators and Representatives, could not make good.

It seems to me that the inclusion of such a provision, which would be much more generous than the provisions with reference to the naval and military academies, would be of real assistance to the Air Force, and would enable each Member of Congress to face up to and to accept some part of the responsibility, which is heavy, in supplying good applicants, and in helping to eliminate those who, for one reason or another, were not so well qualified.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I have no objection. However, it has been pointed out to me that perhaps the Senator from

Florida would accomplish his objective more clearly if he would submit his amendment as follows:

On page 5, line 15, strike out down to and including the word "the", on line 18, and to insert "each Senator and Representative shall nominate not to exceed 10 persons, who shall be eligible to take a competitive examination which shall be held annually. The number of vacancies allocated to each State shall be proportional with the representation in Congress from that State."

If the distinguished Senator from Florida wishes to propose that amendment, I shall be glad to take it to conference. I think it helps rather than hurts the bill.

Mr. HOLLAND. I shall be glad to accept the substitute suggestion. I agree with the Senator from Massachusetts that it is a better statement of the objective I have in view, and I appreciate the willingness of the chairman to take the amendment to conference.

Mr. President, I move the adoption of the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GRISWOLD in the chair). Does the Senator ask unanimous consent for the adoption of the amendment?

Mr. HOLLAND. At the place in the bill where I had suggested the amendment, unanimous consent would not have been required, whereas the rewording of the amendment, which the Senator from Massachusetts has suggested, and which I think improves the carrying out of the objective sought, would require unanimous consent.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I believe that is the proper way to word the amendment. If there is objection by any Senator, it can be worded in another way.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the substitute amendment, as reworded by the chairman of the committee, may be agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 5, line 15, it is proposed to strike out down to and including the word "the" in line 18, and to insert, in lieu thereof, the following:

Each Senator and Representative shall nominate not to exceed 10 persons, who shall be eligible to take a competitive examination, which shall be held annually. The.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

THE AIR ACADEMY—CANDIDATES FOR TRAINING

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. Do I understand correctly that there is proposed a difference in the manner of recommending students for the proposed Air Force training school than applies now to the Naval Academy and to the Military Academy?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. For the first 4 years there would be a different method than now applies to the present academies, until the new school was built up. After the fourth year, or in the fifth year, the method would be the same as is used in the making of nominations to West Point and Annapolis.

Mr. MALONE. Then each Senator and each Representative would propose two candidates. Is that correct?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. No. For the first 3 years, in order to build up the school——

Mr. MALONE. I am talking about the procedure following the first 4 years.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. After the first 4 years the procedure will be the same as it is now for the Military and the Naval Academies, namely, 2 principals and 3 alternates to each principal, as I understand.

Mr. MALONE. Will the Senator from Massachusetts explain exactly how many of the 10 candidates to be recommended for examination will be accepted?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Before the Senator from Nevada came into the Chamber, I had explained that for the first 4 years each State will receive a proportion based on its proportional representation in Congress, including Senators and Representatives. For instance, in Nevada, the Senator's home State, there are 2 Senators and 1 Representative. So in the first year of the operation of the Air Force Academy, Nevada would be permitted to appoint 1 person; in the second year, 2 persons. They would be the top persons on the list. In other words, if the Senator from Nevada and his colleague in the Senate and the Representative from Nevada all submitted 10 names, or whatever number they submitted, the person from the three groups who ranked first in the examinations would be the one to receive the appointment.

Mr. MALONE. Under the existing system, an examination may or may not be held, and the top ranking person may or may not be appointed.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is correct.

Mr. MALONE. But in the procedure stated by the Senator from Massachusetts the top man only could be appointed.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. For the first 4 years.

Mr. MALONE. Regardless of other qualifications any candidate might have?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. For the first 4 years.

Mr. MALONE. So the Senators and the Representative from Nevada would be permitted to appoint one person in the first year.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. No; there would be one person appointed from the entire State.

Mr. MALONE. That is what I said. The three Members of Congress from Nevada would appoint only one person in the first year.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator is correct; there would be one person appointed from the State of Nevada.

Mr. MALONE. Why is there to be a difference in the beginning from what is proposed after the Academy is underway, so to speak?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Because there will be only 300 students in the first year. Ultimately there will be 4 classes in the school, but it will be necessary to build up the school. So in the first year only the members of the first class will be appointed; in the second year there will be two classes; and the school will build up to an enrollment of 600; in the third year the enrollment will be 900; and in the fourth year it will be 1,200.

Mr. MALONE. After the leveling off in the fifth year will it be the policy to permit each Senator and Representative to appoint two candidates in the same manner as is done in the case of the present Academies?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is my understanding. The same law would be followed as now exists with relation to West Point.

Mr. MALONE. How about Annapolis?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I spoke as I did because the law establishing the Air Force Academy will be based on the law pertaining to the Military Academy at West Point rather than the Naval Academy at Annapolis. That is why I so qualified my remarks.

Mr. MALONE. How many will be appointed the first year?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The first year 300 will be appointed. The allocations for appointments on the recommendations or Senators, Representatives, and other sources will total 624. There are 531 Senators and Representatives, and their recommendations will be followed in making 85 percent of the appointments to the Academy, or a total of 255 for the first year.

Mr. MALONE. There will be 255 appointments on recommendations of Senators and Representatives?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MALONE. There is only one Representative from the State of Nevada. May I ask the distinguished Senator how many appointments will be allocated to Massachusetts?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Massachusetts has 16 Senators and Representatives. Massachusetts will have 8 appointees the first year and 8 appointees the second year. Oregon, for example, has a representation of 6 in the Congress. The first year it will have 3 appointments to the academy, and 3 appointments the second year.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I should like to inquire the number of appointments Minnesota would be entitled to under the same formula.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. There are 11 Members of Congress from Minnesota, and it will get 5 appointments to the academy the first year and 6 the second year.

Mr. MALONE. The ones who are appointed, I presume, will be selected by Senators and Representatives. Why is the selection of the candidate on a different basis from the present selection to West Point and the Naval Academy? I understand that it is based solely upon the examination grades.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator is correct, and that subject was discussed by the committee. The method arrived at was believed to be the fairest by which the academy could be started with the best qualified men. We agreed that the boy who passes with the highest grade does not necessarily make the best

officer; but the committee believed that the method provided was the best that could be devised to get the results desired.

Mr. MALONE. Would there not be some merit in having a candidate admitted whose selection was agreed upon by Senators and Representatives from among those who passed the examination in the same manner as candidates are now chosen?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. It would be very difficult to carry out such an arrangement. Let us take as an example the State of New York, which has 43 Representatives and 2 Senators. To get those Members of Congress to agree on 21 candidates would be very difficult.

Mr. MALONE. If they could not agree, the same qualification would apply as that now provided; but if they all did agree on who should be the candidate or candidates, as the case may be, would that not be a better arrangement than encouraging 10 or more times the number than could ever hope to be appointed?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. There might be some difficulty in selecting men under such an arrangement. It was desired to get the academy started in the best possible way. The House has passed the bill. It was the feeling of the Committee on Armed Services, after some discussion of the point which the Senator has raised, that the method arrived at was the best that could be adopted to get the academy started reasonably soon.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada yield, so that I might ask a question along the line he is discussing?

Mr. MALONE. I yield to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. HUNT. I wish to say to the distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee that I can visualize an occurrence which would probably happen every year in my State, where my colleague, and the Member of the House and I would submit the same name, under some conditions. I am wondering whether, as an administrative matter, the distinguished chairman will give some thought to discussing the question in future meetings of the committee, with the thought in mind that the Air Corps would submit the names to the three Members of Congress from my State, let us say, so that they could clear the matter with each other, and if there were duplications one of us could eliminate one name, and an effort could be made to give an opportunity to another boy in the State.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I would have no objection to such an arrangement. It is an administrative matter. I know that the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] and I have in more than one instance followed the practice the Senator suggests.

Mr. HUNT. Such a procedure is necessary, because year before last in my State the same boy was appointed to both West Point and the Naval Academy.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. We had the same difficulty in Massachusetts, and we overcame the problem by clearing it between us beforehand.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the distinguished Senator read the portion of the bill which refers to the period of the 4 first years?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. On page 5 of the bill, section 6 states:

> To permit an orderly increase in the number of Air Force cadets during the period ending not more than 4 years after the entrance of the initial class at the Academy, the Secretary of the Air Force may limit the number to be appointed each year during that period.

That refers to the first 4 years. After that time the provisions of law governing the United States Military Academy apply.

Section 5, on the top of page 4 of the bill, reads:

> All appropriate provisions of law, not inconsistent with the purposes of this act, which pertain to the United States Military Academy shall, by the authority of this section, also pertain to the United States Air Force Academy.

Mr. MALONE. Will the membership in the Air Force Academy ultimately be approximately equal to the membership in the Naval Academy and West Point Military Academy?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The answer to the Senator's question is "Yes."

Mr. MALONE. After 4 years each Senator and each Representative will appoint 1 principal and 3 alternates?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. One principal and three alternates each year.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous request that the amendment of the committee may be amended as proposed by the Senator from Florida? The Chair hears none, and the amendment will be amended as suggested.

The amendment was, in the amendment of the committee, on page 5, line 15, to strike out "(a) A competitive examination shall be held annually among those persons nominated to the Academy by Senators and Representatives, and the" and insert "(a) Each Senator and Representative shall nominate not to exceed 10 persons, who shall be eligible to take a competitive examination which shall be held annually. The."

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts to accept a modification, that in the case of agreement between the 2 Senators and the Representative or Representatives on the appointees they could appoint a principal, or 2 principals, as the case may be, with the usual alternates, so that there need not be 20 or 30 candidates, whatever the number may be, who would be encouraged and be subjected to almost sure disappointment.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I understand the point the Senator is making. The difficulty is to put such an arrangement in appropriate language. It would have to be limited according to the size of the State?

Mr. MALONE. I do not think there would have to be any such limitation. If an agreement were arrived at, such a procedure could be followed. In Massachusetts, for instance, if 16 or 6 candidates were agreed upon, the candidates and alternates could be named. If they were not agreed upon, the procedure provided by the bill could be followed. I am speaking of a modification which would permit States to follow such an arrangement where agreement was had to prevent building up the hopes of so many students when so few can be accepted.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The difficulty would be in applying the law to a larger State such as New York, for instance, which is the largest State in the Union in point of membership in Congress, with 21 appointees the first year and 24 the second year. If a distinction were made between such a large State and a small State, I think it would lead to unfairness. Where is the line to be drawn? Suppose all Members of Congress from Nevada agreed. Nevada has 2 Senators and 1 Representative. It would mean they would agree on 1 man, whereas there might be 10 candidates who wanted to take the examination. We will say that in Massachusetts there was not any agreement. That would force 100 young men to take the examination.

Mr. MALONE. Then only in case of an agreement would there be any difference. If there were no agreement, the law as now proposed would govern, would it not?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Of course, ultimately they would have to take the examinations, anyway.

Mr. MALONE. Yes; but if my suggested amendment were adopted, 4 young men would be designated in case of an agreement—a principal, a first alternate, a second alternate, and a third alternate—instead of building up the hopes of 30 young men when only 1 could be appointed.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. No, that would not be the case, because as the system now works, one man would be chosen from Nevada, but no alternates would be chosen from Nevada. That one man would be the one who would be qualified under the written examination, although he would also have to qualify under the physical and mental examinations.

Mr. MALONE. That is true, under the committee's proposal. But under my proposed amendment, if the Members of Congress from that State agreed on one principal and on a first alternate and a second alternate and a third alternate, then—although only one of them would finally be appointed—only 4, instead of 30 or 40, would take the examinations.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield to me?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Of course, I have not had the benefit of attending the various meetings of the Armed Services Committee, but I understand that the proposed system to which the Senator from Massachusetts has been referring has been worked out by the committee.

Although I do not agree about all the mechanics of the proposed system, nevertheless it is obvious that it is very important to have the Air Force Academy in operation. So I am perfectly willing to have the bill as reported by the committee passed, perhaps as modified by the

amendment—which I believe to be an excellent one—proposed by the Senator from Florida.

I think the question of the arrangements to be made after the first year should be given very careful attention by the committee, after there has been opportunity to see how the system works.

At this time I am not inclined to be favorably disposed toward the proposed amendment of the distinguished Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE], because I do not think there should be two methods of selection. It may be that the matter should be studied further, and that in subsequent legislation, particularly after the first year or two—and let me say that of course I realize the difficulty of getting the Academy started—and perhaps before the fifth year, consideration should be given to having the standards for the Air Force Academy based on the West Point and Annapolis standards.

So I hope the Senator from Massachusetts will not agree to a further modification, by means of the change proposed by the Senator from Nevada, which might result in a differentiation because of the difference in size of the various States, and might make it difficult to determine where the line would be drawn. In fact, I think there would be a great many complications under the amendment of the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, if the Senator from Massachusetts will yield to me, let me say that I have no idea of drawing a line or of making a differentiation on the basis of the difference in size of the various States.

My amendment would simply make it possible for all the Members of Congress from 1 State to get together and decide upon a principal and 3 alternates for each appointment to be made. For instance, in the case of a large State, its 2 Senators and say 40 Representatives could reach such an agreement, and the matter could be handled in that way—then there would only be the number of principals nominated that were to be appointed, together with their alternates, instead of 420 appointees.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Suppose there were to be 30 nominations from Nevada—10 nominations by each of the 2 Senators from Nevada and 10 nominations by the Representative from Nevada. As I understand, those 30 young men would then be given the examination by the Air Force Academy; and from the 30, only 1 or 2 would be appointed from Nevada. In other words, either the top man or the two top men in the examination would be appointed.

Under the theory of the Senator from Nevada, could the 2 Senators and the 1 Representative from Nevada agree upon the appointment of the 30th man in the examination—the 30th in standing, based on the list resulting from the examination—rather than upon the top man in the list?

Mr. MALONE. No. My point is that if 30 nominations are made, all 30 will be encouraged to hope they will be able to enter the Academy, whereas, of course, only 1 will actually be able to attend the Academy.

Therefore, my proposal is that, instead, there be nominated 1 principal and 3 alternates. That could be done if all the Members of Congress from a given State were to agree upon such a principal and three alternates. Of course, that might not be done in some cases. However, if by means of such an agreement, only a principal and 3 alternates were actually nominated, then the hopes of only 4 young men from that particular State would be built up.

Of course, Mr. President, all of us know that many young men who hope to attend the various service academies come to Washington, D. C., from various parts of the States, and here attend special schools, in an effort to be able to pass the entrance examinations, which are difficult. Why build up the hopes of 30 young men from a given State, instead of only a reasonable number? That is why I propose that the Members of Congress from the various States reach such agreements.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The only reason I can see is to have the broadest possible field of selection, so as to encourage young men from Nevada and other States of the Union to take the examinations.

Mr. MALONE. Of course, Mr. President, all of us have had the experience of encouraging young men to take the examinations as alternates then having no appointment for them. The purpose of my proposed amendment is to hold such disappointments to a minimum.

When they take such an examination and go through the necessary special study the ensuing disappointment is very severe—and often the parents have expended additional money for special courses which they can ill afford to expend.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, if the 2 Senators and 1 Representative from Nevada were to agree upon, and were to submit, only the name of Tom Smith, let us say, then Tom Smith would be the only person from Nevada to take the examination. The Members of Congress from Nevada could make such an agreement and thus could carry out the objective of the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. MALONE. I do not understand that the amendment specifically provides for such a procedure.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I say that could be done. Of course, the senior Senator from Nevada could make 10 nominations, and the junior Senator from Nevada could make 10 nominations, and the Representative from Nevada could make 10 nominations—or a total of 30. However, suppose all 3 of those Members of Congress agreed that Tom Smith would be the 1 to be nominated. Then Tom Smith would be the only one to take the examination.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield further to me?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. The senior Senator from Massachusetts has served in the Congress for a longer period of time than has the junior Senator from Nevada, so he realizes fully that each Member of Congress would insist upon making all the nominations he was entitled to make. Thus, in order to avoid disappointing 26 of the 30 young men nominated, in the case of a State having 2 Senators and 1 Representative, 1 student together with 3 alternates could be appointed from that State, then only 3 would be disappointed instead of 26.

The existing arrangement does not specifically provide that those Members of Congress can get together and agree upon only 4 nominations—a principal and 3 alternates—with only 1 of the 4 finally to be appointed, instead of only 1 out of a possible 30 nominations.

However, I withdraw the suggested amendment at the request of the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Of course, as I have said, it is our responsibility to check constantly on the operation of the system decided upon. We shall do so next year, of course.

So I hope the Senator from Nevada will not insist upon his amendment, because the system proposed by it would be difficult to follow fairly.

The arrangement we propose has been examined very carefully. In substantially the same form, it has been approved by the House of Representatives, and it is generally agreed that this method is the best one.

So I hope the Senator from Nevada will permit his amendment to go over until next year.

Mr. MALONE. Let me say I do not agree with the senior Senator from Massachusetts that this subject will be again discussed upon this floor.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I desire to make a very brief statement.

In view of the physical condition of the plant at Annapolis—the inadequacy of the plant, with its existing buildings and facilities—and in view of the increased emphasis in the Navy on aerodynamics, and in view of the number of airplanes in the Navy, the Marine Corps, and the Air Force, it would seem the better part of wisdom for Congress to consider the establishment of a new Defense Academy, one in which all air training can be consolidated, looking toward the eventual establishment of one unified Defense Academy, in which the young men, the future officers of the National Defense Establishment, can be trained.

Mr. President, the United States Army also is placing greater emphasis upon air operations.

Therefore, let me say that a Senator who votes against the passage of the pending bill—and I shall vote against its passage—will not, in my opinion, minimize the importance of air training. Quite to the contrary, I think the establishment of one United States Defense Academy would be the proper way to place greater emphasis on air training as well as the great need for unification.

There is in the bill an amendment providing for interchangeability. That seems to me to be an argument against the establishment of a third academy, rather than in favor of it. Under the interchangeability provision a young man might be appointed, for example, to enter the Naval Academy. He would learn how to operate a submarine or how

to design a ship. Then he could transfer to the Air Force, or vice versa, to the extent of 12½ percent from each of the three academies. Where is the economy in such a system? Wherein lies the wisdom?

Young men are appointed to the academies largely by Members of Congress. A young man applies for entrance into one or the other of the service Academies. Members of Congress do not give aptitude tests in deciding to whom to award appointments to the Naval Academy or to West Point, or—in the event of the passage of the pending bill—to the Air Force Academy. Often an applicant will apply for nomination to either Academy. Under this system no evaluation is made as to the aptitudes of the young man for training in service in a specific field, or of his desire, in many respects.

If we had an opportunity to enlarge and expand the United States Naval Academy or the United States Military Academy, I think $140 million could better be spent in the enlargement and consolidation, or replacement, of the present facilities. It would be even better if Congress would give consideration to the broader scope, not merely to giving the Air Force an Academy, partly because the other services have Academies, but to the needs of unification of both training and service. We are in an age in which aero-dynamics, hydrogen weapons, and atomic weapons will some day force unification. This bill flies in the teeth of unification. We hear many speeches about unification, but there is little action pointing toward unification.

Therefore, I believe the pending proposal goes contrary to the direction in which we should proceed in this modern age, and, therefore, is basically unwise, I shall cast my vote against it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

PROVISION FOR ORDERLY USE, IMPROVEMENT, AND DEVELOPMENT OF NATIONAL FORESTS AND OTHER LANDS

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now resume the consideration of Calendar 1045, Senate bill 2548. I have previously consulted the minority leader regarding the bill. It was temporarily laid aside in order to give priority to consideration of the Air Force Academy bill.

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

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 2548) to facilitate the administration of the national forests and other lands under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of Agriculture; to provide for the orderly use, improvement, and development thereof; to stabilize the livestock industry dependent thereon; and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from California?

There being no objection, the Senate resumed the consideration of the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry with amendments.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, the bill is designed to provide a legal framework for administration of national forest lands and certain Bankhead-Jones Act lands to the end that such lands may be protected and improved and the economic, recreational and other benefits accruing to the general public and to the various segments thereof may be safeguarded and regulated pursuant to rule of law.

The bill was introduced last August 1. Hearings were held in the range States of the West in September. The bill has been approved by the Forest Service. The Forest Service has been very helpful in drafting the provisions of the bill and reconciling some differences of opinion between interested parties; indeed, it has been generally helpful. We have also received considerable help from officials of wildlife and conservation organizations.

In January we held a final hearing in Washington. After the final hearing the bill was turned over to a subcommittee consisting of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] and the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] who gave consideration to all the proposed amendments and submitted to the full committee a bill which, as amended, we believe to be an excellent bill and one which will result in improvement of the forest administration. The bill would write into congressional policy a great many things which for a long time have been Forest Service policy.

The first section of the bill makes it applicable to national forest lands and lands administered by the Secretary of Agriculture under title III of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act. The committee amendments would extend it to lands in all States, rather than the 14 States named in the bill as introduced, and would exclude Bankhead-Jones Act lands administered by the Secretary of the Interior or any other agency other than the Department of Agriculture. These changes supplement the committee amendment to section 6 of the bill extending the appeal provisions to all types of occupancy and use, rather than restricting it to grazing which would be of importance primarily in the 14 named States.

As originally introduced—although it was inadvertent on my part—certain provisions of the bill applied only to those who use forest lands for grazing purposes. That situation has been corrected, so that its provisions are now made applicable to all users of forest lands.

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

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. May I ask what bill is under consideration?

Mr. AIKEN. Senate bill 2548, Calendar 1045.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Is that the bill with respect to which the majority leader asked unanimous consent for consideration at this time? I did not so understand.

Mr. AIKEN. That is the bill.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, earlier in the day I made a unanimous-consent request for consideration of the bill, which request was agreed to. At that time the majority leader and minority leader were both present. However, the bill was temporarily laid aside in order to afford opportunity for the consideration of the Air Force Academy bill.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Then, it was the pending business.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The Senator is correct. The request to make it the pending business had been agreed to. It was laid aside to give priority to consideration of the Air Force Academy bill.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I was not present at the time; hence my inquiry.

May I ask the distinguished chairman of the committee, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], if the bill was reported unanimously?

Mr. AIKEN. There were no disapproving votes in the committee. I will not say that it was reported unanimously, because I doubt that all 15 members of the committee were present. It is my recollection that 12 or 13 members of the committee were present, and the vote was unanimous.

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

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] was just called from the Chamber. He had intended to state, and he has asked that I state in his absence, that all minority members of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry approved the bill.

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

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I do not know how far the Senate wishes me to go in explaining the provisions of the bill. If there is no demand for a detailed explanation——

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, if the Senator from Vermont will yield, I should like to say to my distinguished friend from Montana that the committee did report the bill unanimously. When the bill came before the committee for consideration there was only one question raised, and it was raised by the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER]. References to that situation will be found at page 4 of the committee report. His question related to court procedure.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I thank the Senator from Minnesota. I should like to ask the distinguished chairman of the committee another question, if I may.

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Does the bill have the approval of the Forest Service?

Mr. AIKEN. The bill has the approval of the Forest Service. The Forest Service was very helpful in writing the bill itself, and even more helpful in

reconciling some differences of opinion among the various groups that use the national forest lands. We believe we have met all the major objections and have reconciled all the major differences of opinion. I assume that there are still some slight differences of opinion, but I would not consider them material. If there is no demand for my going through the bill section by section, Mr. President, I ask leave to have the report of the committee printed in the RECORD, at this point.

There being no objection, the report (No. 1041) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, to whom was referred the bill (S. 2548) to facilitate the administration of the national forests and other lands under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of Agriculture; to provide for the orderly use, improvement, and development thereof; to stabilize the livestock industry dependent thereon; and for other purposes, having considered the same, report thereon with a recommendation that it do pass with amendments.

GENERAL PURPOSE

The bill is designed to provide a legal framework for administration of national forest lands and certain Bankhead-Jones Act lands to the end that such lands may be protected and improved and the economic, recreational, and other benefits accruing to the general public and to the various segments thereof may be safeguarded and regulated pursuant to rule of law. To accomplish this end the bill provides for the encouragement of range improvement by grazing permittees, compensation for such improvements lost through Government action or transfer of the permit, regulations governing base property standards and transfer of grazing permits, procedures for review of departmental decisions affecting any use of lands covered by the bill, and multiple-use advisory boards.

LANDS COVERED BY THE BILL

The first section of the bill makes it applicable to national forest lands and lands administered by the Secretary of Agriculture under title III of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act. The committee amendments would extend it to lands in all States, rather than the 14 States named in the bill as introduced, and would exclude Bankhead-Jones Act lands administered by the Secretary of the Interior or any other agency other than the Department of Agriculture. These changes supplement the committee amendment to section 6 of the bill extending the appeal provisions to all types of occupancy and use rather than restricting it to grazing which would be of importance primarily in the 14 named States.

ENCOURAGEMENT OF RANGE IMPROVEMENTS

Section 2 provides for encouraging range improvement by grazing permittees.

Subsection (a) provides for assuring the permittee that he will receive the benefits of the increased grazing capacity resulting from improvements made by him.

Subsection (b) provides for compensating a permittee for loss of a range improvement caused by the Federal Government.

Subsection (c) provides for payment by a subsequent permittee to his predecessor of the value of improvements constructed by such predecessor.

Subsection (d) provides for amortizing the value of any range improvement (based on its replacement cost) over its normal life, not to exceed 20 years. Compensation to which a permittee would be entitled under subsection (b) or (c) could not exceed this amortized value. After the normal life of the improvement had expired it would be deemed of no value for compensation purposes, even though it might have considerable actual value. This would prevent permittees from acquiring continuing interests in improvements on the public range.

The committee amendments to section 2 would add subsection (d), just discussed, and make it clear that noxious plant control would be included in improvements covered by it, that permittees' estates would be entitled to compensation in the event of their decease or disability, that permittees abandoning their permits would not be entitled to compensation for loss or on transfer, that the Government would not be required to pay compensation if its action was necessitated by injury to the lands, and that losses caused by Federal agencies other than the Department of Agriculture would be compensated out of appropriations for such agencies.

TRANSFER OF GRAZING PERMITS

Section 3 provides for regulations governing transfers of grazing privileges. In the past the Department has frequently delayed grazing cuts until the permit is being transferred and made the cut at the time. Under section 3 cuts based solely on the fact that the permit is being transferred are prohibited. Cuts may be made whenever conditions warrant, but the transfer of the permit should form no part of the basis.

BASE PROPERTY STANDARDS

Section 4 provides for maintenance of base property standard (land, water, and improvements required to qualify for a grazing permit) consistent with local practices. Thus in some localities livestock operations may be customarily undertaken with a much larger percentage of rented or permitted lands (whether private, State, forest, or Taylor Grazing Act lands) than is customary in other localities.

GRAZING FEE STUDY

Section 5 of the bill, as introduced, provided for a comprehensive economic study for the purpose of determining suitable grazing fees. This section is a survival from earlier versions of similar bills which would have been applicable to lands administered under the Taylor Grazing Act by the Bureau of Land Management as well as national forest and Bankhead-Jones Act lands, and its original purpose was to provide for a joint study which might result in uniformity of fees. Your committee feels that such a joint study is very desirable and recommends to the Appropriations Committees and to the Congress that funds for such a study be provided. The Department now has authority to participate in such a study and authorizing legislation is not required. A study conducted by the Secretary of Agriculture, however, alone, and relating only to lands covered by the bill, as required by section 5 would not contribute to a uniform fee system, and your committee therefore recommends that section 5 be stricken from the bill.

INFORMAL APPEAL PROCEDURE

Section 6 provides informal appeals, up to the Secretary, from any departmental decision respecting use of lands covered by the bill. Upon request, appeals to the Secretary would be referred to a three-man board consisting of a Department employee (not from the Forest Service) designated by the Secretary, a second member designated by the appellant, and a third member representing the general public and selected by the other two. The committee amendments to this section would (1) extend it to cover all uses of the lands, instead of only grazing uses; (2) strike out the reference to the Chief of the Soil Conservation Service and agencies not involved in the review since departmental reorganization has placed all of the lands covered by the bill, including the Bankhead-Jones Act lands, under the Forest Service; (3) provide that the third member of the board shall represent the general public; and (4) provide for appointment of the third member by the appropriate district court if the first two members are unable to agree upon a third.

FORMAL ADMINISTRATIVE APPEAL

Section 7 provides for a formal review de novo, at which a record is made, for anyone dissatisfied with the result of the informal review under section 6.

COURT APPEAL

Section 8 provides a further appeal to the United States district court. The committee amendment would give this jurisdiction to the district court, rather than the court of appeals, so that appellants would not be required to travel so far from their homes to conduct their appeals.

SCOPE OF COURT APPEAL

Section 9 provides that the review by the district court shall be based upon the record made in the formal review provided by section 7. When your committee was considering this provision it was strongly contended by Senator WELKER that the court review should be upon a trial de novo; that the court should not be bound by the facts produced at the Secretary's hearing, but should have full authority to decide the matter on the basis of the facts presented to it; and that the court's jurisdiction should extend to appeals from cuts in grazing privileges made for the protection of the range or to bring about a change in use of the range. Appeals from protection or changed use cuts are now expressly excluded from the formal and court review provisions of the bill by section 11, which preserves the Secretary's discretion in making cuts for those purposes. While the committee realizes that protection and changed use cuts are a major problem in administration of the lands covered by the bill and are likely to have serious economic effects on permittees who sustain them, the majority of the committee felt that the bill represents a delicate balance of conflicting interests in this respect, and that the change proposed by Senator WELKER would upset this balance, evoke the opposition of other forest users, and quite possibly result in defeat of the bill.

The amendment to this section recommended by your committee would require payment of court costs by losing appellants, and would permit the court to require bond to assure payment of such costs.

STAY OF DECISION

Section 10 provides that the formal and court reviews provided by the bill would operate to stay the decision appealed from only if the Secretary or the court should so order.

PROTECTION AND CHANGED USE CUTS

Section 11 makes the review procedures provided by the bill exclusive, preserves the Secretary's discretion to make protection or changed use cuts, and excludes decisions on such cuts from the formal and court review procedures provided by the bill. The committee amendments would preserve whatever legal remedy a permittee may now have with respect to such cuts for which formal remedies are not provided by the bill, and preserves the Secretary's freedom of action to deal summarily with trespass or other unauthorized use of the lands covered by the bill.

MULTIPLE-USE ADVISORY COUNCILS

Your committee recommends insertion of a new section preceding section 12 of the bill to provide for multiple-use advisory councils. These councils would not supersede the Granger-Thye Act boards in any way, but would advise the Secretary solely on questions involved in the multiple use of lands covered by the bill. Such councils

might be established on local, regional, and national bases. They would not be entitled to any compensation, expenses or per diem.

CONGRESSIONAL POLICY

Section 12 is a statement of the congressional policy that all resources and uses of the lands covered by the bill be safeguarded and given full consideration.

AMENDMENT TO TITLE

Your committee recommends that the title be amended to reflect the changes made in the bill, which broaden and extend it to cover all uses of the lands to which it applies.

A copy of the Department's report on the bill, showing how it would change existing procedure is set out below:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, August 3, 1953.

Hon. GEORGE D. AIKEN,
Chairman, Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR AIKEN: Reference is made to your request of August 3 for a report on S. 2548, a bill "to facilitate the administration of the national forests and other lands under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of Agriculture; to provide for the orderly use, improvement, and development thereof; to stabilize the livestock industry dependent thereon; and for other purposes." This bill is identical to H. R. 6787, by Congressman Hope.

The objective of S. 2548 is to clarify and specify the procedures to be used by the Secretary of Agriculture in administering the grazing resources of the national forests and the title III Bankhead-Jones lands in the 14 Western States.

The bill deals with construction of range improvements by permittees; transfer of grazing privileges; base property standards; an economic study to help develop a method of determining grazing fees; boards of appeal with respect to grazing uses; formal hearings and appeals to the courts. The bill also spells out certain exceptions to its provisions, and recognizes the importance of all resources and uses of these lands.

Following is a summary of the specific provisions of the bill and a comparison of wherein these provisions differ from existing law.

SECTION 1—COVERAGE OF THE BILL

The bill would apply to the national forests and title II Bankhead-Jones lands in the 14 Western States.

SECTION 2—IMPROVEMENTS

The Secretary is authorized to promote and encourage construction of range improvements by grazing permittees. As an incentive to permittees to undertake such action at their own expense, the Secretary is authorized to agree with permittees on the terms under which resulting increased grazing capacity will be made available to them.

Recent changes in administrative practice now assure permittees the benefits of increased grazing capacity resulting from their own investments.

The Secretary is directed to provide for compensation to permittees for the loss of improvements constructed by them with the approval of the Secretary, where the loss is caused by Government action and not by the unlawful act of the permittee. No permit shall be issued to a new permittee to use improvements constructed by a prior permittee, unless the latter has been compensated, either by the Government or by the new permittee.

The Secretary has authority under existing law to compensate permittees for loss of improvements. This proposal directs him to provide such compensation. Issuance of permit to a new permittee where the prior permittee has not been compensated for improvements by either the Government or the new permittee is not now prohibited.

SECTION 3—TRANSFERS OF GRAZING PRIVILIGES

The Secretary shall specify the terms and conditions under which transfers of grazing privileges may be made. No reduction in grazing permits may be made at time of transfer solely on account of the transfer.

Under present regulations the Secretary or his representative specifies the terms and conditions under which the preference may be transferred. Present administrative instructions prohibit reductions at time of transfer solely because of the transfer. A proposed new administrative policy, now under consideration, would provide that protection reductions would be made as and when needed without relation to any transfer of grazing privileges.

SECTION 4—BASE PROPERTY

The Secretary is directed to maintain base property standards considering land, water, or ranch or range improvements based upon customary practice of the locality and to require these standards as a qualification for a grazing privilege.

The requirements in section 4 do not differ from present practice.

SECTION 5—ECONOMIC STUDY

The Secretary is directed to make a comprehensive economic study to obtain information needed to establish a method of determining grazing fees. The Secretary is instructed to consider all relevant facts and circumstances. The Secretary is to submit his recommendations to the Agriculture Committees of both Houses within 2 years, and pending this submission existing methods of determining grazing fees shall remain in effect.

The provision directing the Secretary to make a study and submit his recommendations to Congress is new.

SECTION 6—BOARD OF APPEALS

The Secretary is directed to prescribe by regulation a procedure whereby actions of departmental officers may, upon appeal, be reviewed. In the event of an appeal from decisions of the Chiefs of the Forest Service or Soil Conservation Service, the Secretary shall, if requested by the appellant, refer the case to an advisory board of appeals. The board shall consist of an employee of the Department appointed by the Secretary but not a resident of the State in which the dispute arose; the second member is to be selected by the appellant; and the third member is to be selected by the other two but shall not be an employee of the Federal or any State Governments or directly connected with the livestock industry, nor a resident of the State in which the dispute arose.

Present administrative procedure provides for a five-man advisory board appointed by the Secretary from members of the Department (but not the Forest Service) to consider appeals from decisions of the Chief of the Forest Service.

Present procedure also provides for appeal of administrative decisions to progressively higher levels within the Forest Service. A dissatisfied grazing permittee can appeal to the immediate superior of the officer making the decision all the way from ranger to the Chief Forester. Or he may, if he desires, have his case heard by the local grazing advisory board, which then advises the forest supervisor.

SECTIONS 7, 8, 9, AND 10—FORMAL HEARINGS AND APPEALS TO THE COURTS

These sections provide in detail the procedure to be followed where any person who is aggrieved by any order of the Secretary made pursuant to section 6 may request a formal hearing. The request for the hearing must contain such information and allegations as the Secretary prescribes. The hearing shall be held in the State in which the dispute arose. The appellant may appeal to the circuit court of appeals from the decision of the Secretary based upon such formal hearing. The proper circuit court is that within whose jurisdiction the formal hearing was held. The court is limited in its review to the record made before the Secretary, and must determine that the Secretary's actions were arbitrary, capricious, an abuse of discretion, or otherwise not in accordance with the law before remanding or taking any action contrary to the decision of the Secretary. The request for formal hearing or the petition to the court would not operate to suspend the application of the decision unless so ordered by either the Secretary or the court.

Present law does not authorize formal hearings or statutory appeals to the courts. However, courts will grant relief from arbitrary or capricious actions of public officers.

SECTION 11—EXCEPTIONS TO THE BILL

This section specifically limits the review of decisions of the Secretary with respect to grazing to the manner prescribed in the act. It states that nothing in the act would restrict the authority of the Secretary to limit or discontinue the grazing use of any lands in order to prevent injury to such lands from grazing, or to change the use of any lands, and provides that the formal hearings and appeals procedures of sections 7, 8, and 9 shall not apply to protection adjustments and changes of use.

SECTION 12—RECOGNITION OF OTHER USES

This section states a congressional policy that the Secretary shall give consideration to all resources and uses, including grazing, watershed conservation, timber production, recreation, mining, and wildlife.

The Department has considered carefully the probable effects of S. 2548. It feels that the provisions of the bill would benefit the holders of grazing privileges. It also feels that the bill would not hamper the administration of the national forests or Bankhead-Jones lands; that it would not interfere with the management and protection of the range resource; and that it would give due recognition to the multiple-use objectives of the national forests and importance of all resources and uses on the public lands under the jurisdiction of the Secretary.

The Department recommends enactment of S. 2548.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that there is no objection to the submission of this report.

Sincerely yours,

EZRA T. BENSON,
Secretary.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The committee amendments will be stated.

The committee amendments were severally stated and respectively agreed to, as follows:

The amendments of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry were, on page 1, line 4, after the word "administered", to insert "by the Secretary of Agriculture (hereinafter called the Secretary)"; in line 6, after the word "act", to strike out "in the States of Arizona, California, Colorado, Idaho, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Mexico, North Dakota, Oregon, South Dakota, Utah, Washington, and Wyoming"; on page 2, line 1, after the word "Secretary", to strike out "of Agriculture (hereinafter called the Secretary)"; in line 4, after the word "reseeding", to insert "and noxious plant control"; in line 18, after the word "holders", to insert "or their estates"; in line 22, after the word "action", strike out "and is not caused by" and insert "not occasioned either by abandonment or"; in line 23, after the word "holders"

insert "or by fire, flood, drought, or other disaster which causes injury to the lands or improvements covered by the permit: *Provided*, That in the event such loss is the result of the action of a Federal agency other than the Department of Agriculture or because the Federal lands are needed for or transferred or assigned to another governmental agency for administration such compensation shall be paid by such other agency"; on page 3, line 8, after the word "permittee", insert "or his estate"; in line 11, after the word "permittee", insert "or his estate"; in line 13, after the word "Secretary", insert a semicolon and "but no prior permittee who shall have abandoned his permit shall be required to be compensated"; after line 15, insert:

(d) The value of any improvement as determined under subsection (b) or (c) shall not exceed its replacement cost, less a percentage thereof commensurate with the expired portion of its normal life. The normal life of any improvement shall be determined under rules and regulations of the Secretary and shall not exceed 20 years.

On page 4, after line 9, to strike out:

SEC. 5. The Secretary is authorized and directed to conduct a comprehensive economic study for the purpose of obtaining information necessary to establish a method of determining grazing fees on the lands described in section 1 which will take into consideration all relevant facts and circumstances. Within 2 years after the date of enactment of this act the Secretary shall submit in writing to the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry of the Senate his recommendations as a result of such study. Pending the completion and submission of such study by the Secretary together with his recommendations, existing methods of determining grazing fees and the presently established basis therefor shall remain in effect.

In line 24, to change the section number from "6" to "5"; at the beginning of line 25, to strike out "grazing on" and insert "any occupancy and use of"; on page 5, at the beginning of line 3, strike out "grazing uses" and insert "such occupancy and use"; in line 9, after the word "Service", strike out "or the Chief of the Soil Conservation Service"; in line 10, after the word "to", strike out "grazing uses" and insert "such occupancy and use"; in line 15, after the word "Department", strike out "not involved in the review" and insert "except the Forest Service"; in line 18, after the word, "members", insert "to represent the general public"; in line 21, after the word "the", strike out "livestock industry" and insert "interest or interests concerned. Should the first two members fail for more than 30 days after their appointment to agree upon a third member, such third member representing the general public shall be appointed by the United States district court for any district in which any of the lands with respect to which the matter in dispute arose are located"; on page 6, line 16, after the word "section", strike out "7" and insert "6"; in line 18, to change the section number from "7" to "6"; in line 19, after the word "section", strike out "6" and insert "5"; in line 21, after the word "section", strike out "6" and insert "5"; on page 7, line 6, after the word "section", strike out "6" and insert "5"; in line 12, after the word "section", strike out "6" and insert "5"; in line 15, after the word "section", strike out "9" and insert "8"; on page 8, line 14, change the section number from "8" to "7"; in the same line, after the word "States", strike out "Court of Appeals" and insert "District Court"; in line 16, after the word "section", strike out "7" and insert "6"; in line 17, after the word "section", strike out "7" and insert "6"; on page 9, line 3, after the word "section", strike out "7" and insert "6"; at the beginning of line 8, change the section number from "9" to "8"; in the same line, after the word "section", strike out "8" and insert "7"; in line 13, after the word "section", strike out "7" and insert "6"; in line 18, after the word "requires.", insert "If the court affirms the decision reviewed, the petitioner shall be required to pay the costs of such review as determined by the court. The court may require bond or other assurance from the petitioner to assure payment of such costs."; at the beginning of line 23, change the section number from "10" to "9"; in line 24, after the word "to", strike out "section 7 or section 8" and insert "section 6 or section 7"; on page 10, line 4, change the section number from "11" to "10"; in line 5, after the word "to", strike out "grazing uses on" and insert "the occupancy and use of"; in line 6, after "section 1", insert "(except those relating to the authority described in the next sentence)"; in line 10, after the word "the", strike out "grazing use on" and insert "occupancy and use of"; in line 12, after the word "lands", strike out "from grazing"; in line 13, after the word "from", strike out "grazing" and insert "one use"; in line 14, after the word "under", strike out "sections 7, 8, 9" and insert "sections 6, 7, or 8"; in line 17, after the word "section.", insert "Nor shall anything in this act be construed to prevent or restrict any appropriate action with respect to any unauthorized use or occupancy of any such lands, nor to authorize the review under sections 5, 6, 7, or 8 of this act of any such action or decision with respect thereto."; and after line 21, insert:

SEC. 11. In order to obtain the views and recommendations of the various users of the lands described in section 1 and their resources on questions of policy involved in the multiple use of such lands, the Secretary may establish multiple use advisory councils: *Provided, however*, That such councils shall not supersede or perform any of the functions of the advisory boards established under section 18 of the act of April 24, 1950 (16 U. S. C. 580k). Such councils may be established for any unit of such lands, for groups of such units, and for all such lands. In appointing the members of such councils, the Secretary shall give consideration to the recommendations made by the officers of organizations representing the principal interests concerned with the use and administration of such lands, including, but not limited to, grazing, mining, recreation, timber production, watershed conservation, wildlife, and the general public. Such councils may submit recommendations on their own initiative or in response to requests by the Secretary with respect to any question of policy affecting the multiple use of such lands.

So as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That this act shall apply to the national forests and lands administered by the Secretary of Agriculture (hereinafter called the Secretary) under title III of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act.

SEC. 2. (a) The Secretary is authorized to promote and encourage the construction and maintenance of fences, range water facilities, the undertaking of range reseeding and noxious plant control projects, and other such improvements, upon the Federal lands concerned to the maximum practicable extent by the holders of grazing privileges. As an incentive to make such improvements, the Secretary is authorized to enter into agreements with the holders of grazing privileges providing for the construction and maintenance of such improvements and the terms under which the increased grazing capacity resulting from so much of such improvements as are undertaken at the expense of such holders will be made available to such holders.

(b) To further promote and encourage the construction and maintenance of such range improvements the Secretary shall provide by rules and regulations for compensation to such privilege holders or their estates for the loss of the value of such improvements, where such improvements shall have been authorized by the proper governmental agency and where such loss is caused by subsequent governmental action not occasioned either by abandonment or unlawful acts of the privilege holders or by fire, flood, drought, or other disaster which causes injury to the lands or improvements covered by the permit: *Provided*, That in the event such loss is the result of the action of a Federal agency other than the Department of Agriculture or because the Federal lands are needed for or transferred or assigned to another governmental agency for administration such compensation shall be paid by such other agency.

(c) No permit shall be issued which shall entitle a permittee to the use of improvements constructed and owned by a prior permittee until either such prior permittee or his estate has received compensation from the Government in accordance with the provisions of section 2 (b) or the applicant has paid to the prior permittee or his estate the reasonable value of such improvements to be determined under rules and regulations of the Secretary; but no prior permittee who shall have abandoned his permit shall be required to be compensated.

(d) The value of any improvement as determined under subsection (b) or (c) shall not exceed its replacement cost, less a percentage thereof commensurate with the expired portion of its normal life. The normal life of any improvement shall be determined under rules and regulations of the Secretary and shall not exceed 20 years.

SEC. 3. The Secretary shall provide by rules and regulations for the terms and conditions under which transfers of grazing privileges may be made. The Secretary, at the time of transfer, shall not make any reduction in the number of permitted livestock solely on the basis that the permit is being transferred.

SEC. 4. Based upon the customary practices of the grazing privilege holders of each locality concerned, the Secretary shall maintain standards as to the kind and extent of lands, waters or ranch or range improvements or any combination thereof, commonly known as base properties, required as a qualification for grazing privileges on the lands to which this act applies.

SEC. 5. (a) Regulations of the Secretary applicable to any occupancy and use of lands described in the first section shall include provisions whereby any action or decision of an officer of the Department with respect to such occupancy and use may, upon request of any person aggrieved by the action or decision, be reviewed. Unless a request for

review is made in accordance with the provisions of such regulations, the action or decision shall be final.

(b) Reviews by the Secretary of decisions of the Chief of the Forest Service with respect to such occupancy and use shall, upon written request to the Secretary, be referred by him to a board consisting of three members. One member of the board shall be an employee of the Department of Agriculture, to be designated by the Secretary from any agency of the Department, except the Forest Service. The second member shall be designated by the person requesting the review. The third member of the board shall be selected by the other two members to represent the general public, but such third member shall not be either an employee of the Federal or any State Government or directly connected with the interest or interests concerned. Should the first two members fail for more than 30 days after their appointment to agree upon a third member, such third member representing the general public shall be appointed by the United States district court for any district in which any of the lands with respect to which the matter in dispute arose are located. Neither the first nor third member shall be a resident of the State in which the lands with respect to which the matter in dispute arose are located. The members of the board shall receive such per diem and actual expenses as may be determined by the Secretary. Hearings shall be held in the State in which the lands with respect to which the matter in dispute arose are located. The board shall consider the case on its merits and furnish its advice and recommendation to the Secretary.

(c) Upon the completion of the review, the Secretary shall render a decision which shall affirm, modify, or reverse the action or decision under review. The decision of the Secretary shall be final unless an appeal therefrom pursuant to section 6 is taken within 60 days from the day on which the decision is announced.

SEC. 6. (a) Any person who is aggrieved by a decision of the Secretary under section 5 may appeal to the Secretary for a review de novo of the action or decision of the officer reviewed under section 5, or of such action or decision as modified or reversed by the decision of the Secretary under such section, by filing a petition therefor within 60 days from the day on which the decision of the Secretary under such section is announced. The petition for appeal shall be in such form and contain such information and allegations as the Secretary, by regulations, shall prescribe. Upon the filing of a petition within the time prescribed in this subsection, the Secretary shall, in accordance with the petition, review de novo the action or decision of the officer reviewed under section 5, or such action or decision as modified or reversed by the Secretary under such section. A formal hearing shall be held, in accordance with regulations of the Secretary, in the State in which the lands with respect to which the matter in dispute arose are located. The Secretary shall render a decision affirming, modifying, or reversing the action or decision reviewed under section 5, or such action or decision as modified or reversed by the Secretary under such section. The decision of the Secretary under this section shall, except as provided in section 8, be final.

(b) For the purpose of any hearing provided for in this section, the Secretary or his designated representative is authorized to, and at the request of the appellant shall, take the deposition of any person, and by subpena require any person to appear and testify, or to appear and produce documents, or both, at any named place, before the Secretary or his designated representative, or before the person taking the deposition. The Secretary or his designated representative is also authorized to administer oaths or affirmations to such witnesses. Any deposition may be taken before any person designated by the Secretary or his designated representative and having power to administer oaths.

(c) Witnesses subpenaed under this section shall be paid the same fees and mileage as are paid witnesses in the district courts.

(d) In the case of contumacy by, or refusal to obey a subpena served upon, any person, the district court in which such person resides, transacts business, or is found shall upon application by the Secretary, have jurisdiction to issue an order requiring such person to appear and give testimony, or to appear and produce documents or both, and any failure to obey such order of the court may be punished by such court as a contempt thereof.

SEC. 7. The United States district court within whose jurisdiction the formal hearing required by section 6 (a) was held is vested with jurisdiction to review any decision made under the provisions of section 6 (a) provided a petition for that purpose is filed within 60 days from the date of the entry of such decision. Service of process in any such proceedings may be had upon the Secretary by delivering to him a copy of the petition. Within the time prescribed by, and in accordance with the requirements of, rules promulgated by the court, unless the proceeding has been terminated on a motion to dismiss the petition, the Secretary shall file in the office of the clerk the record on review, duly certified, consisting of the pleadings, evidence, and proceedings before the Secretary under section 6, or such portions thereof as such rules shall require to be included in such record, or such portions thereof as the petitioner and the Secretary, with the approval of the court, shall agree upon in writing.

SEC. 8. Petitions filed pursuant to section 7 of this act, unless determined on a motion to dismiss the petition, shall be heard by the court upon the record of the pleadings, evidence adduced, and proceedings before the Secretary. If the court determines that the decision of the Secretary under section 6 is arbitrary, capricious, an abuse of discretion, or otherwise not in accordance with law, it shall remand such proceedings to the Secretary with directions either (a) to make such decision as the court shall determine to be in accordance with law, or (b) to take such further proceedings as in its opinion the law requires. If the court affirms the decision reviewed, the petitioner shall be required to pay the costs of such review as determined by the court. The court may require bond or other assurance from the petitioner to assure payment of such costs.

SEC. 9. The pendency of proceedings instituted pursuant to section 6 or section 7 of this act shall not, unless specifically ordered by the Secretary or the court as the case may be, operate to stay or suspend the application of the decision involved.

SEC. 10. Decisions and rulings by the Secretary with respect to the occupancy and use of the lands described in section 1 (except those relating to the authority described in the next sentence) shall not be reviewed in any manner except as herein provided. Nothing in this act shall be construed to restrict the authority of the Secretary in his discretion to limit or discontinue the occupancy and use of any such lands for the purpose of preventing injury to such lands or to change the use of any such lands from one use to any other authorized use, nor to authorize the review under section 6, 7 or 8 of this act of any action or decision with respect to the powers reserved to the Secretary in this section. Nor shall anything in this act be construed to prevent or restrict any appropriate action with respect to any unauthorized use or occupancy of any such lands, nor to authorize the review under section 5, 6, 7, or 8 of this act of any such action or decision with respect thereto.

SEC. 11. In order to obtain the views and recommendations of the various users of the lands described in section 1 and their resources on questions of policy involved in the multiple use of such lands, the Secretary may establish multiple use advisory councils; *Provided however*, That such councils shall not supersede or perform any of the functions of the advisory boards established under section 18 of the act of April 24, 1950 (16 U. S. C. 580k). Such councils may be established for any unit of such lands, for groups of such units, and for all such lands. In appointing the members of such councils, the Secretary shall give consideration to the recommendations made by the officers of organizations representing the principal interests concerned with the use and administration of such lands, including, but not limited to, grazing, mining, recreation, timber production, watershed conservation, wildlife, and the general public. Such councils may submit recommendations on their own initiative or in response to requests by the Secretary with respect to any question of policy affecting the multiple use of such lands.

SEC. 12. It is hereby declared to be the policy of the Congress that the Secretary, in carrying out the provisions of this act, shall give full consideration to the safeguarding of all resources and uses made of these lands, including grazing, mining, recreation, timber production, watershed conservation, and wildlife.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. President, I wish to take this opportunity to congratulate the chairman of the committee and the other members of the committee for the splendid work they have done on the bill. I did not raise any objection to the amendment on page 3, but I believe that the language in line 19, on page 3, reading, "The normal life of any improvement shall be determined under rules and regulations of the Secretary and shall not exceed 20 years," does not properly reflect the true condition of depreciation. So I should like to ask the distinguished chairman of the committee whether, if this subject should be in disagreement between the Senate and the House, the Senator from Vermont will endeavor to work out language which will correctly reflect the depreciated value of the improvements.

Mr. AIKEN. I am glad to say to the Senator from Wyoming that the committee did endeavor to fix a limitation of time during which the cost of any expenditure for improvement might be amortized. It is particularly true in the case of a dam, for instance, that the life of the improvement might be more than 20 years. On the other hand, the Forest Service advised me that it was unlikely any dam of that kind would be involved.

The Forest Service stated it would be very helpful if a limitation of time were provided by the bill. Certain persons interested in wildlife suggested 10 years. Certain stockmen suggested the elimination of any ceiling, and letting the time extend to perhaps 30 or 50 years. The committee felt that 20 years represented a fair length of time during which improvements might be amortized.

There is no intent on the part of the committee to perpetrate an injustice on

anyone. The House may get more information on that point than the Senate was able to obtain. I am sure the Members of the House will advise us if they believe the 20-year period is not correct.

Mr. BARRETT. There is one further point about which I should like to inquire. It refers to drift fences that might be built under the terms of the bill. Assuming that a fence, after about 10 years or so, needed extensive repairs, it might well be that to put the fence in good repair would cost half again its original cost. In the Senator's opinion, would that extend the life of the term of the contract for depreciation purposes?

Mr. AIKEN. It is my opinion that if the fence had lost its value and then by agreement with the Forest Service the permittee built another fence, it might constitute a new contract. However, the Forest Service can now make such arrangements. We are merely trying to write into law and make congressional policy what is now Forest Service policy.

In the hearings we found general satisfaction with the administration of the lands by the Forest Service. No one may go ahead and make improvements on his land without full agreement of the Forest Service in the first place, and included in such agreement would be the length of time during which he might be required to amortize the cost of the improvement.

Mr. BARRETT. I thank the Senator. I take it, then, it is the intention of the committee that discretion shall be left with the Forest Service to make supplemental agreements as time goes on, and by doing so they could extend the depreciation period.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I think that is a matter to be determined through an agreement with the Forest Service and the permittee. They have been getting along very nicely in most cases. When land has been removed from grazing use to be used for watershed protection or other purposes, the permittee, naturally, has not felt very happy about it. Nevertheless, he has in almost every instance accepted the decision of the Forest Service.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I do not desire to delay the passage of the bill. I regret that I have not had an opportunity to study it, though. The fault is mine, and I did not know it was coming up today. So I should like to ask a question about it. As I understand from what I have heard regarding the bill, it provides only for improvements which private users may make on Forest Service land. Is that correct? Or does it go beyond that and give an equity in the land?

Mr. AIKEN. No. It gives no equity in the land to the permittee.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. It regulates improvements made on Forest Service lands?

Mr. AIKEN. The improvements are made, in the first place, with the approval of the Forest Service.

The Forest Service asked us to include the eradication of noxious plants as one part of the work which the permittee might do. While the Forest Service itself does some work of that kind, the permittee may discover 4 or 5 acres of land covered with Canadian thistles, or some other weeds, and he might want to eradicate them without further delay. With the approval of the Forest Service he could do that work and be credited with the improvement. It would not give him any interest in the land itself.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. He would have no equity at all in the land, and could not sell his permit to run stock on the range.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator is correct.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. If the permittee had made improvements under agreement with the Forest Service and then, for some reason, the Forest Service decided to use the land for some other purpose, the permittee would be entitled to recover on the undepreciated part of his improvement, would he not?

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. THYE. I will say to my distinguished friend from Colorado that the general purpose of the bill was primarily to provide an incentive for users of grazing areas in the national forests to make improvements which would aid a permittee in managing the range; for instance, to construct drift fences to keep cattle off surrounding areas of the range at certain times of the year, or to improve the springs or water facilities, which might not involve the expenditure of a great deal of money. A man would hesitate before spending very much money to remove brush which is spreading across the grazing area, thereby destroying its use for grazing.

If a rancher wanted to eradicate the brush, either by burning or by some other method, and then to reseed it to grass, and if he went to that expense, he would be certain he would have a right to use the land over a period of 20 years. But let us suppose he passed away, and his widow and children could not carry on, and would have to give up the land. Unless some such provision as this were written into the law, there would be a question as to who would compensate the widow for the expense to which the husband had gone in improving the range. If the improvement of the range is not done by the user, the Forest Service would have to do it, and that, of course, becomes more expensive. Possibly the work would not be done for a long time.

That thought, in part, was behind the language of the bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Then the Senator agrees with me when he says that if the permittee goes to the land and makes improvements he will be guaranteed the use of the land for a period of 20 years.

Mr. THYE. No. I was referring to the maximum value that goes into the improvement. The permittee has no lien or equity.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The permittee, then, cannot do anything more with the land, under the bill, than he can at the present time?

Mr. THYE. No.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] and I were delegated by the committee to study the bill and report our findings to the full committee. We suggested most of the amendments recommended by the committee so as to bring the bill more in keeping with what was intended to be accomplished. As has already been stated we sought to write into law much of what was now being done by the Department of Agriculture through rule and regulations. The main purpose of the bill is to encourage range improvements by grazing permittees. They are assured of receiving the benefits of increased grazing capacity resulting from improvements made by themselves. The permittees are protected against loss of their improvements, less depreciation, should the Government take over the lands leased for its own use. They are also allowed to receive payment by subsequent permittees for such improvements as they may undertake. In order to prevent permittees from acquiring continuing interests in improvements on the public range they are permitted to amortize the value of the improvement over a period of 20 years, after the expiration of which period the improvements would have no value for compensation purposes. The bill in no way gives to the permittees a vested right in the public lands.

Mr. THYE. As the Senator from Vermont pointed out, if any fencing or anything else in the nature of improvement is placed on the land, the permittee will have 20 years within which to charge off the cost of the improvement.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield further?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. If he continues to use the land. But if he should die, as the Senator from Minnesota has suggested, and his estate should be liquidated, under this bill, his right to run stock on the reserve could not be sold.

Mr. AIKEN. Of course not, if he should die.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. But suppose he should live and wanted to go out of the business.

Mr. AIKEN. He could transfer the right. But it would have to be done with the consent of the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I think I have the floor.

Mr. FERGUSON. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. What is the nature of the improvement a man can put on land in order to enable him to retain his rights?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. In the past, persons using Forest Service land have been permitted to build fences. I have run livestock on Forest Reserve land. A number of fences were built, and even a pasture in which to keep cattle. That is an old custom. It was done under the supervision of the Forest Service.

But I know there has been an effort made by livestock men to gain an equity or a property right in a permit to run cattle on the Forest Reserve, and I wondered if this bill would provide for that in a modified way.

Mr. ELLENDER. No. I can assure the Senator it does not. It does not give them any vested right at all in the land itself.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. If a rancher builds a fence and then next year, for one reason or another is unable to use it, he ought to have some way of being reimbursed, if the construction had been done with the consent of the Forest Service.

Mr. AIKEN. That is the purpose of the bill, I may say to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The bill provides for a broadening out, by permitting the development of water holes, for example?

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator is correct.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. And to fight obnoxious weeds?

Mr. AIKEN. In certain areas of the range country, it was desired to undertake some reseeding, while in other areas reseeding would not be effective. That would be determined by the Forest Service. The rancher can do nothing that is not authorized by the Forest Service, under the contract with the Forest Service; but the bill will provide assurance that if he develops the range under agreement with the Forest Service, and then he should be killed a week later, his widow will not lose everything.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I think those are fine objectives. I am glad they are being put in the statute. However, I am surprised that any legislation is needed, because the Forest Service has the authority to do all these things, and it has done all of them, except perhaps to conduct the fight against obnoxious weeds; and it has done that to some extent.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. THYE. I may say to the Senator from Colorado that in his State we met with the ranchers, and also met with the representatives of the Forest Service and with the Secretary of Agriculture. We spent a very informative and profitable day in the range area, in the Senator's own State. We even looked for the Senator, and regretted that he could not have been with us at the time we visited his State.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I regret that I was not able to be present. Colorado has 12 very large forest reserves, and this bill is a matter of great importance to Colorado. I also knew that a great many of the ranchers were trying to establish an equity which they could sell on the market or which they would be authorized to use, and which they would be assured they could use over a long period of time.

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

Mr. AIKEN. I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. I have received objections from persons in Michigan who are interested in conservation, so I wish to ask this question: Is there any prescriptive right possible under the bill? After occupying the land for a period of years, is it possible for one to acquire any prescriptive rights to title, or clear rights to compensation, less depreciation?

Mr. ELLENDER. The bill gives no permittee the right to acquire any of the real estate. What the bill is intended to accomplish is provided in section 2, subsections (a), (b), (c), and (d) and, I believe, subsection (a) spells out the main purpose of the measure and that is "to give assurance to a permittee that he will receive the benefits of the increased grazing capacity resulting from improvements made by him."

Mr. FERGUSON. In other words, if the permittee seeded the range——

Mr. ELLENDER. He would be protected.

Mr. FERGUSON. He has some rights. Suppose the Forest Service desired to cancel his rights. Could it cancel them and compensate the rancher for his improvements?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes, should the Government decide to use the land compensation would then be made to the permittee, less any depreciation.

Let us assume that a fence has been built on the public domain through an agreement between a permittee and the Forest Service, and the fence has been used for 3 years. Let us assume further that the rate of depreciation agreed upon was 10 percent a year. That would be 30 percent of the cost.

If the Federal Government desired to take over the lands under lease for its own use, then it would be obligated, under the bill, simply to compensate the person who built the fence for 70 percent of its cost.

Mr. FERGUSON. Suppose the fence were built, but was of no value; that the permittee had made a mistake such as many persons sometimes make, and even the rancher and the Department of Agriculture came to the conclusion that instead of its being of benefit, it was a detriment to the range.

Would the Government still be required to pay 70 percent of the cost?

Mr. ELLENDER. No. If a permittee should fail to obtain any benefit on the property because of a mistake on his part and he abandons any improvements made by him it would be his loss. In other words, if he should fail in his venture he could not make the Government pay for his improvements.

Mr. AIKEN. A permittee could not install any improvements without the approval of the Forest Service.

Mr. FERGUSON. Oh, he must first get the approval of the Forest Service?

Mr. AIKEN. He must first enter into an agreement with the Forest Service.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Forest Service would determine whether the proposed improvement would or would not be a benefit?

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator is correct. The Forest Service at all times can reduce the number of stock to be grazed on a certain area.

Mr. FERGUSON. A permittee would not be entitled to compensation if it were decided that he should run 50 head of stock instead of 100 head?

Mr. AIKEN. The Forest Service has a right to make such a determination.

Mr. FERGUSON. And a permittee would not get compensation if he were required to make a reduction in the number?

Mr. AIKEN. No.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Does the bill make very clear that no vested right can be gained by a permittee?

Mr. ELLENDER. It does.

Mr. AIKEN. It is absolutely clear, and it is the firm intention of the committee, that no one shall acquire any vested rights in any of the property.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. As the Senator from Vermont knows, the original legislation was sought by the ranchers. Perhaps the father or the grandfather of this bill was a bill which provided that a rancher might be able to secure a vested right in forest land. Then he could improve it and operate it just as thought it were his own. He could sell it to anyone he wished, or he could use it as long as he wished.

However, that has been abandoned, and all that is being done is to formalize the type of improvements a permittee can place on the land, and the Forest Service can reduce the size of his herds or permit increases in them, just as it can now.

Mr. AIKEN. Just as it can do now; yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. There is a great deal of competition, as the Senator knows.

Mr. AIKEN. That is true.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. From the hearings held in Colorado and in other Western States, it appears there is considerable competition for the right to run cattle on the forest lands. That privilege is much sought after. I assume the Forest Service will be in complete control of the lands, as it has been heretofore.

Mr. AIKEN. I cannot too strongly state that to be the fact. The Forest Service will be in complete control of regulating the number of cattle to be run on the land, and will be deprived of no rights and no functions whatever by the proposed legislation.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I have one more question, and then I shall not interrupt further.

Does the proposed legislation meet with the complete approval of the Forest Service?

Mr. AIKEN. Absolutely, it does.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. And of the Department of Agriculture?

Mr. AIKEN. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Did any witnesses who were opposed to the bill appear before the committee?

Mr. AIKEN. Yes. There were several who opposed the original provisions of the bill. I think most of the objections have been reconciled.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. By amendments?

Mr. AIKEN. The committee had a great deal of assistance from persons representing the conservation and wildlife interests. I wish particularly to mention Hugh Woodward, of Albuquerque, and a Mr. Smart, from, I think, Salt Lake City. There were others whose names I cannot recall now. All of them were very helpful, indeed, in pointing out provisions of the bill which could be improved.

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

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. THYE. I may say to my friend, the distinguished Senator from Colorado, that we studied range improvement in Colorado. The whole intent of the bill is to try to help the Forest Service and those in charge of public grazing to obtain better management of the grazing area, and to allow the building of drift fences and to keep cattle on the lower ranges at certain times of the year, and then on the higher ranges as the season progresses.

The entire purpose of the bill is to have the user given the incentive to make improvements, because he can make improvements cheaper than the Government can, for the reason that the user may have his crew available at certain times of the year and be able to build or repair fences, whereas for the Forest Service to do so would require the use of a whole detachment of men, trucks, and other facilities of that nature.

The entire thought was to improve the method of handling the grazing area of the range, and I think an excellent bill has been produced to do exactly that.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. It would appear that this will be good legislation, and I thank the members of the committee for giving me the information which they have. I regret that I had not carefully studied the bill previously.

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

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I should like to ask the chairman of the subcommittee or the chairman of the full committee a few questions relative to the proposed legislation. First, why was section 5 of the bill deleted? This section called for a comprehensive economic study for the purpose of obtaining information necessary to establish a method for determining grazing fees on the lands described in section 1, which would take into consideration all relevant facts and circumstances. It provided that within 2 years the Secretary of Agriculture would make a report.

Mr. AIKEN. Section 5 was originally an offspring of a conservation bill which was referred to the Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs of the Senate and the House, and provided for a study of the public lands, with a view to fixing proper rates for grazing purposes.

But the bill now under consideration refers only to forest lands. Lower rates by far are charged for lands under the Interior Department. Both the Forest Service and the Department of Interior have full authority to make such a study, if they have the money with which to do it. It is presumed it will cost about $200,000, as I recall the estimate.

In our report we are recommending to the Committee on Appropriations that they make the money available for a comprehensive survey not only of forest lands but of the lands under the Interior Department as well. We felt that to make a survey only of the Forest Service lands, which at the present time represent approximately three times the grazing fees per animal unit that the Interior Department lands do, would of itself not prove anything at all. So we are recommending to the Committee on Appropriations that it provide funds for a survey of all the public lands where grazing is permitted.

Mr. MANSFIELD. So, in effect, the intent behind the recommendation of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry will be the same as in the deleted section 5, to wit, that grazing fees will be raised if the study proves an increase to be necessary?

Mr. AIKEN. That is correct. We felt section 5 itself would not go very far in that it would apply only to certain lands which are particularly well administered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The assurance of the chairman of the committee is good enough for me.

Mr. AIKEN. So we recommend that this study be made of the Bureau of Land Management lands, as well as national forest and Bankhead-Jones lands.

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is a strong recommendation, I assume?

Mr. AIKEN. It is as strong as we could make it.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I should like to ask one more question. Why have the activities of the multiple-use advisory councils been reduced from considering all questions relative to Forest Service lands to a limited number of such questions?

Mr. AIKEN. I do not think they have been. There has been no legislative authority for the use of multiple-use advisory councils up to this time. The Department of Agriculture has used them, but they have been strictly informal, and so we are giving them statutory being.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Will they be consulted on all matters affecting the use of Forest Service lands?

Mr. AIKEN. Does the Senator wish me to read section 11, which pertains to his question?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes.

Mr. AIKEN. Section 11, on page 10 of the bill, reads:

> In order to obtain the views and recommendations of the various users of the lands described in section 1—

They are the Forest Service and the Bankhead-Jones lands.

> SEC. 11. In order to obtain the views and recommendations of the various users of the lands described in section 1 and their resources on questions of policy involved in the multiple use of such lands, the Secretary may establish multiple use advisory councils: *Provided, however,* That such councils shall not supersede or perform any of the functions of the advisory boards established under section 18 of the act of April 24, 1950.

That is the Thye-Granger Act.

> Such councils may be established for any unit of such lands, for groups of such units, and for all such lands. In appointing the members of such councils, the Secretary shall give consideration to the recommendations made by the officers of organizations representing the principal interests concerned with the use and administration of such lands, including, but not limited to, grazing, mining, recreation, timber production, watershed conservation, wildlife, and the general public. Such councils may submit recommendations on their own initiative or in response to requests by the Secretary with respect to any question of policy affecting the multiple use of such lands.

That provision gives the multiple use councils official recognition for the first time. They have been used up to now, but only on an informal basis.

Some persons thought provision should be made for per diem fees and expenses; but it seemed to the committee that to do so would simply invite an opening of the gates. Every Member of the Senate knows what such an invitation would mean. It is possible that on a regional or a national basis the Secretary might desire the advice of a multiple use council. It is my understanding that if such provision were made, members of the council could be put on a consulting basis, and transportation and other expenses could be paid. We felt that in each community people interested in recreation, wildlife, grazing, forestry, and so forth, would be willing to contribute their services, just as they do now on an informal basis. The bill does not go so far as some persons would like to go, and I think it goes a little further than some would like to go. To the committee as a whole, however, what is provided seems like a very good step.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I should like to say to the Senator from Vermont that, in my opinion, it would be advisable to set up the multiple use councils, which were just mentioned, on a local basis rather than a regional basis, because many times consulting fees run up to a high figure. I should like to see a continuation of the practice which is in effect at the present time. While I realize the bill will give statutory legality to the councils, nevertheless, discretion rests in the Secretary of Agriculture, as I read the bill.

Mr. AIKEN. The bill takes nothing away from those who would like to employ multiple use councils.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, the committee did not try to do away with the use of the multiple use councils; we tried to dignify the councils by naming them in the law, in the event a controversy arose and there was a need for a council to give consideration to any problem. We dignified the council by having it provided for in the law, but we hoped the use of the councils would be on the same basis on which they have been employed in the past. I do not believe the committee has

deprived the councils of any function; we have made the councils more dignified by referring to them in the law.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I am pleased to note that the chairman of the subcommittee which handled the legislation can give the Senate that assurance. What I have in mind is that I hope the Secretary will not take the word "may" too literally, but that he will consult with the advisory councils so that all interests in the forest lands can be given proper consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BUSH in the chair). The bill is open to further amendment. If no further amendment is to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 2548) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to facilitate the administration of the national forests and other lands under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of Agriculture; to provide for the orderly use, improvement, and development thereof; and for other purposes."

STATEHOOD FOR HAWAII

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California will state it.

Mr. KNOWLAND. What is the pending business before the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending bill is the unfinished business, which will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 49) to enable the people of Hawaii to form a constitution and State government and to be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States.

THE GRAIN-STORAGE PROBLEM

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Mr. President, the junior Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] discussed the grain-storage problem at some length last week. His remarks were included in the RECORD of February 25.

The fact that there are large surpluses of some grains and other farm commodities is, of course, more important at the moment than the question of how they happened to be acquired. Nevertheless, I think it should be pointed out that this administration inherited no small part of these surpluses. They were built up even further during 1953 as a result of decisions made by the former Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Brannan, in 1952. In fairness to Secretary Benson, it should be made very clear that he had no voice in the decision to permit unlimited planting of the 1953 crops of wheat and cotton.

It was Mr. Brannan who determined that there should be no acreage controls. Shortly before leaving office he actually called upon farmers to increase their 1953 acreage of corn.

As soon as he possibly could do so under the law, Secretary Benson moved to prevent further pileups of these three major crops. The surpluses we have on hand are not of his making.

At the same time this administration has gone forward during the last year with the most comprehensive program ever devised to encourage expansion of the Nation's grain-storage facilities. It already has set in motion—well in advance of the marketing of the 1954 crops—an enlarged plan to meet this year's storage needs.

This administration is solving the storage problem with a six-point program which includes:

First. A guaranteed-occupancy plan, with the Commodity Credit Corporation contracting to reimburse commercial and cooperative warehouse operators in the event that actual usage of newly constructed storage facilities falls below specified levels. Net applications accepted to date indicate that more than 200 million bushels of new space will be added under this program.

Second. Direct loans to farmers for construction of bins and cribs. This resulted in the construction of 30 million bushels of storage space on farms during 1953. A companion program made loans available to farmers for the purchase of ventilators, fans, and other drying equipment.

Third. A rapid tax amortization plan, approved by Congress in 1953, permitting farmers and commercial warehousemen to charge off the construction cost of new facilities over a 5-year period.

Fourth. An increase of 96 million bushels in the Commodity Credit Corporation's ownership of storage facilities during 1953.

Fifth. An emergency storage plan under which 305 ships of the reserve fleet are being used to store 68 million bushels of grain.

Sixth. Emergency loans on wheat stored on the ground and in temporary structures at harvest time, as well as special loans on rust-damaged wheat.

This six-point program has made it possible to meet the storage problem thus far.

The guaranteed occupancy plan, together with the individual loans to farmers and the rapid tax amortization, give farmers, co-ops, and commercial warehouse operators the greatest incentives ever offered to increase grain storage facilities. Emphasis has been placed primarily upon encouraging the expansion of storage by farmers and commercial handlers of grain, rather than by the Government itself.

On February 25, the very day when the Senator from Iowa was expressing criticism, Mr. Benson had issued a warning about the possible storage squeeze this year. The Secretary called for cooperation by farmers and all others in getting ready to meet it, and he reviewed the many aids available.

Again—on last Friday, March 5—Secretary Benson announced additional storage program steps for this year. He has called a special meeting at Omaha, Nebr., for March 18. At this meeting, the whole grain storage situation will be reviewed with farmers and others from all grain-producing areas, and plans will be made for further aggressive and coordinated attacks on the whole storage problem. I hope to attend this meeting.

The farmers and storage men of the country know that the present administration is doing an outstanding job of helping to assure the storage which will protect 1954 crops and make the established price supports work as fully as possible.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the grain storage statements issued on February 25 and March 5 by the Secretary of Agriculture be printed at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

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

SECRETARY BENSON WARNS ABOUT STORAGE AND URGES FARMERS TO PLAN EARLY

WASHINGTON, February 24, 1954.—Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson today warned of the danger of serious storage problems this year and urged farmers to make plans now to help assure adequate storage facilities.

"Continued big production, encouraged by high price supports, has built up tremendous supplies of major commodities," Secretary Benson pointed out. "Storage facilities had to be stretched to the limit, and supplemented in many cases, in order to handle 1953 crops.

"With normal weather this spring and summer, the storage problem can be even more acute in 1954. The carryover of old supplies—before this year's harvests—will be at all-time record levels for the two leading grain crops. The wheat carryover is now expected to be above 800 million bushels, as compared with 562 million bushels last year. The corn carryover is expected to be around 900 million bushels, as compared with 769 million in 1953.

"The size of this year's crop will, of course, be a determining factor, but it is obvious that the storage situation can be very serious—especially in areas of heaviest concentration of supplies.

"The effectiveness of price-support programs for storage commodities depends very directly on the availability of adequate storage. The regular price-support loans cannot be extended to farmers unless their commodities are housed in satisfactory storage—either on the farm or in commercial facilities.

"The Department of Agriculture did everything possible to assist the expansion of both farm and commercial storage facilities in 1953. It will continue this vigorous help this year. The final responsibility, however, rests with farmers themselves. They should anticipate their requirements and make plans immediately to see that adequate storage space is available when they need it. We will help in every practicable way."

The Secretary called attention to the following specific types of assistance which the Federal Government is making available to farmers to help them expand storage facilities on their own farms, in addition to special steps to increase commercial space:

Farm storage-facility loans: Commodity Credit Corporation loans for financing new storage construction are available to farmers through local banks or direct from the local county agricultural stabilization and conservation committee. These loans, which can run up to 80 percent of the cost of the new storage facilities in most States, can be paid off over a 4-year period. The loans, at 4 percent interest, are available until June 30, 1954, and are intended to supplement local credit services when for any reason normal lending-agency credit is not available. Last year around 30 million bushels of farm-storage capacity was added under this program.

Storage-equipment loans: Commodity Credit Corporation loans are also available

to farmers for financing the purchase of drying equipment for the conditioning of storable crops. The drying equipment includes mobile mechanical dryers, air circulators, ventilators, tunnels, and fans. The loans, which are available until June 30, 1954, through the same local sources as the storage loans, can be used to meet up to 75 percent of the delivered and assembled cost of the equipment. They are payable in three annual installments, or earlier, at the option of the borrower. The interest rate is 4 percent a year. The loans are intended to assist farmers who need this additional financial help in getting and maintaining their crops in the proper storage conditions required for CCC commodity loans.

Income-tax amortization deductions: Public Law 287, 83d Congress, section 206, signed by the President August 15, 1953, provides an amortization deduction for grain-storage facilities. Under this provision the Federal income-tax payer may elect to amortize over a period of 60 months the depreciable cost of grain-storage facilities constructed after December 31, 1952. The amortization provision also applies to alteration or remodeling of a grain-storage structure that increases the capacity of the structure for grain storage. Eligible storage facilities include any corncrib, grain bin, or grain elevator, or any similar structure suitable primarily for the storage of grain, or any public grain warehouse permanently equipped for receiving, elevating, conditioning, and loading out grain. No application for the deduction is required: The decision by the taxpayer to take the deduction can be announced simply by a statement to that effect in his Federal income-tax return for the taxable year in which the storage structure is completed.

In addition, the following programs and special aids are available to encourage increases in elevator and warehouse space for use by farmers and others as needed:

Guaranteed occupancy of new warehouse storage: Under this program, the CCC contracts to make payments to warehousemen in the event that occupancy of approved new storage construction falls below specified levels over a period of 5 or 6 years, depending on the plan the warehouseman elects. The program is designed to encourage new construction by responsible commercial firms in areas where additional storage facilities are needed. As of February 13, 1954 applications totaling more than 293 million bushels of new storage capacity had been tentatively approved by the Department. Cancellations and withdrawals by applicants of previously accepted applications totaled approximately 85 million bushels, leaving a net total of acceptances of more than 208 million bushels. The new construction will be principally available for farmers' use, with CCC stocks to be used largely as needed to maintain the guaranteed levels of occupancy.

Income-tax amortization deductions: The Federal income tax deductions for amortization over a period of 60 months of the depreciable cost of new grain storage facilities applies to commercial and cooperative storage elevators and warehouses as well as to farm storage structures.

Expanded CCC bin sites: During the past year the CCC has awarded contracts for the purchase of 16,520 grain storage structures—with a total capacity of approximately 96,211,600 bushels—for erection at CCC bin-sites in Illinois, Iowa, Kansas, Michigan, Minnesota, Nebraska, South Dakota, and Wisconsin. This brings CCC bin-site storage capacity, which is used when adequate commercial storage is not available, to a total of approximately 640 million bushels. By storing a large part of its own holdings of corn at these Corn Belt bin-sites, CCC removes this quantity of grain from competition for available farm and commercial storage in these areas.

Emergency ship grain storage: During the past year the CCC made arrangements with the United States Maritime Administration for the emergency storage of grain in 125 ships of the Maritime Administration's Reserve Fleet. These ships—75 at Jones Point, N. Y., and 50 on the James River—have provided storage for approximately 28 million bushels of wheat. Preparations have been completed for the use of an additional 180 ships this year, consisting of 130 ships in the Pacific Northwest and 50 additional ships on the James River. These additions will provide CCC with new emergency ship storage for approximately 40 million bushels of grain, thus opening up an equal quantity of commercial storage for use by farmers and other commercial users.

SECRETARY BENSON ANNOUNCES NEW STORAGE AIDS; CALLS CONFERENCE AT OMAHA MARCH 18

WASHINGTON, March 5, 1954.—Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson today announced additional action in the United States Department of Agriculture's broad program to help assure adequate grain storage facilities to handle the big supplies expected this year, and to make it possible for farmers to take full advantage of the established price support programs:

1. A special resealing program will encourage farmers to hold 1953-crop loan and purchase agreement stocks of seven commodities on the farm for another year, instead of turning them over to the Commodity Credit Corporation this summer. The seven commodities are: Corn, wheat, oats, barley, grain sorghums, rye, and flaxseed.

2. Farm storage facility and equipment loan programs, under which farmers can borrow a large part of the cost of building or buying additional storage space and drying equipment, will be continued for another year.

3. A national grain storage conference will be held at Omaha, Nebr., on Thursday, March 18, to review the whole storage situation and make further plans for a coordinated and aggressive attack upon storage-shortage problems in all areas.

"With average weather, 1954 production—added to all-time record carryovers of former crops—can mean the most serious storage problems we have ever faced," Secretary Benson said in commenting on today's announcement. "We met the situation last year by stretching facilities to the limit and offering many special aids to increase available storage. We are determined to do everything possible again this year to see that the big supplies can be handled and that farmers will be in position to use the price-support loan and purchase agreement programs fully. By starting emergency measures early in the season, we are confident that, with full cooperation, the storage problems can be met satisfactorily."

Department of Agriculture officials point out that the extent of the storage problems ahead will be determined largely by the size of 1954 production. On the basis of average expectancy, however, they think the total supply of grains and oil seeds after harvest this year may be from 300 to 500 million bushels greater than a year ago. In terms of storage needs, some of this anticipated increase in total supplies can be offset by increases in storage capacity already scheduled.

Storage shortages in some areas of concentrated supply may be more severe than the overall national situation, and relatively serious problems can be expected in all heavy grain producing regions if yields are normal. Other special problems will center around the big volume of 1953-crop price support loan and purchase agreement stocks which CCC will probably have to take over at the end of the program year.

Referring to the seriousness of the storage situation, James A. McConnell, Administrator of the Commodity Stabilization Service, said, "Never before in history has this Nation or any other nation been faced with the problem of handling, storing, and keeping in good usable condition such a vast amount of grain. It will require the utmost teamwork on the part of farmers, the grain trade, and the Department of Agriculture. The very heart of the price-support program is storage. Storage on the farm, storage in the country, and terminal storage—all must be brought into play. The more storage farmers provide, the better chance the individual farmer has of getting full benefits."

Under a resealing program which was available last year for loan stocks of three 1952 crops—corn, wheat, and oats—a considerable quantity of grain was held on the farm. The new and broadened program covers four additional crops. Farmers who reseal 1953 stocks this year will earn storage payments in line with 1954 Uniform Grain Storage Agreement rates.

The Department of Agriculture will urge farmers to use the new re-seal program, holding the grain themselves for another year and helping to solve mutual storage problems. It is expected that the quantity of grain re-sealed will be far greater than a year ago. Details of the new re-seal program, and the States where it will apply for the different commodities, will be announced in the near future.

The farm storage facility loans, which are being extended for another year beyond June 30, offer farmers up to 80 percent of the cost of new storage facilities in most States. The loans, which carry 4-percent interest, can be paid off over a 4-year period. A net increase of about 30 million bushels of on-farm storage capacity was financed under these loans in 1953.

The storage equipment loans, also extended for another year beyond June 30, offer up to 75 percent of the delivered and assembled cost of ventilators, fans, and other drying equipment needed to keep stored crops in proper condition. They also carry 4-percent interest, and can be paid off in three annual installments.

The grain-storage conference at Omaha will be attended by administrative officials of the Department of Agriculture and by representatives from grain-producing States. These will include representatives of the extension services of State agricultural colleges, State agricultural stabilization and conservation committees, State departments of agriculture and markets, farm and commodity organizations, and warehouse, feed manufacture, storage supply, and related business and cooperative services.

Facts on the probable storage situation, for different crops and in different regions, will be presented at the conference. Plans will also be made for cooperative efforts, on a State-by-State basis, to do everything necessary to meet the expected storage problems.

In addition to the new storage action announced today, a broad program of other aids and services is in effect. These include:

A "guaranteed occupancy" program to encourage construction of new warehouse and elevator facilities, under which the current net of application acceptances calls for an increase of about 200 million bushels of capacity.

Special income tax features (similar to those authorized for defense plant amortization) under which the cost of new farm or commercial storage facilities can be amortized over a period of 5 years.

Emergency ship storage, for use in holding Commodity Credit Corporation grain stocks in order to relieve regular storage facilities. A total of 305 ships from the Reserve fleet, on both the east and west coasts, can house about 68 million bushels of grain.

CCC bins which are used to store Government-owned grain when commercial facilities are not available, thus freeing storage space for the new crops. CCC owns such bins with a total capacity of about 640 million bushels, of which 96 million bushels were added in 1953.

Decisions on whether it will be necessary to acquire more CCC bin capacity, to meet emergency needs this year, will be made later as the situation develops.

CONSTRUCTION AND OPERATING SUBSIDIES UNDER THE MERCHANT MARINE ACT OF 1936, AS AMENDED

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, in view of the almost complete—and, to my mind, thoroughly tragic—lack of understanding of the purposes of, and the vital need for, the American Merchant Marine, I desire to call to the attention of both Congress and the general public a few facts and opinions, gleaned from an official Government report which has just come to hand.

This report, styled "Analysis of Construction and Operating Subsidies Under Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as Amended," was submitted by the Ocean Shipping Panel of the Transportation Council for the Department of Commerce. The panel is composed of top executives of leading American shipping lines. Based on a study by the panel, the report in question was submitted at the request of the Under Secretary of Commerce in charge of transportation, Robert B. Murray, Jr.

Laid down at the very outset of the report, as a basic premise, is a conclusion to the effect that—

There is a general agreement that we need an adequate and balanced American merchant marine. The authorities appear unanimous, and assign two compelling reasons: (a) The national defense requirements and (b) the economic advantages.

Heading the authorities on these points is listed President Eisenhower. In a statement issued on October 3, 1952, the President declared:

In 1944, from London, I said, "When final victory is ours, there is no organization that will share its credit more deservedly than the American merchant marine." We were caught flatfooted in both world wars because we relied too much upon foreign owned and operated shipping to carry our cargoes abroad and to bring critically needed supplies to this country. America's industrial prosperity and military security both demand that we maintain a privately operated merchant marine adequate in size and of modern design to insure that our lines of supply for either peace or war will be safe. I consider the merchant marine to be our fourth arm of defense and vital to the stability and expansion of our foreign trade.

Mr. President, I ask my colleagues Senators to note carefully the President's undisguised warning against dependence upon foreign shipping in time of emergency. This dangerous doctrine, advanced under the former administration, is readvocated in the report recently made to the President by the Commission on Foreign Economic Policy. In the report, generally known as the Randall Commission report, "availability of foreign vessels" and "the importance to the balance of payments of foreign maritime nations of their dollar earnings from shipping services" are reasons urged for consideration in the determination of the active merchant fleet requirements of the United States.

Against this recommendation are the findings of the Department of Commerce with respect to our experience in World War II and in Korea, as reported by the former Secretary of Commerce to the President on November 1, 1952.

The Secretary's report declared:

World War II and Korea dispel any doubts which might have existed prior to that time as to this country's reliance upon our merchant marine in assuring its national security. Ships are as much materials of war as guns and airplanes, and no world power can depend entirely upon foreign nations to supply it with the sinews of war. It is elementary that our military plans still are governed largely by the availability of shipping.

Mr. President, in this connection it might well be noted that our country paid more than $100,000,000 to Great Britain for temporary use of the passenger ships *Queen Mary* and *Queen Elizabeth* to transport United States troops across the Atlantic in World War II. Under the type of long-range programing which all who are interested in the merchant marine believe is necessary to assure national security, the Government could assure itself, at this cost, of two ultramodern troop ships of the *United States* class for immediate use in time of emergency. Further, without such long-range programing of passenger and cargo-ship construction, there can be no assurance that an adequate number of vessels of either type will be available and ready at hand if and when the need for them should arise again.

A vital point made in the Commerce Department's recent ocean shipping panel report that merits the thoughtful attention of Senators and citizenry alike has to do with cost—and results—of war-built ship construction as against an orderly year-to-year replacement program based upon well-considered passenger, dry cargo and tanker needs.

Noting that the Shipping Act of 1916 was designed chiefly to meet the shipping needs of World War I, the report states:

As time did not permit a rebuilding of privately-owned merchant marine the act authorized the Government to buy, build, and operate an American-flag merchant fleet. We paid heavily for the prior neglect of shipping, the cost to the Government for shipbuilding during 1916–20 being almost $2½ billion.

Here let me remind my colleagues that the Commerce Department report of November 1, 1952, on the Merchant Marine and the Federal Tax Policy, adds the crushing commentary that the World War I shipbuilding program, the cost of which it placed at more than $3 billion produced 2,300 ships, but none of them were actually delivered until after the Armistice.

Immediately pertinent to the foregoing is the statement by the former Secretary of Commerce, in the above-mentioned November 1, 1952, report, concerning what he termed the shipping impasse before this country's entrance into World War I.

The ships of foreign nations, carrying about 90 percent of the American foreign trade, were withdrawn from normal operations—

According to this report—

and the American economy was cut off from foreign raw materials and American export trade was left high and dry.

Is there any assurance that we shall not be left high and dry again in future emergencies, if, despite the warning of our President and of high military leaders who have testified before our Senate subcommittee as to the utter necessity of an adequate Merchant Marine to supplement the American Navy, we delude ourselves into again placing such dependence upon possible allies?

We have seen, then, that shipbuilding costs in World War I were either 2½ billions or more than 3 billions depending upon which set of figures we prefer, and the results, as least so far as the war itself is concerned, were nil. Not a single ship was delivered until after the Armistice.

Turning now to World War II, what do we find? The Commerce Department Report of November 1952 puts it this way:

As a result (of the costly shipbuilding program during World War I) the United States in the early 1920's had a sizable merchant fleet available. The result of the failure to maintain this fleet with new and modern replacements, as well as our inability to rely on foreign shipping for our national security, is clearly evidenced by the gigantic shipbuilding program which we were forced to undertake in World War II. In spite of the creation of an international pool of shipping then, it was still necessary for the United States to undertake that tremendous and unprecedented ship construction program without which World War II could not have been won.

During the 3-year period, 1942 through 1944, the Secretary placed total expenditures for cargo ships at 7 percent of all munitions spending, or $10.5 billion. In this connection, the report made this point clear:

The importance of shipping to this country in time of war was thus again demonstrated * * * At the beginning of World War II, this country had some ships and shipyards. Had it not, there is grave doubt whether completely new ships and shipyards could have been built and operated in time. We can stockpile ships but we can't stockpile skills and industrial organization.

As a result of total expenditures of more than $12 billion for shipbuilding during World War II, the American merchant marine at the beginning of 1953 was declared by the ocean shipping panel to be the largest in the Nation's history.

But there are several unfavorable aspects of the situation which the panel emphasizes in its report.

The danger of block obsolescence is one of these problems. The present tonnage, the panel reminds us, is about 83 percent war built, and thus will become obsolescent in a block in the period from 1962 to 1966. This applies principally to the dry cargo ships, which are

90 percent warbuilt. Of the total of 13 million tons of shipping on hand last year only 9 percent is postwar, and thus relatively modern.

Going more into detail on this point, the panel report says that—

About 75 percent of the Government's standby fleet, which represents the second line of national defense, is commercially obsolete. Composed as it is, predominantly of Liberty ships, it will have only limited utility for national defense purposes a few years hence.

Concerning subsidies, the report makes one statement which should be borne in mind by every Member of Congress and every citizen. It is simply this:

The operating-differential subsidy under the provisions of the 1936 act is the only subsidy paid by the Government that is subject to recapture by the Government.

In this connection, and particularly because the controversy over the amount of construction-differential subsidy paid for the building of the steamship *United States* may have left some of our people under a false impression, it is well to quote a few figures from the panel's analysis.

For the 14 years ending December 1, 1951, the net construction-differential subsidies paid on American ship construction was $88 million plus, or an average of $6,300,000 per annum.

Net operating-differential payments, for the same 14-year period, were $147 million. Exclusive of the 1943–46 period during which subsidy payments were suspended, the net annual cost to the Government for operating-differential payments was $14.7 million.

This net total of some $21 million annual payments in behalf of a strong merchant marine compares with average annual subsidy payments to all industry of almost $1 billion yearly. This is for an industry whose operations in the field of foreign commerce have assisted perhaps more than any other single industry in achieving that "extra" measure of business activity which has been so largely responsible for raising the American standard of living so far beyond the world level of living.

That yearly net total of payments to keep alive an industry that is alike indispensable in peace and war compares most favorably with the $20 million of foreign aid paid to Germany and Japan annually during the last 3 years to help revive their merchant marines—which, incidentally, have increased by leaps and bounds during this period while the American merchant marine has declined.

Why should our merchant marine suffer a decline, some will ask, while German and Japanese shipping booms? The answer goes to the heart of the problems of American shipping in competition with that of the rest of the world.

According to figures presented in the report of the Commerce Department ocean-shipping panel, monthly wages of an American-flag vessel during 1952 totaled $24,500, against $4,100 under Japanese registry, and $5,100 under German registry.

This is only one phase of ship operation showing such divergence in costs. Crew subsistence, stores, supplies and equipment, maintenance and repair work, and marine insurance costs likewise are vastly higher in American ship operations because of higher living standards here, tighter safety regulations, and other factors.

Unfortunately, the report of the ocean-shipping panel to the Transportion Council for the Department of Commerce will necessarily have limited distribution. For this reason and because, also, there seems to be so little general interest concerning the American merchant marine I am afraid the findings, conclusions, and recommendations therein will not normally receive the serious attention and thought they deserve. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point the conclusions and recommendations contained in the "Analysis of Construction and Operating Subsidies Under Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as Amended, Submitted by the Ocean Shipping Panel to the Transportation Council for the Department of Commerce."

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

CONCLUSIONS

(A) A strong and modern merchant marine is essential to the foreign commerce and the national defense of the United States.

(B) Large economic advantages flow from the existence of such merchant marine.

(C) Such marine cannot be maintained without some form of equalization of the high American costs and low foreign costs of shipbuilding and ship operation.

(D) The parity principles of the 1936 act are sound and have worked well in practice.

(E) Under its provisions and those of the Merchant Ship Sales Act, 1946, this Nation has attained the best and most modern merchant marine in its history.

(F) The administration of the act is improving, but requires further improvement, particularly as to prompt payments of operating differentials and consistency of policy.

(G) The costs of ship subsidies have been modest, and have been justified by the war services rendered and peacetime benefits produced.

(H) The American merchant marine is facing keener competition from foreign-flag ships.

(I) Foreign discriminations against American-flag ships are being felt.

(J) The competition from MSTS ships is a serious threat to the American merchant marine.

(K) A large part of the American merchant marine will become obsolete en bloc in 1962–66. The problem of ship replacement is great, particularly in view of increased costs.

(L) The Government's reserve fleet is fast becoming obsolete, and many of the deficiencies in our present military needs may be overcome by upgrading the present reserve fleet.

(M) American shipyards face a slack period between 1955 and 1962.

(N) The controversies and uncertainties as to allowance of construction differential subsidy operate as an impediment to shipbuilding programs.

(O) A realistic program of trade-ins is required to achieve the following objectives: (1) An immediate stimulus to shipbuilding; (2) an advance replacement of vessels, particularly those subject to block obsolescence; and (3) an upgrading of the Government's reserve fleet.

(P) A fleet of dry-cargo bulk carriers is a necessary part of the American merchant marine.

(Q) A consistent Government policy toward its merchant marine is essential.

RECOMMENDATIONS

I. The 1936 act

The 1936 act should be steadfastly supported as the foundation of American maritime policy.

II. Military requirements and the reserve fleet

The Department of Defense has estimated that the total civilian and military requirements for merchant-type shipping in the event of the outbreak of war will exceed the available capacity of the American merchant marine by the following numbers of ships: (1) 165 cargo vessels (in addition to the Mariners) having characteristics of the present-day C–2's and C–3's, but faster and having improved cargo handling gear and other special features; (2) 6 passenger vessels having design characteristics of the P–2; and (3) 43 large tankers, equivalent to the T–5 class.

In making this projection the Department of Defense has also stated that:

"The number and type of vessels in the active national defense fleet which can be gainfully employed in the conduct of normal peacetime commerce appears to be a matter which is controlled by the national economy and foreign commerce."

This recognizes that Government aid to shipping must be limited to the number of ships that can be commercially operated at a profit. To go beyond that limit would ignore the law of diminishing returns and result in an excessive expenditure of public funds.

The military objective fixed by the Department of Defense is far in excess of the commercial requirements of the merchant marine. To avoid uneconomical and wasteful dissipation of the resources of the United States, we believe that this military objective must be compromised in a realistic and practical manner. National-defense requirements provide a temptation to operate as large a number of vessels as possible under the American flag. However, in our national planning ordinary commercial needs must be integrated into the national-defense requirements in the most economical manner consistent with the national safety. We believe that this integration will be best effectuated at the least cost to the American taxpayer by having (A) a first-class active commercial fleet under private ownership, and (B) a high-quality reserve fleet maintained by the Government.

Maintenance of approximately 500 C-type and Victory vessels as a reserve fleet in ready status at widely dispersed anchorages would do much to overcome any military deficiency. Adoption of such a plan would permit ready activation of the reserve fleet in times of dire emergency. To achieve this, thought should be given to such appropriate modification of title V of the 1936 act as would encourage shipowners to accelerate trade-ins of their existing vessels without incurring the economic disability now inherent in such trade-ins. We believe that the national benefits of such a program should be recognized and that the problem should be met in an open and realistic manner.

To induce such advance replacement of vessels and to permit up-grading of the reserve fleet, a program of trade-ins should be authorized, whereby the remaining years of life of the present vessel may be exchanged without extra cost against a similar period of life of a replacement vessel of comparable commercial utility. In the event the replacement ship has greater commercial utility, the allowance should be reduced proportionately.

In addition, it will be necessary to set aside, by legislation or otherwise, the recent decision of the Comptroller General to the effect that section 510 (d) of the 1936 act should be interpreted so as to deduct from the trade-in allowance granted for an obsolete vessel an amount equal to the charter hire on such traded-in vessel during the period of construction of a replacement vessel. Continuation of this penalty provision will discourage the trade-in of the existing fleet.

III. Tax deferment

To facilitate ship replacements, accumulations of earnings and profits in reserve funds should be encouraged, by means of tax-deferment and other inducements.

IV. Technological advances

In view of the rapid advances in the field of gas turbines, atomic propulsion, and attendant ship design, a vigorous program of research should be conducted by the Maritime Administration, in cooperation with the Defense Department and shipbuilding and ship operating industries, to assure American leadership in ship design and propulsion.

V. Foreign discriminations

The State Department and all other Government agencies should be instructed to intercede to prevent discriminations by foreign nations against American-flag vessels.

VI. Construction differentials

(A) Construction differentials should be allowed, based on the difference between the cost of a vessel built to American specifications in American yards and the cost of building a foreign-flag vessel of comparable commercial utility to foreign-flag specifications in a foreign yard.

(B) Construction differential rates should be determined and published periodically, as a basis for adoption by the shipowner for contract purposes.

(C) The Maritime Administration's computation of a construction differential should not be subject to review after the contract has been executed.

VII. MSTS competition

The Government should not compete with private industry. MSTS should be prohibited from carrying cargoes or passengers, for the carriage of which privately-owned American-flag vessels are available.

VIII. Subsidy payments

Payments of accrued operating-differential subsidies should be brought up to date, and unpaid amounts due contractors should be available for offset against ship mortgages and other indebtedness of the contractor to the Government.

IX. Bulk carriers

Aid should be extended on suitable terms and conditions to the building and maintenance of a nucleus fleet of new-type dry-cargo bulk carriers as may be required to assure the carriage of a substantial portion of the cargoes normally carried by tramp vessels and the importation of strategic raw materials in time of emergency. The Defense Department should be authorized to take long-term charters on such tonnage. Also, careful and sympathetic investigation should be given to the possibilities of commercial employment of such tonnage and the basis upon which Government aid may be extended thereto. Any subsidy aid to tramp ships should be extended strictly in accordance with the underlying principles of the 1936 act, including all of the conditions and restrictions to which contracting liners are now subject. In addition, suitable safeguards should be included to prevent undermining of the trades of the contracting liner-operators. No obsolete type of bulk carrier, as defined by the 1936 act, should be eligible for subsidy, unless the applicant simultaneously signs a contract to build forthwith a modern replacement vessel of approved design.

X. Special amortization

In recognition of the cyclical nature of shipping earnings, optional or elective amortization of vessel costs should be allowed for Federal tax purposes.

XI. Present reserve fleet

The present, largely obsolete reserve fleet should be evaluated in the light of future military demands. In addition to upgrading the ready reserve fleet through gradual acquisition of existing C-type and Victory-type ships, it appears necessary to provide for defense purposes a limited number of vessels as a secondary reserve in the laid-up fleet.

In conclusion, it should be noted that certain comments on the report have been filed separately by two panel members, and a minority report by a third member.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON INTERNAL SECURITY AND CODE OF FAIR PLAY FOR CONGRESSIONAL INVESTIGATIONS

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, in introducing today, with the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], a joint resolution to establish by law a Joint Committee on Internal Security and a Code of Fair Play for its investigations, I am influenced by several principles.

I may say that originally it had been the intention of the junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON] to introduce a joint resolution on this subject, and I had agreed to join with him and possibly other Senators in the introduction of such a joint resolution. I have been in conversation with the junior Senator from New Jersey over the weekend, and I believe I am correct in saying that he is in sympathy with the purposes of the joint resolution which we are introducing today, but feels, because of his membership on the Republican policy committtee, which is presumably still considering the subject, that he should not himself formally join us at this time in the introduction of the joint resolution.

Mr. President, these are the principles which I believe to be proper and immediate, and which, to my mind, dictate early action in this field.

First. I desire to introduce into our legislative inquiries that same sense of justice and responsibility which is the foundation of our civil rights, and which guides our courts.

Second. I believe this action is necessary to restore the prestige of the Congress, to save it from falling into disrepute, and to strengthen public support for the proper investigative functions of the Congress.

Third. I believe we will improve our prestige abroad by passage of this legislation.

Fourth. I believe we can save a lot of money, and better employ the limited manpower resources of the Congress by consolidating the investigations of dangers to our security into one strong, legally constituted committee. And I believe we can better justify these investigations before history, by giving the single committee the best manpower from each Chamber and a firm legal basis upon which to proceed.

INVESTIGATIONS NEED FAIR PROCEDURES AND CLARIFIED RESPONSIBILITY

We cannot proceed further with committees competing for headlines and sensations, with chairmen contesting with officials of the executive departments, and with the legislative and executive at loggerheads over the best methods and proper spheres of investigations. President Eisenhower was absolutely right when he called for specific rules to guide congressional investigations. I have long felt that we should do this in order to give a fair trial to those brought before what are in effect legislative courts of public opinion, and I so expressed myself on the floor of the Senate last year. I believe also that we must do so in order to protect our own reputations and that of the National Legislature itself.

I devoutly believe that we must temper our investigations—and indeed all our actions—with justice, compassion, and mercy. I do not advocate that we should be soft; not in the least. But we must develop a sense of Christian charity and mercy in our investigations, and apply the principles of fair play and due process that are the guidelines of American legal justice, if we are going to enlist the fullest support and cooperation of all people. I believe that the present resolution would bring these qualities into our internal-security investigations, without in the least weakening the investigative power. Indeed, they would strengthen that very power by enlisting a wider public support.

SAFEGUARDS FOR PERSONAL REPUTATION ARE ESSENTIAL

The joint resolution which I am introducing largely follows the lines of the excellent bill recently introduced in the House by Representative FRELINGHUYSEN, of New Jersey, a young Representative who is becoming widely known for his fine sense of civic concern and responsibility. Its procedural requirements are very similar to those in bills previously introduced in the Senate by my former colleague, Scott W. Lucas, and by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], and other Senators. I think the basic principles which should be followed have been fairly well established by this time, both from an observation of what is wrong with present procedures and from the concrete proposals which have been advanced. At their heart is the doctrine that the accused should have an adequate and speedy right to defend his most precious possession, namely, his reputation. It is as simple as that.

Painfully over the centuries we have built up the attributes of a fair trial in our criminal and civil courts when men's lives and property are involved. But we have not done so where men's reputations are involved. Yet every one of us, I think, cherishes his reputation more than he cherishes his property or his life. Men should at least have the right adequately to defend that reputation when it is attacked.

MAJORITY POLICY COMMITTEE PLAN IS INADEQUATE

I have noted with great concern that the Republican policy committee apparently does not propose to take positive and binding action on the President's recommendations. Nor do they apparently propose to act upon the various bills previously introduced to improve the investigating procedures generally. Instead of acting resolutely, the Republican policy committee, as I understand it from press reports, proposes to make suggestions to committee chairmen for revised rules of conduct. This, I submit, is not enough. The permissive suggestions by the policy committee would amount to an expression of a pious hope that committees will reform themselves, and no more. A reform of this type could be reversed by the next chairman, or the present chairman at his merest wish.

This does not even touch the problem. It is not what the President had in mind, I am sure. He asked for effective measures. I am sorely disappointed that the Republican majority apparently does not intend to meet this issue squarely and head on. It is not a sufficient acceptance of the responsibility we all have as Members of Congress for the reform of our procedures, and does not show a proper regard for preservation of our precious civil rights.

It is true that the congressional committees cannot jail a man on their own motion; they must go through legal procedures of a grand-jury presentment and trial in court before a man may be deprived of his liberty for perjury or contempt.

But there are those of us who feel that the destruction of a person's reputation, reflections upon his honesty and his patriotism, questions as to his love of country—all unsupported by any evidence other than circumstantial, and that often of the most flimsy sort—is even more devastating than a jail sentence.

It was not lightly that Shakespeare wrote the lines:

> But he that filches from me my good name
> Robs me of that which not enriches him,
> And makes me poor indeed.

DIFFERENCES OF OPINION, LIBERALISM, FREE INQUIRY, AND CHRISTIAN CHARITY ARE NOT DISLOYALTY

We need a reawakening in America to the real purpose and intent of our Constitution and our Bill of Rights. The legislation we have proposed today would help to lead the way, I believe, in that reawakening.

For the love of our own country, and for our own salvation, we must realize before it is too late that—

We can have differences without being disloyal.

We can be soldiers, or sailors, or marines without "coddling" Communists.

We can be liberal without being Communist or subversive.

We can believe in progress without being a danger to free institutions.

We can grant to others the right to be either conformist or nonconformist, to be inquiring and venturesome, to be intellectually provocative, without endangering national security.

We can demonstrate understanding, humanity, compassion, and Christian charity toward others; we can respect our Bill of Rights without being soft or weak toward one ideology or another.

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

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am glad to yield.

Mr. GORE. Can one still do those things without being investigated?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I should hope so. Certainly, one should be able to do those things.

We can and we do have but one ideology, and that is one which supports a free government within the framework of the Constitution of the United States.

It is with this ideology in mind that I have submitted the instant legislation. If we are not to have a due regard to our constitutional and Christian principles, then we have lost the battle before it is joined. Division, suspicion, unfairness, will destroy us.

WISE COUNSEL OF CHIEF JUSTICE HUGHES

Fifteen years ago, on March 4, 1939, our great Chief Justice of the United States, Charles Evans Hughes, on the occasion of the 150th anniversary of the first meeting of the Congress, said some things that I think we need to remember today. May I quote him:

> We work in successful cooperation by being true, each department to its own function, and all to the spirit which pervades our institutions—exalting the processes of reason, seeking through the very limitations of power the promotion of the wise use of power, and finding the ultimate security of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, and the promise of continued stability and a rational progress, in the good sense of the American people.

Mr. President, those words are historic. How great a man was Charles Evans Hughes. What wisdom he displayed and what understanding of government. Let us here and now live up to his concept and his words, and let us be faithful "each department to its own function."

SUMMARY OF PROCEDURAL PROVISIONS

Without going into all of its details, that is exactly what our joint resolution in its field proposes. I summarize herewith its major procedural provisions:

First. Hearings would be held only if voted by a majority of the committee, and a clear advance statement of the subject of hearings would be required.

Second. Witnesses would have the right of counsel and his advice in public hearings, and, unless a majority of the committee voted otherwise, in private hearings also.

Third. Witnesses would be permitted to file supplementary material following examination, or make brief oral statements confined to the matters upon which they were questioned.

Fourth. All sessions would be reported stenographically, and the record made available for inspection by witness or counsel, and furnished to the witness on request at his expense.

Fifth. Only a majority of the committee would be permitted to authorize the release of statements or documents.

Sixth. A majority of the committee would be required to order executive hearings, and at least two members would be required to be present.

Seventh. Committee testimony would be released only in full text except in such cases as might compromise national security.

Eighth. No committee reports could be issued unless submitted in advance to the committee members and adopted at a committee meeting.

Ninth. Advance notice would be required to be given to persons about whom it is proposed to present derogatory information at a public hearing, and insofar as practicable such material shall be presented first in executive session to permit the committee to test its reliability and probative value.

Tenth. Persons who believe they were defamed or their reputations damaged by committee testimony made public would be permitted to file a sworn statement refuting such testimony, to appear personally and testify, to obtain witnesses in their behalf if allowed by the committee majority, and to secure the appearance of and cross-examine adverse witnesses unless the majority should decide otherwise.

Eleventh. Witnesses would also be permitted to submit cross-examination questions in writing to the chairman of the committee to be put to other witnesses who have given damaging testimony.

Twelfth. A novel provision of the bill requires that a witness who gives testimony reflecting adversely on the character and reputation of another in an open hearing shall "be required to disclose his sources of information, unless to do so would endanger the national security." This clause would compel witnesses to identify their sources of information regarding other persons.

If these reforms and the proposal for one Joint Committee on Internal Security are adopted—and I sincerely hope they will be—and soon—Congress' stature and our prestige abroad will be greatly increased.

Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], I ask unanimous consent to introduce for appropriate reference a joint resolution to establish a joint committee on internal security.

There being no objection, the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 137) to establish a joint committee on internal security, introduced by Mr. DOUGLAS (for himself and Mr. HUMPHREY), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, the bill is similar to House Joint Resolution 328, proposed in the House by Representative FRELINGHUYSEN, of New Jersey. I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN's article on this measure from the Reporter, of March 16, 1954, and the full text of the joint resolution which I have just introduced.

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

A GOP CONGRESSMAN'S VIEWS ON SECURITY INVESTIGATIONS

(By Representative PETER FRELINGHUYSEN, JR.)

As a freshman Representative, I have been impressed by the important role played by congressional committees. When they function well, as most of them do, they contribute greatly to the passage of important legislation. I have also been surprised at the relatively small degree of partisanship displayed in most of these bodies. As a member of the Veterans' Affairs Committee, I have seen little evidence that either Republicans or Democrats are thinking of veterans' problems in an exclusively political way.

Even more surprising to me is the small degree of political fireworks on the House Education and Labor Committee. Although individual members have sharply differing opinions, all witnesses are given a full and fair hearing. Each of us has realized that the basic question—the adequacy of present labor-management relations legislation—needs to be considered objectively. So far, at least, partisanship has been minimized. Unfortunately the general objectivity and balance that characterize most of our committees do not carry over to the competing committees in the field of subversive activities.

Competition for publicity among investigating committees is a serious fault, as witness the extraordinary spectacle of the subpenaing contest between Senator WILLIAM JENNER'S Internal Security Subcommittee and Representative HAROLD H. VELDE'S Un-American Activities Committee following the now-famous Chicago Executives Club speech of Attorney General Herbert Brownell last November 6. Another fault is the failure on the part of some committees to afford adequate protection to witnesses. As a result, some persons oppose all congressional investigating committees. They feel these committees do more harm than good, and that Congress should restrict its investigation to the gathering of information needed in the preparation of legislation. I do not hold this view. When properly employed, the investigatory function is an extremely valuable one.

The La Follette Senate Civil Liberties Committee of 1936 did not confine itself to preparing legislation. By its investigations and exposure of substandard working and living conditions it laid the groundwork for the social reforms which followed during the next decade or so. The Truman investigating committee during the Second World War earned general commendation for exposure of inefficiencies in our military procurement program. The Johnson Preparedness Subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee, which carried on this type of investigation during the Korean war, did another fine job. So did the King subcommittee, which investigated tax frauds, and the Fulbright subcommittee, which looked into the operations of the RFC.

Such investigating committees can serve two valuable functions:

They can help Congress to carry out its role of overseeing the work of the executive departments. This function is an essential part of our system of checks and balances. It has become increasingly important with the growth of bureaucracy and the insulation of many governmental decisions from public opinion.

They can help Congress to perform what Woodrow Wilson called the informing function; that is, they can help educate the people and aid them in securing the facts they need to perform as intelligent and responsible citizens.

Investigating committees in the field of subversive activities need not be excepted from the above generalizations. In the field of internal security, as in others, Congress can do a useful and constructive job in overseeing the work of the executive branch. The primary responsibility for investigating subversion and for reassuring the public rests with the Justice Department and the FBI. The role of the legislative branch should be of a general supervisory character, with congressional investigating committees serving as watchdogs to check on the performance of the executive branch. Certainly there primary function should not be to develop ammunition to be used for political purposes.

PROPOSED JOINT COMMITTEE

How then should Congress deal with the problems presented by the various competing committees in investigating subversive activities?

The problem can best be handled, it seems to me, by the establishment of a single Joint Committee on Internal Security, which would have exclusive jurisdiction in this field. On the opening day of this session of Congress I introduced Joint Resolution 328, providing for such a joint committee.

A number of considerations led me to make this proposal. As I have stated, congressional investigating committees have a highly important role to play. They must be employed, however, in an intelligent, fair, and impartial manner. What is needed is a means of curtailing such publicity competitions among the committees as the Jenner-Velde affair. It is also important that investigation of subversives be put on an objective nonpartisan level so as to insure full public support. A joint committee seems uniquely appropriate.

Another advantage of a joint committee is that it provides for a chairmanship alternating between House and Senate Members. This provision, which could well apply to all joint committees, is especially important in the field of subversive activities. It would tend to reduce the possibility of any one person developing a vested interest in investigating subversives. It might encourage the committee to work as a unit rather than as a mere tool of a particular chairman.

The question of efficiency is also involved. Under the present system, with at least three committees going off in different directions, it is obvious that the energy and resources of Congress are dissipated. From the standpoint of efficient legislative-executive relations, furthermore, the joint committee would facilitate closer cooperation. The Justice Department and the FBI would have to deal with only one committee.

The resolution I have introduced contains also a number of fair-play provisions. These would afford witnesses protections similar to those they would receive in a court of law. The problem of developing such a code of procedures, I realize, is not necessarily tied up with the proposal for a joint committee. Other resolutions dealing exclusively with the question of investigating-committee procedures have been introduced. This problem of the rights of witnesses, nonetheless, is one that arises most frequently in connection with investigations of alleged subversion. While considering the question of establishing a single committee in this field, therefore, Congress should have the opportunity to pass upon the question of the rights of witnesses. In that way Congress can establish basic committee procedures. The question of adequate protection for witnesses is so fundamental that it should not simply be left to the committee itself.

EVEN THE DEMOCRATS

Another important motivation behind my proposal is a desire to take the question of communism out of the political arena. This is a field where, in the national interest, there is great need for reducing partisanship. If there is a continuing threat that Communists will penetrate into policymaking positions, both parties are equally interested. If adequate security precautions are being taken, both parties want the public to know it. A single committee can handle these problems more thoroughly and effectively than the three-ring bedlam now in effect.

By its very nature the topic of internal subversion arouses fundamental fears and emotions. Nothing would divide a nation or stir its most violent emotions more than a continuing political war based upon charges that a political party has betrayed the national security. Moreover, these same emotions, if not properly tempered and channeled, could even serve as a real threat to stable representative government.

In the final analysis, representative government is based upon the citizen's trust in the essential good will and integrity of his fellow citizens. Party government works because we have faith that members of both parties will generally strive for what they conceive to be the best interests of the Nation. We abide by the rules of the game. These prescribe that we provide basic support to the party that wins the election and permit that party to govern.

Underlying the disagreements over specific issues and the natural competition between parties has ever been a fundamental respect for the patriotism of the opposition.

If Communists in Government is permitted to continue as a major issue between our political parties, I believe that this fundamental of our political system can become seriously corroded. National unity cannot be maintained when the loyalty of a great political party is constantly being impugned. If you increase people's fears, you eventually sap their strength.

The problem of how best to handle the questions of internal security, like those of foreign policy and military security, should be dealt with on a nonpartisan basis. This is so not only because of the character of the general subject matter but also because charges against individuals are involved—charges similar to those coming before the courts. Naturally, I recognize that party responsibility makes complete agreement between the parties unlikely. The problem of subversion, however, could be handled more effectively if conducted on less of a partisan basis. A single joint committee, with competent personnel and sufficient prestige, would help bring this about.

FOREIGN-AFFAIRS ASPECTS

The divisive effects of communism as a political issue are not only domestic in character. They carry over into our international relations, particularly into our relations with our allies. The nations of Europe, many of which have long histories as great powers, have a natural reluctance to accept the United States as undisputed leader of the western coalition. We should understand this, and win their confidence by demonstrating our capacity for leadership. Maintaining an effective coalition against Soviet aggression would be ticklish enough even if the United States were able to present a perfect picture of maturity and unity in its domestic affairs. When we appear to be seriously dividing our Nation with intemperate charges, it becomes even more difficult to maintain the respect and faith of our allies. Sharp disunity at home could discourage the unity we need abroad.

I realize that many veteran legislators will view my proposal for a Joint Committee on Internal Security as impractical. Because it would require an alteration of our present committee structure, it inevitably runs into certain powerful vested interests. Certainly the present odds are against the resolution's getting out of the Rules Committee this session.

On the other hand, the problem my proposal seeks to remedy is one of more than ordinary importance. It is a problem that

has far-reaching domestic and international implications. Perhaps public opinion will before long force leaders of both parties to take positive steps toward reforming present procedures.

This question of handling adequately the problem of internal security is only one of a number of related problems which require a degree of maturity and stability not demanded even a few decades ago.

Certainly such problems cannot be solved by any gimmick—not a joint committee, a code of fair play, or anything else that simple. The final solution will depend upon what kind of public attitude American citizens finally develop on these questions. In the interim, however, I do believe that the types of machinery and procedures we employ are important. They can serve as a brake upon violent emotions. They can help us direct those emotions into more constructive channels. Such proposals can serve also as a rallying point for those seeking to educate the public concerning the necessity of maintaining its equilibrium and sense of proportion. In that way we can help protect our most important possessions—representative government and our rights and freedoms as American citizens.

Whereas subversive and other un-American activities present an increasingly dangerous threat to the security and welfare of the United States; and

Whereas at present this threat arises principally from a world Communist conspiracy which is of such a complex nature and present in so many guises that to cope with it demands a unified and coordinated effort on the part of the two Houses of the Congress; and

Whereas the jurisdiction of no single standing committee of the Congress is sufficiently comprehensive to deal with the varied shifting tactics of the world Communist conspiracy and other subversive and un-American activities; and

Whereas in the past the duplication of effort and overlapping responsibilities in investigating the problems coming within the scope of this resolution have resulted in an uneconomic utilization of the resources of the Congress; and

Whereas certain agencies of the executive branch of the Government dealing with problems involving our internal security have found it difficult to coordinate the work of the executive branch with that of the Congress; and

Whereas it is the intent of Congress in dealing with the problem of subversive and other un-American activities to make certain that the traditional rights and liberties of our citizens are fully protected: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, etc., That (a) there is hereby established a joint congressional committee to be known as the Joint Committee on Internal Security. As used in this joint resolution, the term "joint committee" means the Joint Committee on Internal Security, and the term "committee" means the joint committee or any of its subcommittees.

(b) The joint committee shall be composed of 12 members, as follows:

(1) Six members who are members of the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate, no more than three of whom are members of the same political party, to be appointed by the President of the Senate; and

(2) Six members who are members of the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives, no more than three of whom are members of the same political party, to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

(c) Any vacancy in the joint committee shall not affect its powers, but shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

(d) The joint committee shall elect a chairman and a vice chairman from among its members. During each odd-numbered Congress, the chairman shall be a Member of the Senate, and during each even-numbered Congress, the chairman shall be a Member of the House of Representatives.

(e) Seven members of the joint committee shall constitute a quorum.

SEC. 2. The members of the joint committee shall serve without compensation in addition to that received for their services as Members of Congress; but they shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of the duties vested in the joint committee other than expenses in connection with meetings of the joint committee held in the District of Columbia during such times as the Congress is in session.

SEC. 3. (a) The joint committee is authorized, without regard to the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1949, to appoint and fix the compensation of such personnel as it deems advisable.

(b) The joint committee is authorized to reimburse the members of its staff for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of the duties vested in the joint committee other than expenses in connection with meetings of the joint committee held in the District of Columbia during such times as the Congress is in session. The chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate and the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives may assign members of the staff of such committees to serve on the staff of the joint committee, without additional compensation, except for the reimbursement of expenses incurred by such staff members as prescribed in this subsection.

(c) The expenses of the joint committee shall be paid one-half from the contingent fund of the Senate and one-half from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives, upon vouchers signed by the chairman of the joint committee or by any member of the joint committee duly authorized by the chairman. Disbursements to pay such expenses shall be made by the Clerk of the House of Representatives out of the contingent fund of the House of Representatives, such contingent fund to be reimbursed from the contingent fund of the Senate in the amount of one-half of the disbursements so made.

SEC. 4. (a) The joint committee shall have exclusive jurisdiction (so far as the Congress is concerned) to make investigations of all subversive and un-American activities, and all proposed legislation, messages, petitions, memorials, and other matters relating to such activities shall be referred to the joint committee.

(b) The members of the joint committee who are Members of the Senate shall from time to time report to the Senate, and the members of the joint committee who are Members of the House of Representatives shall from time to time report to the House, by bill or otherwise, their recommendations with respect to matters within the jurisdiction of their respective Houses, and matters which are referred to the joint committee or are otherwise within the jurisdiction of the joint committee.

(c) For the purposes of this joint resolution, the committee is authorized to sit and act at such times and places within the United States, to hold such hearings, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, and to take such testimony, as it deems advisable. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the joint committee or of any subcommittee, or by any member designated by any such chairman, and may be served by any person designated by any such chairman or member but no subpena shall be issued except with the approval of a majority of the joint committee. Any member of the committee may administer oaths or affirmations to witnesses appearing before the committee.

(d) For the purposes of this section, the term "United States" includes the several States, Territories, and possessions of the United States, the District of Columbia, and the Canal Zone.

SEC. 5. (a) The committee shall be governed by the rules set forth in the following subsections of this section.

(b) Committee meetings, other than regular meetings authorized by section 133 (a) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (60 Stat. 837), shall be called only upon a minimum of 24 hours' written notice to the office of each committee member.

(c) Committee hearings (whether public or in executive session) shall be held only upon the majority vote of the committee in a meeting at which a majority of the committee is actually present, and when executive hearings are held at least two members of the committee shall be present.

(d) A resolution or motion scheduling hearings shall state clearly and concisely the subject thereof which may be amended in the same manner prescribed in subsection (c) for the scheduling of hearings.

(e) Any witness before the committee at a public hearing and, unless the committee by a majority vote determines otherwise, any witness before the committee at a private hearing shall have the right to be accompanied by counsel, who shall be permitted to advise the witness while on the witness stand of his rights.

(f) Every witness shall have an opportunity, at the conclusion of the examination by the committee, to supplement the testimony which he has given, by making a brief written or oral statement, which shall be made part of the record; but such testimony shall be confined to matters with respect to which he has previously been examined.

(g) An accurate stenographic record shall be kept of the testimony of each witness before the committee, whether in public or in executive session. In either case, the record of his testimony shall be made available for inspection by the witness or his counsel; and if given in public session he shall be furnished with a copy thereof at his expense if he so requests, and if given in executive session he shall be furnished with a copy thereof at his expense in case his testimony is subsequently used or referred to in a public session.

(h) No statements shall be released and no documents shall be published by the committee without the approval of a majority of such committee.

(i) No committee report shall be issued unless a draft of such report is submitted to the office of each committee member 24 hours in advance of the meeting at which it is to be considered and is adopted at a meeting at which a majority is actually present.

(j) When testimony given the committee is released, the full text of the testimony shall be released, except where considerations of national security otherwise require.

(k) Insofar as practicable, any person whose activities are the subject of investigation by the committee, or about whom derogatory information is proposed to be presented at a public hearing of the committee, shall be fully advised by the committee as to the matters into which the committee proposes to inquire and the derogatory material which is proposed to be presented. Insofar as practicable, all material reflecting adversely on the character or reputation of any individual which is proposed to be presented at a public hearing of the committee shall be first reviewed in executive session to determine its reliability and probative value and shall not be presented at a public hearing except pursuant to majority vote of the committee.

(1) Any person who is specifically identified by name in public hearing before the committee or in private hearings when the testimony has been made public, and who believes that testimony or other evidence given in such hearing or comment made by any member of the committee or its counsel tends to defame him or otherwise adversely affect his reputation, shall be afforded the following privileges:

(1) To file with the committtee a sworn statement, of reasonable length, concerning such testimony, evidence, or comment, which shall be made a part of the record of such hearings.

(2) To appear personally before the committee and testify in his own behalf.

(3) Unless the committee by a majority vote shall determine otherwise, to have the committee secure the appearance of witnesses whose testimony adversely affected him, and to cross-examine such witnesses, either personally or by counsel; but such cross-examination shall be limited to 1 hour as to any 1 witness unless the committee votes to lengthen the period.

(4) In the discretion of the committee, by a majority vote, to have the committee call a reasonable number of witnesses in his behalf. The extent to which this privilege may be availed of shall be left to the discretion of the committee.

(m) In the discretion of the chairman of the commitee, a witness may question another witness who comments adversely upon his testimony. Where such questioning is allowed, it shall be conducted by means of written questions handed to the chairman and stated by him.

(n) Any witness who gives testimony before the committee in an open hearing which reflects adversely on the character or reputation of another person shall be required to disclose his sources of information, unless to do so would endanger the national security.

SEC. 6. (a) Paragraph 1 of rule X of the Rules of the House of Representatives is amended by striking out the following:

"(q) Committee on Un-American Activities, to consist of nine members."

(b) Paragraph 17 of rule XI (relating to the powers and duties of the Committee on Un-American Activities) is hereby repealed.

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

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. GORE. I have listened with interest and approbation to the principles enunciated by the distinguished senior Senator from Illinois. The principles he has stated and proclaimed are rooted in Anglo-Saxon jurisprudence and in the respect for the dignity and the rights of man which we have cherished since King John was forced to sign the Magna Charta.

I rose to inquire of the Senator if he does not think the same principles which he would apply to congressional investigations should apply with equal force to the procedure with reference to the loyalty program now established in the executive branch.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I think it generally would, but there is one point as to which I have never been able to make up my mind, namely, the question as to whether the source of a charge or of derogatory information must always be made known to the accused in a loyalty investigation.

It is well known that the FBI has undercover men, and it is probably true that to reveal their identity in loyalty hearings might well identify them and make further investigation more difficult. So that when we are dealing with elimination by the executive of possibly subversive persons within the executive branch of the Government, I have a suspended judgment as to that procedural feature. But in the case of a congressional hearing which does not involve, at least directly, the question of tenure in governmental service but does involve great danger perhaps, to one's reputation it seems to me that the source of the charge should be identified.

Mr. GORE. I do not believe that in the ordinary case the FBI makes a charge.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct.

Mr. GORE. There have recently come to my attention the details of a rather tragic case which I shall not discuss on the floor of the Senate. I shall be glad privately to tell the Senator of it. But a very great wrong was done an innocent person. The FBI furnished certain information, not charges.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator is correct. The FBI does not prefer charges; it furnishes information.

Mr. GORE. Yet, no information is given as to the source of the derogatory statement.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I fear that is often true.

Mr. GORE. I am not entirely clear as to what I think should be done. When one cannot reach a conclusion satisfactory to himself, he is in a poor position to convince other persons. But the procedure we have is far from satisfactory. It may be that we must pay a price to preserve the principle that a human being can face his accuser. I, for one, am willing to pay a high price to preserve that right.

I do not wish to prolong the discussion, but, having had the tragic incidents of a case recently brought to my mind, it appeared to me that the fine principles laid down by the distinguished Senator from Illinois could apply in loyalty and security procedures in the executive branch as well as to investigations by congressional committees.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I think it is certainly true that the major portion of them could be so applied. I am not trying today to propose a formula for security investigations, but I am proposing that we begin on our own thinking in Congress. I believe this is very essential, because from the time of King John onward, as the Senator from Tennessee has remarked, the abuses of the courts led men who loved liberty to propose successive safeguards, which have been purchased with great sacrifice, effort, and bloodshed.

We know that English liberties were menaced under King Charles I by star-chamber proceedings by which men were tried and condemned in their absence, without being permitted to face their accusers or to produce testimony in their own defense.

It was the proper resentment against the abuses of the star-chamber proceedings under Bishop Laud which led, in large part, to the revolt of the British people and the creation of the commonwealth under Cromwell.

At great price have we purchased the protection of men's lives, liberties, and property in courts of law, by providing that a judge shall not, at the same time, be the prosecuting attorney; that men shall have the right to testify in their own behalf, but that they shall not be compelled to testify; that they shall have the right to produce witnesses; that they shall have the right to counsel; that they shall have the right of cross-examination; that evidence must meet certain standards of probative value to be admissible; and so forth.

These rights have crystallized over the centuries, not aimlessly, but by great effort. For instance, a reading of the Journal of the Trial of William Penn, under King Charles II, will disclose how the courts at that time abused justice.

We have won these freedoms, and the Founding Fathers, in the Bill of Rights, intended to preserve them. We have largely established them in the courts of law.

But what has happened has been that our investigative bodies have become largely informal courts of public opinion. They do not sentence people; they do not take property away from them. But the testimony which is given and the reports which are issued may take from them something far more precious than their property or their lives, namely, their reputation. But we have not been able to create adequate safeguards within the legislative investigative bodies.

I can speak with some feeling on the subject, as probably the Senator from Tennessee can also, because I once was a Member of a Senate investigating committee, and I remember the struggles which went on in my breast between my duty in the sense of being a prosecutor, my desire to get to the bottom of an issue, and at the same time, my concern that we grant a fair hearing to those who were being adversely reflected upon.

So I appreciate the dangers and complexities of protecting ourselves from the possible tendency to abuse our powers by means of a standard code which would hold us in line.

Mr. GORE. The Senator's eloquent statement recalls the equally eloquent statement made by our distinguished President, Mr. Eisenhower, last year, to the B'nai B'rith. Perhaps the Senator will recall the statement of the President, in which he spoke most eloquently of the right of an American citizen to face his accuser. I applauded that speech. I applaud the speech now being made by the distinguished Senator from Illinois. But how does that apply to the hapless 2,200 persons, some of whom have been charged, and some of whom have had their names blackened, without any knowledge that they were even being investigated? How does the Senator lay the preachment beside the practice?

Mr. DOUGLAS. All I can say is that we cannot reform the entire world at once. If we clean up our own procedures, we shall have taken a mighty step

forward. At present, I should say that in many cases there are probably more safeguards in hearings before loyalty boards, than there are in hearings before congressional committees. If hearings before congressional committees were placed on a higher standard than hearings before loyalty boards, possibly that might be an inducement for the executive department also to move forward.

Mr. GORE. I agree with the Senator that we should start at home. Those who live in glass houses should not cast stones. But one wrong does not justify another. Thousands of persons are being wrongfully accused and wrongfully convicted, without having the privilege of disproving their guilt, without having an opportunity to establish their innocence, without knowing who is accusing them or of what they are being accused.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator from Tennessee is quite correct, and, unfortunately, this tendency has become more marked in the past 14 months. But let us move ahead in Congress to change and improve those procedures which we can most directly affect.

RECESS

Mr. WILLIAMS. I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 56 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Tuesday, March 9, 1954, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate March 8 (legislative day of March 1), 1954:

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

Joseph E. Hines, of South Carolina, to be United States attorney for the western district of South Carolina, vice John C. Williams, resigned.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS

Maynard C. Hutchinson, of Massachusetts, to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 4, with headquarters at Boston, Mass., to fill an existing vacancy.

IN THE AIR FORCE

Gen. John Kenneth Cannon, 3A (major general, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force, to be placed on the retired list in the grade of general, under the provisions of subsection 504 (d) of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947.

IN THE NAVY

Vice Adm. John H. Cassady, United States Navy, to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of an admiral while serving as commander-in-chief, United States Naval Forces, Eastern Atlantic and Mediterranean.

Vice Adm. Thomas S. Combs, United States Navy, to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of a vice admiral while serving as a fleet commander.

Rear Adm. Edmund T. Wooldridge, United States Navy, to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of a vice admiral while serving as a fleet commander.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, MARCH 8, 1954

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Most merciful and gracious God, at whose word of command all life was created and light first sprang out of darkness, we thank Thee for the gift of this new day.

We humbly beseech Thee that our hearts may be filled with a sense of Thy goodness and our minds illumined with that divine wisdom which will make us equal to all our tasks and responsibilities.

We penitently confess that our vision is dim, our faith is feeble and we are tempted to despair as we look and labor for a better world wherein dwelleth righteousness.

Grant that Thy peace, which passeth all understanding, may dispel those doubts and fears which so frequently haunt us and hold us in captivity.

We pray that Thou wilt give health of body and peace of soul to our stricken colleagues. Bless the doctors and nurses with faith and skill as they minister tenderly unto all who are in suffering and pain.

Hear us in the name of the great Physician. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday, March 5, 1954, 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. Tribbe, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills of the House of the following titles:

On March 1, 1954:

H. R. 8069. An act to amend the act of July 10, 1953, which created the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations.

On March 6, 1954:

H. R. 7996. An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and for other purposes.

THE INSIDE STORY OF DEAN MANION'S DISMISSAL

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, Dean Manion's outspoken support of the Bricker amendment was the official excuse or subterfuge for his dismissal. It was not the basic reason. The basic reason for Manion's dismissal was the fact that he took his job too seriously; he proposed to do a thorough job of halting the Federal Government's invasion of State, local, and private functions in the fields of taxation, power, health, housing, education, business, industry, and agriculture, and of returning some of these functions to the States and local governments where they belong under our Constitution.

Dean Manion had laid the groundwork for a thorough job of unscrambling the concentration of powers in Washington that had taken place during the 20-year New Deal regime. He planned to present such a convincing and powerful report that the Congress would feel impelled to pass the necessary legislation to implement the report.

Dean Manion was fired not because he spent too little time on the work of the Commission—as Governor Thornton of Colorado suggested—but rather because he was determined to go further than the administration wanted to go.

Mr. Speaker, Dean Manion is one of the greatest authorities in the Nation on our Federal Constitution. He is perhaps the greatest defender of the Constitution in the United States today. He was fired because of his effectiveness, his thoroughness, because the administration did not want to go as far as Dean Manion proposed to go in the work of decentralization.

PRELIMINARY REPORT BY THE COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE ON HEALTH INQUIRY

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask for unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I am filing today, on behalf of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, a preliminary report growing out of our health inquiry which summarizes important facts about health and disease today.

Last October after the adjournment of the Congress, this committee, in the discharge of its legislative responsibilities in the field of health, initiated a broad inquiry, the first phase of which was a study of our present-day knowledge of the causes, prevention, and control of some of the major diseases of today. We were concerned specifically with finding out just what has been accomplished, what the problems are, what the immediate future holds, and what additional steps might be taken by way of research, or other measures, to hasten relief from these dreadful diseases, mitigate human suffering, and curtail the losses which disease inflicts on our national economy.

Some 95 distinguished physicians, scientists, and laymen participated in the series of panel discussions which we conducted last fall. This report summarizes the testimony received and recommendations made by these outstanding persons in the fields of heart disease, cancer, arthritis, rheumatism, poliomyelitis, tuberculosis, blindness, hearing defects,

epilepsy, cerebral palsy, muscular dystrophy, multiple sclerosis, and mental illness.

While the health inquiry continued through the fall and into this Congress, and will result in further reports to the Congress, it has seemed to the committee that the testimony concerning these major diseases has been so significant and comprehensive that it warrants being drawn together in this preliminary report so that all may have the benefit of this knowledge. The report contains the statements and opinions of qualified persons on subjects which are close to the heart of the people and timely for the consideration now being given to our public health.

I commend the reading of the report to every Member of the Congress.

PROTECTION OF CONGRESSMEN

Mr. LONG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. LONG. Mr. Speaker, I have been receiving a number of letters and telegrams from various people of Louisiana dealing with the matter of bulletproof glass placed in the House and Senate Chambers for the protection of the Members of Congress. I had not paid too much attention to it until I received a letter from the Honorable James A. Noe. Mr. Noe is a very influential citizen of Louisiana, and a former governor. He is the owner of two radio stations and the largest television station in the State of Louisiana. I thought this letter was of enough interest to place in the RECORD in order that you may read it and give it some consideration.

The letter is as follows:

THE JAMES A. NOE STATIONS,
Monroe, La., March 3, 1954.

Congressman GEORGE S. LONG,
House of Representatives, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I heard someone say over the radio that nothing could be done to protect you Congressmen and Senators from some fanatic or crank that wanted to get up in the gallery and shoot you. I do not agree with that. I have sat in the gallery of the Senate many times and I am sure the people who come to Washington and come to the gallery of the House and Senate would not object if there was a 10-foot, bullet-proof glass put around the entire gallery of the House and Senate and, if this had been done, this awful thing could not have happened that happened, and I am writing each member of the delegation from Louisiana to see if this can be done because this awful thing might happen again and be worse the next time.

Hoping to see you soon, I am,
Most sincerely yours,
JAMES A. NOE.

INTERNATIONAL COMMUNIST CONSPIRACY

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, the acts of violence committed in the House last Monday by four fanatics have created a great deal of discussion as to what lies behind that criminal activity. In the first flush of excitement the press identified them as Puerto Rican Nationalists. Shortly thereafter it was revealed that two of the terrorists were involved in the international Communist conspiracy and that the Communist Party was lurking in the background of this criminal activity.

But the question is still unanswered as to what is the real purpose behind the shooting.

It has been obvious for some time that the Kremlin agents operating in Latin America have been using the cover of nationalism for their nefarious activities. A careful study of Kremlin strategy will show conclusively that its agents are associated with and taking advantage of the driving force of nationalism in every part of the free world wherever it becomes active. I wish to emphasize that this strategy is applied only to the free world. The other phase of the Kremlin strategy, which applies to the empire of captive nations over which it ruthlessly rules, is to kill off every vestige of nationalism. This appears to any reasonable person as a contradiction and more particularly a dual policy. That is precisely what it is.

The new internationalism conceived by Lenin and activiated by Stalin remains as the basic doctrine and practice of the international Communist conspiracy. This new internationalism calls for the absolute destruction of all sovereign nation states and their replacement by Communist dictatorships which will be completely controlled by Moscow. This new internationalism has for its objective a world based on one economy, one language, one culture, one tradition, one ruling elite class. It also calls for one ruler—a czar of czars—who will be enthroned on the traditional seat of the czars in Moscow. The superior people of this envisioned empire will be the Muscovites—the proclaimed elite of the new world order.

This is no idle dream, nor it is a classroom theory. It is being put to practice with relentless fury in every one of the non-Russian nations controlled by Moscow. In every respect it is genocide on a scale never before known to man.

Entire nations have been destroyed for opposing it—such as the Crimean Tatars and the Kalmucks. But despite the fury of the Kremlin to destroy nationalism within its slave empire—nationalism still remains its greatest enemy and unrelenting adversary. The spirit of the national patriot is something the mad men of the Kremlin cannot destroy.

In the free world the Kremlin agents associate themselves with and seek to control the natural, healthy aspirations of nationalism. Their objective is to ride to power on the legitimate aspirations of national patriotism. But they also create a false nationalism in areas and countries where it does not exist. They organize, finance, and direct small groups of lunatics and fanatics in order to create turmoil and confusion in the free world.

Puerto Rico is just such a case. There is really no nationalist party or movement in Puerto Rico. The Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the House made an investigation of the so-called nationalist movement in Puerto Rico in 1951 and here is what, in summary, they found.

First. An effort was made to organize a nationalist party in Puerto Rico in the early thirties but it never gained more than 1,000 adherents.

Second. Its leading candidate for senator-at-large was only able to get 2 percent of the vote in the 1932 insular elections.

Third. The defeated candidate then organized an underground army known as the liberating army of the republic. This has a familiar ring, because Moscow has been organizing liberating armies underground for many years. The purpose of course is to liberate free people into Communist slavery.

Fourth. The propaganda line of the phony nationalist party has for years been playing up "Yankee imperialism." We know that in recent years Moscow and all its agents have been spreading false propaganda charges on "Yankee imperialism." The only imperialists left in the world are the Muscovites so they exercise their guilty conscience by making the charge against us.

Fifth. The entire record of the so-called nationalist party in Puerto Rico is one of violence, murder, and underground subversion. The tactics used are identical with those taught in the advanced institute of violence in Moscow.

Sixth. The record and performance of the so-called nationalist party in Puerto Rico is directly interwoven with that of the Communist conspiracy in the United States. The Daily Worker and the Sunday Worker—both mouthpieces of the Kremlin—have long been loud in the praise of these so-called nationalists.

This record all adds up to but one conclusion. We should stop calling the would-be assassins of last Monday nationalists and recognize them for what they really are. They are agents of the world Communist conspiracy. Whether they are witting or unwitting agents is secondary. We should also recognize that the mad men of the Kremlin continue to stoop to the use of lunatics to carry out their black operations. What the Kremlin really hopes to do is to discredit healthy nationalism because it fears that the leaders of the free world will eventually come to support and associate themselves with the forces of healthy nationalism now at work within the Moscow-controlled prison of nations, it is clear that the Kremlin will stop at nothing in order to prevent this from happening.

SPECIAL ORDER VACATED

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the special order granted me for today be vacated.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

MUTUAL SECURITY PROGRAM—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 337)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed with illustrations:

To the Congress of the United States:

I am transmitting herewith the report on the Mutual Security Program covering operations during the 6-month period, June 30, 1953, to December 31, 1953, in furtherance of the purpose of the Mutual Security Act of 1951, as amended.

In this report is factual evidence of valuable progress being made through mutual efforts toward the vital goal of increased security for this Nation and all the free world.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *March 8, 1954.*

FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY ACT OF 1954

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 460 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 8127) to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Public Works, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LYLE] and yield myself such time as I may consume, and I further ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 460 makes in order the consideration of the bill H. R. 8127, the so-called public roads bill, introduced by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MCGREGOR]. This is an open rule, and it provides for 2 hours of general debate.

This bill is the usual public roads measure which is brought into the Congress every 2 years, except it is an enlarged bill. It goes further, perhaps, than any other measure of this type that we have considered for a great many years. The authorization for pubilc roads for this year, for instance, if my memory serves me correctly, is $550 or $575 millions. This measure carries an authorization for public roads purposes of $875 million per year for the 2 years beginning in 1955.

The McGregor bill, the measure before you, is the product of some 13 weeks of subcommittee hearings by the Subcommittee on Public Roads of the House Committee on Public Works. It carries authorization for the appropriation of $270 million for the primary highway system, that is, the Federal aid to be matched by State funds, which is an increase of $32,500,000 over the provisions in the present law.

The bill carries an authorization of $180 million a year in appropriations for Federal aid for the secondary system, for the farm-to-market roads for the Nation, an increase of some $15 million above the present authorization. Incidentally, and rather importantly, too, I might say, this measure provides that in the future the State highway departments shall have the control and final authority over the specifications for farm-to-market roads included in the secondary highway system rather than the Public Roads Administration of the Federal Government, as in the past.

This bill provides also for an interstate highway system of $200 million, or $175 million more than provided in the present law. This interstate system, by the way, is requested by the military authorities of the Nation and will be of great benefit to all States. Incidentally, the matching arrangement on the interstate system is a little different from the ordinary matching system in the Federal-aid-to-highways proposals in the past. Usually the matching has been on a 50–50 basis. However, this bill provides that on interstate systems under the $200 million appropriation authorized, the matching should be on the basis of 60 percent Federal funds and 40 percent State funds. This is done, as I understand it, for the purpose of helping the lower income States in the West which have such large areas and such long road systems that must be constructed, if we are to have a national highway system worthy of the name.

The bill would authorize an appropriation of $875 million out of an estimated income from gasoline taxes of some $906 million. This would leave approximately $31 million to be used for emergency purposes. I think I should point out very clearly, if I may, that the $200 million fund authorized for construction of an interstate highway system is predicated upon the Congress continuing the one-half-cent gasoline tax, which was put on as part of the Korean war emergency effort. I have been requested to point out, as it was pointed out to us in the Committee on Rules, that the Committee on Public Works of the House of Representatives appreciates fully that it has no authority or jurisdiction of any kind over questions as to whether or not this one-half-cent gasoline tax is to be extended. That is a matter over which only the Committee on Ways and Means has original jurisdiction. That great Committee on Ways and Means will, of course, give consideration to the question as to whether the one-half-cent gasoline tax is to be extended or is to be permitted to die. So, the Committee on Public Works has so drawn this bill that in case the Committee on Ways and Means, or the Congress itself decides not to extend the one-half-cent gasoline tax, the emergency tax which is now in existence, the interstate system and the money authorized therefor will be eliminated and will not be put into effect. Am I correct in that statement, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. Will the gentleman please repeat that statement. I am very much interested in that part of the bill to which the gentleman from Ohio is now addressing himself concerning the gasoline-tax provision. Did the gentleman say that is going to be stricken from the bill?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. No, I did not say it would be stricken from the bill. I tried to point out that the Committee on Public Works in appearing before the Committee on Rules made it very clear that the $200 million fund for the construction of the interstate-highway system to be allocated to the States on a 60-40 percent basis was dependent upon whether the one-half-cent gasoline tax now in effect and due to expire is extended by the Congress. They made it very clear also that the Committee on Public Works did not assume, or did not attempt, to take any jurisdiction whatsoever over any tax legislation, and that this question of whether the one-half-cent gasoline tax is to be extended or permitted to expire rests entirely with the Committee on Ways and Means, and then following any action of the Committee on Ways and Means, any action that the Congress itself may take. However, as I understand it, this legislation is so drawn that if for any reason the Committee on Ways and Means or the Congress itself decides not to extend the one-half-cent emergency-gasoline tax, then this section of the bill will not apply. In other words, the funds will not be appropriated or authorized under the $200 million interstate system plan which was set up.

Mr. McCORMACK. Has the gentleman any views as to the effect of this particular provision on the Committee on Appropriations?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I think it has been made pretty clear in the hearings and so forth and so on, of the committee, and in the statements made by the committee, and those statements which I understand will be made later on in debate, so that the Committee on Appropriations will understand clearly.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am not going to press the matter further with my friend because, of course, he is speaking on and presenting the rule. I was interested in that particular provision because it seems to me to be a most unusual one.

I have no recollection of any similar provision being included in any other bill for this.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. In other words, if I may express my understanding of the situation to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] the Public Works Committee, being pressed by many States and by many Members of Congress for some action on this interstate system, finally agreed that they would include the authorization in the bill subject, of course, to later action by the Ways and Means Committee and the House itself. In other words, they did not feel that they should authorize a greater amount of money than would be available under the present law, if it is continued.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MASON. This linking up of the Federal tax on gasoline and the road program is setting quite a precedent, and in view of the fact that the Manion Commission has gone thoroughly into the subject of Federal aid for roads and will have a comprehensive report upon the same, it is doubtful whether the Congress should preview this matter and disregard entirely what the Manion Commission may report and may recommend, by taking this action at this time. I feel that we are establishing a precedent that is a doubtful one. I feel that the Congress should wait at least until they get the report and the recommendations of the Manion Commission on Federal aid for roads.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I thank the gentleman very much for his contribution.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. KEAN. As the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON] knows, when we levied this half-cent tax on gasoline, it was meant to go into the general revenue, and there was no intention that the proceeds of that tax or the continuation of that tax, which we voted the other day, should be specifically applied to roads. I agree that it would be a very bad thing to have in the law.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I understand that the bill does not specifically tie the two together.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. That may be true, as the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. KEAN] has just stated. But I venture to say that 90 out of every 100 people who drive up to a station for gasoline, consciously or perhaps unconsciously, think or understand that the 2 cents a gallon he has to pay for the gas that he buys is in some way connected with the roads of this country and he thinks that that money is being expended for that purpose.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I agree with the gentleman from Michigan. That is exactly the statement I was going to make. There is a strong feeling—and I am one who feels that way—that if we are to levy gasoline taxes on a Federal basis, or for that matter on a State basis, the funds derived from such special gasoline taxes ought to go where the American people think they are going and where they want them to go, on the highways of the Nation.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. I have had a number of people talk to me about this language and what it might mean as some sort of a perpetual Federal tax, as against a State tax. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON] properly referred, of course, to the Commission's work on intergovernmental relations and what might be forthcoming. Let me say that, as far as I am concerned—and I think it is the attitude of the committee—this does not build anything in perpetuity. If in the future it is determined that the Federal Government should get out of the field of gasoline taxation and turn it back to the States, there is nothing here to prevent that being done. That is a matter for continuing study. But what is here sought to be done—and I am for it, and I think generally speaking the Members of the House will be for it—is to see to it that when this becomes effective the money that the people pay in the form of gasoline taxes shall be applied to the building of roads. That is a battle that has gone on in the States before. It went on in my State. It is still going on there. Of course, there are many other taxes, excise taxes, for instance, on automobiles and on lubricating oil and on tires that are not covered here.

Those taxes go into the general revenue to cover the general operations of the Government. But here we are dealing with a specific thing, which is the gasoline tax; and, as the gentleman from Ohio so well points out, it is a tax that the people believe is being expended in the construction of roads and that is where they want it expended.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I thank the gentleman very much. I would like to point out, if I may, that the American motorist is the highest taxed individual in the world. He is being taxed in every direction for every purpose. All that the Committee on Public Works is endeavoring to do in this legislation, as I understand it, is to set up a system of distribution of Federal funds for highway aid purposes somewhat realistic to the amount of money that is being collected from the American people in the form of gas taxes, although by no means the full amount of the gasoline taxes. If that were to be done it would require new legislation. But the people who pay the tax are certainly very much interested, and that is the sort of logic that the committee is following out wisely and well. They have done everything within their power to make certain that they will not intrude upon the rights and privileges of either the Ways and Means Committee or the Members of the House and Senate themselves.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. There have been some observations made by the chairman of the committee and also by the distinguished majority leader that would make the record appear that the 2 cents is going to be used in connection with roadbuilding. That, of course, is not so.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. The gentleman is correct. The money is paid into the general revenue funds as gasoline taxes, and this comes out of the general revenue funds.

Mr. McCORMACK. And if the committee were to bring out a bill providing that gasoline taxes would be used only for roads that would be a different proposition. I would agree to that.

Mr. MASON. So would I.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I am sure we would both agree on that, but the money included in this bill comes out of the general revenue funds.

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. The gasoline tax is paid into the general funds of the Treasury.

I think the gentleman would go a step further and say that if Congress decided that for highway purposes we were to appropriate twice or three times as much out of the general revenue funds as the gasoline taxes we would have a perfect right to do it under the present law and setup. But what the Committee on Public Works is attempting to do here, as I say, is to make a somewhat realistic allocation of highway funds for Federal-aid purposes on the basis of what is being collected in gasoline taxes and going into the revenue fund.

Mr. McCORMACK. We want the record to show that this bill does not provide that the gasoline taxes imposed, or the revenue derived from them shall be used in connection with road building.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I have tried to point that out to the best of my ability. Perhaps I am not sufficiently intelligent to make it clear.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman from Ohio is very intelligent. I simply wanted the record to show in view of the statement made by the majority leader——

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I believe it does.

Mr. McCORMACK. That this applies to the half-cent tax.

What I do not like about it—I am not saying I am opposed to it—but what I do not like about it is that this is conditional legislation and it seems to me it might fall within the jurisdiction of the Ways and Means Committee to consider.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I would suggest that we go ahead and adopt this rule and reserve our questions for a discussion of the merits of the bill later.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 26]

Abbitt	Fogarty	Moulder
Ayres	Forrester	Multer
Barrett	Gamble	O'Brien, N. Y.
Battle	Garmatz	O'Neill
Bender	Gary	Osmers
Bentley	Granahan	Patman, Tex.
Boland	Green	Patterson
Bosch	Gwinn	Philbin
Brownson	Hand	Phillips
Buckley	Hart	Powell
Byrne, Pa.	Heller	Radwan
Camp	Herlong	Rains
Canfield	Hillings	Rayburn
Celler	Holifield	Reams
Chelf	Holtzman	Reece, Tenn.
Chudoff	Hunter	Rivers
Clardy	Javits	Roberts
Cotton	Jensen	Rodino
Coudert	Kearney	Rogers, Fla.
Davis, Tenn.	King, Pa.	Roosevelt
Dawson, Ill.	Klein	Small
Dodd	Knox	Sutton
Donovan	Krueger	Taylor
Dorn, S. C.	Lantaff	Weichel
Edmondson	Latham	Wickersham
Elliott	Miller, Calif.	Widnall
Engle	Miller, N. Y.	Williams, N. J.
Fallon	Morgan	Wilson, Calif.
Fine	Morrison	Wilson, Tex.
Fino	Moss	Yates

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 337 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency may have permission to sit during general debate for the balance of the week on H. R. 7839.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY ACT OF 1954

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED].

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I wanted to make this statement, that so far as I can speak for the Ways and Means Committee, I do not consider that this is any impingement upon the rights of our committee. I am very much in favor of this proposal as presented in this bill.

I think it is essential, and I think the bill is very well drawn. All that the Ways and Means Committee is doing under the excise tax is simply to extend the gasoline tax as requested by the President.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I thank the gentleman from New York, chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means; I thank him very much for his statement.

I would like to say again that perhaps the greatest need of this Nation basically today is for better roads. Almost all of us recognize that the highway system has deteriorated greatly throughout the Nation during the war years. The number of automobiles on the highways today is much larger than it was just a few short years ago.

Perhaps there may be some need for expanded employment in this country in the days ahead; no one knows at the present moment, but I do know that many States are taking action now to try to build better and more highways. My own State just last fall by a vote of the people authorized a bond issue of some $500 million to be expended in the State on State highways and county roads in addition to the $80 million a year that is spent on a regular basis. So it is necessary if we are to have good highways in this country that we continue this Federal-aid program, either that or turn the tax money back to the States.

I think the Committee on Public Works has done well in preparing this legislation. It is comprehensive legislation. Perhaps none of it is exactly the way each and every one of us would like to have it, but it is a good well-rounded bill, and it does return to the local communities and to the States for highway purposes most of the money that the people of the United States put into the general revenue fund through gasoline taxes.

I am hopeful that this rule will be adopted promptly and that we may turn to the consideration of this measure on its merits in 2 hours of general debate under an open rule. You will have an opportunity to offer any amendment you wish. I am hopeful that the rule will be adopted.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. DEMPSEY].

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Speaker, my purpose in taking the floor now is not to go over too much what occurred in our committee but I just want to point out to the membership of this House what this bill proposes.

The able gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN], who just preceded me compared this bill to the last highway-aid bill, and told you that in the existing bill we have $575 million appropriated for the use of highways. That is true, but I will say to my friend from Ohio that Indian roads and forest roads previously have been financed from money coming from other sources.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEMPSEY. I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I am not going on last year's bill; I am telling what is in this bill, $550 million to $575 million.

Mr. DEMPSEY. That is not the fact because it also includes Indian roads and forest roads. The comparison is not equitable.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Perhaps the comparison is wrong; I do not know. But I do know that the highway bill as reported by the Public Works Committee last year carried $550 million to $575 million.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Five hundred and seventy-five million dollars exclusive of forest roads and Indian roads.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. If the gentleman will permit, Public Law No. 413 of the 82d Congress provided $247,500,000 for the primary system.

Mr. DEMPSEY. The gentleman is right.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. One hundred and sixty-five million dollars for the secondary system.

Mr. DEMPSEY. That is correct.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. One hundred and thirty-seven million five hundred thousand dollars for primary and urban; and the interstate system $25 million which if my arithmetic is correct adds up to $575 million. Now, if I have been given incorrect information, I am very sorry, but that is from the public law that was passed by the last session.

Mr. DEMPSEY. I am proud of the gentleman for being a great mathematician because he is 100 percent right, but in the bill before us he adds elements that are not in that bill, so it is not a fair comparison.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. We do have in this bill some items that were not in the other bills; however, this bill does carry a total of $875 million.

Mr. DEMPSEY. In that bill, and the figures the gentleman has just read do not include forest roads and Indian roads.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. That is right. We did not have as much in that bill as we do in this one.

Mr. DEMPSEY. You had as much for forest roads and Indian roads. But we will not confuse that. The comparison is just not equitable because you cannot compare all the elements in the two propositions.

The bill that we are considering has several elements that I disapprove. We have now three categories in the allocation of funds. The first is interstate. Interstate roads are nothing else but the cream of the primary roads that the Defense Department, the Bureau of Public Roads, and the highway departments of the respective States selected as being defense roads. We made them interstate roads because of the comprehensive system we need here in the United States for defense purposes.

The interstate, the primary, and the secondary funds have always been apportioned to the States on a formula predicated upon population, area, and miles of road. The urban are on a different basis, on population alone, and you can see why that should be. It affects the cities.

Now, we have changed the formula. This bill that is before you today splits the $200 million for interstate roads notwithstanding they are defense roads, notwithstanding they were approved by the Defense Department, in fact, recommended by that Department, and puts half of the $200 million on a strictly population basis.

What does that do to the defense highways? Well, the great State of Texas has 2,500 miles of defense roads and on this population-basis apportionment they lose in the 2 years $3,600,000.

There are 19 States affected here and they are all affected in the same way—they all are victims of discrimination. The State of Alabama loses $279,000; Arizona, $772,000; Arkansas, $510,000; Colorado, $1,002,000; Georgia, $388,000; Idaho, $507,000; Iowa, $830,000; Kansas, $1,278,000; Kentucky, $59,000; Maine, $112,000; Minnesota, $789,000; Mississippi, $469,000; Missouri, $520,000; Montana, $1,288,000; Nebraska, $1,153,000; Nevada, $565,000; New Mexico, $903,000; North Carolina, $15,000; North Dakota, $726,000; Oklahoma, $790,000; Oregon, $793,000; South Carolina, $64,000; South Dakota, $838,000; Tennessee, $172,000; Texas, $1,823,000; all annually. Then there is Utah, $424,000; Washington, $212,000; Wisconsin, $281,000; Wyoming, $521,000. In the 2 years this bill covers, fiscal 1956 and 1957, all of the States I have enumerated will lose double the amounts I have just stated.

The States that I have just given you are charged with the responsibility of the care of 64 percent—about two-thirds—of the defense roads. Those with about one-third of the interstate mileage get more than all the States to which I have just called your attention. In other words, the States with one-third of that mileage are given almost 50 percent more of the Federal funds than are the States with twice as much mileage.

Now, I am not going to talk too long on this subject. We fought in the committee up and down, and the majority of my committee felt that they would split it two ways and let it go at that.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEMPSEY. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. McGREGOR. My distinguished colleague said that the majority of the committee split it two ways. My distinguished friend from New Mexico was the only one who objected to splitting it two ways.

Mr. DEMPSEY. I have not denied that; that is just what I am bragging about, if you will let me do it, because there is a principle involved here. You have changed the formula that has been in existence a great many years. Now we find that a gentleman in another part of this Capitol, in another branch of the Congress, wants to change the apportionment made to farm-to-market roads and put it on the basis of the number of automobiles owned by the respective States. We are getting away from a comprehensive system of highways and going back to something that I dislike because, after all, if in defense areas radar or something of that kind was needed, and it cost a billion dollars, I would vote for it. You do not need it in sparsely settled areas, but in sparsely settled areas is where you have your defense projects. They need roads there. I have in my State a project that is over 90 miles long and 30 miles wide. They condemned much of that land owned by ranchers because it was needed by the Federal Government, and I was happy the Government obtained it.

Now, there are several things about this bill I want to call to your attention. I promised the chairman of my committee, who introduced the bill, I would be for retaining 2-cent gasoline and diesel fuel tax. I am for it, but I believe the money should go to the construction of highways in the United States. I have been advised, not directly but indirectly, by the President of the United States through his speeches, that that is what he wants done. The majority floor leader of this honorable body is a great person. The press this morning quotes him as saying this money should be expended for roads. But, when does this bill we are now considering take effect? A year from next July, and in the meantime if we retain this extra half cent on gasoline, it earns from April to next July $500 million. Where is that going? Is it going on roads? We should be fair. I tried to get in my committee consideration for a bill introduced a year ago last January providing for $200 million additional for interstate highways last year and this. Now, I tried to get $200 million more for last year and this year for this interstate system because those roads are in deplorable condition and need immediate work. There was no argument against my bill except balancing the budget. We had hearings last year, a terrific number of them, to find out what the situation was. We found that the situation was that everybody needed more and better roads. People were constantly being killed on the highways, even some murdered. Thirty-eight thousand three hundred people were killed last year, far over 300 more than the year before, and it will be more this year. That will continue until we do our job and get this money for the highways that we need.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEMPSEY. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Are there any toll roads in the gentleman's State?

Mr. DEMPSEY. Not one. We could use more money. If this bill is not going to take effect until a year from next July, then we should get something in the meantime, or else use the $500 million that we are going to tax the people in the meantime, take it and put it where it is going to construct more and better roads.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEMPSEY. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. I want to compliment the gentleman in directing the attention of the House to the disproportionate distribution of this money as it deals with the western territory, as he has previously outlined. What I would like to know is, What would be the correct answer, in the opinion of the gentleman? Should we retain it on the basis of population, area, and road miles?

Mr. DEMPSEY. Defense roads should be absolutely placed on the basis of population, area, and total miles in your State. That formula has been in effect for years and years.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Was there any other formula suggested to the committee of which the gentleman is a member as to the manner in which this should be apportioned other than 50–50 on the basis of population and on the primary fund roads?

Mr. DEMPSEY. I will say this, that the chairman of the Subcommittee on Roads and the gentleman from New Mexico had worked very closely together until this thing came up.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from California [Mr. YORTY].

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Speaker, the authorization for highway purposes proposed in this bill (H. R. 8127) is not adequate. Years of neglect, much of it caused by war and defense expenditures, have left our roads dilapidated, dangerous, and inadequate from many standpoints. Further delay in attacking the problem in a bold, effective way cannot be justified. For a nation on wheels, a highly industrialized nation, to longer tolerate our highway deficiencies is inexcusable.

This Nation should be criss-crossed with broad, safe, smooth, modern highways. Even now, to bring our highways up to reasonable standards will require years of vigorous effort. Obviously further delay means drifting toward avoidable highway dangers and possible defense calamity.

Our civil defense authorities are now beginning to feel that their previous program of "duck and cover" is being made untenable by the increasing destructive power of nuclear weapons. Can anyone here imagine what would happen if our large city populations had to be quickly moved to the country? The chaos, congestion, and confusion would be a sorry and sad testimonial to our failure to build adequate highways. We would pay in lives then for our failure to spend dollars now.

We are presently reducing the size of our Army and planning to keep it, insofar as possible, here in the States, as a strategic reserve. We hope to somewhat offset the size of our Army by emphasis on mobility. This necessary mobility would be closer to actuality if we had modern highways. For instance, out in California, one inadequate trans-Sierra highway would prove a most hazardous bottleneck to movements in or out of central California, including the crowded and highly strategic bay region. Added to this overall lack of good highways must be added the inadequacy of military access roads. This was called to my attention last year by the Department of Defense.

We are in a period of increasing unemployment. There is talk of trying to reverse the trend by construction of public works. No public works could be more sensible or useful than highways to get America out of the traffic jam.

The great Hearst newspapers, in an article of March 6, written by Mr. John A. O'Brien, have estimated that this proposed program is $1,900,000,000 short of our minimum requirement to merely start on a 10-year highway plan. Mr. O'Brien quoted President Eisenhower, where on several occasions he indicated cognizance of the need for a greately expanded highway program. I should like

to include Mr. O'Brien's ably written article at this point in the RECORD:

[From the Los Angeles Examiner of March 7, 1954]

ROAD BILLS FAIL TO MEET CRISIS OUTLINED BY IKE—MEASURES FALL $1,900,000,000 SHORT OF NATION'S NEEDS

(By John H. O'Brien)

WASHINGTON, March 6.—A review of the statements of President Eisenhower on highways not only demonstrates his understanding of the Nation's congestion crisis, it also demonstrates the inadequacy of the Federal-aid highway bill supported by his administration.

The President's first statement concerning highways was printed in the Hearst newspapers of October 26, 1952, when he was a candidate for the office to which the American public elected him by a landslide vote.

The statement was a lengthy one, and in it the President showed a keen awareness of the obsolescence of our streets and roads; the congestion around cities, and, in his words, the "appalling problem of waste, death, and danger."

MILITARY VIEWS

He looked at the problem, too, with the eyes of a military man.

"More than at any time in history, modern roads are necessary to defense and traffic is an interstate problem of concern to the Federal Government."

In stating his own solution to the problem, the President spoke in general terms. He said:

"By intelligent leadership and wise planning, an integrated program can be devised within the ability of the people to pay the cost."

TAX REQUEST

A year after he took office, the President on January 7, 1954, referred to highways in his state of the Union message.

He asked that the Federal gasoline tax be kept at 2 cents "so that maximum progress can be made to overcome present inadequacies in the interstate highway system."

The tax was to be reduced automatically to 1½ cents next April 1. Congress has demonstrated its undoubted intent to retain the full tax.

Shortly thereafter, a bill written by Representative MCGREGOR, Republican, of Ohio, chairman of the House Subcommittee on Roads, was introduced calling for the annual authorization of $875 million in Federal aid to highways.

The author of the bill said it had administration support, and this has never been questioned.

At a White House press conference a few days later, the President was asked what he thought should be the amount of Federal aid.

An aide handed him a slip of paper, and the President replied that it ought to be $800 million. It developed in subsequent discussion that the aide had written $825 million on the slip of paper, but that the President had cut it down by $25 million to be on the conservative side.

It thus became apparent that the administration favored a bill authorizing somewhere between $800 million and $875 million, with the larger figure actually incorporated in an administration bill.

On January 28, the President submitted to Congress the Economic Report of the President, a 225-page book.

On page 104, under a subhead reading "Need for Public Works," the President wrote:

"The largest current requirement for predominantly State and local facilities is streets and roads."

CITES NEEDS

"It has been estimated that an annual expenditure of $3½ billion would be required for 10 years to eliminate the existing backlog for federally aided systems and another one to two billion dollars for other roads and streets.

"In the meantime, many roads now adequate would need to be improved as traffic increases, or rebuilt because of normal wear, adding over $1,500,000,000 of construction annually, while maintenance costs would average another $1,700,000,000.

"Thus, the total annual expenditure required to provide an adequate road system within a decade is apparently over $8 billion, which compares with a current outlay of about $5 billion."

To meet the needs of the Federal-aid road system alone, as the President wrote, requires the annual expenditure for 10 years of $3,500,000,000.

BILLS LAG

The administration bill calls for the spending of $875 million, and with matching funds required from each State would bring the total to something like $1,600,000,000.

The need: $3,500,000,000.

The solution: $1,600,000,000.

The gap between need and solution: $1,900,000,000.

Thus the gap is larger than the solution.

Since all of the foregoing information comes from administration sources, it bears out the conclusion reached in the first paragraph:

That the statements demonstrate the President's awareness of the scope of the problem and the inadequacy of the administration's solution.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I take this time to point out a section of the bill which I think is surplusage under the present situation. I think on the whole the bill is a very good bill. Of course, I am for it. However, there is a provision written into this bill, on page 5, line 11, that reads as follows:

That the Secretary of Commerce shall not apportion to the States the sum authorized by this section for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, unless a Federal excise tax on gasoline in the amount of not less than 2 cents per gallon is in effect on September 30, 1954; and the Secretary of Commerce shall not apportion to the States the sum authorized by this section for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, unless a Federal excise tax on gasoline in the amount of not less than 2 cents per gallon is in effect on September 30, 1955.

I think I understand the reasoning behind that and the reasons for that provision's being in the bill. At the time this bill was written and adopted by the very splendid Committee on Public Works, the bill continuing that excess tax of half a cent and bringing it up to 2 cents had not been voted out by the Committee on Ways and Means. Since that time that tax has been voted out—that is, a continuation of that tax of half a cent, which gives the 2-cent tax that is mentioned here. It will be passed by this body on Wednesday.

You might argue, What difference does it make then? It makes this difference: For the first time in the history of all this Federal-aid road legislation, as I understand it, such a restriction has been placed upon these allocations.

Let us bear in mind there is nothing partisan about this. This is not partisan legislation. This is a matter that has been supported uniformly by both the Democratic and the Republican Parties when they were in power. I do not think there is anything sinister or partisan about this provision under discussion, but I am apprehensive—and others who have given thought to this matter are apprehensive—of the precedent set here when we put that in the bill. Once you write that into this bill, do not forget that it is going to continue in there from now on and will become permanent legislation.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLMER. I yield.

Mr. McGREGOR. I am sure we all recognize the fact that the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi has always been fair and his honesty and integrity cannot be questioned. We are trying to do that in this legislation. We are trying to say to the traveling public in all honesty that we are going to give them the approximate amount of money that they pay in for gasoline taxes and diesel fuel. Certainly there is nothing in this legislation that makes it permanent. But we are pointing out to the other body that we want to be in a position where we can say to the States in which we have contractual obligations that we are going to live up to them as long as we have the 2 cents gasoline tax revenue. I am sure the gentleman will agree with me on that.

Mr. COLMER. Now will the gentleman from Ohio answer a question for me? If the gentleman had been assured in the premises that the one-half cent excise tax would be continued, then I would take it he would not have written this provision into the bill?

Mr. McGREGOR. We might have had that assurance in this body, but I will say that sometimes the other body does things that we do not do here.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McGREGOR. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. What assurance is there, assuming that this bill becomes law that the Committee on Appropriations will appropriate the one-half cent that this relates to? There is no guarantee of that?

Mr. McGREGOR. I am certain that the minority whip is familiar with the rules of the House relative to authorizations which might be considered appropriations as far as roads are concerned. The Committee on Appropriations is practically bound to appropriate money called for in road authorizations because of the contractual obligations made with the various States.

Mr. McCORMACK. Is the gentleman stating that our Government is bound by the provisions of these bills and that the Committee on Appropriations should appropriate funds which have not been authorized?

Mr. McGREGOR. I am glad to be corrected. I will say that we are morally bound because of the contractual obligations that exist with the States.

Mr. McCORMACK. I will agree when the gentleman says we are morally bound. But that is a different matter than being legally bound because if what the gentleman says is correct, then we are making an appropriation which the standing committee has no power to make.

Mr. McGREGOR. I might say to my distinguished friend, there is nothing in this bill relative to appropriations that is not in the basic Highway Act of 1944, and the gentleman from Massachusetts was here at that time and helped pass that bill.

Mr. McCORMACK. The basic act of 1944 provides for authorizations.

Mr. McGREGOR. That is correct.

Mr. McCORMACK. The bill we are now considering makes an authorization dependent upon the existence of a tax, is that not correct?

Mr. McGREGOR. We are just being honest and saying you cannot have the cake and eat it too; if you want good roads, you must pay for them.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am not impugning the honesty of my friends or of the committee. The language is very plain. I am not even saying that I am going to vote against it, but I have certain doubts about the advisability of it.

Mr. McGREGOR. May I say to my good friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts, who is so worried over this additional one-half cent tax that is going to be renewed, I hope, on Wednesday. If he wants to make a motion to strike out that one-half cent tax on Wednesday on a recommitment motion, that is his privilege. Then we can definitely decide whether we want good roads or bad roads.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman from Massachusetts is deeply indebted to his friend, the gentleman from Ohio, for advising him as to something he can do, which the gentleman from Massachusetts is thoroughly acquainted with and knows that he can do. But let us confine ourselves to this bill. According to what the gentleman said this amounts to an appropriation, or has the effect of an appropriation.

Mr. McGREGOR. Not any more, as my distinguished friend knows, than any other authorization bill relating to roads coming from the Committee on Public Works.

Mr. McCORMACK. My dear friend fails to differentiate. This is entirely different from an ordinary authorization, as the gentleman knows.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I think it is very obvious here that under the present situation we do not need this provision in the bill. My good friend, the chairman of the subcommittee, falls back on that old relief measure, that we are going to leave this to the other body to attend to. I think sometimes we ought to do a little legislating on our own over here.

Let us go back to the merits of this proposal for just a moment. It is not going to make any practical difference if this tax is continued and if this language stays in, except for the danger of the precedent that you set for the future. Once you tie it in here with this, you are going to have it continue in the bills that follow. If that is what you are going to do, and you collect 2 cents for the Federal Government, which amounts to more than these allocations, why not put it all on a Federal-aid basis, if you are going to match it dollar for dollar and that is your purpose? But again I would be opposed to that for the simple reason that I do not want this highway legislation tied down with this kind of restriction. Your administrative problems would be enormous.

For instance, take your fishing fleets, your agricultural tractors, and other farm implements, where they do not pay the tax. You would have an enormous administrative problem there in making these deductions. The Federal Government would have to go in and figure out the various deductions for these fishing fleets and agricultural implements, where the tax was not required.

I was in hopes—I do not have too much now—that my distinguished friend might see his way clear to eliminating this section. I am not so sure, if somebody else does not do it, in the consideration of the bill, that I shall not be constrained to offer an amendment to delete it.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of the time on this side to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SCHERER].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SCHERER] is recognized for 9 minutes.

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct my remarks to the provisions of the bill which provide $200 million of Federal matching funds for the interstate highway system.

There are a few basic facts about this system which should be recalled:

Its designation as interstate indicates that this is the system with which the Federal Government should be primarily concerned.

If another war should come, which, of course, we all pray will not happen, these are the highways which the Department of Defense says must do the job. Today they are the roads which are carrying the load. These 40,000 miles of interstate highways comprise only 1 percent of the entire road mileage in the United States yet they carry 20 percent of all the traffic.

The evidence adduced by the committee is conclusive that this system today is totally inadequate to do the job because of this high volume and heavy traffic load. This is particularly true in the highly populated areas. It is on these interstate roads in the congested sections that the movement of traffic has been reduced to a snail's pace. It is here where the highways have deteriorated—where they are too narrow and outmoded. These are the highways that were built at the beginning of the automobile era. They now need rebuilding and replacement. It is here where the great losses are incurred—in cargo delays, in driver time loss, in added gasoline and oil consumption, in wear and tear on motor vehicles and the motoring public's nervous system.

These are some of the reasons why the McGregor bill provides for the first time a substantial sum for the interstate system. It is my personal opinion that an even greater amount of the total should be allocated to this system.

The American Association of State Highway Officials who are responsible for the roads in your State and, who on a whole know more about the road problem than any other persons in the country, have made an exhaustive study and survey with reference to the interstate system and have reached the conclusions as I have outlined them. Their study goes further and recommends what must be done to improve the interstate system. They point out that the improvement of the interstate system must be a uniform improvement throughout the entire country. It must be a uniform improvement if it is to be effective, particularly in the time of emergency. In other words, this interstate chain of roads is no stronger or effective than its weakest section.

These State highway officials have determined the approximate cost of bringing these roads up to the standard needed to meet the commercial and defense requirements of the Nation.

One of their significant findings is the fact that the cost of doing this job in the 8 most populated States is 51½ percent of the total, while the cost of all of the remaining 40 States represents 48½ percent of the total cost. Their findings further point out that in the first 8 States we find 71,500,000 of our people as against 79,200,000 in the remaining 40 States.

Then again these 8 States account for 25,700,000 motor-vehicle registrations against 27,500,000 in the remaining 40 States.

With these cogent facts before them, the State highway officials in convention assembled voted to recommend to the Congress that the money allocated for the interstate system be distributed on a population basis. The significant thing about this recommendation is the fact that 46 highway departments voted specifically for the population formula and only 2 against.

It should be further noted that each State had one vote irrespective of its size, population, or the amount contributed to the Federal Government in gasoline taxes.

It seems to me that with these facts no fair-minded person can come to a different conclusion than have our State highway officials, especially when it is known that in many instances the cost per mile of constructing these interstate highways in the industrial areas is seven times the cost in rural areas.

The McGregor bill before us provides that only one-half of the two hundred million be distributed under the population formula; that the remaining one hundred million be distributed under the old formula.

It is obvious from what I have said that if the interstate system is to be improved uniformly and the job property done all of the two hundred million should be distributed under the population formula as the State highway officials recommend. Yet there are some who selfishly insist that we should ignore the population formula completely and distribute this entire two hundred million on the old basis. If we do this those States where the cost of improvement is 51½

percent, get only 34 1/10 percent of the funds while those States where the cost is only 48½ percent get 67 9/10 of the money.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHERER. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. I want to commend the gentleman for making a very excellent statement. It is quite evident that as a member of this great committee he has paid close attention to the testimony before the committee and made a great study of it and he is, better than that and more than that, expressing so well and for the education of all of us the solutions to the problems that confronted the committee.

Mr. SCHERER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 8127) to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 8127, with Mr. NICHOLSON in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 8 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the bill presented to the House today is the result not of brief hearings on the part of the Committee on Public Works or its subcommittee on roads but is the result of long and extended hearings that lasted more than 3 months last year and many days this year. We think it is a good bill. There may be some provisions in it that some Members of the House and some members of the committee are not entirely satisfied with.

But, upon the whole this is a good bill and provides more money for highways than any highway-aid bill ever presented to Congress.

I think the great problem before the American people today is not how to build the best automobiles in the world, because we are doing that, but the great problem which presents itself to us in the House today is to find some means of providing adequate facilities on which to operate them. The Bureau of Public Roads informs us that we now have 55 million registered motor vehicles in our country, 1 for every 3 people in the United States. More than that, we are adding to that number about 3 million new cars annually. The industry provides about 6 million new cars every year, while 3 million cars leave the roads each year because of time and travel; in other words, they become old, obsolete, and worn out. In the next 2 years we will have 60 million cars traveling the highways of this country. More than that, we are told that we aggregate about one-half trillion miles of travel every year. The people who own automobiles use their cars more than they did 10 years ago. They travel more miles; they go longer distances; they use the car more often, and we are burning up about 40 billion gallons of gasoline annually. I know of no people on the face of the earth who are more dependent upon their motor transportation facilities for their daily needs or when the ownership of motor vehicles have become such an important factor in the lives and welfare of the people, as here in the United States. So, I refer once more to the problem that faces this Congress and the public officials of this country, namely, to provide adequate facilities to operate the enormous number of cars that travel the highways of our land.

There has been some criticism found with one or two of the provisions. This bill provides $225 million more in matching money than the previous bill which was passed by this Congress two years ago. It has been the policy of the Congress to pass a road bill every 2 years. This bill provides for the fiscal years 1956 and 1957. The money for the fiscal years 1954–55 has already been provided for and has been allocated to the States. Some argument has been presented that this bill ought to be set up a year sooner. I heard it discussed in the well of the House. I doubt very much, if you did that, whether the States could match it in time to take advantage of it; in other words, we have a road policy in this land that started back in 1916, a Federal-State highway system. Upon the whole that system has worked admirably for more than 35 years. Why should we change it? Why should we change it when it is time-tested and found not wanting? I think it would be a great mistake. Even the suggestion that the Federal Bureau of Roads be abolished and the Federal Government withdraw from collecting taxes on gasoline suggested by the governors' conference I think would be a tragic mistake, because you would have no coordinating agency to integrate this vast system of highways that has been built up since 1916. Why, more than 300 years ago it was discovered that "the easy conveyance of men and goods from place to place was one of the three things necessary to make a nation great and strong." Good roads manifested itself to the people of this world even 2,000 years ago. The Romans believed in good roads and they built a road that has lasted more than 2,000 years. The Greeks believed in good roads, and 300 years ago an English authority came forth and said that the easy conveyance of men and goods from place to place is one of the three essentials which make a nation great and strong. That is the subject we are dealing with today on the floor of this House, the subject of transportation.

I am not going into the question of the technical points of the bill, because, may I say to the House, in justice to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MCGREGOR], that he has devoted much time, thought, and energy to the question of good roads. It was from his subcommittee that the bill was presented to the full committee and adopted by us unanimously.

The opposition presented here about this half-cent gas tax I think is a tempest in a teapot. Perhaps the language is unusual, but if the tax bill which will come to this floor next Wednesday had been passed before this bill came to the floor you would have heard no discussion about it and there would have been no necessity for putting the language in the bill. I am satisfied that the half-cent gas tax should be continued, and I believe it will be continued.

I am not going to take any more time at this point.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois. Will the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Public Works yield me a moment in order that I may confess that there are certain provisions in this bill I do not understand? Knowing how careful and capable the gentleman is in delving into these subjects in his committee, I should like him to explain, in order that I may vote intelligently on the provisions of this bill, first, what is meant by the Federal-aid primary highway system. Is that within the States alone?

Mr. DONDERO. I trust the gentleman will defer his question because I have tried to avoid discussing such questions, leaving them to the chairman of the Subcommittee on Roads [Mr. MCGREGOR], which committee practically prepared this bill.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois. I am willing to wait if the gentleman will give me time to ask that question later.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I will first state to the committee that I am appearing as a substitute today. The absence of our distinguished colleague from Maryland [Mr. FALLON], ranking member of the Roads Subcommittee, was caused by the tragic incident that happened here last Monday. There were two members of our committee who received injury then, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FALLON] and the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. DAVIS]. I am happy to report to the committee today that both Mr. FALLON and Mr. DAVIS of this committee have been able to return home and their conditions have been reported as satisfactory.

In spite of the combined efforts of the local governments, the State governments, and the Federal Government, we have not been able to settle the tremendous and urgent road problem existing in this country today. You will recall that we have 3 million miles of roads in our country. It is estimated that to put all our roads in repair and bring them up to present-day standards it would require an appropriation of from

$35 to $40 billions. The number of vehicles has increased far in excess of the building program that has been carried on throughout the country.

The principal section is section 1, dealing with the traditional recognized highway program, the primary, urban, secondary, or so-called farm-to-market roads. This amount of $550 million provided under existing law has been increased to $600 million. There has been some change in the administration of the secondary-road program. It establishes the elimination of the rigid requirements that heretofore have been required of local governments in the construction of secondary roads to meet certain criteria and certain standards and certain specifications. The provision of that part of the bill is somewhat distasteful to me. However, there still remains the right of the Secretary of Commerce to veto any standards or specifications that do not meet requirements. There has been a contention throughout the land that we need to relax those high standards which have been imposed heretofore and give the local governments more opportunity to have their say as to what type and what character of roads they should construct. I have always been of the opinion that we have a firm obligation to see that the Federal Government's tax dollars are being wisely invested, and, even though there might have been some complaints, it has served a most useful purpose.

In section 1 we also find a 25-percent interchange of funds that has been made retroactive to the act of 1952.

The most controversial section of the bill is section 2, dealing with the interstate system. The last act we passed in 1952 provided for $25 million to be spent on the principal or main arterial highways throughout the country known as the defense highways. That road system found its life in the act of 1944. It places a limitation of 40,000 miles of roads in the interstate system. So far we have had designated 37,000 miles of the interstate system. It carries the heavy load of the traffic index figures. We are increasing the former amount to $175 million to be made available in the fiscal year 1956–57 for the construction of the interstate system. Heretofore the interstate system has been on a 50–50 matching program, 50 percent being furnished by the Federal Government and 50 percent by the local and State governments. We have increased Federal participation to 60–40 percent. We have changed the formula of $100 million from the traditional matching basis that we have used in the past to a population basis. The other $100 million is to follow the same matching formula that we have had in the primary and other road systems. This represents a compromise between the urban voices and that of the rural States.

In my own State we would be most happy to have the traditional formula written, based upon the three ingredients that have been recognized historically in the writing of the roads bill. Unfortunately, we did not have sufficient strength, we did not have the urge nor the facilities to write into this bill everything that would be suitable to my people or suitable to all the people in the other States. So we agreed that one-half of the total amount would be based on a population formula and the other $100 million would be based upon the formula we have used in the past.

There is a great deal of contention about the continuation of the one-half cent gasoline tax. I assure you this is no effort on the part of the Committee on Public Works to trespass upon the sovereignty and the authority of the Committee on Ways and Means. But with an increase of $175 million it was necessary to have some agreement and some voice of concert that we would have available in 1956 and 1957 sufficient moneys to pay for the increases made in the bill.

There is a great deal of uneasiness about this proposal. You will recall that in the discussion with the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McGREGOR] the very question was raised as to whether or not the normal relationship existing between an authorization and an appropriation would prevail in making funds available for the construction of roads. The Committee on Appropriations has recognized that this authorization gives rise to a moral obigation that when the contracts are made between the Bureau of Public Roads and a State highway department, they could then proceed with the planning and the expenditures of local funds in obtaining rights-of-way, a condition precedent to carrying out its contractual relations.

This bill recognizes, as we have in the past, that within 2 years the State highway departments of the various States would have credits of moneys that were not used in a single year. So I do not conceive nor do I believe that this provision in the bill is as serious as the objectors find it to be.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. I wanted to inquire of the gentleman whether or not he knew of any precedent in previous legislation for adopting the 60–40 matching fund basis rather than the 50–50 basis. It is the first time it has come to my attention.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. The 60–40 formula is based upon several reasons, the principal one being the tremendous cost of building the interstate system. In the State of Rhode Island for example, it is estimated that on the interstate system the cost would be in excess of $2 million a mile. To take care of 4- and 6-lane highways such as these, it is necessary that we have huge and large expenditures to construct that type of road.

Second, the ability of the State to match these funds has been most difficult for a number of States. As an inducement to the States to carry on the construction of an interstate system it was necessary, in the opinion of the committee, to provide an increase in Federal participation.

I, for one, along with several other members of the committee, would like to have seen the formula changed to 75–25. Our views, however, did not prevail, and that too was a compromise figure.

Mr. KEATING. Does the gentleman know whether or not we have in the past adopted such a matching basis? My only experience has been with a 50–50 basis. I am wondering if the gentleman has additional information on that.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I do not recall in a single instance when the matching ratio has been that high on the four principal categories of roads.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I yield.

Mr. EVINS. I have been somewhat concerned about the provision in the bill for the diversion of 25 percent from one purpose to another. Is it the intention of the committee that funds appropriated for urban roads might be diverted to rural roads or that funds appropriated for rural roads might be diverted to the building of city streets?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Not in excess of 25 percent; and that 25 percent provision was written in, in order that there should be some versatility of effort on the part of State highway departments to meet their State's needs. It is hard to anticipate this far in advance the particular needs of an individual State.

Mr. EVINS. I do not remember that flexibility in such legislation before. Funds have been appropriated for a particular purpose and they have been used for that purpose.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Yes; they have the 25 percent formula in existing law.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I yield.

Mr. McGREGOR. I want to say in reply to the distinguished gentleman from New York that the act of 1941 carried a different formula than the 50–50 matching provision.

Mr. Chairman, I also wish to take advantage of this opportunity to extend my thanks and appreciation to the gentleman from Alabama for the distinguished service and assistance he has given us on this bill and legislation.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 27 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McGREGOR], chairman of the Subcommittee on Roads of the Committee on Public Works, and the author of the bill before us.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, I want to pay my respects not only to the Subcommittee on Roads but also to the full Committee on Public Works. They have worked hard and diligently. This is a bill that came out of our committee by a unanimous vote. There was no politics; we considered all of the areas which it is our privilege to represent; and, as so ably stated by the distinguished gentleman from Alabama, this is a compromise measure. There are many things in the bill that, possibly, if I were writing it for the 17th Congressional District of Ohio or for the State of Ohio, I would have changed to coincide with the Ohio viewpoint; but all of us in representing our respective

districts and States recognized this as a national matter and thus agreed on a compromise bill which we all accepted. I want to say to the members of the committee that I certainly appreciate the splendid cooperation they have given me.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to read a statement which was presented to me by one of our colleagues on the committee, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. DAVIS]; and I also ask, Mr. Chairman, that after this statement our colleague, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FALLON], who is the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Roads, be granted permission to insert his remarks ahead of those of the gentleman from Ohio. Both of these gentlemen are confined to the hospital for reason known to all of us.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. McGREGOR. This is a statement of the gentleman from Tennessee:

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, as a member of the Committee on Public Works, I rise to support House Resolution 8127. This measure is necessary and should be enacted into law to provide Federal-aid authorizations for orderly continuation of the highway construction program for an additional 2-year period. The amounts authorized by this bill will become available to the States during the fiscal years 1956 and 1957, on a matching basis.

The Subcommittee on Roads of the Committee on Public Works conducted a complete study of the highway problem, as well as the needs for a new construction and numerous other factors all relating to highways. As a result of the factual material furnished to the committee by Federal department representatives, State highway officials, road builders, automobile associations, truckers, the motorist, and many persons in private industry as well as others, we were convinced that the highway problem was one which demanded top priority.

We were informed that $800 million was the minimum annual Federal-aid authorization which would be required to accomplish most urgently needed construction work and that such a program would have to be kept in effect for at least 20 years to keep pace with the problems.

I believe the committee in reporting favorably on H. R. 8127 is attempting to be realistic, consistent with the economy of the Nation, and is meeting head on the challenge which the highway problem presents.

In authorizing $800 million for Federal aid to highways for each of the fiscal years 1956 and 1957, we have increased the amount authorized in the 1952 act by $225 million per fiscal year.

I believe the provision in section 1 of the bill, which permits up to 25 percent of the amount apportioned to any State in any year for primary, secondary, and urban systems, respectively, to be transferred from one system to either of the others, is a progressive measure and allows greater latitude in administering the funds which will accomplish better results on a more satisfactory basis. This same observation may be made with respect to the second proviso in section 1, for that will also assure more perfect cooperation between the States and the Bureau of Public Roads with respect to secondary roads, and should prove mutually advantageous.

The committee should be commended for the constructive action which it has taken in this bill with respect to two vital and somewhat controversial measures. In section 9, it has directed the Secretary of Commerce to make a study in cooperation with the State highway departments and other parties in interest relative to the problems posed by necessary relocation and reconstruction of public utilities services resulting from authorized highway improvements. Among other things, such a study is to include a review and financial analysis of existing relationships between the State highway departments and affected utilities of all types, and a review of the various State statutes regulating existing relationships, to the end that a full and informative report may be made to the President for transmittal to the Congress of the United States not later than February 1, 1955.

In section 12 the committee has given recognition to the need for a great highway to traverse the Mississippi Valley from Canada to the Gulf and has authorized the expenditure of $250,000 from general administrative funds to expedite the planning and coordination of this Great River Road.

The purposes and objectives of this legislation are reasonable and urgently required. These authorizations are needed not only as part of the national defense program but also the national highway safety program.

I earnestly and sincerely support this bill and respectfully urge its passage.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, it is a privilege and a pleasure for me to incorporate in the RECORD at this point the statement of the Honorable CLIFFORD DAVIS, a member of our subcommittee and the Committee on Public Works.

Mr. Chairman, for the first time in history, the bill before you, H. R. 8127 authorizes appropriations for Federal-aid highways and for highway work in the national forests, national parks and parkways, and Indian reservations in the approximate amount of the Federal road user tax on motor fuels. The total of $875 million authorizations carried in the bill compares with the approximately $905 million collected by the Federal Government on gasoline and diesel fuel in the fiscal year 1953.

There are several important features in the bill which I shall describe more in detail in a moment. These are:

First. Provision for a greatly enlarged authorization for the improvement of the national system of interstate highways.

Second. Provision for the transfer of funds between different categories to provide a flexibility necessary to meet highway needs which vary from State to State.

Third. The transfer to the State highway departments of much greater authority to handle the local problems involved in the farm-to-market road program.

The bill provides for carrying forward the time-proven pattern of cooperation between the Federal Government operating through the Bureau of Public Roads and the several States operating through their respective State highway departments with a few changes which experience has indicated are desirable.

The bill would authorize $600 million for each of the fiscal years 1956 and 1957, divided among the three categories of projects established initially in the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1944, as follows:

Two hundred and seventy million dollars, or 45 percent, for projects on the Federal-aid primary highway system.

One hundred and eighty million dollars, or 30 percent, for projects on the Federal-aid secondary highway system.

One hundred and fifty million dollars, or 25 percent, for projects on the Federal-aid primary system in urban areas.

An additional $200 million annually is authorized for improvements on the interstate system. This system, which was set up through cooperative effort of the State highway departments and the Bureau of Public Roads under the direction of Congress, is limited to 40,000 miles. It represents the most important highways in the primary system. It is important not only to our peacetime economy but is vital to our national defense, consisting as it does of highways of the greatest strategic importance. The rural portions of this system, although comprising only slightly more than 1 percent of all the highways in the country, carry 20 percent or more of all the rural traffic. It has been well said that this system, together with other important mileage, is an integral part of our industrial assembly line. It provides an indispensable service.

The approximate amounts which each State would receive from the $800 million authorized are shown in the table which I submit for the RECORD:

Approximate apportionment of Federal-aid highway funds pursuant to H. R. 8127

State	Federal-aid				Interstate			Total ($800,000,000)
	Primary ($270,000,000)	Secondary ($180,000,000)	Urban ($150,000,000)	Subtotal ($600,000,000)	Population [1] ($100,000,000)	Sec. 21 [2] ($100,000,000)	Subtotal ($200,000,000)	
Alabama	$5,761,000	$4,465,000	$1,938,000	$12,164,000	$1,876,000	$2,155,000	$4,031,000	$16,195,000
Arizona	4,038,000	2,750,000	575,000	7,363,000	735,000	1,507,000	2,242,000	9,605,000
Arkansas	4,495,000	3,597,000	827,000	8,919,000	1,170,000	1,680,000	2,850,000	11,769,000
California	12,393,000	6,381,000	13,148,000	31,922,000	6,487,000	4,652,000	11,139,000	43,061,000
Colorado	4,858,000	3,245,000	1,229,000	9,332,000	812,000	1,814,000	2,626,000	11,958,000
Connecticut	1,751,000	882,000	2,864,000	5,497,000	1,230,000	658,000	1,888,000	7,385,000
Delaware	1,323,000	882,000	303,000	2,508,000	735,000	490,000	1,225,000	3,733,000
Florida	4,386,000	2,867,000	2,652,000	9,905,000	1,698,000	1,643,000	3,341,000	13,246,000
Georgia	6,682,000	5,103,000	2,156,000	13,941,000	2,111,000	2,499,000	4,610,000	18,551,000

[1] Apportioned according to total population with minimum of ¾ of 1 percent.
[2] Apportioned according to sec. 21 of Federal Highway Act—⅓ area, ⅓ total population, and ⅓ post road mileage, with minimum of ½ of 1 percent.

Approximate apportionment of Federal-aid highway funds pursuant to H. R. 8127—Continued

State	Federal-aid				Interstate			Total ($800,000,000)
	Primary ($270,000,000)	Secondary ($180,000,000)	Urban ($150,000,000)	Subtotal ($600,000,000)	Population ($100,000,000)	Sec. 21 ($100,000,000)	Subtotal ($200,000,000)	
Idaho	$3,328,000	$2,341,000	$285,000	$5,954,000	$735,000	$1,242,000	$1,977,000	$7,931,000
Illinois	10,401,000	5,664,000	10,344,000	26,409,000	5,339,000	3,901,000	9,240,000	35,649,000
Indiana	6,409,000	4,418,000	3,538,000	14,365,000	2,411,000	2,399,000	4,810,000	19,175,000
Iowa	6,520,000	4,772,000	1,756,000	13,048,000	1,606,000	2,436,000	4,042,000	17,090,000
Kansas	6,552,000	4,587,000	1,390,000	12,529,000	1,168,000	2,446,000	3,614,000	16,143,000
Kentucky	4,977,000	4,131,000	1,536,000	10,644,000	1,804,000	1,863,000	3,667,000	14,311,000
Louisiana	4,207,000	3,045,000	2,168,000	9,420,000	1,644,000	1,576,000	3,220,000	12,640,000
Maine	2,265,000	1,621,000	618,000	4,504,000	735,000	847,000	1,582,000	6,086,000
Maryland	2,374,000	1,451,000	2,510,000	6,335,000	1,436,000	892,000	2,328,000	8,663,000
Massachusetts	3,429,000	1,273,000	6,156,000	10,858,000	2,874,000	1,293,000	4,167,000	15,025,000
Michigan	8,379,000	5,113,000	6,884,000	20,376,000	3,904,000	3,141,000	7,045,000	27,421,000
Minnesota	7,002,000	4,943,000	2,408,000	14,353,000	1,828,000	2,617,000	4,445,000	18,798,000
Mississippi	4,826,000	4,021,000	819,000	9,666,000	1,335,000	1,804,000	3,139,000	12,805,000
Missouri	7,870,000	5,325,000	3,643,000	16,838,000	2,423,000	2,943,000	5,366,000	22,204,000
Montana	5,423,000	3,730,000	348,000	9,501,000	735,000	2,023,000	2,758,000	12,259,000
Nebraska	5,264,000	3,733,000	868,000	9,865,000	812,000	1,965,000	2,777,000	12,642,000
Nevada	3,486,000	2,330,000	113,000	5,929,000	735,000	1,300,000	2,035,000	7,964,000
New Hampshire	1,323,000	882,000	438,000	2,643,000	735,000	490,000	1,225,000	3,868,000
New Jersey	3,491,000	1,175,000	6,475,000	11,141,000	2,963,000	1,316,000	4,279,000	15,420,000
New Mexico	4,389,000	3,015,000	485,000	7,889,000	735,000	1,638,000	2,373,000	10,262,000
New York	12,691,000	5,085,000	19,770,000	37,546,000	9,087,000	4,775,000	13,862,000	51,408,000
North Carolina	6,690,000	5,715,000	1,901,000	14,306,000	2,489,000	2,504,000	4,993,000	19,299,000
North Dakota	3,917,000	2,844,000	250,000	7,011,000	735,000	1,461,000	2,196,000	9,207,000
Ohio	9,415,000	5,727,000	8,559,000	23,701,000	4,869,000	3,531,000	8,400,000	32,101,000
Oklahoma	5,778,000	4,137,000	1,616,000	11,531,000	1,369,000	2,159,000	3,528,000	15,059,000
Oregon	4,616,000	3,226,000	1,186,000	9,028,000	932,000	1,725,000	2,657,000	11,685,000
Pennsylvania	10,597,000	6,306,000	11,197,000	28,100,000	6,433,000	3,980,000	10,413,000	38,513,000
Rhode Island	1,323,000	882,000	1,057,000	3,262,000	735,000	490,000	1,225,000	4,487,000
South Carolina	3,635,000	3,010,000	1,017,000	7,662,000	1,297,000	1,361,000	2,658,000	10,320,000
South Dakota	4,217,000	3,012,000	287,000	7,516,000	735,000	1,573,000	2,308,000	9,824,000
Tennessee	5,851,000	4,560,000	2,139,000	12,550,000	2,017,000	2,189,000	4,206,000	16,756,000
Texas	17,513,000	11,727,000	7,086,000	36,326,000	4,725,000	6,548,000	11,273,000	47,599,000
Utah	3,104,000	2,053,000	627,000	5,784,000	735,000	1,159,000	1,894,000	7,678,000
Vermont	1,323,000	882,000	230,000	2,435,000	735,000	490,000	1,225,000	3,660,000
Virginia	5,128,000	3,986,000	2,306,000	11,420,000	2,034,000	1,920,000	3,954,000	15,374,000
Washington	4,463,000	2,982,000	2,232,000	9,677,000	1,458,000	1,670,000	3,128,000	12,805,000
West Virginia	2,944,000	2,563,000	963,000	6,470,000	1,229,000	1,103,000	2,332,000	8,802,000
Wisconsin	6,378,000	4,450,000	2,896,000	13,724,000	2,105,000	2,386,000	4,491,000	18,215,000
Wyoming	3,367,000	2,282,000	161,000	5,810,000	735,000	1,256,000	1,991,000	7,801,000
Hawaii	1,323,000	882,000	497,000	2,702,000				2,702,000
District of Columbia	1,323,000	882,000	1,278,000	3,483,000	735,000	490,000	1,225,000	4,708,000
Puerto Rico	1,462,000	1,465,000	1,271,000	4,138,000				4,138,000

No one can dispute the urgent need for modernizing our highway system. Testimony submitted to the committee by the State highway officials indicated that the estimated cost of eliminating the deficiencies on the approved Federal-aid systems of 673,000 miles amounted to approximately $35 billion. This estimate is larger than similar estimates made in prior years. The increase in the estimated cost of modernizing this mileage shows that under our present rate of expenditure we have been losing ground. This has happened in spite of an expenditure of $3,600,000,000 on the Federal-aid systems in the past few years.

A look at the increase in automobile registrations will help to explain this situation. Ten years ago, in 1944, 30,479,000 motor vehicles were registered. The number of motor vehicles using our highways has steadily increased at such an unprecedented rate that in the year just closed more than 55 million motor vehicles were in service. This is an increase in a 10-year period of 80 percent.

These statistics, however, do not tell the full story. Many owners of automobiles are using them more and more each year for both recreation and daily activities. We are truly a nation on wheels. Over night our whole population could be moved from one place to another with less than an average of three persons per car—that is, it could if we had the highways to accommodate our motor vehicles.

Now a word of explanation as to the new features in the bill which experience has indicated are desirable. The $600 million authorized for work on the three categories of projects—primary, secondary, and urban, which might be referred to as the regular Federal-aid highway program—is apportioned in the same manner among the States as provided in the 1944 act. To provide greater flexibility in the use of these funds to meet varying conditions encountered in different States, there is provision in the bill that would permit the transfer between these 3 classes of projects to the extent of not more than 25 percent when such transfer is requested by a State highway department and approved by the Secretary of Commerce as being in the public interest.

Such a provision has been recommended by the State highway officials several times in the past in connection with consideration of previous legislation, and the committee is now convinced that such a provision is necessary to provide the flexibility necessary for a State highway department to make the most beneficial use of Federal funds apportioned to it in meeting its particular highway needs.

Another provision would give to the State highway departments much geater authority in handling their secondary road program. Following the apportionment of the secondary funds to the States and the programing of projects, the State highway departments would carry on the secondary program without the necessity of referring the plans to the Bureau of Public Roads for approval and without detail inspection by engineers of the Bureau of Public Roads as is required by the present law. Payment of the Federal share of the cost of secondary projects would be made on certification by the State highway department that the plans, design, and construction of such projects were in accord with the standards and procedures applicable to such projects which had previously been approved and following a final inspection by the Bureau engineers to see that the work had been performed.

This provision is intended to place back in the States the handling of the local problems involved in the building of farm-to-market roads and would relieve the Bureau of Public Roads of many administrative and engineering responsibilities imposed by present law. It is my belief that this provision will provide a pattern of cooperation between the State highway departments and counties, or other local units, comparable to that which has been built up through the years and which would continue between the Bureau of Public Roads and the State highway departments on the primary and urban systems. This desirable transfer of authority to the State highway departments will in no way affect the requirement that the States or counties maintain the projects after construction. This maintenance requirement will insure the protection of the Federal interest in these projects and the public of continuing satisfactory highway service through proper maintenance.

The committee gave the most serious consideration to the apportionment formula for the $200 million authorized for the interstate system. The State highway officials association had repeatedly recommended that these funds be apportioned on the basis of population rather than the formula for primary roads which gives equal weight to the three factors of population, area, and

mileage of post roads. To provide a larger apportionment to States with sparse population, a floor of three-fourths of 1 percent was recommended as a part of the population formula. The reason for apportioning these funds on a population basis, which was stressed before the committee, was that it would permit reasonably uniform progress in removing the deficiencies from the interstate system in all of the States. After extended consideration, the committee decided to provide that one-half the funds authorized for the interstate system be apportioned on the traditional primary formula and one-half on population with a floor of three-fourths of 1 percent. This is a good compromise because testimony before the committee indicated that the cost of removing the deficiencies on the interstate system are about equally divided between urban and rural areas and one-half the interstate funds would be apportioned under the bill on a formula similar to that covering the apportionment of urban funds and the remaining half in the same manner as primary funds.

Another departure from current practice is a provision which would make the Federal share of the cost of improving the interstate system 60 percent and the States' share 40 percent, with the sliding scale applying in the public land States. Strong support was presented to the committee for increasing the Federal share above the traditional 50-50 matching ratio because of the vital importance of this system to the Nation as a whole. The State Highway Officials Association and the American Automobile Association each recommended that the Federal share be increased to 75 percent. Other witnesses appearing before the committee thought that the regular 50-50 matching should be continued. Recognizing the great importance of the interstate system and the importance of expediting its modernization and that a larger Federal share would serve as an inducement to proceed more rapidly with the costly improvements on the interstate system, the committee included the 60-40 matching provision.

The apportionment and availability of the interstate funds is conditioned on the continuation of the 2-cent Federal gasoline tax. A reduction of one-half cent in this tax would reduce the income from this source by an amount in excess of the $200,000,000 being provided for the interstate system. To make this program self-supporting from the motor fuel tax revenue it is necessary that this tax be retained at 2 cents per gallon.

The bill also provides for continuation of present programs of highway work in Federal reservations for each of the fiscal years 1956 and 1957 as follows:

Forest highways	$22,500,000
Forest development roads and trails	22,500,000
National park roads	10,000,000
Parkways	10,000,000
Indian reservation roads	10,000,000
Total	75,000,000

Because of the great lag between appropriations and authorizations for forest highways, the bill proposes to cancel the authorization of $22,500,000 authorized for the fiscal year 1955. Such a cancellation will still leave nearly $21 million authorized but not appropriated. There is precedent for such cancellation action since a similar situation of lagging appropriations existed when the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1948 was under consideration and the authorization for 1948 was canceled.

No new authorization is contained in H. R. 8127 for continuing work on the Inter-American Highway and the so-called Rama Road in Nicaragua. However, on recommendation of the Department of State the unappropriated balances of the funds heretofore authorized to be appropriated for such purposes are continued for the fiscal years 1955 and 1956. This will provide for continuing this work at an acceptable rate.

A number of witnesses appeared before the committee urging that the cost of adjusting public utilities in connection with the construction of Federal-aid projects be made reimbursable from Federal funds regardless of current State laws and franchise provisions. The committee recognizes that assumption of the costs involved in making adjustments necessitated by highway projects imposes a serious burden on many utilities, particularly the smaller ones. The committee concluded, however, that before recommending such a step it should have the benefit of a factual study including a review and financial analysis of existing relationships between the State highway departments and affected utilities of all types and so has directed the Secretary of Commerce to make such a study in cooperation with the State highway departments and other parties and interests relative to the problems posed by the necessary relocation and reconstruction of public utilities resulting from Federal-aid highway improvements.

Under present legislation there is no specific provision for the improvement of extensions of the secondary system in urban areas. To correct this situation section 11 provides for Federal participation in the improvement of such extensions with urban funds. This is a very desirable provision. In my opinion it might be well also to permit the improvement of such extensions with primary funds.

The bill authorizes the Secretary of Commerce to use not to exceed $250,000 from General Administrative funds for the purpose of expediting the planning and coordination of a continuous Great River Road which would traverse the Mississippi Valley from Canada to the Gulf of Mexico. Such Mississippi Valley Parkway has been proposed in accordance with the plan recommended in the joint report submitted to Congress November 28, 1951, by the Secretaries of Commerce and Interior. The committee feels that such authorization would provide an incentive to the 10 States bordering the Mississippi toward the developing of such parkway in line with established Federal-aid procedures. During recent years the committee has had before it numerous bills to provide Federal authorizations and assistance toward this project.

In concluding my description of the bill I wish to reemphasize that for the first time in history, through the enactment of H. R. 8127, we will be making available for highway work approximately the amount of the Federal tax on motor fuels.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McGREGOR. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois. I want to ask the question that I propounded of the distinguished chairman of the Public Works Committee as to the meaning or significance of the words "private highway" system. Does that include the roads within each respective State?

Mr. McGREGOR. I may say that the gentleman's inference is correct. The primary highway system is a network of principal highways comprising the Federal-aid primary-highway systems in the States. Since World War II, 45 percent of each year's authorization has gone to this particular system.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois. Is the percentage allocated this year on a par or is it the same as the pattern we have followed every year previously?

Mr. McGREGOR. That is correct. The bill makes no change whatsoever in the primary, urban, and secondary systems; 45 percent goes to the primary, 30 percent goes to the secondary, and 25 percent to the urban.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois. It is noted here that $150 million is for projects on Federal-aid and primary highways in urban areas and $200 million is set aside for interstate roads concerning urban areas. Why is not the $200 million tied in with the $150 million?

Mr. McGREGOR. I might say that under the interstate system we have 40,000 miles, and that 40,000 miles comprises primarily urban and, I expect, a little secondary. But the 40,000 miles is the main routes of arterial travel from one section of the country to the other, and that is really under the category of a military road. We have allocated $200 million for the interstate system. We have changed the formula on that. Instead of a 50–50 matching clause, which is applicable to the primary, secondary, and urban on the interstate system, we call it 60–40, which is 60 percent put up by the Federal Government and 40 percent put up by the States. We do that to add a little incentive for the States to hurry the so-called interstate system, because it is a part of our defense program. This defense program is quite mobile, and I feel that the interstate system is more of a Federal responsibility than it is a State responsibility.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois. I thank the distinguished gentleman of the subcommittee for the information he gave me. Then the sum total of these figures would be $800 million?

Mr. McGREGOR. The matching money is $800 million. The actual total of the bill proper is $875 million. The $75 million represents forest highways, parks, and so forth.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois. All of this is to be allocated to the improvement and construction of new roads; am I correct?

Mr. McGREGOR. That is correct. If I may interrupt the gentleman, this $875 million is the highest amount of money ever allocated or authorized by the Federal Government for roads. The actual return from the 2-cent fuel gas tax this year is approximately $906 million. We are authorizing $875 million of this amount. We are leaving approximately $30 million as a cushion fund for an emergency that might arise.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois. I just want to add to what I have heretofore stated, that I am sure the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee is familiar with the statement the President of the United States made recently before the National Safety Council. He described the maiming and the slaughter of thousands of individuals killed on the highways, and the loss of property. My only regret, Mr. Chairman, is that the figure just mentioned is not four times as big as that which this bill calls for. I think it is one of the most worthy, one of the most outstanding, one of the most necessary causes to which we can contribute our funds that has ever been conjured up since I have been in this House.

Mr. McGREGOR. I appreciate the gentleman's statement, because I know of his intense interest in this problem. I might say that on page 2615 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD you will find the apportionment of Federal-aid highway funds as it compares with existing law as to each of the segments of the highway program.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McGREGOR. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. DOLLIVER. One of the subjects discussed on the floor during the consideration of the rule on this bill was the question of linkage between the tax on gasoline and the amount appropriated. Now, I would like to ask the chairman of the subcommittee if he is an advocate of linkage between the proceeds of the gas tax and the appropriations.

Mr. McGREGOR. I might say to my distinguished friend from Iowa that there is really no linkage in this particular bill. We are saying to the people, "If you want good highways, you give us the money that you have been paying in, the 2-cent gas tax, and we will assure you by the passage of this legislation that we will put approximately the same amount of money on roads." Now, being absolutely honest and sincere, we are saying "you can either have good roads or you can vote out the one-half cent liquid fuel tax and not have them." We have no jurisdiction over the continuation of the half-cent tax, and I was highly pleased when the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, Congressman REED, made the statement that we were not interfering with operation of his committee. It is imperative that the 2-cent gas tax be continued and not be permitted to expire for the revenue therefrom will bring in approximately $910 million. With this fund available, we can assure you that you will have $875 million spent on roads. We are not linking it. The revenue from gas and diesel oil all goes into the general fund of the Treasury. Ninety percent of the American people believe that the gas taxes which they pay are all going into roads.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Is it fair to say to people who inquire of me that this is not a linkage bill?

Mr. McGREGOR. I would say to my friend from Iowa, in my opinion, it is not entirely a linkage bill. If it were a direct linkage bill we would be interfering with the jurisdiction of the Committee on Ways and Means, or at least that question could be raised. There has been a great debate here on whether or not we should continue the one-half cent tax. You will have an opportunity to vote on that Wednesday—for it is part of the tax bill.

Mr. DOLLIVER. That is in connection with the tax bill?

Mr. McGREGOR. That is right. It is in the tax bill, I am told. If they want to argue whether or not we should continue the tax bill, that is the time to debate it. We are saying here, if you do continue the tax, we will give approximately that amount of money to the road program. If you do not continue it, we cannot, because we just have so much money. This one-half cent represents approximately $225 million. We cannot enter into contractual obligations with the various States and then have that $225 million taken from us.

Mr. DOLLIVER. I may say to the gentleman that as a member of the Commission on Inter-Governmental Relations this subject of Federal aid to highways has been one of the subjects which is under current consideration.

Mr. McGREGOR. I recognize the gentleman is a member of that Commission and doing a splendid job.

Mr. DOLLIVER. The Commission is presently having under consideration a special report with reference to Federal aid for highways. That was in the background of my thinking in asking these questions.

Mr. McGREGOR. Please remember that this is not permanent legislation. The Congress can change its mind. But one thing we are doing, we are saying to the other body that when this piece of legislation goes over there they cannot do what some of us think they want to do, which is to take out the half-cent tax and still have good roads.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McGREGOR. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. I think the gentleman should also point out that that half cent brings in about $225 million a year. If that half cent is not continued, it means the income from that gas tax is that much less. In this bill we are increasing the amount to the States $225 million. It makes a spread of $450 million.

Mr. McGREGOR. The gentleman's figures are correct.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McGREGOR. I yield to the gentleman from Maine.

Mr. NELSON. Do I correctly understand that the gentleman from Ohio means to say that the Committee on Public Works confines itself in making appropriations for public roads solely to the revenue received from the gas tax?

Mr. McGREGOR. Indeed not. We are not changing the existing tax law. If we were, we would say that it would be earmarked specifically for interstate roads. In no place in this legislation are we saying that we are earmarking any funds. It all goes into the General Treasury. But we are saying that we cannot give you good roads and then allow you to take one-half cent of the gasoline tax away from us.

Mr. NELSON. The gentleman's committee has made an appropriation of some $200 million for interstate highways. I understand from the address of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SCHERER], when he spoke on the rule, that the committee considers it a primary responsibility of the Federal Government to develop the interstate highway system.

Mr. McGREGOR. We do consider the interstate system more of a Federal responsibility because of its military value and its possible expensive and rigid specifications?

Mr. NELSON. Yet, in this bill you appropriate $600 million for intrastate highways without any limitation, but you place an express limitation on interstate highways that the money shall not be apportioned or spent unless the gas tax continues at 2 cents.

Mr. McGREGOR. We have not changed the formula in the primary, secondary, or urban systems.

Mr. NELSON. I am talking about your limitation upon interstate highways. You have an express limitation that the money shall not be apportioned by the Secretary of Commerce unless the gas tax continues at 2 cents.

Mr. McGREGOR. Again I say to my friend, we are just saying truthfully, if we do not have the money, we cannot build the roads.

Mr. NELSON. I have gathered from the debate, and I have listened to it very carefully, the primary purpose of the linkage between the $200 million and the 2-cent gas tax is to get the excise tax through the other body; is that correct?

Mr. McGREGOR. I would not think so. The other body can do as they please with the excise-tax bill. If my friend wants to take off the one-half cent, he will have that privilege next Wednesday by making such a motion.

Mr. NELSON. Your friend has no desire to take off the one-half-cent tax, but he does oppose the linkage of the one-half-cent gasoline tax to the development of the interstate highways.

Mr. McGREGOR. Would my friend then want us to be in the position of entering into a contract or an obligation with a State thinking that we were going to get approximately $910 million of revenue, and then the other body deciding that we were only going to get approximately $700 million? We would then be faced with the problem of canceling our obligations.

Mr. NELSON. No; the gentleman is objecting to the linkage of the tax in connection with the development of our highways. I think the development of our highways is the responsibility of the

Federal Government, regardless of the income from the gasoline taxes.

Mr. McGREGOR. I think it is the responsibility of the States and the Federal Government, but I also think it is our responsibility to be honest and fair with the road users and see to it that the money they are paying for gas tax goes on the roads.

Mr. NELSON. Does not the gentleman consider that this limitation on the expenditure of $200 million is in effect an announcement that your committee does not consider that the Government has any responsibility for interstate highways unless and only as long as it collects the gasoline tax?

Mr. McGREGOR. No; the gentleman is entirely wrong. I am certain that the gentleman has not read the hearings. We had weeks and weeks of hearings on this. Certainly, we tried to be fair and not infringe upon the Committee on Ways and Means, as the chairman so stated a few moments ago.

Mr. NELSON. I have no doubt about that at all.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McGREGOR. I yield.

Mr. BOW. The gentleman from Maine, in his colloquy with my colleague who is addressing us from the well of the House, has said numerous times that your committee has made appropriations for highway purposes. Now, to keep the record straight, is it not true that what your committee has done is to authorize this expenditure, but it has made no appropriations? I just would like to have the record straight on that.

Mr. McGREGOR. That is correct. We cannot initiate an appropriation bill, we can only authorize. As you readily recall, the Committee on Appropriations took out $55 million of our authorization bill for 1954.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McGREGOR. I yield.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. I want to take this opportunity to commend the gentleman on the fine statement he is making, and to commend him also for the provision in the bill with respect to forest highways. I note the bill provides for an authorization of $22½ million for forest highways. As the gentleman knows, we are extremely interested in that subject. I assume that we can count on the gentleman's support when that authorization bill or rather appropriation bill comes up.

Mr. McGREGOR. Certainly, and I recognize the gentleman's interest in forest highways as well as in the rest of the highway program, he has discussed the problem with me many times.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McGREGOR. I yield.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I think the gentleman from Ohio has done a very fine job in presenting this bill. I congratulate him and I congratulate the members of his committee for the excellent work that they have done. However, I do have a few questions. If I understood the gentleman correctly, the bill which we are now considering does not change previous law going back to, let us say, 1948, 1947, or 1946 except that you have increased the amounts. But the allocation or the formula remains the same.

Mr. McGREGOR. Yes, with the exception of the interstate system, which we put on a 60–40 basis.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Yes. But, as I understood the gentleman, no money has ever been earmarked in the Federal Treasury for the use of the highways, and this bill does not earmark any money; is that not correct?

Mr. McGREGOR. That is correct.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Then, under this bill a certain amount is authorized, which is larger than any other previous bill in history or in recent years, and once we pass this bill and that money is authorized, it will be the obligation of the Federal Government whether the Federal gas tax is reduced or not; is that not correct?

Mr. McGREGOR. That is correct, except on the interstate system.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Therefore, there would be no direct relationship between this bill and the retaining of the present 2-cent per-gallon tax?

Mr. McGREGOR. I do not think that is true.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. And that is the wording of this bill as of now, is it not?

Mr. McGREGOR. That is correct.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. May I say one more word? Then, in the event that the Congress should see fit to reduce the Federal gasoline tax from 2 cents to 1½ cents a gallon sometime in the future, the next bill that comes from this committee would have to take that into consideration; but in no way would it affect the legislation now pending before us.

Mr. McGREGOR. The question then would be for the Congress to decide upon the amount of money it would authorize.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. At some future date.

Mr. McGREGOR. That is right.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. It would be the obligation of the Congress to find the money for this purpose, even if it had to go into the Federal Treasury and take money out that had been acquired from the highway user under some other tax, such as the tax on tires or tubes, or new automobiles, or automobile parts; am I correct?

Mr. McGREGOR. I think the language is very clear on that.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McGREGOR. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Referring to section 9, am I to infer from reading that section, that there is support in the committee for a policy of permitting the use of these Federal funds in the relocating and reconstruction of public utilities?

Mr. McGREGOR. I think the gentleman is right in the assumption that there is support in the committee, because many members of the committee feel that there is a problem relating to utilities. Some of the members wanted to earmark 4 percent or 5 percent of the fund for that specific purpose, but we decided that a study should be made first to determine various States rights.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. If I may ask one other question, at the present time none of these Federal funds may be used for such relocation or reconstruction or to assume any part of the cost of operating a public utility; is that right?

Mr. McGREGOR. That is correct—except condemnation on private property.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. McGREGOR. I should like to call attention of the membership to the secondary-road problem. We have heard that the governors and various other State officials want more control. On page 3 you will find a clause which gives to the State highway departments the right to draw plans and specifications and construct secondary roads to meet the needs in a particular area. There we are doing away with the practice of having to adhere to rigid Federal specifications, which are more costly than the type of road in certain areas requires.

There was reference a few moments ago that upon recommendation, the States may take the initiative, and permit a transfer from one fund to the other, of 25 percent. That is made flexible so that if the States have more money in the primary fund than they need and are short in the urban fund, they can transfer from primary to urban; or vice versa, the exception being the interstate system.

I should like to say a word on the matter of the population basis. You have heard arguments here this afternoon to the effect that the formula for the interstate roads should be on a basis of population alone. You have heard arguments to the effect that it should be based on the old formula alone. We had $200 million. Along with other members of the committee I agreed that in order to be fair we should divide the $200 million; take $100 million, or 50 percent, to be spent on the basis of population, and the other $100 million distributed according to the old formula, that is, one-third, one-third, and one-third.

That was the compromise, Mr. Chairman, and I hope that this Committee stays with that compromise. There are arguments that could be made on both sides.

I wish we had money enough to give every rural Representative all the money that he wanted and to give every urban Representative all the money that he wanted. But we do not have it. So this is a compromise, and I hope the Committee will go along with it.

This is not a perfect bill. There are some things in it that some of us do not like. But we have spent weeks and weeks on this proposed legislation, and I hope the Committee will join with every member of our committee in endeavoring to keep the bill intact, as it is written, and then send it over the other body for consideration.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. WATTS].

Mr. WATTS. Mr. Chairman, in discussing H. R. 8127, the Federal Aid Road Act for the fiscal years of 1956 and 1957, I am sure that every member of the committee shares with me a feeling of gratification that we are authorizing the appropriation and spending of Federal money on projects to improve our own country. Good roads have contributed much to the expansion and growth of this country. They have added much to the health, happiness, and welfare of our people and have made possible to a large extent our economic expansion and the great wealth of material things that we all enjoy.

The great trouble has been and now is that we have not and are not even in this bill expending as much as we should and certainly not enough to have and enjoy a system of roads such as we all want and should have.

Money spent on the improvement, education, and welfare of our own people never seems to be enough to accomplish our objectives and our needs. Yet every dollar that we spend in these fields is returned to us and to future generations many times over. While H. R. 8127 authorizes more money to be spent on our Federal-aid roads than has ever been authorized before, and while being a step in the right direction, it by no means meets the need. It has been accurately estimated that as of November 1953, 63.8 percent of our roads on the Federal-aid system are now below safe standards for such roads and that expenditures of about thirty-five billions would have to be made to bring them up to the standard of safety that is needed. This same report or estimate shows that we are not even keeping even with our road-building program—that 2 years ago it would have required thirty-two billions to put our roads in good condition, whereas today it would take at least thirty-five billions. We are falling behind in spite of the large sums we are spending on our highways.

H. R. 8127 authorizes the spending of $800 million in each of the years of 1956 and 1957 on our primary, secondary, urban, and interstate systems of roads as against the sum of $575 million for fiscal years 1954 and 1955.

While our committee recognized that this is not as much money as could be beneficially spent, the majority of the committee felt that under all the circumstances with which our country is faced today that it was about as much as we could afford to spend.

The committee held extensive hearings in the spring of 1953 on national highway problems and gained much information that has been a real help in framing this piece of legislation. We held adequate hearings immediately prior to the introduction of H. R. 8127 as a clean bill. In our hearings we quickly discovered that all categories of our roads needed more money. More money was needed on the primary system, on the secondary system, and on the urban system. This bill provides more money on all of those systems on a percentage division among the States. That is basic law and has worked very well for a number of years.

It was almost the unanimous opinion of all witnesses that appeared before us and the opinion of the committee that the greatest need was for a rapid development of the Federal system of interstate roads. This system of over 38,000 miles comprises the main arterial highways of our country. They were selected by the highway departments of the various States. They are the main defense roads of our country. They carry the bulk of our interstate traffic. While representing only about 1 percent of our roads, 20 percent of our travel and traffic is over them. These roads run through both the rural and urban sections of our country and are parts of our primary and urban systems. The committee authorized $200 billion for this system for each of the years covered by this legislation. We further provided that on this system of roads, which in reality is a primary obligation of the Federal Government, that the Federal Government should provide 60 percent of the cost of construction and reconstruction of same and that the States should provide 40 percent, making allowances in addition to those States that have large public landholdings within their borders. By this change in matching formula I feel that these things will be accomplished; mainly, first, it will accelerate the building of this system of roads; second, it will allow the construction, particularly in large cities, of many costly improvements that have long been delayed due to their high construction cost; third, it will help many States who are or will be hard pressed to match Federal funds on road construction.

The committee adopted a new formula for the distribution of the interstate funds among the several States. Many members of the committee wanted the sum distributed on the old formula—one-third on population, one-third on area, one-third on miles of rural and star-route roads. Many others wanted the funds provided solely on a population basis. Neither group got exactly what it wanted, but a large majority on the committee finally determined that the fair and proper thing to do was to distribute the funds on a divided basis—that is, one-half or $100 million should be divided among the States on the old formula, and the remaining one-half, or $100 million, should be divided on a population basis with the provision that out of the fund divided on a population basis no State should receive less than three-fourths of 1 percent of that fund. While this was not satisfactory to all members of the committee, I for one who come from a State that would be benefited by the entire sum being divided on the old formula feel that on the evidence before our committee and all other things considered that the action of the committee and the terms of the bill as it is before you was, and are, fair.

The committee made several other changes in the present highway law that were thought to be beneficial and needed in the legislation.

First. The bill provides that as to the funds for the primary, secondary, and urban systems that upon the request of the highway department of a respective State and with the approval of the Secretary of Commerce 25 percent of any of these funds could be transferred to any one or more of the other funds, but at the same time limiting the amount that any such fund could be increased to 25 percent.

Second. The bill further provides that this same arrangement shall apply to any funds heretofore authorized. This change in the law will be very beneficial in that it recognizes that different States have different problems, that in some States more money may be needed on a particular system, whereas in other States the reverse may be true. At least, it allows each State to evaluate its own problems and shift some of the funds so as to better meet those problems.

Third. A further change effected by the bill deals with the construction of secondary roads. Under present law the construction of secondary roads on the Federal-aid system are all required to fit or be up to more or less a rigid standard with little leeway for deviation therefrom. This legislation somewhat relaxes that rigid standard and provides that the highway departments of the different States may submit overall plans for design and construction of such roads subject to the approval of the Secretary of Commerce; and when such plans have been approved, the Secretary may discharge his responsibility as to individual projects in a State by receiving a certification from the highway department of that State that the plans for the project conform to the standards approved for that State. This change recognizes the need for different types and kinds of construction on secondary roads in the different States and recognizes differences in different parts of the same State. It vests more authority and latitude in the various highway departments in dealing with problems in their States.

With the exception of the changes above noted, H. R. 8127 generally conforms to former highway bills except that a continuation of the 2-cent gas tax is made necessary by the language of the bill if the $200 million provided for the interstate system is to be made available to the States and further provides for a study by the Secretary of Commerce in cooperation with the State highway departments and other interested parties of the problems posed by the relocation and reconstruction of public utilities services for highway improvement.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WATTS. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. PERKINS. I first want to compliment my distinguished colleague on the excellent statement he is now making. What are the requirements in connection with the secondary road system; I mean does the State road commissioner have more latitude under this authorization bill than in the previous bill?

Mr. WATTS. I may say to the gentleman that under existing law the Federal Bureau of Public Roads adopted pretty much a rigid standard and required that all States construct their secondary roads in accordance with that

standard. We have attempted in this legislation to relax this standard so that now all the highway department has to do is go before the Bureau of Public Roads and present a standard that fits that State—that will work good in that State—and if the Bureau of Public Roads feels that standard is adequate it will approve the overall plans for that State. The Secretary of Commerce or the Bureau of Public Roads may then discharge its obligation so far as the secondary roads are concerned by receiving from the highway departments of the various States a certification that the plans and specifications on the individual projects conform to the overall plans and specifications that have been heretofore approved for that State by the Bureau of Public Roads.

Mr. PERKINS. Let us assume that we are back home in Kentucky for just a few moments. In the area that I represent in eastern Kentucky it is impractical in many instances to obtain a 60-foot right-of-way due to the narrowness of valleys.

Under the present law, as I understand, you cannot get matching funds from the Federal Government unless you obtain that 60-foot right-of-way. Now, let us assume that we have acquired a right-of-way up some narrow valley of only 30 feet. Would it be possible to receive matching funds for the 30-foot right-of-way for the purpose of constructing an 18-foot roadbed from the Federal Government?

Mr. WATTS. I cannot tell the gentleman that the Federal Bureau of Roads or the Department of Commerce would approve a plan along that line, but I will say that the language as written in this bill makes it possible for the approval of a road of that kind, whereas the old language did not.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, this proposal to amend the Federal Aid Road Act by revising the formula for the allocation of Federal funds and giving the States more responsibility for the proper expenditure of these funds is of primary importance to the country at this time.

The current economic conditions have reduced the amount of State funds available for matching purposes and at the same time caused widespread unemployment. This authorization for an appropriation approximately equal to the receipts from the Federal gasoline tax is fully justified as this tax comes from the same source as that of the major portion of the State highway funds. The practice of diverting a portion of the proceeds from the Federal gasoline tax to uses other than highway construction must be stopped. The increased construction costs make it more than necessary that every possible source of funds for the construction of an adequate national highway system be fully utilized.

Modern highways must be built to sustain the heavy traffic of interstate trucking with secondary roads adequate to carry this heavy traffic to every section of the country. This interstate traffic is one of the major items that has increased the cost of building a good State system of highways. This increased cost is definitely a proper charge against the Federal Government. It is impossible to make an exact breakdown of the cost to be charged to the Federal program, but this ratio of 60–40 is more reasonable in the light of current conditions than is the old ratio of 50–50. In fact, I would gladly go along with the ratio originally proposed in this bill of 3 to 1.

The liberalization, as I understand, of the requirements for secondary roads in particular is also a progressive step. The long history of Federal-State cooperation in highway building clearly indicates that the Federal Government need not be so strict as to sometimes appear unreasonable in order to assure that the State highway departments will make proper use of these funds. There will always be some need of Federal standards but that does not mean that the Federal highway engineers be required to follow in detail every action taken by the State highway departments.

The delegation of responsibility to the State highway departments, which are fully responsible to the people for their actions, will do much to expedite both the Federal and State highway programs. The current rise of unemployment makes it more urgent that our road-building program be expanded at the earliest possible date.

I know that all the Members in this body are concerned about our inadequate highway system. The lack of both water and highway transportation has retarded industrial development in the area that I represent in eastern Kentucky.

I deeply regret that the committee has seen fit to postpone the effective date of this authorization bill until July of 1955. I am hopeful that more consideration will be given to our secondary-road system. In many rural areas school children are now forced to walk several miles to school, and at times, wade the creek.

I have always doubted the wisdom in denying matching funds to certain rural areas because local governments are not able to comply with rigid standards and specifications of the Federal Government. In many instances it is now impractical to meet the Federal requirement of a 60-foot right-of-way for the construction of rural roads due to the narrowness of the valleys.

Mr. Chairman, I intend to support this legislation.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. DEMPSEY].

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Chairman, it is rather confusing to me to be told that we are going to spend all this money collected by way of gasoline tax. I am going to vote for a continuation of 2 cents Federal gasoline tax, but it is disturbing to me to know that as of April 1 of this year there is not one cent of money you are talking about appropriating today in this bill that any of the States will get before a year from next July. That is when it becomes effective. We are now spending for Federal-aid roads a total of $575 million a year. We are collecting, or have collected last year, more than $900 million, and the increase is at the rate of between 5 and 7 percent annually. So, from April 1954 to July 1955 there will be collected by the Federal Treasury approximately $500 million more than will be used on the highway system. By the time that this $800 million Federal aid will be used in fiscal years 1956–57 the take by the Federal Treasury from the taxpayers of this country will be running about $1.1 billion a year at least.

I tried to get a bill through that would amend the Federal-aid highway law now in effect by adding $200 million a year for the interstate roads. We are told by every speaker that they are defense roads, so selected by the Defense Department, the Bureau of Public Roads, and the highway departments of the respective States.

You would think by the allocation of some of these funds on a population basis that the amount of roads in the respective States had nothing to do with it. The 29 States that are going to take a beating on this bill on this population basis have 23,342 miles out of the 37,000 miles in this interstate system, and there are 13,616 miles in what is known as the area of population. That is the situation. I am getting rather tired of talking so much about this bill.

Mr. WIER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEMPSEY. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. WIER. I want to ask the gentleman two questions, and he has touched on both of them. Under the Federal excise tax of 2 cents a gallon, is all of that income from gasoline confined to highway construction or does the Federal Government use any part of it for any other service?

Mr. DEMPSEY. The funds are commingled with the general fund and we get whatever the roads committee recommends and is approved by the House, when the bill is signed by the President. We are using about $575 million out of more than $900 million that was collected last year.

Mr. WIER. The gasoline tax is diverted to other expenditures?

Mr. DEMPSEY. It is and always has been, and it is going to be under this bill.

Mr. WIER. That is what I understand.

The next question I want to ask the gentleman from New Mexico is this: In the gentleman's first presentation under the rule he used the figure that the State of Minnesota would lose approximately $800,000.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Seven hundred and eighty-nine thousand dollars a year.

Mr. WIER. I have heard this new formula used quite often here. Will the gentleman explain why it is that Minnesota loses $800,000-odd as the result of this new formula?

Mr. DEMPSEY. Under the old formula, which was based on population, area, and miles of road, out of $100 million the State of Minnesota received

$2,617,000. Under the population formula you will receive $1,828,000. That is where you lose.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEMPSEY. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. McGREGOR. Under the existing law, the State of Minnesota gets $13,744,000, and under the bill that is before us for consideration the State of Minnesota gets $18,798,000.

Mr. DEMPSEY. May I say to the chairman of the Public Works Subcommittee that the gentleman did not ask me how much they would be entitled to with these additional funds, he asked what they were going to lose because of the change in formula.

Mr. WIER. If the gentleman will yield, that is a different picture. I was assuming that the State of Minnesota, under this new formula of population, would have been $800,000 shorter than they would have been under the old formula or the present formula.

Mr. McGREGOR. Is the gentleman referring to the present formula of one-third, one-third, and one-third?

Mr. DEMPSEY. That is the present formula.

Mr. WIER. Yes; I am referring to the difference between what we will get under the new formula and what we would get under the old formula.

Mr. McGREGOR. I hope the gentleman will recognize and give consideration to what he is getting under the new bill regardless of the taxes and what he would be getting under the old law. It is approximately $5 million.

Mr. WIER. I do recognize that the State of Minnesota will get considerably more.

Mr. DEMPSEY. So will every other State.

Mr. WIER. I think that is due to the fact that more money is being appropriated.

Mr. DEMPSEY. That is right. Mr. Chairman, I cannot yield further to the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, under the old formula, we had four categories. We have the urban, the secondary, the primary, and the interstate systems. The primary system apportionment was on a three-way basis of population, area, and mileage. The interstate system was on that basis. The secondary system was on that basis, and is now, but the urban system was not. That was recognized as a population proposition, and is on a population basis. I pleaded with the committee, both with the chairman of the subcommittee and the chairman of the full committee, to put in any amount that they wanted for the urban system if the cities were hard hit and needed more money, and told them that I would support that. But here we have just put in a new system, a new category in 1952 that they have been trying to get in since 1944. It was never possible because of the fear of what would happen, and it has happened. Right now, in the other body, one of the Members has gone further than this, and in his bill he wants to put the secondary road system on a population basis predicated upon the number of cars licensed in the respective States. Have you ever heard of such a thing as that? Farm-to-market roads, if you please, put on the basis of the number of cars owned in the respective States. I am perfectly amazed that anybody from the State of Michigan would support such a theory or philosophy, because, after all, we look to the State of Michigan to give us or sell us more cars. We are getting the best cars in the world, and we certainly are using them as much as we can. But I am afraid that, notwithstanding Henry Ford and some of the other people who have put America on wheels, that with the unjust taxes we are now collecting and have been collecting we are going to take a lot of our people off wheels.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEMPSEY. I yield.

Mr. BAILEY. Will the gentleman explain why the Secretary of Commerce is given discretionary power over the distribution of the funds?

Mr. DEMPSEY. I am glad the gentleman asked that question because that, too, was discussed at very great length. I was happy to find that the respective highway departments in the States could have some say as to what they should put in the secondary roads. I think a standard should be set up so that proper roads will be constructed. But the language in this bill is improper. It says he may do such and such in connection with this responsibility. It does not say he will do so. He could tell the State of West Virginia, "You can go ahead." Then he could tell the State of Iowa, "No; you cannot go ahead." There is nothing in this bill which makes it mandatory upon the Secretary of Commerce to give each State the same treatment. If he says "No," that is no, and you cannot do it; but if he says "Yes," then you can do it. I have never seen legislation of that kind brought up on the floor of this House.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEMPSEY. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. Unfortunately, I did not hear all of the gentleman's remarks. Does the gentleman say that this bill gives discretionary power to the Secretary of Commerce?

Mr. DEMPSEY. Yes; let me read that part of the bill to you.

Mr. GROSS. That road aid was to be apportioned on the basis of cars owned?

Mr. DEMPSEY. No, no; that is not stated in this bill. The question asked me by the gentleman from West Virginia had to do with the Secretary of Commerce permitting different States to have money on the secondary road system and giving some States more liberal treatment than others. In other words, they can provide what they want and he may approve it. But I want to read to you the language in this bill. It states:

> The Secretary of Commerce may discharge his responsibility relative to the plans, design, inspection, and construction of such secondary road projects upon his receipt and approval of a certified statement by the State highway departments setting forth that the plans, design, and construction for such projects are in accord with the standards and procedures of the respective States applicable to projects in this category approved by him.

He may do it. I think it should have said that he shall do it. Then we would be somewhere.

I will tell the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] another thing. We have been talking about who is getting this money. I will tell the gentleman how much he is going to lose in his State. Eight hundred and thirty thousand dollars in what the State of Iowa is going to lose.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the able gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me for a question?

Mr. DEMPSEY. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. Could the gentleman give the figures on North Carolina?

Mr. DEMPSEY. North Carolina loses $15,000 a year.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEMPSEY. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ENGLE. Does California gain or lose under this formula?

Mr. DEMPSEY. California loses in number of tourists but it gains in dollars. The State of California gets approximately $1,800,000 more; it may be more than that. But every State north of California or every State around California—Oregon, Washington, Utah, Nevada, Arizona, New Mexico, Idaho—gets less. I think California would prefer to have good roads coming into the State, because they represent the big source for tourists in America. That is, California is the largest area for tourists in America. Florida comes next. Despite the great citrus fruit crop in California, the greatest dollar crop is the tourists who come to California. That is the great cash crop in California.

Mr. ENGLE. Will the gentleman yield further for a comment?

Mr. DEMPSEY. I yield.

Mr. ENGLE. The gentleman is eminently correct. We want good roads leading into California.

Mr. DEMPSEY. The gentleman is not going to get them on this basis.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEMPSEY. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. How does Arizona come out on this basis?

Mr. DEMPSEY. Not very well. Arizona loses $1,544,000. I had a letter on this from your representative in the other body.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEMPSEY. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. McGREGOR. I am sure the gentleman wants to get the figures right for the record. On the basis in the bill, California would get $9,255,000, and on a basis of population it would get $12,974,000.

Mr. DEMPSEY. I have the figures right here. California would gain about $1,835,000 each year. But every State

around California would lose. I think the State of California is more concerned about the roads leading into it, which would bring the tourists into California, because California itself has done a very good job with its roads, perhaps the best of any State in the Nation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman one additional minute.

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEMPSEY. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. SCHERER. This is not a question of what a State loses under this formula, is it?

Mr. DEMPSEY. No; it is a question of what the national defense loses. These are national defense roads.

Mr. SCHERER. Is it not a fact that the figures that I quoted in my remarks on the rule are correct; namely, that the improvement in the 8 States will cost 51½ percent of the total and that if the money is divided as you say it should be, they will get only 32.4 percent, while the States——

Mr. DEMPSEY. I heard the gentleman's speech and did not interrupt him when he made it, notwithstanding I thought his philosophy was somewhat wrong. But that is the gentleman's opinion to which he has a right.

Mr. SCHERER. Will the gentleman permit me to finish my statement? Is it not a fact that all the State highway officials agree with my philosophy, including the officials of the gentleman's own State?

Mr. DEMPSEY. No; they did not. They voted against it.

Mr. SCHERER. In the gentleman's State?

Mr. DEMPSEY. Yes; and also in the State of Arizona. Both of those States voted against it.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McGREGOR].

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, I just want to correct the record. Our distinguished friend from New Mexico has left an erroneous impression, I am sure quite unintentionally, but just let us get down to the facts: California under the basic section 21 specifications that the gentleman from New Mexico is advocating, would get $9,255,000; and under population would get $12,974,000.

Texas under basic 21 would get $13,030,000; and under population $9,450,000.

Illinois under basic 21 would get $7,763,000; and under population $10,677,000.

Ohio under basic 21 would get $7,026,000; and under population $9,738,000, in round figures.

Michigan under basic 21 would get $6,250,000; under population $7,809,000.

Pennsylvania under basic No. 21, advocated by the distinguished gentleman from New Mexico, would get $7,920,000; under population, $12,866,000.

New York under the recommendation of the gentleman from New Mexico would get $9,501,000; and under population, $18,174,000.

New Jersey under basic No. 21 would get $2,618,000; and on a population basis would get $5,926,000.

I repeat that we attempted to make a compromise between the rural and the city areas.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a brief question?

Mr. McGREGOR. I yield.

Mr. DEMPSEY. The State of New Jersey which the gentleman just mentioned has 192 miles of the interstate system. The State of New York has 1,034 miles.

As I remember, the State of Pennsylvania has 1,300 miles.

The State of Texas has 2,700 miles not put on her by the State of Texas but put on her by the Defense Department for defense roads and you cut them down.

Mr. McGREGOR. That was O. K.'d by the Highway Department of Texas.

Mr. DEMPSEY. But it was not O. K.'d by the people of Texas.

Mr. McGREGOR. The highway department O. K.'d it.

Mr. DEMPSEY. That may be.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MACK].

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Chairman, just before coming to the floor of the House I obtained from the National Safety Council a report on the number of automobile accidents which occurred in the United States in calendar year 1953.

The National Safety Council places the number of automobile accidents for 1953 at 9,500,000. In these accidents, the National Safety Council says, there were 1,350,000 people injured and 33,300 killed. In addition to that the National Safety Council says that the property losses and the expenses incurred through medical and hospital services as a result of these accidents totalled $3,950,000,000.

This great number of deaths according to Mr. James Cope, vice president of the Chrysler Corp., who testified before the Public Works Committee as a representative of the Automobile Manufacturers' Association, were to a great extent preventable. He stated that the Nation's best traffic authorities estimated that 2 in every 5 traffic deaths automatically would have been avoided if present highway deficiencies did not exist.

Thus, according to the Nation's best traffic experts, the lives of about 13,000 traffic victims would have been saved had the Nation, last year, possessed adequate highways. The main justfication for proving the increased highways building sums which this bill would authorize is that the additional money will provide safer highways to save lives, to lessen the number of persons being injured, and to decrease the economic and financial losses which occur as the result of unnecessary accidents that result from the inadequacies of our present highways.

President Eisenhower, in his state of the Union message, urged that the present 2-cent-a-gallon Federal gasoline tax be kept in effect after April 1, 1954, when it is due to expire. In return for keeping the 2-cent a-gallon Federal tax in effect, the President promised an expanded highway program.

This bill provides for that expanded-highway program. It fulfills the President's promise.

President Eisenhower in his state of the Union speech in January said:

> To protect the vital interest of every citizen in a safe and adequate highway system, the Federal Government is continuing its central role in the Federal-aid highway program. So that maximum progress can be made to overcome present inadequacies in the interstate highway system, we must continue the Federal gasoline tax at 2 cents per gallon. This will require cancellation of the one-half-cent decrease which otherwise will become effective April 1, and will maintain revenues so that an expanded highway program can be undertaken.

During the past 2 years, the Federal Government, under existing legislation, provided the States with $575 million a year in Federal matching funds. This bill increases the amount of these matching funds to $800 million, or in short, increases them by $225 million.

In addition to this $800 million there is $75 million in this bill for other types of highways, forest highways, parkways, and so forth. The total amount of money in this bill for highways is $875 million.

During the past year, the Federal Government collected $906 million from its 2-cent-a-gallon tax on liquid fuels, gasoline and diesel oil. The new bill, therefore, gives back to the States for highway purposes nearly all of the money derived from the Federal 2-cent gasoline tax. This, in my opinion, is sound policy. Federal gasoline taxes should not be diverted to other purposes than road building.

Gasoline taxes are paid by a special class of our citizens—the American motorists. These taxes are paid by the motorist largely in proportion to the number of miles he drives and therefore, in essence are based on the extent to which a motorist uses the highways. What the motorist pays in gasoline taxes should be used by both the Federal Government and the States to building more, better, and safer highways.

These gasoline-tax revenues should not be diverted to foreign aid or to any other purposes.

MUST PAY FOR ROADS

All of the evidence submitted before our Public Works Committee, which sponsors this bill, indicated that American highways are wearing out much faster than old ones have been repaired or replaced or new ones built. This evidence was to the effect that $35 billion will be required to place our American highways in A–1 condition.

Whether money is spent to build these needed highways or not taxpayers will pay for them just the same.

If the highways the Nation desperately needs are built, the motorists must pay for them in taxes. If the highways are not built the motorist will pay for them just the same in increased wear and tear on his car and tires, in costlier repair

bills, in higher medical and hospital expenses and in higher automobile insurance rates.

In the long run the motorists will be better off paying a 2-cent gasoline tax provided that the revenue derived from this tax is expended on more, better and safer highways.

In the long run it is cheaper to build good highways now than not to build them.

INCREASE IN CARS

In the past 20 years, the number of motor vehicles, automobiles, buses and trucks, using our American highways have more than doubled.

In 1931, there were only 25.8 million motor vehicles licensed in this country. By 1952, this number had doubled and stood at 53.3 million.

Between 1931 and 1952, the number of motor buses licensed and using American highways increased fivefold, from 42,000 to 240,000.

The number of motor trucks using our highways in 1931 was 3.5 million. In 1952 there were 9.2 million, nearly 3 times as many as in 1931.

The number of pleasure automobiles licensed in the United States increased from 22.3 million in 1931 to 43.8 million in 1952.

The number of motor vehicles using the highways is still increasing and will continue to increase.

The population of the Nation which in 1900 was less than 75 million by 1950 had doubled and stood at more than 150 million. There is every reason to believe that, barring a war of extermination, that our Nation's population will double again in the last half of the century and stand at about 300 million by 2000 A. D.

If the population doubles, the number of motor vehicles in use, it may be expected, also will double. The Nation, probably, will have 100 million instead of the present 53 million motor vehicles on its highways within 50 years. Our highway problem is not finished. It is just beginning.

In building more, better, and safer highways we build not alone for the present but also for the future.

HOW PACIFIC COAST FARES

My constituents will be interested in knowing how the three Pacific Coast States of Oregon, Washington, and California will benefit from this bill.

I have obtained from Commissioner F. V. du Pont, of the Federal Bureau of Roads, how much each of these three States will share in the increased funds in this bill.

Washington during each of the past 2 years has received $9,148,000 a year in Federal highway matching funds. Under this bill, Washington State will be allocated, Commissioner du Pont informs me, $12,805,000 a year for each of the next 2 years. This will be an increase of $3,657,000 a year for Washington State for each of the next 2 years.

Oregon during the past 2 years has received $8,502,000 a year in Federal highway matching funds. Under this bill, Oregon will be allocated $11,685,000 a year for each of the next 2 years. This will be an increase for Oregon of $3,183,000 a year over the amount now being received.

California during the past 2 years has been receiving $29,912,000 a year in Federal highway matching funds. Under this bill, California will be allocated $43,061,000 a year during each of the next 2 years. This will be an increase of $13,049,000 a year for California.

Altogether, the 3 Pacific coast States will receive about $20 million a year or $40 million during the next 2 years more than these 3 States received in Federal matching funds during the past 2 years.

Under this bill, most of this Federal money must be matched on a 50–50 basis by the States. This means that during the next 2 years there will be $80 million more spent on the highways of these 3 States than in the past 2 years. This additional $80 million, on top of the millions already being expended, will do wonders toward improving the highways of the Pacific coast by making them wider, better, and safer.

TO HELP MANY INDUSTRIES

The bill carries a total of $300 million more in Federal matching funds for the 48 States and Territories than any previous highway bill.

Most of these Federal funds must be matched by the States on a 50–50 basis. This means that the additional $300 million of Federal money will stimulate a $600 million increase in the Nation's highway building program during each of the next 2 years—will increase that highway building program by more than a billion dollars during the next 2 years.

Such an increase in the highway building program means the creation of jobs for tens of thousands of additional construction workers.

Also, this vast expansion of the national highway program means the creation of an enormous increased demand for cement, asphalt, steel, lumber, plywood, and all of those other materials that go into highway and bridge construction. This will bring into being tens of thousands of additional jobs for those who work to produce building and construction materials.

The railroads, truck and other transportation companies, also, will benefit through the increased freight this expanded road program will generate.

While the bill is not perfect in every detail, it is the best highway bill ever presented to Congress. I am proud to have, as a member of the House Public Works Committee, participated in writing it. I hope it will have the support of all Members of the House.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, the bill before us today is on the whole a very good highway bill, one that has the bipartisan endorsement of the Committee on Public Works, one that will go a long ways toward meeting the highway problems that we have in this country of ours. The main complaint I have against the bill is that the sum authorized is still entirely inadequate to meet the highway needs of the Nation on a year-to-year basis. I do not believe that we should ever allow ourselves to get into a position in regard to Federal appropriations for highways of saying: We will only appropriate so much money as we get in the way of a Federal gasoline tax.

With respect to that idea, it is well to call the attention of the Members of the House who have listened to the debate as to how distribution of the interstate highway system money will be applied, because we have had a serious effort made in the past few years to do away entirely with the Federal gasoline tax and to do away entirely with the Federal system of highway aid. I would like to call the attention of those of us who represent some of the so-called poor States that if that system is done away with we will be left out in the cold entirely. I think the compromise that has been worked out in regard to the interstate system in this bill is reasonable and equitable.

I call your attention to the fact that the chairman of our subcommittee, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McGREGOR] comes from a State that would benefit greatly if the interstate funds were allocated purely on the basis of population. I happen to come from a State that would benefit if the allocation was purely on the basis of the old formula. I believe, however, that in the compromise that has been worked out, where equal attention is given to both of these factors, we have reached a solution that is best for all of us concerned. If those of us from the so-called poorer States, from the large and sparsely settled States, succeeded in writing into the law a provision that ignores the needs of the highly populated States, we are liable to wake up 2 years from now and find that we get no Federal highway aid.

As has been pointed out on the floor here before, the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations is studying this problem now. Under the former Chairman of that Commission, I think it is very likely that we would have come through with a recommendation to do away with the Federal aid to highways system. I hope the Commission will not come through with that recommendation. If it does not, the reason will be in good part due to the fine work done by the Subcommittee on Highways of our committee under the leadership of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McGREGOR]. A very thorough study of this entire problem was made at great length last year, with hearings that took more than 13 weeks. It was the considered opinion of most of those who testified at that time that the Federal-aid system should be continued.

I fully realize the problems of these urban areas; that these highly populated areas must be fully considered and some attempt be made to resolve these problems in this legislation as is proposed in the portion of the bill that gives distribution of these funds in half of the interstate system on the basis of population. I think it is a fair and reasonable proposition as presented to us today, and I hope that the House will go along with this attempt that the committee has made to arrive at a meeting of the minds in the committee that will,

so far as is possible for it to do so, meet the needs of the entire country. We are not legislating here today to solve the highway problem of Mississippi, Ohio, or any other individual State. We are attempting to help and work out a national highway system that will, insofar as possible, meet the basic needs of this country.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. SCUDDER].

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Chairman, the bill you have before you today is the work of several months of investigation by the subcommittee of the Committee on Public Works. I believe they have given to you a comprehensive, well-rounded piece of legislation for your consideration.

There are a few matters that have not been touched upon during the course of the discussion, and I would like to give you a few figures that seem rather important to me. While this bill is not one of linkage, nor do we by this bill endeavor to appropriate all moneys that are collected in the form of gas tax, there is a relationship, because most of us feel that the ordinary motorist, when he drives up to a gas station to purchase gasoline, does that with a feeling that the tax that he is paying is being used for the construction and maintenance of highways throughout our entire country.

In 1952 there was collected in gas tax $866,221,000. The highway users contributed $800,755,000. The nonusers of the highways paid in gas tax that year $65,466,000. We had complaints come to us from the airplane companies that they were paying a gas tax and, therefore, their portion of the tax should not be used for highways. The same type of complaint came from farmers, who said that the gas tax on tractors and other implements used on the farm should not be used for highways. We also had similar complaints from the motorboat owners.

I made some research and I found that this coming year we expect to collect about $910 million. It is estimated that 91 percent of the tax will be paid by the highway users, in other words $878,100,000 of the money to be paid in through this tax will be paid by the highway users. The amount set forth in this bill is quite a coincidence in that we are asking in the bill for $875 million, so there is a spread of only a little over $3 million in favor of the general fund left from the taxes paid by the users of the highways. It seems to me that should satisfy everyone when it comes to an equal distribution of the taxes paid.

I feel that another very important factor in this bill is that we have turned over to the various States the responsibility of constructing, maintaining, and writing the specifications for secondary roads. It was pointed out that the administrative cost of the Federal Bureau of Roads would be reduced by 50 percent if the secondary roads were handled entirely and directly by the State departments of highways. I think that is a very good argument in favor of this bill.

Another thing that you from the rural areas will be interested in is that this bill provides that the Federal Government may use urban money for the construction of secondary highways through the small municipalities. You are aware that the urban moneys go only to cities of 5,000 and more, so the smaller cities are left without any funds to assist them in building the trunklines through their small municipalities. This bill will assist them. The Highway Commission may appropriate urban moneys for the construction of highways through the small cities.

I feel that this is a very fine, well worked out bill, and urge your support of it in toto.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE].

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Chairman, we face two national crises—rising unemployment, which, if not checked, will bring us into a major depression; and a woefully inadequate highway system.

I maintain these two crises in the same breath, because a solution for one is a solution for both. Members of this body who drive to and from Washington, no matter in what direction they leave the Capital, must be painfully aware of the poor condition of our highways.

The one good stretch of highway—the 18 miles of the Shirley Highway in Virginia—is rapidly becoming a death trap. Scarcely a week goes by that we do not pick up our morning newspaper and read of a serious accident.

When I drive to my home in East St. Louis, I travel over roads that are battered from the pounding of traffic. For long stretches they are narrow, and I am forced to crawl behind trucks or risk my life trying to pass. Quaint little Frederick bogs me down with congested streets; Cumberland slows me with interminable stop signs; Wheeling brings me almost to a crawl with steep hills, sharp turns, and a bridge more than 100 years old; the route takes me through the heavily congested areas of Columbus and Indianapolis.

My route takes me over an important artery, an artery over which flows the lifeblood of our economy; a route over which important military traffic must pass in time of war or national emergency. To me, the delays and the bumps mean only an inconvenience, and a month off the life of my car. As I experience these delays, however, I ask myself what they mean to the logistic snowball of military support. How many hours or days delay in a vital air strike results from 5 minutes loss by a truckload of electronic gear in Cumberland or Wheeling or Columbus?

Mr. Chairman, we in the Congress can take a long step toward solving the highway crisis. We may do it without deficit financing. All we need do is to recognize that an adequate interstate highway system is a Federal responsibility. Within a period of no more than 10 years we can build our interstate highway system up to par. We can do it without going into debt. The financing of such a program can be achieved by devoting all the money collected from gasoline and other taxes on highway users to the highway program.

That would provide about a billion and a half dollars a year to be spent on the highway system. States could continue to do the actual work, under Bureau of Public Roads supervision, But the States would not be required to match the funds. This would free state and ordinary Federal-aid funds for work on our rural highways and on streets over which interstate traffic rarely passes.

Now how would this meet the unemployment crisis? In the first place, it would provide jobs. The program would not be boondoggling, for we would be building to increase the national wealth and to increase the national security.

In the second place, unless our highways are made adequate the market for new automobiles will continue to shrink. More and more people will come to realize that it is folly to endanger an investment of two thousand dollars, or more, on narrow, winding, rough highways. When fewer cars and trucks are built, less steel is consumed. When less steel is consumed, less coal is burned. That is something very close to me and the people living in the district I have the honor to represent.

Finally, I cannot stress too much the importance of adequate highways to our national defense. The Eisenhower administration is wedded to the military strategy of fast and massive retaliation. The effectiveness of such a strategy depends upon speed all along the line, not just in a fast carrier or a jet bomber. In a time of mobilization, every truck on our highways will be making a contribution to power we exert on the enemy. All the money we appropriate for jet aircraft, fast ships, and speedy tanks will be of no avail if these weapons are shackled by a horse and buggy highway system.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TRIMBLE].

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Chairman, service on a committee of this House is more like service on a jury than anything I know. Those of you who have served on juries know that you will sit day after day and hear testimony and then hear the court give the instructions on the law, and then you will go out and all 12 of you will have a different idea as to what the verdict ought to be. Then you have to give and take. You do not surrender your convictions if it comes to that. You hang the jury.

There are 29 of us on this Committee on Public Works, and I presume that if we had had our way there would have been 29 different bills. I happen to represent a State that is rather thinly populated, and we are not entirely satisfied with the provisions of this bill. I think the division of the fund on the interstate highway system under this bill would get more votes and would be more equitable to the thinly populated and poorer States if the formula was 75/25. There are other features of the bill which I would change. I am not particularly strong for the idea of linkage because if we have the highway system, say, linked to the gasoline tax, and then a future Congress does away with the gasoline tax, we would be thrown into utter confusion with reference to our program. The interstate system is set

up on a formula different from the general road funds which obtained through the years since I have been here and before. I have had quite a few phone calls, and some telegrams, and some letters expressing concern over the fact that this bill takes away or disturbs the old formula of the primary, secondary, and urban roads. I think that comes about by reason of the fact that here for the second time we have the interstate or so-called defense roads system mentioned. Indirectly, this defense roads system or the interstate system will help us because it will take from the primary system, for instance, in the State of Arkansas, although I do not remember the mileage, but Highway No. 70 goes through our State, and Highway No. 67 from Little Rock and northeast through our State—as I say, I do not recall the mileage but whatever the mileage is, it is subtracted from the primary system which has heretofore declared in our State, and we will have that much more to put on the primary, secondary system, and the urban system. Another thing that disturbs me too is the formula. That is not new in this bill. It has been in other bills. We are losing population in the State of Arkansas, and it is largely because our road systems, our secondary or farm-to-market or rural routes and postal route roads are poor and people are just not going to live on those gravel roads when they can move to better roads. Then there is the so-called transfer in this bill as in the previous bill. We have a switch of 25 percent allowed. The highway department of the State of Arkansas, for instance, can take 25 percent of the funds allocated for secondary roads and use it on primary roads. But, by the same token, it can take 25 percent from the primary roads and use it on the secondary roads. The pressure gets pretty heavy on the highway department of the State. Personally, I would like to have that nailed down especially with reference to the secondary road system. Because if we can get those roads, and if they can be traveled over and get these people out of the mud, then our gas tax receipts will increase because the people will travel more. I can cite one instance in the district that I represent where the average travel on the highway was 75 vehicles per day, but it was paved and then the travel on that highway increased to about 300 vehicles per day. Of course, with the incidental increase in the gasoline tax money that was used.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TRIMBLE. I yield.

Mr. BAILEY. Will the gentleman explain just how the State road department in my State or your State would take those funds that we are allocating for primary roads and use them on urban roads? Would the gentleman be a little more definite as to just how that could happen?

Mr. TRIMBLE. The highway department of the State, as I understand this legislation—and this was in legislation prior to this, and is not new in this particular bill—could, let us say, in the State of West Virginia have $3 million for a primary system, and then, if the highway department decides they need more funds on the secondary system, they could take 25 percent, or $750,000, and set it over on the secondary system, or vice versa.

Mr. BAILEY. They could also take funds for secondary roads and use them for access roads to municipalities in the urban centers?

Mr. TRIMBLE. I am not sure about that. I would not want to be bound by a statement to that effect. I think they can shift 25 percent of any of these funds to any other fund. That is my understanding of the bill.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. GEORGE].

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. Chairman, I have been a member of this subcommittee that has been making a study of this road problem the past 2 years. I want to commend the membership of this committee. As you listened to the debate today, you noticed some difference of opinion. Different areas are affected in different ways by this bill. It is a compromise bill between the various groups from the different types of States that we have in the United States, with the overall idea in mind that we are trying to pass legislation here which will do the greatest good to the greatest number of people.

Mr. Chairman, it is my intention to support H. R. 8127, because in my judgment, it is the most realistic highway contruction bill ever considered by Congress. This bill was prepared after exhaustive hearings held many days last year in the 1st session of the 83d Congress, in which witnesses from all segments of our economy were heard. In addition, extensive hearings have been held this year before our Subcommittee on Roads, and the House Public Works Committee took final action on this bill after complete discussion.

There are many things in this bill that can be considered of a controversial nature. Each segment, however, of our people who are interested in highway construction, have something in this bill that commends itself to them. This bill raises the regular funds for highway construction $100 million. In addition to that, $200 million was established in comparatively new funds to be used on our strategic military network.

Altogether, this bill provides for additional construction of highways in our country amounting to over $1 billion for the 2-year period fiscal 1956 and 1957. This is only a step in the right direction. It will not nearly meet the Nation's highway needs. I hope this expanded program will meet with such success that the people of the various States will ask Congress to increase the amount to be used on highway construction many millions of dollars per year in the near future.

We have been spending billions of dollars for foreign aid, and other billions for our military strength. It seems to me it is time that we are starting to partly meet our highway construction problems in the United States. This bill is a forward step in that direction.

Federal apportionment of funds State of Kansas would receive under new national Federal-aid-to-highways bill:

Primary	$6, 552, 000
Secondary	4, 587, 000
Urban	1, 390, 000
Subtotal	12, 529, 000
Interstate population formula	1, 168, 000
Old formula under sec. 21	2, 446, 000
Subtotal	3, 614, 000
Overall approximate total	16, 143, 000
1955 total	12, 035, 698
Increase per year	4, 107, 302

Federal apportionment which Kansas is receiving under the 1952 law for fiscal 1954 and fiscal 1955:

1954	
Primary	$5, 950, 738
Secondary	4, 165, 742
Urban	1, 261, 297
Interstate	605, 853
Total	11, 898, 630

1955	
Primary	$5, 975, 744
Secondary	4, 183, 753
Urban	1, 267, 798
Interstate	608, 403
Total	12, 035,698

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I should like to ask the gentleman a question; I should like to say beforehand, parenthetically, that I would not be so emboldened as to put my own individual judgment up against the judgment of the committee which has given so much thought and attention to this problem; not only to this one bill but to this problem over a period of years.

I want also to say that I have been in touch with the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McGREGOR], who has always been attentive and interested and thoughtful and very nice about listening to suggestions. My concern with these public-works road bills now is that we have a tendency, in my judgment, to lose sight of the primary need for defense highways; and I get that idea from traveling through the country.

If we were to have world war III now I tremble to think about how we would move the traffic engendered by such a war over our highways, because they go through these urban centers, which are the first ones which would be knocked out, and they go through every town and village, and make no appreciable effort to bypass them. How to get military traffic through at a high rate of speed is the great question, and that is the thing that I see in the tendency, not of the committee so much, but the tendency of the citizens, the people, to overlook the need for defense highways.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY].

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to direct my remarks to section 2

(a), on page 5, this controversial proviso beginning in line 10. Despite what the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McGREGOR] says of this bill and has to say about there being no connection or no linkage there, a lot of people back in my State seem to think that there is.

I have before me here—and I would like to include in the RECORD—a statement by the public-relations officer of the Standard Oil Co. located in my State protesting it.

I have another from one of the officers of the State Contractors' Association protesting it.

I am wondering if the gentleman will again explain to the members of the Committee why there is not a connection there. They seem to think so and my mind is not clear that there is not. So I ask the gentleman to explain it.

Mr. McGREGOR. We simply say to the people that we cannot give you additional miles of better roads unless we have the money with which to do it. Now if we are talking about continuing the half-cent gas tax, that bill will be in here on Wednesday and everyone will have an opportunity to vote "yes" or "no" on the continuation of the gas tax. This can be changed overnight; there is nothing permanent about this legislation whatsoever.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. J. M. Douds says:

> We are definitely opposed to the provision linking the gasoline tax and the Federal-aid highway program because of the traditional responsibility of the Federal Government to construct and maintain interstate post and military roads.

It has been the tradition of the Government to do that. Why use the gasoline tax to do it? That is the question all will ask.

Mr. McGREGOR. If you ask the average man on the street what the gasoline tax was used for he would say it was used for highways.

Mr. BAILEY. Under the circumstances I shall support the amendment of the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Chairman, the pending measure to amend the Federal Aid Road Act and to authorize increased appropriations for the construction of highways is an important measure and certainly represents a forward-looking and progressive piece of legislation.

The building of better highways and improved secondary road systems for the Nation is a nonpartisan issue. We all are for, or should be for, better roads and improved highways. The new bill represents an extension of the Federal Aid Highways Act of years past and provides for carrying forward the basic highway pattern of Federal Government and State cooperation on a matching funds basis—a 50–50 basis with some exceptions.

The bill would authorize the appropriation of $600 million for each of the fiscal years of 1956 and 1957 and to be made available to the States and expended as follows:

Two hundred and seventy millions of dollars for projects on Federal aid primary highway systems.

One hundred and eighty millions of dollars for Federal-aid projects on secondary road systems.

One hundred and fifty millions of dollars for projects on Federal-aid highway systems in urban areas.

Under this authorization, the State of Tennessee will receive $5,851,000 in Federal aid funds for primary road construction; $4,560,000 for Federal aid for secondary road construction; and $2,139,000 for Federal aid for urban road construction—a total of $12,550,000 in Federal aid for highway and rural road construction and development in the State of Tennessee—and a total of $16,756,000 with the additional population increase basis.

This represents a substantial increase over funds provided in recent years and marks a progressive step forward. It is an indication of the fact that an increased highway construction program is needed and should be stimulated inasmuch as there has been a period of some laxity in road construction during the war years and postwar years.

Mr. Chairman, I have been somewhat concerned about the provisions contained in the bill with respect to the transfer of funds from rural to urban road purposes and vice versa. The bill would permit not exceeding 25 percent of the amount authorized to be appropriated to the States, in any one year, to be transferred from the apportionment under one system to either of the others.

Many of us are greatly concerned about the construction of rural roads and it is to be hoped there will not be any substantial diversion or transfer of funds herein appropriated for rural road development to urban projects. It is noted that such transfer of funds can only be effected when requested and certified to by State highway departments of the various States and being in the public interest, and when approved by the Secretary of Commerce.

The apportionment is the same as before—on a 50–50 basis except in the case of the authorization of $200 million for interstate highway construction in which case a new formula is adopted with the Federal Government making a contribution of 60 percent as compared with 40 percent from the States. This is to stimulate an increased interstate highway construction program.

This is a progressive measure, a constructive measure and represents an extension of progressive legislation which has been in effect for a number of years.

I wish to commend members of the committee for recommending this legislation and I urge its adoption.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. NEAL], a member of the committee.

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Chairman, insofar as linkage is concerned, it does not seem to me it makes a great deal of difference how you look at this matter. In West Virginia we have a gasoline tax which goes entirely to the support and maintenance of the highway system. We may be in this particular bill adopting the principle of linkage, yet it is temporary and it does not necessarily mean that it is a precedent.

I do not believe, after getting extensive information in the hearings extending over many weeks, that we could possibly present to you a bill that would satisfy everybody; however, there is something about this bill which I think needs to be commended and that is this: In all these years that we have been neglecting our highways, we have been building more and more automobiles and creating more and more traffic. We have diverted funds which we really should have used for highway purposes. We have diverted those funds to other purposes.

Regardless of the criticism you may have of this particular bill, it does one thing, it at least makes a start toward the Federal Government's assumption of its duty to improve the Federal highways. If the money comes from the gasoline tax, if it comes from the general fund or from whatever source, we must recognize it is a start in the right direction and certainly there is not anything in this country that needs the support of Federal funds as much as the highway system of the Nation. I think this is a good bill.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NEAL. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. McGREGOR. As author of the pending bill, I want to pay my respects to the splendid work that the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. NEAL] has done in behalf of good legislation. He has made many excellent contributions to problems studied by our committee.

Mr. NEAL. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield the remaining time on this side to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ROGERS].

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I take this time to point out that I believe this committee has taken the wrong approach when it attempts to change the formula whereby you take the money authorized in this legislation and change it to the formula as set forth on page 4 of this bill. I say that for the reason that all of us know that heretofore the formula used has been satisfactory and also, may I say, that this authorization where it changes that formula will be a disadvantage to the thing that you desire to accomplish. The thing that you desire to accomplish, as I understand it, is national defense highways.

In my State as an example, there has only been authorized 661 miles of roads for national defense highways, but under this apportionment we stand to lose over a million dollars. I know it has been said around here that if you would take a look at the figures compiled on page 20 of the report it will be found that the State of Colorado pursuant to old apportionment received $8,484,000, and that on page 18 in pursuance to the appointment as set forth therein the State of Colorado would get $11,958,000,

an increase of approximately $4 million. The thing that they have overlooked is that as they compiled the figures set forth on page 20 of the report they only used $575 million as the appropriation.

In this bill we have $800 million, and as the result, if we had had the same proportion—and it will apply to 29 other States—then we would have received in excess of almost $13 million. Now, I can readily understand how many members of the Highway Engineers, meeting in a convention, were told that if you would follow this formula, then you would get $3 or $4 million for your respective States, but the thing that they did not tell them was that of the increased amount, and if they had followed the old formula, they would have received all the way from $1 million to $2 to $5 million more under the old formula.

Mr. Chairman, it is therefore going to be my privilege when this bill is presented under the 5-minute rule to offer an amendment to strike that portion of the bill which deals with population only. I want to point out that if you are going to have this for a national-defense highway system, it is as essential to have that defense highway through sparsely settled sections of the United States as it is to have it in the thickly populated sections of the United States.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JONES].

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Under the formula on the interstate system of 60-40, the State of Colorado will get 65.16 percent of the Federal appropriation; in other words, you are getting 5.16 percent more than the average State will receive.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Yes, that is correct. This increase to Colorado is due to the fact the public lands formula has been employed. I have always supported the public land in the Highway Act, which the gentleman from Alabama well knows.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. ENGLE].

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, I have asked for this time to ask the distinguished chairman of the committee or the author of the bill a question in regard to this interstate highway fund. In California we have one road that has given us a great deal of grief. It is Highway U. S. 40 which runs from San Francisco through Sacramento, over the Sierra Nevada Mountains at the Donner Pass and into Reno. It is an interstate highway. During the wintertime it is plugged up with snow and a great deal of the time is impassable. In the last session of the legislature the State legislature voted $20 million to improve that highway, provided that the Federal Government would put up an additional $20 million as a matching fund. Five of us Members of the House have introduced bills to authorize that particular contribution by the Federal Government, which would be additional and extra to the annual Federal aid allotment. Those measures are pending before your committee at this time, and we are seeking the support of the Defense Department for those bills, because this is a defense highway which, when blocked, cuts off the defense establishments east of the Sierra Nevada Mountains.

The question I want to ask the gentleman is this: Since $200 million has been put into this bill, would it be possible to take California's portion of that $200 million and use it in connection with the $20 million now set aside and earmarked by the State of California for the improvement of Highway 40?

Mr. McGREGOR. It would be, if it were so recommended by the California State Highway Department and concurred in by the Bureau of Public Roads They could probably take that amount before it is allocated anywhere else, because it would probably have preferential treatment because of its military value.

Mr. ENGLE. The State of California has already indicated the preferential treatment it wants to give this highway. As I understand, if the State of California, its road official, can convince the Bureau of Public Roads that this allocation which goes to California out of that $200 million should be used on Highway 40, it can be used for that purpose.

Mr. McGREGOR. If they can prove it to the Public Roads Administration, it can be taken as part of the California share under this new legislation; we are stressing the $200 million interstate because of military value.

Mr. ENGLE. And because that is a primary defense highway?

Mr. McGREGOR. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. ENGLE. I thank the gentleman, and I compliment the committee on the excellent work it has done on this legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), and all acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $600,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and a like sum for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957.

The sum herein authorized for each fiscal year shall be available for expenditure as follows:

(a) $270,000,000 for projects on the Federal-aid primary highway system.

(b) $180,000,000 for projects on the Federal-aid secondary highway system.

(c) $150,000,000 for projects on the Federal-aid primary highway system in urban areas, and for projects on approved extensions of the Federal-aid secondary system within urban areas.

The sums authorized by this section for each fiscal year, respectively, shall be apportioned among the several States in the manner now provided by law and in accordance with the formulas set forth in section 4 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944, approved December 20, 1944 (58 Stat. 838).

Any sums apportioned to any State under the provision of this section shall be available for expenditure in that State for 2 years after the close of the fiscal year for which such sums are authorized, and any amount so apportioned remaining unexpended at the end of such period shall lapse: *Provided*, That such funds for any fiscal year shall be deemed to have been expended if a sum equal to the total of the sums apportioned to the State for such fiscal year is covered by formal agreements with the Secretary of Commerce for the improvement of specific projects as provided by this act: *Provided further*, That in the case of those sums apportioned to any State for projects on the Federal-aid secondary highway system, the Secretary of Commerce may discharge his responsibility relative to the plans, design, inspection, and construction of such secondary road projects upon his receipt and approval of a certified statement by the State highway department setting forth that the plans, design, and construction for such projects are in accord with the standards and procedures of the respective States applicable to projects in this category approved by him: *Provided further*, That not more than 25 percent of the amount apportioned to each State under subparagraphs (a), (b), or (c) of this section may be transferred from the apportionment under one subparagraph to the apportionment under either of the other subparagraphs: *Provided further*, That such transfer is requested by the State highway department and is approved by the Secretary of Commerce as being in the public interest: *Provided further*, That the total of such transfers shall not increase the original apportionment under any subparagraph by more than 25 percent: *Provided further*, That the transfers hereinabove permitted for funds authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1956, and June 30, 1957, shall likewise be permitted on the same basis for funds heretofore or hereafter authorized to be appropriated for any prior or subsequent fiscal year: *And provided further*, That nothing herein contained shall be deemed to alter or impair the authority contained in the last proviso to subparagraph (b) of section 3 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944.

SEC. 2. (a) For the purpose of expediting the construction, reconstruction, and improvement, inclusive of necessary bridges and tunnels, of the national system of interstate highways, including extensions thereof through urban areas, designated in accordance with the provisions of section 7 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944 (58 Stat. 838), there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the additional sum of $200 million for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and a like additional sum for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957. The sum herein authorized for each fiscal year shall be apportioned among the several States in the following manner: one-half in the ratio which the population of each State bears to the total population of all the States, as shown by the latest available Federal census: *Provided*, That no State shall receive less than three-fourths of 1 percent of the money so apportioned; and one-half in the manner now provided by law for apportionment of funds for the Federal-aid primary system: *Provided further*, That the Federal share payable on account of any project on the national system of interstate highways provided for by funds made available under the provisions of this section shall be increased to 60 percent of the total cost thereof, plus a percentage of the remaining 40 percent of such cost in any State containing unappropriated and unreserved public lands and nontaxable Indian lands, individual and tribal, exceeding 5 percent of the total area of all lands therein, equal to the percentage that the area of such lands in such State is of its total area: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Commerce shall not apportion to the States the sum authorized by this section for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, unless a Federal excise tax on gasoline in the amount of not less than 2 cents per gallon is in effect on September 30, 1954; and the Secretary of Commerce shall not apportion to the States the sum authorized by this section for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, unless a Fed-

eral excise tax on gasoline in the amount of not less than 2 cents per gallon is in effect on September 30, 1955.

(b) Any sums apportioned to any State under the provisions of this section shall be available for expenditure in that State for 2 years after the close of fiscal year for which such sums are authorized: *Provided,* That such funds shall be deemed to be expended upon execution of formal agreements with the Secretary of Commerce for the improvement of specific projects under this section.

(c) Any amount apportioned to the States under the provisions of this section unexpended at the end of the period during which it is available for expenditure under the terms of subsection (b) of this section shall lapse.

SEC. 3. For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of section 23 of the Federal Highway Act (42 Stat. 218), as amended and supplemented, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated (1) for forest highways the sum of $22,500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and a like sum for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957: *Provided,* That the authorization in section 3 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1952 for forest highways for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, is hereby canceled; and (2) for forest development roads and trails the sum of $22,500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and a like sum for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957: *Provided,* That with respect to any proposed construction or reconstruction of a timber access road, advisory public hearings shall be held at a place convenient or adjacent to the area of construction or reconstruction with notice and reasonable opportunity for interested persons to present their views as to the practicability and feasibility of such construction or reconstruction: *Provided further,* That hereafter funds available for forest development roads and trails shall also be available for vehicular parking areas: *Provided further,* That the appropriation herein authorized for forest highways shall be apportioned by the Secretary of Commerce for expenditure in the several States, Alaska, and Puerto Rico in accordance with the provision of section 3 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1950.

SEC. 4. (a) For the construction, reconstruction, and improvement of roads and trails, inclusive of necessary bridges, in national parks, monuments, and other areas administered by the National Park Service, including areas authorized to be established as national parks and monuments, and national park and monument approach roads authorized by the act of January 31, 1931 (46 Stat. 1053), as amended, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $10 million for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and a like sum for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957.

(b) For the construction, reconstruction, and improvement of parkways, authorized by acts of Congress, on lands to which title is vested in the United States, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $10 million for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and a like sum for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957.

(c) For the construction, improvement, and maintenance of Indian reservation roads and bridges and roads and bridges to provide access to Indian reservations and Indian lands under the provisions of the act approved May 26, 1928 (45 Stat. 750), there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $10 million for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and a like sum for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957: *Provided,* That the location, type, and design of all roads and bridges constructed shall be approved by the Secretary of Commerce before any expenditures are made thereon, and all such construction shall be under the general supervision of the Secretary of Commerce.

SEC. 5. Any unappropriated balance of the sums heretofore authorized to be appropriated by sections 5 and 6 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1952 (66 Stat. 158), for the Rama Road in Nicaragua and the Inter-American Highway, respectively, for the fiscal years 1953 and 1954, shall continue to be authorized to be appropriated for such purposes for the fiscal years 1955 and 1956.

SEC. 6. All provisions of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944, approved December 20, 1944 (58 Stat. 838); the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1948, approved June 29, 1948 (62 Stat. 1105); and the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1950, approved September 7, 1950 (64 Stat. 785); and the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1952, approved June 25, 1952 (66 Stat. 158), not inconsistent with this act, shall remain in full force and effect.

SEC. 7. If any section, subsection, or other provision of this act or the application thereof to any person or circumstance is held invalid, the remainder of this act and the application of such section, subsection, or other provision to other persons or circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

SEC. 8. All acts or parts of acts in any way inconsistent with the provisions of this act are hereby repealed, and this act shall take effect on its passage.

SEC. 9. The Secretary of Commerce is hereby directed to make a study in cooperation with the State highway departments and other parties in interest relative to the problems posed by necessary relocation and reconstruction of public utilities services resulting from highway improvements authorized under this act. Among other things, such a study shall include a review and financial analysis of existing relationships between the State highway departments and affected utilities of all types, and a review of the various State statutes regulating existing relationships, to the end that a full and informative report may be made to the President for transmittal to the Congress of the United States not later than February 1, 1955.

SEC. 10. The term "highway," as defined in section 2 of the Federal Highway Act of November 9, 1921 (42 Stat. 212), as amended and supplemented, shall be deemed to include "tunnels."

SEC. 11. The Secretary of Commerce may approve as a part of the Federal-aid secondary system, extensions through urban areas, connecting points on that system, provided that Federal participation in projects on such extensions shall be limited to urban funds.

SEC. 12. For the purpose of expediting the interstate planning and coordination of a continuous Great River Road and appurtenances thereto traversing the Mississippi Valley from Canada to the Gulf of Mexico in general conformity with the provisions of the Federal-Aid Road Act of July 11, 1916, as amended and supplemented, and with the recommended plan set forth in the joint report submitted to the Congress November 28, 1951, by the Secretaries of Commerce and Interior pursuant to the act of August 24, 1949 (Public Law 262, 81st Cong.), there is hereby authorized to be expended by the Secretary of Commerce from general administrative funds not to exceed $250,000; the amount expended under this section shall be apportioned among the 10 States bordering the Mississippi River in proportion to the amount allocated by these respective States for the improvement and extension of existing sections of this highway project as approved by the Secretary of Commerce in cooperation with other public agencies concerned therewith.

SEC. 13. This act may be cited as the "Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1954."

Mr. DONDERO (interrupting the reading of the bill). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered as read and open to amendment at any point.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, does the gentleman have any idea how much time we will have for debate before we are shut off?

Mr. DONDERO. There is no disposition on the part of the chairman to shut off debate.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I know there is no such disposition on the part of the gentleman, but I want to know if we can have some time, because there are some things that should be discussed on this bill.

I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. McGREGOR. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, and I certainly will not object, I wonder if in the opinion of the members of the committee on that side we might finish the legislation tonight, and set a time of not later than 6 o'clock, we will say, for closing debate.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McGREGOR. I yield.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Of course, there is no disposition on this side of the aisle that I know of to extend debate on the bill. I see no reason why we cannot conclude it tonight. I suggest that we proceed and see how we come out, and then consider closing debate.

Mr. McGREGOR. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. HALLECK. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, the immediate request will of course be granted, and certainly, as the chairman has pointed out, there is no disposition to shut off debate. However, in scheduling the program for the week, it was my understanding after consultation generally that we could conclude the matter today. I am very sure that we can. I have checked at the desk and there are three amendments there. That does not necessarily mean that there are not other amendments that will be offered, because Members may have amendments that are not at the desk. If Members do have amendments, if they would send them to the desk we could tell better how we could proceed in order to grant plenty of time for the discussion of the amendments that may be offered.

I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DEMPSEY:

Page 1, line 7, strike out "$600,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$700,000,000."

Page 2, line 3, strike out "$270,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$315,000,000."

Page 2, line 5, strike out "$180,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$210,000,000."

Page 2, line 7, strike out "$150,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$175,000,000."

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Chairman, this is a very simple amendment. In view of the fact that it is proposed to continue the gasoline tax at 2 cents, we will build up an additional fund of about $500 million from the 1st of February of this year until the 1st of July of next year.

There is nothing in this bill we have before us which provides for spending any money before the fiscal years 1956 and 1957. The amount of money in addition that I am asking is $100 million to be given to these categories that have not been treated very generously in this bill. They are the primary system, the secondary system, and the urban system. The primary system would get an additional $45 million, on the same ratio as they would under the formula now. The secondary system would get $30 million and the urban system would get $25 million. That is the formula that has been in effect for a great many years. Everybody who speaks about highways is concerned about the accidents we have been having and the lack of funds we need to do the job that has to be done. If we want to be sincere about this thing, I do not believe we should continue for another year and 3 months with not one additional dime for highways in view of the increase in accidents. We should provide something additional for 1956–57. That is all there is to this amendment. It affects every segment of this Nation. It affects all people. It provides the same formula that we have been working on for a great many years. I think the money is available and I do not see any excuse not to adopt this amendment.

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEMPSEY. I yield.

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Chairman, is it the purpose of the gentleman to take that $100 million from the $200 million provided in section 2?

Mr. DEMPSEY. It has nothing to do with that at all. This is just an additional $100 million. This amendment has nothing to do with that.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEMPSEY. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. As I understand the gentleman's amendment, you are seeking to set this up one year?

Mr. DEMPSEY. No, I am asking to set up an additional $100 million for each of the fiscal years 1956–57. And I hope we may get some of that back before that time.

Mr. DONDERO. That means that you want to increase the bill by $100 million.

Mr. DEMPSEY. That is right. It may be that we will get the authority to use some of it earlier, but the bill we are considering now, notwithstanding what the President said about the highway accidents, what he said about these killings on the highways, and what he said about using this gasoline tax for construction, does not provide sufficient money to do the job, in my opinion. The funds authorized by this amendment will at least help out and help in the categories that have not been given anything in a great many years. You set up $50 million for many, many years for that category.

Mr. STEED. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEMPSEY. I yield.

Mr. STEED. Do I understand the main purpose you have here in asking for this $100 million increase is due to the fact that for the next year or slightly more than 1 year you are going to continue to collect the 2-cent gasoline tax?

Mr. DEMPSEY. For 1 year and 3 months.

Mr. STEED. And that money will be spent on building roads?

Mr. DEMPSEY. That is right. I am asking for $100 million additional for 15 months, and I think we should use some of it.

Mr. STEED. If your amendment is adopted, then in these 2 following years you are going to have a total of $200 million additional?

Mr. DEMPSEY. That is right.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEMPSEY. I yield.

Mr. McGREGOR. It is my understanding the gentleman is talking about the 3 categories where the States match funds on a 50–50 basis?

Mr. DEMPSEY. Yes, that is right.

Mr. McGREGOR. I am certain the gentleman has listened to the testimony. There were a number of States wondering whether they would be able to match the funds that we have established here in this bill to say nothing of matching any additional funds.

Mr. DEMPSEY. May I point out to the chairman that if there are any States that cannot match it, they are not required to match the funds. But, if they can match the funds—and I am sure they would if they were given the opportunity—we are giving them another year to do so. Certainly, they will be able to match the funds. The gentleman is trying to predict what the States will do. The Bureau of Public Roads told you that they have not failed yet.

Mr. McGREGOR. But you do have on record the fact that there are other States that cannot match the amount that we have in the bill now before us. The gentleman knows, if he is making assurances, as he suggested, that we have no assurance as to what the gasoline-tax income for the coming year is going to be. As of now, it is $906 million without any increase. I would ask the gentleman in all sincerity, because I know he believes in a balanced budget, where are we going to get this extra $100 million?

Mr. DEMPSEY. I will tell the gentleman where we can get this extra $100 million.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. DEMPSEY was given permission to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. DEMPSEY. I got my figures primarily from the chairman, who stated to the Rules Committee that we had $100 million or more last year. He also stated that it was increasing at the rate of about 5 percent per year. So there would be $45 million more in 1 year, or $56 million in 15 months.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me at that point?

Mr. DEMPSEY. I will yield to my chairman.

Mr. DONDERO. The gentleman understands that we are stepping up this bill now over $225 million above what it was at any previous time. We did that for the purpose of practically absorbing all of the gasoline tax. We are within $31 million of it now. If the gentleman's amendment prevails, we would go a way beyond that.

Mr. DEMPSEY. The gentleman has put in $70 million that he knows is not going to be appropriated. They are not matching funds with the Federal Government. They have to do with Indian roads, and with parks, and such things as that, which really do not come before the committee. They do not represent a matching proposition. They are in the same category as in 1952.

Mr. DONDERO. But the money comes out of the Federal Treasury.

Mr. DEMPSEY. The money comes out of the Federal Treasury, certainly. But you are delaying this action for a year or 15 months. That is what you are doing, if you do not appropriate this money until 1956 or 1957. With all of this gasoline tax money coming in, under your own figures it will be close to $500 million and we will not be doing anything about building roads.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The question of the amount of money provided for roads in this bill has been considered thoroughly by the members of the committee. That was done before we reported it to the House. No one suggested that we should increase the amount of the bill. If the gentleman's amendment were adopted, we would be authorizing more money than is coming into the Federal Treasury from the gasoline tax, if you want to link the question of the gasoline tax with the question of road funds.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for an observation?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. McGREGOR. At no time did my distinguished friend from New Mexico [Mr. DEMPSEY] bring this amendment before the committee. This bill came out of the committee by a unanimous vote. We all recognize that it is not as much as we want, but it is a compromise and my good friend voted for it.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me for just a word?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. DEMPSEY. I did everything in my power to get the chairman of the committee and the chairman of the subcommittee to approve more money for urban roads, did I not? The gentleman said that there was no way to do it except by changing the formula. I tried to prevail upon the gentleman to change the formula for the interstate roads, but in what the gentleman has done he has hurt the other category, the primary system of highways. I did every thing in my power to get additional money for these roads, because the amount of money was inadequate. I asked the chairman of the committee if we would have a chance to get some additional money for 1955 and he said, "No." If we can for 1955, we should; if not, for 1956 or 1957; just so the money is available.

Mr. DONDERO. Money is provided in this bill for 1956 and 1957. The question of money for 1954 and 1955 has already been disposed of and the money allocated to the States. The amendment would increase the total another $100 million.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield.

Mr. DEMPSEY. In January 1953, when we convened I introduced a bill providing for $200 million for interstate roads. The gentleman put in a bill for $250 million. I went along with him. I did not want my bill, I wanted his. But he did not do anything about it, and he is not doing anything about it now, except what is in this bill.

Mr. DONDERO. That may be true, but we have done this, we have added to the bill before the House now $225 million more than any previous bill.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Certainly.

Mr. DONDERO. I think we have gone a long way in increasing the amount of the authorization.

Mr. DEMPSEY. We have done that because of the terrific increase in the gasoline tax we are collecting.

Mr. DONDERO. But this bill takes nearly all the gasoline tax; we are within $31 million of it.

Mr. DEMPSEY. The gentleman's figures are in error.

Mr. DONDERO. I doubt it very much.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Those are not the figures the gentleman has been using.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the House vote down this amendment, because if it is approved we would be providing far in excess of what the present program for roads contains.

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield.

Mr. SCUDDER. I just want to make an observation: There is about $100 million involved in the difference between the highway users' gasoline tax and other forms of tax paid in under this legislation. Now if we do get to a point where they are charging us with linkage, then I think that we would have plenty of opportunity for our colleagues on the other side of the Capitol to bring in an amendment to strike that part out. I think we are on dangerous ground in endeavoring to absorb all this money that comes in from both the users' tax and nonusers' tax.

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield.

Mr. MACHROWICZ. We are appropriating money for the years 1956 and 1957. Is it not true that by that time we will have about $1,200,000,000 in the tax?

Mr. DONDERO. At the rate of increase of 5 percent a year.

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Then the fact of the matter is that we would be using up only about $900 million out of $1,200,000,000.

Mr. DONDERO. That may be true.

I ask for a vote, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Mexico.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. DEMPSEY) there were—ayes 17, noes 59.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JONES of Missouri: Page 9, line 15, strike out all of section 9 on pages 9 and 10 and insert a new section to be known as section 9 and to read as follows:

"SEC. 9. No part of any appropriation authorized by this act shall be used to defray any part of the cost of relocating, reconstructing, or improving any public utility service."

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I am offering this amendment not because I have any desire to change anything that is being done under the present law, but I am fearful of the effect of section 9.

I was rather amazed when the author of this bill told me upon interrogation that there was support in that committee advocating a policy of using a part of the tax money to reimburse or to help pay a part of the cost of construction or relocation or reconstruction or improvement of public utilities. I think that in this bill unless we take out section 9, you are beginning to establish a policy of paying a part of the expenses which should be borne by the public utilities and which no one ever dreamed would come out of the pockets of the payers of gasoline taxes to help relocate gas lines, electric lines, telephone lines, and what have you. Already the various States are giving free rights-of-way to these utilities, permitting them to tear up along the sides of the highways, the shoulders, if you please, interrupting traffic and causing great inconvenience to the traveling public. We are already doing that.

Here someone is proposing through this study to do something else, and I think we might as well face the situation. We all realize that under this administration no one will deny it is anything but favorable to the public utilities. The Secretary of Commerce could very well next time bring in a report and a recommendation that we allocate a certain percentage of these funds to pay the public utilities for a part of the work which they should do themselves. I say that already we are giving the utilities enough when we grant them the privilege of using the right-of-way and when we subject ourselves to the inconvenience caused thereby.

For that reason, Mr. Chairman, I think my amendment should be adopted.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. GEORGE. Under existing law the utilities that are occupying their own rights-of-way can be reimbursed 50 percent under Federal aid. The gentleman's amendment will fix it so that no money whatever can be paid to the utilities.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. No. If they are occupying their own rights-of-way, yes, but practically all of this right-of-way is along State highways. It is not owned by the utility. They pay nothing for the use of it, they pay no rental or lease, they get it absolutely free, and I am not in favor of taking gasoline tax money to reimburse utilities for doing something they should be doing themselves.

Mr. GEORGE. That is the view of the majority of this committee, but the gentleman's amendment would change existing law.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. No. Under the present law they cannot use these funds for that because the State Highway Department does not include it as a part of the cost of construction. They make no application for Federal funds for that purpose. They are not paying it now and I do not want them to pay it in the future.

Mr. GEORGE. It is considered part of the highway in our State if they are occupying their own right-of-way and is to be charged against construction. If they are on a public right-of-way or on a highway that is an entirely different matter.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. The gentleman does not want to use part of this money to pay a public utility for moving a gas line or a cable line or anything like that, does he?

Mr. GEORGE. Not according to the telegrams I have been getting and according to the hearings. I conducted the hearings on this problem and they did not think I was on that side.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I am glad the gentleman is on my side and if that is the case I know he will support my amendment.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. JONES].

Mr. Chairman, we want to be fair with all segments of our economy, whether it is the labor group, the farm group, the utility group or whoever it might be. The committee had under discussion for many days, a proposal that 5 percent of the money authorized under this legislation be used for the relocation of utilities, both private and public. We did have a lot of evidence that there was a possible problem relative to utility relocations. Even those who do not believe in the utility program recognized that. We were informed that some of the small utility groups were made completely bankrupt by the relocation of highway systems. We decided that rather than make it a mandatory provision of 5 percent we would authorize a study in conjunction with the State highway departments and the Secretary of Commerce and other parties in interest. To me this is nothing more than fair.

Next year you can vote on it, whether you think it is right or whether you think it is wrong, but certainly these people are entitled to their term in court. May I say to my distinguished friend that many of the States are using State moneys for doing this very thing? I concur in the statement of my colleague from Kansas, that should this amendment prevail we would have to have some corrective amendments relative to State laws.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McGREGOR. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I would like to ask the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee who wrote the bill whether this provision would cover the case of an interstate pipeline company, for instance, transporting petroleum up here to Washington, or natural gas.

Mr. McGREGOR. I think it would, sir. They would come under the study, because we endeavored to make it broad. You will note "State highway departments and other parties in interest," so that they can report back to the Congress, I think it is, in February 1955.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McGREGOR. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. The gentleman will admit, though, that the Secretary of Commerce already has the authority to make this study, without directing it, and without providing an opening wedge for coming in for this percentage that you say a member of the committee already endorses.

Mr. McGREGOR. It is very much in question whether the Secretary of Commerce has authority. He might be going beyond his line of authority to make that investigation and have the right and privilege of calling in other interested parties. I am taking the position that I think they are entitled to a study being made.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McGREGOR. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. PRIEST. I thank the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee. This study would include, would it not, also the small utility districts that are entirely membership propositions; nonprofit? For example, a small water district organization may be adjacent to a large city but not a part of the city water system.

Mr. McGREGOR. I want to say to my distinguished colleague, and I do appreciate his interest, those are the very ones that caused some of the members of our committee to agree even to a study.

Mr. PRIEST. I fully agree with the gentleman, and I hope that the amendment will be rejected and the study be made, because I feel in that particular field there is certainly a case for a very real study to be made as it might affect the small utility districts.

Mr. McGREGOR. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, after some real authorities have spoken on this subject, like the chairman of the subcommittee, I hate to add any remarks here, but I rise in opposition to the amendment and would like to explain the situation with which my home town community is faced. My home town, the growing city of Jacksonville, Fla., owns many of the things which ordinarily are owned by private industry. Jacksonville owns its own public utilities and was faced very recently with a situation which shows up the inequity of the present legislation, because when a Federal highway was built through the center of the city of Jacksonville they paid the railroads for the small disturbance they made for them, but they entirely overlooked the municipal public utilities whose damages ran into millions of dollars. Now, so I am advised, the city of Jacksonville, if they had been placing this Federal highway, would not have placed it where it was placed. As a matter of fact, the State authority and the Federal authorities got together on a location which suited them just fine but it did not suit the city of Jacksonville at all, because this particular location cost the city a great deal of money in requiring the relocation of its utilities. If this location had been moved just a block to the right or to the left, it would not have cost nearly that much money. Should the Federal and the State governments be allowed to come into a city like Jacksonville and tell its public utility that it has to pay out $2 million for improving this road which this city would have preferred to be located elsewhere? That does not seem to me to be a proper and just procedure.

The approach to this problem which we of the Jacksonville area are advocating is embodied in H. R. 7897 which I introduced recently in the House. The first section of H. R. 7897 redefines "construction" as used in the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1944 to include "relocation and readjustment of utility facilities necessitated by the construction or reconstruction of the highway." Section 2 of my bill would put nonrailway utilities on an equal basis with railroad facilities, with the same limitation as to Federal funds which may be used for readjusting and relocating nonrailway utility facilities. Section 5 (b) of the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1944 provides a formula where railroads reimburse the United States for a small amount when it has been established that the railroad has received a net benefit from the project. However, there can be no net benefit to nonrailway utility facilities, so this proposed draft leaves the present provisions of law applicable to railway facilities exactly as they are, and adds the new provisos applicable alone to nonrailway utility facilities.

Section 2 of my bill makes the bill applicable only to Federal funds heretofore or hereafter apportioned to the States. This excludes any application of the proposed statute to Federal funds already expended.

Interest in this problem is shown by this committee including section 9 of the bill now before the House.

I believe the committee's study of this problem over the last 3 years and the study now underway by the committee give sufficient foundation for concrete action along the lines of H. R. 7897.

The problem in Jacksonville arising out of the construction of the Jacksonville Expressway is an illustration of the need for this legislation. The expressway is part of the Federal-aid system and as such has been recognized as a project built to defend our country and to facilitate interstate commerce. City officials tell me that the project was well underway before they were advised that these facilities would have to be moved, and that the city would have to bear the expense of relocation. This is an expense of one and a half to two million dollars. This thrusts upon the city the necessity of raising this money either by taxes or by increased utility rates. Both alternatives present complicated and difficult problems.

Briefly, there are several reasons why these expenses should be considered a part of the construction. First, the cost of alterations to railroads is already recognized as a legitimate part of the highway construction costs. There is no logical or ethical reason why such discrimination between railroad and nonrailroad utilities should be allowed to continue.

Second, the law as it now stands creates an inequity because in some States this Federal benefit is available and in others it is not. Whatever a State wants to do with its own highway system should be left up to the State involved, but a Federal benefit should not be withheld from a local utility on the basis of a State's highway policies.

Third, to allow the present condition to continue places a double burden on residents of the localities involved by requiring Federal taxation for support of the Federal highway system and also requiring increased local taxes or utility rates to pay for the Federal function of moving the utilities for the Federal highway.

At this point I include the provisions of H. R. 7897:

H. R. 7897

A bill to amend the laws relating to the construction of Federal-aid highways to provide for equality of treatment of railroads and other public utilities with respect to the cost of relocation of utility facilities necessitated by the construction of such highways by defining the term "construction" to include relocation and readjustment of utility facilities necessitated by the construction or reconstruction of such highways and by prescribing the extent to which Federal funds may be used for the relocation and readjustment of such utility facilities

Be it enacted, etc., That the definition of the term "construction" contained in the first section of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"The term 'construction' means the supervising, inspecting, actual building, and all expenses incidental to the construction or reconstruction of a highway, including locating, surveying, and mapping, costs of rights-of-way, relocation and readjustment of utility facilities necessitated by the construction or reconstruction of the highway, and elimination of hazards of railway-grade crossings."

SEC. 2. Section 5 (a) of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944, as amended, is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof a colon and the following: *Provided further*, That the entire cost of relocation and readjustment of nonrailway utility facilities necessitated by the construction or reconstruction of any highway with funds made available under the foregoing provisions of this act also may be paid from Federal funds, except that not more than 50 percent of the right-of-way and property damage costs, paid from public funds, on any such project, may be paid from Federal funds: *Provided further*, That not more than

10 percent of the sums apportioned to any State under the terms of this act for each fiscal year shall be used for the relocation and readjustment of such nonrailway utility facilities, to be expended in accordance with the Federal-Aid Highway Act, as amended and supplemented, and the provisions of this section."

SEC. 3. The foregoing provisions of this act shall be applicable with respect to all Federal funds heretofore or hereafter apportioned to each State for Federal-aid highway projects.

At this point I include a statement by Mayor Haydon Burns, of Jacksonville, in which he was joined by William Madison, city attorney for Jacksonville, both very able city officials:

THE EVER-EXPANDING PROGRAM OF FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY CONSTRUCTION MAKES REIMBURSEMENT OF COSTS OF READJUSTING UTILITY FACILITIES IMPERATIVE

A serious problem confronts utilities, with the exception of the railroads, whether they be public or private, in connection with the readjustment of their facilities attendant upon the construction and improvement of highways and railroad grade crossings where related to the improvement of the system of Federal-aid roads. The acceleration of public road construction under the Federal-aid highway program to meet the needs of interstate commerce and the national defense has made the problem one of urgent moment. These roads, containing double lanes, overpasses, underpasses, and cloverleafs require greater widths for rights-of-way and the extensive readjustment of utility facilities to accommodate them has imposed a cost burden that greatly overshadows that necessary to meet local road requirements. Such an imposition on nonrailroad utilities of relocation costs necessarily incurred under the Federal-aid program is unfair, burdensome, and inequitable to the users of utility services who, in the long run, will be forced to bear these costs.

FEDERAL FUNDS ARE AUTHORIZED FOR PAYMENT TO THE RAILROADS OF READJUSTMENT COSTS BUT ARE DENIED, UNDER THE GENERAL PRACTICE, TO ALL OTHER UTILITIES

The Federal Aid Highway Act of 1944 (58 Stat. 838; U. S. Code Cong. Service, 1944, p. 840) makes no specific provision for payment from Federal funds of any portion of the expense of relocating or readjusting the facilities of utilities which are located within highway rights-of-way and which must necessarily move to accommodate Federal-aid highway projects.

On the other hand, the Federal Aid Highway Act authorizes payment from Federal funds of costs in relocating facilities of railroads which are located within the highway right-of-way and which are included in Federal-aid grade crossing projects. The regulations of the Bureau of Roads relieve the railroads of making any contribution toward the elimination of railway-highway grade crossings in connection with Federal-aid projects, even where applicable State laws impose a duty on the railroads to bear a substantial part of the cost of eliminating such hazards at grade crossings.

Furthermore, the Bureau of Public Roads has consistently refused reimbursement to nonrailroad utilities except where State authorities determine that nonrailroad utilities are relieved of this obligation under State laws.

This ruling of the Bureau of Public Roads has prevailed even where the relocation of non-railroad-utility facilities was necessitated because of railway grade crossing elimination projects.

WHAT HAS BEEN DONE THROUGH CONGRESSIONAL ACTIVITY TO RELIEVE THE INEQUITABLE BURDEN PRESENTLY IMPOSED ON NONRAILROAD UTILITIES?

At the first session of the present Congress, the Subcommittee on Roads of the House Public Works Committee held extensive hearings under the authority of a resolution authorizing it to make a comprehensive study and review of the highway problem. On July 8, 1953, upon invitation of this subcommittee numerous representatives and spokesmen for public and privately owned utilities and cooperatives appeared before the subcommittee urging the enactment of legislation which would relieve utility users of the inequitable burden attendant upon relocation costs. Heading the list of those who appeared before the subcommittee was the representative of the National Association of Railroad and Utilities Commissioners which is an organization composed of Federal and State bodies which regulate utility activities and operations.

Among those appearing before the Subcommittee on Roads on this occasion were the representatives of the following organizations:

National Association of Railroad & Utilities Commissioners.
Bell System Telephone Companies.
National Institute of Municipal Law Officers.
American Transit Association.
United States Independent Telephone Association.
American Water Works Association.
Western Union Telegraph Co.
Tennessee Valley Public Power Association.
American Public Power Association.
Kansas City Power & Electric Co.
City of Nashville Public Works Department.
Michigan Consolidated Gas Co.
American Gas Association (Syracuse Suburban Gas Co., Inc.).
Consolidated Gas, Electric Light & Power Co. of Baltimore.
National Rural Electric Cooperative Association.
Cleveland Electric Illuminating Co.
Cincinnati Gas & Electric Co.
Dayton Power & Light Co.
Marietta Electric Co.
Ohio Edison Co.
Toledo Edison Co.
Columbus & Southern Ohio Electric Co.

There is now pending before the Public Works Committee of the Senate a bill introduced by Senator JOHNSON of Colorado (S. 1108), the purpose of which is to authorize reimbursement to nonrailroad utilities, of relocation costs incurred in connection with Federal-aid highway projects. This measure is similar to bills introduced in the 82d Congress by Senator McKellar and Representative DAVIS, both of Tennessee. No action was taken on S. 1108 by the committee during the 1st session of the 83d Congress.

ARGUMENTS ADVANCED BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON ROADS BY REPRESENTATIVES OF AFFECTED UTILITY GROUPS

I

The added costs and expenses made necessary by the relocation of utility facilities to accommodate Federal-aid highway projects constitutes a burden which must, in the final analysis, be borne by the subscriber, since the expense of furnishing utility services can only be realized through rates charged to and collected from subscribers of utility services.

The former Commissioner of Public Roads, Hon. Thomas H. MacDonald, in supporting the law authorizing reimbursement from Federal funds to railroads, stated, in testimony before the House Public Works Committee in 1944: "If funds were contributed by the railroads they would have to come from their earnings; that is, they would have to be gathered from the public." (Hearings before Committee on Roads, House of Representatives, 78th Cong., 2d sess., on H. R. 2426, vol. 2, p. 968.)

It is strongly urged that the same reasoning applies with equal force to users of nonrailroad utility services.

II

Utilities use the highway rights-of-way through grants of franchise rights by State and local governments. These grants were not made just to favor the utilities but that the public welfare might be enhanced through the development and extension of utility services throughout the several States. The use of the highways for utility purposes is a proper public purpose and function and is in the public interest.

Utility development would be retarded greatly and rates would be prohibitive for many citizens if utilities were forced to acquire private rights-of-way for a function essentially public in nature.

III

The use of Federal funds for Federal-aid highway purposes is primarily justified on the theory that these highways are constructed in the interest of national defense and interstate commerce for the general welfare. Taxes levied on the general public provide the funds thus expended. The nonrailroad utility subscriber, as a member of the general public pays his fair share of all Federal taxes, but must also pay, through rates charged for services, all costs and expenses incurred for the relocation of the utilities facilities. Thus the nonrailroad utility user makes a double contribution to the cost of Federal-aid highway construction—once in taxes and again in rates. He is thereby doubly taxed. Such a discrimination between classes of taxpayers is completely unjustified and discriminatory.

IV

The relocation of nonrailroad utility facilities is necessitated only because of the construction or reconstruction of a Federal-aid highway or railroad grade crossing in order to meet needs of the general traveling public. Utility subscribers receive no greater benefits from Federal-aid highway construction than any other user of the highway; no improvement in service results. Hence, relocation costs should be treated as a part of construction costs of the highway just as any other cost. For many years Congress has given recognition to this principle in connection with the relocating of railroad facilities. A different treatment for nonrailroad utilities is wholly unjustified.

V

There can be no argument against reimbursement of railroads for relocation costs in connection with Federal-aid highway projects. But thus relieving one utility, the railroads, of a burden left to be borne by other utilities is beyond defense on any sound basis. This unfair and inequitable discrimination is compounded when we consider that the railroad facilities create a hazard to the traveling public, but the facilities of other utilities are quite harmless from the standpoint of public safety.

It has been said that railroads should be reimbursed because their facilities are situated within private rights-of-way. If this were uniformly true the railroads would not need the benefit of Federal legislation since their rights would be protected under the eminent domain laws. Actually, whether the railroad facilities are on public or private right-of-way at the site of the highway-railway grade crossing is immaterial. The point is that virtually all States impose on railroads an obligation to bear all or a substantial part of the cost of relocating their facilities at railroad-grade crossings irrespective of whether the railroad is

on public or private right-of-way. The theory of these statutes is that the railroad creates the hazard to the public required to be eliminated, which justifies the imposition of these special burdens on them. Yet, the Federal-Aid Highway Act expressly relieves the railroads of that liability and provides reimbursement to the railroads for any relocation costs incurred by them in connection with Federal-aid projects. These circumstances further illustrate the justification for authorizing reimbursement to nonrailroad utilities of the relocation costs incurred by them in connection with Federal-aid projects.

VI

As a result of the expansion of the Federal-aid highway system, the problem of relocation cost is becoming serious to nonrailroad utilities. Roads geared to the needs of the national defense and interstate commerce replace local and State roads. The new and elaborate highways require greatly widened rights-of-way. The extensive relocation of utility lines, required by these superhighways, imposes on subscribers to utility services a substantial cost far in excess of that required to accommodate roads of a character suitable for local needs only.

VII

In recent years many States have passed statutes providing for the construction of freeways or turnpikes. These freeways or turnpikes are similar in size and character to Federal-aid highways. The State legislatures which have enacted such legislation have recognized that public utilities should be fully reimbursed for relocation costs made necessary by the construction of such freeways or turnpikes. The following States have acted in such a manner: Florida (1953), Georgia (1952), Kansas (1950), Kentucky (1953), Michigan (1953), New Jersey (1948), New York (1946), North Carolina (1951), Ohio (1949), Oklahoma (1953), Texas (1953), and Virginia (1952).

Hence, it may be observed that recognition is being accorded to the changing character of modern roadways as they affect the use and placement of utility facilities.

So many inquiries have been made by members of congressional committees, and properly so, regarding the costs involved in relocating nonrailroad utility facilities that for the purpose of developing information on the subject the National Association of Railroad and Utilities Commissioners suggested that a study be made to determine such costs. Twelve representative States were selected and certain information was obtained by committees composed of representatives from the various utilities both publicly and privately owned.

The study encompassed all Federal-aid highway projects completed in a recent 12-month period as well as the cost borne by each utility as a result of relocating facilities to accommodate each Federal-aid project excluding any cost resulting from improvement or betterment of the particular facilities.

This study reveals that the cost to all nonrailroad utilities of relocating facilities to accommodate Federal-aid highway projects was 2.34 percent of the total cost of such projects. While these costs pose serious problems for individual utilities, and their subscribers, they constitute a very small part, indeed, of the total cost of constructing Federal-aid highways.

Some suggestion was made during the course of the hearings in July before the Subcommittee on Roads that the exercise of greater care by highway authorities in the selection of routes would reduce the expense of relocation of nonrailway utility facilities below the figure mentioned in the preceding paragraph. Nothing could encourage such a result to a greater extent than the enactment of legislation authorizing reimbursement to the nonrailroad utilities of their relocation costs.

It has been contended that this cost added to the annual cost of the Federal-aid program would reduce the miles of roads which could be constructed. This argument overlooks every equitable principle involved in the matter. With equal force and justification it could be argued that private property owners should not be compensated from Federal funds because this likewise would reduce the funds which would otherwise be available for highway construction purposes. It is difficult to comprehend how such an argument could justify the unfair burden presently imposed on the subscribers of nonrailroad utility services who are forced to make a double contribution toward the cost of construction of Federal-aid highways, whereas they receive no benefits in excess of those received by the members of the public who only contributed once.

I would like to conclude by saying I certainly hope that the amendment of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. JONES] will be defeated, because this study is very greatly needed. I personally feel that much more than this should be done. I think the testimony before the committee shows that public utilities certainly need assistance at this time.

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. SCUDDER. Complaint was made before the committee that the engineers had put in a subterranean bypass where they might have relocated it somewhere else and put in an overpass. The plan of putting in the subterranean bypass disturbed all the utilities and caused a great amount of expense to the utility owners. If such a bill were passed it might result in the engineers being a little more careful how many utility lines they disturbed.

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. I thank the gentleman very much.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. JONES].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ROGERS of Colorado: On page 4, line 18, after "following manner", strike out the remainder of line 18 and all down to and including the word "system" in line 24 and insert the following: "In the manner now provided by law for apportionment of funds for the Federal-aid primary system: *Provided*, That no State shall receive less than three-fourths of 1 percent of the money so apportioned."

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, my amendment is merely to reinstate what I consider a successful operation under the apportionment of money under the present law. It is conceded that this change in apportionment is based one-half upon the population of the State and the other half upon the amount of roads in the respective States. My amendment, instead of taking one-half on the population and one-half on roads, would make it conform to the present law, where you take into consideration the three separate factors, the area, the roads, and the population.

I believe the Committee should consider that, this being a national defense highway, and that is what I understand the object and purpose of it is, a road in a sparsely settled part of the country is as essential as in other sections of the country. The best way I can illustrate it is that when the attack on Pearl Harbor occurred in 1941, when the roads were not able to carry much of the military equipment, the railroads out my way were loaded day after day and day after day with a full right-of-way of military equipment going to the west coast.

If the object and purpose of this legislation, and that is what they told me in the Committee here a moment ago, is to provide national defense highways, then why cannot we make it on a formula that will assure us that we will have an adequate highway defense system?

May I point out to this Committee that in my State of Colorado, where you have the Continental Divide from Wyoming down to New Mexico, you have a large range of mountains. We have 661 miles in the State of Colorado. If you are going to have a national defense highway, you are going to have to have some money to take care of those mountains and those problems.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. The purpose of the gentleman's amendment would be to take the $200 million interstate which we provide additionally in this bill and have it come under the existing formula as it stands now under the old law?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. That is right.

Mr. DONDERO. One-third, one-third, and one-third?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. That is right, because I think that the experience of this legislation since it was first enacted has proven that to be equitable and fair.

Mr. DONDERO. That would in no way recognize the populated sections of the country like the large cities where 40 percent of the traffic originates.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Except that you have changed the formula here where the Federal Government contributes 60 percent of the funds without the 50–50 basis, as I understand it, and now it is a 60–40 proposition. You have made available, as I believe you pointed out a moment ago in this bill, approximately $250 million more than at any other particular time to help take care of that situation. Now if you found the necessity of getting additional funds, as we are in this legislation, why do you want to change the formula which everybody has felt is satisfactory? That is the purpose of my amendment, and I feel it would supply a sufficient sum to the populated areas.

Mr. DONDERO. Of course, this matter was discussed at great length in committee, and I admit it comes to the floor as a matter of compromise. We divided the money—$100 million for the interstate system and $100 million to the urban centers.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. I compliment the gentleman. I know he has made a tremendous study of this problem and has come up with the formula that we have in this bill. I merely want to point out that with the wide spaces and with the tremendous amount of work you have to go through in building these roads through the mountains, if you are going to have any particular east-west national defense highways, then let us make adequate provisions for them. I think this amendment does so.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute amendment for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ROGERS].

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SCHERER as a substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. ROGERS of Colorado: On page 4, line 18, strike out all the language beginning with the word "following" down to and including the word "system" in line 24 and insert "ratio which the population of each State bears to the total population of all the States as shown by the latest available Federal census: *Provided*, That no State shall receive less than three-fourths of 1 percentum of the sum authorized to be apportioned each year under this subsection."

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Chairman, my amendment provides that the $200 million allocated for the interstate system be distributed on a population basis. I am going to repeat some of the things I said during the debate on the rule. The American Association of State Highway Officials, as I said before, recognizes that one of the most serious road problems in this country is the deplorable condition of the interstate system, which although it represents only 1 percent of the total road mileage in this country carries 20 percent of the traffic. These highway officials and the Department of Defense found that this system must be improved at once if it is to meet the future emergency needs and the present day commercial requirements of this country. They made an exhaustive study to determine how this system could best be improved. They came to the conclusion that the interstate system must be improved uniformly throughout the country. You cannot improve it in Colorado and in New Jersey and let it deteriorate in New Mexico. It must be a uniform improvement. It is not a question of miles or area. It is a matter of costs. The State highway officials of this country, who know more about highway problem than anyone else, proceeded to make a study on this basis. They determined the total cost necessary to bring this system up to the standards required to meet the defense needs of this country and also the commercial needs. They went further in this study and found out that the cost of doing this job in eight of the most populated States, is 51½ percent of the total cost, while the cost in the remaining 40 States is only 48½ percent of the total.

The gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ROGERS] forgets that you must take into consideration costs; that in the industrial areas or the highly populated States the average cost per mile of construction of these interstate highways is 7½ times the cost in the rural areas. As I said before the highway officials of 46 States, each State having 1 vote, recommend to this Congress that we distribute all of this money for the interstate system on a population basis.

You have to consider that there is an additional $600 million distributed on the old formula under which the so-called rural States get the break. They get a tremendous break on the distribution of the $600 million otherwise provided for in this bill.

Lastly, if we do what the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ROGERS] wants, we are going to have this result. The States where it costs 51½ percent of the total cost to do this job are going to get only 32.4 percent of the $200 milion. The States where the cost is only 48½ percent of the total cost are going to get 67.6 percent of the $200 million. If we are going to do this job properly, as the State highway officials recommend and as the Defense Department says, you have got to distribute the $200 million on a population basis.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendments.

Mr. Chairman, you can see what this committee has been going through for several months. I want to say in all sincerity that the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ROGERS] made an excellent statement in behalf of the rural areas. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SCHERER] made an excellent statement in behalf of the urban areas. If we had enough money to give them both what they want, I am sure the chairman would have more friends. But this bill, after weeks of discussion, came out, as I have said, a compromise right down the middle; that is, $200 million is authorized, $100 million of it being distributed on the basis of population, as desired by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SCHERER], and $100 million distributed on the formula of one-third, one-third, and one-third, as suggested by the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ROGERS].

I do not know of any fairer way to do it, and I hope that this committee will agree with the committee that has submitted this proposal that it is a fair distribution, because we recognize the needs of both and we cannot give either one of them all the money that they might wish.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McGREGOR. I yield to the distinguished floor leader.

Mr. HALLECK. I want to commend the chairman and all the members of the committee for the magnificent job they have done in bringing this bill before us. I think it is highly desirable from the standpoint of the interests of the country.

As to these amendments, what the gentleman has said is obviously correct. There are differences of opinion; but the committee, in my view, has done a good job of trying to work out a fair median balance. I agree with the gentleman that both of these amendments should be voted down.

Mr. McGREGOR. I thank the distinguished floor leader. I might say that the district of the gentleman from Ohio would probably get more money if we were to base the distribution on population, but I am trying to be fair. We are distributing it one-half on the basis of population and one-half on the basis of the old formula—a compromise recognizing the needs and problems of both rural as well as urban areas.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McGREGOR. I yield to my chairman.

Mr. DONDERO. Is it not a matter of fact that it was thoroughly discussed, that those gentlemen from the populous States could have taken the selfish point of view and insisted upon the full $200 million being distributed on a basis of population? But in order to compromise the matter in committee and bring the bill to the floor we yielded in our view.

Mr. McGREGOR. I think the gentleman's statement is equally applicable to the members of the committee from rural districts. They, too, could have been selfish and asked for the $200 million on the basis of area, but we agreed on 50 percent and that is what this legislation provides.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McGREGOR. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. I want to call to the attention of the chairman of the subcommittee and also of the full committee that a number of us from the smaller States supported the amendment in the subcommittee and in the full committee. We are united in opposing both amendments presented here and hope the committee bill will be voted up.

Mr. McGREGOR. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. JONAS of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McGREGOR. I yield.

Mr. JONAS of North Carolina. Will the gentleman tell me whether his committee took any testimony bearing upon the question of grade-crossing elimination?

Mr. McGREGOR. No. We discussed grade-crossing eliminations as far as railroads and toll roads were concerned, but we made no change in the existing law relative to grade-crossing eliminations.

Mr. JONAS of North Carolina. That is the 1952 act provides that State highway commissions may in their discretion use some of these funds for this purpose, as I understand.

Mr. McGREGOR. That is correct.

Mr. JONAS of North Carolina. And this bill does not change that in any way.

Mr. McGREGOR. We did not change it in any way; and I think that the committee will agree with me.

Mr. OAKMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McGREGOR. I yield.

Mr. OAKMAN. I agree with the chairman of the Subcommittee on Roads, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McGREGOR]. I would like very much to see the substitute offered by the gentleman from Ohio

[Mr. SCHERER] carried, for in my district we are building a hundred miles of the interstate system at a cost of $8 million a mile, over a total cost of $800 million. Out in the open country that is equivalent to 4,000 miles of road. So from the standpoint of equity I should have to go along with the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SCHERER], but realizing that good legislation is usually a matter of compromise I lend my voice to that of the chairman, hoping now that both of these amendments will be defeated, and that the committee bill will be approved.

Mr. McGREGOR. I thank the gentleman very much.

I want to reiterate my hope that the substitute amendment offered by my friend from Ohio be defeated, as well as the amendment offered by my friend from Colorado so that we may go down the line and be equitable in the distribution of the funds authorized in this legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SCHERER].

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question recurs on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ROGERS].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MARTIN of Iowa: Page 5, line 10, change the colon to a period and strike out all that follows through line 20.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, as a member of the Ways and Means Committee, I reluctantly approved the extension of the 2-cent-a-gallon Federal gasoline-tax rate enacted in 1951. I did this only because I was convinced that there was no other recourse. The extreme revenue needs of the Federal Government made it impossible to carry out the scheduled reduction in this tax.

However, I certainly cannot condone the clause in this bill, which would connect the Federal gasoline tax with the grants for the interstate-highway system.

The Federal gasoline tax is a general-revenue tax, imposed upon all uses of gasoline. It never has been in any way connected with highways or with the use of the highways.

A 1-cent-per-gallon tax was imposed in 1932 as a 1-year temporary emergency measure to balance the budget. It has been extended, reenacted, and increased for other general-revenue emergency purposes. In 1940 the tax was increased to 1½ cents a gallon to raise revenue for the national-defense buildup. In 1951 the rate went up to 2 cents as part of the series of tax increases prompted by the Korean war. The Ways and Means Committee has recommended that this 2-cent increase be continued to meet the present unavoidable revenue needs of the Federal Government.

It may be, and I am sure we all hope it will be, possible to reduce this tax as general revenue needs abate. But certainly I do not think it would be either proper or wise for us to nail this tax into the Federal highway-aid program. This is my last year on the Committee on Ways and Means. It is the prerogative of the Ways and Means Committee to recommend tax rates to Congress. I do not see how the committee can continue to exercise that prerogative if other committees attempt to link certain taxes with certain programs and specify the rates.

Regardless of what the situation of the country might be or the desires of Congress, some people might contend that we would be bound by the terms of this bill to retain the Federal gasoline tax at 2 cents per gallon at least until September 30, 1955, and that the alternative would be to strip the Federal-aid program of grants for the vital interstate highway system.

Mr. Chairman, the Federal tax on gasoline is not a highway tax either in intent or in effect. Gasoline is not strictly a fuel for highway vehicles. It is used in aviation, in motorboats, in industry, in tractors and other farm machinery.

Take the situation in my State, for example. According to figures of the United States Bureau of Public Roads, nearly 220 million gallons of gasoline were consumed in Iowa for nonhighway purposes during 1952. That means the Federal gasoline tax costs the people of my State more than $4 million a year on motor fuel that is not consumed on the highways at all. Furthermore, the Bureau reports that nearly a hundred and ninety-nine million of these gasoline gallons were consumed by farmers in agricultural machinery and equipment used off the highways.

The figures will vary but the facts will be the same for any State that has aviation, boating, factories, or farms.

If we break with precedent and tradition by linking the Federal gasoline tax with any part of Federal highway aid, we will be ignoring the true nature and uses of gasoline. We will be creating a precedent that could bring increasing demands upon us to link other taxes with other Federal programs until at last Congress is deprived of all initiative in the establishment of tax rates.

Mr. Chairman, I ask that the full implications of this provision in the bill be seriously weighed. It serves no useful purpose and carries a potential for enduring harm. That is why I believe this amendment to strike that clause out of the bill merits our wholehearted approval.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. COLMER. The gentleman, of course, is speaking for the deletion of this provision having to do with the 2-cent gasoline tax. The gentleman is a very important member of the Ways and Means Committee. He is familiar with the fact that the Ways and Means Committee has reported legislation which will be considered on the floor this week providing under a closed rule for continuation of that half-cent excise tax. That was the sole reason, as I understand it, why this provision was written into the pending bill in the beginning.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

(At the request of Mr. PRIEST, and by unanimous consent, Mr. MARTIN of Iowa was allowed to proceed for 5 additional minutes.)

Mr. COLMER. I will ask the gentleman if it is not true that we have every reason to assume, the condition of the Treasury being what it is and the desire of the administration and others to balance the budget, that the other body will also continue that tax when it gets over there?

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. I expect it to be continued in this present bill.

Mr. COLMER. What we are doing here is setting a precedent, nailing this thing down, linking up the tax with Federal aid to roads?

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. The gentleman is correct. As I have stated here, much of the gasoline is used on the farm and off the highways. There is no logic in tying that tax to the road. I might add that I fought against the automotive tax increase in 1951 also, and that yields almost as much money or practically the same amount of money as the gasoline tax. I do not know how this committee happened to single out the gasoline tax to tie down for a specific use. I take it it would be just as logical to include the other taxes that are connected with the use of highways. I have always fought against all such earmarking very strongly.

Mr. COLMER. Is there any question in the distinguished gentleman's mind that once this gets into this bill and becomes a part of the legislation but what it will remain there for the rest of the time as permanent legislation?

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Yes, and it will be used as leverage against future action by the Committee on Ways and Means or subject that committee to the charge that they are exercising jurisdiction over road building policies if they lower the tax rate on gasoline hereafter.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. I agree with the gentleman in the serious question he raised about this. I would like to ask: Does the language there serve any good purpose? Without it, you will still have the same road program, and without it the House will still get an opportunity to act affirmatively on the gasoline tax in the other bill, is that not correct?

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. The gentleman is correct, absolutely. The adoption of this amendment will not cut down the authorization at all. It only cuts out the provision tying it to a specific excise tax, which provision does not serve any good purpose.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. McGREGOR. I notice my distinguished friend was commenting relative to the other body. We hate to lose him, but we hope he goes to the Senate. But, let me call his attention to this fact. He

does not know and neither does the present speaker know what they are going to do in the other body. My distinguished friend stated that he was always opposed to this half-cent additional tax. I might ask him, is this his way of trying to do away with the half-cent tax?

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. No, this is one of the ways that we might avoid unfair pressure on the Committee on Ways and Means if that committee gives further consideration to a change in the gasoline tax.

Mr. McGREGOR. Had the committee not voted out the bill, I am sure that is true, but that bill was voted out, so all we are doing now is saying "Give us the revenue and we will give you the roads." I would like to ask the gentleman if we do away with this half-cent tax, where are we going to get the money for those roads?

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. COOPER. I am sure the gentleman will agree that this is an authorization bill. Now, when you come along with an appropriation for these funds for highway purposes, are you certain that a conditional authorization is going to be sufficient to secure the appropriation? As you well know, a point of order can be made against an appropriation that is not authorized by law. Now you are raising the question about a conditional authorization for an appropriation. The purpose here is to carry on the Federal-State highway program. When you impose a condition of this type, you are establishing a new precedent that might serve to cause difficulty in the future.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I will say that we possibly are establishing a precedent, because we are going to assure the highway users that we are going to spend the money that they pay as a tax on gasoline on roads. That is a precedent.

Mr. COOPER. Why not bring in a bill to that effect? Why jeopardize your Federal-aid highway program by having a questionable provision of this type included in an authorization bill?

Mr. McGREGOR. The distinguished chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means made the statement awhile ago in which he took exactly the opposite view of the gentleman.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if we cannot agree upon a limitation of time on this amendment and all other amendments to the bill. I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the bill and all amendments thereto terminate in 10 minutes.

Mr. WITHROW. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, and I shall object, if the gentleman will recall I asked him for time during general debate and I was allocated 3 minutes, and finally I could not use that. I want 5 minutes.

Mr. DONDERO. Then, Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the bill and all amendments thereto close at 5 o'clock, which will allow 20 minutes, the last 5 minutes to be reserved to the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maine [Mr. NELSON].

Mr. NELSON. Mr. Chairman, during the course of the general debate I tried to find out whether or not there was linkage in this bill between this authorization bill and the tax on gasoline. I was assured there was none. If there is not linkage with the gas tax, there certainly is a very well prepared system of cross-reference. This debate well illustrates what happens when you tie in an authorization bill with a particular tax. What we have been debating here today is not so much the need for this Federal aid to highways as where the money is coming from. Thus provisions of the bill have been tied in time after time with the gas tax. It is a function of the Committee on Public Works to authorize needed highway aid. It is up to the Appropriations Committee to find the money.

Once you say that all of the tax from a given source shall be used for highways, it immediately follows that then only the tax from that source will be used for highways. The result is immediately that you cannot meet the needs. The result in this case would be that you could use the gas tax only for highways, and then you would either have to increase the gas tax or let the highways be neglected or, if the gas tax is repealed, cut out Federal aid entirely.

This linkage should not be written into law. If you write it into law in this bill, you will be writing it into law for the first time and setting a definite precedent.

The Federal gas tax is not a tax based on user. This linkage means that in the highway program those from the most populous sections will pay through the gas tax to build highways in the less populous States. Perhaps people would prefer to pay it through the income tax. It would undoubtedly be more equitable. They do not doubt that these highways should be built, but this is a basic question which should not be discussed on a bill like this. We have listened all day to a discussion about interstate highways and the primary duty of the Federal Government to contribute to the cost of construction of such interstate highways. We have been told that the Federal Government has a duty to build these interstate highways, and that we are in crying need of building them, but then the provision this amendment would strike says the Federal Government cannot and will not discharge that duty unless it continues to receive income from the 2-cent gas tax. There could be no more effective argument against linking our Federal-aid program to a particular tax. The principle of linking the gas tax with aid for roads is entirely wrong. It should not be considered in this bill.

The bill is a fine bill otherwise. I compliment the chairman of the committee on it and the chairman of the subcommittee, who have worked very hard to bring this bill out. It is a very excellent job. But let us not set a precedent which may adversely affect our highway program by putting this linkage provision into the bill.

The only reason given for this provision that I have heard is that it will force the other body to vote for extension of the 2-cent gas tax. This result it will not accomplish. But it goes further. It is a direct blow aimed at our many State Governors, who have advocated that the Federal Government get out of the gas-tax field. By this linkage you say to them in effect, "Give up your ideas or you will lose 200 million a year for interstate highways."

The Federal gas tax was never designed to be used only for roads. It should not be so restricted. Nor should the responsibility of the Federal Government for highways be limited to the extent of the revenue that is received from a gas tax, if any.

The gentleman from Ohio asked what the Senate will do with the excise tax. I say the first thing the Senate will do is take this provision out of this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maine [Mr. HALE].

Mr. HALE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN]. It is not necessary for me to recapitulate the arguments these gentlemen have used. They seem to me completely sound.

The use of gasoline is not confined to highways. It would be perfectly logical to say that the proceeds of the gasoline tax should be used for the construction of airports since airplanes use gas. It would be perfectly logical to say that the proceeds of the gasoline tax should be used for harbor improvements, because harbor improvements are utilized by vessels, and vessels nowadays are fueled predominantly by gasoline.

Further, I think it is a thoroughly pernicious precedent to have an attempt made to have one committee of the Congress coerce another committee of the Congress in this way.

I think we ought to vote on highway legislation in a highway bill and on excise tax legislation in a tax bill, appropriately reported by the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALE. I yield.

Mr. PRIEST. Would it not be just as logical for the gentleman and me and other members of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, which tomorrow will bring before the House a bill authorizing some appropriations for the hospital construction act, to require that certain revenues from certain excise taxes be used for that purpose insofar as establishing a precedent is concerned?

Mr. HALE. Of course, the whole idea of earmarking, sometimes called dedication, seems to me completely false. Or to take another example, you might say that the automobile excise tax should be used entirely on highways. No proposition of that kind has been made. I have not myself seen the bill, which will be here on Wednesday from the Committee on Ways and Means. Neither I

nor anybody else knows what the House will do on that measure, still less what will be done on the measure in the other Chamber or by the Chief Executive.

I append certain telegrams recently received on this legislation:

AUGUSTA, MAINE, *March 6, 1954.*

Hon. ROBERT HALE,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building:

Maine State Grange has repeatedly urged withdrawal of Federal Government from field of gasoline taxation. New Federal Aid Highway Act making portion of Federal aid dependent on continuance of tax at 2-cent level contrary to policy of both National and Maine State Grange. Urge your strong opposition to portion of H. R. 8127 linking Federal aid with motor-fuel tax.

MAYNARD C. DOLOFF,
Master, Maine State Grange.

AUGUSTA, MAINE, *March 8, 1954.*

Representative ROBERT HALE,
House Office Building:

We urge you to oppose highway-aid legislation which would tie appropriations to Federal gasoline tax revenue. Federal gasoline tax should be eliminated and left to States and Federal aid to highways should be continued because of national defense, mail delivery, interstate commerce, and general welfare. These are not responsibilities of highway uses alone but of all the people. Farmers can see no reason to pay Federal tax on gasoline used in farming operations.

MAINE FARM BUREAU ASSOCIATION,
C. WILDER SMITH, *President, Cutler, Maine.*

PORTLAND, MAINE, *March 5, 1954.*

Hon. ROBERT HALE,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

We earnestly request your consideration of our views on H. R. 8127, proposed Federal Aid Highway Act. Section 2A, page 4, printed bill calls for earmarked funds for national system of interstate highways which we have long advocated and hope you will support. Section 2A, page 5, calls for 60 percent matching share for same funds. We urge that this be increased to 75 percent. Same section and page makes earmarked interstate authorization available only if present 2-cent Federal gas tax continued. This involves linkage and is highly undesirable. It would also make Federal-highway aid legislation contingent on tax legislation handled by different congressional committee and would adversely affect urban highway planning. May we have your views.

Thanks.

MAINE AUTOMOBILE ASSOCIATION.
ARLYN E. BARNARD.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. WITHROW].

Mr. WITHROW. Mr. Chairman, I favor the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN]. I believe that if we do not adopt the amendment we will be doing that which every Congress since 1932 scrupulously avoided doing. In 1932 the subcommittee of the Committee on Ways and Means on double taxation had this to say. This was in December of 1932:

When the gasoline tax was first discussed in the House of Representatives, it was felt by many that this field of taxation was fully occupied by the States and should be left to them. The House did not include this tax in the revenue bill as transmitted to the Senate. The Senate, however, in the light of later figures as to deficit and as to the probable tax yield, was obliged to amend the bill by including a tax upon gasoline, and that was accepted by the House.

Then, the following year, during the hearings on the Federal gasoline tax, when it was being considered by the House Committee on Ways and Means, the Honorable Robert J. Doughton, who was then chairman of the committee, had this to say. This was in 1933. I quote:

This was an emergency tax measure. I am sure the Congress was reluctant to propose a tax on gasoline, but in order to balance the budget, the Congress felt it was necessary temporarily to impose a tax of 1 cent a gallon on gasoline over the objection of the House. It was passed in the Senate, and we concurred in it because they said the whole structure of government would perish if the budget was not balanced, and we were, too, anxious to balance it, and, consequently, in the rush of the close of the session of Congress and to balance the budget, we imposed the gasoline tax.

Despite the good intention of the Congress that imposed this temporary tax on gasoline, it was not permitted to expire on schedule. In 1933, the new Congress extended the tax, again on a temporary basis only, and increased its rate to 1½ cents per gallon as part of the National Industrial Recovery Act. Again, there was no pretense that this was a road tax; it was a general revenue tax. The additional one-half cent tax was permitted to expire on December 31, 1933, so the rate reverted to 1 cent per gallon. From then until July 1940, the tax was reimposed again and again at that rate, in order to meet the emergency requirements of a continuing depression.

In 1940 the tax was once more increased to 1½ cents a gallon. The Nation was recovering from the depression; but we now faced the necessity of building our military strength. The tax increase was for this avowed purpose. This tax money was needed for general-fund purposes, and there was no allegation that it was for the purpose of highway aid.

From 1940 until 1951 the tax continued at the 1½-cent rate. The fact that normal highway construction halted completely during the war years and regular Federal highway aid was suspended, serves to emphasize that the Federal gasoline tax had no connection with Federal highway aid.

In November 1951 the Federal gasoline tax was boosted to its present rate of 2 cents per gallon. Here again, the tax increase was not alleged to be for highway aid, but rather as a part of a schedule of general tax increases to raise revenue for the stepped-up defense program occasioned by the Korean war.

The history of the Federal gasoline tax speaks for itself. It shows beyond any possible question that this is and has always been a straight out general revenue tax, imposed and increased to meet general governmental emergencies. This is further emphasized by the fact that the tax applies not only to highway use of gasoline but to all gasoline, including that used in industry and agriculture.

It is a distortion of history to claim that there has ever been the slightest connection between Federal taxation of gasoline and Federal highway aid to the States. It is not only erroneous but even dangerous to suggest that the Federal gasoline tax be linked with future Federal highway aid to the States. The linkage theory upsets the very principle of Federal highway aid and jeopardizes its continuance on a sound basis.

One warning to this effect comes from the Honorable Wilburn Cartwright, who was chairman of the House Roads Committee from 1934 to 1943 and who, along with Senator CARL HAYDEN, was coauthor of a succession of Federal highway aid acts. In 1940, Representative Cartwright made a statement that offers food for reflection to all who espouse Federal gasoline tax linkage. He said:

The participation of the Federal Government in the improvement of highways in coperation with the States, using general Treasury funds therefor, is amply justified on the grounds of * * * national defense, post roads, and interstate commerce. When the first Federal Aid Road Act was passed in 1916, neither the States nor the Federal Government had levied any special taxes, commonly known as road-user taxes, such as the taxes on gasoline, lubricating oils, and motor vehicles.

I think it is important that these broader reasons for justifying Federal participation in highway construction be not even tacitly abandoned by road advocates by putting too much emphasis on the relationship between road authorizations and road-user tax revenues. There might come a time when these taxes would not be levied, but that would not, in my opinion, remove the justification for further Federal participation in road improvements.

It will be noted that Representative Cartwright mentioned Federal taxes on lubricating oil and motor vehicles, as well as the tax on gasoline. As a matter of fact, there is a whole series of Federal excises on automobiles, trucks and buses, parts and accessories, tires and tubes—which produce over a billion dollars a year in revenue over and above the $935 million yielded by the Federal gasoline and diesel fuel taxes.

Like the Federal gasoline tax, these automotive excises have no connection whatever with the Federal aid highway program. Like the Federal gasoline tax, they are emergency general excises which have been raised and lowered from time to time without any reference whatever to highway aid grants.

The nature of all these taxes underlines the lack of logic in singling out the Federal tax on gasoline as a highway tax. This fuel is used in farm tractors, boats, stationary engines and aircraft, as well as in vehicles using the highways. The Federal tax is paid on nonhighway use as well as highway use.

The linkage theory logically means that the gasoline tax would become a highway use tax—it means that nonhighway use of gasoline should be exempt from the tax. In the interests of justice, the Federal Government would be obligated to refund the tax on all gasoline used for nonhighway purposes, such as in industry and agriculture. Besides reducing receipts from

the tax, this would add enormously to collection costs. It would require the creation of another Federal bureau to process the enormous volume of refund applications.

Consumers who use gasoline on farms and in factories would be burdened with the complex report filing essential to running a tax refund system.

But this would be only one problem of many brought on by tax linkage. With a stepped-up program of Federal highway aid, linked to Federal gasoline tax receipts, it is easy to foresee endless bickering over Federal-aid allocation formulas.

The densely populated, heavily traveled States would demand Federal grants equal to the gasoline tax money collected within their borders. The States with large areas and sparse populations would continue to expect larger-than-average grants because the original purpose of Federal highway aid was to help them most of all. And this would be only the beginning of the problem. Political subdivisions within each State would be making their demands, too.

A linkage of Federal excise taxes with Federal aid for highways will place Congress in the position of a glorified road commission which will be required to act as referee between the repeated and continuous demands of the several States as well as the political subdivisions within each of the States. Linkage, which on the surface appears to be an easy way out, would create many more problems than it solves. In fact, it would be the beginning of a succession of problems where the referee will never make a decision to the liking of the participants, and the decision will be reappealed and reargued every 2 years. Linkage is not the solution to the problem; rather, it will be the beginning of a multitude of new problems.

If this linkage theory is ever accepted, it will establish a precedent for a rash of other proposals to link other Federal taxes with specific beneficiaries for each tax collected by the Government. Congress has enough problems without borrowing more of them by adopting the linkage theory.

These facts support only one conclusion: Federal gasoline tax linkage is not a program or principle. It is a gigantic fallacy—unfounded in fact and unworkable in practice.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS].

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment. I am going to try to get away from the subject of the particular tax involved because I feel the danger here is the precedent which is being set of trying to tie one particular tax in with any particular purpose. In fact, I question whether it is constitutional to do such a thing. This is just a method of getting around a very basic constitutional provision which as I read it says that taxes may be raised for general revenue purposes. I submit that if you tie it to this, you are going to tie it to other things as we go along, and we are going to disrupt our whole system of taxation completely.

I should like to make one other suggestion to the Committee on Public Works. Although they might think they were putting pressure on the Committee on Ways and Means, it will work in the opposite way because this is, in effect, turning over to the Committee on Ways and Means the power of saying whether or not you are going to have your highway program. Let us not tie in any more taxes with specific programs to give to the Ways and Means Committee additional power. We already have unemployment insurance and social security because this procedure was followed. As a member of that committee I do not believe we want to get into the business of providing roads and of making decisions in this field. I suggest that this amendment be approved and that in the future we do not attempt to tie any particular tax in with a particular program.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. GEORGE].

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me if we do not adopt the committee proposal we are going to do one of two things. We are going to turn down this expanded highway program or else we are going to create a larger deficit in the Federal budget. It resolves itself into something just as simple as that, as far as I am concerned.

During the past several years we have had a diversion of the use tax which in most States they think is to be used on their State and national highway system. It has amounted to between $400 and $500 million a year for the last several years. If we, as Members of Congress, had been doing our duty over a period of years, we would have seen to it that that money went back on the highways because the figures show that we have killed more people on our highways in the last 20 years than were killed in our wars. It means that we are not staying on top of our job. I hope the committee will stay with the Committee on Public Works in this proposal, and perhaps we can work out something better 2 years from now.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK].

(Mr. MCCORMACK, by unanimous consent, yielded his time to Mr. HAYS of Arkansas.)

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Chairman, I am reluctant to take any time at all but, as a minority member of the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, I have been impressed with the fact that students of this problem, who are primarily interested in the point of view of the States, are universally opposed to the principle of linkage of the gasoline tax and Federal authorizations. The chairman of the subcommittee has done an excellent job with this bill, and I am for it, and I would not say anything derogatory of the bill as a whole. But I think we could improve this legislation, and I trust that the chairman of the subcommittee will not feel that those of us who offer criticism on this point fail to appreciate the splendid work that has been done by the Public Works Commission. It would set a thoroughly bad precedent if we should adopt the idea of linkage, which could spread to other types of legislation.

It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that the logic of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN] is irrefutable, and that we will be perfecting this legislation to eliminate the principle of linkage and stick strictly to a Federal-aid program extending to all phases of highway legislation. For that reason I shall support the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I have not given a great deal of attention to the merits of this particular amendment. I would like to say just a few words as to the overall meaning of this bill.

It has been testified here today that we lose on our highways annually 33,300 people and that the financial loss is $3,950,000,000, owing to the inadequacy of our highways. It was also testified, I think by our colleague from the State of Washington, that two-fifths of this loss, both in human life and in property, is due to the inadequacy of our highway system.

Breaking these figures down to date it is something like this: Our financial loss is $3,950,000,000 per year due altogether to this inadequacy. In 2 years—and we are making this appropriation for 2 years—it is double that, or $7,950,000,000. These are losses we are dealing with, losses due to inadequacy that this House admittedly is responsible for. Let us think of it, Mr. Chairman. That means that every day, this day in which are living here and discussing this bill 36 people are being killed on our highways on account of things that we have failed to do; that is two-fifths of the entire number. One hundred and more were killed yesterday and today and will be killed tomorrow.

I have heard the argument put forth that there is not enough road equipment in existence to make use of a larger appropriation. I submit that that problem will shortly be solved once an appropriation shall be made. How long, Mr. Chairman, do you suppose it would be if Congress were to double the appropriation proposed in this bill until the manufacturers of road-building equipment would call back on the job the thousands of men recently dismissed from employment? How long would it be until additional facilities for manufacture would be under construction? There is no avenue of increasing business actively and consequent employment equal to this opportunity in existence, because it will result in the immediate saving of human life and property.

I favor the passage of this bill, but I regret that no member of the committee has seen fit to introduce an amendment to double or treble the amount of money to be appropriated. I am convinced the American people would heartily approve such a measure.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO].

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, if this bill had come to the floor next Wednesday and the bill from the Committee on Ways and Means had been on

the floor today, it is quite possible that all the debate and argument we have listened to would not have been heard at all.

As I stated earlier in the day, the half-cent a gallon gasoline tax yields $225 million a year. If that be not reenacted it means that the income instead of being $906 million a year would be about $700 million. Then if this bill be enacted at $875 million we would far exceed all of the income from the gas tax.

We are saying to the people of this country by this provision—call it linkage if you will—we want to give you good roads; we want to take the money that you paid for using the roads and spend it on the highways—I mean the gas tax that you pay for the gasoline you buy, we want to take it and spend it on the roads. You cannot spend it if you do not pay it; you cannot spend it if this bill is not passed, to continue the two-cent a gallon tax. The one question that is involved, and that is the old controversy, namely, if you want roads then provide the money to pay for them. If you do not link the half-cent gas tax but still enact this bill you have a spread of $450 million throwing the budget out of balance more than ever before because the income from such tax would be $225 million less while the bill provides $225 million more for roads.

What is wrong with this language? What harm does it do? Should the tax bill be passed as recommended, the language sought to be stricken out would be meaningless. We accomplished what we seek to do—morally to indicate that the money which comes from the gas tax shall be used for the building of roads; but we must have the tax continued if we are to have better highway facilities.

For the reasons stated—I will not take more time, Mr. Chairman—I ask that the amendment be voted down and call for a vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MARTIN of Iowa) there were—ayes 70, noes 70.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. DONDERO and Mr. MARTIN of Iowa.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 80, noes 93.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. NICHOLSON, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 8127) to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 460, he reported the bill back to the House.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk, in engrossing the bill H. R. 8127, be authorized to capitalize the word "commerce" on page 3, line 5, to correct a typographical error.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may be permitted to revise and extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

HOUR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. HALLECK. 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 Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, there are no special orders granted for tomorrow after the conclusion of the day's business. I trust that we can, if possible, avoid any special orders because we, on our side, desire to have a conference after the bill is disposed of tomorrow.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts asked and was granted permission to address the House for 5 minutes today, following any special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. VAN PELT asked and was given permission to address the House for 5 minutes today, following any special orders heretofore entered.

EXCISE TAX ON AUTOMOBILES

Mr. OAKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. OAKMAN. Mr. Speaker, the automobile today is as necessary to the average workingman as his dinner pail. On Wednesday of this week the House will have before it H. R. 8224, the Excise Tax Reduction Act of 1954. This brings up a measure which in one of its elements contains a gross inequity. This inequity will have a direct material bearing on 1 out of every 7 productive workers in this Nation. This is the number of workers it is said receive their paycheck directly or indirectly from the automotive industry. I believe that, when this inequity is clearly pointed up to the committee, the only course of action would be for the Ways and Means Committee, through its chairman, to offer or accept an amendment to rectify the injustice.

I am speaking of the continuation of the 10-percent excise-tax rate on passenger cars and the 8-percent excise tax on trucks, buses, trailers, parts and accessories. As it is generally known, by law the excise tax on passenger cars was to have been automatically reduced from 10 percent to 7 percent and on trucks, buses, trailers, parts and accessories from 8 percent to 5 percent on April 1. These 3 percentage points were added to the excise tax on these commodities in 1951. It was clearly recognized by the Congress at that time that these were excessive, temporary rates that in all equity should be reduced when this country was no longer on an extreme emergency basis.

Not only does this bill continue this exorbitant tax but it performs the additional injustice of not establishing a definite cutoff date when such increases will be eliminated.

It has been said that the existence of a termination date on an excise tax in an act of Congress only invites a buyers' strike. An example has been cited to the effect that automobile dealers today have organized to stop accepting deliveries from manufacturers simply because the tax was scheduled to go down April 1. Mr. Speaker, I contend that the simple solution to this phase of a buyers' strike can be accomplished by including in the bill a provision for an automatic refund to the dealers of stocks on hand as of the effective date of the reduction in tax. This has been the case historically upon the termination or reduction of excise taxes.

The question logically follows then, Would there not be a public buyers' strike as opposed to a dealers' buyer strike? The Ways and Means Committee in its report has clearly stated that it is its intention to take another look at the rates on these items next year. Surely the existence of this intention would have as serious an effect on the buying public as the existence of a termination date in the act itself.

In the first session of the 83d Congress, I introduced a bill calling for the complete elimination of excise taxes on the items under discussion—H. R. 3186. I still believe that such action

is prudent and proper. Automotive excise taxes are unfair to millions of workers, particularly to the lower-income group who comprise more than 75 percent of the passenger-car owners. They are discriminatory against makers and owners. This is true because the tax is so highly selective and departs from the normal concept of uniformity of treatment. Excise taxes represent a threat to demand and employment. The automobile in our economy is clearly not a luxury but has been proven definitely to be a necessity. The universal high rate of use testifies to this point. As of mid-1953 there was 1 passenger car for every 4 persons in this country or 1 car for every 1.1 families.

Clearly a strong case can be made for the elimination of excise taxes on automotive items, but I am not politically naive enough to think that this action is practicable to the extent of full accomplishment or realization at the moment. Rather, I will content myself with the argument that the inequity and injustice contained in this bill should be corrected here and now. Surely the arguments for repeal speak eloquently for such correction.

Actually, this represents an inequity heaped on injustice since this same bill provides for a drastic reduction in the excise tax on luxury items. At the same time, an exorbitant rate is continued, not reduced, on automotive items, which are clearly not luxury items. Historically, excise taxes were imposed on automotive items in periods when their purchase was being discouraged because of shortage of materials. Surely, no such argument can be made today and it should be abundantly clear that an incentive rather than a detriment should be given to this vital industry.

We have heard much of an endeavor to obtain a uniform excise or manufacturer's tax on all items produced. The reduction of all excise taxes to a common level, namely, 10 percent, contained in this bill begins to look like a move in the direction of a standard excise tax. Can it be that this is the basic reason for the refusal to accept a termination date on these 3 percentage points on automotive items? If so, surely this is not the proper solution to this problem. Such a tax must be measured in the light of all the circumstances and in totality, and then only with due deliberation.

It is, therefore, my contention that the Committee should adopt an amendment to this bill, H. R. 8224, which would provide for the automatic reduction not later than April 1, 1955, of the tax on passenger cars from 10 percent to 7 percent, and on trucks, buses, trailers, parts, and accessories, from 8 percent to 5 percent. In addition, this amendment should provide that stocks of such items in the hands of dealers on said date will be the subject of a tax refund.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS ON FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY ACT OF 1954

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks in the RECORD on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, as a sponsor of the Mississippi River Parkway legislation, I am happy to know that the Committee on Public Works has included an authorization of $250,000 in the bill before us today to assist the States in expediting the planning of the Great River Road.

This great riverside highway following the Mississippi River from its source to the sea will not only welcome travelers seeking history and scenery but it will link Minnesota and the Gulf of Mexico with a defenseway through the heart of our continent. With agriculture and industry thriving along the river, there is a steadily growing need for such a midcontinent thoroughfare.

The splendid record of Federal-State cooperation which has marked all of the planning by the 10 great States bordering the Mississippi River is one unequaled in my experience in the Congress. By following present State highways, we will have an economical thoroughfare that will benefit both the States and the Federal Government. It will raise these highways to modern standards for interstate travel that will serve both national commerce and national defense. It will be at once a farm-to-market road, a scenic and historic parkway, and a modern trunk thoroughfare linking the 35 million people of the river States. As the Mississippi River has always served the heartland of the North American Continent, so too, will the great river road serve our agriculture and our commerce.

The Mississippi River Parkway Planning Commission deserves to be commended for its constant spirit of cooperation and the single-mindedness with which it has worked to make this remarkable project possible. It includes 10 members appointed by each of the 10 governors of the States bordering the Mississippi and it has given us a plan worthy of our support.

The people of the river States have long wanted a scenic interstate highway that will open the Mississippi Valley to the thousands of tourists each year who want to see America first.

In Minnesota, as in other States, the tourist trade is a rapidly expanding industry and an interesting and safe highway along the river will surely be one of America's great attractions. The river and the valley are rich in history and in a variety of scenery unequaled in our country.

At the same time it will help our State to modernize the highway system that is the midcontinent artery of our transportation system. It will connect the rich and varied agricultural areas and rural towns with the centers of industry into which their raw materials flow.

The recreation potential of the Mississippi Valley is almost unlimited and a safe modern highway will open new possibilities in every State.

In my own congressional district, the highway will offer travelers easy access to the historical and scenic cities and towns and farmlands along the river. Following is a brief summary of some of the sights to be seen in our district:

Aitkin: In this vicinity the Mississippi River runs through land which was once the floor of Lake Aitkin, a large and ancient body of water formed behind the terminal moraine of the Keewatin ice sheet. The sandy plain of the old lake is now a prosperous farming area devoted largely to dairy products, turkeys, and small fruits.

West of Aitkin the present roads run through a pleasant country of mixed farm and forest. In the spring this region is noted for the vivid coloring of the wildflowers which grow in roadside meadows and swamps.

Crosby, Ironton: In the vicinity of these towns is the Cuyuna Iron Range. Parkway travelers would be able to visit some of the mines, including the immense open-pit manganiferous ore mine which lies near the Mississippi River north of Crosby. The river here runs broad and deep between sandy banks. Dense second-growth forests, edged with brilliant wildflowers, grow to the very brink of the low banks.

Brainerd: This town is the gateway to an extensive recreation area. When the glaciers retreated from this region, great outwash streams deposited sand and gravel around and on top of huge blocks of ice. When the ice melted, pits were left in the terrain which filled with water and became lakes. North of Brainerd a series of these pit lakes—Gull Lakes, Long Lake, Whitefish Lakes, and others—forms the setting for some of Minnesota's best-known resorts. East and south of Brainerd is Mille Lacs Lake, another resort center. When the French first entered the upper Mississippi area toward the end of the 17th century they found many important Sioux towns on the shores of this lake. Both De Luth and Hennepin visited the principal Sioux village of Izatys. The lodges of present-day Indians are seen in numbers along the highways around the lake.

In the Brainerd vicinity and for many miles to the south modern highways paralleling the Mississippi to the east traverse a broad, sandy plain, marked by occasional groups of dunes. This Anoka sand plain, as it is known to geologists, was formed by wash from the Mississippi River as it pushed westward against the retreating Grantsburg sublobe of glacial ice.

Crow Wing River: A short distance below Brainerd the Mississippi is joined by its first large tributary, the clear and beautiful Crow Wing, which drains a large area of forest, farm, and lake. Near its mouth one branch of the Red River trail, over which the squeaking oxcarts made their annual journeys between Canada and the Twin Cities, crossed the Mississippi. Fur-trading posts and the vanished frontier town of Old Crow Wing were situated near the confluence of the two streams.

Fort Gaines site: On the west bank of the Mississippi, about midway between

the Crow Wing and Little Falls, stands the weathered ruin of an old brick powder magazine, all that remains to mark the site of Fort Gaines—later called Fort Ripley—a military post occupied between 1849 and 1878.

Camp Ripley: An active military reservation where Minnesota's National Guard receives its field training.

Little Falls: A modern dam largely obscures the rapids in the Mississippi, once well-known landmarks to explorers and French voyageurs. A short distance northeast of the city is Hole-in-the-Day's Bluff, named for an Ojibway chief said to have been slain by his own people and buried on the summit.

Charles A. Lindbergh State Memorial Park: This tract of 110 acres on the west bank of the Mississippi was dedicated by the State of Minnesota to the memory of Congressman Charles A. Lindbergh, who was associated with pioneer liberal movements in the State, and who was prominent in the Non-Partisan League and the Farm-Labor Party. The clapboard-covered cottage in which he lived for many years and which was the boyhood home of his famous son, the "Flying Colonel," is preserved as a museum. The park contains one of the finest remaining stands of virgin white pine and affords facilities for picnicking and hiking.

Pike's Fort site: Here on the sandy bluff overlooking the river, Lt. Zebulon M. Pike built a stockade for his exploring party during the winter of 1805–06.

South of Little Falls existing roads, sometimes unpaved, enable the traveler to follow quite closely along the west bank of the Mississippi as far as Minneapolis. Occasionally the tops of the sandy bluffs afford striking views of the blue river and the terraces—frequently wooded—which characterize the opposite bank. Although largely farmland, the country presents a diversified scene. In the spring the wildflower displays are outstanding. Occasional factories, dams, and crossings of tributary streams serve to give a pleasant variety to the landscape. Sites of early trading posts and missions are reminders of the days when the upper Mississippi was a wild frontier.

Sartell: A large pulp and paper mill is located directly on the riverbank here and probably would be open for inspection by parkway travelers.

St. Cloud: This prosperous city is the center of a famous quarrying region. The fine-grained granite found here has been used in the construction of some of the most impressive public and private buildings throughout the Nation. A pioneer log cabin built by Balthasarr Rosenberger about 1855 is preserved in Riverside Park.

Oliver H. Kelley house: On the east bank of the Mississippi about 3 miles south of Elk River is the former farm and home of Oliver Hudson Kelley, founder of the National Grange of the Order of Patrons of Husbandry. Now owned and maintained by the Grange, this property would enable parkway travelers to visualize the development of a typical Minnesota homestead into a prosperous present-day farm. Here is the outstanding site in the Nation for telling the story of the movement for farmer organization.

THE MASK HAS BECOME THE MAN

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, 13 years ago, in its February 1941 issue, Reader's Digest carried a story entitled "A Visit to Berchtesgaden."

The story opens at the peak of Hitler's victories in World War II. It tells of Joshua's visit to Hitler at Berchtesgaden and of Hitler's visit, through time, with Joshua to the famed trumpet and the crumbling walls of Jericho, 40 centuries ago.

The moral of the story appears to be that as you fight something, unless you are exceedingly careful, you are apt to absorb the spirit of what you fight, setting in train acts like those you sought to avoid.

Appalled at the slaughter and the misery he had seen at Jericho, Hitler tried to return to Berchtesgaden untainted. But it was too late. "The mask has become the man," said Joshua, "you cannot doff it."

Under unanimous consent, the article is cited below. I trust that it will be of some interest to the Congress in its current deliberations, especially in these days when so many people feel drained of strength and achievement and of purpose:

A Visit to Berchtesgaden

(By Hillel Bernstein)

(This seems to me the story of the year. To read it is a personal experience, and upon publication the story will become a national and international experience. It is more than literature. It is the contemporary mind coming to a great conclusion about one of the great contemporary problems. (Carl Van Doren.))

(Historical Note.—The World War of 1914–18 gave birth to the legend of the Unknown Soldier. After the World War which began in 1939 the despairing, mystical times brought forth a new legend, that of the Resurrected Soldier. He was expected hourly to return from the grave and liberate the enslaved peoples from the yoke of the Nazi conquerors.)

When Hitler felt the need for brooding mystically over some problem of state, he usually repaired to his mountain residence at Berchtesgaden, high above the Bavarian countryside. In such a mood he sat one evening in the private projection room of his mountain retreat, viewing again—for the hundredth time—the motion-picture record of his military triumphs.

He sat alone there, savoring with relish the striking power of his army and air force. The performance was ever a bracing tonic to the Führer. Having willed all these campaigns he also felt that he had achieved all this destruction personally. It was as if he, Hitler, has smashed Warsaw with a drive of his right first, and had destroyed a square mile of buildings in the center of Amsterdam with a vigorous kick of his left boot. He drank it in greedily with his eyes.

No previous military leader in history had enjoyed the delights of being able to view his campaigns again whenever he pleased. Hitler reflected that Napoleon, or Caesar, or Alexander, would have envied him this precious advantage. Great as they were, they could not bring back the sights of their stirring, smashing triumphs. They could not re-create, as he could, the scenes of power, victory, and glory.

Suddenly he felt a chill, and had a creepy feeling that he was not alone. He peered anxiously through the dark of the room. At the back there stood what seemed to be the figure of a huge man. Hitler's first instinct was to ring for his guards. But somehow his hand—the hand that had smashed Warsaw—was powerless to function.

"Who's there?" he said.

"I am a soldier," replied a low voice.

Hitler knew that this was no flesh-and-blood intruder. He was nervous and he played for time.

"Who let you in?" he demanded.

"I come from the past. No one let me in."

"Do not imagine that I am alone," Hitler cried. "The power of my invincible Reichswehr is about me. I am not unprotected."

"Yet now you are alone," the voice answered.

"What do you want?" Hitler's voice was thin and piping.

"For the present," came the answer, "I am looking at your battles."

"You said you were a soldier. What is your rank?"

"I am a commander."

Hitler became ingratiating. "A commander. Then you can study my battles with the eye of an expert. No doubt you can compare them with your own campaigns."

"My battles were different," said the other, curtly. A sense of superiority was evident in his manner but Hitler chose to ignore it.

"Naturally," he said. "All battles are different. A different general, a different kind of battle. And what were your battles like?"

"In most of them," said the stranger, "I spared no living thing."

Hitler's military vanity was piqued. "Do not try to talk to me in superior tones," he cried. "What scale were your campaigns on? Mine are on a world scale. Suppose I do leave a building standing here or there, or a few miserable enemies alive. Think of the immensity of my work. Military experts agree that there has been nothing like my wars in history. I have succeeded more than any other man—more than Napoleon, or Caesar, or Alexander. Who, then, are you?"

The other's voice indicated a cold fury; he, too, evidently had his military vanity. "You are going to see my battles," he said.

It was said ominously, and Hitler grew wary, remembering that he was facing an unknown danger. He said, in softer tones, "How can I see your battles? They are over and done with."

"No," was the answer. "They are still going on. I have fought them over again a thousand times. I will take you into the fighting, from the very beginning of my first campaign."

"I don't know what you mean," Hitler said, "and I cannot waste more time. I have many things to do."

The voice was freezingly contemptuous. "You are coming with me."

For the first time Hitler became clearly aware of the face. It was like nothing that he had known before: large, strong, hard-featured, expressionless, unearthly. But the eyes—the eyes. They were somehow like windows which widened out so that a world could be seen through them, a world of dooms and agonies.

Hitler felt drained of strength, achievement, fame, everything. Now the stranger's voice, as he spoke again, was inexorable. "Come with me," he said.

Hitler had a sudden feeling that he was in movement, and he struggled with all his might. But it was useless. In a moment he was out of Germany and out of his element.

They traveled on the wings of the past. They sped past the Napoleonic wars and the French Revolution, past the Thirty Years' War, past the Renaissance, and they did not even stop for the Middle Ages and the struggle between the emperors and the popes.

"Where are you taking me?" Hitler asked.

"Patience," said his fellow traveler. "I visited with you in modern times. You will visit with me in ancient times."

The Roman Empire went by like a flash, and the campaigns of Alexander the Great were just a flicker on the way. "That was Greek civilization just then," said the stranger, with a backward gesture. And then at last, "We have arrived."

Hitler found himself set down in rugged country, among warriors—hard, fierce, determined-looking men—many thousands of them gathered in an encampment. He watched his companion instantly take charge, as if he had not been away. He noted, too, from the moment of arrival, that there was a change in his companion. He looked smaller now, and without that terrifying atmosphere of doom which had characterized him at Berchtesgaden. He was more of a man and less of a shade. Although Hitler was in his power, the Führer did not fear his captor as much as he had a little while ago in the 20th century. Set in his own environment, the man was no more terrible than Hitler in his.

Immediately after his arrival there was an inspection of forces. Hitler went down the ranks with his companion, surveying the faces and military bearing of the soldiers. "Excellent fighting men," he said. "They remind me of some of my good sergeants in the Reichswehr." He spoke directly to one man, saying, "I should like to have had you for my good Reichswehr."

The man seemed to take no notice of this pretty speech, and Hitler said angrily to his companion, "Do you approve of your common soldiers behaving rudely to a visiting commander?"

"Forty centuries separate you from these men," was the reply. "They cannot see or hear you. You are not even dust in anyone's eye."

"Did you take me out of the 20th century in order to insult me?" Hitler complained. "I want to go back to the Reich, where I am in everyone's eye."

"You will go back soon," said the leader. "Meanwhile, there are battles to be viewed."

The inspection was followed by a council of war. The warriors, under the leadership of Hitler's companion, planned to invade new lands, slay all the inhabitants, and take their lands for themselves and their posterity. Hitler, the invisible one, listened to the plan of action.

"All, then, is in readiness," said the leader.

"Wait," said Hitler. "As a commander I criticize your preparations as crude and amateurish. Your plan is incomplete."

"Speak on," said Hitler's companion.

Hitler said: "Where is your propaganda machine? Where are your grievances? Why haven't you proved first that your nationals over there are being persecuted? That the other side is plotting to attack you? Where are your frontier incidents? Your atrocities? You haven't even shown the foresight to colonize some people over there first, to be killed in atrocities at the right moment. What a bungled campaign."

"None of that is necessary," said the leader. "We do not have to justify ourselves. It is the Lord who has told us to take those lands."

"That's good about the Lord," Hitler admitted. "That's always good. God is with me, too."

Then he bethought himself of another piece of excellent counsel. "You've forgotten one very important move," he said. "You ought to prove first of all that your enemies are dominated by the Jews. By the Jewish warmongers, who have instigated them to fight against you. If you do that, you will always be a hero, no matter what else you do."

His companion smiled. "That won't be necessary, either," he said. "For, you see, we are the Jews."

Hitler gasped. He looked wildly about, at those fierce, hard faces, at those warriors whose strength and soldierlike qualities he had admired. "But it's impossible," he cried. "Jews. But it can't be. And you yourself?"

"All of us."

"You're joking. I know what Jews are, and they're not fighters," he screamed. "Bankers, merchants, lawyers, doctors, tradesmen, journalists." He spat out his contempt. "Warmongers. They get others to do their fighting."

"These are the Jewish soldiers," said his companion, "and they will do their own fighting. Forty thousand of them are gathered here, and not an enemy will escape the edge of their swords."

Hitler was suddenly in panic. Forty thousand fighting Jews, and he alone among them, without a single army of 2 million to defend him. And the leader knew who he was. Already Hitler writhed in anticipation of being torn to pieces.

"You forget that they cannot see or hear you," said the leader, reading his thoughts.

Yet Hitler was sick. He sat down on a rock, and said feebly, "What is this place?"

"You are in the first chapter of the Book of Joshua of the Old Testament."

"In the Bible," groaned Hitler. "And you?"

"Joshua."

"The Bible. I had to listen to sermons from that when I was a boy. There was one about Joshua, the miracle soldier. Are you he who blew down the walls of Jericho?"

"You will see them blown down," said Joshua.

Then Hitler made a fighting effort to liberate himself from his environment. He stood up and shrieked: "No! No! I won't stay here in the Bible. I hate that book. I've got a book—my own book, Mein Kampf—and I want to go back to it. I want to go back to my German Reich and my German people."

His voice rose to a scream which he hoped would pierce the centuries, reach Berlin, arouse the Gestapo. "Help! Help! Germans to the rescue. I've been kidnaped by the Jews."

"They can't see or hear you in Berlin either," said Joshua. "There is no Berlin. It is still a marsh."

Hitler was forced to resign himself for the time being to the role of invisible spectator. The one satisfaction he enjoyed, as he looked at the fighting Jews, was his knowledge that in his day their descendants would constitute a minority that he could persecute and terrorize. At times he indulged in secret bravado. "Yah!" he jeered. "You capitalistic, bolshevistic, democratic, pacifistic, warmongering, trading, scribbling, pill-rolling, lawyering, banking Jews—yah!—you men of peace and good will, I despise you, I persecute you, I make you fear me. You tremble at the thought of me. I am the scourge." But no one heard him.

After a night of preparation and prayer, the army started on its campaign of invasion. The destination was Jericho and the first objective was the crossing of the river Jordan. To achieve the crossing swiftly and successfully, Joshua said that a miracle was in order, a miracle which would divide the waters. "Miracle," scoffed Hitler. "My army engineers create a miracle by spanning the river with pontoon bridges or rubber boats."

Hitler crossed the Jordan with Joshua as the waters divided. He was present at the siege of Jericho and he saw the walls come tumbling down at the final blast of the trumpets. It reminded him that he had blown down the bastion of Prague with a radio speech and the accompanying Nazi "Sieg Heil." "My voice, too," he said, "is the trumpet of destiny."

The walls came down, and Hitler watched the soldiers swarm over the debris and into the city with their swords flashing. It was slaughter and annihilation in the name of the Lord, who had instructed Joshua to spare no living thing.

Hitler had often dreamed of the annihilation of a foe to the last man. He had never seen his dream realized so completely as at Jericho. It sickened him.

Joshua, observing him, said, "It takes a strong stomach to do the Lord's work."

"What are you trying to insinuate?" said Hitler, touchily. "I never felt better in my life."

"You look woefully sick," said Joshua. "But you would be far sicker if you had to direct this slaughter over and over again a thousand times, as I have had to do."

The campaigns continued. Hitler watched the burning of Ai, and he saw the King of Ai hanged on a tree until eventide. For the first time he noticed a peculiar change in Joshua. The Jewish commander was indomitable, fiery, relentless; but there were moments in the midst of it all when he looked sad and weary and inconceivably old. Hitler happened to catch Joshua in his tent in one of those moments; the sight startled him.

"Go away," said Joshua, in a tired, weak voice.

"Where shall I go?" said Hitler. "You must take me back to my Reich."

"I can't do that until my campaigns are over," said Joshua.

"Then why did you bring me here in the first place?"

"Military pride," said Joshua. "I always feel that way at the beginning. But as the campaigns go on my spirit staggers under the burden. There is that within me which wants to cry out against the slaughter. But the words stop in my throat, and I cannot. I am powerless to change the course of the battle. And I feel every wound, every plunge of the sword, every slaying. It is the mass slaying of Joshua which I undergo. And it is Joshua who directs his own thousandfold slaying."

"I am not weak," said Hitler. "I do not sigh and falter at the sight of bloodshed."

"You have battles, too, which you will want to change later," said Joshua. "You, too, will be powerless."

"I will not want to change anything," said Hitler.

He was delighted to have caught Joshua in such a revealing moment; it made him feel superior and contemptuous. But if he believed this would continue as a permanent condition, he was disappointed. Joshua was again militant, again merciless. He marched against the coalition of the five kings, met their forces at Gibeon and slaughtered them. The 5 kings were hanged on 5 trees. At Azekah, Hitler saw the fleeing hordes of the enemy bombed with great stones from Heaven. There was another miracle that day, and this time Hitler was really impressed. It was getting towards evening and Joshua needed more daylight in order to complete the victory. He commanded the sun to stand still at Gibeon and the moon to remain in the valley of Ajalon.

The invasion and occupation of other lands continued, and Hitler watched the destruction of the Canaanites, the Amorites, the Hittites, the Perizzites, the Jebusites.

One part of the Jewish leader looked young and implacable, commanded the army and drove the soldiers on to triumph. The other part, aged, weary, sad, looked heavily on at the destruction. "The slaughter avails nothing," this second Joshua said. "The miracles avail nothing. They have to be paid for in misery."

Joshua had conquered completely and the children of Israel were in possession of the Promised Land. There was a great gathering of joy. All the victorious warriors were assembled to honor the man who had led them to victory. When Joshua appeared, the din was terrific.

Hitler, standing nearby, was assailed with nostalgia. This was the kind of applause he usually got in Germany, and it went to

his head like a powerful stimulant. It took fortitude not to respond.

Little by little, however, the faces faded out, the scene blurred; only the mass effect of a great celebration remained.

Joshua was addressing his soldiers. "With the help of the Lord," he was saying, "we have conquered. Now the children of Israel have the Promised Land. Let us worship the Lord and observe His Commandments, and we shall always enjoy the fruits of these victories—we and our children and our children's children."

There was another burst of applause, and this time Hitler, no longer aware of time and place, responded to it as automatically as if the applause came from a Nazi cheering section directed by Herr Goebbels. He bounded to the front of the platform, acknowledged the shouts of the warriors, and began to speak, pouring out his pentup emotions. "My German Soldier Comrades," he began. "This is a great hour in our history. The Lord has been with us, and we have conquered. The Lord told me to lead the Germans out of the wilderness of despair and the Versailles Diktat. The Lord told me to take the lands of the Czechs, the Poles, the Dutch, the Norwegians, the Danes, the Belgians, the French, the English, the Russians, the Americans. All these lands, He said, should be German lands, and those whom we do not annihilate should be our serfs—hewers of wood and drawers of water for the Germans.

"Now we have conquered, and now the world is ours. Now our German Reich embraces and dominates the earth, and we shall be the master race for the next 1,000 years. We Germans are the chosen people, chosen by God. The world must recognize that we are the chosen people and it must submit to our decisions and our government, for this universe is ours."

He went on and on, in a paroxysm of joy, and his body quivered as if he were experiencing the ecstasy of divine communication. But suddenly Joshua was at his side and leading him away.

"They did not hear a word, and cannot," said Joshua. "But I heard, and it is sufficient. And now, home to your Reich."

Again there was the sudden sense of motion. Just as speedily as they had traveled toward the times of Joshua, they now moved toward the times of Hitler. Almost immediately they were once more in the motion-picture projection room at Berchtesgaden. The film of Hitler's triumphs was still on the screen, and the scene as they entered showed a gathering of 200,000 Nazis shouting "Seig Heil."

"It is not true," said Hitler, "that no one heard me when I made that speech. Eighty-five million Germans heard me."

"So much the worse for them," said Joshua.

He was again a huge, formidable shape in the darkness, but Hitler no longer felt as disturbed as he had been at the beginning. "Eighty-five million triumphant, victorious people," cried Hitler, ecstatically, "The German master race. The rulers of the world."

"So be it," said Joshua. "You have declared yourselves a chosen people, and it is done. The Germans of your day are taking the place of the Jews of my day, and the Germans of a future day will take the place of the Jews of your day. It relieves us of a burden that has scarred us and borne us down, and which in adversity has made us the targets and scapegoats of all mankind. From now on you can have all the triumphs of a chosen people, and afterward, upon your downfall, you can have their persecutions, too. My Jews may rest at last. And I may rest."

"Whatever are you saying?" said Hitler. "Persecutions? Taking the place of Jews? What devilish nonsense is this?"

"You have been imitating the Jews of my time," said Joshua, and his voice ranged through the world with more volume than all the choruses of "Sieg Heil." "You have desired to be a chosen people, and now you have become one—self-chosen. I have been waiting 4,000 years for this day, waiting to be relieved of the painful punishment of fighting my battles over. And during that time I have seen the descendants of my Jews suffering the revenge of a world that remembered them once as chosen. But now, in the world's eyes, there is a new chosen people, a self-proclaimed one. Let them suffer when their time comes, while my people enjoy the delights of oblivion. My people have earned their rest."

Hitler looked into those window-eyes, and what he saw there affrighted him. Harassed Germans were there, weak and furtive, driven from pillar to post, with men lashing at them with whips while the mob jeered and showed its fangs of hatred. He sobbed and wept for the sight. Then he frantically fought off the illusion.

"No," he shrieked. "It is not so. We have not been imitating the Jews. We want to be nothing like them. Our destiny is a German destiny. Siegfried, not Joshua. We shall never know defeat and dispersion."

"You have seen what we were," said Joshua. "You may see what you will become."

Hitler put his hands over his eyes.

"It is not for nothing," said Joshua, "that in every plan of conquest you strove to identify your foes with the Jews; to make them Jews, no matter what they were in reality. Not for nothing have you fashioned the Jew into your world enemy. Deep down, deep in the spirit, an urge drove you. An urge to supplant the Jews. Not as they are today but in their ancient role."

"Outrageous and ridiculous," cried Hitler, full of hysteria. "I used the Jews as a propaganda weapon, yes—but with contempt. I made them my enemy, yes. I identified them with our foes, so that I could achieve what I wanted without opposition, because no one would dream of opposing me on behalf of the Jews. But what has that to do with imitation?"

"The mask has become the man," said Joshua. "You cannot doff it."

Hitler looked through those eyes again, and was appalled.

Joshua said, "When Moses placed his hand upon me and God instructed me, we were the chosen people. Thus imbued, I led my people in conquest of the Promised Land. No man in my lifetime could withstand me, no man and no people. We believed ourselves a chosen people, and while we were victorious we gloried in it. After me there came others, who strove to temper what I had done, whose aim was justice and mercy, the blessed leaven of tolerance and understanding, and then the brotherhood of man rather than the exclusive brotherhood of one tribe of men. But we have not been allowed to forget that we were once a chosen people. Defeated, dispersed, persecuted, we have paid bitterly and long after our time. We have done enough penance. We desired to forget that we were ever a military people; we cultivated all the ways of peace; we forgot the practice of arms. But our path was not made lighter.

"Now, at last, you have come, you and the Germans, and you hunger and strive to be chosen. So be it. For centuries my people have tried to escape the burden of memory of their role, but they had to wait for your coming. As for me, I have made my journey and my long penance is over.

"And now, O Wandering German to be, I leave you."

"Wait, wait," cried Hitler, hurrying to the door as if Joshua had left by that medium. "Let us talk this over. I——"

But he was 40 centuries too late.

INCREASED SECURITY FOR THE UNITED STATES CAPITOL AND THE CONGRESS

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include a joint resolution just introduced by me.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, one week ago the membership of the House was subjected to the tragic shooting from the gallery by fanatical Puerto Ricans who made the trip down from New York in order to murder Members of Congress. It did not make any difference to them whether they were located in the House or in the Senate. Their purpose was to inflict mortal injury upon Members of Congress.

I am tremendously pleased the Members that were injured by the fusillade of bullets which were fired by these terrorists are going to completely recover and will soon again be here with us in this honorable association. Also, I am thankful to God more of the membership were not injured and that none of those who were shot were mortally wounded.

During this week that has passed, I have given tremendous thought to the problem emphasized by this tragic occurrence. By way of conclusion to these thoughts, I have filed today a joint resolution having as its purpose the protection of the Congress of the United States, as well as the United States Capitol and its grounds. It is my view that the recommendations I have suggested in this joint resolution, if adopted by the Congress, would prove to be very effective in accomplishing the desired security for Members of Congress and for the United States Capitol.

It is to be noted that in this resolution of mine, I have made the requirement that no person shall be permitted to enter the Capitol Building unless that person has answered in the negative as to whether or not he is a Communist or a member of the Communist Party.

House Joint Resolution 464

Joint resolution to provide increase security for the United States Capitol and for the Congress

Resolved, etc., That a Board to be known as the Capitol Security Board is hereby created. The Capitol Security Board shall be composed of the Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, 3 Members of the Senate of the United States to be appointed by the Vice President, 3 Members of the House of Representatives of the United States to be appointed by the Speaker, the Sergeant at Arms of the Senate, the Sergeant at Arms of the House, and the Architect of the Capitol. The Capitol Security Board shall be responsible for the complete security of the United States Capitol Building and grounds, and the Congress of the United States.

SEC. 2. (a) That an office to be known as the Security Office of the Capitol is hereby created. The Security Office of the Capitol shall be headed by a Security Officer of the Capitol who shall be appointed by, and shall

perform his duties under the supervision of, the Capitol Security Board. There shall be in such office a Deputy Security Officer of the Capitol, two Assistant Security Officers of the Capitol, and such other assistants and employees as may be necessary to enable the Security Officer of the Capitol to carry out his duties under this Act.

(b) The Security Officer of the Capitol, the Deputy Security Officer of the Capitol, and Assistant Security Officers of the Capitol shall be trained in the arts and sciences of security operations.

(c) The Capitol police shall be subject to the authority and control of the Security Officer of the Capitol.

(1) The Capitol police shall be trained in the arts and sciences of police duties and operations.

(2) The Capitol police shall be increased in organization and personnel to adequately care for increased responsibilities.

SEC. 3. (a) The Security Officer of the Capitol shall have the responsibility of controlling the admission of persons to the Capitol Building, to the end that no person shall be admitted to such building who might commit therein any act of violence.

(b) In order to accomplish the objective set forth in the preceding subsection, the Security Officer of the Capitol shall issue regulations providing, among other things, that no person shall be admitted to the Capitol Building unless—

(1) he has a pass duly issued to him by a Senator, Representative, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner, or one of their authorized representatives,

(2) he is an employee of the legislative branch who has been issued a pass by the Security Office of the Capitol,

(3) he is a Senator, Representative, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner,

(4) he has been summoned to appear before a committee of the Senate or House of Representatives, or before a joint committee of the Congress, or

(5) he has been given such examination, and has furnished such information as the Security Officer thall require.

SEC. 4. No person shall be issued a pass by the Security Officer of the Capitol as provided in clause (2) of section 3 (b) of this Act, or admitted after examination as provided in clause (5) of section 3 (d) of this Act, until he has been asked whether he is or has ever been a member of the Communist Party of the United States of America, and has answered in the negative, except that this section shall not apply to persons summoned to appear before a committee of the Senate or House of Representatives, or a joint committee of the Congress.

SEC. 5. The Security Officer of the Capitol, the Deputy and Assistant Security Officers shall receive compensation in accord with the prevailing schedule for Federal Government employees. Employees of the Capitol Security Office shall be subject to the rules and regulations adopted by the Capitol Security Board.

SEC. 6. The Capitol Police Board is hereby abolished.

THE MEXICAN LABOR BILL

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House, to revise and extend my remarks and include a news article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, a week ago today the Mexican farm labor bill was being considered in the House. A week ago tomorrow the final vote was taken. The following day, on Wednesday, March 3, the bill passed the Senate and on the following day, Thursday, March 4, the bill was again considered in the House and an amendment by the Senate was agreed to and the bill was sent on to the President for his signature. I understand that the bill is now on the President's desk.

At the time the resolution was first presented to the House Committee on Agriculture I objected to its consideration for many reasons. The first and most important reason was that I believed that such a resolution would be incompatible with the good-neighbor policy of our Government and I was convinced that the passage of the resolution would have far-reaching international implications. I further thought that the resolution was calculated to embarrass the officials of our own Government. I did not believe at that time that an effort in good faith had been made to compose the differences between the two governments regarding the international agreement which is definitely contemplated by existing law. These were but a few of my objections to House Joint Resolution 355. At the time I interposed my first objection and insisted upon delaying indefinitely the consideration of the measure I took the position that negotiations should be resumed in the hope than an agreement satisfactory to both governments might soon be reached.

After I had insisted upon open public hearings and after I had communicated with officials of our own Government and with the Mexican Ambassador to Washington and with the White House and was advised that the President of the United States had expressed the hope that negotiations might be resumed immediately, negotiations were resumed in Mexico City that very night. From that time forward great progress has been made. I am now advised that all matters and things in controversy have been composed and that only the drafting of the details of the provisions of the contract remain to be worked out. I understand that the language difficulties will soon be resolved and finally agreed upon. I asked for only a few weeks and at last for only a week or two in which I thought that an agreement might be reached. I stated before the Rules Committee that I did not believe that the President could very gracefully sign and approve House Joint Resolution 355 especially in view of the fact that he had caused negotiations to be resumed on the night of February 10, 1954. The President is at the present time apparently experiencing some difficulties in determining whether or not he should approve the measure.

I take the floor at this time, Mr. Speaker, to express the hope that the President will not sign and approve House Joint Resolution 355 which is generally known as the Mexican farm-labor bill. If he will withhold signing for perhaps a few more hours an agreement will probably be reached and it will not then be necessary for him to sign or to approve the measure.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. I sincerely hope that the President will hold up the signing of the bill, and if the agreement is entered into that he will not sign it. As a matter of fact, I hope he will not sign the bill because, like the gentleman from North Carolina, I opposed it because of the serious and unfortunate results that might develop as a result of the passage of the bill, so far as it would affect our friendly relations with our neighbors to the south. And particularly in the light of the information which is now available. I hope that the course will be one which will be consistent with strengthening the friendship between the United States and Mexico rather than the creation of tension between the two countries which is unnecessary.

Mr. COOLEY. I appreciate the observations of my distinguished friend from Massachusetts and agree entirely with the sentiment he has expressed.

Mr. Speaker, I submit for the RECORD a news article which I understand appeared in the San Diego Union on Saturday morning, March 6. The byline is by Frank Macomber and the date line is Washington, March 5.

ENTIRE WETBACK PICTURE SNAFUED AGAIN

(By Frank Macomber)

WASHINGTON, March 5.—United States negotiators at Mexico City have agreed to toss border recruiting of Mexican farm workers out of a new international program in exchange for other concessions from the Mexican Government, California Congressmen were told today by the State Department.

An international commission meanwhile will be created to study the question of whether border recruiting should be made a provision of an international agreement, Department officials told the Congressmen.

A new international agreement is due to be signed perhaps as early as Monday. The Department's admission that its negotiators had given way on the controversial border recruiting issue came as a shock to Congressmen who have fought for weeks to put through the House and Senate a bill legalizing United States border recruiting of Mexican farm workers without Mexico's participation.

Its primary aim was to give United States negotiators, headed by American Ambassador Francis White, a strong hand in insisting on border recruiting for farmers close to the international boundary in San Diego and Imperial Counties of southern California and in a half-dozen Texas border farming areas.

The border recruiting bill only reached the President's desk today, after a stormy trip through the House and Senate.

Representatives JOHN PHILLIPS, BOB WILSON, and JAMES B. UTT, Republican of California, first got wind of a report that the United States was about to sign a pact with Mexico without a border recruiting provision.

They went into a huddle with Vice President NIXON and Senator WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND, Republican of California. The State Department and the White House were called and the report was confirmed.

Then Speaker JOSEPH MARTIN, Republican of Massachusetts, and Representative CHARLES A. HALLECK, Republican of Indiana, House majority leader, were brought into the huddle. The GOP congressional leaders were asked to take up the border recruiting issue Monday with the President at their regular weekly legislative huddle.

KNOWLAND said it would be the first order of business at the White House Monday.

The California Congressmen want the President to order the United States to hold up agreement on the new international farm labor agreement until some border recruiting provision is inserted.

State Department officials explained to the legislators they gave way on this issue, sidetracking it to a proposed international

study commission, as a trade for Mexican concessions.

But UTT, WILSON, and PHILLIPS charged the United State negotiators gave away the most important provision from the viewpoint of the United States farmer close to the border, in exchange for concession on far less vital provisions.

The Congressmen said they understood, too, that United States negotiators agreed to an informal understanding there would be no further United States operated border recruiting program during the life of the new international agreement.

UTT, WILSON, and PHILLIPS told the congressional leaders they should insist on at least 20 percent border recruiting—that is, of 200,000 Mexican farm laborers brought into this country each year, at least 40,000 should be recruited from the border area and the rest from the interior.

UTT, WILSON, and PHILLIPS, who spent all afternoon conferring with congressional leader on the new complication in an already complicated Mexican farm labor picture, charged that the State Department's concession on the border recruiting issue makes Congress look foolish.

"We have been fighting for weeks to get this border recruiting bill through the House and Senate, to give our negotiators backing in Mexico City," UTT recalled. "Now that the bill is about to become law and can be used as a valuable weapon in the negotiations, the State Department gives way on the one issue we have insisted upon—some border recruiting for southern California and Texas farmers."

UTT, WILSON, and PHILLIPS warned that the border recruiting program was sold to Congress on the claim that it would be the best possible way to combat the penetration of Mexican wetbacks into this country. In the last few weeks, they pointed out, since border recruiting was in effect, immigration border patrolmen have raided 110 border area farms and picked up only 10 wetbacks. Before border recruiting the raiding of 110 farms usually netted about 1,000 wetbacks, they pointed out.

The proposed United States-Mexican Commission to study border recruiting and other issues still in dispute will be a part of the new agreement as it presently is drafted, State Department officials told the Congressmen.

Rocco Siciliano, in testimony before a House Appropriations Subcommittee Wednesday but made public today, said the United States and Mexico likely will be ready to sign a new farm labor agreement by Monday.

Testimony taken at the hastily called Wednesday hearing was released as the House Appropriations Committee approved a special bill providing $478,000 to finance the Mexican farm labor program until June 30, end of the present fiscal year.

Chairman FRED BUSBEY (Republican of Illinois) of the Appropriations Subcommittee which held hearings on the Labor Department's request for the funds, emphasized the money may be spent either on a United States border recruiting setup, without Mexico's participation, or for an international program with Mexico.

State Department officials said United States negotiators are near agreement with Mexico on an international farm labor pact but said there was no assurance negotiations have been concluded and await only the signatures of both nations.

"There often is much give and take in the editing and interpretation of a final draft of an international agreement, and it would be premature to say final agreement has been reached," an official State Department spokesman said.

Labor Department officials have credited the border recruiting issue with being a potent weapon which helped to bring United States-Mexican negotiations close to agreement on a new international program.

Siciliano said Mexico now has agreed that the United States Labor Secretary will determine the prevailing wage rates on which pay of Mexican farmworkers will be based. This was a serious point of dispute which held up agreement for weeks.

Mexico also has recognized worker responsibility and the need for United States employers to withhold some wages as assurance Mexican employees won't leave the job before their contract ends, Siciliano said.

The United States has compromised with Mexico on establishment of subsistence rates for Mexican workers, insisting that the United States Labor Secretary set this amount but allowing Mexico to investigate if it believes the rate is incorrect, the Assistant Secretary added.

Negotiators have agreed, he testified, to the Joint Commission, possibly to be comprised of two members from each Government, to investigate such still disputed issues as—

1. Whether border recruiting stations for farmworkers shall be set up just inside the Mexican side of the border or on the American side, as under the unilateral recruiting setup.

2. A United States farmers' proposal that the minimum contract time be reduced from 6 to 4 weeks, making it easier for border-area growers to hire contract Mexican labor. They have complained that 6 weeks is too long a contract period.

Siciliano said the Commission also might investigate the so-called Mexican wetback traffic along the border, to determine its causes. But he did not elaborate.

ONE HUNDREDTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE FOUNDING OF THE REPUBLICAN PARTY

The SPEAKER. Under special order heretofore entered, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. VAN PELT] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. VAN PELT. Mr. Speaker, this month marks the 100th anniversary of the founding of the Republican Party. This significant event, which changed the history of this Nation, took place in Ripon, Wis., which is in the district I have the honor to represent in the Congress.

For a brief moment, Mr. Speaker, permit me to conjure up a picture of the scene that occurred the evening of March 20, 1854. It was a cold, bleak night, and the word had just reached the Midwest of the passage of the Kansas-Nebraska bill by the United States Senate. This was the call to arms for a determined band of antislavery Whig, Democrats, and Free Soilers. They had been discussing the issue for months, and had decided to form a new political party if steps were taken to extend slavery into the Territories of the West.

Maj. Alan E. Bovay, of Ripon, had suggested the name of Republican for this new party. It was at his call that the small group assembled in the candlelit white schoolhouse and, huddled around a brightly flaming wood fire, launched the new party which, in 1860, elected the immortal Lincoln to the Presidency.

The white schoolhouse still stands at Ripon, the symbol of a mighty political force in this Nation. The citizens of that community are preparing to observe the birth of the party with a great centennial celebration starting on March 20. Hon. Leonard Hall, chairman of the National Republican Committee, will be the speaker on that occasion. It is hoped that President Eisenhower will pull the switch lighting a new freedom flame at the spot where the party was born 100 years ago. Later in the year Vice President RICHARD NIXON will visit Ripon.

I have been asked by Mr. William A. Royce, Jr., cochairman of the celebration committee, to extend an invitation to the Members of the Congress to join in this pilgrimage. Complete particulars regarding the program will be available in my office.

And now, Mr. Speaker, I ask permission to extend my remarks and include at this point a documented statement on the origin of the Republican Party. This authentic version was prepared by the late James H. Davidson, who served in this Congress from 1897 to 1913. The statement follows:

ORIGIN OF THE REPUBLICAN PARTY

The Republican Party of the United States originated, both as to organization and name in the town of Ripon, this county. "One of the earliest, if not the earliest, of the movements," says Henry Wilson, "that contemplated definite action and the formation of a new party, was made in Ripon, Fond du Lac County, Wis., in the early months of 1854. In consequence of a very thorough canvass, conference and general comparison of views, inaugurated by A. E. Bovay (Alan E. Bovay), a prominent member of the Whig Party, among the Whigs, Free Soilers, and Democrats of that township, a call was issued * * * for a public meeting to consider the grave issues which were assuming an aspect of such alarming importance. The meeting was held on the last (day) of February, in the Congregational Church. It was largely attended by persons of both sexes from the town and surrounding country. It was a meeting solely for the discussion of principles and comparison of views. * * * The burden and drift of the speeches were the hopeless subserviency of the national parties to the behests of the slaveholders, the necessity of abandoning them, and the proposed policy of constructing a party from the materials thus set at liberty, with such as could be persuaded to leave the Democratic Party for a similar purpose. A resolution was adopted that, if the Nebraska bill, then pending, should pass, they would "throw old party organizations to the winds, and organize a new party on the sole issue of the nonextension of slavery."

"A second meeting was held," continues Mr. Wilson, "on the 20th of March, for the purpose of organization and for the adoption of such preliminary measures as the inauguration of the new party required. By formal vote, the town committees of the Whig and Free Soil Parties were dissolved, and a committee of 5, consisting of 3 Whigs, 1 Free Soiler, and 1 Democrat, was chosen. 'The work done on that evening,' says Mr. Bovay, 'was fully accepted by the Whig and Free Soil Parties of all this section immediately, and very soon—that is to say, in a few months—by these parties throughout the entire State.' A State convention was held in July, by which the organization of the party was perfected for the State, a majority of the delegation was secured for the next Congress; and a Free Soiler, Charles Durkee, was elected to the Senate of the United States. At the meeting of the 20th of March, Mr. Bovay, though stating his belief that the party should and probably would take the name of 'Republican,' advised against such a christening at that time, and by that small local body of men. He, however, wrote to the editor of the New York Tribune, suggesting the name, giving his reasons therefor, and requesting him, if

his views corresponded with his own, to call the attention of his readers to it in the columns of his paper. Thus early did the men of that frontier town inaugurate a movement which was destined to sweep and control the Nation, and which did sweep the country, and change entirely the policy of the Government."

Careful investigations in the city of Ripon more than confirm the opinion of the late Vice President of the United States—Mr. Wilson. Facts have been brought from original sources—from living witnesses—from documentary evidence—all bearing upon this interesting and important movement, and all prove beyond question that Alan E. Bovay first suggested the formation and name of the political party of the United States known as the Republican Party; that several of his neighbors whose names are hereafter given powerfully aided him in its first organization in Ripon—cordially cooperating with him in the inauguration of the new party.

Says Major Bovay:

"I had been a Whig, but the Whig Party was then dead. Its defunct condition was not generally realized, but it was dead nevertheless. It had been routed horse, foot, and artillery in the fall of 1852. That battle was its Waterloo." No party could outlive such a terrible slaughter of its innocents as that was.

"True, up to the spring of 1854, it still held on to its organization. But it was a mere shell; a skeleton army, nothing more.

"The leaders could not marshal their troops; could not anywhere bring their forces into line; in short, the party was dead, though not dissolved. Moreover, the country no longer took any interest in the old Whig issues. The slavery question dominated everything else. Nobody talked or thought any longer about protection to American industry. It was slavery in the States, slavery in the Territories, the fugitive slave law, and the refrain was ever slavery, and nothing else. There was one great, overshadowing, proslavery party—the Democratic; there must also be one great antislavery party to antagonize it. The logic of history demanded it. Such a party had become inevitable. The Whig Party was not this party, and could not be. It had outstayed its time and its usefulness; it was an anachronism. It had become an obstruction, an impediment, a nuisance. But how to get the organization out of the way—that was a rather formidable question. It stood there a great, useless, lifeless thing, awaiting some possible political earthquake, which would be violent enough to shake it to pieces. And the earthquake came.

"The triumph of slavery had been so complete in the slaughter of 1852, that its cohorts thought themselves strong enough to do anything, so they laid their hands on the oldest and most sacred of the compromises. The shock was tremendous. Instantly the whole North was in a flame of indignation and rage. The hour had struck. This was the tempest that was to sweep from our sight not only the Whig organization, but also all those little fragments of parties, Free Soil and the like, that had grown out of the slavery agitation in years that were past. The time had come for all liberty-loving Whigs to dismantle their house. As for me, I did not propose to wait for the passage of the Nebraska bill. It was foreordained to pass; then why wait? I felt 'in my bones,' as old Candace said, that the righteous rage of the time ought to be turned to some permanent account, and not permitted to effervesce in useless foam. I set to work in the most systematic way that I could contrive, to dissolve the Whig Party and to organize the Republican Party right here, fully convinced that others would do the like elsewhere, and, that in a few months we should have a great, irresistible northern party, organized on the single issue of the nonextension of slavery.

"This is the point at which the late Vice President takes notice of our movement. His history is very brief, but substantially correct. Jehdiah Bowen was my chief helper; a merchant of high standing, a man of intelligence, position, and influence, his assistance was of the utmost importance. One part of the work was specially difficult. All the peope, except the most hardened Democrats, responded to my appeals with the utmost avidity, up to a certain limit. They said, 'Oh, yes; oh, yes, we are with you in denouncing this thing. It is a great outrage; it is a swindle; we will protest; we will resolve; we will sign all the remonstrances you can think of.'

"But—and just here came the pinch—a good many of the old Whigs begged hard for the Whig Party. 'Spare the party; spare the party. Let all the outside elements come to us; our party is good enough; we will fight the democracy on this ground; we will triumph.' The good souls; they had to be told squarely that the 'Whig Party must go;' that the very heart and core of our movement was that to which they could not agree. To let the Whig Party stay was to insure permanent power to the Democratic Party. To retreat from the formation of a new party was to surrender to the slave power. They came to the meetings, and were respectfully heard, but the large majority had made up their minds. The hour was late, the candles burned low; it was a cold, windy night at the vernal equinox. In the end, all but 2 or 3 gave in, and we formed our organization.

"I remember every word and act, as if the time was but yesterday. The election of that first Republican committee—A. E. Bovay, Jehdiah Bowen, Amos Loper, Jacob Woodruff, and Abraham Thomas—was a solemn act. Every man present fully believed that he was helping to make a permanent piece of history. And he was. Yes; that point ought to be clearly understood. This was no blind, unconscious movement, of which the human family make so many. We did not build better than we knew, as some have supposed; we built precisely as we knew; and there stands the edifice. Look at it. It will bear examination. It was no fragmentary movement. It contemplated the combination of all shades of antislavery sentiment in the country in one grand organization to resist the encroachments of slavery, under the name 'Republican.'

"The name was as well settled in my mind as the organization, and I took what seemed to me the most effectual course to secure its general adoption. Republican; the common weal; an old and cherished name in our own political history, and the name which is owned, as theirs, by all liberal men and liberal organizations throughout the world. The adoption of this name was as much inevitable as was the nomination of Abraham Lincoln in 1860. In both of these cases, a wise choice meant success, and an unwise one meant defeat; no more, no less. That I was advocating this name for the great party which I saw looming in the near future above the horizon, as far back as the autumn of 1852, there is abundant evidence.

"Were Horace Greeley living, I could readily convince anyone that I was contemplating this identical state of things in the political world, name, organization and all, as early even as May 1852; but, as Mr. Greeley's testimony is not now attainable, and I have but one living witness to this latter fact (which witness I do not choose to call), I must rest upon the autumn of 1852.

"And perhaps the autumn will do as well as the spring. That gives Ripon a precedence of nearly 2 years (or, to be exact, 19 months) in the matter of the name; for it was not until June 1854, that the name 'Republican' was adopted formally, and that was by the State convention of Michigan.

"I take pleasure in referring to one of our oldest and most prominent citizens, Judge E. L. Runals, who took no part in the movement, but was cognizant of it all. This is his testimony:

"RIPON, *December 16, 1879.*

"To Maj. A. E. BOVAY, *Ripon, Wis.*

"DEAR SIR: I remember well a conversation I had with you in the fall of 1852, not more than 2 or 3 weeks, I should think, after the election of Franklin Pierce to Presidency, in relation to the political affairs of the country. You, in substance, said that the Whig party, to which you belonged, could not survive such an overwhelming defeat as it had just suffered; that it could never rally again; that it would have to abandon its organization and its name; that the country had ceased to care for the old Whig issues; that slavery had become the all-absorbing question; that on some phase of this question a new party would probably soon be formed at the North, which would combine the Whigs, Free-Soilers, and all the outside elements against the Democracy, which was the great pillar and support of slavery; that the selection of a name would be an object of the first importance to this new party; and that, in your opinion, it should be called the "Republican" party. You also gave your reasons at considerable length for so thinking;

"You said that as this was the name by which the party of Jefferson had been called from its foundation up to Jackson's time, it would possess a charm, by reason of these old associations, for all Americans, and that it would be attractive to men of foreign birth by reason of its general use amongst the liberals of Europe—and much more to the same effect. Having known you in politics as a Whig, I was rather surprised at these predictions as coming from you, and it is probably owing to this fact that they made so firm an impression on my mind.

"Yours very truly,

"E. L. RUNALS."

On the 25th day of January 1854, Jeremiah Bowen, then (as now) a citizen of Ripon—a Democrat with Free-Soil proclivities—caused to be published in the Ripon Herald, a Democratic paper, the following communication:

"MR. EDITOR: Nothing indicates more clearly the truth of these words of Jefferson's—"Eternal vigilance is the price of liberty"—than the course pursued in Congress by the committee to which was referred the call from Nebraska for a Territorial Government.

"It is well known that the Territory is intended to be bounded on the south, at farthest, by the old Missouri Compromise line of 30° and 30′ north latitude. It is a portion of that vast territory ceded to the United States by its treaty with France, by which the present State of Louisiana was secured to us. It is a portion of that territory which, by the act known as the Missouri Compromise, was to be forever free from the introduction of slavery or involuntary servitude, except in punishment of crimes.

"Mark, then, the appropriateness of Jefferson's maxim, when we find that Senator Douglas, as head of the above-mentioned committee, reported a bill for a Territorial Government, in which is a clause prospectively annulling that clause of the Missouri Compromise Act, mentioned above, relating to slavery in that Territory. Douglas' bill provides that should any portion of the Territory, upon application to Congress for admission into the Union as a State (have permitted involuntary servitude, it) shall not be rejected by reason of the establishment of slavery therein, by virtue of its constitution.

"One might think from the wailings and threats of the Southern press and politicians, and the echoes by their servile friends at the North, that peace was all that they demand for their peculiar institution; but it is not so; not satisfied with the triumph obtained over the North by the passage of the most odious law that encumbers the

statute books of any Christian nation, they now demand that they shall not only enjoy in peace their favorite slavery at home, and its further security under the fugitive slave law, but that the whole country shall submit to the extension of slavery into territory, which, by right and solemn compact, has been consecrated to liberty.

"What do our great men do in view of this demand? Do they not indignantly frown upon such barefaced impudence? Surely one might expect to learn, that at least the Representatives of States free from the incubus of slavery would protest against so glaring a wrong to our honor and to humanity. But what do we see? One of the highest in our national councils—the chief leader of the 'Young Democracy'—one who aspires to the chief magistracy of this great Nation, bending, cringing, licking the dust at the very feet of this Moloch—groveling in the mire before it, to gather the withered laurels cast away from the Nation's brow by reason of this insatiate monster. Is there no shame left, that a man pretending to represent a free State should thus so degrade his constituents and humanity itself? 'Whom the gods would destroy, they first make mad.' It cannot be otherwise than that these men, pandering to the worst sins of a people to obtain an ephemeral fame, are deluded by their own depravity to their own ruin; God forbid that it be the Nation. Can it be supposed that the cry of 'down with agitation and agitators,' will avail in the face of so gross an offense as is here offered to a people awakening to the inconsistencies and oppression of slavery?

"So long as Senator Douglas, or any other man, shall defend what, by compact and right, pertains to the slave States, as such, we would not refuse to him his just meed of honor; but when he stoops so low as to bend the knee of slavery and to discard the approbation of freemen, let no lover of his country's honor fail to point the finger of scorn at him, and indignantly blot his name from the list of our country's friends."

This communication was published over the signature "X" but Mr. Bowen was not at all disposed to deny its paternity, notwithstanding his affiliation with the Democratic Party; he was not adverse to being classed among anti-Nebraska Democrats. The editor of the Ripon Herald in his issue of February 1, in commenting upon Bowen's article, said: "We inserted in our last a communication over the signature "X" upon the subject of Senator Douglas' Nebraska bill, passing severe strictures upon the Senate (Senator) and his bill. We should then have said that we were not prepared to indorse the grounds taken by "X". For ourselves, we will say that we measure much of our political creed by the doctrine of State rights.

"A few days (perhaps a week) after the appearance of the article containing some strictures upon the course of Senator Douglas, in the Ripon Herald of January 25, 1854, I was called upon by A. E. Bovay, who requested an interview, if I could spare the time, to talk over the subject of that article and what ought to be done in furtherance of its purposes.

"As Mr. Bovay had widely differed with me on some of the political questions that had been under discussion during the 3 years of our acquaintance, he expressed some surprise and gratification at the publication of the sentiment contained in the article by me, and yet, as I thought then, not without some doubt as to my earnestness. However, he soon became convinced on that point. We talked for some time upon the probabilities of the future, in view of the excitement caused by the advocacy by Senator Douglas of the Kansas and Nebraska Act, for there seemed to be no adequate power to oppose his measure successfully, the Whig Party being as much divided in Congress as the Democrats. We argued that the only hope of defeating the extension of slavery, lay in the outspoken sentiment of the people, irrespective of existing parties. Then came the proposition of Mr. Bovay, to endeavor to crystalize public feeling by calling a meeting to discuss the question of organizing a new party. I hesitated; my faith was not strong that we could effect the object. I represented the sparseness of our population; we were in a small rural village, remote even from the county seat, and upon no great line of travel; could we make ourselves heard by the public at large? To this, Mr. Bovay replied, that there would be no question about it. The conclusion was that we should try it. Then followed the question of method of proceeding and the name by which to call the party—which Mr. Bovay suggested. Some estimates were attempted to be made as to what would be the relative proportion of the two parties who would give in their adherence to the new party. We agreed in the main, as to the classes of men that we had hopes of. We went to the house of Amos Loper, living some 3 miles north of the village, laid the matter before him in all its bearings, Mr. Bovay taking the lead in the conversation. Mr. Loper was not long in making up his mind, and we agreed to make a call for a meeting, to be held at the Congregational Church, on the last day of February.

"I cannot recall the exact language used by either of us. The subject occupied all our thoughts. We looked upon the movement as of considerable importance in a personal point of view, touching our relations with the citizens; for, to make a move and fail, would probably bring obloquy, and I was not prepared financially to court such a state of things; but, concluding that we were in the line of duty, it was undertaken in a hopeful and cheerful spirit. We were afterward astonished at the progress made, and watched with intense interest the spread of the movement through all the Northern States."

The call spoken of by Mr. Bowen was drawn up and printed in the Ripon Herald on the 29th of February.

The moderator of the meeting was William Dunham; W. N. Martin was secretary. The burden and drift of the speeches were, as Mr. Wilson truthfully says, "the hopeless subserviency of the national parties to the behests of the slaveholders, the necessity of abandoning them, and the proposed policy of constructing a party from the materials thus set at liberty."

The following preamble and resolutions were freely discussed and unanimously adopted:

"Whereas the Senate of the United States is entertaining, and from present indications is likely to pass, bills organizing governments for the Territories of Kansas and Nebraska, in which is embodied a clause repealing the Missouri Compromise Act, and so admit into these Territories the slave system with all its evils; and, whereas, we deem that compact irrepealable as to the Constitution itself: Therefore

"*Resolved*, That of all outrages hitherto perpetrated or attempted upon the North and freedom by the slaveholders and their natural allies, not one compares in bold and impudent aduacity, treachery, and meanness with this, the Nebraska bill, as to the sum of all its other villanies it adds the repudiation of a solemn compact held as sacred as the Constitution itself for the period of 34 years;

"*Resolved*, That the Northern man who can aid and abet in commission of so stupendous a crime, is none too good to become an accomplice in renewing the African slave trade, the service which, doubtless, will next be required of him by his Southern masters, should the Nebraska treason succeed;

"*Resolved*, That the attempt to overthrow the Missouri Compromise, whether successful or not, admonishes the North to adopt the maxim for all time to come, 'No more compromise with slavery';

"*Resolved*, That the passage of this bill (if pass it should) will be the call to arms of a great northern party, such an one as the country has not hitherto seen, composed of Whigs, Democrats, and Free-Soilers; every man with a heart in him united under the single banner cry of 'Repeal! Repeal!'

"*Resolved*, That the small but compact phalanx of true men, who oppose the mad scheme upon the broadest principle of humanity, as well as their unflinching efforts to uphold public faith, deserve not only our applause, but our profound esteem;

"*Resolved*, That the heroic attitude of General Houston, amidst a host of degenerate men in the United States Senate, is worthy of honor and applause."

Then and there was born the Republican Party of the United States; the time was the evening of the last day of February 1854; the place, the frame Congregational Church, which is still standing in the city of Ripon.

On the 18th of March the following call was printed in the Ripon Herald:

"THE NEBRASKA BILL

"A bill expressly intended to extend and strengthen the institution of slavery has passed the Senate by a very large majority, many northern Senators voting for it, and many more sitting in their seats and not voting at all. It is evidently destined to pass the House and become a law unless its progress is arrested by the general uprising of the North against it.

"Therefore we, the undersigned, believing this community to be nearly or quite unanimous in opposition to the nefarious scheme, would call a public meeting of citizens of all parties to be held at the schoolhouse in Ripon on Monday evening, March 20, at 6:30 o'clock, to resolve, to petition, and to organize against it.

"J. BOWEN,
"A. LOPER,
"T. L. REYNOLDS,
"A. E. BOVAY,
"(And 50 others)."

The 54 citizens—Whigs, Democrats, and Free-Soilers—who signed the call, understood perfectly that, in so doing, they were pledging themselves to join the new party. It will be remembered that Mr. Wilson says of the meeting which followed, that "by formal vote, the town committees of the Whig and Free-Soil Parties were dissolved, and a committee of 5, consisting of 3 Whigs, 1 Free-Soiler, and 1 Democrat, was chosen." A. E. Bovay, J. Bowen, Amos Loper, Abram Thomas, and Jacon Woodruff constituted the committee. Then and there the Republican Party of the United States was christened, and these men were its godfathers. "The actors in this remote little eddy of politics," afterward wrote Mr. Bovay, "thought at the time that they were making a bit of history by that solitary tallow candle, in the little while schoolhouse on the prairie; and whether ever recognized and published or not, they think so still."

TAXPAYER, BEWARE

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, when the President talked late last year and early in January about the kind of legislative program he was going to send up here for enactment, he said it was going to be dynamic and progressive.

I do not intend at this time to take up the entire program in any detail but I would like to address my remarks for a

few minutes to one extremely important part of it—the tax bill.

The revenue revision bill of 1954, which will shortly come before the House after many, many weeks of exhausting and frustrating study in the Ways and Means Committee, is certainly not progressive in any sense of the word. Nor is it dynamic. Rather, I would term it, dynamite.

The bill itself is big enough to choke an elephant. But it will be mighty palatable to those millionaires who have been most active over the years in supporting the GOP elephant. They will get back their assistance many times over if this bill becomes law in its present form.

But the average taxpayer will get nothing. In fact, he will get worse than nothing—he will find in this bill the seeds of higher tax obligations for him in the future.

His Federal taxes will ultimately have to go up if this bill passes. His State taxes will go up. His local taxes will go up. He is going to take a beating. And so I say, Mr. Speaker, "Taxpayer, beware." This bill is a fiscal killer.

I have told the House on many occasions—so many that I have become self-conscious about boring any among us who may have such closed minds they do not want the facts or the truth—about the booby traps and pitfalls and gimmicks and loopholes written into this bill, provisions intended to benefit big business and the wealthy at the expense of the rest of the citizens of the United States.

Today I want to call attention once again to the provision dealing with the falsely named, completely misleading subject of "double taxation of dividends," but I am directing my remarks not to the patent unfairness of this provision as it benefits stockholders to the disadvantage of everyone else, but rather to its broad range implications to the whole economy.

The bill, as Members know, sets up a special category of income—dividends from common stocks—which is to be treated under the tax laws as if it had divine origin—as if anyone who receives income from stocks is so much better than workingmen or other taxpayers that they should get special handouts in the form of special tax deductions and exemptions. As this provision originally stood in the bill, with the support of the majority members of the committee, it would have allowed an investor receiving $12,000 in dividends a year to get off with a Federal income tax of $10 whereas the man who earned the same amount of money by working would pay $1,836. Think of that.

The disparity here was so glaring, so preposterously unfair, and so indefensible that eventually the committee majority reconsidered and toned it down a bit and now the stockholder will not do quite as well as that, but he will still do very well, thank you, in comparison with those who earn their incomes or receive it through means other than possession of common stocks paying dividends.

Now, instead of having 5 or 10 or 15 percent—by the third year—of his dividend income deducted from the amount of the tax he owes—the most outlandish idea I ever heard of for a handout to the wealthy—he will now have 5 or 10 percent of the tax on that dividend income deducted from his tax bill. It is still a tremendous handout, a tremendous tax immunity bath for the well-to-do.

Believe me, Mr. Speaker, I do not today want to bore any of the Members who might look on this largess with unconcern. I have spoken often of the unfairness of this provision and I think I have made that point if it can be made at all. But let us look at the implications of this thing from another standpoint—let us look at it in cold-blooded fiscal or banker's terms rather than in terms of fairness or unfairness or right or wrong. Let us examine what it would do to the investment market—and I am sure every Member is interested in that.

This provision is intended to make common stocks more attractive to investors. If it had been written on the floor of the New York Stock Exchange or in the office of the board of governors of the exchange, it could not have been better timed or better written to promote the present drive of the stockbrockers to get more people to buy common stocks, even on the installment plan, $40 a month.

I have no objection to the stockbrokers trying to get more customers. At present, only about 4 out of 100 persons are owners of stocks. At present, only about 1 family out of 10 owns stocks. At present, only 1 out of 16 adults owns stocks. The more people who buy and sell stocks, the more commissions the brokers make, and that is their livelihood, and I have no objection to them making a living or promoting their business.

But this provision is intended to encourage stockbuying and stockholding by making common stocks more attractive from an income tax standpoint than other types of securities.

As stocks become more attractive, bonds usually lose out. So the interest rates on bonds must rise in order better to compete with stocks for investors' money. What happens when bond interest rates go up?

Borough and township, city and county, and State and Federal costs go up, because the officials of these public agencies must bid higher and higher for investors' dollars in order to compete with common stocks. That is perfectly normal.

What we are doing in this tax bill, however, is taking sides in the battle, deliberately extending tax advantages to common stocks which will react adversely to the bond market and force higher interest rates on municipal bonds, on State bonds, on Federal bonds—and do not forget we have got a $275 billion debt to fund—and on mortgages, railroad equipment bonds, corporation bonds, and every other type of security which competes with common stocks for investment funds.

Who pays the higher interest rates? In the last analysis the taxpayer—and at every level of Government.

Shades of the late but lamented hard-money policy—the monumental blunder of the Treasury last year which had much to do with today's economic dislocations. Now we are going back once again to the hard-money, high-interest policy, only this time we are going it through the medium of a tax bill to give common stocks an unnecessary, completely gratuitous, extra and special promotional gimmick, one, which I said earlier, could not have been more sweet and lovely to the stockbrokers in the Exchange if they had written it themselves in Wall Street.

In this time of worldwide military danger from communism, of huge and almost incomprehensible military expenditures for our safety and survival, of a $275 billion national debt which apparently is going to get bigger before it gets smaller—if it does get any smaller under this administration—and of burdensome direct and indirect taxes at every level of Government on the wage earner and the small-business man, what is there about common stocks which deserves such special largess right now?

Are they depressed? They are not. They are today reaching record levels, perhaps partly in anticipation of the handout momentarily expected from Congress. Are common stocks a poor investment? Obviously not—they have been exceptionally good investments for many years.

I have in my hand a pamphlet issued by one of the Wall Street brokers showing that over the years since the war, common stocks have returned in dividends anywhere from 6 to nearly 8 percent a year on market values. What other investment has done as well year after year? Not savings banks or savings and loan associations, not bonds.

Mark you, Mr. Speaker, I am not referring to earnings—I am referring to dividends. Earnings on common stocks have run anywhere from 11 to 16 percent on stockholder investment through the postwar years. And of this, the corporations' boards have seen fit to return to the stockholders in dividends about half or less of the earnings, plowing the rest back into expansion and improvements which have the effect of strengthening the stockholders' equity and investment. So it is hard to see how stockholders have been suffering in any way from this mislabeled phony, this alleged discrimination euphemistically called double taxation.

For 11 years in a row, aggregate cash dividend payments by listed common stocks topped the total for the preceding 12-month period. So let us have no tears for the poor stockholder; let us look before we leap to the "rescue" of this group of stockholders from a continued fate of 6 and 7 and 8 percent a year on investment in the form of dividends alone, not counting the appreciation in the value of their stockholdings which usually gets taxed at the capital gains rate anyhow.

Let us beware of reinstituting a hard-money policy without realizing what we are doing. Let us not doom the cities of this country to an even more severe jolt on bond funding costs—thus causing an increase in real estate and other local tax rates. Let us not force even higher rates on Government bonds and securities to thus raise our debt costs and hence our tax requirements.

Shall we permit this stock gimmick to go though? Taxpayer, beware.

GATTAS E. MALOOF

Mr. RAY asked and was granted leave to withdraw from the files of the House, without leaving copies, the papers in the case of Gattas E. Maloof, no adverse report having been made thereon.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. HUNTER and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MCGREGOR the remarks he will make in the Committee of the Whole today and to include certain articles.

Mr. BONIN.

Mr. DEMPSEY.

Mr. KING of California (at the request of Mr. MCCORMACK).

Mr. MCCORMACK.

Mr. D'EWART.

Mr. SPRINGER and to include an editorial appearing in the Washington Daily News.

Mr. BENNETT of Florida to revise and extend his remarks in the Committee of the Whole today and include extraneous matter.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas to revise and extend his remarks in the Committee of the Whole today and to include extraneous matter.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to the enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 2714. An act to increase the borrowing power of Commodity Credit Corporation.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. VAN PELT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 23 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, March 9, 1954, at 11 o'clock a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1335. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Power Commission, transmitting the 33d Annual Report of the Federal Power Commission for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1336. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a bill entitled "A bill to authorize the transmission and disposition by the Secretary of the Interior of electric energy generated at Falcon Dam on the Rio Grande"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1337. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a copy of a bill entitled, "A bill to limit the operation of sections 281 and 283 of title 18, United States Code, and section 190 of the Revised Statutes of the United States (5 U. S. C. 99) with respect to counsel in a certain case"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 8193. A bill to amend the Refugee Relief Act of 1953; without amendment (Rept. No. 1323). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan: Committee on Government Operations. Ninth intermediate report on investigation of racketeering in the Detroit area (Rept. No. 1324). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. REES of Kansas: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. S. 2348. An act to repeal the act entitled "An act to authorize the Director of the Census to collect and publish statistics of red-cedar shingles"; without amendment (Rept. No. 1325). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Miss THOMPSON of Michigan: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 6563. A bill for the relief of Zdzislaw (Jerzy) Jazwinski; with amendment (Rept. No. 1321). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. House Joint Resolution 455. Joint resolution granting the status of permanent residence to certain aliens; without amendment (Rept. No. 1322). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HARRISON of Nebraska:

H. R. 8267. A bill to increase the consumption of United States agricultural commodities in foreign countries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ABERNETHY:

H. R. 8268. A bill to increase the consumption of United States agricultural commodities in foreign countries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BURLESON:

H. R. 8269. A bill to increase the consumption of United States agricultural commodities in foreign countries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. JUDD:

H. R. 8270. A bill to increase the consumption of United States agricultural commodities in foreign countries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. POAGE:

H. R. 8271. A bill to increase the consumption of United States agricultural commodities in foreign countries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ANGELL:

H. R. 8272. A bill to amend the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act in order to provide that revenues under the provisions of such act shall be used as grants-in-aid of primary, secondary, and higher education; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FERNANDEZ:

H. R. 8273. A bill to authorize the disposal of public lands in the Fort Stanton Marine Hospital Reservation, N. Mex., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. JAVITS:

H. R. 8274. A bill to provide for research into cancer and heart disease; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 8275. A bill to postpone tobacco and cigarette tax reductions 2 years; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MARSHALL:

H. R. 8276. A bill to encourage a stable, prosperous and productive dairy program and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SHORT:

H. R. 8277. A bill to amend the Universal Military Training and Service Act, as amended, to remove the requirement for a final physical examination for inductees who continue on active duty in another status in the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. D'EWART:

H. R. 8278. A bill to increase the consumption of United States agricultural commodities in foreign countries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. FORAND:

H. R. 8279. A bill to reclassify dictaphones in the Tariff Act of 1930; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SIKES:

H. R. 8280. A bill for the relief of the Military Department of the State of Florida; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. J. Res. 463. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing that no citizen of the United States shall have the right to vote unless such citizen has reached the age of 21; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. J. Res. 464. Joint resolution providing increased security for the United States Capitol and for the Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. GOODWIN: Memorial of the Massachusetts Legislature memorializing Congress to continue Federal grants to State relief programs for the aged to preserve the Federal social security program; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Arizona, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to increasing Federal aid allocations for the highways of the Nation; to the Committee on Public Works.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Arizona, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to retaining the present formula in allocating Federal-aid funds to the national system of interstate highways; to the Committee on Public Works.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 8281. A bill for the relief of the estate of William B. Rice; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H. R. 8282. A bill for the relief of Max Kozlowski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GAMBLE:

H. R. 8283. A bill for the relief of Vesma and Gustav Fridenvalds; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GORDON:

H. R. 8284. A bill for the relief of Fong Bick Sem; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. KELLY of New York:

H. R. 8285. A bill for the relief of Richard Kieve; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. METCALF:

H. R. 8286. A bill to provide for the relief of Milton Beatty and others by providing for determination and settlement of certain claims of former owners of lands and improvements purchased by the United States in connection with the Canyon Ferry Reservoir project, Montana; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WATTS:

H. R. 8287. A bill for the relief of Lew F. Bryan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

550. By Mr. MASON: Petition of 1,309 civilian employees of the United States Naval Ammunition Depot, Crane, Ind., asking Congress to enact H. R. 6539, a bill to amend the Social Security Act to provide unemployment insurance for Federal civilian employees; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

551. By the SPEAKER: Petition of James F. Evans, director of State parks, State of New York, Albany, N. Y., relative to cooperative beach erosion control study of Selkirk Shores State Park, N. Y.; to the Committee on Public Works.

552. Also, petition of Mary F. Parkinson and others, Dunlap, Ill., urging revision of the present 15 and 25 percent rates on Federal excise tax on telephone service; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

553. Also, petition of the deputy clerk, Board of Supervisors, County of Erie, Buffalo, N. Y., relative to enactment of necessary legislation so that all individual persons be allowed an exemption of $1,200 instead of the $600 now allowed for tax exemption; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

554. Also, petition of the president, M. I. S. Veterans, Honolulu, T. H., urging the immediate admission of the Territory of Hawaii as a State in the Union; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Increase in Personal Income-Tax Exemptions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 8, 1954

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the full text of a letter dated February 19, 1954, addressed by me to the President of the United States, urging a $200 increase in personal income-tax exemptions, in order to increase the buying power and the consumption of goods, as a deterrent to a further decline in business.

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

FEBRUARY 19, 1954,

The Honorable DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER,
President of the United States,
The White House,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The purpose of this letter is to urge you to reconsider your tax proposals in the light of later clarifications in the economic picture. I believe, after careful reflection, that you will agree with me that increasing personal exemptions for income-tax purposes to $800, and drastic reductions in taxes on consumer goods (excise tax) would be far more just and stabilizing than the current administration proposals which are primarily aimed to stimulate savings through tax reductions to corporations and to the upper income groups.

I hope that, by now, you realize that my attempts during the past 3 months to alert the country on the need to be on guard against depression neither mark me as a prophet of doom and gloom, nor represent any desire to talk the country into a depression. Perhaps it is true that my party would get more votes this fall if the country were to go into a depression. But, it seems obvious that if our motives were selfish and political, the course I would have followed would have been to remain silent and let it happen. I would rather the Democratic Party remain out of power perpetually than to return to power in the wake of the mass misery of a great depression.

So far as my being a prophet is concerned, I have not predicted a depression. But I have, as emphatically as I could, tried to keep our Nation on its toes and ready to act to stop a worsening of the economic picture.

A look at the present economic situation indicates, in my judgment, that the time for action is here. At least we should take some initial effective steps to counteract the downward trend.

The Census Bureau now estimates that there were 3.1 million unemployed in January, or 750,000 more than they had estimated a few weeks before. There is no doubt, therefore, that unemployment has increased markedly in the last few months. In addition the Census figures for January estimated that there were 275,000 "temporarily laid off" who were counted as having a job although they drew no pay and would not have been permitted by their employer to work had they showed up at their former jobs. Employers have also put large numbers on part time in order to spread the work and reduce the payments which they would otherwise have to make to the State unemployment compensation funds. During the month of January the Census estimates that there were 1.9 millions of workers outside of agriculture who actually worked less than 15 hours a week, 1.7 millions from 15 to 21 hours and 1.6 millions from 22 to 29 hours. In all, therefore, 5.2 million workers, or 10 percent of those employed in nonagricultural occupations, worked less than 30 hours a week. Some of this lost time was caused by absenteeism, sickness and voluntary absentation from work, but a large proportion was undoubtedly involuntary and caused by the employer putting the workers on part time.

The ratio of farm prices received to prices paid by farmers is hovering at its lowest point in 12 years. Steel production has dropped to only 75 percent of capacity compared with 99 percent a year ago, and is 21 percent below last year in physical volume. Freight car loadings are down 10 percent. Mail order sales are over 13 percent below last year and retail sales have fallen off somewhat. Business failures have risen by almost 50 percent.

While I believe we are in a very definite recession, I still do not predict a depression. We have erected many safety nets during the past 20 years to prevent the bottom from dropping out of the national economy. We have farm price supports, minimum wages, unemployment compensation, collective bargaining, social security, assistance to the needy aged, blind, and dependent children, insured savings deposits, and housing programs, to mention a few of these safeguards. But while they may very well cushion the heaviest impact of a depression such as the one which began 25 years ago, that is about as far as they can go. They, by themselves, will not stop the economy from getting into a tight situation.

Thus, I am urging you, as an immediate step, to alter your tax proposals. I know that you are subjected to tremendous pressures to grant the vast majority of tax relief to business, investors, and those in the upper income brackets generally. But what is needed as a stabilizing force in the economy is a tax policy to stimulate purchasing power. Increased purchasing power will mean more consumption, sales, services, production, and employment. In short, it will mean more business activity which will do much to reverse the downward trend.

I know it has been argued that stimulants to business and investors are what is needed to keep the economy up. It is argued that by giving such incentives, business will expand production and hence increase employment. But, under such a premise, who will buy the goods? Only adequate monetary purchasing power broadly distributed can do this.

A reduction in taxes to the upper income groups and to corporations would probably stimulate savings. In normal times, savings are converted into investments and give each worker more capital with which to work. This in turn leads to increased productivity and to higher real wages.

But in times such as these while savings may flow into banks, they do not flow out to the same degree in the form of actual investments since businesses are afraid to borrow and banks are afraid to lend. With the large supply of idle industrial equipment on hand, business in general does not want to borrow to add to it. The savings therefore tend to be in large part sterilized and do not expand production and employment as they would in normal times.

To prevent the recession from deepening into a depression, it is, therefore, far better to stimulate consumption than it is savings.

The idea of giving tax relief only to business and investors as a stabilizing force is simply the old "trickle down" theory, or "what's good for business is good for the country." Such policies, followed in the twenties, ended up with the greatest depression this Nation ever had. What is necessary is a "trickle up" theory, or "what's good for the country is good for business." If people have money to buy, business will have markets and persons will have jobs.

The present administration tax proposals, when in full effect, give investors and business 12 times as much relief as individuals. Individuals would get only $250 million in the form of such items as babysitter allowances and an increase in allowable medical deductions. Recipients of dividends would get $1.2 billion and businesses would get $1.8 billion, for a total of nearly $3 billion.

Yet saying that individuals would get only one-twelfth of the relief given to investors and business is vastly to understate the disparity. Let us analyze this further.

The average individual would get $6 in tax relief ($250 million divided by 39 million tax returns showing taxable income), while the average dividend recipient would ultimately get $200 ($1.2 billion divided by 6 million

stockholders), or 33 times as much. The discrimination is still understated, since less than 4 percent of the taxpayers receiving dividends (those with income over $10,000) get more than three-fourths of all taxable dividends (see table I of Treasury Release No. H-266, October 8, 1953). If we consider families rather than tax returns, we find that less than 1 percent of the American families own 80 percent of all publicly held stocks.

This seems unfair, and I believe it is. Yet the cause I am pleading is based not only on justice but on the economic needs of the Nation. For tax relief to individuals means increased purchases and business activity.

Let us consider a family of 4—husband, wife, and 2 children. Increasing personal income tax exemptions by $200 would give total extra personal exemptions of $800. At the lowest tax rate of 20 percent, this would mean tax savings of $160 a year, enough to buy a major appliance, or any one of several dozen of goods and services on the market. It would mean an increase of about 8 cents an hour in take-home pay.

Lower taxes on consumer goods, meanwhile, would leave more money for the purchase of other items and hence greater purchasing power.

Therefore, I sincerely hope that you will see fit to advocate immediate increases of $200 in personal exemptions on individual income taxes and selective decreases in the excise taxes.

When I advocated such measures while representatives of your administration were before the Joint Committee on the Economic Report, they seemed to have little sympathy for them. I have hitherto advocated such policies in radio and television discussions, and in talks before and with businessmen of my own State of Illinois. I found in most cases that there was a wide public appreciation of their merit.

I should like also to call your attention to a reasoned, powerful statement made in the Senate today by Senator WALTER F. GEORGE, of Georgia, ranking minority member of the Committee on Finance and its former chairman. Senator GEORGE recognizes, and ably stated the case, that the situation calls for tax relief for the millions of individual taxpayers, and an expansion of purchasing power. He advocated, as have I, an immediate increase of at least $200 in the personal income exemption. His competence as a tax authority commands the most serious consideration of his views.

If you adopt these suggestions, I believe Congress will enact them. There may be some opposition in the ranks of your own party, but we Democrats, I believe, will provide the force you need to enact such tax revisions, just as we have helped to provide the necessary support for the main lines of your foreign policies.

Faithfully,

PAUL H. DOUGLAS.

Ninth Anniversary of Communist Seizure of Rumania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 8, 1954

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement I have prepared deploring the Communist seizure of Rumania, and urging that the United States refuse to recognize the satellite government of Rumania.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR DOUGLAS

Last Saturday, March 6, marked the ninth anniversary of the Communist aggressive seizure of the Government of Rumania. Since then, nearly 20 million human beings have toiled and starved under Communist slavery.

Persecution, economic pillage, confiscation of property, suppression of civil and religious liberties, the destruction of the independent worker and agriculturalist have been rampant ever since.

This was not accomplished without the most strenuous measures. The acts of terrorism and brigandage were in themselves insufficient to quell the revolts of the Rumanian people. The Soviets then moved in their armed forces, and forcibly disarmed the patriot garrison in Bucharest, holding the city hostage.

While the effective seizure was not consummated until March 6, it was on February 27, 1945, that the Communists sent their star persecutor, Andrei Vishinsky, who now is their representative on the United Nations Security Council, to deliver their ultimatum. Vishinsky informed the King that he had only a few hours to decide, or the Russians would resort to armed suppression. The legal government was ousted, under threats of force, and Moscow's agents took over.

From then on the pattern is familiar: rigged elections on November 19, 1946, and the consequent welding of the once free nation into the Communist orbit. Since then our Department of State has repeatedly protested the tyranny and suppression of the Communist puppet government of Rumania, but this has not sufficed.

I am convinced that time will erase this perfidy, and that Rumania will again stand as a free nation. I have hitherto offered a resolution for the withdrawal of diplomatic recognition from the satellite Communist puppet governments, and for condemnation of Soviet Russia's enslavement of free peoples. It is my hope that we can get action on this resolution, and demonstrate to the world again our conviction that these governments are a forcible travesty upon the sentiments and faith of the peoples of these countries.

Acts of Congress Benefiting Korean War Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 8, 1954

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, recently I asked the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress to prepare a study for me on the acts of Congress which provide benefits to veterans of the Korean conflict. I ask unanimous consent that this study be printed in the RECORD.

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

ACTS OF CONGRESS PROVIDING BENEFITS TO VETERANS WITH SERVICE DURING THE KOREAN CONFLICT OR SUBSEQUENT TO JUNE 27, 1950

Miscellaneous benefits: Persons who served in active service in the Armed Forces of the United States on or after June 27, 1950, and prior to such date as the President or Congress shall determine, shall be entitled to compensation, pension, medical, hospital, and domiciliary care, and burial benefits as are provided by law for World War II veterans and their dependents. (Joint resolution of May 11, 1951, Public Law 28, 82d Cong., 65 Stat. 40.)

Automobiles: The Administrator of Veterans' Affairs is directed to pay $1,600 on the purchase price of an automobile or other conveyance for veterans who served on or after June 27, 1950, and who suffered service-connected disability through loss of feet or hands or impairment of eyesight. Application for such vehicle must be made by October 20, 1954, or within 3 years after discharge or release if discharge or release occurs after October 20, 1954. (Act of October 20, 1951, Public Law 187, 82d Cong., 65 Stat. 574.)

Education and training: The Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act extends educational and training benefits to veterans of the Armed Forces of the United States who served during any period from June 27, 1950, and the end of the emergency declared by the President or the Congress. Programs are required to be initiated within 2 years of release from active service or by August 20, 1954, whichever is later, and entitlements hereunder shall terminate 7 years from discharge or release. The veteran shall be entitled to benefits for a period equal to 1½ times the duration of his active service, but not in excess of 36 months for service since June 27, 1950, nor 48 months if he is entitled to benefits for previous service.

An allowance to meet, in part, the expense of his subsistence, tuition, supplies, etc., is to be paid to each veteran pursuing a program of education hereunder, which allowance shall vary in relation to the time spent on education, the type he is pursuing, and the number of dependents he has.

Payments to educational institutions shall be at the rate of the established charges of the institutions for tuition and fees required of nonveterans.

All courses taken by veterans must be approved by the State approving agencies in accordance with the provisions of this act. Part VI of the act sets up certain standards for courses offered by training establishments and institutional on-farm training. The State approving agency shall approve courses accredited by responsible accrediting agencies; and shall also approve nonaccredited courses for veterans training under this act if they comply with certain stated requirements. (Act of July 16, 1952, Public Law 550, 82d Cong., 66 Stat. 663–82.)

Employment: Benefits of the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944 relating to Federal employment are extended to persons who have served on active duty in the Armed Forces of the United States during the period between April 28, 1952 and July 2, 1955. (Act of July 14, 1952, Public Law 536, 82d Cong., 66 Stat. 626–27.)

Employment: Veterans who served in the Armed Forces of the United States after June 30, 1950, shall be entitled to the same civil-service benefits as are accorded to World War II veterans who lost opportunity for probational appointment because of induction into the Armed Forces. Persons who voluntarily continue in military service beyond the 4 years required shall not be entitled to the benefits of this act. (Act of July 16, 1953, Public Law 121, 83d Cong., 67 Stat. 173–74.)

Housing: Persons who served in the Armed Forces at any time on or after June 27, 1950, and before a date to be determined by the President, shall be accorded the same preferences in the purchase and occupancy of publicly owned war and low-rent housing, and of FHA-aided cooperative housing as are accorded veterans of World War II. (Act of October 26, 1951, Public Law 214, 82d Cong., 65 Stat. 647–48.)

Housing: The provision granting preferences to veterans under title V of the Lan-

ham Act (housing for distressed families of servicemen and veterans with families) is amended so as to include persons who served in the Armed Forces of the United States during the Korean conflict. (Act of June 30, 1953, Public Law 98, sec. 1, 83d Cong., 67 Stat. 132, sec. 1.)

Insurance: The Servicemen's Indemnity and Insurance Act of April 25, 1951, provides automatic insurance coverage for persons in active service on and after June 27, 1950. (Act of April 25, 1951, Public Law 23, 82d Cong., 65 Stat. 33–38.)

Loans: Title III of the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952 extends, to veterans with service in the Armed Forces of the United States at any time on or after June 27, 1950, and prior to such date as the President or Congress shall determine, the benefits provided under title III of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 relating to loans for the purchase or construction of homes, farms, and business property. Application for such loans shall be made within 10 years after the termination date of the Korean conflict as fixed by the President or Congress. (Act of July 16, 1952, Public Law 550, 82d Cong., 66 Stat. 682–684.)

Loans: Preferences in applications for benefits under the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act and the Housing Act of 1949 are extended to veterans who served in the Armed Forces of the United States between June 27, 1950, and such date as is determined by the President or Congress. (Act of June 30, 1953, Public Law 98, secs. 2, 3, 83d Cong., 67 Stat. 132–133, secs. 2, 3.)

Mailing privileges: The transmission of first-class mail free of postage is permitted until June 30, 1955, for members of the Armed Forces who "as a result of service in Korea," are hospitalized outside the continental limits of the United States. (Act of March 23, 1953, Public Law 9, 83d Cong., 67 Stat. 7, ch. 9.)

Missing Persons Act: Provision is made for extension, until July 1, 1955, of provisions of the Missing Persons Act and incorporation of certain changes made by Public Law 450, 82d Congress, so as to cover the Korean situation. (Act of April 4, 1953, Public Law 16, 83d Cong., 67 Stat. 20–21, as amended January 30, 1954, by Public Law 291, 83d Cong., 68 Stat. 7.)

Mustering-out pay: With certain enumerated exceptions, members of the Armed Forces who were engaged in active service on or after June 27, 1950, and prior to such date determined by the President or Congress, shall be eligible to receive mustering-out pay. (Act of July 16, 1952, Public Law 550, title V, 82d Cong., 66 Stat. 688, title V.)

Naturalization privileges: Any person not a citizen of the United States who has been lawfully admitted for permanent residence or been in the United States at least 1 year before entering the Armed Forces, and who actively served with the Armed Forces for not less than 90 days on or after June 24, 1950, and not later than July 1, 1955, may, regardless of age, be naturalized without full compliance with the naturalization laws, such as period of residence, payment of fees, etc. Such naturalization proceedings may take place before any representative of the service designated by the Attorney General, provided the petitioner while serving is not within the jurisdiction of a court. (Act of June 30, 1953, Public Law 86, 83d Cong., 67 Stat. 108–110.)

Service flag and lapel button: The act of October 17, 1942, authorizing approval of a standard design for a service flag and service lapel button for World War II veterans is amended to include veterans with service during any period of "hostilities in which the Armed Forces of the United States may be engaged." (Act of May 27, 1953, Public Law 36, 83d Cong., 67 Stat. 35.)

Unemployment compensation: Title IV of the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952 provides for compensation at the rate of $26 per week for any weeks of unemployment (not in excess of twenty-six) which may occur 90 days after July 16, 1952, for any veteran with service on or after June 27, 1950, and prior to such date as shall be determined by the President or Congress.

No compensation shall be paid hereunder for any week commencing more than 5 years after such date as determined by the President or Congress.

Veterans eligible to receive mustering-out payments are not eligible for unemployment compensation for prescribed periods of 30, 60, or 90 days after discharge depending on amount of mustering-out pay. (Act of July 16, 1952, Public Law 550, 82d Cong., 66 Stat. 684–688.)

Vocational rehabilitation: Benefits provided under Public Law 16, 78th Congress are extended to veterans with service on or after June 27, 1950, and prior to such date thereafter as is determined by the President or Congress, who are in need of vocational rehabilitation to overcome the handicap of a disability incurred in combat, extra-hazardous service, or when the United States was at war. (Act of December 28, 1950, Public Law 894, 81st Cong., 64 Stat. 1121.)

Vocational rehabilitation: The benefits under the act of December 28, 1950, above, which were limited to injuries incurred in combat, etc., are extended hereunder to veterans of the Korean campaign on the same basis as veterans of World War II. (Act of October 11, 1951, Public Law 170, 82d Cong., 65 Stat. 404.)

The United States Has Lost a Great American With the Death of Will H. Hays

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. SPRINGER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 8, 1954

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I know that the House will regret today's news of the death of Will H. Hays.

The story of Will Hays is the story of America. Here is an example of the Middle West small-town boy who on his ability only rose from precinct committeeman to be the chairman of the Republican National Committee and later Postmaster General. I grew up in Sullivan, Ind., where Will Hays was born, came to stature, and died. My father and Will Hays started out as precinct committeemen together. When he was chairman of the Sullivan County Central Committee my father was secretary.

I have known him from a small boy. Will Hays was the kindly and gracious gentleman for whom no favor was too much to do for any friend.

He was not only the statesman, but one continually interested in the welfare of his community, his State, and his country. He was a God-fearing man—a deacon and moderator of the Presbyterian Church. During all of his time in Washington he always managed to come back to Sullivan and to his church to take holy communion.

Even when he was in Washington and later in the movie industry he always retained his friendly interest in Indiana and the early loves of his boyhood.

The high morality which he had learned as a boy he carried with him into the movie industry where he was principally responsible for the cleaning up of the movie industry and bringing it greater respectability in the eyes of the public. In this job his ability and his integrity stood him well for he was never known to weaken on the matter of principle even when he was opposed by large segments of the industry. After his retirement he came back to Sullivan and retained his interest in his friends and the practice of law, which was his first love.

I am sure that Will Hays will be missed, not only by his friends in this body and in Washington, but the many people whom he befriended throughout the United States. The loss of this kind of a man is always felt because he was thoroughly an American.

Mr. Speaker, I am attaching herewith for the RECORD, the editorial from today's Washington Daily News on the death of the Will H. Hays, which tells a great deal about the high respect in which this man was held:

WILL H. HAYS

High-powered persuasiveness sums up best the qualities which carried Will Hays from a small-town Indiana boyhood to the czardom of a $2 billion industry—American movies.

Mr. Hays died yesterday at his Sullivan, Ind., home at the age of 74, ending a prodigious career that included politics, publicity, the profession of law, and policeman of Hollywood's screen morals.

It is a tribute to this grassroots American with a Presbyterian-elder outlook that no Federal regulation or supervision of the motion-picture industry has ever been found necessary. The system of voluntary censorship that the famed "Hays Office" introduced has been sufficiently effective.

Mr. Hays was once described, literally, as "the cat's whiskers of the movie industry" in that the film producers relied on him to guide them through tight places and around dangerous corners the way a cat relies on its whiskers for approximately the same purposes.

He held the job for 21 years. Against moralists who thought he was sometimes too liberal and against liberals who thought he was too moral, Will Hays needed only to turn on his persuasive personality to calm them. He won the respect of industry heads, the critics, and the mass of movie fans who to this day want a movie kiss no longer than the limit once decreed by the Hays office. America owes him an unpayable debt to the influence of decency and good taste he bequeathed to an industry which has such incalculable effect on our manners and morals.

Setting the Record Straight

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALLAN OAKLEY HUNTER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 8, 1954

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, a situation exists which I believe is in need of clarification for the benefit of the Members of this body.

On March 2, 1954, at pages 2506, et seq., of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, my colleague, Mr. HAGEN, who represents the 14th District of California, which adjoins the 12th District, represented by me, cited certain statements by the Fresno

County Board of Supervisors in support of his opposition to House Joint Resolution 355, relating to the supplying of agricultural workers from Mexico. Later, on March 4, at pages 2701, et seq., of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Mr. HAGEN, in commenting on that part of the State, Justice, and Commerce appropriation bill which provides funds for the administration of the Mexican agricultural worker program, again relied upon certain statements of the Fresno County Board of Supervisors in support of his opposition to the program.

In view of the fact that Fresno County is within my district and not Mr. HAGEN'S, I believe it would be well to call to the attention of the Members the position of the Fresno County Board of Supervisors with respect to House Joint Resolution 355 as they conveyed it to me.

In a telegram dated March 2, 1954, the board of supervisors of Fresno County advised me as follows:

> Understand some Members of Congress are under misapprehension that we feel no supplemental supply of Mexican labor is necessary in this area to properly care for and harvest crops from time to time. This is not true but we are unalterably opposed to influx of illegal Mexican nationals or so-called wetbacks. We definitely feel that a simplified and workable plan, with proper controls, is absolutely necessary and will go a long way in solving wetback problem.

I voted for House Joint Resolution 355 because, as I stated in my remarks on page 2507 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on March 2, I believe it will serve two major purposes. First, it helps to provide for the orderly recruitment of supplemental agricultural labor from Mexico. Second, it makes possible more effective administration of the immigration laws. In other words, it will help solve the wetback problem.

Imports of Residual Fuel Oil

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. BONIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 8, 1954

Mr. BONIN. Mr. Speaker, the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania is the only State in the Union which can produce in substantial quantity that practical mineral known as anthracite coal. This product has been the stabilizing factor in the economy of our anthracite coal fields. For the past several years, the production of hard coal has declined from a yearly 60 million tons to approximately 30 million tons. The decrease in production of anthracite coal caused the trustees of the United Mine Workers of America Welfare Fund to reduce the monthly benefits from $100 to $50. This is a severe blow to the men who risked their lives at this hazardous occupation during the war years. The steady decline in production of hard coal has caused a severe unemployment situation in my congressional district. Why?

One of the basic reasons for the loss of production has been the importation of residual fuel oil into the eastern part of our Nation. In 1953, 134 million barrels of residual fuel oil came into this country. This was more than we imported in 1952. I have been told that 130 million barrels were imported in 1952 and the same number of barrels in 1951. This cheap product from foreign shores has caused the drop in tonnage at our mines and fewer work days for the miners.

Recently, the Randall Commission made its report to the President about our foreign trade. The Commission, in my opinion, has ignored the problem of the anthracite coal industry. I studied that report and nowhere do I find a suggestion or recommendation to protect our local industries against the dumping of foreign products on our markets.

I was happy to read the minority report which condemned the majority report for failing to give some protection to the smaller industries of our Nation. I realize that we must export products to other countries to maintain favorable trade balance with other countries. However, I am opposed to the dumping of foreign products on our shores to the detriment of our American industries. There is no duty or obligation on the part of the people of the United States to accept the surplus products of the world to the detriment of our own economic welfare. That is the theory and philosophy of the majority members of the Randall Commission. I want no part of that doctrine.

The Randall Commission would import 168 million barrels of residual fuel oil and cause a loss of an additional 30 millions of tons of hard coal. They suggest a loss of $300 million to the mining companies: a loss of $160 million in wages; $180 million loss to railroad; $88 million loss to railroad employees, plus the indirect losses to Federal, State and local governments in taxes. The Commission would bankrupt the coal companies, the railroad companies and put the employees of each of these on the relief rolls.

Mr. Speaker, the Members of Congress who supported the Simpson bill last year are determined to protect our local industries. We shall cut off the free flow of residual fuel oil into this Nation just as effectively as the German submarines did in World War II. When that happens, and that day is not to far distant, the mines will produce again and the miners will work as they did before.

Federal-Aid Highway Bill Analysis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. DEMPSEY

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 8, 1954

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Speaker, I sincerely trust that my colleagues in the House will, before they vote on the bill, give it the most careful consideration possible, particularly section 2, which apportions the $200 million per year authorized for expediting construction and improvement of the Nation's system of interstate highways. I suggest that you make a searching examination of the provisions in that section which, in my opinion, are so discriminatory against 29 of the 48 States of the Union that the Members from those 29 States will be fully justified in refusing to accept them.

The majority members of the Subcommittee on Roads, of which I am the only member from a Rocky Mountain State, originally proposed to depart from the long-established and approved Federal-aid formula in apportionment of the entire $200 million and apportion this money solely on the basis of population. Never before has such a radical departure from the established formula been proposed, not even for the apportionment of the $25 million in interstate-highway funds authorized for each year in the 1952 legislation, the first money ever authorized for this Federal-aid category.

When the annual authorization was increased to $200 million in the bill soon to come before this honorable body for consideration, the amount had grown to such alluring proportions as to appeal to the cupidity of the more populous States. The result was that allocation of these Federal funds solely on population basis was written into the original bill. That proposal, of course, was entirely unacceptable to me, because it disregarded the area and the interstate highway mileage of two-thirds of our States. It was, in fact, so apparent an attempt to grab more than an equitable and fair share of these Federal funds for the populous States, regardless of their area or highway mileage, that I was forced to oppose it strenuously. As a result, the bill now provides that one-half of the $200 million annual authorization for interstate highways shall be apportioned on the regular Federal-aid formula and the other half on the basis of population. It is my contention that the entire $200 million should be allocated in accordance with the regular formula.

The 29 States which are the victims of discrimination under the present provisions of the bill have 23,542 miles of interstate highways as compared to 13,616 miles in the 19 more populous States. The 29 States, having 63.4 percent of the total interstate system mileage, are allocated $40,687,000 of interstate-highway funds, while the 19 States are to receive $57,313,000. In other words, the States with about two-thirds of the highways being improved under this program would receive two-fifths less than half of the Federal-aid funds. So that my colleagues from those 29 States may know just what this discrimination is costing them in Federal-aid matching funds annually I am giving them the list herewith:

Alabama, $279,000; Arizona, $772,000; Arkansas, $510,000; Colorado, $1,002,000; Georgia, $388,000; Idaho, $507,000; Iowa, $830,000; Kansas, $1,278,000; Kentucky, $59,000; Maine, $112,000; Minnesota, $789,000; Mississippi, $469,000; Missouri, $520,000; Montana, $1,288,000; Nebraska, $1,153,000; Nevada, $565,000; New Mexico, $903,000; North Carolina, $15,000; North Dakota, $726,000; Oklahoma, $790,000; Oregon, $793,000; South Carolina, $64,000; South Dakota, $838,000; Tennessee, $172,000; Texas, $1,823,-

000; Utah, $424,000; Washington, $212,000; Wisconsin, $281,000; and Wyoming, $521,000.

If the original plan to apportion the entire $200 million on population basis had remained in the bill, the annual loss to those States would be double the amount indicated. That, I repeat, makes this proposal wrong. There is no justification for supporting a proposal which is wrong in any degree when we are fully aware that it is wrong. I would point out that we are not building new roads with this interstate highway money. We are improving our principal highways, all of which have been built under the established Federal-aid formula. The Congress authorized them to be financed that way. That was, in substance, our agreement with the States. We should not violate it.

The subcommittee majority offered as justification for their action the fact that only two States voted against the endorsement of population-basis allocation by the American Association of State Highway Officials at that organization's convention in Pittsburgh a few months ago. Those two States, for your information, were Arizona and New Mexico. Why the highway officials representing the other States, which would suffer considerable loss of funds under this proposal, did not voice opposition to it at this convention is difficult to understand. The best information available to me indicates that many of them believed the allocation for which they voted approval was based upon population and area. At least, that is their claim now. The highway mileage in the various States was not included as a factor in reaching this decision, yet that has been an accepted part of the Federal-aid apportionment formula for many years. Up to now I have been given no reasonable justification for the abandonment of a formula that has been long recognized as fair and equitable and productive of the best results in the Nation's development of its highways.

This interstate highway system, comprising about 38,000 miles, was set up by the Congress in 1944 because the roads included in it were the most heavily traveled of all of our traffic arteries. This determination was reached also for the reason that the Department of Defense had designated those roads as requiring immediate improvement and proper maintenance as a defense network. They are deemed the most necessary to an adequate defense production program. They are virtually essential to proper evacuation of our civilian population in event of an extreme emergency. They were during World War II and are today 15 to 20 years behind the rest of the Nation's economic progress. In brief, they constitute the most dangerous and critical bottleneck to our economy and our defense. The interstate system, which is only 1 percent of our Nation's highway mileage, carries 20 percent of our entire highway travel.

In 1953, according to the National Safety Council, 38,300 American lives were lost on our highways. Far more than the proportionate percentage of those people were killed on the interstate highways and by far the greater proportionate ratio were killed in less populous States. As an example, I cite the fact that in New Mexico the 1953 highway-traffic death toll was 56 per 100,000 population. In populous congested New York State it was 13. More than 50 percent of those killed on New Mexico highways were from other States and the big percentage of those nonresidents lost their lives on the 1,012 miles of interstate highways in New Mexico. That, to my mind, should be convincing proof that the improvement of the interstate system is not of purely local benefit. We must regard it, on the other hand, as a program designed for the protection and the benefit of our entire population.

For the Congress to apportion any part of these interstate funds on a population basis is not in accord with the best interests of all of our people. Such an apportionment would be shortsighted. I believe the Members from the more populous States will recognize that when they consider how dependent their States are upon income derived from the thousands of visitors who come to them over the Nation's highways each year. If those heavily traveled highways are inadequate, if they are filled with such death-dealing hazards as narrow bridges, sharp curves, and substandard traffic lanes they deter thousands of tourists from making trips. This reduction in travel, the records will show, costs such States as Florida, California, and others millions of dollars in income. Their economies are injured to a considerable degree.

On the other hand the allocation of these interstate highway funds on a purely population basis does not benefit them materially. Under the apportionment set up by the bill California would receive $1,835,000 more per year than if the regular Federal formula were applied. Florida would receive a trifling $55,000 more. Michigan, the Nation's top motor-vehicle producer, would receive only $763,000 additional per year. I wonder if the Michigan delegation has considered how hard a cutback in motorcar travel, due to inadequate and dangerous highways in the other States, would hit Michigan's pocketbook. That State in 1951—the last year for which accurate data are available—had 7 million out-of-State visitors who spent $560 million. Its annual motorcar production is high in the billions every year. To pass a bill which will reduce that income even 5 percent would hit Michigan's economy hard.

Sound business judgment will tell the representatives of those States that the proposal for apportionment of interstate highway funds as contained in this bill is not actually in their best interest. If the highways in such large less-populated States as New Mexico, Texas, Colorado, Oklahoma, Arizona, and many others are underdeveloped and dangerous, the tourist traffic to the other States will be greatly reduced. They will sacrifice a huge potential income for the comparatively few dollars of additional Federal-aid money they would derive under the terms of this bill. Those funds fairly apportioned on the basis of the regular Federal-aid formula will do them a much greater service by encouraging highway travel from which those populous States derive by far the greatest benefit. Every transcontinental tourist has to cross the Mountain States. Is it good judgment to take $11 million from a highway-improvement program in those States?

I trust that you will go beyond the printed language of this bill and consider its implications. Should we pass this measure as written it will establish a precedent of legislative discrimination, something that we must always seek to guard against most carefully. The only proper place in this Federal-aid highway legislation for apportionment of Federal funds upon a population basis is in the urban category. There population should be the determining factor just as it has been in the past. If more money for urban highways is justified—and I am inclined to believe that it may be—then it should be included in the urban category. To rob vast segments of the interstate highway system of necessary funds will defeat the original intent of the Congress and hamper the defense program of our Nation.

Need for Passport Office for Los Angeles, Calif.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CECIL R. KING

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 8, 1954

Mr. KING of California. Mr. Speaker, it has come to my attention that again Los Angeles is being treated as a frontier town.

Los Angeles needs and has needed for some time a passport office to meet the demands of this city with its phenomenal growth.

Los Angeles is the third largest metropolitan area in North America. We have the finest international airport in the country and the greatest man-made harbor with the finest terminals in the world. And yet—Los Angeles must conduct its passport business via an outmoded system through a Federal court clerk who must send the applications to Washington, D. C., or to San Francisco in emergency cases.

Los Angeles, a city of over 2 million population, is the third largest city in the United States handling foreign passports, with applications filed last year totaling 17,913 and involving the collection of $179,000 in fees. And yet, San Francisco, with half the population and handling far less traffic than this city, boasts an official passport office.

In 1929 Los Angeles County boasted a record passport traffic of 5,404, for a $54,000 return to the Federal Government. Today, with passport traffic more than tripled, and tourist and commercial trade growing by leaps and bounds, Los Angeles is still without an official passport office.

Los Angeles should have an issuing office on the strength of current statistics showing it to be the third largest producer in passport applications. Last month, the Los Angeles Federal court clerk received 1,701 applications for pass-

ports, as compared to a record total of 883 in 1930.

A typical day in local passport activities was reported on February 3 of this year, when 89 applications were received, of which 74 of them were sent to Washington, D. C., and 15 to San Francisco for emergency treatment. This is an entirely unnecessary restraint on world travel emanating from Los Angeles and the surrounding area. The establishment of a passport office in Los Angeles is a necessity to all types of travel, and would be in keeping with the growth of this area and its international airport and excellent harbor.

Thomas Masaryk and Czechoslovakia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 8, 1954

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, two sister Slavic peoples, the Czechs and the Slovaks, have lived in Central Europe for at least 1,500 years. The geographic position of the country, at the historic crossroads between East and West, is the key to the long and often tragic history of the Czechoslovaks. We know that early in their history the country flourished, and the zenith of its greatness and glory was reached in the 14th century. From then on, however, the history of Czechoslovaks has been very uneven. During most of that time their country has been dominated by foreign powers, governed by alien rulers and they have suffered endless injustices and iniquities. Alien overlords have done everything in their power to extinguish all traces of Czechoslovak national life, but these agents of tyranny could not eradicate the Czechoslovak national spirit of independence and freedom.

Toward the end of World War I when the days of oppressive monarchies were numbered in that part of the world, the Czechoslovaks were fortunate in having as their spokesman and leader the great philosopher-statesman, Thomas Masaryk. It was through his relentless efforts that the Czechoslovak National Council secured recognition from the Allies, later proclaimed Czechoslovak independence, and then laid the foundations of the new state. For more than two decades Masaryk and his devoted disciple, Eduard Benes, guided the destiny of Czechoslovakia. During its early years the young Republic came through its teething troubles more quickly and successfully than any other state in central and southeastern Europe, and * * * a few years later earned for itself the title of model democracy. Trade flourished and the country's economy was stabilized; the economic well being of the people was promoted; social and educational reforms were undertaken on a large scale; and there was a remarkable revival of the national culture. All these things were accomplished according to the wishes and humanitarian beliefs of its founding father, who by this time had become an elder statesman of Europe. And in 1935, when he laid aside the burden of the presidency and passed the duties of his office on to his able disciple, Eduard Benes, Czechoslovakia was well along the road of progress and prosperity.

Late in the thirties, however, the aggressive designs of Nazi Germany singled out Czechoslovakia as one of its first victims, and some 6 months before the start of World War II, the Czechoslovak state was destroyed, the country was once more dismembered, and Nazi overlords in Prague ruled the country. For more than 5 years, from March 1939 to early May of 1945, Czechoslovaks suffered under Nazi tyrrany; and for their courageous resistance against their ruthless oppressors they paid abundantly with their lives.

On May 9, 1945, when their country was liberated, Czechoslovaks once more started their task of nation building. But this time, faced with difficult political and diplomatic problems, that task seemed almost forbidding. The Nazi danger was gone, but that of communism came closer. As a matter of fact, the Communist danger literally stalked poor Czechoslovaks soon after their liberation from the Nazi tyranny. Whenever they manifested their natural desire to establish close ties with the democratic West, they received indications of Moscow's displeasure. Whenever they made known their preference for the democratic way of life they were accused of bourgeois mentality. And in mid-1947 when they were disposed to accept Marshall plan aid, they were restrained and reprimanded by Moscow. That was the first open and unmistakable warning to them that they were not masters of their own destiny. Finally, in February of 1948, with the encouragement and underhanded support of Moscow, Czechoslovak Communists took over the government of the country.

Since then the history of the country may be described as the rapid replacement of a successful democracy by a Communist satellite in the Soviet pattern. All industries are nationalized and farms are collectivized. The country's economy is geared to that of the Soviet Union. The Communist regime maintains itself by its dreaded but efficient secret police. All traces of freedom are eliminated, and all contact with the free world is forbidden. The secret police control the public and private affairs of every citizen. Today the country is virtually a slave of the Soviet Union. It is, however, heartening that despite all these almost unbelievable restrictions and rigidity in Czechoslovak life, in spite of this reign of terror, thousands of anti-Communists succeed in finding their way to freedom by escaping to the West. And within Czechoslovakia there is unending resistance to the Communist regime. By means of such organized underground movements, brave and patriotic Czechoslovaks are not only risking their lives to regain their own freedoms, but are also carrying on the fight of democracy against tyranny in that European outpost. Let us all hope that soon their country will be liberated from Communist tyranny and all Czechoslovaks once more enjoy the blessings of freedom and national independence.

Increase Consumption of United States Agricultural Commodities in Foreign Countries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WESLEY A. D'EWART

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 8, 1954

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to increase the consumption of United States agricultural commodities in foreign countries, a measure that I believe will be most helpful in distributing for consumption a large part of the food and fiber that is now in storage in this country.

The fact that we have not been able to find means of consuming or distributing for consumption the plentiful harvests of our farms and ranches is a perplexing problem. I sometimes think that we let our concern about this problem obscure the fact that we should be truly grateful for the abundance we have enjoyed in recent years. The real problem is to find better means of getting our farm produce to the people, both at home and abroad, who need and can use it. This bill endeavors to help with the distribution of our produce in other nations around the globe.

The purpose of the act, stated in section 2, is to promote "the stability of American agriculture and the national welfare by stimulating and facilitating the expansion of foreign trade in agricultural commodities produced in the United States."

This objective would be accomplished by both private and Government sales of agricultural commodities over and above what is considered to be the normal quantities exported, and by measures to expand a continuous market demand abroad for our agricutural commodities.

It is proposed to accomplish these ends by loans through the Export-Import Bank, and to permit payment in the currency of the borrower nation.

The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to designate the quantities and kinds of surplus agricultural commodities which may be offered, to reimburse the Export-Import Bank, and to direct the CCC to sell to domestic exporters for export such surplus commodities as may be shipped abroad.

The President is authorized to use foreign currencies acquired under this act to develop new markets and to purchase materials needed for our own strategic materials stockpiles. The facilities of the Foreign Operations Administration would be available to carry out this work.

It is my belief that this legislation can be of material help in creating international trade and good will, in distributing the great abundance of agricultural products now available in America, thus serving the interests not only of the farmers and ranchers of this country but of the Nation generally. I trust that it will be considered in this light.