Congressional Record

United States of America

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 83d CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

SENATE

THURSDAY, APRIL 29, 1954

(Legislative day of Wednesday, April 14, 1954)

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

Dr. Fred M. Lange, L. H. D., vice president and executive director, Dallas County Community Chest, Texas, offered the following prayer:

O God, our Father, in these times of stress, when many minds are perplexed and many hearts are faint, we turn, in simple trust, to Thee, our strength and our Redeemer.

We ask Thee for wisdom, that we may seek Thy will; for courage, that we may do it; and for faith, that we may walk in calm assurance.

Guide the thoughts and purposes of these chosen leaders of our people, O Lord, that they may, above all else, say and do what is pleasing in Thy sight. And help us all to be true to our American heritage and faithful servants of the living God.

In the name of Christ, our Saviour. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D. C., April 29, 1954.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. FRANK CARLSON, a Senator from the State of Kansas, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

STYLES BRIDGES,
President pro tempore.

Mr. CARLSON 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 Wednesday, April 28, 1954, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, its reading clerk, announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6896) to extend the period for the filing of certain claims under the War Claims Act of 1948 by World War II prisoners of war.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency may meet today. There are witnesses who must testify before the committee today, and for that reason the chairman of the committee requested that I make the unanimous-consent request.

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

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 clerk 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.

CONFIRMATION OF POSTMASTER NOMINATIONS

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, as in executive session, the Senate consider the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FLANDERS in the chair). Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the clerk will proceed to state the nominations.

POSTMASTERS

The Chief Clerk proceeded to state sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the postmaster nominations be confirmed en bloc.

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

Mr. KNOWLAND. I also ask unanimous consent that the President be notified forthwith of these confirmations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in the executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. BUSH, from the Committee on Banking and Currency:

A. Jackson Goodwin, of Alabama, to be a member of the Securities and Exchange Commission.

By Mr. BRICKER, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

Robert Bruce Bacon and sundry other cadets to be ensigns in the United States Coast Guard.

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, as in executive session, from the Committee on Armed Services, I report a number of routine military nominations in the Air Force, all in the lower commissioned grades.

In order to save the expense of printing on the Executive Calendar of these 626 names which have already appeared once in the RECORD, I ask unanimous consent that these nominations be ordered to lie on the Vice President's desk for the information of any Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The nominations will be received and will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Massachusetts.

OUTLINE OF MAO TSE-TUNG'S MEMORANDUM ON NEW PROGRAM FOR WORLD REVOLUTION

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, some information which came to me, purporting to be an outline of Mao Tse-tung's memorandum on the new program for world revolution, carried to Moscow by Chou En-lai in March of 1953. I believe the information substantially states the Communist policy on world revolution. In any event, I think the Senate may find this matter of interest.

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

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

AN OUTLINE OF MAO TSE-TUNG'S MEMORANDUM ON NEW PROGRAM FOR WORLD REVOLUTION

(Carried to Moscow by Chou En-lai in March 1953)

1. ASIA TO BE THE IMMEDIATE GOAL

Due to the profound leadership of Comrade Stalin, amazing achievements have been made in the great task of world revolution. The success that has been attained both in Europe and in Asia after World War II is entirely attributable to Comrade Stalin's able and correct guidance and direction. May his wisdom still guide us.

It appears that time has come that we have to look upon Asia as our immediate goal. Under the present circumstances, any vigorous action in Europe such as internal revolution, effective infiltration, or intimidation into inaction or submission is now impossible (Communist terminology is different, this represents what it really means) more forcible measures may bring about a war. In Asia, on the contrary, such tactics will yield an abundant harvest.

2. WORLD WAR TO BE TEMPORARILY AVOIDED

There is no assurance of victory because of the higher rate of industrial production and larger stockpile of atomic weapons on the part of the capitalist countries, incompletion of antiatomic defenses of the industrial areas and oil installations in the Soviet Union, and immaturity of China's agricultural and industrial developments. Consequently, we have to, until we are certain of victory, take a course which will not lead to war.

3. DIPLOMATIC OFFENSIVE

The United States must be isolated by all possible means.

Britain must be placated by being convinced that there is possibility of settling the major issues between the East and the West and that the Communists and the capitalist countries can live in peace. Opportunities for trade will have a great influence on the British mind.

In the case of France, her warweariness and fear of Germany must be thoroughly exploited. She must be made to feel a sense of greater security in cooperating with us than with the western countries.

Japan must be convinced that rearmament endangers instead of guaranteeing her national security and that, in case of war, the American forces distributed all over the world cannot spare sufficient strength for the defense of Japan. Rearmament is, therefore, an expression of hostility toward her potential friends. Her desire to trade will offer great possibilities for steering Japan away from the United States.

4. MILITARY PREPAREDNESS

As a final goal, there should be in east and southeast Asia (after these areas are liberated) 25 million well trained men who can be immediately mobilized. These men are to be held in readiness for emergency. They will achieve two purposes. On the one hand they will force the capitalist countries to keep on increasing defense expenses until economic collapse overtakes them. On the other hand, a mere show of force, when time is ripe, will bring about the capitulation of the ruling cliques of the countries to be liberated.

5. THE KOREAN WAR

The important reason that we cannot win decisive victory in Korea is our lack of naval strength. Without naval support, we have to confine our operations to frontal attacks along a line limited by sea. Such actions always entail great losses and are seldom capable of destroying the enemy. In March 1951 I suggested to Comrade Stalin to make use of the Soviet submarines in Asia under some arrangement that the Soviet Union would not be apparently involved in the war. Comrade Stalin preferred to be cautious lest it might give the capitalist imperialism the pretext of expanding the war to the Continent. I agreed with his point of view.

Until we are better equipped for victory, it is to our advantage to accept agreeable terms for an armistice.

6. FORMOSA

Formosa must be incorporated into the People's Republic of China because of the Government's commitment to the people. If seizure by force is to be avoided for the time being, the entry of the Chinese People's Government into the United Nations may help solve this problem. If there should be serious obstacles to the immediate transfer of Formosa to the control of the People's Government, a United Nations trusteeship over Formosa as an intermediary step could be taken into consideration.

7. INDOCHINA

We shall give the maximum assistance to our comrades and friends in Indochina. The experiences we have had in Korea should enrich their knowledge in fighting for liberation. The case of Indochina cannot be compared with that of China. In Indochina, as in Korea, there is serious intervention of the capitalist bloc, while in China there was nothing so direct and vigorous. The experiences in Korea tell us that so long as there is foreign intervention and so long as we have no naval support, military operations alone cannot achieve the objective of liberation.

The military operations in Indochina should be carried out to such an extent as to make the war extremely unpopular among the French people and to make the French and Americans extremely hateful among the Indochinese people. The object is to force the French to back out of Indochina preferably through the face-saving means of an armistice. Once foreign intervention is out of the picture, vigorous propaganda, infiltration, forming united fronts with the progressive elements in and outside the reactionary regimes will accelerate the process of liberation. A final stroke of force will accomplish the task. Two years may be needed for this work.

8. BURMA, THAILAND, INDONESIA, AND MALAY PENINSULA

After the liberation of Indochina, Burma will fall in line as good foundation has already been laid there. The then reactionary ruling clique in Thailand will capitulate and the country will be in the hands of the people. The liberation of Indonesia, which will fall to Communist camp as a ripe fruit, will complete the circle around the Malay Peninsula.

The British will realize, under these circumstances, the hopelessness of putting up a fight and will withdraw as quickly as they can. We expect that the whole process will be competed in or before 1960.

9. JAPAN AND INDIA

By 1960 China's military, economic and industrial power will be so developed that with a mere show of force by the Soviet Union and China, the ruling clique of Japan will capitulate and a peaceful revolution will take place. We must be on guard against the possibility that the United States will choose to have war at this moment. She may even want the war earlier. The defensive and offensive preparations of the Soviet Union and China must, therefore, be completed before 1960. Whether we can prevent the United States from starting the war depends upon how much success we have in isolating her and how effective is our peace offensive. If the war can be averted, the success of our plan of peaceful penetration for the other parts of Asia is almost assured.

In the case of India, only peaceful means should be adopted. Any employment of force will alienate ourselves from the Arabic countries and Africa, because India is considered to be our friend.

10. ARABIC COUNTRIES AND AFRICA

After India has been won over, the problems of the Philippines and the Arabic countries can be easily solved by economic cooperation, alliances, united fronts, and coalitions. This task may be completed in 1965. Then a wave of revolution will sweep over the whole continent of Africa and the imperialists and the colonizationists will be quickly driven into the sea. In fact this powerful movement may have been under way much earlier.

With Asia and Africa disconnected with the capitalist countries in Europe, there will be a total economic collapse in Western Europe. There capitulation will be a matter of course.

11. THE UNITED STATES

Crushing economic collapse and industrial breakdown will follow the European crisis. Canada and South America will find themselves in the same hopeless and defenseless condition. Twenty years from now, world revolution will be an accomplished fact. If the United States should ever start a war, she would do so before the liberation of Japan, the Philippines, and India. The courses of action in that event are outlined in the memorandum on military aid.

ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT BEFORE THE DAUGHTERS OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, the Daughters of the American Revolution have recently concluded their 63d Continental Congress, which was held in Washington, D. C.

This outstanding organization, organized to perpetuate the memory and spirit of those who achieved American independence, and to aid in securing for mankind the blessings of liberty, is rendering a great service to the Nation at the present time. This great, patriotic organization has never faltered in its stand for the continuance of the ideals based on the teachings of our Creator, and the furtherance of programs in the interest of our great Nation.

At the recent convention, the membership had an opportunity again to further affirm their faith in these principles and ideals; and they heard many prominent and interesting speakers on the importance of continuing their militant, patriotic program.

Among the outstanding speakers was the President of the United States. I ask unanimous consent that his remarks at the convention be made a part of the RECORD at this point.

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

Madam President, and members and friends of this great typically American society [applause], it is a tremendous honor that you accord me by inviting me to appear before you, even though very informally and briefly. My first message is from Mrs. Eisenhower [applause] who for once in a long lifetime bowed to my wishes and remained at her little place of rest down in Georgia while I came to bring you greetings from the family.

I want to talk to you for a few moments from the standpoint of the application of the great principles for which this society stands, which this society supports, the application of those principles to today's life.

I think we would not have to go to any great length to describe what we mean by those basic principles.

Our Founding Fathers, in writing the Declaration of Independence, put it in a nutshell when they said:

"We hold that all men are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights."

In that one phrase was created a political system which demands and requires that all men have equality of right before the law, that they are not treated differently merely because of social distinction, of money, of economic standing, of intelligence or intellectual capacity or anything else.

It acknowledges that man has a soul, and for that reason is equal to every other man, and that is the system, that is the cornerstone, that is the principle, that is the cornerstone of what we call the American system.

There are, of course, dozens of auxiliary principles that go along with this, but rip out this one and you have destroyed America, while many others could be at least revised, studied and considered without necessarily damaging our whole governmental and political structure.

Now, how do we apply such a system in a world where there is present one great power complex that stands for the exact opposite? Remember, in the phrase I quoted to you, "Men are endowed by their Creator." Our system demands the Supreme Being. There is no question about the American system being the translation into the political world of a deeply felt religious faith.

The system that challenges us today is the atheistic. It is self-admitted as an atheistic document. They believe in a materialistic dialectic, in other words, there are no values except material values. It challenges us today in every corner of the globe.

Now, how do we approach Indochina or debt management or taxes or France or any other problem that looms up as important to us in a world where no nation may live alone? How do we approach the idea of the equality of men which means group action by cooperation among men as against dictatorial, atheistic policy that treats man merely as an agent, as a pawn, as an atom to be used according to the dictates of the ruler? That is the problem of today.

It would be interesting if we could have the counsel of Washington, of Madison or of Jefferson or of Franklin today after all this span of almost two centuries, if they could sit with us and counsel with us on these problems. They cannot do it.

We find, like all other generations, we have our problems. I hold they are not insoluble. America can do it. [Applause.]

But remember, among equals group action is done to the greatest extent possible by cooperation. You are a free individual. The general limits of your freedom are merely these: that you do not trespass upon equal rights of others.

In the same way, in a free society of nations, we don't dictate to one of our friends what they must do, and we certainly won't tolerate any attempt of theirs to dictate to us what to do. [Applause.]

We are a society of equals, both nationally and internationally, and that is the problem. How do we marshal the great intellectual, scientific, economic, financial, spiritual resources of such a great aggregation of equals against a single dictatorial, ruthless enemy that threatens, through every possible type of aggression, the peace of the world?

Now, those are the problems, and I want to say several things: First, and I think possibly I am talking about the reasons that I venerate and admire the Daughters of the American Revolution, because the very fact that you preserve this society means that you do venerate the system that was established by our forefathers. Your lives, or at least this part of your lives, your public service, is dedicated to the preservation of those principles. If we are then united in spirit, we develop a power that is unknown to regimentation.

Woodrow Wilson said, in far better words than could I, something of what I am trying to get at. He said:

"The highest form of efficiency is the spontaneous cooperation of a free people."

What I am trying to talk about is the great power, the great force, that is developed by people who believe in certain causes or a certain principle with their whole heart and soul.

You know, there was an old feeling among people that you could not have great elan, great esprit in a service and at the same time an iron discipline. People that believe that ought to read the story of Cromwell's Ironsides. They had not only stern discipline but a great elan because they believed in something. They went into battle singing hymns.

I sometimes wish that as we approach a concentration, a mobilization of ourselves, of the powers of which we are capable, that we would meet in the idea of singing, whether it is America the Beautiful or something else, but coming together in the idea that here is a spirit, a belief, a determination that can't be whipped by anything in the world, and that is all we need. [Applause.]

If any of you would allow your imagination to travel around the world, you would find that still in the control of that part of the world we call independent outside the Iron Curtain, there is a great preponderance of the world's material resources, a great preponderance of human beings, a great intellectual capacity, particularly in certain centers, a great culture, great scientific advancement in the aggregate resources so overwhelming as compared to the Iron Curtain countries, that you sometimes wonder why we grow tense, we grow fearful, and that brings me back again to my one single thought.

It is because we instinctively fear a power that is in the hands of a single dictatorial group or person. How do we combat that power? Again I say by a spiritual unity among ourselves that is indestructible, among ourselves as individuals, among the nations that we are proud to call friends.

Now, that is a rough start, as I see it, of the way we will win the cold war and prevent a hot war, because we will bring to bear in this search and quest for peace all the great spiritual, intellectual, and material values which the free world can concentrate to this one purpose.

Underneath it all must lie this common understanding, this common purpose: the love of liberty, the belief in the dignity of man, and in that to brush aside all minor problems as unimportant, the determination to press forward in that quest.

Now, the kind of unity of which I speak, my friends, is not regimentation. By no means do I believe that a democracy is to live if each person is compelled to think the same thought and agree on all the multitudinous details that go to make up the legislative history of a land, but I do say this.

We must be bound together in common devotion to great ideals, in common readiness to sacrifice for the attainment of those ideals, and in a common comprehension of our situation in the world where we are living, how we are living, and what in broad outline we must do to achieve that victory.

Then, if our spiritual dedication is up to the task, we cannot fail.

Now, that is something that I believe this society does for our people. It increases and keeps alive and nurtures that dedication to dignity of man, to the greatness of our country and the right of every man to walk upright, fearlessly among his own equals.

I do hope that during this week you have had a grand time in Washington. I hope that it will not be 7 years that shall pass before I see you again.

Thank you and good day. [Applause.]

OBSCENE LITERATURE—RESOLUTION OF WOMEN'S SOCIETY OF CHRISTIAN SERVICE, BLACK RIVER FALLS, WIS.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I present a resolution which I have received from the Women's Society of Christian Service of the Methodist Church at Black River Falls, Wis. It concerns the vital matter of protecting our Nation, particularly its young people, from vile literature. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed in the RECORD, and be thereafter appropriately referred to the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"It appears that obscene comic books and other literature are being offered for sale to juvenile persons in this area; and

"It appears that such literature is being transported from State to State and through the public-mail service, all to the detriment of the parents, schools, and religious societies: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Women's Society of Christian Service, and upon the recommendation of Judge Lambert Hansen, of Sparta, Wis.*, That this organization go on record as favoring action to oppose this traffic; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That certified copies of this resolution be forwarded to our United States Senators and Representatives in Congress for proper remedial action.

"Mabel E. Moore, Arline Zeman, Hazel Boehlke, Agnes Manthe, Ruby Pearce, Cleo Galston, Diana Lovell, Wilma Dimmick, Pearl Hayes, Thelma M. Klick, Edel Fromm, Marie Fristed, Gladys Lund, Marie Strasburg, Marie Nash, Dorothy Upton, Amby Widmar, Phyllis Harden, Mavis Dugan, Jeanne Klein, Alice Welda, Janette E. Kotman, Lela Westerfield, Beulah Small, Aldena Meyer, Doris Morris, Olive Bean, Arline Grover."

I hereby certify that the above resolution is a true and correct copy of the resolution passed by the Women's Society of Christian Service of the Methodist Church at Black River Falls, Wis., on April 26, 1954.

MABEL E. MOORE,
President.

INCREASED COMPENSATION OF MEMBERS OF CONGRESS AND THE JUDICIARY—RESOLUTION OF ARIZONA STATE BAR ASSOCIATION

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, and appropriately referred, a resolution adopted by the State Bar of Arizona, relating to increased compensation of Members of Congress and the judiciary.

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

"Be it resolved by the State Bar of Arizona in convention assembled, That it is the sense of this organization that the McCarran bill, presently before the Congress of the United States, providing for increase in compensation for Members of the Congress and members of the Federal judiciary, be adopted; be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of this organization be instructed to transmit copies of this resolution to the Arizona congressional delegation and to the chairman of the respective Judiciary Committees of the House and Senate of the Congress of the United States."

The above resolution was adopted by the State Bar of Arizona at the regular meeting on April 24, 1954.

JOSEPH A. CROWE,
Secretary.

HEALTH SERVICE PREPAYMENT PLAN REINSURANCE ACT—LETTER

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a letter addressed to me by the insurance commissioners of the State of Nevada, relative to the bill (S. 3114) to improve the public health by encouraging more extensive use of the voluntary prepayment method in the provision of personal health services, and characterizing that administration-sponsored measure as "very bad socialistic legislation," may be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

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

STATE OF NEVADA,
INSURANCE DEPARTMENT,
Carson City, April 20, 1954.

Hon. PATRICK MCCARRAN,
United States Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: I am writing to state a few personal views relative to S. 3114 as commented about in my telegram of last week.

1. There is no need for a program of Federal reinsurance on accident and health plans. The amount at risk under most all of such plans can be assumed readily by the original insurer without danger to its financial structure. In those few instances where reinsurance might be deemed desirable or necessary it is presently available from private sources.

2. The cost of operation of the so-called Federal Reinsurance Corporation would come, for at least the first 5 years, from tax moneys.

3. Voluntary accident and health insurance is available now to all but the indigent, those who will not provide the coverage for themselves, and the uninsurable. This act will not provide coverage for those people. Further, it is not the responsibility of the Federal Government but of local government to care for the indigent and the uninsurable. It should be done directly and not as a camouflaged insurance program.

4. This bill would nullify all State insurance laws relative to accident and health insurance as the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare could determine the content of the policy form, the premium, the justness of claims, etc.

5. This bill would authorize the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to use as she deems advisable the insurance departments of the several States.

6. This bill would definitely place the Federal Government into another phase of the insurance business.

I am enclosing a copy of the analysis of the bill prepared by the subcommittee of the National Association of Insurance Commissioners and a copy of the resolution passed by the executive committee of the National Association of Insurance Commissioners, of which I am a member, at its special meeting in Chicago April 5 and 6.

I realize, as you say in your letter of April 15, that it will be a difficult task to stop the legislation, but regardless of who is sponsoring it, I feel that it is very bad socialistic legislation.

Your consideration to opposing this bill and its authority for further encroachment of the Federal Government on State rights is requested.

Respectfully yours,
PAUL A. HAMMEL,
Insurance Commissioner.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following report of a committee was submitted:

By Mr. POTTER, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

S. 2818. A bill to amend sections 4417 and 4418 of the Revised Statutes, to authorize biennial inspection of the hulls and boilers of cargo vessels, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 1272).

REVISION OF ORGANIC ACT OF VIRGIN ISLANDS—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Mr. President, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, I report an original bill to revise the Organic Act of the Virgin Islands of the United States, and I submit a report (No. 1271) thereon.

This is a committee bill, worked out by the committee after hearings in the Virgin Islands and executive sessions here in Washington.

The Members of the Senate will recall that last July I introduced three measures, by request, to revise the Organic Act of the Virgin Islands. These measures are: S. 2321, introduced at the request of the Department of the Interior; S. 2322, introduced at the request of the Chamber of Commerce of St. Thomas, the most populous island of the Virgin Islands; and S. 2323, introduced at the request of the popularly elected Legislative Assembly of the Virgin Islands. I stated at the time that I did not, myself, necessarily endorse any of the three, but that I thought that they should be before the Senate so that the views of the people of the Virgin Islands might be had on all of them.

In accordance with my commitment, I went to the Virgin Islands last autumn and held quite extensive hearings and executive conferences with the people and officials there. I think I can state that no one in the islands who wished to be heard was denied the opportunity. In addition, a large number of written statements were submitted to me. I have made my report to the committee and submitted the views of the people of the islands to the Members.

The present bill which I am reporting on behalf of the committee combines many of the features of each of the previous bills with such other provisions and changes as the committee saw fit to make upon the basis of my report and the views of the people of the Virgin Islands.

Mr. President, we have a new administration in the Virgin Islands, the first really new administration in 20 years. President Eisenhower appointed the Honorable Archie A. Alexander, of Des Moines, Iowa, a Negro and a highly successful businessman and builder, as Governor of the Islands, and he already has initiated some changes that are long overdue there.

However, Governor Alexander cannot do the job the people of the Virgin Islands and the people of the mainland need to have done unless we give him the proper legislative machinery. The present Organic Act dates from 1936 and combines many of the worst features of the old Dutch colonial system, on which it was based, and many of the worst features of the stultifying paternalism that characterized some of the legislative innovations of the mid-1930's.

Revision of the 1936 Organic Act is long overdue, and I earnestly urge that the Senate consider the committee's bill and act upon it at an early date.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be received and the bill will be placed on the calendar.

The bill (S. 3378) to revise the Organic Act of the Virgin Islands of the United States, reported by Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, was read twice by its title and placed on the calendar.

BILLS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. THYE:

S. 3376. A bill for the relief of Neil C. Hemmer and Mildred Hemmer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 3377. A bill to provide for the effective distribution through voluntary agencies of surplus agricultural commodities abroad to needy persons, to improve the foreign relations of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

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

By Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska:

S. 3378. A bill to revise the Organic Act of the Virgin Islands of the United States; placed on the calendar.

(See the remarks of Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska when he reported the above bill from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. PURTELL:

S. 3379. A bill to amend the Flammable Fabrics Act, so as to exempt from its application fabrics and wearing apparel which are not highly flammable; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

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

By Mr. SALTONSTALL:

S. 3380. A bill for the relief of the Massachusetts College of Pharmacy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CASE:

S. 3381. A bill to authorize the President to provide assistance to an expedition to the Antarctic in furtherance of the interests of

the United States; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EFFECTIVE DISTRIBUTION ABROAD OF SURPLUS AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to provide an additional means for the effective distribution of surplus agricultural commodities.

The bill is entitled "A bill to provide for the effective distribution through voluntary agencies of surplus agricultural commodities abroad to needy persons, to improve the foreign relations of the United States, and for other purposes."

Sections 1 and 2 lay the basis for distributing surplus foods through nonprofit voluntary agencies acceptable to, and registered by, the Department of State.

Sections 3 and 4 authorize the President, when he finds it to be in the public interest, to transfer such surpluses free of costs at domestic storage points, to voluntary agencies for distribution in friendly countries.

Section 5 provides that the voluntary agency may enter into agreements with receiving countries for bearing the cost of packaging, ocean freight and all other distribution costs, where it is possible to negotiate such agreements.

Where such cost cannot be borne by the receiving country the President, if he deems it in the Nation's interest, may pay these costs or may require the distributing agency to pay for them.

Section 6 provides that distributing agencies will insure delivery of surpluses only to needy persons without political, racial, or religious discrimination; that all surpluses shall enter the country duty free; and that either argreements between the agency and the receiving country, or between the United States and the receiving country, shall provide for the kind and conditions of distribution listed above.

It also provides that where the receiving country can be induced to do so, that the country will set up development funds to at least the extent of one-fourth of the market value of the food and fiber distributed, these funds to be set up to the credit of the nonprofit voluntary agency.

Section 7 provides for use of these funds in self-help programs in the receiving country, with the mutual consent of the agency, the receiving country, and under general policies laid down by the President.

Sections 8 to 10 inclusive provide for mutually agreed use of the funds in a third country, for annual reports by the agency to the United States on distribution of surpluses and use of development funds, and finally for cancellation of notes of the Commodity Credit Corporation to the Treasury for the value of surpluses released by the corporation to the distribution agency.

There are three foreign channels for use of surpluses in farm production in this country, namely: one, normal commercial export markets; two, sale of surpluses outside of these channels with acceptance of local currency for reinvestment in the purchasing countries; and, three, distribution of surpluses largely through church relief organizations, refugee organizations, CARE, CROP, and other similar organizations.

My bill is intended to supply this third channel of distribution of surpluses.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill, together with a statement prepared by me, be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3377) to provide for the effective distribution through voluntary agencies of surplus agricultural commodities abroad to needy persons, to improve the foreign relations of the United States, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. THYE, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc.—

DECLARATION OF POLICY

SECTION 1. It is declared to be the policy of the United States of America to encourage the full utilization of its surplus agricultural commodities, to promote international friendship by the most effective distribution of its surplus agricultural commodities abroad to needy persons, and to improve the productive economy of cooperating countries.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 2. As used in this act—

(a) The term "surplus agricultural commodities" shall mean any agricultural commodities acquired by the Department of Agriculture or the Commodity Credit Corporation in the operation of the price-support program, and any other agricultural commodities as determined by or purchased by the President to carry out the purposes of this act.

(b) The term "distribution agencies" shall mean nonprofit voluntary agencies now registered with the Advisory Committee on Voluntary Foreign Aid of the Foreign Operations Administration or which may become registered with such committee or with any department or agency of the Government which may hereafter succeed to the powers and duties thereof.

AUTHORITY OF THE PRESIDENT TO TRANSFER AND PURCHASE SURPLUS AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES

SEC. 3. (a) Subject to the terms and conditions hereinafter set forth, but without regard to the provisions of section 416 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, the President is authorized to transfer surplus agricultural commodities to distribution agencies for distribution in any country designated by the President as a cooperating country pursuant to this act: *Provided*, That prior to each such transfer the President shall have satisfied himself that the proposed distribution by the distributing agency will not substitute for, and that it will displace to a minimum practical extent, usual marketings of the United States or friendly countries.

(b) The President is authorized to purchase in the United States for such transfer any agricultural commodity when, in his determination, to do so will serve the public interest.

POINT OF TRANSFER

SEC. 4. Transfer of title to surplus agricultural commodities to distribution agencies shall be made at no cost to such agencies at points of storage in the United States.

BURDEN OF COSTS

SEC. 5. The costs, after transfer to any distribution agency, of processing or repackaging of surplus agricultural commodities, of freight within the United States, of ocean freight, of overseas transportation and distribution, and of storage and administration in the United States or overseas connected therewith, shall be borne by the distribution agency: *Provided, however*, That—

(a) such agency is authorized to negotiate and conclude an agreement with the government of each cooperating country in which it proposes to distribute such commodities, under which the government of such country shall assume so much of the costs referred to above as is economically feasible, through the contribution of dollars, local currency, transportation services, or otherwise;

(b) the costs referred to above, to the extent that they are not assumed by the government of such country, may be reimbursed by the President to such distribution agency, if and to the extent that he determines such reimbursement to be in the public interest;

(c) upon the determination of the President that such retransfer is in the public interest, such distribution agency may be authorized to cover its processing or repackaging costs through the retransfer, to the processor or repackager, of a portion of the products received hereunder, but the quantity to be so retransferred shall in each instance be subject to approval of the President; and

(d) nothing herein shall prevent the reimbursement of ocean freight costs to such an agency to the extent that shipments are eligible for reimbursement under the provisions of section 117 (c) of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended (62 Stat. 153; 22 U. S. C. 1515 (c)).

CONDITIONS OF TRANSFER AND REIMBURSEMENT

SEC. 6. (a) No surplus agricultural commodities shall be transferred to any such agency for distribution in any cooperating country, nor reimbursement commitments in connection therewith be made to any such agency, until and unless the operation of the agency within the country and importation of the commodities into the country free of duty are authorized by a written operating agreement concluded between the agency and the government of such country or an agreement between the Government of the United States and the government of such country.

(b) The agreement, whether between the distribution agency and the government of such country or between the Government of the United States and the government of such country, shall also provide that distribution of said surplus agricultural commodities shall be made to needy persons or groups without cost to them, and without discrimination based on race, religion, creed, or political affiliation; that such distribution shall be made in accordance with programs to be agreed upon from time to time between the distribution agency involved and the cooperating country; and that distribution shall be subject to supervision by representatives of United States nationality appointed by such distribution agency.

(c) The agreement shall also provide, unless the President specifically determines otherwise, that the government of the cooperating country shall establish a fund in favor of the distribution agency in local currency to an amount equal to not less than one-quarter of the world market value of the surplus agricultural commodities distributed by the agency in the country under the authority of this act, and that the government of the country authorizes the agency to make use of such fund in accordance with the provisions of section 7 of this act.

USE OF LOCAL CURRENCIES

SEC. 7. (a) The fund established in favor of the distribution agency pursuant to section 6 (c) of this act and the proceeds from the interest therefrom shall be available for use by the agency for development of self-help and relief programs through loans or grants-in-aid in the country where established. Self-help programs shall be in the field of sanitation, education, public health, medicine, industry, and agriculture. All programs using funds pursuant to section 6 (c) shall be planned and agreed upon jointly by the distribution agency and the cooperating country.

(b) The distribution agency shall receive no profit from the self-help or relief programs referred to previously but may charge to such programs the normal administrative and operating costs properly attributable thereto.

(c) On the termination of operation by the agency in any cooperating country, and in any event not later than 20 years after the first establishment of any fund in favor of the agency in any such country, any unobligated portion of the agency's fund therein or of the proceeds held therein from interest on or the repayment of loans made out of any such fund, shall be remitted to the government of such country.

USE OF FUNDS IN OTHER COUNTRIES

SEC. 8. With the approval of the President and of the government establishing the fund under section 6 (c) of this act, the agency may use an agreed portion of the fund for self-help programs in another country, or for the purchase of equipment or supplies in another country to be used in self-help or relief programs in the country where such fund is established.

REPORTS

SEC. 9. Each distribution agency operating under this act shall file with the Advisory Committee on Voluntary Foreign Aid of the Foreign Operations Administration, or its legal successor, not later than September 30 in each year a report on its operations under this act for the year ending June 30 preceding, in such form and detail as said committee shall prescribe. On January 1, 1956, and each year for 2 years thereafter, the President shall transmit a report to the Congress on the operations under this act conducted in the previous fiscal year.

REIMBURSEMENT OF DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE OR THE COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

SEC. 10. In order to make payment to the Commodity Credit Corporation for any commodities transferred pursuant to section 3 of this act, the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to cancel notes issued by the Commodity Credit Corporation to the Secretary of the Treasury in amounts equal to the value of any commodities so transferred. The value of any commodity so transferred, for the purpose of this section, shall be the lower of the domestic market price or the Commodity Credit Corporation's investment therein as of the date of transfer, as determined by the Secretary of Agriculture.

The statement presented by Mr. THYE is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR THYE ON USE OF PART OF FARM SURPLUSES BY VOLUNTARY AGENCIES IN FOREIGN COUNTRIES

Our agricultural surplus problem is probably our most important domestic problem.

Its solution involves not only the prosperity of our farmers, but sooner or later the continued prosperity of the city laborer and industry.

And it affects to a profound extent our foreign relations and whether or not we have real friends among the free nations of the world.

These surpluses need not be regarded as a curse, as some seem to think; they could well be one of our greatest blessings if only we have the good sense to use them as a blessing.

We must always have sufficient plantings of food and fiber to meet our needs.

It is inevitable that in some years, when all factors are favorable including such an uncertain one as the weather, there will be surpluses.

We must not allow the proportionately small surpluses of our Nation's farm economy to bring poverty to our farmers.

That is the reason why I am introducing a bill which provides a long-time practical plan for moving our surplus food and fiber into uses by our allies and friendly nations where these foods and fibers are greatly needed; where they will serve as a most powerful means of creating new profitable future markets for these surpluses, and at the same time serve as powerful forces creating good will.

There are three distinct foreign channels for use of these surpluses, and under present circumstances it will require fullest use of all three means of disposal to put these surpluses where they can be used as a blessing and as a means of avoiding spoilage and waste.

The most important of these three foreign channels is sales in normal commercial markets which as an aftermath of war in general have shrunken by as much as 30 to 40 percent.

A second channel is that of selling surpluses outside of regular commercial channels, but accepting in payment local currencies of the purchasing country and reinvesting these currencies largely in the purchasing countries. Sales of this type which do not interfere with normal commercial sales and usage cannot be adequate to absorb all our current and prospective surpluses.

This view is held by those in charge of these sales under section 550 of the Mutual Security Act of 1953.

In many years we will have unused surpluses on our hands after we have exhausted all disposals under the above-mentioned two means, and will need to use our remaining surpluses to distribute to the needy people of our allies and friends.

By this means wastage of these surpluses can be avoided, good will can be created, and profitable new markets for the future can be opened up.

My bill is intended to supply this third channel of distribution of surpluses, largely through nonprofit voluntary agencies such as the church relief organizations, the refugee organizations, CARE, CROP, and other similar organizations.

SERIOUS SURPLUS PROBLEM

Let us examine the seriousness of our mounting surpluses and the likelihood of additional surpluses continuing in the future.

In a statement April 19 before the Grocery Representatives, Inc., Under Secretary of Agriculture True D. Morse summarized the mounting seriousness of these surpluses in the following words :

"Wheat carryover July will equal the domestic needs for a full year.

"Cotton carryover doubled last year and at the end of this crop year will be enough to care for the Nation's needs for a full year.

"Corn carryover will reach a record high if a normal corn crop is produced.

"The Government owns over 1.3 billion pounds of butter, cheese, and dried milk, and is having to take more.

"The Government owns enough vegetable oils to make more than a billion pounds of margarine.

"It costs a half-million dollars per day just to pay storage on Government-owned stocks.

"The Government has about $6¾ billion in purchases, and loans, and other commitments covering farm products—and Congress has increased the limit of supports up to $8½ billion."

Even a cursory examination into the nature of farming in our Nation will reveal the inevitability of surpluses in some years regardless of the kind of price support or farm program we may have.

The nature of the farm business makes a continued full output from our farmers essential. Also, the rapid improvement of our knowledge, methods, and machinery insures a continued rapid increase in our productivity per man, per acre, and per head of livestock.

FULL PRODUCTION FACTORS

These conclusions are drawn from the following facts:

Regardless of price, control of acreages, of war, of peace, prosperity or depression, American farmers for the past 20 years have not varied their total crop acreage by any appreciable amount.

They have planted around 350 million to 360 million acres, year in and year out.

During this same period, as we have shifted rapidly from animal to tractor power, we have greatly expanded our total available units of fieldwork horsepower.

In 1935 we had 25 million units of power to prepare, plant, till, and harvest our 360 million acres of cropland, or 1 unit of horsepower for each 14 acres of cropland.

We now have over 40 million units, counting each tractor as 8 units of horsepower, or 1 unit for each 9 acres of cropland.

On the labor side during these two decades the farmer and his family labor supply have gradually supplied a larger and larger proportion of all labor needed to operate the farm.

Machinery and mechanical power has made the farm gradually more self-sufficient of its necessary farm labor.

Cropland, therefore, for our farms, is remarkably stable.

Field power from crop work is abundant and for any year is largely a fixed factor. In addition, the average farm supplies around 80 percent or more of all labor needed to operate the farm.

It must clearly be kept in mind that this fixed nature does not hold only for farmers as a whole, but for groups of farmers, and for each farmer. It thus is a powerful force for continued full output throughout all agriculture, since we are still a family-farm Nation and since mechanization has tended to reinforce the family farm rather than weaken it.

YOUNG FARMERS SURPLUS

Here we have an unbeatable and inevitable full output combination. One may ask what are the chances that low prices and high costs will drive the farmers away from the farm and into industry, and in that way stop our surplus farm production machine.

There is, in my opinion, not a chance in the world, for by far the biggest and most persistent surplus our farms produce is their surplus of prospective farmers, in the form of farm-reared boys who would like to farm as a lifework but who cannot find an available farm.

It probably takes about 150,000 to 200,000 new farmers each year for replacement of those who die or retire.

We have supplied this replacement, and an average surplus of 250,000 additional farm boys that had to go to the city each year, for the past 3 decades.

There seems to be no slackening or end to this surplus of boys coming from our farms, so there is no chance whatever that our farms will be unmanned in future years due to too few boys who know farming and who want to farm.

This unchanging amount of land used, this fixed amount of power and labor, this never-ending supply of new farmers, is still not the

end of the story of the inevitability of our surplus farm output.

The Department of Agriculture made an elaborate and careful study in 1952 of our agriculture's capacity to produce.

They came up with the astounding conclusion that if farmers applied all the known and readily available "know-how" the output of the four feed crops (corn, barley, oats and sorghums) could be increased 57 percent more than the 1950 production on the same amount of land; that cotton output could be upped 76 percent; peanuts by 83 percent; wheat 40 percent; tame hay 56 percent; soy beans 41 percent; and, remarkable though it may seem, pastures by 97 percent.

Food livestock production per unit of livestock has possible increases fully commensurate with those of crops, the report concludes.

PRODUCTIVITY TO REMAIN HIGH

From these facts on the nature of the farm business, it is clear that, other than setbacks from drought years, it is more difficult if not impossible to reverse the upward movement of increased productivity of American farms at the present state of our development.

Acreage controls, diversion of land to planting of legumes for soil building, and other means will help maintain a balance, but basically we must anticipate that surpluses will occur.

Because of our own and world needs, our agricultural machine has been geared to a high level of productivity.

Obviously this acceleration cannot continue forever, but rash, indeed, would be the farm economist who would predict where the increased productivity of our American farms will level off, especially with research paying such good returns and with expanded research and extension being heartily endorsed and vigorously advocated by nearly everyone.

In our acreage control efforts during the last 2 decades we have never reduced our total crop acreage any—but merely shifted it from one surplus producing crop to others.

We are trying to avoid that by encouraging shifts to soil-building rather than marketable crops.

The high fixed cost nature of the farm business and the uncertainties and hazards of farming make the effort for full production not only logical but necessary.

Hence we must realize that this great continued abundance of our food and fiber—this even, full flow from our farms of the means of high standards of living—is one of the greatest factors of our Nation's greatness and of its leadership in the world.

We must look upon it as one of God's richest endowments to our Nation.

Let us not for once look upon it as a curse, but as one of the greatest blessings sent to a troubled, hungry world.

It is one of the most powerful weapons of peace ever given to a nation.

Let us use it as such to help feed hungry people, to help them gain strength so they can themselves become more productive; and finally let us use it as a far more potent destroyer of communism than is the hydrogen bomb.

Communism has no greater ally than hunger; democracy and freedom no greater ally than a well-nourished people.

The bill which I have introduced is aimed solely at using part of our farm surplus to help us as a nation attain these ends.

It, as stated previously, provides for distribution through nonprofit voluntary agencies.

WOULD BUILD GOODWILL

One of the most important results of distributing our unmarketable surpluses through nonprofit voluntary agencies is the goodwill that results in aid distributed under the name of the United States but by private agencies to needy persons in a country.

Person to person help, always marked as coming as assistance from the United States, rather than the over-all nation to nation assistance, avoids the natural skepticism that one nation has for another when such mutual aid efforts are undertaken through national channels.

Dollar for dollar such aid can without doubt be extended at far less cost to the United States through voluntary nonprofit agencies, as is provided in the bill I have introduced, than through direct governmental distribution.

This type of aid also assures that the aid is given solely to the needy and does not get into speculative channels as is often the case in government to government distribution.

OPEN NEW FIELDS

The provisions of this bill, I am certain, will open up a vast new field of use and distribution of our surpluses that cannot otherwise be disposed of.

It will yield great future rewards in goodwill, and rewards for our country in expanded markets.

It will result in increased productivity of friendly countries and consequent increased future profitable commercial intercourse between them and us.

To summarize, I believe that a servicable use of some of our current and future unmarketable surpluses is highly important as a means of avoiding the spread of an aggressive communism.

If these surpluses are allowed to waste, or are dumped onto the world markets to break normal markets, great discredit and ill will to us will be the result.

On the other hand, if these surpluses are used to relieve hunger, to increase productivity and trade, and to establish new future demands without interfering with normal private trade, we can reap rich harvests of good will, of reduced costs of checking aggression, and of increased profitable future trade with friendly nations.

AMENDMENT OF FLAMMABLE FABRICS ACT, RELATING TO EXEMPTION OF CERTAIN FABRICS AND WEARING APPAREL

Mr. PURTELL. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend the Flammable Fabrics Act, which I have prepared.

The bill would add scarfs made of plain surface fabrics to the other articles which are already exempted by present law, namely hats, gloves and footwear.

The bill would also change the conditions under which the present flammability tests are conducted. At present, samples are made bone-dry before they are tested under commercial standard 191–53. This bill would require samples to be tested under the normal conditions under which articles of clothing are generally worn, namely in room temperature with average humidity.

The Senate and House committee reports indicate that the purpose of the Flammable Fabrics Act was to protect the public from the danger surrounding the use in wearing apparel of highly flammable textiles of the types which had caused either bodily injury or death to numerous individuals. The bill was aimed at dangerous articles of wearing apparel, such as highly flammable children's cowboy playsuits, torch sweaters or jackets, and the like. The major hazards arose from certain cotton or rayon fabrics having fuzzy or furlike surfaces which flash and burn with exceeding rapidity.

The Senate and House committees were faced with the major problem of discriminating between the conventional fabrics that present moderate and generally recognized hazards and the special types of fabrics which present unusual hazards and are highly dangerous. The committees followed the advice of industry spokesmen and experts and incorporated into the law commercial standard 191–53. Now, less than 10 months after the law is passed, the industry calls to our attention the fact that a large percentage of silk, organdie, batiste, veils, nettings, and so forth, have been unexpectedly banned by that commercial standard, notwithstanding the fact that they are made of conventional fabrics with a good record for safety down through the years. The possibility that these conventional fabrics might be banned under the standards of the law was never even broached in the hearings and it is quite likely that closer scrutiny would have been given to commercial standard 191–53, if this had been called to the attention of the committees. That is the reason why it is necessary to consider amending the law within 1 year after it has passed and about 2 months before it goes into effect.

Although the legislative history makes clear that scarfs of some kinds at least were included within the terms of the act, industry experts point out that the only ones which present unusual hazards and are highly dangerous are the ones which are not made of plain surface fabrics. Furthermore, there is no indication that scarfs have been made of cotton or rayon fabrics having fuzzy or furlike surfaces which flash and burn with exceeding rapidity, but if they were, they would still come under the testing procedures of the act under my bill. Handkerchiefs and scarfs are used primarily as accessories and not as regular clothing. A handkerchief can easily and quickly be discarded or dropped if it burns rapidly. The same observation applies to scarfs, except that they may take a little more time to remove. However, if scarfs are made of plain surface fabrics, according to industry experts, the burning time is slow enough to allow the person to discard them.

The other amendment added by my bill is a change in the conditions under which the present flammability tests are conducted. I have already pointed out that we are surprised that certain conventional fabrics, such as organdie, batiste, veils, nettings, and so forth, with a long record of safety performance are now banned by the present tests. Industry representatives and experts point out that the reason is that sample are not tested under the conditions existing where those materials are generally worn. At present, samples are tested bone dry. My bill would require samples to be tested under the normal conditions under which articles of clothing are generally worn, namely, in room temperature with average humidity. Experts have advised me that when so

tested, conventional fabrics such as organdies, batistes, veils, nettings, and so forth, will pass the test although silk would not be materially helped by this change. I believe this result will be more in keeping with the professed purposes of the Flammable Fabrics Act.

I intend to send this bill to the Federal Trade Commission and to the Department of Commerce by special messenger for a quick appraisal of its merits and I will welcome any recommendation on their part for improvement of the bill. As soon as I obtain their views, I intend to call a meeting of the subcommittee to consider this urgent problem. This may take place early next week.

I ask unanimous consent to have two statements prepared by me and two letters relating to the bill printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statements and letters will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3379) to amend the Flammable Fabrics Act, so as to exempt from its application fabrics and wearing apparel which are not highly flammable, introduced by Mr. PURTELL, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The statements and letters presented by Mr. PURTELL are as follows:

EXEMPTION FROM FLAMMABLE FABRICS ACT OF FABRICS AND WEARING APPAREL NOT HIGHLY FLAMMABLE

Senator WILLIAM A. PURTELL, Republican, of Connecticut, chairman of the Subcommittee on Business and Consumer Interests, introduced in the Senate today a bill which would amend the Flammable Fabrics Act (Public Law 88, 83d Cong.), so as to exempt from its application fabrics and articles of wearing apparel which are not highly flammable. The Flammable Fabrics Act was approved in the 1st session of the present Congress, on June 30, 1953. By its terms, the act becomes effective on June 30, 1954.

Senator PURTELL's bill would add scarfs made of plain-surface fabrics to the other articles which are already exempted by present law, namely hats, gloves, and footwear.

The bill would also change the conditions under which the present flammability tests are conducted. At present, samples are made bone-dry before they are tested under commercial standard 191-53. Senator PURTELL's bill would require samples to be tested under the normal conditions under which articles of clothing are generally worn, namely in room temperature with average humidity.

NEED FOR LEGISLATION

Senator PURTELL explained the need for the legislation, as follows:

"The Senate and House committee reports indicate that the purpose of the Flammable Fabrics Act was 'to protect the public from the danger surrounding the use in wearing apparel of highly flammable textiles of the types which had caused either bodily injury or death to numerous individuals.' The bill was aimed at dangerous articles of wearing apparel, such as highly flammable children's cowboy playsuits, torch sweaters or jackets, and the like. The major hazards arose from certain cotton or rayon fabrics having fuzzy or furlike surfaces which flash and burn with exceeding rapidity.

"The Senate and House committees were faced with the major problem of discriminating between the conventional fabrics that present moderate and generally recognized hazards and the special types of fabrics which present unusual hazards and are highly dangerous. The committees followed the advice of industry spokesmen and experts and incorporated into the law commercial standard 191-53. Now, less than 10 months after the law is passed, the industry calls to our attention the fact that a large percenage of silk, organdie, batiste, veils, nettings, etc., have been unexpectedly banned by that commercial standard, notwithstanding the fact that they are made of conventional fabrics with a good record for safety down through the years. The possibility that these conventional fabrics might be banned under the standards of the law was never even broached in the hearings and it is quite likely that closer scrutiny would have been given to commercial standard 191-53, if this had been called to the attention of the committees. That is the reason why it is necessary to consider amending the law within 1 year after it was passed and about 2 months before it goes into effect."

REASON FOR PARTICULAR LEGISLATIVE APPROACH

"At the request of the subcommittee, counsel was asked to explore the possibility of an administrative solution to the problem. Counsel has advised me that the standards laid down in the act are so clear and stringent that possible administrative relief is inadequate. For instance, the Federal Trade Commission has been asked by members of the industry to rule that scarfs and handkerchiefs are not articles of wearing apparel under the terms of the act but merely accessories. According to committee counsel, while handkerchiefs should not be regarded as within the terms of the Flammable Fabrics Act, it is quite likely that scarfs are included, because express mention was made by Federal agency witnesses at the hearings that scarfs that covered part of the neck and shoulders should be regarded as wearing apparel within the meaning of the terms. This legislative history is difficult to overcome. If handkerchiefs are excluded from the coverage of the present law, as we are advised by committee counsel, this alone will in part take care of the silk problem, because a large portion of sheer silks are used in the manufacture of handkerchiefs. If we report out amendments to the act, I shall advise the committee to cover the matter of handkerchiefs, at least in the report, to make clear that a handkerchief is not an article of wearing apparel in the sense of the act.

"Although the legislative history makes clear that scarfs of some kinds at least were included within the terms of the act, industry experts point out that the only ones which present unusual hazards and are highly dangerous are the ones which are not made of plain-surface fabrics. Furthermore, there is no indication that scarfs have been made of cotton or rayon fabrics having fuzzy or furlike surfaces which flash and burn with exceeding rapidity, but if they were, they would still come under the testing procedures of the act under my bill. Handkerchiefs and scarfs are used primarily as accessories and not as regular clothing. A handkerchief can easily and quickly be discarded or dropped if it burns rapidly. The same observation applies to scarfs, except that they may take a little more time to remove. However, if scarfs are made of plain-surface fabrics, according to industry experts, the burning time is slow enough to allow the person to discard them.

"With the exemption of handkerchiefs and scarfs from the act, the problem of silk is largely solved. Sample flammability tests on silks were recently conducted with the following results:

Weight of silk:	*Flame spread (seconds)*
3 momme	3.0
4 momme	3.3
5 momme	4.1
8 momme	5.0

"As only those fabrics which burn in less than 4 seconds are banned by the act, 5-momme silk would generally pass the present tests. Four momme and three momme silk (sheer silk) is imported in large quantities into this country primarily for handkerchiefs and scarfs. Experts point out that while 3 momme and 4 momme silk under present tests burns in less than 4 seconds, silk has the characteristics of ceasing to burn when the flame is removed from the material. Therefore, it presents much less of a hazard than pile synthetic materials or brushed rayon. The fact is that silk for handkerchiefs and scarfs was used down through the years without its ever being considered hazardous. The same is true of the use of other plain-surface fabrics when used for handkerchiefs and scarfs.

"On the other hand, except for handkerchiefs and scarfs, it is my belief that silk and other plain-surface fabrics, like any other fabric which burns in less than 4 seconds under the test conditions outlined in my bill, should not be used in the manufacture of articles of wearing apparel. To the extent that 3 momme or 4 momme silk or other plain-surface fabrics may be banned from use in shirts, nightgowns, and other wearing apparel, that is the price of safety which we must exact from the producers of these materials as we do from the producers of other materials banned by the act. We will not compromise with public safety.

"The only other amendment added by my bill is a change in the conditions under which the present flammability tests are conducted. I have already pointed out that we are surprised that certain conventional fabrics, such as organdie, batiste, veils, nettings, etc., with a long record of safety performance are now banned by the present tests. Industry representatives and experts point out that the reason is that samples are not tested under the conditions existing where those materials are generally worn. At present, samples are tested bone dry. My bill would require samples to be tested under the normal conditions under which articles of clothing are generally worn, namely, in room temperature with average humidity. Experts have advised me that, when so tested, conventional fabrics such as organdies, batistes, veils, nettings, etc., will pass the test, although silk would not be materially helped by this change. I believe this result will be more in keeping with the professed purposes of the Flammable Fabrics Act.

"I intend to send this bill to the Federal Trade Commission and to the Department of Commerce by special messenger for a quick appraisal of its merits and I will welcome any recommendation on their part for improvement of the bill. As soon as I obtain their views I intend to call a meeting of the subcommittee to consider this urgent problem. This may take place early next week."

INQUIRY INTO COMPLAINTS AGAINST THE FLAMMABLE FABRICS ACT

Senator WILLIAM A. PURTELL, Republican, of Connecticut, chairman of the Subcommittee on Business and Consumer Interests of the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, announced today that his group is looking into numerous complaints that the Flammable Fabrics Act (Public Law 88, 83d Cong., approved June 30, 1953, effective June 30, 1954) will unduly cripple certain segments of the textile industry.

Senator PURTELL said: "This month, the full committee and our subcommittee have received numerous letters to the effect that this act, if it is allowed to become effective on schedule, on June 30 of this year, will cause severe hardship to many business firms engaged in the importation and distribution of lightweight cotton, rayon, and silk textile fabrics, as well as to domestic manufacturers and distributors of some sheer fabrics which have long been used with safety by the Amer-

ican consumer. We are looking into these complaints and, if we find that they are justified, we will find a solution and recommend whatever action is necessary to the full committee." The Senator explained that the matter was considered in a subcommittee meeting on April 14. As a result, discussions are going on between the staffs of the subcommittee, the Federal Trade Commission, and the Department of Commerce to determine whether an administrative solution to the problem is feasible and in the public interest. "The results of initial exploration into the feasibility of an administrative remedy are not too encouraging," Senator PURTELL said. "The act is quite specific upon the standard of flammability, and if we find that it is unduly restrictive, we may have to amend it," he added.

In closing, Senator PURTELL stated: "It may well be that section 4 of the act, in incorporating Commercial Standards 191–53 and 192–53 by reference, went further than the professed purposes of the act, and that the present testing procedures are in need of some revision because they do not distinguish properly between the flash-burning type of fabrics and those that have been safely worn for generations. If the subcommittee finds this to be the case it will call upon the Bureau of Standards and the industry to recommend or develop more suitable testing procedures to prevent the banning of conventional fabrics that present no unusual hazards and which have been worn safely down through the years. However, I wish to serve notice that our subcommittee will not compromise with the public safety and that no postponement of the effective date of the act or weakening of the act will be recommended at the risk of allowing those special types of fabrics to be sold which present unusual hazards and are highly dangerous. Industry itself, generally, would object to our inviting this risk."

The complete text of the Senator's statement is as follows:

"For several years past there have been shocking instances of deaths and serious bodily harm caused by wearing apparel of highly flammable textiles. Until last year, it was not too unusual to pick up a newspaper and read of burnings and even deaths suffered by children when wearing highly flammable cowboy or Halloween suits or by adults wearing so-called explosive sweaters. One would read of a man driving his automobile and lighting a cigarette, with the result that the sweater burst into flames and seriously injured him; or of high school girls at a prom suffering similar harm while wearing a tulle dress, or at home when clad with a cotton chenille dressing gown; or of a woman wearing nitrocellulose buttons on her dress while sitting in front of a chafing dish, with the result that the buttons practically exploded in her face and set her afire. I could give instances ad nauseam. Some of these incidents happened in waves. Accordingly, an outraged public demanded that something be done to put a stop to this menace. Bills were introduced in several State legislatures to protect the public from this danger, but they were opposed by the wearing-apparel industry who joined in the chorus for Federal legislation in order to protect the industry from the requirements of possibly conflicting and diverse regulations by the various State and communities.

"Bills to prohibit the transportation in interstate commerce of highly flammable fabrics and wearing apparel were introduced in the House of Representatives of the United States beginning with the 79th Congress, 1st session (1945). In the 80th Congress (1947–48), the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce held extensive hearings on three flammable fabrics bills. Similar bills were introduced during the 81st and 82d Congresses. In the 82d Congress, the Senate passed unanimously on July 3, 1952, S. 2918, a bill which had many of the features of the present law. The House committee also reported the bill, but the House took no action upon it prior to the adjournment of the Congress.

"On April 16, 28, and 29, 1953, the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce held public hearings on 5 similar bills. The principal objective of all these bills was to prohibit the introduction or movement in interstate commerce of articles of wearing apparel and fabrics which are so highly flammable as to be dangerous when worn by individuals.

"The present law originated from H. R. 5069, which was introduced by Congressman WOLVERTON, chairman of the House committee, at the direction of the committee, as a 'clean' bill as a result of the committee hearings and after executive consideration of all the bills pending before the committee.

"Every witness who testified before the committee, without exception, representing virtually all segments of the textile industries and trades, urged prompt and effective Federal legislation to protect the public from the dangers of highly flammable wearing apparel and fabrics used in wearing apparel, and supported these bills in principle. Moreover, the committee was urgently requested to take prompt action on this legislation. It was pointed out that if this legislation was not enacted, a variety of State and local regulations lacking in uniformity might well ensue.

"Testimony in support of legislation on this subject was received from the Federal Trade Commission, the National Cotton Council of America, the National Retail Dry Goods Association, the Tufted Textile Manufacturers Association, the Society of the Plastics Industry, the Rayon and Acetate Fiber Producers, and others. These expert witnesses were helpful in suggesting accurate language for the legislation. H. R. 5069, while substantially similar to the bill that this committee had reported favorably the preceding year, represented a distinct improvement over that measure, especially in section 4, concerning the standard of flammability. Our committee reported favorably this improved version and it became the present law on June 30, 1953.

"Section 4 of the Flammable Fabrics Act prescribes the standards of flammability. Commercial standard 191–53, promulgated by the Secretary of Commerce effective January 30, 1953, prescribed the standard for flammability of clothing textiles and commercial standard 192–53, promulgated by the Secretary of Commerce effective May 22, 1953, prescribed the standard of flammability for vinyl plastic film.

"Commercial standard 191–53 was developed as a voluntary standard through the combined effort of a number of scientific and technical groups and represents the combined opinion of an industry committee speaking for the cotton and rayon producers, and fabric manufacturers, finishers, converters, wholesalers, retailers, and consumers coordinated by the American Association of Textile Chemists & Colorists and the National Retail Dry Goods Association. The National Bureau of Standards participated in this work by active service on technical committees, by the conduct of a wide variety of investigational and testing work, and by aiding in the reconciliation of different points of view.

"The flammability test provided in the commercial standard 191–53 makes use of strips of fabric 2 by 6 inches in dimensions. The test consists of measuring the burning time in seconds when the test piece is mounted in a specially designed apparatus and a flame is applied in a prescribed manner. Fabrics with a flame spread of more than 7 seconds are classed as having normal flammability. Those with a flame spread of less than 4 seconds are classed as rapid and intense burning, while those burning in 4 to 7 seconds are rated as having intermediate flammability. The law is directed to those fabrics which are classed as rapid and intense burning fabrics.

"Commercial standard 192–53 is the industry-approved standard with respect to vinyl plastic film. Such film is used in the manufacture of various articles of wearing apparel such as raincoats, capes, hoods, pants, and aprons. The flammability test is prescribed in paragraph 3.11 of this standard.

"Section 4 of the act provides for reports by the Secretary of Commerce if he at any time finds that the commercial standard referred to becomes inadequate. The Senate report on this bill made clear our intent that the 'Secretary of Commerce shall make continuous studies of the suitability and effectiveness of these and related test methods.'

"I have outlined the history, scope, and standards of this law at some length in order to show that the provisions of the law were not adopted arbitrarily or without serious reflection.

"This month the full committee and our subcommittee have received numerous letters to the effect that this act, if it is allowed to become effective on schedule, on June 30 of this year, will cause severe hardship to many business firms engaged in the importation and distribution of lightweight cotton, rayon, and silk textile fabrics, as well as to domestic manufacturers and distributors of some sheer fabrics which have long been used with safety by the American consumer.

"The question suggests itself at this point, why did not the affected industry call these alleged defects in the law to the attention of the Senate and House committees? One correspondent answers this question as follows:

" 'Businessmen engaged in the distribution of established types of textiles knew vaguely that Federal legislation had been under consideration for several years to prohibit the sale of fabrics and wearing apparel which, in the language of the act, are so highly flammable as to be dangerous when worn by individuals. It may be safely said that the business community is strongly in favor of such legislation. The general understanding, however, was that the act merely applied to fabrics and articles of wearing apparel which will ignite and burn in a flash when they come in contact with a flame or a cigarette. It is only in recent months that businessmen have come to realize, as a result of laboratory tests conducted pursuant to the method prescribed in commercial standard 191–53, that many textile fabrics which have never been involved in a flash burning episode will be classed as dangerously flammable under the Flammable Fabrics Act, and thus not legally salable after June 29, 1954.'

"Our subcommittee has heard mostly from businessmen in the silk trade who say that they were convinced that the act was passed to protect the public from fabrics which burn intensely and in a flash, such as brushed rayon and other synthetic pile fabrics, and that they never believed that the act would be applicable to silk, because it is a historical fact that silk has been imported into the United States for over 100 years, and to their knowledge the fabric made from it has never endangered a person.

"It was not until silk was tested under the standards set forth by Commercial Standard 191–53, which were incorporated specifically in the act, that it was discovered that the provisions of the act would be applicable to silk. As far as is known, there is no practicable method to render silk fireproof which will not make it lose its appealing softness and luster. Intensive tests are presently being conducted by competent chemical firms in an attempt to solve this problem, but they will need time to conduct their tests and research. Because silk is frequently made into thin fabrics, such as

fine sheers, chiffons, silk stockings, etc., it will be affected by the strict standards of flammability contained in the act. Some businessmen estimate that the law as it is now written will cause the banishment of 75 percent of the silk scarves and silk fabrics which until the present have been imported from Japan. One New York company alone estimates that enforcement of the act will amount to virtual confiscation of large quantities of merchandise which it has had on hand, some for as long as 3 years or more, the total of which will amount to hundreds of thousands of dollars.

"It is easy to understand that the act has an effect now, even before its effective date, as prospective customers are unwilling to buy certain materials from wholesalers, and even retail outlets are left holding on to large stocks which they carried over from previous seasons. Furthermore, many companies, in order to prepare for the fall season this year, made extensive purchases of affected materials—for instance, in Japan—and have established irrevocable letters of credit for payment. It goes without saying that the economy of Japan is directly affected, as it is the largest producer of sheer fabrics made of silk. Light-weight silk materials constitute over 50 percent of Japan's export of silk to the United States. The main end use of these materials is silk scarves and veiling which American women use as accessories to their usual articles of clothing.

"To a lesser extent, the subcommittee has heard from domestic manufacturers and distributors of sheer fabrics, such as organdie fabrics and netting for evening dresses, which, it is claimed, have had a good record for 50 years. Laboratories are experimenting with tests to determine the flammability of fabrics. The subcommittee has been informed by the industry that there are now available only about 125 testing machines to make the required tests, and the laboratories report a heavy backlog of a great variety of fabrics still to be tested. It is doubtful that tests can be completed on a great many types of fabrics prior to the present effective date of the act.

"Furthermore, the industry advises us that most of the light-weight fabrics which do not meet the present tests can be treated with flame-retarding finishes, but such finishes will cause a deterioration of the fabric in a relatively short time, and will also cause the color of the fabric to become yellowish or gray in a few months. The chemists in the finishing industry are trying to develop a more satisfactory flame-retarding finish, but it will take quite some time to accomplish this. In most cases it is not possible to refinish goods now in inventory, and certainly nothing can be done about fabrics already made up into wearing apparel.

"The matter was considered in a subcommittee meeting on April 14, 1954. As a result, discussions are going on between the staffs of the subcommittee, the Federal Trade Commission, and the Department of Commerce to determine whether an administrative solution to the problem is feasible and in the public interest. The results of initial exploration into the feasibility of an administrative remedy are not too encouraging. The act is quite specific upon the standard of flammability, as I have already shown. Commercial Standard 191–53 was rigidly incorporated into the act, with the express additional inclusion of hats, gloves, and footwear.

"From the start, the industry objected to complete discretion being lodged in a Federal official or agency, such as in the Secretary of Commerce or in the Federal Trade Commission.

"When a forerunner of the act was first introduced (H. R. 3851, 83d Cong.), it contained a provision to the effect that when in his opinion the protection of the public interest so required, the Secretary of Commerce was authorized to modify or supplement the test standard of flammability provided he followed the procedure used in setting up commercial standard 191–53. Many people in industry and in the Government felt that the Secretary of Commerce should not have that authority. The Federal Trade Commission sounded the death-knell of this provision when it wrote on April 9, 1953, to the chairman of the House committee upon this point, as follows:

" 'This requirement would prohibit the Secretary of Commerce from modifying or supplementing the test unless he obtained the consent of 65 percent of the industry or at least of a majority, which is a requirement of the commercial standard procedure. Such presents an unprecedented situation of having the standard of legality or illegality under a penal and civil statute turn upon the consent of the industry to which the legislation applies.'

"That flexible approach raised serious constitutional doubts of the constitutionality of the legislation. Accordingly, the House and Senate committees wrote the existing standards developed by industry specifically into the act, as I have explained above.

"Our subcommittee has been informed that on some types of conventional fabrics that have already been tested, the burning rate is between 3.2 seconds and 3.9 seconds, although these fabrics have never been known to catch fire when worn by individuals. I have already pointed out that, under commercial standard 191–53, which is incorporated by reference into the act, fabrics with a flame spread of less than 4 seconds are classed as rapid and intense burning and banned from importation, transportation, or sale in interstate or foreign commerce.

"There is no doubt that the act was aimed primarily at the banning of fabrics which burn intensely and in a flash. H. R. 5069, which became the present law (Public Law 88, 83d Cong.), was entitled 'To prohibit the introduction or movement in interstate commerce of articles of wearing apparel and fabrics which are so highly flammable as to be dangerous when worn by individuals, and for other purposes.'

"The Senate and House reports, in discussing the purpose of the legislation, state:

" 'The purpose of the bill * * * is to protect the public from the danger surrounding the use in wearing apparel of highly flammable textiles of the types which have caused either bodily injury or death to numerous individuals. The bill is limited in scope to wearing apparel and fabrics which are intended or sold for use in wearing apparel. It will outlaw, for example, the introduction, movement, or sale in interstate commerce of highly flammable children's cowboy playsuits, and the so-called torch sweaters or jackets which have caused serious injuries and death to a number of innocent and unsuspecting individuals in recent years.' (See H. Rept. No. 425, and S. Rept. No. 400, 83d Cong., 1st sess.)

"In discussing the standards of flammability, those reports state:

" 'The major problem in formulating legislation to control the use of dangerously flammable textiles is to discriminate between the conventional fabrics that present moderate and generally recognized hazards and the special types of fabrics which present unusual hazards and are highly dangerous.'

"It may well be that section 4 of the act, in incorporating commercial standards 191–53 and 192–53 by reference, went further than the professed purposes of the act, and that the present testing procedures are in need of some revision because they do not distinguish properly between the flash-burning type of fabrics and those that have been safely worn for generations. If the subcommittee finds this to be the case, it will call upon the Bureau of Standards and the industry to recommend or develop more suitable testing procedures to prevent the banning of conventional fabrics that present no unusual hazards and which have been worn safely down through the years. However, I wish to serve notice that our subcommittee will not compromise with the public safety and that no postponement of the effective date of the act or weakening of the act will be recommended at the risk of allowing those special types of fabrics to be sold which present unusual hazards and are highly dangerous. Industry itself, generally, would object to our inviting this risk."

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, April 27, 1954.

The Honorable WILLIAM A. PURTELL,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Business and Consumer Interests, Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR PURTELL: The Department is gratified to learn of your announcement on April 20 that the Subcommittee on Business and Consumer Interests of the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee is looking into numerous complaints that the Flammable Fabrics Act (Public Law 88, 83d Cong., approved June 30, 1953, effective June 30, 1954) will unduly cripple certain segments of the textile industry. Similar complaints have been made to the Department in recent months, particularly by representatives of the Japanese Embassy and by importers of Japanese silk fabrics and silk articles such as handkerchiefs and scarfs. As your press release points out, the economy of Japan would be directly and substantially affected by the banishment of perhaps 75 percent of the silk scarfs and silk fabrics which until the present have been imported from Japan. The Department is also aware that the Flammable Fabrics Act is a matter of concern to French, Swiss, and Italian exporters of sheer fabrics and to the domestic importers and distributors of these materials.

The Department endorses your view that there should be no compromise with the public safety and that no postponement of the effective date of the act or weakening of the act should be recommended at the risk of allowing those special types of fabrics to be sold which present unusual hazards and are highly dangerous. The press release issued by your subcommittee contains a clear statement of the problems involved in preventing loss of life or serious injury from wearing apparel made of highly flammable textiles without creating severe hardship to domestic and foreign trade in materials which have long been used with safety by the American consumer. The program being undertaken by the subcommittee and your statement concerning the possible need for amendment of the act, if it is found to be unduly restrictive and if no administrative remedy is available, should help to allay the concern of both foreign and domestic interests concerning the effect of the act.

Sincerely yours,

THRUSTON B. MORTON,
Assistant Secretary.

EMBASSY OF JAPAN,
Washington, D. C., April 23, 1954.

The Honorable WILLIAM A. PURTELL,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR PURTELL: I am writing you to express my appreciation of your recent statement concerning the Flammable Fabrics Act and the severe hardship it will cause to certain segments of the textile business, especially the silk trade. Your recognition that the congressional intent in passing the act was not to prohibit the sale of traditional fabrics which have been used safely for years, but was rather to prevent the use of dangerously flammable textiles with a flash-burning rate, has been most encouraging to the Japanese people.

The people of Japan view with complete and sympathetic understanding the efforts of

the Congress of the United States to protect the American public from the recurrence of the recently publicized and most unfortunate accidents. They recognize the need for a protective law but are hopeful that the legislation may be so drafted or interpreted as to permit the import of sheer silk manufactures, which have a long history of safe use.

As you know, silk fabrics and manufactures are among the most important exports from Japan to the United States. Any substantial reduction in this trade, even though unintentional, would be a serious blow to my country's attempt to attain economic stability.

I wish to you and your subcommittee success in your endeavor to limit the effects of the act to textiles which are truly dangerous. Again may I state the thanks of the Japanese people for your understanding approach to their problem.

Sincerely yours,

SADAO IGUCHI,
Ambassador.

AMENDMENT OF LABOR MANAGEMENT RELATIONS ACT, 1947—AMENDMENT

Mr. GOLDWATER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 2650) to amend the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

PROPOSED CAPITAL GAINS TAX ON FOREIGN TRADERS

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, in the report submitted by the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry on August 23, 1950, covering the investigations of coffee prices which the Subcommittee on Utilization of Farm Crops conducted during 1949–50, appeared this sentence:

About 50 percent of the long position in coffee on the New York Coffee and Sugar Exchange, Inc., as of March 31, 1950, was owned by foreign interests, and fully 30 percent controlled through one broker in Brazil."

Among the several recommendations which the committee made in its report was this one:

No. 6: That in order to curb the undesirable speculation now existing in dealing in coffee futures the revenue laws of the United States be amended so as to tax profits of foreign interests made on the commodity exchanges of the United States.

In the appendix of the report appeared a draft of an amendment to the Internal Revenue Code which the committee recommended be adopted by the Congress. As no Member of the House of Representatives has yet offered this type of an amendment, and in view of the fact that the tax revision bill is now pending before the Senate Finance Committee, I am today submitting this proposal in the form of an amendment to H. R. 8300 for the consideration of the Finance Committee and of the Senate.

The amendment would impose on the capital gains of nonresident foreign individuals, partnerships or corporations, not engaged in trade or business in the United States, a tax of 30 percent of the amount by which such gains, derived from sources within the United States, from sales or exchanges, exceed losses, allocable to sources within the United States, from such sales or exchanges.

Because of the unfortunate fact that neither the Senate Banking and Currency Committee investigation of the recent price rise in coffee nor the Federal Trade Commission investigation of the same subject has been completed, it is impossible to know to what extent the situation that existed in 1950 still holds at the present time. But it is incontrovertible, I believe, that during the price rise of this past December and January foreign speculators were extremely active on the coffee exchange. They have unquestionably earned tremendous profits from their operations and the least the American people can expect, if they cannot be protected from such raids on their pocketbooks, is that those who earn these fortunes from speculating on our commodity exchanges should have to pay a fair tax to our Federal Treasury.

I now submit amendments intended to be proposed by me to the bill (H. R. 8300) to revise the internal revenue laws of the United States, and ask that they be referred to the Committee on Finance.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments will be received and printed, and will be referred to the Committee on Finance.

AMENDMENT OF LABOR MANAGEMENT RELATIONS ACT, 1947—MINORITY VIEWS

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the views of the minority on Senate bill 2650, to amend the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947, and for other purposes, may be submitted and printed during the recess.

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

REVIEW OF DECISIONS OF GOVERNMENT CONTRACTING OFFICERS IN CERTAIN CASES

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 24) to permit review of decisions of Government contracting officers involving questions of fact arising under Government contracts in cases other than those in which fraud is alleged, and for other purposes, which were to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That no provision of any contract entered into by the United States, relating to the finality or conclusiveness of any decision of the head of any department or agency or his duly authorized representative or board in a dispute involving a question arising under such contract, shall be pleaded in any suit now filed or to be filed as limiting judicial review of any such decision to cases where fraud by such official or his said representatives or board is alleged: *Provided, however,* That any such decision shall be final and conclusive unless the same is fraudulent or capricious or arbitrary or so grossly erroneous as necessarily to imply bad faith, or is not supported by substantial evidence.

SEC. 2. No Government contract shall contain a provision making final on a question of law the decision of any administrative official, representative, or board.

And to amend the title so as to read: "An act to permit review of decisions of the heads of departments, or their representatives or boards, involving questions arising under Government contracts."

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, this is a bill which passed the Senate on June 8, 1953, and which has now been passed by the House, in amended form.

The purpose of the proposed legislation is to overcome the inequitable effect, under the decision of the Supreme Court in the Wunderlich case, of language in Government contracts which makes the decision of the contracting officer or the head of the agency final, with respect to questions of fact. To put it another way, the objective of this bill is to preserve the right of review by the courts in cases involving action by a contracting officer which is arbitrary, capricious, fraudulent, or so grossly erroneous as necessarily to imply bad faith.

The language of the House bill, while quite different from the langauge approved in the Senate, is designed to accomplish the same purpose. It is my understanding the Department of Justice takes the view that the House language will accomplish the same purpose as the Senate language. It is my further understanding that the Comptroller General of the United States has expressed complete satisfaction with the House language, and has declared that in his opinion it will accomplish the purposes sought to be served by the Senate language.

As author of the Senate bill, I want to say that I am not sure that the House language gives protection as complete as that which would have been given under the language approved by the Senate. However, I am willing to go along with the House language, in view of the assurances which I have mentioned, and the further fact that so far as I know all others interested in this legislation are satisfied with the language approved by the House.

Accordingly, Mr. President, I now move that the Senate concur in the House amendments to the bill S. 24.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN].

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

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. CASE. Can the Senator from Nevada tell us how the assurance was given that the bill was satisfactory to the General Accounting Office? Would the Senator kindly restate the assurance which he voiced with reference to the opinion of the General Accounting Office?

Mr. McCARRAN. The General Accounting Office is satisfied with the language in the House bill. It has assured me of that.

Mr. CASE. The Comptroller General has assured the Senator from Nevada on that point?

Mr. McCARRAN. That is correct; otherwise I would not care to go along.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I have no objection.

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

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. THYE. As I understand, the bill was passed by the Senate, and a similar bill was passed by the House. The only question involved is a modification of the language in the Senate bill, and the two bills agree in their effect, so to speak?

Mr. McCARRAN. That is correct.

Mr. THYE. There is nothing else of a legislative nature involved. Is that correct?

Mr. McCARRAN. That is correct.

Mr. THYE. I cannot see any objection to the enactment of the legislation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN].

The motion was agreed to.

ARMORING THE SUPREME COURT—EDITORIAL FROM THE WASHINGTON POST AND TIMES-HERALD

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, on Saturday April 17, 1954, there appeared in the Washington Post and Times-Herald an editorial entitled "Armoring the Supreme Court." Within the next 2 weeks, Mr. President, debate will open on the floor of the Senate on Senate Joint Resolution 44, which I introduced in February 1953. The joint resolution has for its purpose the strengthening of the Supreme Court, both as to its composition and as to its jurisdiction. Accordingly, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, for the information of the Senate.

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

ARMORING THE SUPREME COURT

Too little attention has been given to the proposed constitutional amendment reported out by the Senate Judiciary Committee recently to buttress the independence of the Supreme Court. As the Court is now functioning smoothly, there is a strong disposition to let well enough alone. Some critics of the proposal also fear that it might cast the Court into too rigid a mold. In our opinion, however, a strong case can be made for fortifying the independence of the Court in those spots where it has been attacked in the past.

History has amply demonstrated that the Founding Fathers, while creating an independent Supreme Court left some gaping holes in its armor. The most notorious of these is the power of Congress to change the number of Justices and thus enable the President and Senate indirectly to influence the opinions of the Court. The second grave defect is the constitutional phrase which enables Congress to take away the Court's appellate jurisdiction. On one regrettable occasion in 1868 Congress exercised this power to prevent the Court from hearing an appeal involving a writ of habeas corpus. In effect, then, enforcement of the Bill of Rights is left to the discretion of Congress.

This bit of history should be well remembered when the proposed amendment comes up for debate. An editor named McCardle sought a writ of habeas corpus after being arrested by the military in the post-Civil-War period and held for trial before a military commission on charges that he had published libelous and incendiary articles. When his petition was denied by the lower courts, he appealed to the Supreme Court. But before his case could be decided by that tribunal, Congress passed a law denying it the right to hear appeals in habeas corpus cases. The Court then acknowledged the right of Congress to determine the extent of its appellate jurisdiction and refused to decide the case.

The proposed amendment would prevent such legislative invasions of the judicial sphere by specifically giving the Court appellate jurisdiction, both as to law and fact, "in all cases arising under this Constitution." Congress might then limit appeals to the Supreme Court in cases involving Federal statutes, but it could not undermine the Constitution by preventing enforcement of its guaranties in the highest Court in the land.

No less important is the section permanently fixing the membership of the Supreme Court at nine. This will be generally interpreted as a Republican effort to prevent any repetition of President Roosevelt's efforts to pack the Court in 1937. It is probably more significant, however, as a means of preventing the kind of congressional interference with the Court that occurred in the Andrew Johnson administration. Congress reduced the number of Justices from 9 to 7 to prevent the President from having any opportunity to appoint Justices who might favor his policies. This was court-packing in reverse.

Two other provisions have been included in the proposed amendment. It would force the retirement of all Supreme Court Justices at the age of 75 and make any Justice ineligible to serve as President unless he had been off the bench at least 5 years. The 75-year cutoff might occasionally deprive the Court of an Oliver Wendell Holmes, but it would more frequently force out men no longer capable of carrying the arduous burden of a Supreme Court Justice. Five years probably is too long a period to make a Justice wait if he wishes to resign and try for the Presidency, but the idea of discouraging political ambitions on the Bench is sound. Not only that Justices sometimes need protection from politicians who are inclined to "raid" the Supreme Court. To our way of thinking the advantages that would flow from the amendment outweigh the argument against cluttering the Constitution with details.

COMMERCE DEPARTMENT REPORT ON MARITIME SUBSIDY POLICY

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, the Commerce Department's report on Maritime Subsidy Policy, based upon its extensive study in the light of present national requirements for a merchant marine and a shipbuilding industry, will be presented to the Senate Water Transportation Subcommittee on Monday next, at 2:30 p. m., in room G-16 of the Capitol.

In view of the long-range significance of the report, its importance to American shipping, and the assistance it undoubtedly will afford to Members of Congress of both Houses in connection with future legislative proposals regarding the maritime industry, our subcommittee has invited the members of the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee to join with us in receipt of the report.

At the meeting, the Under Secretary of Commerce for Transportation, the Honorable Robert B. Murray, Jr., will formally transmit the report to the Congress. It was at his direction and under his supervision that the study was made and the report prepared, and he and his very competent staff have done a most excellent job in this respect.

One of the major deterrents to positive action on behalf of this vital segment of the Nation's economy has been the misunderstanding and lack of factual information about it and the national policies involved. Certainly the report is coming to us at an opportune time, for both the American merchant marine and the vast shipbuilding industry, so mutually interdependent, one upon the other, are in dire straits, and are in need of immediate, as well as long-range, consideration. This is necessary, not alone for their future welfare, but more particularly because it is urgent in the public interest. Frankly, Mr. President, we need the merchant marine. We cannot do without a strong shipping and shipbuilding industry, either in war or in peace.

The forthcoming Department of Commerce report, I can give assurance, will present an overall picture of the policies laid down in the various acts of Congress with respect to establishment and maintenance of an adequate merchant marine. It will show how these policies have been carried out, their cost, and their net results.

Most importantly, the report will present certain definite recommendations for action by the Congress and the administration toward a sound annual ship-construction program consistent with and adequate to the requirement of a future mobilization day, as established by the responsible defense authorities.

Such a ship-construction program is basic to any program in this field. It is our sincere hope that this and other recommendations of the report will be received with due recognition of their importance to the national security, as well as to the Nation's economic progress.

REHABILITATION AND EMPLOYMENT OF PHYSICALLY HANDICAPPED—TRIBUTE TO GEN. MELVIN J. MAAS

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, it was my privilege this morning to attend the Exposition and Parade of Progress for the Rehabilitation and Employment of the Physically Handicapped, here in Washington, D. C. It was quite inspiring to me to visit that vast hall and view the exhibits from all over the United States showing what the physically handicapped had been able to accomplish.

More important, I think, it was inspiring because it showed what employers can do in order to help war veterans and other citizens who have suffered some physical disability, and how such handicapped persons can continue to make a contribution to the productivity of our Nation. Even more important, it showed how they can gain a feeling of being useful to themselves and of contributing to the general good of society.

I hope other Members of Congress will avail themselves of this privilege and visit the exposition. I hope it will add emphasis to the bill which has been introduced by the able Senator from Montana and of which I am a cosponsor call-

ing for the establishment of a Federal department to aid the physically handicapped. I hope it will enable employers all over the United States to see what the physically handicapped can do, and how useful they can be, even though they are disabled. I believe this exposition will afford great impetus to the entire program of aiding the physically handicapped to aid themselves and in turn their Nation.

Mr. President, one last word, this morning the first person I met was our former colleague in the House of Representatives, Mel Maas. This courageous man has now lost his sight. However, true to his great background and tradition, General Maas does not despair. He is active in this program of aiding the physically handicapped. He, by example, is showing others what can be done. He is indeed a man of whom this Nation can be proud.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks an article entitled "Handicap Tips From Miami," which I think is appropriate to the remarks I have made.

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

HANDICAP TIPS FROM MIAMI

Thousands of physically handicapped people are working today and living normal lives because a boy suffered heart trouble.

When Edward was 12 years old a hastily called physician stood by his bedside. "You have only a few months to live," the doctor told the boy. "You must resign yourself."

Hurriedly the father pushed the doctor out of the room.

"Don't frighten my boy," the father said. "Just tell me."

After the physician had gone, the father returned to Edward. The bed was empty. The house was searched in vain. He couldn't be found.

His father looked in the garden and found Edward sobbing behind the rose bushes.

"I'm going to live," he told his father. "I don't care what that doctor said, I'm going to live. And if God lets me live I'm going to dedicate my life to helping others."

When he was 16, Edward started a small upholstering business employing only physically handicapped workers. Two years later his business had expanded and the number of employees increased and all were physically handicapped in some fashion.

Edward only lived to be 24, but today the business he founded is still growing and there's not a physically sound man employed there.

His father, partly in memory of Edward has spearheaded every drive for the employment of the physically handicapped. The first one in Miami was initiated in 1939 by Edward, himself, in the form of an organization he named Independence, Inc.

According to population, Miami now leads the Nation in physically handicapped placements and has for several years, although it is not primarily an industrial community.

Now practical businessmen have taken over the machinery from professional and governmental employees to make the placement of the physically handicapped one of the best publicized year-around drives in the city.

National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week came to Miami in 1946 through several governmental agencies. Much of the advertising material was sent to the Florida State Employment Service and men from interested agencies gathered there to form the first local NEPH committee.

For the most part these men represented governmental agencies working with the rehabilitation and placement of the handicapped. The Florida State Employment Service, Veterans' Administration, the VA hospital, the Vocational Rehabilitation Service, and the Disabled American Veterans organization.

In the first years businessmen were not present, with 1 or 2 notable exceptions, and businessmen were the very ones who must do the hiring if the movement was to be a success.

A chairman was elected, placards were placed in store windows of willing proprietors, radio talks were arranged for, press releases were mailed, and 5-minute speakers talked at luncheon clubs.

At the end of the week, the Employment Service counted the number of placements made of the handicapped workers during that time and everyone felt the affair had been an immense success.

Then the whole thing was forgotten—as far as publicity was concerned—until next year. This was the usual story in most communities.

The Miami story might have been similar to that of other cities except for two things. A local radio station, WKAT, offered time to the Employment Service for a weekly program devoted to the placement of the handicapped and * * *.

The organization Edward founded, Independence, Inc., joined with the local NEPH committee and then later with the Miami Chamber of Commerce committee on placement of the physically handicapped, to bring new and sustaining life to the movement.

Edward's father now carried on the business his son began and with other individuals used Independence, Inc., as a stalking horse for handicap placements.

It was only natural for him to be selected as chairman of the chamber's committee and this close association with businessmen gave handicap placements a new impetus.

He found the NEPH committee with a daytime radio program and obtained a night spot for it on Station WQAM. For 3 years now, under the title of "Hope Unlimited" it has promoted handicap placements each week at a time when it may catch the ear of an employer.

This program is widely credited with being a major factor in increasing handicap placements.

The members of each committee, NEPH, Miami Chamber of Commerce, and Independence, Inc., were interlocking by becoming automatically members of the other committees. At no time was there any sense of rivalry.

Edward's father continued to work toward interesting other organizations in doing placement work. The Polio Foundation made placements of polios through the director. The Miami Hearing Society cooperated closely with the Exployment Service and the Vocational Rehabilitation Service to the same end.

The Mental Health Society offered its services in discovering understanding employers who were willing to work with the emotionally unstable.

The Tuberculosis Association employed arrested cases in its own organization when it had work for them and tried to find jobs for those who could work only part of a day.

The Cancer Society found employer resistance to the employment of these victims of cancer who had been disfigured by facial operations and worked to get jobs for these people.

The Jewish Vocational Service which was established to aid new American to find jobs, discovered many of them were physically handicapped and was drawn into the movement.

The Dade County Medical Association deserves a great deal of credit not only for the part its members have played in the rehabilitation of the disabled, but for appearing publically on radio stations and in print to show that the physically handicapped could be employed.

A new committee of the chamber of commerce was formed, this time by the women's division, to push the employment of those over 45 years of age who were having trouble finding work because of age.

A new channel of public information to the public was found at Radio Station WIOD for the placement of these applicants. Now in its second year, it has aided greatly in the acceptance of the senior citizen as a valued employee.

Finding that many employers were prejudiced against hiring a man with a damaged heart, the Heart Association employed a part-time placement officer. Many placements have been made although initially this department was believed mainly educational. Probably Miami is unique in having a Heart Association doing placement work.

Most of the credit for handicap placements go to the businessmen of Miami who were willing to use selective placement in hiring those who had been partially disabled.

They found that it was indeed "good business to hire the handicapped." Placed on the right jobs they outproduced the average employee, had less absenteeism, no greater accident record, and changed jobs far less often.

One of the first was, of course, the company Edward founded, the Empire Furniture Co. Another was Eastern Air Lines, which not only worked handicaps successfully, but persuaded other airlines to try them out.

Some of them were a little squeamish at first, fearing an unfavorable public reaction if it were known physical handicaps were employed by them. Of course, no such reaction occurred.

Employer after employer was interested until in 1 month 500 known placements were made.

What has happened in Miami can happen in any city if interested agencies work together and businessmen can be induced to hire the handicapped for an initial trial. Thereafter they will be boosters for the movement.

Initially, citations were given by the Miami Chamber of Commerce to firms who had hired handicaps and this encouraged others to experiment. Now chambers in other cities are working along these lines.

While it is good business to hire the physically handicapped, it does take a little more thinking and planning on the part of the employer and he deserves credit for this. It is only fair to recognize and honor him.

All this adds up to the fact that men who might otherwise have been selling shoe laces, pencils, and apples on the streets are now employed and live normal lives to the great benefit of their families, themselves, the community and society.

The credit for the success of handicap placements in Miami may be divided among hundreds—or it may be given to a small boy crying under a rose bush and pledging himself to help his fellow man.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. President, this morning I attended the first Exposition and Parade of Progress for the Rehabilitation and Employment of the Physically Handicapped. It is being held at the Departmental Auditorium on Constitution Avenue, between 12th and 14th Streets.

Mr. President, I was amazed at the work that is being done among the handicapped. I would say to all of my colleagues that it would be well worth their time if they were to view the exhibits. I was particularly interested because the

vice chairman of the President's Committee on the Employment of the Physically Handicapped is a former House colleague of mine, Maj. Gen. Melvin J. Maas, United States Marine Corps Reserve (Retired). He is giving all of his time to that activity, and he is doing a wonderful job.

We are all proud of General Maas. As most of my colleagues know, he completely lost his eyesight a few years ago. He has courageously carried on, and he is now doing unselfishly a great job for the handicapped of the country.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I wish to concur in the remarks not only of the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT], but also of the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] in speaking about the exhibits of the handicapped and rehabilitated.

I wish to comment specifically because General Maas, a former Representative, is a Minnesota citizen. Although General Maas lost his eyesight, he has rehabilitated himself. It is an inspiration to see General Maas aiding others to rehabilitate themselves.

General Maas was in my office only a few weeks ago. If I had not known that he had lost his eyesight I would not have been aware of it, because of the manner in which he carries himself and the manner in which he actually turns his face toward one when he speaks.

I particularly desired to refer to this subject because only this morning the Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, of the Committee on Appropriations, considered rehabilitation funds and vocational education funds. In my opinion, no subject is more worthy of consideration by Congress than that of appropriating for the rehabilitation of the physically handicapped and for the granting of assistance in that field of activity.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, apropos of the comment made by the distinguished acting majority leader, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], I wish to observe that I spent many pleasant years in association with the distinguished General Maas. He is one of the great Americans I have known. He is courageous, he is patriotic, and he has contributed as much to the building of a sound national defense of our country as any man that I have ever served with on the defense committees of Congress.

I wish to associate myself with the fine tribute the distinguished acting majority leader has paid this great man.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I appreciate the fact that other Members of the Senate have spoken in appreciation of the services of Gen. Melvin J. Maas.

I have a special pleasure in hearing what they have said, because it was also my privilege to serve with Mel Maas in the House of Representatives. However, I first met him, I may say to the distinguished Senator from Minnesota, not as a Member of Congress, but as a member of the United States Marine Corps.

Mel Maas was a very loyal member of the Marine Corps. He comes to the Capitol frequently to join with other former members of the Marine Corps in breakfasts. The most recent one of those breakfasts held by Members of the House and of the Senate who are former members of the Marine Corps was one at which I was the host. Mel Maas sat to my left, and I can say as a matter of personal testimony that I was tremendously thrilled to see the manner in which Mel has adapted himself to his new situation in life. Mr. President, he eats right along with you, and he talks right along with you. If anyone draws attention to his handicap, it is not Mel Maas. He has the courage that characterized his service during World War I and World War II. It will be remembered that he took a leave of absence from the House and went into active service in both conflicts.

Mel Maas is an inspiration to all Americans. It is a matter of pride, as a friend and as a former colleague in the House of Representatives and as a former active member on duty with the United States Marine Corps, that I salute Mel Maas today for the great service he continues to render in his capacity as the President's special appointee on the program which is being conducted in the Nation's Capital today.

PUBLIC WORKS CONSTRUCTION FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 8097) to authorize the financing of a program of public works construction for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I desire to address myself to the bill which is under consideration, House bill 8097, to authorize the financing of a program of public works construction for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

The bill, by title and also by popular reference, has been called a public works bill. In a certain sense, that is true. It is a revenue measure. It originated in the House of Representatives, which passed it on March 22, 1954. The bill was the product, however, of extensive joint hearings and informal joint meetings of the fiscal subcommittees of the District Committees of the other body and of the Senate.

Copies of the hearings and of the committee report are on the desks of Senators.

The bill is intended to provide the District of Columbia government with added revenues of $24.4 million a year, of which $14.2 million is from local taxes and charges and $10.2 million from increased Federal payments. The bill also authorizes new Federal loans to the District of $67 million.

Present District revenues, from all sources, local and Federal, total $137.2 million a year. With the addition of the proposed new revenues of $24.4 million a year, it is expected that some $30.5 million a year, on the average, will be available for public works—capital outlay—over the next 10 years.

This arrangement will finance a 10-year construction program now estimated at $305.3 million. In the past 10 years, the District has spent $190 million for capital outlay. Thus, what is now proposed is a 50 percent increase in the rate of construction, dollarwise, for the next 10 years, over what has been done in the past 10 years.

At this point, Mr. President, I think it should be pointed out that the District of Columbia government is one government in America which by statute has to operate on a balanced budget. Under a law which Congress passed some years ago, the District of Columbia Commissioners may not present to the Congress a budget estimate or a request for funds for a new fiscal year out of balance with the prospective revenues. The situation as it now exists is that the normal continuation of the functions of government in the District of Columbia at their present level, with authorizations which exist for salaries to the various employees of the District of Columbia, such as teachers, firemen, and so forth, means that without some new revenue the District of Columbia government, through its Commissioners, would not be able to present to the Congress for next year any sizable construction program whatsoever. In fact, no construction program can be presented to the Congress unless there is some revenue in sight to finance it.

This bill may be regarded as an attempt to make it possible for the District of Columbia to provide necessary improvements in the sewer and water systems and the construction of public buildings of one sort or another. Without this bill the District of Columbia would be held to the present level of expenditures, which would be merely an operating level.

The provisions of the bill which accomplish this needed increase in revenue fall into four categories: local revenues, Federal payments, Federal loans, and miscellaneous provisions. I shall discuss them in that order.

LOCAL REVENUES

Local revenues provided by the bill include a new sewer-service charge, authority for water-rate increases, higher assessments for water mains and sewers, higher taxes on realty, alcoholic beverages, cigarettes, gasoline, hotel rooms, individual income, and bus companies. The personal-property tax on household goods is repealed. A flat fee system is substituted for registration fees and personal-property taxes on motor vehicles.

At this point, Mr. President, I should like to say that the House of Representatives a year ago passed a bill to repeal the personal-property tax in the District of Columbia. The Senate Committee on the District of Columbia has not acted on that bill directly. We felt that since the matter of construction revenue was in the offing, and since some additional revenues were needed, the entire problem of revenues should be considered at one time. Therefore, we did not take action upon the bill presented by the House, but held the bill in committee un-

til the total program could be brought before us. The bill which is now before the Senate proposes to incorporate the repeal of the personal-property-tax levy.

The sales tax is extended to cover groceries at one-half the regular rate, or 1 percent, and to cover meals over 50 cents and purchases by national banks and Federal savings and loan associations. A 2-percent tax is imposed on combined rail and bus operations of street-railroad companies in lieu of the mileage tax they now pay. Local taxes in the District now total $125 million a year. These changes would add $14.2 million, an increase of 11 percent.

It might be noted at this point, Mr. President, that this increase in local taxes means an increase of about $16 a year on a per capita basis for the Washington taxpayer.

How does this make Washington's local tax burden compare with other cities of comparable size? That is a question which is always raised when revenue questions come up in either body of the Congress.

In 1952, Mr. President, out of 13 cities of 500,000 to 1 million inhabitants, Washington ranked 11th in per capita local tax payments. It was third from the bottom.

The proposals in the bill before the Senate even with the increases suggested, would leave Washington in seventh place among those 13 cities. That would be one below the middle point of the 13 cities, and, in dollars, it would place the District of Columbia approximately $47 below the highest, and $40 above the lowest, on the basis of latest available figures.

I present that fact to the Senate as making clear that the tax increase here proposed would not put Washington out of line with other cities of comparable size. In fact, it leaves it below the center point.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. AIKEN in the chair). Does the Senator from South Dakota yield to the Senator from Connecticut?

Mr. CASE. I yield.

Mr. BUSH. How are the 13 cities chosen?

Mr. CASE. According to population.

Mr. BUSH. Are they the 13 largest cities?

Mr. CASE. They are cities of a size comparable to that of Washington.

I have here, Mr. President, a table which I should like to place in the RECORD, in view of the question which the distinguished Senator from Connecticut has asked. I think it is a very informative table. The population figures are taken from the 1950 census. The cities represented are San Francisco, Boston, Milwaukee, Minneapolis, Buffalo, New Orleans, Washington, Cincinnati, Pittsburgh, Cleveland, Baltimore, Houston, and St. Louis, in the order of position which they now occupy, on the basis of the total per capita tax.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the table be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

Comparison of tax burden and income in 13 city areas having 500,000 to 1,000,000 inhabitants in 1950, and in the Washington metropolitan area

	Population (1950)	Total per capita tax State-city area,[1] 1952	Median income[2] (families and unrelated individuals) 1949
San Francisco	775,357	$197.71	$3,009
Boston	801,444	195.52	2,643
Milwaukee	637,392	167.48	3,340
Minneapolis	521,718	166.87	3,078
Buffalo	580,132	164.40	3,079
New Orleans	570,445	161.34	2,267
Cincinnati	503,998	142.49	2,644
Pittsburgh	676,806	137.36	3,314
Cleveland	914,808	136.34	3,153
Baltimore	949,708	134.45	2,817
Washington	802,178	[3] 134.13	2,975
Houston	596,193	127.82	2,937
St. Louis	856,796	110.17	2,718
Maryland:			
Prince Georges County	194,182	(4)	3,634 [5] 3,901
Montgomery County	164,401	124.46	4,532 [5] 5,005
Virginia:			
Fairfax County	98,557	(4)	3,446 [5] 5,045
Arlington County	135,449	102.38	4,580
Alexandria	61,787	(4)	3,903
Falls Church	7,535	(4)	5,098

[1] Includes payments to State, city and overlying taxing units.
[2] Denotes that income level which is higher than half of the unreported incomes and lower than the other half.
[3] H. R. 8097 as reported by Senate District Committee, $150.22.
[4] Not available.
[5] Urban portion of county only.

Source: U. S. Bureau of the Census. Prepared by Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, Apr. 5, 1954.

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

Mr. CASE. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BUSH. Are we to understand from the statement by the distinguished Senator from South Dakota that the increased appropriations are to be in addition to the normal annual appropriations which Congress makes for the operation of the District of Columbia?

Mr. CASE. What I have been talking about are the local revenues provided by the citizens of the District of Columbia.

Mr. BUSH. I understood that. I apologize for going back to an earlier part of the Senator's remarks, but are not the appropriations for the improvements to be in addition to the normal annual appropriations which the Federal Government makes for the operation of the District of Columbia?

Mr. CASE. I shall discuss that subject in a little more detail shortly. Let me say, in direct answer to the implication of the Senator's question, that at present there is an authorized contribution from the Federal Government to the District of Columbia of $11 million. The proposals of the bill would increase the Federal contribution to $20 million. That would be an increase of $9 million.

Another provision of the bill would change the water rate, and would make the water rate which the Federal Government pays to the District of Columbia comparable with that charged to Arlington County, Va., or to other users of city water. So the total possible increase in the payment by the Federal Government to the District of Columbia would be $10.2 million.

Mr. BUSH. Are the revenues to which the Senator has referred to be segregated purely for the purposes of the improvements of which the Senator has spoken?

Mr. CASE. I am very glad the Senator from Connecticut has asked that question, because it highlights the problem to which the committee have addressed themselves, and on which we arrived at a specific answer. It was decided to provide that the top $6,500,000 of the increased payment to the District of Columbia should be available or should be in order only if the local government produced revenues to match this amount. In other words, the top $6,500,000 would not be in order as an appropriation by Congress unless the revenues proposed to be raised by the District of Columbia were available to match it.

Mr. BUSH. Will the Senator from South Dakota kindly state what would happen to the money in case the District of Columbia Government did not match the amount made available by the Federal Government?

Mr. CASE. In the first place, the funds could not be included in an appropriation bill. Such a provision would be subject to a point of order as legislation unless the matching revenues were available. Specific language to cover that point has been included in the bill. A little later, perhaps, we can discuss the specific language, but I can assure the Senator from Connecticut that the additional Federal contribution for the public works features will be made available only if the corresponding revenue is provided by the local District of Columbia government.

I am reminded, in thinking about the question further, that not only must the revenue be available, but the revenue must be proposed for the specific and particular purpose of matching the Federal contribution. It is not merely that the District of Columbia may have that amount of money in the Treasury, but it must be offered, in effect, to show that the money is available for an expenditure for the specific purpose on a contingent basis.

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

Mr. CASE. I yield.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Can the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia advise the Senate whether the proposals in the bill are in any way related to any promises made during the 1952 campaign, first, either to increase the benefits for any State or the District of Columbia in any program such as the one proposed, or, on the other hand, is the bill related in any way to any pledges for economy or to seek a balanced budget, which were made by the Republican Party or its candidates during the campaign?

Mr. CASE. The only relationship to the campaign which I can see would be

with respect to a balanced budget, because the bill provides that there must be a balanced budget. The bill recognizes the statutory provision with respect to the District of Columbia to the effect that the Commissioners may not propose an unbalanced budget; consequently, they could not propose a construction program without having the revenue in sight with which to accomplish it.

Mr. DWORSHAK. My question related more directly to the balancing of the Federal budget, rather than to the balancing of the District of Columbia budget. Will there be any contribution, through the proposed legislation, toward attaining the goal of a balanced Federal budget?

Mr. CASE. Yes; I think I can say to the Senator from Idaho that there will be. When the so-called Addison report was made, and the suggestion was carried in the press and was proposed at public meetings throughout the District of Columbia for a $350 million public-works program, the junior Senator from South Dakota, as chairman of the Senate Committee on the District of Columbia, was invited to attend various group meetings and to hear the various proposals by the Commissioners and by the Citizens Advisory Committee on Public Works for the District of Columbia, who had prepared a report dated September 26, 1953, in which they proposed a program by which, over a period of 10 years, the District of Columbia would contribute $100 million and the Federal Government would contribute $100 million. Then the suggestion was made that the Federal Government should make a $100 million loan to the District of Columbia, interest free, I may say to the Senator from Idaho.

I could not conceive what an interest-free loan would be on the part of the Federal Government to the District of Columbia. The Federal Government has to sell bonds in order raise money, and it must pay interest on those bonds. So I simply could not understand how the Federal Government could make an interest-free loan to the District of Columbia.

As I recall the suggestion which came from the Citizens Advisory Committee of the District of Columbia, it was proposed that the District of Columbia should repay the loan over a 50-year period, at the rate of 2 percent interest a year. I took the position that that would not constitute a repayment of the loan because the average rate of interest which the Federal Government would be paying upon bonds which it sold in order to raise the cash to lend to the District of Columbia would itself exceed 2 percent a year. So any so-called amortization of the interest-free loan at the rate of 2 percent a year for 50 years would not have paid back to the Federal Government the interest which the Federal Government would have had to pay for the money which it borrowed, much less retire the principal.

I think I may say to the Senator from Idaho, without taking too much credit, that it was my position as chairman of the Senate Committee on the District of Columbia, in pointing that out in conferences with the representatives of the Addison committee and with the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, which led to a revision of the proposal.

I may say, further, that it led to a conference which I had at the White House with representatives from the Bureau of the Budget, in which they indicated they had been making a study of the situation, and desired to make a further study.

A conference was held, at which we went into other phases of the question, and the result was a complete revision of the program as it was submitted to Congress formally, finally, and with the approval of the Bureau of the Budget. That is the revised program which came before the House and is now before the Senate.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MARTIN in the chair). Does the Senator from South Dakota yield further to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. CASE. I yield.

Mr. DWORSHAK. The Senator from South Dakota always inspires confidence, because of the thoroughness with which he undertakes any mission. In this particular instance, after having his explanation, it is apparent that he has rendered outstanding service in exposing some of the fallacies included in the original report. So he is entitled to commendation once more in helping to focus the attention of Congress, through its proper committee, upon something which challenges Congress. I am hopeful that the Senator from South Dakota will continue to maintain an interest in this particular measure.

Mr. CASE. The Senator from Idaho is very generous in his remarks. I appreciate the point he raised, however, because it helps to make the point that we can present the bill to Congress with the assurance that it has undergone budget scrutiny, and is not the first proposal which was offered to us. It represents real study, and an attempt to present a bill which is sound. The bill can be presented to Congress with confidence that it has had the water squeezed out of it, so to speak, and is a sound bill.

The next category in the bill relates to Federal payments. The present Federal payment to the District of Columbia, as suggested in my colloquy with the distinguished Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH], is authorized at $11 million a year for the general fund and $1 million a year for the water fund. In addition, of course, the District shares in the regular Federal aid programs of various types available to the States, and receives from such programs from $5 million to $7 million a year. They include the social-security program, the unemployment program, and activities of that type.

The bill before the Senate proposes to increase the authorized Federal payment to the general fund from $11 million to $20 million. That is an increase of $9 million, to which I alluded in my colloquy with the distinguished Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH].

The bill provides that any payment to the general fund in excess of $13.5 million—in other words, the top $6.5 million, assuming the full amount is appropriated—shall be earmarked for public works, capital outlay. And it provides that this earmarked portion shall be available only to the extent that it is matched, dollar for dollar, by local revenues applied to capital outlay.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. CASE. I am glad to yield.

Mr. BUSH. What happens to the difference between the $6.5 million and the $9 million which is not earmarked?

Mr. CASE. It simply is not appropriated.

Mr. BUSH. Does that go into the general fund of the District of Columbia?

Mr. CASE. The part that is not earmarked for public works?

Mr. BUSH. Yes.

Mr. CASE. That goes into the general fund of the District of Columbia.

Mr. BUSH. Are we to understand that the annual contribution of $11 million would be increased by that $2.5 million?

Mr. CASE. The annual contribution would be increased by that $2.5 million, up to $13.5 million. Perhaps I was misleading when I said that that amount goes into the general fund. I should have completed my statement by saying it goes into the general fund for operating expenses. So that $2.5 million would be available for whatever demands for operating expenses there may be on the general fund. That amount could be used for construction, provided the budget otherwise permitted it; but the top $6.5 million can be appropriated only for the capital fund outlay, and is matched.

Mr. BUSH. And the other $2.5 million could also be used for capital expenditures?

Mr. CASE. If there were a desire to use it, yes.

The bill also provides that the United States Government will start paying for the water it receives from the District at regular rates, which would increase the payment to the water fund from the present $1 million to about $1.5 million. And the bill applies the proposed new sewer service charge against Federal establishments—as it does against private users—which will mean an additional payment, to the new sewer fund, of about $700,000 a year.

The total new authorized Federal payments in the bill come to about $10.2 million a year, which would be available in addition to the present payments of $12 million. In both cases I am using figures which include water payments.

FEDERAL LOANS

The third general category of provisions in the bill, Mr. President, is Federal loans to the District.

This is not a novel idea in the Federal-District relationship. Lacking any machinery here for public referendum on bond issues or any authority to issue bonds, as exists in most cities, the District does its banking business with the Federal Treasury.

At the present time there is authorized about $50 million in Federal loans

to the District for various special purposes, most of which has not yet been appropriated and actually borrowed. The authorization includes $23 million in borrowing authority for the water fund, $4.5 million balance from the Capper-Cramton Act, $5 million for the District of Columbia share of the United States court building, and $17.5 million for the District of Columbia share of the hospital center.

New Federal loans authorized in this bill all are subject to actual later appropriation of the money. They are required to be repaid in 30 equal annual installments, at a rate of interest which will cover the cost of the money to the Treasury. Amortization must begin 1 year from the date of the loan. The amounts authorized are $12 million additional for the water fund, $5 million for the new sanitary sewer fund, and $50,254,000 for the highway fund.

When the bill originally was proposed by the Commissioners, it included provision for an additional loan of about $40 million for the general fund, but that proposal was eliminated in the committee of the other body, as recommended by the joint subcommittee of the two committees when the joint hearings were held. There was a feeling, I believe, that the total authorized debt of the city should not become unreasonably high. Added to the $50 million now authorized, the $67 million debt authority remaining in the bill will make a total debt authorization of $117 million, which is about the limit that a city of the assessed valuation of Washington should have.

It should be pointed out, however, that this bill provides for an authorization, and will not actually create a debt. If the authorization is made, the debt will not actually be created until the money is appropriated by the Congress and borrowed by the District of Columbia.

It is not accurate to say, however, as some critics of the committee's action have said, that we are trying to force the District to remain on an unworkable pay-as-you-go basis. Anyone with experience in local government knows that cities and States cannot always be run that way. That rule will continue to apply only to the general fund of the District; and because much of the revenue for that fund is from taxes whose yield is subject to the ups-and-downs of the general economy, I believe it may be wise to avoid debt that is a charge on this fund.

MISCELLANEOUS

Mr. President, there are some miscellaneous provisions of the bill which should be mentioned. The miscellaneous provisions include sections covering the billing, collection and allocation of revenues, the appropriation and expenditure of funds. A separate sanitary sewer fund is created, taking appropriate receipts and expenditures for this activity from the general fund. I believe the result will be better bookkeeping which will be of benefit to the District of Columbia finances as a whole. There are also the usual enabling and separability clauses.

NEED FOR REVENUES

In conclusion, Mr. President, let me say just a brief word on the rather critical need for the revenues proposed by this bill.

Present and planned needs of the District government exceed anticipated revenues from present authorized sources. The general fund situation is the most aggravated, as illustrated by the lack of any proposed construction funds in the 1955 budget. Normal construction needs met from that fund run about $10 million a year. Furthermore, present forecasts indicate that operating costs in the general fund will begin to exceed revenues in fiscal 1955; and that if no new legislation is enacted the deficit will total $92 million by 1964. If a normal capital outlay were made during this period, without any new sources of revenue, the deficit conceivably would be $253 million by 1964. I may say that the figures on this disturbing prospect were considered at some length by the joint subcommittees. I cannot say the figures were popular, insofar as the officials or citizens of the District of Columbia were concerned; but the figures were prepared by the fiscal section of the city government, on the basis of normal anticipations. The joint subcommittees were compelled to recognize the dire prospect as a real one, unless some new sources of revenue are found. Consequently, in the bill the committee sought to recognize that situation, and to do something about it. I cannot say the committee has met the problem 100 percent, but the committee has met it in what seems to me to be a constructive way, all things considered.

The situations in the case of the other funds, aside from the general fund, are also serious. Washington's water supply is not assured without extensive new works. Of course, that is a serious statement to make when we are speaking of the National Capital. In the case of many of the cities of the Nation, a situation endangering their water supply would immediately threaten the public health, public safety, and public security; and where there are defense installations of one sort or another, an adequate water supply is regarded as of the utmost national importance. The same should apply to the Nation's Capital. I say soberly and seriously that without extensive new works Washington's water supply is not assured. Its sewage system is tremendously overtaxed. Needs for new highway development and a new Potomac River bridge are dramatized daily in the growing congestion of the central city area.

Presently available revenues for the funds necessary to provide for these improvements fall far short of meeting the needs in the decade ahead. That situation is alarming today; but 10 years from now it will be even worse. It must be recognized that when a program for public works is authorized the public works are not made available immediately upon their authorization, or immediately upon the making of the appropriations for them. On the contrary, it takes time to plan and to build them. Consequently, no magic wand will be waved, even if the pending bill shall be passed, and even if the appropriations authorized by it shall be made. We must realize that we are trying to look ahead and not only meet the current need but also make provision so that the Nation's Capital will not be too far behind when the needs of future decades arise.

Nearly 2 years ago the Commissioners launched a study of overall long-range public-works needs of the city. In its present form, the plan they have developed calls for a capital outlay of $305 million in the next 10 years, divided as follows: Water, $35.8 million; sewer, $27.9 million; highway and bridge, $111.9 million; schools, hospital, and other buildings, $83.3 million; storm-water sewers, $46.4 million.

The present revenue bill often is confused with this public-works program. Technically, the bill does not authorize or spell out any specific program. The program of construction will be developed from year to year by the inclusion of specific projects in the annual appropriation bills.

H. R. 8097 provides revenues to meet the $305 million program the Commissioners now have in mind. It makes possible the prediction of balanced budgets for 10 years in the highway, water, and sanitary sewer funds, although I must say that House bill 8097 of itself does not provide sufficient revenues to meet both this program and the presently foreseen $92 million deficit in the general fund. However, in that connection it should be pointed out that the revenues of the city themselves can undergo fluctuations; and if we can judge by the past, the revenues probably will increase, considering the 10-year period as a whole.

If expenses do exceed revenues, as now anticipated—and such forecasts admittedly are subject to considerable error because of changing economic conditions—the District obviously will have to trim its planned capital outlay or seek new revenue sources, beyond those proposed in the present bill, within a period of 4 or 5 years, or possibly within a period of 2 or 3 years.

Thus, this is a minimum program, Mr. President. It is the least we can and should do to catch up on the city's public works needs.

Mr. President, I think I can say, as one who has now been in Washington for going on 17½ years, as a Member of either the House of Representatives or the Senate, that the program called for by this bill is a minimum one if we are to fulfill our obligations, as the legislative body for the District of Columbia, in providing the needed improvements to the city's public works, in order to make it possible for the city to meet its needs as the capital city for this great Nation.

COMMITTEE AMENDMENTS

Mr. President, at this time I should like to ask that the committee amendments be considered en bloc. In requesting that the amendments be considered en bloc, I wish it distinctly understood that if it is agreed that they be considered and agreed to en bloc, thereafter any member of the Senate, including the present speaker, will have the individual right of requesting the consideration of any of them, should he later desire to have any of them reconsidered, for the purpose of having them amended later on.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MARTIN in the chair). Is there objection to the request of the Senator from South Dakota? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I submit the committee amendments en bloc as they appear in the printed bill, and ask for their adoption, with the understanding that I shall not object to a request for reconsideration of any individual amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the committee amendments are agreed to en bloc.

The committee amendments agreed to en bloc are as follows:

On page 5, line 10, after the word "thereof", insert "situated in the District"; in line 15, after the word "District.", insert "All water and water services furnished from the District water supply system through any connection thereto for direct use by the Government of the United States or any department, independent establishment, or agency thereof, situated outside the District in the States of Maryland or Virginia, except water and water services furnished to the United States for the maintenance, operation, and extension of the water system, shall be paid for at rates comparable to those which may be in effect and charged to State, municipal, or county agencies or other political authorities or jurisdictions within the respective States wherein said Federal facilities may be situated for similar water service from the District water supply system: *Provided*, That conditions as to water pressure, quantity, rates of demand, and points of connection available or permissible at any time for service outside the District, if any, shall be fixed by the Commissioners so as to fully protect the prior interests of water consumers within the District: *Provided further*, That as a condition of service, at each point of Federal connection to the water system of the District for service outside the District there shall be installed and maintained at the expense of the department, independent establishment, or agency of the United States which is to use water therefrom a suitable meter or meters and incidental vaults, valves, piping and recording devices, and such other equipment as the Commissioners in their discretion deem necessary to control and record the use of water through each such connection."; on page 29, line 5, after the word "more", strike out "$202" and insert "$202: *Provided*, That in determining the total weight of a vehicle subject to the provisions of this clause, there shall be excluded, in computing such weight, the weight of any special equipment which is subject to taxation as tangible personal property under subsection (e) of this section"; on page 30, line 1, after the word "more", strike out "$182" and insert "$182: *Provided*, That in determining the total weight of a trailer subject to the provisions of this class C, there shall be excluded, in computing such weight, the weight of any special equipment which is subject to taxation as tangible personal property under subsection (e) of this section"; in line 8, after "(e)", strike out "class E is amended to read "class E. Motor vehicles not propelled by gasoline, double the fees for similar vehicles propelled by gasoline, other than motor vehicles used for the transportation of passengers" and insert "by striking therefrom "Class E. Motor vehicles not propelled by gasoline, double the fees for similar vehicles propelled by gasoline"; in line 23, after the word "Columbia", insert a colon and "*Provided*, That the percentage of proceeds deposited to the credit of the General Fund shall not be less than 64 percent or more than 74 percent of all proceeds from fees payable under this title"; on page 31, after line 6, strike out:

"(e) Notwithstanding the provisions of this act, special equipment mounted on a motor vehicle or trailer and not used primarily for the transportation of persons or property, including, but not limited to, such equipment as concrete mixers, air compressors, power shovels, draglines, clamshells, welding equipment, road construction or maintenance equipment or machinery, ditch digging equipment, winches, cranes, pile driving equipment, well boring equipment, liftgates, hydraulic hoists, load packers, conversion hoists, power end gates, and other equipment which may be added to a motor vehicle or trailer for the purpose of permitting such vehicle to be used for a special purpose, shall continue to be taxed as provided by law."

And in lieu thereof insert:

"(e) Notwithstanding the provisions of this act, special equipment mounted on a motor vehicle or trailer and not used primarily for the transportation of persons or property shall be taxed as tangible personal property as provided by law. For the purpose of determining the fees authorized by clause 1 of class B and class C of subsection (b) of this section, the weight of special equipment taxed in accordance with the provisions of this subsection (e) shall be excluded in computing the weight of the vehicle or trailer on which it is mounted."

On page 32, line 20, after the word "special", strike out "equipment," and insert "equipment"; in line 22, after the word "property", strike out "including, but not limited to, such equipment as concrete mixers, air compressors, power shovels, draglines, clamshells, welding equipment, road construction or maintenance equipment or machinery, ditch digging equipment, winches, cranes, pile driving equipment, well boring equipment, liftgates, hydraulic hoists, load packers, conversion hoists, power end gates, and other equipment which may be added to a motor vehicle or trailer for the purpose of permitting such vehicle or trailer to be used for a special purpose, shall continue to be taxed as provided by law" and insert "shall be taxed as tangible personal property as provided by law."; on page 34, after line 8, strike out:

"SEC. 2. (a) For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and for each fiscal year thereafter there is hereby authorized to be appropriated, in addition to the sums appropriated under section 1 of this article, an annual payment by the United States toward defraying the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia in the sum of $9 million: *Provided*, That so much of the aggregate annual payments by the United States appropriated under this article to the credit of the general fund as is in excess of $12,500,000 shall be available for expenditure only for capital outlay, and then only to the extent of not more than 50 percent of the capital outlay payable from such general fund. Any portion of such excess not available for expenditure hereunder in any fiscal year shall be available for expenditure in any subsequent fiscal year upon the terms and conditions set forth in the preceding proviso."

And insert:

"SEC. 2. (a) For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and for each fiscal year thereafter there is hereby authorized to be appropriated, in addition to the sums appropriated under section 1 of this article, an annual payment by the United States toward defraying the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia in the sum of $9 million: *Provided*, That so much of the aggregate annual payments by the United States appropriated under this article to the credit of the general fund as is in excess of $13,500,000 shall be available for capital outlay only, and then on a cumulative total basis only to the extent of not more than 50 percent of the cumulative total of capital outlay appropriations payable from such general fund which becomes available for expenditure on or after July 1, 1954."

On page 39, after line 24, strike out:

"SEC. 804. Subsection (a) of section 40 of said act, as amended (sec. 25, 138, D. C. Code 1951), is hereby further amended by striking out "$1" and inserting in lieu thereof "$1.50"."

On page 40, line 4, to change the section number from "805" to "804"; in line 8, to change the section number from "806" to "805"; on page 42, line 22, after the word "storage", insert "and boats (excluding boats used as places of abode)"; in line 25, after the word "words", strike out "'house" and insert "'household", and on page 51, line 18, after the word "thereof", strike out "1 cent" and insert "2 cents."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

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

THE NEED FOR THE ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, yesterday's and today's Washington newspapers contained a full-page advertisement inserted by an organization which has called itself the National St. Lawrence Project Conference.

The advertisement is entitled "The St. Lawrence Seaway—A Way to Waste." It must have been composed by a master of deception and self-deception—yes, by a master of unconscious humor.

In one page of solid type, the advertisement manages to crowd more nonsense, more motheaten, hobgobblin arguments and self-contradictory assertions than I have seen in almost any similar effort in the past decade.

The advertisement boomerangs. It is so extreme, so transparently false that it proves the best possible argument for completion of action by the House of Representatives on the Wiley bill, S. 2150, and defeat of the so-called Brownson amendment.

Final indication of the Wiley bill's victory has already been given by Representative LEO ALLEN, Chairman of the Rules Committee and by Representative CHARLES HALLECK, House majority leader.

Meanwhile, however, the advertisement is a sign of the utter desperation on the antiseaway lobby. It reminds me of the moaning that took place in bygone years by the enemies of progress whenever they saw that all of their sabotage was going to prove unavailing against progress.

It is akin to the efforts of those who might in years past have inserted an advertisement entitled "The Panama Canal—A Way to Waste," or, "The Airplane Industry—A Way to Waste," or, "The Horseless Carriage—A Way to Waste."

The National St. Lawrence Project Conference is weeping crocodile tears over the project because the Conference knows that it will soon be out of business. History will have passed it by.

The United States Congress will at long last have crushed the blind, provincial opposition to the seaway.

The President of the United States, Dwight D. Eisenhower, will have

achieved what no President in three decades could achieve, namely, a victory over the forces of reaction, the forces which want to hold up transportation progress, the forces which do not visualize an expanded America.

To those 19th century minds who believe that the steamboat "will not run," that "the airplane cannot fly," that the automobile "cannot transport," I commend this advertisement and urge them to frame it on the wall.

But I urge those who believe in progress and who want progress, and those who want a strong America to read the advertisement and have a good laugh.

I send to the desk the text of a most interesting article published in the April 20 issue of the Philadelphia Evening Bulletin. The port city of Philadelphia has long tended to be a center in which antiseaway lobbyists have won some victories. I believe, however, that this article will open many eyes. I send it to the desk and ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD.

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

FACING SEAWAY FACTS

(By Ralph W. Page)

The 30 years' debate about the advisability of building the St. Lawrence Seaway from the Atlantic to the Great Lakes has now reached the climax.

As the matter stands, Canada has definitely decided to construct the channel on its side of the river if the United States fails to cooperate. On our side the Senate has voted to participate by a vote of 51 to 33.

Now the question is before the House of Representatives. The Public Works Committee has approved forming a St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation with a Treasury credit of $105 million.

The only practical matter left for citizens of Pennsylvania to discuss is whether to support this House bill or to defeat it and so let Canada do the whole job on its side of the river.

For years the railroads and the port authorities have been bitterly opposed to any seaway at all. They fear that it will divert a substantial amount of western freight from the roads and our shipping. Although it is now entirely academic, this opposition still persists against our shouldering any share of the project.

In this situation it would seem that the Philadelphia Industrial Council, CIO, has come forward with much the most constructive idea. Since the seaway is going to be built in any event, Joseph P. Kelley, the president, proposes that Philadelphia should support the mutual program and proceed to make an intensive study how to gain the maximum advantage to the city from the development.

Certainly if the city will be damaged by the seaway the main burden will fall upon the workmen.

But, representing these workers, Kelley asserts that in fact Philadelphia will be helped and not hurt. "On the contrary," he says, "we can expect an increase of traffic through this port and over the railroads resulting from the economic development and progress that will inevitably follow the construction of the seaway."

The thesis is that anything that helps one part of the country is of benefit to all the country—that history proves that any regional development provides markets and income for all the rest.

And, of course, all matters of Federal aid are mutual affairs. The Middle West wants the seaway. Pennsylvania wants Federal appropriation for deepening the Delaware River channel. Kelley points out "this stupid campaign in opposition to the seaway is doing nothing but antagonizing the pro-St. Lawrence Congressmen whose votes will be necessary to obtain this appropriation."

The prevailing reason why we should join Canada in this program has nothing to do with Philadelphia at all. It is that, in the considered opinion of the President, the Cabinet, the National Security Council, and the military staff, our national security requires such participation.

And it is observed that since the vast majority of the shipping through the passage will be our vessels, we will be paying for most of the cost in tolls, whether we own any of it or not.

So whatever our interests are, or we fancy they are, the best sense is to give in to the inevitable, endorse our maintaining some control over this major waterway, and proceed from here to learn how we can best benefit by the process.

MAY DAY FESTIVITIES—FREE ELECTIONS IN POLAND (S. REPT. NO. 1273)

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I submit the report of the Committee on Foreign Relations on Senate Resolution 178, submitted by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. POTTER], Senate Concurrent Resolution 58, submitted by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], Senate Concurrent Resolution 59, Senate Concurrent Resolution 62, and Senate Concurrent Resolution 65, also submitted by the Senator from Illinois.

The committee gave careful consideration to these resolutions and has sought to bring together in one resolution the essential points which were made by their original sponsors. It has amended Senate Concurrent Resolution 58 by striking out all after the heading "Concurrent resolution" and inserting language which covers all of the resolutions on this subject pending before the committee.

The committee felt that it would be advisable for the Senate to act on the subjects covered by this resolution at the earliest possible date.

This resolution calls to the attention of the American people the situation throughout the world in relation to May Day festivities. It calls attention particularly to the atrocities of the Kremlin and the great sins of omission and commission of which the leaders of the Kremlin have been guilty. It calls attention to the importance of America resolving that we shall stand firm.

Mr. President, I ask for the immediate consideration of the resolution.

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

The CHIEF CLERK. A concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 58) favoring the immediate holding of free and fair elections in Poland.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, no funds or appropriations are involved. This is simply a resolution, in substance, condemning the action of the Communist world.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I was not aware that a request of this kind would be made today. It is rather unusual. It is not in keeping with the procedures which the leaders normally follow in matters of this kind.

The distinguished majority leader has announced repeatedly that the business today would be the unfinished business, until it is concluded. I have not seen the resolution. I am not aware of what it contains. It may have the highest merit. I am inclined to think that it has, considering its author. However, I hope the Senator will defer his request until we can have an opportunity to consider the subject with the majority leader.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I withdraw the request. I made the statement that the resolution was being reported from the Committee on Foreign Relations. The Senator from Michigan [Mr. POTTER] submitted a resolution on the same subject, and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] also submitted four resolutions on the matter.

Day after tomorrow will be May 1. On Saturday the American Legion will be conducting May Day festivities throughout the land. If the resolution involved any request for an appropriation, or anything of that nature, I should say that there would be some reason for deferring its consideration. However, if it is the wish of the minority leader to postpone consideration of the resolution, that will have to be done. I have not had time to present the subject in further detail than I have presented it in submitting the report from the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator has the remainder of the day. I have no doubt that the Senate will be in session until 5 or 6 o'clock this evening.

Mr. WILEY. At 5:30 I am leaving for Chicago on official business. I withdraw my request for the second time, and I still have heard no objection.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The request has been withdrawn.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, in fairness to the minority leader and the majority leader, let me say that so far as I know, no request had been made of the majority leader for the consideration of the resolution For the time being the Senator from South Dakota is acting majority leader, during the unavoidable absence of the distinguished Senator from California [Mr KNOWLAND] at a department meeting downtown. I believe it is in keeping with the policy that has been established heretofore and the general understanding between the leadership on both sides of the aisle that requests of this sort ought to be referred to the majority leader and to the minority leader, so that the program of the Senate may proceed in an orderly fashion.

In saying this the Senator from South Dakota, neither for himself nor for the majority leader, is expressing any opposition to the passage of the resolution or to the very fine statement made in its behalf by the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], the chairman of

the Committee on Foreign Relations. However, I do think that in fairness to the minority leader I should say that what the minority leader has said is absolutely correct, namely, that these matters should be presented to the leadership on both sides of the aisle so that the program may proceed in an orderly way.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I appreciate the statement of the distinguished acting majority leader, the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE]. I have no doubt that the resolution is a worthwhile measure, and I have no doubt that the Senate will consider it, and I base my belief solely on the statement made by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations.

However, if it is worthy of consideration and if the Senate should consider it, there is no reason why the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] should not follow the usual procedure.

The majority leader has an obligation to protect the Senators on his side of the aisle and to formulate the program of the Senate. It is the purpose of the minority, and the continuous objective of the minority, to cooperate to the fullest extent with the majority on procedural matters.

It has been the policy, if nothing has been discussed concerning new legislation or a new resolution or a unanimous-consent request, other than the placing of something in the RECORD, to have a quorum call and to bring such a matter to the attention of Senators on both sides of the aisle, and then to agree, as gentlemen ordinarily agree, on matters of this kind.

I would not permit a member of the minority to make a request of this type without full concurrence and full knowledge and full consent of the majority leader, because he is responsible for procedure in the Senate. I know that if the Senator from Wisconsin will permit us to explore the subject, as we do every day on dozens of matters, the Senate will be able to adopt the resolution before he must leave for Chicago this afternoon. I believe the resolution is worthy of consideration or he would not have said what he did, even though he has now withdrawn it.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I withdrew it some time ago. I appreciate both lectures that were delivered on the subject. I wish to say very sincerely that this matter was laid on my desk with the request by a number of Senators for quick action. I have been in a committee hearing all day, and I had expected to present the matter to the majority leader and to the minority leader, but neither of them was in the Chamber at the time.

It is a May Day resolution, on which I requested the Senate take immediate action. However, I found that there was objection to taking it up at this time. I may say in that connection that I have known the rules of the Senate to be subject to exceptions. However, after I found that there was objection to the resolution, I withdrew it. Following my withdrawal of the resolution I was lectured, as though I did not know anything about the rules of the Senate, though this motion was no violation of the rules. I appreciate that, too.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. No one has undertaken to lecture the Senator from Wisconsin. In the first place, there is no rule on the subject which prevents the Senator from Wisconsin doing what he has done.

In the second place, the minority leader has been in the Chamber since a quarter to 12, except when he has been called to the telephone in connection with his duties as a Senator.

If the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations had exercised the prudence and care and ordinary diligence which is so characteristic of him, he could have sent a page to the cloakroom to call the minority leader, and the resolution probably would have been agreed to by now. I hope to be able later this afternoon to communicate to the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin the views of the minority on this subject.

Mr. WILEY. I appreciate the third lecture very much, though the minority leader confirms my statement he was absent in the cloakroom.

PUBLIC WORKS CONSTRUCTION FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 8097) to authorize the financing of a program of public-works construction for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, I offer several amendments to the pending bill, and ask that they be stated and considered en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendments will be considered en bloc, and the Secretary will state the amendments.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 45, line 17, it is proposed to strike the number "SEC. 1201" and in lieu thereof insert the number "SEC. 1202" and a new section 1201, as follows:

SEC. 1201. (a) Section 2 of title V of the District of Columbia Income and Franchise Tax Act of 1947 (61 Stat. 331, 341, ch. 258), as amended (sec. 47–1564a, D. C. Code, 1951), is amended by striking "$4,000" wherever it appears therein and inserting in lieu thereof "$3,000."

(b) Section 2 of title VI of such act, as amended (sec. 47–1567a, D. C. Code, 1951), is amended by striking "$4,000" wherever it appears therein and inserting in lieu thereof "$3,000."

Page 46, after line 7, insert a new section 1203, as follows:

SEC. 1203. Section 1 of title VIII of the District of Columbia Income and Franchise Tax Act of 1947 (61 Stat. 345, ch. 258; sec. 47–1574, D. C. Code, 1951) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 1. Definition of unincorporated business: For the purposes of this article (not alone of this title) and unless otherwise required by the context, the words 'unincorporated business' means any trade, business, profession, vocation, or commercial activity, including rental of real estate and rental of real and personal property, conducted or engaged in by any individual or group of individuals, whether resident or nonresident, statutory or common-law trust, estate, partnership, limited or special partnership, society, association, joint venture, executor, administrator, receiver, trustee, liquidator, conservator, committee, assignee, fiduciary, joint tenants, tenants in common or tenants by the entirety of property, or by any other entity or fiduciary, other than a trade or business conducted or engaged in by a corporation which would be taxable under title VII of this article."

Page 46, line 8, renumber sections 1202 to 1204.

Page 46, starting on line 16, insert a period after the word "drinks" and strike all thereafter through the end of line 19.

Page 47, strike all of lines 5, 6, and 7.

Page 47, lines 18 and 19, strike the words "other than sales of food for human consumption off the premises where such food is sold, and."

Page 48, strike all of lines 1 to 6, inclusive.

Page 48, line 7, strike "(c)" and in lieu thereof insert "(b)."

Page 48, strike lines 16 to 25, inclusive.

Page 49, strike lines 1 to 7, inclusive.

Page 49, line 8, renumber section 1308 to section 1306.

Page 49, line 8, strike the word "said."

Page 49, after line 12, insert the following new sections 1307, 1308, 1309, and 1310:

SEC. 1307. Subsection (a) of section 114 of said District of Columbia Sales Tax Act (par. 14 (a) of sec. 47–2601, D. C. Code 1951) is amended by adding thereto the following paragraph (7):

"(7) The sale or charges to subscribers for local telephone service. The term 'local telephone service' shall be construed in the same manner and to the same extent as such term is construed under section 3465 (a) (3) of the Internal Revenue Code and regulations relating thereto, at the time of the enactment of these amendments to the District of Columbia Sales Tax Act. The exemptions authorized in subsections (a), (b), (c), and (m) of section 128 of the District of Columbia Sales Tax Act shall not apply to local telephone service, and in lieu thereof the same exemptions and exclusions shall be applicable as are, at the time of the enactment of these amendments to the District of Columbia Sales Tax Act, applicable with respect to the tax on local telephone service imposed by said section 3465 (a) (3) of the Internal Revenue Code. The repeal or amendment of the Federal tax on local telephone service referred to herein shall not in any way be construed as repealing or amending the tax on local telephone services under the District of Columbia Sales Tax Act."

SEC. 1308. Subsection (b) (2) of section 114 of said District of Columbia Sales Tax Act is amended to read as follows:

"(2) Sales of transportation services and communication services other than sales of local telephone service as provided in this title."

SEC. 1309. Subsection (b) of section 114 of said District of Columbia Sales Tax Act is further amended by adding thereto the following subparagraph (5):

"(5) Where sales of local telephone service are rendered by means of a coin-operated telephone available to the public: *Provided, however,* That where coin-operated telephone service is furnished a subscriber for a guaranteed amount such service shall be deemed a retail sale to the extent of such guaranteed amount."

SEC. 1310. Subsection (b) of section 116 of said District of Columbia Sales Tax Act is amended by adding thereto the following subparagraph (6):

"(6) Amounts charged for the installation of instruments, wires, poles, switchboards, apparatus, and equipment in connection with local telephone service."

Page 49, line 13, renumber section 1309 to section 1311.

Page 52, line 5, strike the figure "2.20" and in lieu thereof insert "2.30."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing en bloc to the amendments offered by the Senator from Maine [Mr. PAYNE].

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, in offering these amendments I wish to assure my colleagues that I am not opposing in any way the purpose and objectives of the very essential legislation under consideration. There is no question at all in my mind that this type of long-range public works financing is absolutely necessary if the Nation's Capital is to avoid deterioration and decay and is to continue as one of America's most beautiful and inspiring cities.

At this point I wish to pay the highest tribute to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia, the able and distinguished Senator from the State of South Dakota [Mr. CASE]. He has worked long and hard not only on this bill but on many other worthwhile proposals designed to be of benefit to the people of the District of Columbia—people, who, because of the structure of our laws at the present time, do not have the right to vote in their own interests in connection with legislation of this type, but must depend upon the Members of Congress to protect their interests at all times.

The Senator from South Dakota has, in my opinion, given very, very careful consideration to the text of the bill which is presented before the Senate, and the only reason why I must offer the amendments which I have offered is because it is my feeling that there are certain inequities, and if they are allowed to go unchallenged, I would certainly never rest easy in my heart, because of the fact that they are provisions like those which I have long opposed while serving in State government.

I am referring, Mr. President, to the provisions of the bill which would levy a 1-percent tax on groceries and would reduce the present restaurant meal tax exemption from $1.25 to 50 cents. Such taxes as these are of the retrogressive type, unduly burdening those citizens who are least financially able to meet the burden, making it even more difficult for a number of District citizens to make both ends meet. It appears to me that taxes of this sort will only result in increased Federal appropriations to provide the necessary health, food, and welfare services for even more people who are unable to pay their own bills because of increased tax dollars coming out of their meager incomes.

Take, for example, those who are receiving assistance under the public welfare laws and those who are receiving old-age assistance, established on a bare minimum of support in order to enable them to carry on through the years of advanced age.

The proposed tax would throw a definite burden upon those persons and would result in 1 of 2 things: Either they would go without, or the District Government would have to make up in a supplementary manner further assistance in those cases.

I just cannot go along with this type of financial philosophy, which would extend the sales-tax concept to an extreme as being in the best interest of the persons concerned.

I know it is very easy to oppose a tax and it is very easy to encourage the spending of money for governmental agencies. Therefore, to be fully in line and to be consistent, I am presenting in the amendments which I have sent to the desk provisions which will replace the eliminated taxes to which I have referred with something which, I believe, would be more fair and equitable.

For instance, Mr. President, in the amendments offered I propose to eliminate the 1-percent tax on groceries which it has been estimated will raise $3,500,000 for the needed public works financing. They would eliminate the reduction of exemption for restaurant meals from $1.25 to 50 cents, which would raise $1,500,000. A total loss of revenue of $5 million would result.

I submit to the Members of this body a proposal which would reduce the personal income-tax exemption from $4,000 to $3,000, leaving undisturbed the provision of the bill which raises income-tax rates 1 percent across the board. This proposal would raise $1,200,000.

I propose an increase in the realty tax to 2.30 percent. The present rate is 2.15, and the bill proposes a rate of 2.20. This would raise $1,800,000.

A 2 percent sales tax on local telephone service would raise $400,000.

To apply the unincorporated business tax to personal service businesses and income from rental of real property would raise $1,500,000, representing a total revenue gain of $4,900,000 to replace the $5 million which would be eliminated if the amendments were accepted.

In contrast to the inequities of the taxes these amendments would eliminate, I want to emphasize the facts regarding the tax increases proposed.

First, in regard to reducing the District of Columbia personal income-tax exemption from $4,000 to $3,000, the most striking evidence of the fairness of this change is a table of comparative income-tax exemptions showing the exemption totals for all the States that levy a personal income tax.

As of September 1, 1953, of the 31 States and the District of Columbia having such a tax, only 1, Mississippi, has an exemption as high as that of the District of Columbia. In striking variance with the District's single-person exemption of $4,000, and married or head-of-the-family exemption of $6,000, both Virginia and Maryland, nearby tax jurisdictions, allow single-person exemptions of only $1,000 and married or head-of-family exemptions of only $2,000.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have included in the RECORD at this point, as a part of my remarks, a table which has been compiled relating to income-tax exemptions.

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

TABLE SHOWING WHY PERSONAL INCOME TAX EXEMPTIONS IN DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA SHOULD BE REDUCED

TABLE 11.—*State individual income taxes: Personal exemptions and credits for dependents, Sept. 1, 1953*

States	Personal exemption				Credit for dependents		Additional exemption on account of—	
	Single		Married or head of family				Age	Blindness
Alabama	$1,500		$3,000		$300.00			
Arizona [1]	10	($1,000)	20	($2,000)	4.00	($320)		
Arkansas	2,500		3,500		600.00			
California	2,000		3,500		400.00			[2] $500
Colorado	600		1,200		600.00		[2] $600	[2] 600
Delaware	600		1,200		600.00		600	600
Georgia	1,000		2,500		500.00		[2] 500	[2] 500
Idaho	700		1,500		[3] 200.00			
Iowa [1] [4]	15	(1,500)	30	(2,333)	7.50	(333)		
Kansas	600		1,200		600.00		[2] 600	[2] 600
Kentucky [1]	20	(1,000)	40	(2,000)	10.00	(500)		
Louisiana [5]	2,500	(50)	5,000	(100)	400.00	(8)		
Maryland	1,000		2,000		[6] 600.00		[7] 1,000	[7] 1,000
Massachusetts [8]	2,000		2,500		400.00			
Minnesota [1]	10	(1,000)	30	(2,000)	10.00	(333)	([9])	([9])
Mississippi	4,000		6,000					
Missouri	1,200		2,400		400.00			
Montana	1,000		2,000		300.00			
New Hampshire [10]	600		600					

[1] Personal exemptions and credits for dependents are allowed in the form of tax credits which are deductible from the amount of tax. With respect to personal exemptions, the sum in parentheses is the exemption equivalent of the tax credit assuming that the exemption is deducted from the lowest brackets. With respect to the credits for dependents, the sum in parentheses is the amount by which the 1st dependent raises the level at which a married person or head of family becomes taxable.

[2] An identical exemption is allowed for a spouse if separate returns are filed.

[3] In addition, a tax credit of $5 is allowed for each dependent.

[4] In the case of dependent father, mother, or grandparent, the taxpayer may take a deduction of $450 in lieu of the $7.50 tax credit.

[5] The exemptions and credits for dependents are deductible from the lowest income bracket and are equivalent to the tax credits shown in parentheses.

[6] An additional credit of $600 is allowed for each dependent 65 years of age or over.

[7] An identical exemption is allowed for a spouse.

[8] A $2,000 exemption is allowed all taxpayers against salary and business income, in addition to a $500 personal exemption for a spouse (whose income from all sources does not exceed $2,000) and a credit of $400 for each dependent. With respect to income from interest, dividends, annuities, and net gains from sales of intangibles, the $2,000 exemption is allowed only if the total income from all sources does not exceed $2,000 for single persons and $2,500 for husband and wife. However, the tax on these 3 categories of income may not reduce the taxpayer's total income below $2,000 or $2,500, respectively.

[9] An additional tax credit ($10 for single persons and $15 each for taxpayer and spouse) is allowed for persons 65 years of age or over and for blind persons.

[10] Tax applies only to interest and dividends.

TABLE 11.—*State individual income taxes: Personal exemptions and credits for dependents, Sept. 1, 1953*—Continued

States	Personal exemption				Credit for dependents		Additional exemption on account of—	
	Single		Married or head of family				Age	Blindness
New Mexico	$1,500		$2,500		$200.00			
New York	1,000		2,500		400.00			
North Carolina	1,000		[11] 2,000		300.00			$1,000
North Dakota	600		1,500		600.00		[7] $600	
Oklahoma	1,000		2,000		500.00			
Oregon	600		1,200		600.00		([12])	[7] 600
South Carolina	1,000		2,000		400.00			
Tennessee [10]								
Utah	600		1,200		600.00			
Vermont	500		1,000		500.00		500	500
Virginia	1,000		2,000		200.00		[2] 600	[2] 600
Wisconsin [1 13]	7	($700)	14	($1,320)	7.00	($560)		
District of Columbia	4,000		4,500 or [14] 8,000		500.00			

[11] An additional exemption of $1,000 is allowed a married woman with separate income.
[12] A tax credit of $6 is allowed taxpayers 65 years of age or over.
[13] Applicable to calendar and fiscal years 1953 and thereafter.
[14] The exemption is $4,500 if the spouse is a dependent. If both husband and wife file returns each is allowed a $4,000 exemption.

Source: Treasury Department, analysis staff, Tax Division.

Mr. PAYNE. Second, Mr. President, one of my amendments would increase the realty tax rate to 2.30 percent from the present rate of 2.15 percent and from 2.20 percent as now written in the bill. In discussing this change, I again invite attention to comparative real estate tax figures in nearby Virginia and Maryland, which, of course, have a very definite bearing on the real estate market conditions in the District of Columbia. It is interesting to note that according to figures submitted by Mr. James L. Martin, finance officer and assessor of the District of Columbia, at hearings on the pending measure before the Joint Fiscal Subcommittee, the proposed increase would not be out of line with the taxes paid in surrounding areas.

In the District of Columbia the rate would be $2.30 per $100 if the amendment were adopted. In Maryland the present rate is from $2.1625 to $0.2125 per $100. In Virginia the rate is $2.91 per $100.

Therefore, Mr. President, the rate which would be imposed upon real estate in the District of Columbia would not be in excess of that in the surrounding territory. It would be in line, so that further development within the District of Columbia itself would not be stymied in any way, shape, or manner.

In the third place, a 2-percent tax on local telephone service would be levied. This proposal creates a new tax on local telephone service, to produce approximately $400,000 a year.

My reason for submitting my proposals is not to take out of the bill any revenue needed, but it is merely to submit a method which I deem to be equitable and fair, much more equitable and fair than are some of the proposals in the bill.

Local telephone service is not taxed under existing law. Sales of gas and electricity are already subject to the sales tax. So we would not be adopting a new tax; we would merely be putting into effect the same ratio of tax presently in effect against the other utilities; namely, gas and electric power operations in the District of Columbia.

The Federal Government imposes a tax of 10 percent on long-distance telephone calls and 10 percent on local telephone service.

If the proposed telephone tax becomes law there will be no dispute about revenues from local telephone service that would be subject to the tax, since representatives of the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co. and the Assessor's Office are in agreement as to taxable and nontaxable items.

About 14 States impose a tax on local and long-distance telephone service. The taxing of interstate service is exceptional.

The proposed tax would follow the Federal law so far as exemptions are concerned in order that the least possible burden be placed upon the telephone company. Deviation from the Federal law would be costly to the telephone company in computing bills. The principal change from the exemptions granted by the Sales and Use Tax Act of 1949 would affect semipublic institutions. However, these institutions are already favored in that they receive a 33⅓ percent discount on bills for telephone service.

Finally, one of my amendments would apply the unincorporated business tax to personal service businesses. This change, it seems to me, is most appropriate in order to eliminate any exemptions to a tax which, by its very nature, was intended originally to apply to all forms of unincorporated activity. At this point, I should like to quote from pages 679 and 680 of the hearings before the Joint Subcommittee on Fiscal Affairs regarding the purposes and reasons for this change in the law:

PURPOSE

The purpose of the changes is to eliminate the exemption afforded some personal service businesses, thereby making them subject to the franchise tax and to make the renting of all real estate a business, thereby causing all of such businesses to be subject to the franchise tax.

REASONS

It is considered proper that all firms doing business in the District should be subject to the franchise tax because—

(a) If a tax is to be imposed for the privilege of doing business there would seem to be no good reason for taxing only those businesses which are in competition with corporations. On the other hand it would seem more proper that all firms doing business should be subjected to taxes for that privilege, especially since all firms doing business within the District may avail themselves of the benefits derived from the Government of the United States.

(b) When considered in the light that taxes should be paid by those best able to pay, it is unfair to require the retail merchants having a comparatively small profit to pay a tax for the privilege of engaging in business while the professional people who are also engaging in business and generally making substantially greater profits are not required to pay a tax.

2. The firms which, it is proposed, should be subjected to the francise tax and who are not now subject to the franchise tax are receiving the same benefits from the District of Columbia government such as police and fire protection and use of the courts, as are those firms who are presently paying the franchise tax.

This would merely give such firms an opportunity likewise to share comparably in the operations of the District of Columbia government.

I read further:

3. It would seem proper that we should seek to obtain taxes from those not now subject to the tax, assuming they are equally able to pay.

4. A precedent for taxing personal service businesses was established under the business privilege tax law of 1937–38 and 1939–40.

5. The passage of the amendment to delete the exemption section of the statute so as to bring in the personal service companies would save the District a substantial amount of money through a decrease in litigation, both from the standpoint of attorneys' costs and administrative costs. The same would be true of the proposed amendment to the law under which the renting of all real or personal property would be considered a business regardless of whether or not personal services were rendered to the tenant by the owner.

For reasons I have given I submit that the particular tax changes which I advocate will place the tax burden where it can be better met without harming the interests which are receiving the burden. This is true since the overall competitive position of these interests is not made less favorable by those changes when compared with tax conditions which would be found in the nearby jurisdictions.

To my way of thinking, this amendment will serve to remove the truly discriminatory local taxes, discriminating against those who are least able to pay; but at the same time the amendment will not impair the total amount of tax financing required for the successful implementation of this splendid program, developed through the hard work of the District of Columbia Commissioners, their advisory committee, and the Joint Senate-House District of Columbia Subcommittee on Fiscal Affairs, directed so ably by the distinguished Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] and Representative JOSEPH P. O'HARA.

This program deserves a favorable reaction from the Senate; it deserves assurance that the moneys will be available to carry out the many contemplated capital improvement projects and so must not depend too much on the uncertainties of future congressional appropriations. At the same time, a portion of the program deserves tax financing from those revenue sources which can meet

the burden with the least personal privation. These are sources whose incomes directly depend upon the continuation of a strong, expanding Washington, which is the primary objective of the proposed 10-year $305 million capital-improvement program.

Mr. President, I shall take but one moment longer, in which again to emphasize the fact that if Congress intends to support legislation of this type, which is needed, then Congress, in turn, should finance such a program from sources which can bear the freight, and can do so without harming those who are least able to contribute.

It is for that reason that I have submitted these amendments. I hope the Senate will favorably consider them, and will not impose burdensome taxation measures upon those who least can afford to pay the expense.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendments offered by the Senator from Maine.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I find myself in a very interesting and difficult parliamentary situation, because I am confronted with some amendments offered by my good friend, the distinguished Senator from Maine [Mr. PAYNE], which I consider to be better than the provisions of the committee bill which he seeks to amend. Yet I find myself with some modification of opinion in respect to his amendments with relation to certain amendments offered in the committee.

I am very fond of the Senator from Maine, because he and I have worked together, as has the present Presiding Officer of the Senate, the distinguished junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL], with the chairman of the committee, the distinguished junior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], and the distinguished junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT], on a great many issues which have come before the Committee on the District of Columbia. In fact, I think I may say, good naturedly, that there seems to be surprising agreement among the members of our committee. There has not been as much difference of opinion, since I was assigned to the Committee on the District of Columbia, as many persons predicted would be the case as a result of that assignment. On the contrary, we have had some very delightful sessions. Our differences, as they have arisen, have not been too great. I suppose we are discussing today the only substantial disagreement, or any disagreement to a marked degree, which has appeared within the Committee on the District of Columbia since I became a member. As will be seen as the debate proceeds, it is not even a very serious difference.

But the parliamentary situation being what it is, my consultation with the parliamentarian supports the proposal which I am now about to make, with the consent of the Senate. Rather than to modify, by way of amendment, each of the amendments offered by the distinguished Senator from Maine, I shall ask permission to follow the same parliamentary procedure which has been granted to the Senator from Maine, namely, that on these items, I may offer amendments en bloc, by way of a substitute bill, as an amendment to the amendments offered by the Senator from Maine. I now send such a proposed substitute amendment to the desk, and ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. CASE. Reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, I merely wish to point out that had the committee not adopted the committee amendments en bloc and made them a part of the bill, the amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon at this time might be interpreted as an amendment in the third degree. If the committee amendments were still pending, and then the Senate had before it the amendments offered by the Senator from Maine [Mr. PAYNE] as amendments to the committee amendments, and then the amendment in the nature of a substitute had been offered by the Senator from Oregon, I believe some point might be raised to the amendment as being one in the third degree. However, that is not the situation. The committee amendments were adopted en bloc.

There are some rather clear-cut issues presented in the amendments which have been offered, and, whatever the parliamentary situation may be, I feel the Senate should not try to emphasize or press it. I have no objection to the amendments being considered en bloc. The Senator from Maine and the Senator from Oregon have been most cooperative in their work and studies in the committee, and I am glad that they may have an opportunity to present their questions in full and in such detail as they desire.

I withdraw the reservation.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to thank the committee chairman for his statement. I think, in the interest of saving time, this is the way to expedite the handling of these differences, which are differences only in degree. I wish to have the attention of my friend, the Senator from Maine [Mr. PAYNE], when I state that although I am hopeful that my amendments will be adopted as a substitute for his, if they are not adopted, I intend to support his amendments in preference to the present wording of the bill as reported by the committee.

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

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. PAYNE. I was quite interested in having an opportunity to refer to the suggested substitute. It so happens that here again apparently the distinguished Senator from Oregon and I are in practically complete agreement, because, in the event that the previous amendments which I have offered were not favorably considered, I had intended fully to introduce the type of amendment which has been presented by the distinguished Senator from Oregon. I wish to say to the Senator from Oregon that, in reciprocity, I will support, under those circumstances, the amendment which he has offered, although I would take it as a second choice, because I am sure the Senator from Oregon will agree with me that one amendment provides for certain revenues, whereas the amendment which has just been proposed as a substitute provides for an authorization, and there would then still have to be a fight to get an appropriation to cover it.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator from Maine is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment to the amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. The Senator from Oregon proposes an amendment in the nature of a substitute for the amendment of the Senator from Maine [Mr. PAYNE], on page 46, after line 9, to strike out all of title XIII and in lieu thereof insert the following:

TITLE XIII—ADDITIONAL ANNUAL FEDERAL PAYMENT TO THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

SEC. 1301. For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and for each fiscal year thereafter there is hereby authorized to be appropriated, in addition to the sums appropriated under article VI of the District of Columbia Revenue Act of 1947, approved July 16, 1947 (61 Stat. 361), as amended (sec. 47-2501a, D. C. Code, 1951 ed.), and as further amended by title VII of this act, an annual payment by the United States toward defraying the expenses of the Government of the District of Columbia in the sum of $5,225,000.

SEC. 1302. The payments authorized by this title shall be credited to the general fund of the District of Columbia.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, my argument will be very brief. It will be based on the major premise which I urged in committee, but which failed to secure majority approval in committee.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] supported me in committee. He is ill today, and he has authorized me to say that if he were here, he would support my amendment, as he did in committee.

The major premise to which I refer is that, in my judgment, the Federal Government owes a greater obligation to the District of Columbia to make a lump sum appropriation in order to meet the public works needs of the District of Columbia than is to be found in the bill reported by the committee.

In support of that premise, I wish to observe that the District of Columbia relationship to the Federal Government was aptly described many years ago, in 1835, by Senator Southard, when he said on the floor of the Senate:

> The committee has been unable to separate the interests of the District from the interests of the United States. They regard it as the child of the Union—as the creation of the Union for its own purposes. The design of the Constitution and its founders was to create a residence for the Government, where they should have absolute and unlimited control.

The statement made by Senator Southard in 1835 is just as true today as it was then, when he made the statement I have just quoted that the interests of the District of Columbia cannot be separated from the interests of the United States. In fact, the primary interest of the District of Columbia is Government. The major purpose of the operations of this Capital City is to carry on the governmental functions of the Federal Government.

In my judgment, there is not being paid to the District of Columbia the contribution which the people of the

country as a whole owe to the District of Columbia. I repeat what I said in committee, Mr. President, that, in my judgment, we would pay a larger amount if the citizens of the District of Columbia had representatives who had a vote in the House of Representatives and the Senate of the United States. The people of the District of Columbia are at a great disadvantage because they do not have the influence of elected representatives in the House of Representatives and in the Senate to represent their interests as taxpayers of the District of Columbia. I say, therefore, there is a great moral obligation which rests upon us as representatives from the States of the Union to see to it that we never take advantage of the people of the District of Columbia simply because they owe no political responsibility to us, and we owe no political responsibility to them, in the sense that we are not subject to their votes. I think it is very important that the Congress be very careful when it passes tax legislation, particularly, that it does not impose upon the people of the District of Columbia the yoke of unfair taxes. It is my judgment, I say most respectfully, that the bill as reported from the Committee on the District of Columbia which is presently before the Senate is not fair in all respects to the taxpayers of the District of Columbia.

Mr. President, for further opinion in support of my major premise; namely, that the interests of the District of Columbia cannot be separated from the interests of the Nation. I wish to quote from William Howard Taft, who, in 1896, said:

> The object of the grant of exclusive legislation over the District was, therefore, national in the highest sense, and the city organized under the grant became the city, not of a State, not of a district, but of a nation.

Mr. President, in this matter, we are dealing with the Nation's Capital. All the taxpayers of the United States, across the Nation, should be willing to pay a fair share of the cost of operating the District of Columbia. It is my contention that the Nation is not presently paying such a fair share.

In order to understand my point of view, I believe we need to spend several minutes on a résumé of the history of the development of the relationship between the Federal Government and the city of Washington. If we do so, we find that the Federal payment for the District of Columbia has gone through four major phases.

During the first period, between 1790 and 1878, there was no fixed system for Federal payments. In some years there were lump-sum payments, and in other years there were no payments at all; but during this early period the average Federal Government payment was approximately 25 percent of the city's budget.

During the second period, from 1879 to 1921, the District of Columbia was on a 50–50 basis with the Federal Government.

Mr. President, if today I were engaged in a compromise procedure, I would be willing to settle on a 50–50 basis, which was the basis from 1879 to 1921. However, the percentage paid by the Federal Government has dropped far below 50 percent.

The fixed ratio payment on a 50–50 basis, established in the organic act of 1878, lasted for almost half a century. It was much fairer than the present relationship, although if I had to fix an arbitrary percentage relationship, my conclusion as a member of the District of Columbia Committee, having studied this matter, is that the share of the Federal Government should be not less than 60 percent. I believe the Federal Government's share should have been modified upward from the historic pattern of 1879 to 1921, from a 50–50 basis to at least a ratio of 60–40, with the Nation as a whole bearing 60 percent of the cost, for reasons which in a moment I shall set forth.

However, the movement has been in the opposite direction. The share of the Federal Government is now far below even the 50-percent share the Federal Government paid during the period from 1879 to 1921.

The third period in the history of the relationship between the Nation and the city of Washington began in 1921, when Congress ignored the organic act, and provided for a 40–60 basis, with the Federal Government paying 40 percent and the District of Columbia paying 60 percent. The Federal Government's 40-percent share during the third period was, in my judgment, entirely too small.

The same plan was used in 1922. In 1923, the 40–60 ratio basis of payment was supposed to have been made a permanent basis.

The fourth and final period in the history of the relationship between the city of Washington and the National Government began in 1925, when the Congress adopted the present lump-sum payment system. It is a very bad system, Mr. President. It is very dependent upon chance and upon political alinements in the Congress. It does not permit of careful planning over a long-time period for a public works program, for instance. I think the lump-sum plan leads to a great many inefficiencies. We have only to look at the results, it seems to me, since 1925, to have ample proof of the contention I am making.

But, Mr. President, I am aware of the fact that, as of the present moment, at this session of Congress, there is no hope of going back to any ratio formula; there is no hope of returning to the 50–50 formula or of going to a 60–40 formula, with the Federal Government paying 60 percent and the District of Columbia paying 40 percent. For that matter, I think there is no hope of going back to the 40–60 formula, which I believe was unfair to the District of Columbia. But if such legislation were enacted with the idea that it would be permanent, at least it would permit of a little more scientific planning than has characterized District of Columbia planning since 1925.

The first lump-sum payment was for $9 million, or for approximately 30 percent of the city's expenses in that period. But during the period since 1925 and up to the present time, the share of the Federal Government has declined from 30 percent to less than 9 percent. That is simply unfair, Mr. President. We cannot justify reducing the payment of the Federal Government to any such percentage as that. My amendment seeks at least to remedy the immediate situation confronting us.

I serve notice now that if my amendment is adopted, it must be adopted on the basis of being only a temporary plan insofar as this basic principle is concerned, because I do not like the lump-sum principle. But we are confronted with a legislative reality, namely, that we must accept the lump-sum principle this year because time does not permit us to come forward with a carefully worked out ratio principle which I believe ought to be the fiscal principle followed in determining the budget of the District of Columbia and the Federal share. So the situation now confronting us is complicated in actual practice, and it serves to deprive the District of Columbia of revenues, and at the same time it imposes cost burdens.

Illustrative of the means by which Washington, D. C., is deprived of revenues because it is operated as the Federal city, are the following points, among many others I could mention—but these are the ones I wish to emphasize today:

First. The District has developed because of the presence of the Federal Government, and does not have and probably never will have independent basic industries that would support it. On this point, a recent study showed that four of the Nation's largest corporations pay $1 in State and local taxes for every $20 spent for salaries. If the same ratio were to be applied to the Federal payroll of $800 million in Washington, the Federal payment to the District would be $40 million.

That shows how far short we fall from making the contribution which I believe the Federal Government should make to the District of Columbia, in view of the fact that the major industry of Washington, D. C., is Government, and in view of the further fact that the Congress follows courses of action, as regards the District of Columbia, restrictive in nature, and bound to keep Government as the major industry of Washington, D. C. I do not believe the time will ever come when Washington, D. C., will be cataloged among the industrial cities of the Nation. I think all of us will agree it should not be. I believe all will agree that the Capital City of the Nation should be one of the beauty spots of America, and should be one of the model cities of the Nation. It should be devoted primarily to operation of the Federal Government; and I think it would be rather unfortunate if Washington, D. C., became another smokestack city, with industry predominating over Government. However, unless we are willing to pay a larger share of the cost of operating the city, then I think every inducement should be made available to turn it into a smokestack city. That would mean, for example, that Congress would have to change some legislation regarding zoning and industries in the city.

Mr. President, my next point is:

Second. In Washington, D. C., Federal Government land amounts to 42.8 percent of the total. No taxes are paid on

this land, and no other major city has such a large part of its land and improvements tax exempt. This area, if taxable, would yield $18,971,000 in real estate taxes. To further show how industry supports the ordinary city, a survey of taxes in the District revealed that for each $1 of real estate tax that is paid by business, an additional sum of 80 cents is paid for other District business taxes. Consequently, if the Federal Government were taxable as a private business in the District, it probably would pay total taxes of about $35 million. This would indicate that a Federal payment of between the $35 million just mentioned and the $40 million cited in the previous paragraph could be justified.

The third point I would mention in support of a larger contribution by the Federal Government to the District of Columbia budget is this: Washington attracts tax-exempt activities, such as charitable foundations, because it is the Capital City. Each year more taxable property is being taken off the tax rolls of the District of Columbia. Today $20 million more of property is exempt than was the case only 3 years ago.

In my discussion with District officials who are thoroughly grounded in the fiscal problem I am now discussing, they tell me that there is every indication and every reason to believe that tax-exempt property will continue to increase in amount in the years ahead. I think we must take that into account when, as legislators, we come to decide what is fair and equitable as Federal appropriations for the District of Columbia.

My fourth point is that building-height limitations are set to prevent any commercial structure from overshadowing Federal structures which precludes the skyscrapers common to most large cities. These limitations hold down real-estate value. They likewise hold down tax revenues. To show the effect of such limitations, Chicago has an employment density of about 160,000 persons per square mile in its central business district, contrasted with 90,000 in the District of Columbia.

We of Congress are responsible for holding down tax revenues. I think we ought to keep this a beautiful city, as I have said before, but I think we ought to be willing to pay the price for beauty. I think we should recognize that the burden of maintaining a beautiful city, a model city, as the Capital of the United States, should not be placed upon the tax shoulders of the citizens of the District of Columbia to an extent out of all proportion to what is fair and equitable. It is my contention that that is exactly what we are doing, and that the committee bill would perpetuate that injustice.

The fifth point I wish to make under this topic is that many local residents maintain their legal domicile elsewhere, and thereby entirely avoid the payment of District of Columbia income taxes. This could not happen in any State. Let me say good naturedly, and somewhat against self-interest, that we in the Congress do not pay taxes in the District of Columbia. We live here, but we do not pay taxes in the District of Columbia.

I note the presence in the Chamber of the two Senators from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER and Mr. BEALL]. I understand that the State of Maryland has been very cooperative with Members of Congress, as has the State of Virginia. Members of Congress are not asked to pay income taxes in those States, although, as I say to some of my brethren living in those States, it is a matter of sufferance so far as the law is concerned. I think the attitude of those two States is very charitable. I make this point good naturedly, because it is rather interesting, as we sit here voting to impose taxes on the District of Columbia which, in my judgment, if this bill is enacted, will in due course of time force some increases in income-tax costs on the part of the permanent residents of the District of Columbia, to which, of course, we in the Congress are not subject, to reflect upon our position. There is something about it—I do not know what it is—that says to me that it is not quite cricket, and that I had better be extremely careful, as a Member of the Senate, to see to it that I am very fair toward the residents of the District of Columbia, because the residents of the District of Columbia are more than fair with me and with every other Member of Congress who lives in the District of Columbia, in that the District of Columbia does not impose District income taxes upon us. As a matter of law, there is nothing which would entitle us to exemption if the District chose to impose such a tax.

The sixth point under this topic is that many cities practically solve their revenue problems by extending their boundaries to include growing suburbs. Obviously this is not possible here, but that fact is particularly pertinent to our problem in view of the fact that, contrary to popular opinion, the median income level in the District of Columbia is materially lower than in the surrounding suburbs, being $2,975 in the District, and ranging from $3,446 to $5,098 in the various suburbs. This point is worth dwelling upon a little longer, although I wish to keep this speech very short.

The District of Columbia is not in the position of my hometown of Eugene, Oreg., and the hometown of every other Senator, I believe. My hometown has been extending its city limits as suburbs developed and fire and police protection and sanitary protection became necessary. What is the practice in most of our home State communities? City limits are extended so as to take in a larger taxable area. That proves to be of great benefit to the city treasury. The District of Columbia cannot do that. It overflows into Virginia and Maryland, but it cannot extend its city boundaries. Yet, of course, the suburbs which are developing in Virginia and Maryland bear a direct relationship, so far as the cost of their development is concerned, to the transaction of Government business in the District of Columbia. However, the District of Columbia cannot obtain the advantage of taxing the development of the suburbs to obtain the revenue with which to meet the extra costs, for example, of the public works program which we are discussing today.

When all is said and done, the thing which underlies this debate today is the need for finding the means to develop the public works which the District of Columbia needs in order to carry on Government operations more efficiently.

Of course, such public works are essential to the transaction of Government business. There has been a great deal of controversy for weeks in the press about the building of a bridge across the Potomac. Of course, a bridge ought to be built. Perhaps more than one bridge is needed. I do not think the people of the District of Columbia should have to pay most of the cost. Such bridges are necessary to the transaction of Government business. In my judgment such bridges are just as necessary to carrying on the functions of the Government as are any of the Government buildings which house workers who cross the bridges in order to get to work. If we are to pass appropriations for the construction of Federal buildings in the District of Columbia, in my judgment we should pass the appropriations necessary to construct bridges so that people living outside the District of Columbia—and they all could not live inside the District, unless we wanted a terribly crowded city—may go to and from work. Bridges must be built so that they can get to the buildings where they work, in order to carry on Government business.

It is easy to take the position, "After all, why should the people of Maine, Oregon, California, and Florida pay any of the cost of building a bridge across the Potomac for Government workers to get to Government buildings to carry on the business of the Government?"

My answer to that is that it is essential to the transaction of the business of the Government, which belongs to the people of Maine, Oregon, California, Florida, and every other State.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Would the Senator go so far as to say that the approaches and highways from such bridges into the State of Maryland should be paid for by the Federal Government?

Mr. MORSE. I am with the Senator on the Peace Cross development. I have asked that a study be prepared by the staff of the District of Columbia Committee. The Senator ought to thank me for that.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I do thank the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. I will tell the Senator what the study will show. We have not the final result as yet, but it is perfectly obvious what it will show. The study goes into the question of the loss of time and the delay which the Government suffers every time there is a flood around the Peace Cross.

My hunch is—and I will eat these words if the survey does not show it—and I am not preparing it, either, but it is being prepared by engineers and experts in that field—but I will eat my words if the study does not show that the Federal Government should pay the total cost, and that the Government will save money in a few years by the elimination of the loss which it suffers because of the time that people who work

for the Government lose in getting to work.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I thank the Senator from Oregon. I believe the Senator is eminently correct. The Senator should give some consideration, too, as should Congress, of course, to the overloading of the facilities of the counties adjacent to the Capital of this country.

Mr. MORSE. I believe the Senator is quite correct.

I continue with my statement. The sixth point I wish to make—and I summarize it now—is that the median income level in the District of Columbia is materially lower than in the surrounding suburbs, being $2,975 in the District, and ranging from $3,446 to $5,098 in the various suburbs.

Similarly to the foregoing, the District incurs increased costs because it is the Nation's Capital. Among many I enumerate the following examples of increases:

First. The Fine Arts Commission and National Capital Planning Commission require that most public-works structures be designed to harmonize with the Federal master plan for the Capital City. The new highway bridge cost $1,182,000, or 21 percent, extra because of this. Municipal Center is also an illustration of fine monumental construction consistent with such concepts.

Mr. President, it may be argued that these are very small items. They are small items standing alone, but if we multiply them over the years they represent a considerable additional cost that we impose upon the taxpayers of the District of Columbia, because we insist that not only must Federal buildings conform to a certain design, but buildings of the municipality and of private enterprise in the area also must conform to a design that will not detract from the governmental structures.

Second. The federally conceived plan of the city calls for wide, beautiful tree-lined streets such as few other major cities enjoy. Planting and maintaining these trees is costing $325,000 this year, and further increases are in sight. Wide streets also mean additional paving costs.

Third. An unusually fine federally operated zoo is wholly paid for by the District of Columbia. The cost this year is about $650,000.

Let anyone suggest abandoning the zoo, Mr. President, and what a howl would be made—a howl even louder than the lions and the tigers make in the zoo. That howl would reach all the way up to the eagle in the ceiling of the Senate Chamber. If anyone were to suggest that we get rid of the zoo, we would have speeches made on the floor of the Senate in behalf of the little school kiddies that would make tears run down our cheeks. Yet it costs money to operate the zoo, Mr. President, and the costs of operating it are paid for by the District citizens alone.

Fourth. The National Park Service receives about $1,500,000 each year from the District of Columbia for maintenance and operation of federally owned and controlled parks in the city. In addition, the District pays approximately $500,000 per year to support the Park Police. This is more park land and more park expenditures than is customary in comparable cities.

Mr. President, I am in favor of keeping it that way. I want my Nation's Capital to have the beautiful parks which now characterize it. In fact, I shall continue, as my record shows, to oppose any attempt in any way to desecrate the parks of this city by diminishing them in size or by not giving them the support they ought to have. I believe the Capital City of my Nation ought to be a city of beautiful parks.

I shall not let myself digress too long to discuss the need for a beautiful Potomac. I shall make a speech on that subject within a few days, when I offer an amendment to my so-called pollution bill. However, I do wish to make mention of that point here because I believe it is our responsibility to beautify the Potomac. There it is, Mr. President—nothing but a slow-moving sludge. We cannot call it a river. It is a slow-moving sludge, many parts of it 12 feet deep of filthy sewage, the filthiest river in the world.

I again issue the challenge on the floor of the Senate for any of my colleagues to come forward with any engineering and sanitary proof that there is a river in the world comparable to the Potomac River in filth. Yet it flows through the Nation's Capital.

I say we ought to be ashamed of ourselves for letting that moving sludge, that cesspool, degrade the beauty of the city of Washington.

Yet try to get Congress to appropriate the money it ought to appropriate to protect the beauty and the health of the District of Columbia, and there is opposition. I am trying, Mr. President. I never get discouraged. It has been said that the fight for progress is never won. However, we must never let ourselves adopt the pessimistic attitude of believing that the fight can ever be lost.

When we are fighting for this kind of legislation today, we are fighting for progress and we are fighting for a decent National Capital.

Fifth. The large volume of Federal structures imposes significant demands on our police, fire, sanitation, and other services, which cannot be precisely computed in dollars, but which, nonetheless, add to the cost of building and operating the city.

I have some approximations of these costs. I shall mention them on the floor of the Senate at this time because we are about to vote. Approximations of some of these costs are as follows:

Police, special details	$60,000
Fire, special services	90,000
Cleaning streets	175,000
Sewage handling and treatment	625,000
Installing curbs and gutters abutting Federal property	50,000
Motor-vehicle titling, etc	15,000
Temporary home for soldiers and sailors	30,000

Every one of these extra costs is borne by taxpayers of the District of Columbia. In my judgment, the costs ought to be paid by all the taxpayers of this country in support of their Capital.

Sixth. Because of Federal expansion in the area, Washington is now completely encircled by a thickly settled area that is more populous than the city itself, and which requires the construction of expensive arterial highways to enable suburban populations to move to and from the city. The fact that two rivers have to be crossed by much of this traffic requires the construction of very costly bridges.

Because of the fact that so many people are able to reside here and legally avoid some of our taxes, many District residents now carry a disproportionate share of the tax burden. This does not appear to be justified by the trend in incomes in the District as compared with its suburbs. These taxes are being materially increased, and thereafter will be substantially higher than most other cities of comparable size.

The next major item in the bill, Mr. President, to which I am objecting and which my amendment would eliminate is, of course, the proposal of the committee of a 1 percent tax on groceries and the proposal of a reduction in exemption with reference to restaurant meals of from $1.25 to 50 cents. Every 51-cent meal is now going to be taxed, and groceries are going to be taxed if the committee's bill is enacted. The bill also proposes a 1-percent increase in tax on hotel rooms. The present tax is 2 percent, which is high enough, but I do not think there should be any tax at all on hotel rooms. The argument is that it is an easy tax to get by with. Hotel people come and go, and there is nothing they can do about it. We tax them 2 percent, and now a tax of 3 percent is proposed. That does not make it fair or right or just. I do not think a visit to the District of Columbia by citizens of this country ought to carry with it a sales-tax penalty. I think we should encourage the visitations of our citizens. I think we ought to encourage the poor as well as the wealthy to come here. I just do not like the regressive sales tax in any form, shape, or manner. I do not like it on even transient rooms.

Then there is the proposed application of the sales tax to national banks and Federal savings and loan associations.

Mr. President, my amendment abolishes those sales taxes and substitutes therefor an additional Federal payment of $5,225,000, a lump-sum amount added to the lump-sum principle already in the bill, which would help to take care of the public-works program which has really given rise to the need for the bill at all. I think we should make that contribution to the public-works program, and we should not do it by way of a sales tax on necessities of life. I recognize the fact that sincere men differ on the political philosophy behind the sales tax. I have always opposed it. I am proud of the fact that in my State every time the sales-tax proponents have tried to put it across, we have taken it to the people by way of a referendum vote, and we not only have beaten them every time, but we have beaten them by an overwhelming majority. I am willing to say we are going to lick them again. Selfish interests in my States are trying once more to whip up public opinion on the

basis of the fallacious argument that because Washington, D. C., and California have sales taxes, we ought to impose the same kind of an unfair tax yoke upon the necks of the people of Oregon. We shall oppose it again, and I am satisfied that we shall beat it again. As long as I sit in the Senate of the United States I shall not vote such a tax yoke upon the necks of the people of the District of Columbia.

Mr. President, in conclusion—and I hope the majority leader is pleased to hear those words, "in conclusion," because I have assured him that this was going to be one of my shorter speeches—I am sure my amendment will have the vote of the majority leader. He has sat here so impressed throughout my entire speech, that I am sure I have convinced him that he should vote for my amendment.

All joking aside, Mr. President, I should like to say that the District of Columbia differs greatly from other cities because of the complex relationship with its "industry," the Federal Government, and that a significant increase in Federal responsibility for the cost of building and maintaining the city is fully justified. To that end I offer my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] to the amendments offered by the Senator from Maine [Mr. PAYNE].

GENERAL BUSINESS CONDITIONS

PRESS REPORTS

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, the current press reports make interesting reading for our unemployed and our small businesses. On page 17 of the New York Journal of Commerce, there is an article headed "Traders Hedge on Significance of Import Rate," and indicating that the objective of this Nation is to increase imports—they say that "imports have been holding fairly well." The Randall, Paley, and Bell reports, of course, were made to sell the people of this Nation that the more goods we can import from the peon and sweatshop labor countries, the more money the workers and investors in America will make. I read:

> So far, imports have been holding fairly well, although if a comparison of the January-February imports of this year were made with the peak rate reached in the spring of 1953, the contraction would be about as severe as the latter prediction.

It is a typical implication that the greater our imports, the greater our employment.

IDLE SHIPYARDS

Mr. President, on the same page of the New York Journal of Commerce there is the following heading: "Idle Shipyards Termed Threat to United States Defense; Navy Official Sees Need for Government Aid to Industry."

Government aid, Mr. President, to keep the shipyards running. I read:

> The Navy official said that for the long run he favored a policy of building ships through private enterprise with Government encouragement, but he stressed that the present situation was a critical one for which an emergency program was necessary.

WE LOAN COLOMBIA $50 MILLION—GERMANY BUILDS HER SHIPS

Mr. President, on page 24 of the same Journal there is a headline as follows: "Grancolombiana Orders Four Ships."

The item under that heading reads, in part, as follows:

> BOGOTA, April 28.—A West German shipyard has been awarded a contract to build four new freighters for the Flota Mercante Grancolombiana, the company announced today. H. G. Stuelken Sohn yard, of Hamburg, won the award over bidders from British, Swedish, Japanese, and Italian yards.
>
> The contract, reportedly worth $4.5 million, provides that the new vessels will be of the same sepcifications as the German-built Brunsbuttel, now the Ciudad de Bucaramanga. They will have a cargo capacity of 4,500 tons and speed of 13 knots. Delivery will begin in April next year with the fourth ship to be delivered by August 1955.

Mr. President, there was a very prominent official, a White House aide, by the name of J. Laughlin Currie, I believe, who went to Colombia rather suddenly a few years ago, on the eve of an investigation, and took about $50 million from the Export-Import Bank with him as a loan for Colombia—for that he was retained by the Columbian Nation as an adviser. This man was naturalized in 1934 as a United States citizen.

But, Mr. President, I notice, however, that shipyards in Germany, Japan, and the British Empire build ships for Colombian firms, while our shipyards are idle. Incidently, German wages are only a fraction of the pay rate here.

UNITED STATES SEWING-MACHINE BUSINESS MOVES TO ITALY AND JAPAN

On page 4 of the same Journal there is a leading article headed "Immigrant Builds $50 Million Business; Sewing Machine Bonanza Spurs Europe Trade."

I read:

> Trade between the United States and Western Europe has been stimulated by a Polish refugee who came here 7 years ago with $6. Since then he has built a $50 million a year business, assembling and distributing Italian and Swiss sewing machines.
>
> These machines use American-made components—in addition to the imported parts, worth millions of dollars each year. And the mass market created for the Italian machines has enabled the Italian factory to buy American-made machine tools and other equipment so that it could adopt mass-production methods.

Many freetraders, supporters of the 1934 Trade Agreements Act, in the United States, say they do not fear imports because of our modern machinery and assembly line methods. So I simply wanted to read the dispatch to show that foreign manufacturers are using our modern machinery and our assembly line methods and using the peon and sweatshop labor to displace American workers.

I believe that it was in 1951, when the extension of the 1934 Trade Agreements Act was before the Senate for extension, that I placed a sewing machine made in Japan on one corner of my desk and a Singer sewing machine on the other corner. Each machine was guaranteed to do the work of the other.

The difference between them was that one was made by Japanese labor, paid 12 to 15 cents an hour, and the other was made by American labor receiving $1.80 an hour. They could not be distinguished from each other by a person standing 10 feet away.

The name of the Japanese machine was attached underneath its structure, so that the housewife could not see where it was made. The Japanese machine sold for about $21 wholesale and the American-made machine sold for about $72 wholesale.

Mr. President, I know it will be good news to the Senate, which voted for the 2-year extension of free trade—1934 Trade Agreements Act—at that time, and for a year's extension last year, that the sewing-machine business in the United States is being slowly cut down, if not eliminated.

That same Trade Agreements Act, under which the sewing-machine business is being sold out, expires at midnight on June 12 of this year.

Reading further from the statement by the immigrant who built a $50 million business by importing machines manufactured in Italy, where the labor is paid only a fraction of what is paid to American labor, the article continues as follows:

> What his company has done to help the Italian economy has directly helped American producers of machine tools and other equipment.

Note that they use our modern machinery with their cheap labor and the combination built a $50 million import business for the immigrant.

The article continues:

> Mr. Jolson believes in stressing automaticity in advertisements. They say, "Just insert a disk—sit back and watch—it's as easy as playing a record."

The article contains this further statement:

> The Singer Co., still the largest domestic producer of sewing machines, is also importing machines from its subsidiary in Scotland.

I suppose the Singer Co. has been forced to build a factory in Scotland in order to compete with other cheap labor imports. I continue to read:

> But Mr. Jolson, who today believes he has 10 percent of the American market, says he doesn't fear his competitor as much as he did back in 1947. Then, Mr. Jolson and his wife worked 16 hours a day to make up samples of the work done on the Necchi machine.

I know that will be good news for the United States Senate, which passed the 1934 Trade Agreements Act to shift their responsibility of regulating the national economy each 3 years to the executive branch, meaning, as it now operates, the State Department. This has merely meant a transfer of the constitutional responsibility of Congress to set duties, imposts, and excises, and to regulate foreign trade, to the executive branch, meaning the State Department, which probably does not even know where sewing machines are made in the United States. The State Department, under the trade agreements, is able to trade away any business at any time, just as it has traded away in whole or in part the wool business, the mineral business, the

watch business, and several hundred other businesses.

LOWERING TAXES ON FOREIGN PROFITS ENCOURAGING USE OF FOREIGN CHEAP LABOR

Mr. President, in today's issue of the New York Journal of Commerce, I observe the following statement:

Much has been said here this tax-happy spring about "removing the roadblocks to the flow of American investment abroad," and one of the many Gordian subchapters of the revision bill sets out to achieve this.

Revenuewise, foreign income is the bill's third biggest revision item—at least in the first year of operation—being ticketed to cost the Government $147 million, according to Treasury estimates. Only the dividend credit ($240 million) and declining-balance depreciation ($375 million) rank larger.

In the 3 weeks of Senate hearings just concluded, two aspects of the bill's treatment of foreign income came in for sustained keelhauling.

One was the exclusion of wholesalers operating abroad from the benefits of a 14-percent tax cut for foreign operations.

It probably is not news to the Senate that the House Committee on Ways and Means has made a 14 percent reduction in the taxes on foreign profits of American manufacturers who will locate their plants behind the foreign-sweatshop curtain.

Mr. President, there is now a complete cycle. Free trade, so that American individuals and companies can locate factories behind the sweatshop-labor curtain, as Mr. Ford, Mr. Hoffman, of Studebaker, Mr. Coleman, and others, are doing, and to import the products into the United States without having to pay any tariff or evener of the wage and tax differential.

Then the United States Congress reduces the taxes on the imported profits from products produced abroad.

There are many other considerations which Congress is trying to give to anyone who will leave the United States and use the low-cost labor and ship the finished material back to the United States, including purchasing modern machinery for them with the taxpayers money.

Mr. President, the Chicago Tribune of this morning contains a very enlightening editorial, entitled "Charity Begins at Home." The first paragraph reads as follows:

One of the peculiarities of the new internationalism, spawned by the New Deal and carried on by the Eisenhower administration, occasioned remonstrances from members of the House Foreign Affairs Committee. Grumbling was evoked by the administration's demand for almost $3½ billion in new money for foreign aid during the fiscal year 1955.

Mr. President, in addition to writing down the taxes on profits made behind the sweatshop-labor curtain and imported into this country, we are approaching free trade so that manufacturers can import products which are made abroad by factories behind the low-wage curtain, and with American machinery and American assembly line methods.

The extension of free trade, the 1934 Trade Agreements Act, for 3 years already has been recommended in accordance with the Randall report—the bill is in the Committee on Ways and Means of the House—we then, after contributing $50 billion to such foreign countries, for the construction of factories and to promote competition with American industry, now ask for $3.5 billion additional for another year.

The $100 million to build up European competition in the coal and steel business came from the Export-Import Bank which also distributes the American taxpayers' money abroad. One hundred million dollars has just gone to Europe to promote additional steel capacity and additional coal production to compete with American workers.

So the $3.5 billion is new money for foreign aid during the fiscal year 1955, as referred to in the editorial, is intended to continue building American competition abroad.

I read further from the editorial:

Congress said that $400 million of this was to be spent in European countries on boats, armaments, and expansion of European chemical production.

The head of one of the largest chemical producing companies in the United States has said publicly that unless something is done about the situation, the American chemical industry will move back to the Rhine in Germany, unless it is afforded tariff protection, if you please—duty protection, as the Constitution of the United States calls it.

I remember that during World War I there was no chemical industry in the United States. After the war had been concluded, the United States placed duties or tariffs on chemical materials and built up a chemical industry in the United States. Now it has been traded away. I continue to read from the editorial:

The critics complained that American workers need jobs and that the money could be laid out here to produce the same items while keeping Americans at work. The funds earmarked for chemical production were challenged because, it was said, European exports already are damaging the American chemical industry.

Representative FULTON, Pennsylvania Republican, charged that the diversion of money to Europe for economic aid would aggravate unemployment here.

Mr. President, press dispatches show that every day more unemployment is occurring, and more investments are being lost in this country. All one has to do to learn such facts is just follow the news.

On the same page of the Journal of Commerce of April 29, 1954, from which I just read, I wish to read another article. I want to compliment the reporters for the Journal of Commerce. The officials certainly run a good newspaper, and the reporters do a good job of reporting.

GATT—FOUNDED UPON THE 1934 TRADE AGREEMENTS ACT

The headline of the article to which I have just referred reads: "Peru Signs Agreement Extending GATT Tariffs."

Perhaps some of the Senators who are present will remember the agreement at Geneva.

The article reads:

Peru has signed the declaration extending until July 1, 1955, tariffs negotiated under the 34-nation General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT).

The declaration was drawn up in Geneva last fall by GATT nations to prolong for 18 months tariff schedules that would otherwise have expired at the end of 1953. Peru and Australia were granted additional time to sign the accord. Australia signed February 23.

Brazil is the only GATT nation that has not yet signed. The South American nation has not taken any action because it is revising its tariffs and is expected to submit the new rates to GATT for approval.

Mr. President, in closing, I wish to say that if the Congress allows the 1934 Trade Agreements Act, laughingly called a reciprocal trade act, to expire at midnight on June 12 of this year, the fixing of duties, imposts, and excises and the regulation of foreign commerce reverts to the Tariff Commission, which as an agent of Congress is directed to determine the difference in the cost—not the highest or lowest cost, but the fair cost—between the production of any article in this country and of a like article in the chief competing foreign nation, and to recommend such difference as the duty or tariff.

The Tariff Commission determines the tariff on the basis that if it costs $22 to manufacture a sewing machine in Japan, when the cost of labor in Japan is 15 cents an hour as compared to $72 with $1.80 per hour labor in this country, the Tariff Commission determines the difference, and recommends the amount of the tariff.

The State Department operates under the 1934 Trade Agreements Act entirely independent of Congress, and decides what is for the national good. If the Secretary of State determines that it is for the national good to put the sewing machine, the mineral industry, and the watch industry out of business in this country and allow the low-wage nations to capture the market for such products through free trade, then the State Department may make such an agreement. Under the 1934 Trade Agreements Act, it is the Secretary of State who regulates the national economy. Under the Constitution of the United States, it is the Congress of the United States. Article I, section 8, of the Constitution, provides that the Congress of the United States, the legislative branch, has the duty to set the duties, imposts, and excises, and to regulate foreign commerce. Why? The debates indicate that the regulation of the domestic economy was left in the hands of the Congress of the United States, because Members of Congress represent every area in this Nation. The Constitution of the United States provides that the elected representatives of the people shall regulate the national economy. I call that to the attention of my colleagues, Mr. President.

PUBLIC WORKS CONSTRUCTION FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 8097) to authorize the financing of a program of public-works construction for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WELKER in the chair). 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. CASE. Mr. President, the pending amendment, offered by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], to the amendments of the Senator from Maine [Mr. PAYNE], presents a rather clear-cut issue for decision. The amendment of the Senator from Oregon proposes to increase the Federal Government's contribution by $5,225,000 over and above whatever increases are provided by the bill as reported by the committee.

The Senator from Oregon has made a speech on behalf of the National Capital; and I think most of us can endorse the sentiments expressed by him in the course of his speech, namely, the desire to have a beautiful Capital, a Capital with good streets, good bridges, good highways, and other good public facilities.

However, I fear that the amendment of the Senator from Oregon would not accomplish the purposes of its sponsor. For many years Congress authorized for the District of Columbia a Federal appropriation far in excess of the appropriation actually voted by Congress. Only within the last 2 years has Congress appropriated the full amount of the authorization of $11 million.

The pending bill proposes that the District of Columbia itself increase its revenues by about $14 million a year, and that the contribution of the Federal Government be increased by $9 million, the top two-thirds of which would be dedicated to a public-works program, conditioned upon the ability of the District of Columbia to match, by means of revenues raised by the District of Columbia, the Federal Government's contribution.

If the amendment of the Senator from Oregon were adopted, I fear that, in the first place, the Appropriations Committees would not report a bill providing for the appropriation of the amount of the authorization; and, in the second place, if the Appropriations Committees did not report a bill calling for the appropriation of the full amount of the authorization, and if, at the same time, it were made impossible for the District of Columbia to obtain the revenue it would obtain under the provisions of the pending bill, then the District of Columbia would not have the revenue with which to match the increased appropriation by the Federal Government, and thus the increased Federal Government appropriation would not be made and would not be effective. In other words, I think the purpose of the amendment of the Senator from Oregon would actually be defeated.

Mr. President, I believe the issue presented by the amendment of the Senator from Oregon is a rather simple and clear-cut one. I hope the Senate will vote immediately upon the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment in the nature of a substitute, submitted by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] to the amendments of the Senator from Maine [Mr. PAYNE].

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, on this question I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. 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. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the question of agreeing to the amendment in the nature of a substitute, submitted by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] to the amendments of the Senator from Maine [Mr. PAYNE].

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HAYDEN (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "yea." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "nay." I therefore withhold my vote.

The rollcall was concluded.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] are absent on official business.

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PURTELL], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. UPTON] are necessarily absent. If present and voting, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] would vote "yea."

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT], the Senators from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE and Mr. NEELY], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. LENNON], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] are necessarily absent.

I announce further that on this vote the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] is paired with the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY]. If present and voting, the Senator from Louisiana would vote "nay," and the Senator from West Virginia would vote "yea."

I announce also that if present and voting, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 15, nays 51, as follows:

YEAS—15

Anderson	Ives	Morse
Douglas	Jackson	Murray
Ferguson	Johnston, S. C.	Payne
Hennings	Kefauver	Schoeppel
Hill	Lehman	Young

NAYS—51

Barrett	Ellender	McClellan
Beall	Flanders	Millikin
Bennett	Frear	Monroney
Bowring	Goldwater	Mundt
Bricker	Gore	Pastore
Burke	Green	Potter
Bush	Hickenlooper	Robertson
Butler, Md.	Hoey	Saltonstall
Butler, Nebr.	Holland	Smathers
Carlson	Johnson, Colo.	Smith, Maine
Case	Johnson, Tex.	Stennis
Clements	Kerr	Symington
Cooper	Knowland	Thye
Cordon	Malone	Watkins
Daniel	Martin	Welker
Dirksen	Maybank	Wiley
Dworshak	McCarthy	Williams

NOT VOTING—30

Aiken	Hayden	Long
Bridges	Hendrickson	Magnuson
Byrd	Humphrey	Mansfield
Capehart	Hunt	McCarran
Chavez	Jenner	Neely
Duff	Kennedy	Purtell
Eastland	Kilgore	Russell
Fulbright	Kuchel	Smith, N. J.
George	Langer	Sparkman
Gillette	Lennon	Upton

So Mr. MORSE's amendment in the nature of a substitute for the amendments of Mr. PAYNE was rejected.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California will state it.

Mr. KNOWLAND. As I understand, the pending question is on agreeing to the amendments offered by the Senator from Maine [Mr. PAYNE]. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California is correct. The question is on agreeing to the amendments offered by the Senator from Maine [Mr. PAYNE]. The yeas and nays have been ordered.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I shall not detain the Senate for more than 2 or 3 minutes. I wish to explain to the Senate what the amendments offered by the Senator from Maine would do. The Senator from Maine has been a very hard-working and valuable member of the Committee on the District of Columbia, and he is presenting a very fine study of the transportation system in the District of Columbia.

The amendments he offers are amendments which propose to substitute 3 or 4 different types of taxes, or increases in taxes, for the tax on groceries which is included in the committee bill.

The bill is a District of Columbia revenue bill. It is designed to make it

possible for the District of Columbia to have a public-works program. At the present time the law does not permit the Commissioners to submit an unbalanced budget to Congress.

The bill provides for increasing the revenues of the District. If the District increases its revenues, the bill authorizes a limited increase in the Federal contribution, but most of the Federal contribution is conditioned upon the District raising additional revenue to match the Federal contribution for sewers, water extensions, streets, bridges, buildings, and various items of that nature.

The amendments offered by the Senator from Maine would eliminate the 1-percent tax on groceries and reduce the personal income-tax exemption, which is now $4,000, to $3,000. It would mean an increase in the personal income tax of the people who pay it. I believe that would be somewhat in violation of the pledge that was made to the people to retain the higher personal income-tax exemption at the time the sales tax was first set up.

The second increase, under the amendments, would be in the realty tax. The bill proposes an increase in the realty tax from the present $2.15 a hundred to $2.20. The Payne amendments would increase it by an additional 10 cents. That is an increase which the District Commissioners oppose very much. They are afraid it would increase the present flight to the suburbs. They are very much opposed to it.

The third increase in the Payne amendments would be a 2 percent sales tax on local telephone service, which would raise about $400,000. It strikes me that it would be a little inconsistent for us, after having reduced the excise tax on telephone calls nationally, to increase the excise tax on telephone service in the District of Columbia.

The fourth tax proposed in the Payne amendments would be a new tax, to apply to unincorporated businesses. The committee gave some consideration to that matter. No doubt it would raise a great deal of money. It is estimated that it would raise a half million dollars. However, it is a new type of tax, and no city with which I am familiar has had any experience with that kind of tax. Perhaps the District may some day wish to give some consideration to such a tax, but I doubt that it should be enacted at this time, with the limited amount of study we have been able to give to it.

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

Mr. CASE. I yield.

Mr. THYE. With reference to the proposed 2 percent tax on telephone service, am I correct in understanding that the greatest user of telephone service in the District is the Federal Government?

Mr. CASE. I believe that is correct.

Mr. THYE. Therefore, the Federal Government would pay the tax in the expenditures made by the various agencies of the Government. If that is the case, we might as well make a direct appropriation, instead of increasing the excise tax.

Mr. CASE. I believe that is correct. I trust the Senate will reject the amendments.

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

Mr. CASE. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. Did I understand the Senator to say that the Federal contribution would be increased by what is provided in the pending bill?

Mr. CASE. The pending bill increases the contribution by $9 million, two-thirds of it being conditioned upon the District increasing its own revenue to match the contribution.

Mr. ELLENDER. The amendments would not increase the Federal contribution?

Mr. CASE. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. They would make it possible to collect taxes with which to match the contribution. Is that correct?

Mr. CASE. Yes. However, they strike out the other revenue.

Mr. ELLENDER. But they deal with revenue only?

Mr. CASE. Yes; not with the Federal contribution.

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

Mr. CASE. I yield.

Mr. JACKSON. Perhaps I should make a point of order. I wonder how long it will be before the Senate will vote. I must attend a television program, as the Senate knows.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote! Vote!

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendments, en bloc, offered by the Senator from Maine [Mr. PAYNE]. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] are absent on official business.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PURTELL], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. UPTON] are necessarily absent. If present and voting, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] would vote "yea."

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senators from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE and Mr. NEELY], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. LENNON], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] are necessarily absent.

I announce further that on this vote the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] is paired with the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY]. If present and voting, the Senator from Louisiana would vote "nay," and the Senator from West Virginia would vote "yea."

I announce also that if present and voting, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 23, nays 45, as follows:

YEAS—23

Cordon	Hill	Schoeppel
Douglas	Ives	Smathers
Dworshak	Jackson	Thye
Ferguson	Lehman	Welker
Flanders	Monroney	Wiley
Gillette	Morse	Williams
Goldwater	Murray	Young
Hennings	Payne	

NAYS—45

Anderson	Dirksen	Martin
Barrett	Ellender	Maybank
Beall	Frear	McCarthy
Bennett	Gore	McClellan
Bowring	Green	Millikin
Bricker	Hayden	Mundt
Burke	Hickenlooper	Pastore
Bush	Hoey	Potter
Butler, Md.	Holland	Robertson
Butler, Nebr.	Johnson, Colo.	Russell
Carlson	Johnson, Tex.	Saltonstall
Case	Johnston, S. C.	Smith, Maine
Clements	Kerr	Stennis
Cooper	Knowland	Symington
Daniel	Malone	Watkins

NOT VOTING—28

Aiken	Humphrey	Magnuson
Bridges	Hunt	Mansfield
Byrd	Jenner	McCarran
Capehart	Kefauver	Neely
Chavez	Kennedy	Purtell
Duff	Kilgore	Smith, N. J.
Eastland	Kuchel	Sparkman
Fulbright	Langer	Upton
George	Lennon	
Hendrickson	Long	

So Mr. PAYNE'S amendments were rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill (H. R. 8097) was read the third time and passed.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which House bill 8097 was passed.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I move that the motion be laid on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from California.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OF LABOR MANAGEMENT RELATIONS ACT OF 1947

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar 1217, Senate bill 2650, to amend the Labor Manage-

ment Relations Act of 1947, and for other purposes.

I would say for the information of the Senate that I merely desire to make the bill the unfinished business before the Senate. When we dispose of routine business this afternoon I shall move that the Senate stand in recess until Monday next. At that time there will be a call of the calendar of bills to which there is no objection, from where we left off the last time the calendar was called, and then we will proceed to the debate and discussion of the bill which I have just mentioned.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the bill by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 2650) to amend the Labor Management Relations Act of 1947, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from California.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2650) to amend the Labor Management Relations Act of 1947, and for other purposes, which had been reported by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, with an amendment.

ORDER FOR RECESS UNTIL MONDAY

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I am prepared to keep the Senate in session for the introduction of any matters into the RECORD; but as soon as that has been completed, I shall be prepared to suggest that the Senate take a recess.

I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

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

MAY DAY FESTIVITIES—FREE ELECTION IN POLAND

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, before Senators leave the Chamber, I desire to call up a resolution which was reported by the Committee on Foreign Relations, on which some discussion was had earlier in the day, when both the majority leader and the minority leader were absent from the Chamber. At that time it had been pointed out that there had been no discussion with either the majority leader or the minority leader with reference to the resolution being placed on the program for today. Had I been present, I should have felt that, under all the circumstances, and with the general understanding which is held on both sides of the aisle, the matter should go over until I could have consulted with the minority leader and also had had an opportunity to check with the members of the committee, and with other Senators who would have wished to have the matter discussed with them.

The question has now been discussed by the minority leader and the majority leader with Senators on both sides of the aisle, and I understand the minority leader is now prepared to have the resolution considered immediately, without its having to go to the calendar.

In the normal course of events, I believe it is better legislative procedure to have any resolution which comes from a committee go to the calendar. But due to the fact that the concurrent resolution in question relates to May Day, which is a day that is celebrated by Communists throughout the world, and because the concurrent resolution expresses hope and inspiration to the people who are temporarily enslaved behind the Iron Curtain, I think that if the measure is to have any value, it should be considered at this time, for it will be subsequent to May Day when the Senate meets on Monday next. Therefore, I am prepared to waive the objection I would normally have to the consideration of the concurrent resolution because of the time element.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I am glad to yield to the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I share fully the views expressed by the distinguished majority leader. I was called to the telephone and was, therefore, absent for a few minutes earlier in the day. When I returned, I explained to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations the procedure that is always followed, and he agreed to defer his request.

I appreciate the courtesy which the majority leader always shows to the minority in connection with programing the business of the Senate. I know that if he had been present, he would have done just as he said he would have done, and would not have allowed the measure to be considered until the minority had been forewarned.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] is prepared to submit the concurrent resolution. I suggest that it be called up while many Senators are still present.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate Concurrent Resolution 58.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the concurrent resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the concurrent resolution.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may submit a Senate resolution in lieu of the concurrent resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Illinois? The Chair hears none.

The resolution (S. Res. 241) submitted by Mr. DOUGLAS was thereupon read and considered, as follows:

Whereas the General Assembly of the United Nations has called upon every nation, as one of the essentials of peace, to promote, in recognition of the paramount importance of preserving the dignity and worth of the human person, full freedom for the peaceful expression of political opposition, full opportunity for the exercise of religious freedom and full respect for all the other fundamental rights; and

Whereas the Government of the Soviet Union and the satellite governments, which it has imposed upon its captive countries, have consistently ignored and flouted the principles listed above; and

Whereas the Soviet Government repeatedly has given lip service to the idea of free and unfettered elections in those captive countries; and

Whereas the Soviet Government has, in addition, forcibly and aggressively incorporated the territory of the nations of Lithuania, Estonia, and Latvia into the Soviet Union; and

Whereas the Soviet Government has furthermore been found responsible by a committee of Congress for the Katyn massacre of Polish military personnel; and

Whereas the General Assembly, in considering the suppression, by the Governments of Bulgaria, Hungary, and Rumania, of human rights and fundamental freedoms in violation of their peace-treaty obligations, has expressed the opinion that the three countries are callously indifferent to the sentiments of the world community; and

Whereas the United Nations General Assembly has expressed the grave concern which is felt by all decent men "at reports and information that North Korean and Chinese Communist forces have, in a large number of instances, employed inhuman practices against the heroic soldiers of forces under the United Nations command in Korea and against the civilian population of Korea": Therefore, be it

Resolved, That—

(1) The Senate condemns the notorious disregard for fundamental human rights and basic civil and religious liberties in all countries under the domination of the Soviet Government.

(2) The Senate condemns the refusal of the Soviet Government and of its puppet governments to allow free and fair elections in Poland, Hungary, Rumania, Bulgaria, Albania, Czechoslovakia, and the Soviet zone of Germany.

(3) The Senate endorses the refusal of Presidents Roosevelt, Truman, and Eisenhower to recognize the Soviet conquests of Lithuania, Estonia, and Latvia.

(4) The Senate condemns the flagrant disregard for human life shown by the Soviet Government throughout the areas under its domination, and particularly in the atrocities committed by Communist regimes in the Katyn Forest and in Korea.

(5) The Senate endorses the resolution of the United Nations General Assembly of December 3, 1953, condemning "the commission by any governments or authorities of murder, mutiliation, torture, and other atrocious acts against captured military personnel or civilian populations, as a violation of rules of international law and basic standards of conduct and morality and as affronting human rights and the dignity and worth of the human person."

(6) The Senate requests the President to use all available and appropriate means, through the United Nations, United States Information Agency, and otherwise, to keep the facts of the Soviet Government's inhuman actions in these matters and its violations of solemn agreements before the attention of the world and to let the subject peoples know that they have not been forgotten.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 241) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 58) will be indefinitely postponed.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan will state it.

Mr. FERGUSON. Do I understand correctly that the concurrent resolution

which has been adopted by the Committee on Foreign Relations, of which I am a member, has been changed to a simple Senate resolution?

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The concurrent resolution was changed to a simple resolution, and was agreed to as a simple resolution.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California will state it.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Was not the resolution reported by the Committee on Foreign Relations as a concurrent resolution?

Mr. DOUGLAS. It was reported as a concurrent resolution, which would have necessitated joint action by the House. But since there would not be time for the House to act before May 1, the Committee on Foreign Relations recommended that the concurrent resolution be agreed to as a Senate resolution.

Mr. KNOWLAND. It is because of the time element that the action has been taken without the concurrence of the House; but the language of the Senate resolution is precisely the same as that which was included in the concurrent resolution reported by the committee.

Mr. FERGUSON. The only reason why I raised the point was that I thought the action would be much stronger if it were taken by both Houses of Congress. I think both Houses are interested in making the resolution as strong as possible, as representing the opinion of the people of the United States. I merely wished to raise the point that a concurrent resolution would have indicated that the House of Representatives, as well as the Senate, was in favor of the resolution as reported by the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations.

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

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I have just been informed, and I believe the information to be accurate, that the House is about to recess until Monday next.

Mr. FERGUSON. If that is so, I shall not press the point any further.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I do not believe it would be possible to obtain the concurrence of the House before May 1, notwithstanding prompt action by the Senate.

Mr. FERGUSON. That being true, I shall not raise any objection. I think the expression of the sense of the Senate is important in this matter, although I believe it would have been much stronger and more representative of the feelings of the people of the United States if Congress could have agreed to a concurrent resolution.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, does the action which has been taken indicate approval of the resolution as a simple Senate resolution, with the necessary language changes having been made, namely, with the word "Senate" being substituted for the word "Congress"?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thank the Chair.

POLISH CONSTITUTION DAY

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senate having agreed to the resolution, I now wish to place in the RECORD as a part of my remarks a statement in relation to May 3, which is the anniversary of the adoption of the Polish Constitution.

On May 3, Americans of Polish descent, together with Americans generally, will have in mind Polish Constitution Day, for it is the 163d anniversary of the adoption of the Polish Constitution in 1791.

I am glad that the Committee on Foreign Relations was able to submit the resolution which has just been agreed to. As I have already said, I think it would have been stronger, when presented to the people of the world, if both Houses of Congress had acted on it. But I am glad to be able to have the Senate resolution made a part of the RECORD today, so that the world may know that Americans have in mind the desire for liberty and freedom on the part of the people behind the Iron Curtain.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my statement relative to the anniversary of Polish Constitution Day be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HOMER FERGUSON ON ANNIVERSARY OF POLISH CONSTITUTION DAY

Mr. President, Monday, May 3, will be celebrated by Americans of Polish descent and by Americans generally, as Polish Constitution Day, for it is the 163d anniversary of Poland's Constitution of 1791.

I am certain that freedom-loving citizens in Poland today would risk imprisonment and death if they were to take public note of this occasion so it is important for freedom in Poland and here in the United States for us to observe this anniversary on behalf of those suffering people.

Constitution day cannot be celebrated in Poland today because the constitution of 1791 is a document of freedom and liberty. It gave formal expression to that age-old striving of the Polish people for their liberty. Like our own Constitution which was adopted only 2 years earlier, the Polish Constitution places sovereignty in the people and bases the government on the consent of the governed. It is a remarkable document and one whose provisions still inspire free men.

It is particularly appropriate that this day be honored in America because the bonds between the people of this country and the people of Poland, in spite of the present Communist regime at Warsaw, continue to be close and firm. We Americans acknowledge with appreciation the great contributions which citizens of Polish descent have made to our Nation from its very beginning.

Americans and Poles, too, stand shoulder to shoulder in their unshakable opposition to their common enemy, international communism.

This year it is heartening to know that we can celebrate Polish Constitution Day without doing it under the spying eyes of Communist agents in Polish Communist consulates in Detroit, Chicago, and New York. I am delighted to have been able, with the aid of many Polish groups, to secure the closing of these Communist centers which operated as an open insult to the millions of Americans of Polish descent.

This action by our Government has been effective in reducing Communist propaganda outlets in this country and reducing the number of diplomatic Communist agents in the country. The real effectiveness of these closings is proved, in my opinion, by the noisy protests which the Communist government registered. Needless to say, these protests fell on deaf ears in our State Department.

The policy of the United States for many years has favored and supported a strong, free, and independent Poland with the unrestricted right of the Polish people freely to select their own form of government.

This policy has been strongly emphasized during the past year by our President and Secretary of State. I am confident that we will continue to use every peaceful means to achieve the objectives of our policy in this respect.

Our present policy includes complete opposition to the idea of freezing the captive nations behind the Iron Curtain and we must continue to oppose this. We cannot recognize as legitimate and permanent those regimes whose rule is based on police power, treachery, and brutal conquest. Our Government's official position supports every peaceful means which will enable Poland and the other countries of Eastern Europe to take their proud and rightful places as free and independent nations.

We know that the overwhelming majority of Poles are unyielding opponents of Communist domination and we take this opportunity to salute their bravery, their patriotism, and their love of freedom.

The people of Poland are our friends and our allies. We have not forgotten them and we never will. We owe it to them to labor by all proper means for their liberation and we shall do so.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I wish to commend the Senator from Michigan upon his statement, and I join with him in his remarks.

On Sunday, in Boston, I intend to participate in a meeting of Polish-American citizens, who are tremendously interested in the independence and the freedom of Poland. I was glad to be able to join with the Senator from Michigan, and with other Senators, in the resolution which has been agreed to, and to be able to so inform the Polish-American citizens on Sunday.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to congratulate the Committee on Foreign Relations upon its resolution calling for free elections in Poland, because it is further evidence that we in the United States recognize that freedom cannot exist without a free ballot.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 1 OF 1954—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 381)

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BARRETT in the chair) laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, transmitting Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1954, relating to the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

(For President's message, see House proceedings in today's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 2 OF 1954—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 382)

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, transmitting Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1954, relating to the liquidation of certain affairs of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, which was read, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

(For President's message, see House proceedings in today's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

THE FLEXIBLE FARM POLICY

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, a statement addressed to the Oregon congressional delegation by Mark V. Weatherford, a distinguished lawyer of Oregon, who is thoroughly familiar with the problems of the American farmer. I desire to associate myself with the arguments he presents in his very fine statement.

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

STATEMENT ON FARM ISSUE SUBMITTED TO OREGON CONGRESSIONAL DELEGATION BY MARK V. WEATHERFORD

May I discuss with you some of the features of the new farm bill which is now in committee and will probably be before Congress in the very near future? It is named the flexible farm policy.

THE BILL IS MISNAMED

This new bill is termed the flexible farm policy. The only thing that flexes is the lowering of the price the farmer receives. That which he is compelled to pay out in his operation remained fixed. One of the greatest items the wheat farmer meets is freight rates. These are fixed by law, State and Federal, upon a basis to guarantee cost of operation and a reasonable return upon the investment. These laws are as inflexible as the Rock of Gibraltar. The same applies to the cost of power and electricity, telephone rates, and all corporate services which the farmer must purchase. These rates are fixed and inflexible. The new farm bill proposes to leave these secure and fixed and still lower the price of wheat under the term of a flexible policy. The only thing that flexes is the price that the farmer receives. We, therefore, submit that the term "flexible" farm prices is a misnomer.

THE PRESENT FARM BILL IS A FLEXIBLE FARM PRICE BILL

After years of study and groping, there crept into the legislation of Congress on the farm laws, the word "parity," which means that the farmer shall receive a sum which puts him on an equality with other industries. If freight rates go up under the rule of parity, the guaranteed price goes up. If freight rates go down, likewise, under the parity rule, farm prices go down. This applies to all other commodities, including farm machinery, equipment, and all things that the farmer purchases. This is a flexible farm policy, and it is the only way that a flexible policy can exist. Under the present law the farmer is given only 90 percent of parity; still this is based upon a flexible formula.

The present proposed law is not flexible. It doesn't disturb the cost of machinery, the cost of freight rates, the cost of power rates, the cost of telephone rates, or the cost of labor, but arbitrarily slashes the farm price and leaves all of the prices that he must pay out in his operations fixed and inflexible. The bill is nothing more or less than a provision that sells the farmers down the river. The new bill is misnamed. It is unfair and it will bring disaster to agriculture.

BRIEF HISTORY OF FARM LEGISLATION

The writer had a small part in farm legislation. He was president of the first group of wheat growers who assembled to discuss farm prices at Arlington, Oreg., in 1923, when efforts were initiated by the wheat growers to meet the situation and get the wheat industry on an equality with other industries. The writer had returned from World War I somewhat as a disabled soldier and spent 6 years, from 1920 through 1925, in wheat raising, primarily to regain his health, and during that time, and since, has been engaged in operating an averaged-sized farm in the wheat areas of Gilliam County, now joined by his daughter and son-in-law and his son and another associate. Since 1923 the writer has been more or less active in the wheat program of the United States Congress. He wrote probably the first draft of the McNary-Haugen bill and cooperated with Senator McNary and later Congressman Pierce in assisting to formulate a farm program. The McNary-Haugen bill was copied after the Brazilian coffee bill. It guaranteed a domestic price for the part of the crop used in this country, with the idea that the exportable surplus should be sold upon world market price. It twice passed Congress; it was twice vetoed, among other things, on the ground that it was unconstitutional.

Those who advocate the present so-called plan for a two-price system are advocating substantially the same thing that the McNary-Haugen bill provided.

The Grange had what they called a debenture plan, which was never passed by Congress. Later came the bill that was declared unconstitutional by the United States, and then, substantially, the present farm bill which has worked for years, and has kept agriculture on an equality with other industries and has been a means of creating and maintaining prosperity in the Nation. To disturb this law is to unsettle agriculture and bring about uncertainty in the Nation, if not greater disastrous results.

THE PRESENT AGRICULTURE LAW IS NONPARTISAN

The present law under which agriculture has prospered is a nonpartisan bill. So far as Oregon is concerned, we were fortunate in having Senator McNary until his death as chairman of the Agriculture Committee of the Senate, and Walter Pierce a member of the Agriculture Committee of the House. One was a Republican and the other a Democrat. They did yeoman work for the farmers and for the Nation all along the line as long as either of them was in Congress in establishing a suitable farm policy.

SURPLUS

It is claimed that we cannot continue the present farm policy because of the surpluses which have been created. This is not a sound objection to the present law, and the writer is discussing the present law as it applies to wheat. The farmers were asked to produce to the maximum during World War II and during the Korean war, this because of the ending of the war has created a surplus.

The current crop under the old law has been cut down in acreage, which is the only feasible way of cutting down surpluses. The farmers overwhelmingly voted for this cut-down in acreage. On the writer's ranch alone, in compliance with this law, 600 acres has been planted to barley—substantially one-third of the acreage in crop this year. All farmers have likewise cut down the acreage. This is the method provided under the present law for the elimination of surpluses. It is the only method known to Congress whereby this can be done.

Surpluses cannot be cut down by lowering the price. The farmers, in order to meet their obligations, will raise all that they possibly can in order to make ends meet, if the price is lowered. We had that experience in the twenties and early thirties. The wheat was worth 28 cents a bushel, and the writer sold one crop for that price. The reason for the low price given at that time was surplus—too much wheat. So the low price did not solve the farm situation. On the contrary, it created the depression, with monumental loss to the whole Nation. The farmer could not buy equipment; factories closed, and the depression was nationwide. Taxes could not be paid; farm mortgages were foreclosed all over the Nation.

During this time, however, under Federal law and State law, freight rates, power rates, telephone rates were all guaranteed to those engaged in that line of business. They were as inflexible as the Rock of Gibraltar. The farm price was flexible and as an illustration of the result, attention is called to the situation the farmer met at that time. Few farmers then had trucks; they could not buy them. They had to hire the wheat hauled. In the writer's operation this cost 7 cents a bushel. The freight rate was about 8 cents a bushel to the terminal. The terminal price was 35 cents. Thus 15 cents of the 35 cents was exacted by the inflexible freight rates. That left 20 cents per bushel out of the 35 cents which was received for the crop. At that time the writer joined others in the agitation to the effect that freight rates should be flexible and when the wheat price was lowered, the freight rates should be lowered. No relief was available.

It cannot be said that lower prices will solve the farm problem. On the contrary, it will cause farm failure and national failure. It did it in the 1920's and 1930's, and it will do it again.

The national economy is now geared to the parity program and to disturb it by a so-called flexible program which is inflexible as to all the farmer buys and flexible only to what he sells, by lowering his price, is a program of ruin. Prices are upon a high level. Tractors which formerly could be bought for from four to six thousand dollars are now priced at from nine to twelve thousand dollars. Combines formerly could be bought for $3,000; now they are $9,000. These prices are stated roughly. The last tractor the writer bought was $7,500. Taxes on the farm which in the early 1940's were $1,100 a year, are now substantially $4,000 per year. Exact figures on all of these questions are more readily available to you gentlemen than they are to the writer. The present wheat price of 90 percent of parity makes it possible for the farmer to survive in meeting these high prices. To disturb this situation by lowering the farmer's prices and leaving what he must pay out in his operation at the inflexible price fixed by law, is to invite inequality and create havoc with the farming industry. It is to invite disaster to the Nation.

Every farm must pay additional taxes, far above what now exists, and they have already raised, substantially, four times since 1942 in order to take care of the growing school problem which is national in its scope. Other governmental local expenses likewise will continue to increase. These burdens cannot be borne by agriculture with a lowering of the commodities that it produces. It means economic disaster for the farmer and the Nation. We have gone through it once. This will cause us to go through it again.

BOTH PARTIES PLEDGED EQUALITY TO THE FARMER

Politically, the farmer in the last election voted for Eisenhower in the majority, and this upon his promise that the farmer should receive not only 90 percent of parity but 100 percent of parity. The farmers heard this

speech where he made this pledge. It is realized that the Oregon delegation is Republican, with the exception of one Independent, and, while the writer is a Democrat, he, as well as all citizens, expect that a pledge solemnly made to the voters of the Nation will be kept, not only by the President of the United States but by the Representatives of the successful party in Congress.

RECESS UNTIL MONDAY

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further business before the Senate, the Senate will stand in recess, under the previous order of the Senate, until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

Thereupon (at 4 o'clock and 6 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess, the recess being, under the order previously entered, until Monday, May 3, 1954, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate April 29 (legislative day of April 14), 1954:

POSTMASTERS

CALIFORNIA

Ernest L. Kincaid, Napa.
Edward C. Wright, National City.
Marion R. Bessac, Riverbank.
John J. Vizzolini, Westley.

ILLINOIS

John R. Depper, Caseyville.
Harry A. Lange, Mattoon.

MASSACHUSETTS

Robert H. Hughes, Oak Bluffs.

MINNESOTA

Raymond J. Michelau, Dundee.

MONTANA

Willard J. Adams, Bridger.

NEW JERSEY

John R. Dougherty, Bordentown.
Margaret G. Spencer, Lake Hopatcong.
Frank Elia, Union City.

PENNSYLVANIA

Charles M. Brubaker, Dornsife.
Anna E. Lefever, Holtwood.
Dallas L. Darr, Jacobus.
George A. McDowell, Jamestown.
Marianna W. McClelland, Masontown.
Lillian M. Mengle, Port Clinton.
Jacob F. Lefever, Smoketown.
Walter C. Snyder, Swarthmore.
Charles W. Snyder, Three Springs.
Keith G. Baird, Youngwood.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Harold O. Ewing, Jr., Turton.
Marvin W. Wilcox, Volin.
Clair E. Woodard, White.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, APRIL 29, 1954

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

The Reverend Edward J. Craddock, Nashville, Tenn., offered the following prayer:

Our Father, who art in heaven, may Thy name be exalted in all the earth, Thy will be done. We are thankful for past blessings, for Thy guiding hand in all things. Lord, today we pray for guidance. Give us the faith of Abraham, to live beyond ourselves with ultimate good in mind. Like Solomon, we seek wisdom to do the right thing. May parents with David say, "Except the Lord build the house, they labor in vain who build it." Give our young people Gideon's discipline and will to leadership. May they see in us, most of all, integrity, that, like Joshua, we may know our own minds. Like Paul, may we be committed with the sense of mission for life or death.

God bless the President, the Congress, all leaders of Government, and all the people. In Jesus' name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 2098. An act to provide for the compensation of certain persons whose lands have been flooded and damaged by reason of fluctuations in the water level of the Lake of the Woods.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 2665. An act to amend the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, and the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945, as amended, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 8481. An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. CORDON, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. RUSSELL, and Mr. MCCARRAN to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. FORAND asked and was given permission to address the House for 30 minutes on Monday next, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

FILING OF CERTAIN CLAIMS UNDER WAR CLAIMS ACT OF 1948

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 6896) to extend the period for the filing of certain claims under the War Claims Act of 1948 by World War II prisoners of war, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Line 7, strike out "November" and insert "August."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. ANGELL asked and was given permission to address the House for 15 minutes today, following the legislative program of the day and any special orders heretofore granted, and also to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Obviously, 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. 57]

Barrett	Gamble	Pilcher
Battle	Graham	Powell
Bender	Haley	Radwan
Boykin	Harrison, Va.	Reed, Ill.
Camp	Hart	Richards
Carlyle	Herlong	Roberts
Chatham	Howell	Saylor
Chelf	Jenkins	Shafer
Clardy	Kearney	Sieminski
Crosser	Kersten, Wis.	Sutton
Curtis, Mo.	King, Calif.	Talle
Curtis, Nebr.	Klein	Thompson, Mich.
Deane	Lantaff	Walter
Dies	McDonough	Warburton
Dingell	Martin, Iowa	Weichel
Dollinger	Metcalf	Westland
Donovan	Morrison	Wier
Dorn, S. Dak.	Murray	Yorty
Doyle	Norblad	
Engle	O'Konski	
Fine	Osmers	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 371 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

APPOINTMENT TO COMMISSION ON INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 2, Public Law 109, 83d Congress, the Chair appoints as a member of the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations to fill the existing vacancy thereon, the gentleman from Massachusetts, Mr. GOODWIN.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. HYDE asked and was given permission to address the House for 15 minutes today, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. SHEEHAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 10 minutes today, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. KEOGH asked and was given permission to address the House for 10 minutes today, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, and that following his remarks Mr. THOMPSON of Texas be permitted to address the House for 5 minutes.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1955

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 8873) making appropriations for the Department of Defense and related independent agency for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, 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 further consideration of the bill H. R. 8873, with Mr. MCCULLOCH in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and ask unanimous consent to proceed for 10 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, this is unquestionably the most important bill to be considered in this session, in this Congress, and possibly in the last several years. There is no issue that transcends in urgency or in importance the national defense—the safety of the Nation.

On this bill, Mr. Chairman, I go along with the President of the United States who possibly is better qualified to pass on military matters than anyone else in the Nation today. And I go along with the Joint Chiefs of Staff, although—as you may have had opportunity to observe—the Joint Chiefs of Staff, as Mr. Dooley said of the Supreme Court, "goes along with the election returns."

We have been impressed, as the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH], the chairman of the subcommittee reminded us, with the tremendous amount of money involved. But, efficiency in appropriation is not governed by the amount of money involved in a bill. The essential consideration, the determining factor is the manner in which that money is allotted by the bill. We can appropriate millions of dollars more than is required and lose the war. Or we can allocate a much lesser fund more advantageously and win the war.

The subject with which we are dealing here is a very old subject. The earliest recorded history is a record of wars, and from that earliest day down to this, history is a continuous recital of the annals of war. But, Mr. Chairman, it is also a new subject, possibly the newest subject that could be brought before the House this morning. War today, and war in the future, are so different as contrasted with all previous wars—so different in methods, strategy, and weapons—as to challenge all comparison.

In every previous war, we have fought for victory. Defeat merely meant indemnities and humiliating treaties. But in the next war we fight for survival. Defeat this time means extermination. Free government will perish from the earth and our cities will become as Nineveh and Tyre.

Again, this war differs from every previous global war, in that we have always been the last to be engaged. Heretofore we have always had allies that bore the brunt of the first attack and held the enemy until we could arm and develop power to deliver the final blow. This time they will pass our allies by and America with her shining cities and boundless wealth will be the first marked for destruction, leaving the rest of the civilized world to be devoured at leisure. We must be alert and ready when our outposts signal the lightning approach of the first bombers or we will never be ready at all.

Third, we have entered all former wars with a morale buttressed by a record of unbroken victories. In every conflict we have dictated the terms of peace and without debate or deprecation the enemy has signed on the dotted line.

But in Korea we repeatedly sought an end of hostilities. And an insolent and nondescript people, who had never occupied a place in the family of nations, dictated the time and place of negotiations and largely dictated the terms of what the representatives of the Armed Forces, appearing before the committee in the hearings on this bill, termed "an uneasy armistice." And we have been unable to secure a treaty of permanent peace to this day.

So unsatisfactory were the negotiations and the terms of the protocol that Vice President NIXON told 400 newspapermen last week that "the Korean truce may have been a mistake and perhaps we should have fought to a decisive victory." But it is too late to rewrite the record now and we must face the next war with the shattered faith of our allies and the exultant and accelerated confidence of the enemy.

Again, Mr. Chairman, in every former war we have been insulated and protected by the broad bulwarks of continental oceans behind which life went on as usual and business proceeded without appreciable interruption. Aside from the boys we sent across, the war hardly touched us. But the next time every inhabitant—men, women, and children—in the remotest hamlet in the land, will be under attack and in the line of fire. Death and devastation will drop from the skies and even if we win the war—of which there is no complete assurance—there will be hardly enough left to celebrate the victory—or with composure or spirit enough to care to celebrate it.

And then, Mr. Chairman, in every previous war we have fought with superior weapons. We have equipped our men with planes, tanks, guns, and all of the paraphernalia of war better and more effective than any they had to meet in the air, on the ground, or under the sea.

Neither the Japanese nor the Germans realized they were fighting against proximity fuse bombs and other new and improved equipment. Not until after they had surrendered did they know that the weapons which decimated their ranks so accurately had never been used on any battlefield before. And they died in windrows at Hiroshima and Nagasaki before they ever heard of the atomic bomb. In both Europe and Asia it was the superiority of American weapons that ended the war.

But this time the enemy has the superior weapons. They were first to perfect the jet plane. Our engineers could get it up in the air but could not get it down. And they were manufacturing jet planes in quantity while ours were still in the experimental stage. They put the first snorkle submarine to sea and have today three times as many modern underwater craft as the rest of the world combined. And they have over a hundred more trained and equipped divisions than the allies combined can put in the field.

They have just notified us defiantly and belligerently in the last 10 days that they have the atomic bomb and they have the H-bomb in ample reserve and that they are ready and prepared to use it on a minute's notice. And notwithstanding our ultimatum to them that we will tolerate no encroachment from any quarter, they are equipping and directing the forces relentlessly closing in on Indochina.

Now, I am not an alarmist. I eschew the role of a Jeremiah. But no one is so thoroughly deceived as those who deceive themselves. Let us face the facts as they are. Let us see the situation as it is. When attack comes it will come like a thief in the night. There will be no notice, no declaration of war, no warning. I tried by repeated questioning to get the Secretary of Defense, when he appeared before the committee, to tell us how vulnerable the country is—to give us an estimate of how many attacking planes we could knock down in event of attack. That is the one question before any council or defense today. He refused to say.

But we have dependable information on that question. And to ignore it is to hide our heads in the sand.

There is some division of opinion as to the exact extent of the area which would be devastated by a modern bomb, either the atomic bomb or the H-bomb.

But it is a matter of general knowledge that the enemy today has bombs which, if dropped upon Washington, or any similar city, would encompass an area of complete destruction for a diameter of 7 miles. Predictions have been made of bombs which would engulf a part of a continent. But for present purposes 7 miles is enough. It is also a matter of common note that the Department of Defense has from Russian sources a list of 86 American cities arranged in the order of priority of attack; including, of course, centers of production, centers of communication, and population which if attacked simultaneously would so completely destroy the nerve centers of the Nation as to render us powerless to retaliate.

Early in 1951 we were told by those best qualified to testify on the subject that out of every 10 bomb-laden planes which Russia sent against American

cities 7 out of 10 would get through. And then we were told in October of 1951 that barring some mechanical defect, out of every 10 planes Russia launched against American cities 10 would get through. We have been told of no positive means of stopping a single plane after it leaves the borders of Russia.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. May I say to show how correct the gentleman is that only the early part of this month, April, the Administrator of Civil Defense said that we would have only 15 minutes' notice of attack. That means that the attacking plane would be within 60 to 75 miles of a city to be attacked before the city would have knowledge of its approach, except an inland city, which might have a little more warning. The Assistant Administrator made a speech the other day in Boston in which he said that anywhere from 33 to 75 percent of the attacking planes can get through, which would result in millions of Americans being killed and wounded; in other words, the loss of millions of Americans.

Mr. CANNON. The gentleman has touched upon one of the most vital features of the situation before us.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

(On request of Mr. CANNON, and by unanimous consent, he was allowed to proceed for 5 minutes.)

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, we have spread across the American Continent a vast network of radar screens, and we have established listening posts in every accessible part of the world, in order to be apprised if and when any hostile planes cross the top of the world in battle formation. The time of warning is a matter of conjecture. Some talk about 6 hours warning, some talk about 15 minutes warning, but we can be certain that the enemy in choosing their time will give us wholly inadequate warning. Unless we have devised in the meantime some means of stopping these planes—some means of interception, our only defense is to evacuate the city. That is the only practical defense that has been suggested up to this time—just get the people out. At the same time we are confronted with the fact that we can evacuate no city of any size in less than 6 hours.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. Last year with several other Members of Congress I made a tour around the world. We visited many nations, we skirted the Iron Curtain all the way. I must say at this time, and I think it should be mentioned, that we found the military high command of every nation that we visited well aware of the conditions and the position of the Communist forces. We were greatly encouraged to know of the safety methods that are being taken in connection with the radar system and by every other manner and means possible to keep the "commies" boxed up.

Mr. Chairman, I may say to the gentleman from Missouri and to the Members of the House and to the American people that they have today around the world the finest military forces all of whom are well aware of the great responsibility which rests on their shoulders. May I say also, with great emphasis, that not only myself but every member of the committee was greatly encouraged and felt a sense of security in the knowledge that we are doing everything possible, our military forces and every branch thereof are doing everything possible to keep the would be or supposed enemy boxed up to the best possible degree.

Mr. CANNON. The gentleman from Iowa always adds materially to the information and logic of any debate, and this is no exception to that rule. I wish that those who represented the Armed Forces before the committee for many weeks could have given us that assurance.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has again expired.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, but I hope that later on we are not going to be limited to 1 minute or half a minute or something like that on amendments.

The CHAIRMAN. The time is within the control of the committee.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON. In the days when dueling was the accepted custom, an expert marksman, who had a record of having killed a dozen men, insolently and gratuitously challenged a businessman who had no familiarity with arms. But the man challenged always had the choice of weapons, and in this case selected sawed-off shotguns to be fired at a distance of 2 feet. The duel was not fought. That is our position today. Both nations have atomic weapons. We face each other at a distance of 2 feet with sawed-off shotguns. And in this bill we appropriate for our sawed-off shotgun. We hope that in this instance, as in that historic instance on the Bladensburg flats, it will not be necessary to use the shotgun.

Mr. Chairman, I do not think that this bill completely satisfies any one Member of the House on either side. If rewritten by any Member of the House, it would be at least slightly different. Perhaps that is its virtue. But laying aside the bill, no one can review the evidence adduced before this committee without realizing that any preparation except as a deterrent is futile. We must not go to war. War, even if we win, is suicide. There will be neither people nor country left. Let us pass this bill as recommended by the President of the United States as expeditiously as possible. But let us understand at the same time that if it ever becomes necessary to use the facilities for which the bill provides, civilization has failed. And nothing matters in the dark ages which will engulf the world.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, the gentleman from Missouri is chairman of the Committee on Armed Services. Does the gentleman want more than 5 minutes? I am sure we would all like to hear some of the views the gentleman has.

Mr. SHORT. I do not want to unduly trespass upon the time and patience of the Committee.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be permitted to proceed for 10 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I take the floor at this time to pay an humble but well-deserved tribute to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH], and to all the able members of his subcommittee on both sides of the aisle who have worked so long, hard, and diligently in the preparation of this splendid bill. In my opinion, the subcommittee has rendered a great service not only to all the Members of the Congress but to the entire American people. We all know that as long as there are brigands abroad and aggressors let loose in the world the United States must, out of sheer necessity for survival, remain strong on land, sea, and in the air. Our Military Establishment is the biggest business on earth.

Mr. Chairman, a day or two after his confirmation by the Senate of the United States the Secretary of Defense paid me a courtesy call at my office. I told him at that time, early last year, that I considered the President and the American people fortunate in getting a man of his long, successful business experience, his hard, practical sense, to dispose of his stock and to accept one of the most onerous and burdensome positions in the United States Government, one that forced one man to jump out of a window and another to resign. While he employed 486,000 people in General Motors, the greatest corporation on earth, and did an annual volume of business of approximately $7 billion, I said to him, "Mr. Wilson, that is peanuts compared to the job you have now. As Secretary of Defense you are going to have working for you almost 5 million people; 3½ million in uniform and 1,280,000 civilians in the Department of Defense, more civilian personnel in that one department than in all the other departments of the President's Cabinet combined."

Instead of doing $7 billion a year of business, I reminded him that during the past year preceding his becoming Secretary of Defense, this Nation spent more than $50 billion. In 1 year, this fiscal year, we are spending $42 billion, an astronomical sum, almost twice as large as was our national debt at the end of World War I, $26 billion.

We know that America, with all of her resources, her scientific genius, her

inventive capacity, cannot forever carry such a tremendous burden. Of course, the American people will never quarrel as long as they feel that they are getting their money's worth. Today I feel that because of the wise management and honest administration, the elimination of waste and duplication of effort, under the guidance of Charlie Wilson and Roger Kyes, and the Secretaries of the three Departments of Army, Navy, and Air Force, we are getting more real defense for our dollars than we have in many, many years. Let no one get the erroneous impression that because there is a reduction in expenditures or even a reduction of personnel, we are weakening the defense of our Nation. On the contrary, we are not only achieving economy, but increasing efficiency, particularly the combat effectiveness, by taking men out of swivel chairs in the armed services, out of auxiliary and housekeeping positions, and placing them in positions where they can achieve combat effectiveness. We are building a better, more mobile, hard-hitting, fighting Army, Navy, and Air Force.

America, I repeat, must remain strong on land, sea and in the air if we want to survive as a nation and as a free people. But along with our military might, we must be careful to preserve our economic strength. You cannot have one without the other. The two are wedded. It is impossible to divorce them without destroying both. We must have security with solvency. The battlefront can never be stronger than the homefront. Every great military leader, whether an admiral or a general, will readily confess to you that the thing that won World War II over the axis powers was America's industrial might and productive capacity. We were the arsenal of democracy and it was on the farms and in the factories and in the forests, with men not only in uniform but civilians, if you please, the good soldiers at home who produced the food and the fiber and the weapons and sinews of war that won us the victory over Germany, Italy, and Japan. We must be careful not to overextend ourselves by siphoning off our wealth in economic or military aid to countries all around the world.

Lenin once wrote:

> The United States of America, like all capitalistic countries, will eventually spend herself into bankruptcy.

That is a consummation devoutly to be wished by the Soviets. Stalin uttered the same sentiment in Red Square, as he stood on top of Lenin's tomb, while in that Red Square, outside the historic walls of the Kremlin I watched hundreds of thousands of soldiers march by in review. The Communists hope and work for an economic collapse in this country. They aim at an American depression with millions of idle men. Like Hitler, their motto is, "divide and conquer." Psychological penetration and subversive infiltration are their silent but effective weapons.

The 14 mad dogs in the Kremlin today who have been winning every battle of the cold war without firing a shot or losing a man are hoping that the United States will spend herself into bankruptcy, will knock herself out by her own profligacy, by giving so many blood transfusions to others that we will be bled white—Korea yesterday, Indochina today, no one knows where tomorrow. If we become bogged down in distant places of the world to fight wars that are chosen by the enemy, instead of choosing the place and the time ourselves, Russia can achieve her goal and accomplish her purpose without ever firing a shot or losing a man. All we will be doing will be killing Koreans and Chinese or other of her slave satellites while many Americans are getting killed. Human life is the cheapest commodity on earth in the Orient. Their men are expendable, ours are not. America can never hope to match man for man the hordes on the Asiatic continent.

Our only hope of victory in another global conflict and our only chance of survival depend upon our superiority in weapons and the superior skill of the men who man those weapons.

I am glad that the committee after making substantial cuts in the defense budget has done it, I think, without seriously impairing the security of the Nation. Of course, you always run a calculated risk, but in order to build up and maintain your military might you must preserve your economic strength because only with a sound economy, a going industry, where we can outproduce not only in quantity but far surpass in quality in the weapons and sinews of war, can we ever hope to defeat an enemy that lives in a land three times, almost, as large as America in area, and controls 800 million people, one-third of the total population of the globe.

Mr. Chairman, not only must we have military might and economic strength, we must have a moral resurgence in this country, a spiritual revival, that recognizes after all the real strength of a nation and its people is in the intelligence, culture, and character of its citizenry. There is nothing great in the world but man, and nothing in man great but mind. In this global conflict that is called a cold war but that is really sizzling hot, we are in a battle for the minds, the hearts, the consciences, and the allegiances of men. Necessary and fundamental as are military might and economic strength, it is after all in the character of man, in spiritual idealism, moral values, and ethical principles that there lies the greatness of a country.

We are engaged in an ideological war, and in this total war where civilians will suffer first, where old men, innocent women, and helpless children will perish perhaps before the men in the front battleline, in this modern age when war is a total effort of an entire nation and people, we must fight it not only with military weapons and with economic strength, we also have to fight it with intelligence and spiritual ideals and ideas because, after all, an idea is a powerful weapon. It can be the most dangerous weapon on earth because you cannot shoot an idea with a rifle. You cannot stab it with a bayonet. You cannot destroy it with an atomic bomb or a hydrogen bomb. The only way to overcome a bad idea is with a good one. It is only truth, justice, and freedom, those ideas, to which all men everywhere are entitled that can make us strong. I hope and pray to God that the United States will never try to defend or practice colonialism under any regime in any section of the world. If we would grant independence and liberty to men to make them really free, they will fight and defend themselves, but they have to have something to fight for. They must be consecrated and dedicated to love liberty more than life itself, and unless they have that dedication and consecration, if their hearts are not in it, if they are not willing to dig down in their pockets and pay enormous, burdesome taxes, unless they are willing to deny themselves many luxuries, finally unless they are willing to lay down their lives upon the altar of freedom, there will be no hope for our survival. When I think of America, I want to keep her strong because only in strength is our freedom. It is freedom that likewise gives us our strength. So "Not by power, nor by might, but by my spirit sayeth Yahweh the Lord, God of Hosts." Let us not put all our faith in horses that run upon the rocks, but let us put forth every effort to keep America militarily strong, economically sound, and spiritually alive and vital. If we do that as representatives of a great, free people, I have no fear of what the future holds.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. I have listened with great interest to the remarks of the gentleman, not only because I remember many great battles that the gentleman and I had in bygone years before World War II and the differences of opinion that existed between us, but particularly because the gentleman now is charged with the duty of being chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, and the gentleman's party is in control and determining the policies. Our military strength is necessary to carry out the national objectives of our country in relation to foreign affairs; is that not right?

Mr. SHORT. That is right. We, however, need more than just military strength.

Mr. McCORMACK. There is one way to do it, and that is to be so strong that an enemy will not attack us through fear. Does the gentleman think we are strong enough?

Mr. SHORT. I would only say, if any possible enemy attacked us today, God pity him.

Mr. McCORMACK. That is not an answer to my question.

Mr. SHORT. Yes, that is the answer.

Mr. McCORMACK. All right, but my question is, Does the gentleman think we are strong enough so that the Soviet Union—let us talk plainly—would be afraid to carry out a sneak attack on us?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time may be extended—how many minutes would the gentleman require?

Mr. SHORT. I would ask for a couple of minutes. I have a luncheon engagement at the White House at 12:30 p. m.

Mr. McCORMACK. I hope you get a lot of good information at the White House.

Mr. SHORT. You get it down there pure and undefiled. It is honest and usually accurate, more than in many years.

Mr. McCORMACK. I was very much disturbed at what I got 3 weeks ago in the office of the Secretary of State. I was very much disturbed.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman from Missouri is recognized for 2 additional minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Now to come back. Does the gentleman think we are strong enough so that the Soviet Union will be afraid to carry out a sneak attack on us militarily?

Mr. SHORT. I might say that with this grave responsibility, and although I spend many hours day and night studying these military problems and talk to generals and admirals daily, I must confess I am not the great military authority that the gentleman from Massachusetts is.

Mr. McCORMACK. Now do not turn to ridicule. This is a serious matter.

Mr. SHORT. I do not think that Soviet Russia dares attack us today. She does not have an adequate supply of steel, rubber, oil, or transportation system to fight successfully a prolonged, global conflict.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman thinks we are strong enough to put fear into their minds?

Mr. SHORT. They have already got that fear or they would have attacked us long ago. The only language they understand is force. They respect strength and have only contempt for weakness.

Mr. McCORMACK. What are they doing in southeast Asia?

Mr. MASON. They are not attacking us.

Mr. McCORMACK. Are they not? Read the newspapers. Read the public utterances. If you do not think that is directed toward the United States, you had better do some more thinking.

Let me ask the gentleman this: Does the gentleman think we are strong enough, in case we are suddenly hurled into war, to win the war at the present time?

Mr. SHORT. Oh, I think we could win a war at the present time. I certainly do. But I hope and pray we are not forced into a shooting war. In a war even the winner is loser.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am glad to hear that, coming from the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services. I must reluctantly say I wish we were considerably stronger.

Mr. SHORT. Oh, of course I wish we were stronger. Everybody wishes we were stronger. We are as strong as our economy will allow us to be. I have tried to bring out that military strength is not the only thing. You have got to have economic strength and spiritual strength.

Mr. McCORMACK. How much would another war cost?

Mr. SHORT. That is problematical. Of course it is conjectural. You do not know. I do not know. No one knew that World War II would leave a debt of $275 billion on our backs.

Mr. McCORMACK. In other words, we would spend any amount to save our country.

Mr. SHORT. Of course we would. There is no argument about that. The security of our Nation comes first. We must defend it at any and all costs.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has again expired.

(By unanimous consent Mr. SHORT was given 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. SHORT. But I think we can rest pretty well at ease. We have managed to stay out of the pitfall mess which we have inherited; World War I, World War II, and the Korean conflict—it just so happened, I guess, that the Democratic Party was in power in all three of those wars. We are not beating the war drums. We do not want another war. But I am saying that we are strong and that this committee has done a marvelous job, and they have gone as far as our economic strength will permit at this time.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT. I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. I trust the gentleman will join with me in expressing the hope that whatever indications have come from the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] that our Nation is not strong will not have such an effect around the world as may——

Mr. SHORT. Invite an attack from an enemy.

Mr. HALLECK. I would like to point out that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT] has made a magnificent statement. It certainly ought to be encouraging for all of us. I simply want to corroborate what I understand his viewpoint to be in this regard. Of course, having regard to the fact that we must be economically strong because, as General Eisenhower said once in the Congressional Library when he returned from Europe, that the Armed Forces in the field can but be the cutting edge of the great productive machine that is America. So we have to try to balance between what we provide in the way of strength for the Armed Forces in the field and the maintenance of our economic strength at home; because, as the gentleman well knows, to obtain absolute, ultimate military strength, we would go to total, all-out mobilization. We would close today every automobile factory; we would close the tractor factories; we would regiment everybody; we would have price and wage controls. We could do that and then, if war did not come, we could be destroyed at home, we could lose our freedoms we seek to protect, without firing a shot. Of course, there is some calculated risk in trying to draw the line between that all-out mobilization and what we deem is sufficient for our defense and our protection, having regard to the necessities of the long pull.

I want to join the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT] in commending the members of this committee, and in commending the people in the armed services and the leaders in the administration, for drawing what I think is a fair balance between the maintenance of strong forces in the field and the maintenance of a strong, protective, effective, functioning economy here at home.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has again expired.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. YATES. I think the gentleman might discuss the recent statement by Secretary of Defense Wilson in which he said that we may have to have a soul-searching review of our proposed military expenditures.

Mr. McCORMACK. That is a pertinent observation.

Mr. Chairman, I would not have taken this time if it were not for the cutting, unnecessary, and gratuitously unkind observation made by the majority leader of this House when he undertook to read into my mind and my lips something that I never thought and something that I never said.

The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT] and I were having a colloquy. He certainly did not show any offense. It was for the purpose of bringing out information, and I suggest to my friend from Indiana—and I have been majority leader for 10 years out of the last 13—that he better be a little more temperate than to try to accuse people of things that never were in their minds.

I look back through the years before Pearl Harbor when I was fighting to get legislation through this House that the gentleman from Indiana was opposing. I can remember an extension of the Selective Service Act 3 months before Pearl Harbor by this House by a vote of 202 to 201. I voted for its passage. How did the gentleman from Indiana vote?

I am for a strong military defense, have been for years, because I have said in this House and outside of this House that the only thing the Communists respect is what they fear and that is fear of a strength greater than they possess.

Yes, you talk about the strength we have, but if I am going to err in judgment I prefer to err on the side of greater strength than on the side of weakness.

Who brought this strength about? Who made the decision on the atomic bomb? Franklin D. Roosevelt. Who made the decision on the hydrogen bomb? Harry S. Truman. Where would

this country be if we did not have these weapons and the Soviet Union did?

Every plane that came off the production rolls last year, every one that will come off this year, every one that will come off next year, and some of them for years to come comes as a result of appropriations recommended by Democratic Presidents and passed by Democratic Congresses, for it takes from 3 to 7 or more years to build a plane, according to its type.

Our military strength is an important and in fact a necessary element in carrying out our national objectives in connection with our foreign affairs. The gentleman from Missouri answered some questions, but there are serious doubts in my mind that our country is strong enough today to deter a sneak attack. Certainly we are not strong enough today to negotiate around the bargaining table because we have seen what has happened. We are in Geneva. You cannot blame the Democrats for Geneva. A speech was made at the Propeller Club by Secretary Dulles that should never have been made. He said there would be "united action" and he did not have an agreement. He should have had an agreement with England, France, and other countries before he made that speech; otherwise he should never have made the speech. When I read that speech I assumed he had an agreement signed and sealed that England, France, and other countries would carry out certain things in conjunction with ourselves if Red China went too far; and we had to find out by way of Berlin and Paris only a few weeks ago that no negotiations had been made and that he was hastily over there trying to repair the damage that he had done. I knew it 3 days before because I was at the conference in the office of the Secretary of State. We were very close then and if it were not for the leaders on the Hill and the position they took then, the situation would be entirely different today. We were not told that the Joint Chiefs of Staff were not in full agreement until I asked the question.

The thing we should do if we are going to err is to err on the side of strength. I am one of the few who has the courage to say that we ought to have more strength and greater capacity. I said that on the floor of the House only a few weeks ago when the excise tax-reduction bill was up for consideration. I said at that time that if President Eisenhower would recommend more appropriations for greater defense and a continuance of the expiring taxes the American people would support him.

So the speech of the gentleman from Missouri, chairman of the Committee on the Armed Services, is a keen disappointment to me personally because it shows me that as chairman of that committee and looking behind what he said and interpreting it, has not changed one iota from what he was 13 years ago. So, if we are going to make any error of judgment we better err on the side of strength, not on the side of weakness.

The Communists understand the language of strength; they also understand the language of weakness. I said on this floor 4 years ago that the purpose and the intent of the Communist leaders was to take over country after country by internal subversion if they could, by other means, if necessary, with the ultimate objective of attacking the United States of America. There is no question but what that was their plan then and in the several years that have transpired since that plan has been definitely unfolded.

I agree with the gentleman from Missouri about being strong spiritually, but I deny the fact that our people are not strong spiritually. Perhaps we could have greater spiritual strength, but the people of America do have great spiritual strength now. I agree with the significance of that statement, but we have to be all powerful from the military angle, because the only thing that the Communists respect is what they fear, and remember too, Mr. Chairman, when you are dealing with the Communists you are dealing with persons who are possessed of a world-dominating mind and a world-bitter mind. They are out to destroy every civilization, every country that does not submit or agree with communism. We have that cold, sinister, killer mind to contend with and we have to prepare ourselves accordingly.

So far as I am concerned, as between dollars and liberty, I prefer liberty.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending paragraph do now close.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE I

NATIONAL SECURITY TRAINING COMMISSION

Salaries and expenses: For necessary expenses of the National Security Training Commission, including services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), at rates for individuals not in excess of $50 per diem and contracts with temporary or part-time employees may be renewed annually; and expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with the purposes of this appropriation; $55,000.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, as a member of the Committee on Armed Services, I want to compliment the Committee on Appropriations for turning in a magnificent performance of which they can well be proud. I also listened with a great deal of interest to my very good and able friend and colleague, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT], and I also listened with a great deal of interest to my very good friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK]. And he also is a very able Representative from a great State, whom I greatly admire. However, some of the things that he said were just a bit too extravagant for me to sit and listen to about what happened in the previous administrations. I can remain quiet no longer. I am glad that the gentleman is present, because I want to call to his attention some of the things that happened in the previous administration that he speaks about.

Mr. Chairman, back in 1949, when we had a stabilized condition in Korea, when we had 50,000 troops in Korea, a decision was reached to pull out the 50,000 troops, and I think the last 6,000 were moved out of Korea in December 1949, which was an open invitation for the Chinese Communists to move in. At that time I recall we had an authorization bill of $17 billion before our committee, the Armed Services Committee, Mr. CARL VINSON, a great, farsighted American, being chairman at that time. The administration that he refers to, that turned in, as he calls it, such a fine performance, cut that appropriation back from $17 billion to $13 billion. At that time our good friend, the late beloved Secretary of Defense Jimmy Forrestal, went out, and in came Louis Johnson. And they were still economy minded. They were economy minded at the wrong time and in the wrong place. They cut it back a couple of billion dollars more, this about 2 months before Korea. They mothballed the fleet, they canceled the carrier, Admiral Denfeld was fired. They cut back the ground forces, they cut back the Navy air; however, the most drastic mistake was the cutback in the Air Force from 70 to 48 groups. You remember that. Certainly you remember it. The gentleman from Massachusetts says it takes from 6 to 7 years to build a plane. And you remember back in 1950, when they cut back the Air Force from 70 to 48 groups, and we heard but little from that side. If it takes 6 or 7 years to build a plane, one can readily understand what this action did to our Air Force. You hear little about that.

So let us not forget. The gentleman from Massachusetts called attention to some of the things that happened in the past, and I want to call his attention to what happened 2 months before Korea. Suddenly, we got tough, and we decided to move into Korea. So we moved into Korea. And what did we have? We had but little equipment, a few obsolete tanks, a few bazookas, and we sent our boys into Korea to fight against one of the greatest military machines that had ever been assembled in the Far East. And what happened? We were nearly pushed back into the sea at Pusan, the most humiliating incident that ever occurred in the history of this Nation.

So we are here now talking about preparedness and the necessity for building our national defense. Inferences have been made on the Republican side there is an effort to curtail the defense program for economic reasons. The facts are that we have in this bill $28,727,000,000. We have a carryover of $48,147,000,000, making a total of $76,874,000,000 to be spent on national defense within the next 2 years.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. GAVIN was given permission to proceed for an additional 3 minutes.)

Mr. GAVIN. So we have $76 billion to spend for defense. A million dollars is one thousand thousand dollars. A billion dollars is one thousand million dollars. We have set up 76 thousand million dollars for defense. So let further talk about not giving the defense

program every dollar they want be discontinued. The facts are that the productivity of this Nation could not absorb what we have already authorized and appropriated to be spent on national defense in the next 2 years—76 billion dollars. So I do not want my friends on the other side to intimate or infer that we have been lax in any way. We have recognized the need for building the greatest military strength that the world has ever known to meet any demands that may be made upon us, any time, anywhere in the world.

I would say that the Appropriations Committee in bringing out this bill has turned in a magnificent job and deserves the hearty commendations of the Members of the Congress, and any inferences that the Republicans are trying to be economy minded in this respect is unfounded because it is not a fact. We have $76 billion to spend in the next 2 years, to build a mighty defense strength. Secretary of Defense Wilson is doing a great job. We can well be thankful we have a man of his ability heading up our defense program.

May I say right now that without question we are making great progress in our defense program. What we need in America is a reawakening, a reinspiration, a rehabilitation of that spirit of Americanism that has made our country great. I feel that we are now in a position of growing strength, growing steadily every day, and in a greatly improved position to meet any demands if they should ever be made upon us or if we should suddenly be catapulted into a cataclysm of war.

Let us recognize that we in the Congress have appropriated some 76 thousand million dollars to meet the needs of our national defense program. We in no way will discontinue this program until we build the greatest military strength we have ever had.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GAVIN. I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. Last year the same arguments were made when we were fighting for 143 air wings. The gentleman's party took the position that we should have 126 wings. That number is now up to 137 in this budget, and I am glad to see it. Who was right last year, the gentleman's party or our party?

Mr. GAVIN. I have always been for a great national defense program, the gentleman knows that.

Mr. McCORMACK. Did the gentleman favor the 143 wings last year?

Mr. GAVIN. I am asking the gentleman today why he was not on his feet when his administration cut the 70 air wings to 48 back in 1950; an action that set the Air Force back several years?

Mr. McCORMACK. I will say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that the gentleman from Massachusetts was on his feet.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, as the Members of the House know, it is hoped to conclude this bill today. I have no desire to curtail debate at this time, but I hope we will be able to proceed with the reading of the bill.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph do now close.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE II

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Office of the Secretary of Defense

Salaries and Expenses

For expenses necessary for the Office of the Secretary of Defense, including hire of passenger motor vehicles; and not to exceed $60,000 for emergency and extraordinary expenses, to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of Defense for such purposes as he deems proper, and his determination thereon shall be final and conclusive; $12 million.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I have sat here and listened to the very fine and commendatory statements that have been made about the subcommittee and I want to take this moment to express my appreciation.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, there would be no reason for taking the time of the House at this time since I am not a member of either of the committees concerned, unless we had a matter of paramount importance facing us which deals with the foreign policy, which is the concern of the committee upon which I serve, and which is very pertinent to this discussion.

We are going to be faced by an amendment from my colleague from New York, of which all the Members have been apprised, and which seeks to limit very materially the powers of the President, as Commander in Chief, in the command of the Armed Forces of the United States.

This amendment bears very directly upon the subject which has just been discussed between the majority and the minority sides, and for this reason. It is my deep conviction that if we are in any danger of defeat by the Communists—and no man would be adult who would not endeavor to be sure that we can win—it will not be because we are bleeding ourselves white economically. The power of the American industrial machine, and of the American industrial production is, in my opinion, even now not yet fully appreciated. Just to give a few figures to those who fear a national debt of $275 billion; a conservative estimate by, I believe, the National Industrial Conference Board shows that our tangible national wealth is not less than $800 billion—that does not mean we should be extravagant or go hog wild; it does mean that we are on very firm ground economically.

The grave danger today is in seeing our will to resist weakened, our suspicions of each other heightened, and our divisions made deep and permanent. That is the danger of the kind of debate that has taken place just now, especially in the face of the kind of amendment that is going to come up. It is a plausible amendment—in that the Congress is ostensibly asked to be asserting its right to see that the President does not commit our troops in Indochina unless the Congress agrees. But it is dangerous in its view because it fails to recognize that today our defense cannot be shackled by depriving ourselves of the timely opportunity to protect our national security—our defense today is intercontinental, to avoid world war III, and not just a matter of defending the borders of the United States. And that is the way in which we and the other free peoples might have had a chance to avert World War II—by stopping Japan when she went into Manchuria, and by cracking down on Hitler when he went into the Rhineland, and by not having tolerated aggression anywhere in the world when we ought to have known that it is inevitable when aggression is gotten away with by the Communists or anybody else that ultimately it only breeds more aggression, until it is impossible to take it any more in terms of security and peace and a world war results.

I would like to answer my colleague, the gentleman from Massachusetts who asked, I think, a very important question, as to whether in the view of the gentleman who was then speaking, the very distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee, the Soviet Union was deterred by fear of American power in not attacking us. I believe the Soviet Union is deterred by fear of American power in not attacking us. I believe the Soviet Union is deterred by fear of American power in not attacking us directly, but I believe that the Soviet Union believes in the opinion of its Communist masters and their appraisal of public opinion and the general attitude in the United States, that it can get away successfully with attacking us indirectly. They tried it in Korea where we finally had to accept a stalemate, about at the point where the aggression started and now they are trying it in Indochina. From what we hear including this kind of amendment I am discussing, we have to be careful that no Soviet leader has a right to conclude that we will not stand up and do our share with other free nations, if need be and there is reasonable prospect of repelling aggression, from the frontiers of our own security, which in fact may prove to be far away from our shores and even on the other side of the Pacific.

It is our duty in this Congress out of a sense of deep responsibility to face that issue, because it is before us and we must face it and no one else will face it for us.

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman ask unanimous consent that his time may be extended for 1 minute, to answer a question?

Mr. JAVITS. I will be glad to do so.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman from New York is recognized for 1 additional minute.

There was no objection.

Mrs. CHURCH. I certainly do not feel that the gentleman from New York yields to anyone in his patriotism or in his fight upon Communism. I would like

to ask the gentleman this question, however. Does he not believe that such decision to deter aggression at the time of Hitler or during the other instances cited or now, where according to his statement we should not hesitate to deter aggression should have been made not by any President but by the Congress of the United States, representing the people who sent them here?

Mr. JAVITS. There is no question about the fact that we should face the responsibility here ourselves, and I hasten to point out to the gentlewoman that we face the responsibility as a Nation by making the decision here in the Congress or by honoring the power given to the President under the Constitution and that both decisions are our decisions as a Nation.

We should pass upon an amendment like this. The only point I make is that we should turn it down decisively because that, too, is an exercise of our power and our direction as to how the whole effort to secure our country shall go. We should not telegraph to the other side what we will or will not do. We should keep them in the greatest doubt. At the same time in answer to the views of the gentleman from Massachusetts, we should point out that we do not consider that we are going to lock up our strength in the United States, but that we consider it strength to be used for our defense and the defense of freedom when aggression threatens our vital national interest. Let us not forget that the attacks at Pearl Harbor took place in Hawaii almost 2,000 miles away and not in California.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph do now close.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Office of Public Information

For salaries and expenses necessary for the Office of Public Information, $500,000.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] closed his very forceful, eloquent, and perhaps political plea with the statement that as between dollars and liberty he would choose liberty.

Well, I assume if the issue was that simple, no one would prefer dollars rather than freedom. The gentleman's views are, on that point at least no different than those of the rest of us. Hence similarity, if any, of his statement to Patrick Henry's "Give me liberty or give me death" speech arouses in me no high blood pressure. The issue as I understand it is not quite that simple. I might add that the criticism by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] of the majority leader, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] was in my opinion entirely unwarranted.

The gentlemen are not so far in disagreement. Apparently the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] thinks we should spend everything in sight, everything we can borrow for national defense, while the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] seems to believe in the views that were stated by our Vice President when he answered Mr. Stevenson on March 13.

On that occasion, Vice President NIXON, speaking of the issue of communism and the containment of communism, among other things said:

We found—

That is, when the Republicans came to power—

that, despite record spending for military purposes, that in our efforts to be strong everywhere, we weren't strong enough anywhere. And since our former policy failed, we then asked ourselves the question what kind of a new policy should we adopt, and in determining what that policy should be, we decided to find out what the men in the Kremlin were up to.

We found that militarily their plans, apparently, were to destroy us by drawing us into little wars all over the world with their satellites. However, where they must be alone, and where, due to our inability to bring to bear our great superiority on the sea and in the air that we were unable to win those wars. We found that economically their plan, apparently, was to force the United States to stay armed to the teeth, to be prepared to fight anywhere, anywhere in the world that they the men in the Kremlin, chose. Why? Because they knew that this would force us into bankruptcy, that we would destroy our freedom in attempting to defend it.

Well, we decided that we would not fall into these traps. And so we adopted a new plan, and that new plan, summed up, is this: Rather than let the Communists nibble us to death all over the world in little wars, we would rely, in the future, primarily on our massive, mobile, retaliatory power which we could use at our discretion against the major source of aggression at times and places that we chose.

Perhaps we should all remember that what is said in the well of this House is nothing more than the opinion of the individual who is speaking.

If I understood the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] correctly, all he argued was that he, too, believes in the views expressed by Vice President NIXON, and to which I subscribe, that we should have an adequate national defense, but that we should not destroy ourselves by spending all of our energy, all of our dollars, all of our manpower everywhere throughout the world where the Communists might instigate a war.

The substance of the argument of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] as I got it was that we should not bankrupt ourselves, destroy our freedom, by being enticed into futile wars. That is the same thing that was expressed some time ago by our Vice President.

Just how are we to balance the demands for defense against our ability to pay and retain our economy is a question to which I assume no one can give the precise and adequate answer. So each of us must follow his own judgment and vote for such sums, at least I shall, as the committee may recommend—the armed services need—because I assume they have more knowledge than have I.

I know not the need of the armed services and I assume very few Members of this House have personal knowledge of these needs. All I can do is to accept the advice of those who are trained in national defense; then unceasingly check on their expenditures to see that the money is not wasted.

Perhaps, in addition, through acts of Congress, I may assist in the effort to prevent us becoming so frequently involved in the affairs of other nations that the need for military preparedness may not be so great.

Another purpose in speaking at this time was to further call attention to what the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] said. He said, "Who made the decision as to the atomic bomb?" And he answered, "Mr. Truman." "Who made the decision as to the H-bomb?" And he replied, "Mr. Roosevelt."

Mr. McCORMACK. It is the other way around.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. All right. Admitting that those two gentlemen made those two decisions, I ask one question: Who got us into the situations which made those decisions necessary? Who created the conditions which got us into two wars? The same two gentlemen you mentioned?

Mr. GREEN. Hoover.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Oh nonsense—your theory would bear out the assertion that Hoover was responsibile for the flood.

Mr. McCORMACK. I will answer that. Do you want an answer?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I would not have asked the question if I did not.

Mr. McCORMACK. The Communists.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Oh. Again, what nonsense. The Communists did not leave Pearl Harbor unprotected. They did not force us to participate in the war on Germany before war was declared. Roosevelt did that. The Communists did not withdraw our troops from Korea—invite the Communists in—then send our men into that war. Truman did that. That is to say, the substance of his answer is that the Communists stated for Roosevelt and Truman what policy should be followed. Shaped the events which determined the policy of Roosevelt and Truman. Is that not a fine thing to admit?

I knew there were a lot of Communists in policymaking positions in the two previous administrations, but I never thought I would see the day when the party would admit, through their leadership, through the whip today, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK], that the Communists formulated and put into effect the policies of the last two administrations. Is that not something to think about? That is what was said.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I do not want the gentleman to revise his remarks. My answer shows that the Communists throughout the world have brought about this situation.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Do not worry. Your statement may stand.

The three futile world wars came—as did a national debt of more than $250 billion—as the result of the New Deal policies and programs.

And one more: Who was responsible for the mess which resulted in the political overthrow of your party?

Mr. GREEN. Which mess? The mess going on now?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. The mess, the corruption—that bunch of crooks and their works that you left us as a gift when you died politically on November 4, 1952.

Mr. GREEN. How about the mess that is going on now?

Mr. PATTEN. What about the McCarthy business? Is that a mess?

The CHAIRMAN. The Committee will be in order.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Personally I have no objection to 3 or 4 people trying to answer my apparently simple question, but to get back to my point, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK], expressed, as I think, the true answer to the issue which we have here: That, in making appropriations for our national defense, no matter how necessary they may seem to be, we should not go so far as to destroy here at home not only our own freedom and liberty, but also our ability to defend ourselves.

Not being allwise, not military experts, few of us can actually know whether the armed services should be given twenty-eight billion, ten billion, or a hundred billion.

All we can do—at least, all I can do—is to assume that those who have expert knowledge of world affairs, of military strategy, when they come asking us for billions, are just as patriotic; have at least adequate knowledge of the ability of our taxpayers to pay, and then grant their requests, even though those demands seem exorbitant.

Voting on those requests, I should, and I will, keep in mind the necessity of not enslaving our people, destroying our freedom and our liberty, by, speaking figuratively, as did the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK], chain them to the wheels of a military chariot, driven by a military dictator.

Nor will I destroy our people's welfare, their liberty, their ability to provide for themselves, our independence as a nation, by falling into step with those internationalists who seem to have lost all faith in our form of government, in the courage, the endurance, the ability of our people to produce, and to meet and successfully resist all foreign foes.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE III

INTERSERVICE ACTIVITIES

Claims

For payment of claims by the Office of the Secretary of Defense, the Army (except as provided in appropriations for civil functions administered by the Department of the Army), Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force, as authorized by law; claims (not to exceed $1,000 in any one case) for damages to or loss of private property incident to the operation of Army and Air National Guard camps of instruction, either during the stay of units of said organizations at such camps or while en route thereto or therefrom; claims, as authorized by law, for damage to property of railroads under training contracts; and repayment of amounts determined by the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, or the Secretary of the Air Force, or officers designated by them, to have been erroneously collected from military and civilian personnel of the Department of the Army, Navy, and Air Force or from States, Territories, or the District of Columbia, or members of National Guard units thereof; $7,680,000.

TITLE IV

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

Military personnel

For pay, allowances, individual clothing, interest on deposits, and permanent change of station travel, for members of the Army on active duty (except those undergoing Reserve training); expenses incident to movement of troop detachments, including rental of campsites and procurement of utility and other services; expenses of apprehension and delivery of deserters, prisoners, and soldiers absent without leave, including payment of rewards (not to exceed $25 in any one case), and costs of confinement of military prisoners in nonmilitary facilities; donations of not to exceed $25 to each prisoner upon each release from confinement in an Army prison (other than a disciplinary barracks) and to each person discharged for fraudulent enlistment; authorized issues of articles to prisoners, other than those in disciplinary barracks; subsistence of enlisted personnel, selective service registrants called for induction and applicants for enlistment while held under observation, and prisoners (except those at disciplinary barracks), or reimbursement therefor while such personnel are sick in hospitals; and subsistence of supernumeraries necessitated by emergent military circumstances; $4,150,479,000: *Provided*, That section 212 of the act of June 30, 1932 (5 U. S. C. 59a), shall not apply to retired military personnel on duty at the United States Soldiers' Home: *Provided further*, That the duties of the librarian at the United States Military Academy may be performed by a retired officer detailed on active duty.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DONOHUE: On page 8, line 21——

Mr. FORD (interrupting the reading of the amendment). Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts is premature. We have not as yet concluded the first paragraph of title IV.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan is correct. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 5 minutes.

(On request of Mr. McCORMACK, and by unanimous consent, Mr. PRICE was granted 3 additional minutes.)

LESS ARMY COMBAT EFFECTIVENESS FOR LESS MONEY

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Chairman, the promice of "more defense for less money," was at the heart of the Eisenhower administration's defense program. This was sometimes jocularly referred to as "more bang for a buck."

In the President's budget message submitted to Congress this year, it was stated:

We expect to improve the combat effectiveness of our forces by the application of new weapons and new techniques, and ultimately achieve far greater flexibility than heretofore attainable. (Budget message, p. M39.)

Further, in the same message it was stated:

Under the long-range plan recommended by the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the number of Army divisions may be less than those currently organized, but increased mobility and the availability of modern weapons will provide each division with increasingly greater striking power (ibid., p. M44).

Also in the President's state of the Union message, we were assured by President Eisenhower that—

As we enter this new year, our military power continues to grow.

More recently, we have been assured by the Secretary of Defense, in his recently released semiannual report, that, in Secretary Wilson's words:

We have devised a strategy that permits the selection of those force elements and weapons systems which provide the greatest combat effectiveness. (Semiannual report, March 15, 1954, p. 2.)

In the Secretary of the Army's section of the same report, we were told by Secretary Stevens, in his words:

We are continuing to take every possible step to increase the combat effectiveness of units. (Semiannual report, p. 18.)

Mr. Chairman, to keep the record straight, and that we may go into this defense appropriation with our eyes open, it is necessary to review briefly the most recent testimony of Army leaders regarding what this budget has done to the Army's combat effectiveness.

It is clear from what I have recalled above that most of our top defense officials have assured us that we have not altered our military combat effectiveness. But let us be reminded of the views of Gen. Matthew Ridgway and Secretary of the Army Robert T. Stevens on this question.

In testimony before the appropriations subcommittee for the Department of the Army, the Army Chief of Staff, General Ridgway, was asked this question:

Do you feel under this budget * * * that the Army will be able to maintain or increase combat effectiveness above the present level?

General Ridgway's reply was:

No, sir; I would not think we can improve combat effectiveness. I think all the improvements that are going on all the time will increase the relative combat effectiveness unit-for-unit, but a reduction in the order of magnitude that we are making will certainly when completed leave us with less combat effectiveness than we had when we started. (Hearings, p. 54.)

Further, General Ridgway was asked:

Then those new weapons will not be of particular benefit to you in replacing ground forces during the coming fiscal year?

Answered General Ridgway:

I think that is a fair statement; yes, sir. (Hearings, p. 54.)

General Ridgway was backed up in his estimate of the situation by Army Secreary Stevens, who also said:

It is true, as the general indicated, that the overall combat effectiveness of the Army by the end of 1955, even with gains we could

make with improved weapons, will be somewhat less than it is today. (Hearings, p. 55.)

Let us all be aware, Mr. Speaker, of these significant statements by the Army Chief of Staff and the Secretary of the Army. Our Army's combat effectiveness is being decreased in the coming year. Whether this is being made up by the development of other weapons, in other branches, is debatable. I suppose it depends to a great extent on how much value you are willing to place today on the foot soldier. It seems quite clear that this administration is placing less emphasis on ground forces.

What we have here, in the testimony of General Ridgway and Secretary Stevens, are words of warning regarding the combat effectiveness of our Army. During the coming year the calculated risk is being increased. The American people should be informed of this greater gamble; and high tribute should be paid to General Ridgway and Secretary Stevens for their forthright words of warning.

The situation is perhaps best summed up by General Ridgway's candid observation:

The Army has been guided in the preparation of this budget by basic economic and strategic decisions which have been made at a higher level. (Hearings, p. 42.)

Let us note especially the Chief of Staff's expression of concern because, in his words:

We are steadily reducing Army forces—a reduction through which our capabilities will be lessened while our responsibilities for meeting the continuing enemy threat remain unchanged. (Hearings, p. 34.)

Finally, Mr. Chairman, the record should show the following disturbing fact. Let all my colleagues listen carefully to these words of Gen. Matthew Ridgway:

The military power ratio between western defense capability and the Soviet bloc's offensive capability is not changing to our advantage. (Hearings, p. 43.)

All of this reminds me of Adlai Stevenson's advice:

Let's talk sense to the American people.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Roosevelt: At line 12, page 6, after the figure "$4,150,479,000", insert the following: "plus such other amounts, from the funds available to the Commodity Credit Corporation for price support to producers of milk, butterfat and the products of milk and butterfat, which the Secretary of the Army requires in order to make available to each of the persons herein described, a minimum daily ration of 1 quart of whole fluid milk in addition to such other amounts of milk products to which he is entitled."

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Would the gentleman withhold his point of order?

Mr. FORD. I would be glad to reserve the point of order.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment is very simple. It says that the milk ration for the men in the Armed Forces will be increased from 1 glass of milk a day, which is the present ration, to 1 quart of milk a day. That does not seem very much for the boys who are drafted into our Armed Forces. May I say that this amendment will cost the Federal Government nothing; in fact, it will actually save the Federal Government dollars and cents.

This is important to the dairy farmers of our country. I might point out that the State of New York is the second most productive State of dairy products, so it is important to my State. It is important to them for this reason, that this will use 10 percent of the surplus. But, it is more important than just using 10 percent of the surplus. If that surplus goes into dried milk, into butter, into cheese, and then into storage, it means a limited return to the dairy farmer, but if it is sold as fluid milk, the dairy farmer gets in dollars and cents about half again as much for that product.

Mr. Chairman, if this amendment is adopted, it will save the Federal Government the cost of storing this surplus in the form of butter, cheese, and dried milk. That is a very expensive operation at the present time, and that cost to the Federal Government through the Commodity Credit Corporation will be saved. Therefore, since this is merely transferring funds already appropriated for purchasing and storing surplus milk, so as to use it in its fluid condition for the benefit of men and women in our Armed Forces, this will not cost Uncle Sam a dime. In fact, it will save Uncle Sam present storage costs. It seems to me that this amendment has great merit for the better health of our Armed Forces and for the economic drive to save money for our taxpayers. It will mean an increase in the income of our dairy farmers at a time when they are suffering a serious reduction.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I want to join with the gentleman and also commend him for offering this amendment. This is a very important amendment to California, like it is to New York, and I think the gentleman has a very constructive way to handle a very distressing and troublesome surplus.

I am also very sorry that a point of order was raised against it, but I appreciate that points of order must be raised in certain situations. But I hope we can find some way to put into effect what the gentleman has in mind in order to help dairy farmers who are now in great distress in various parts of the country.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I, too, want to commend the gentleman. I think the gentleman ought to point out to the Members of the House who are on the floor today that the daily ration of fluid milk in the armed services is one-half pint.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. It is a glass of milk, such as the glass that I hold in my hand. That is all that our boys in the Armed Forces are getting today.

Mr. MILLER of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. MILLER of Kansas. I should like to say that the same condition applies in Kansas. We also have an extensive dairy industry there. I think we can all agree that this Government could not furnish any more nourishing food to our soldiers than milk. The very thought that they should be denied a reasonable ration when we have it in surplus is something which this Congress must consider.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. May I add for the benefit of the gentleman that all this amendment will do is to take 10 percent of our present surplus and, instead of putting it into storage, to put it into muscle and bone and the health and welfare of our boys in the armed services.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me further?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I am glad to yield.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman is now referring to domestically produced milk?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. This is all domestically produced milk; yes. This is in fluid, fresh form. That is the way my amendment reads.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. FORD. The gentleman on March 6 circularized by letter all the members of this subcommittee. And, speaking for the subcommittee, I appropriate the method by which he contacted us in reference to this amendment. Subsequent to the receipt of the gentleman's letter I checked with the Army to find out the facts from the Department's side. I have information here which indicates, in reply to the contentions made by the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROOSEVELT] that several statements in his letter, while they may be technically correct, in practical effect are inaccurate and misleading. For example, the statement made that each individual has an allowance of one-half pint per day is, I suspect, probably true, but the net amount that each individual gets—and they have made a number of tests throughout the Army—is up to a pint and a half of milk for his own consumption.

I believe the Army, Navy, and Air Force should emphasize milk consumption by all personnel, however, the method suggested by the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROOSEVELT] is not the practical way to accomplish the desired result.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. ROOSEVELT was given permission to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. ROOSEVELT. In cooking the daily ration of the Armed Forces some dairy products are presently used. That, in my opinion, should continue and my amendment contemplates that. All I say is that the enlisted men and women

should be entitled, instead of their present allotment of 1 glass of fluid milk per day, to receive 1 quart of fluid milk per day.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I yield.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has again expired.

Mr. SIKES. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, that the gentleman may have an additional minute so that I may make an observation.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIKES. I think what the gentleman is trying to do is a very fine thing. I do not believe anybody in the House would want to prevent it. However, I do think it should be pointed out that there is certainly no disposition on the part of the Army or on the part of the Congress to prevent the soldiers having more milk if they want it. The practical sense of the situation is that the wishes of the troops have been taken under consideration. Many of them prefer tea or coffee to milk. It is not actually a matter of denying them additional milk. It is a question of giving them what they prefer. I agree with the gentleman that it would be a fine thing if they consumed more milk.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Let me say to the gentleman that from my own personal experience in destroyers in the last war—and I had 5 years riding tin cans—that the first thing my enlisted men did when they hit the beach was to go for a glass of milk. They may like coffee, too, and I am not saying that they should not have coffee, even though the price goes through the roof. Also, they may like tea. But I know that the enlisted men of this country would be a lot better off if they had more milk.

Mr. SIKES. Of course, the gentleman knows that it is very difficult to store fresh milk on a destroyer.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Yes; that is a difficult situation.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I press the point of order, based on the fact that this amendment seeks to change existing law, first; secondly, it seeks to provide funds other than those provided in the act; and, thirdly, I believe it seeks to place additional duties on the Secretary of the Army.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROOSEVELT] desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Yes, Mr. Chairman.

May I say in opposition to my friend on the point of order that this does not change existing law insofar as appropriations have been made. As I pointed out, this does not call for any new appropriation. It merely marks the transfer of existing appropriations for dispensation in accordance with the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule.

The Chair is of the opinion that the amendment is legislation on an appropriation bill, and that the point of order is well taken. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the high-school ROTC program, since its inception, has been one of the most important reserve training programs offered by the armed services. It has been of great value to the high-school students and to the Army. It has earned the high commendation of those participating in the program, of the school officials supervising the program, and of leaders in the community. Yet, several years ago, for some unknown reason, the Army undertook to cut down the program to a level which amounted to its destruction.

I testified before the Armed Services subcommittee urging support for the high-school ROTC program, and I am grateful that the committee agreed with my views by allowing the full amount requested by the Bureau of the Budget for this training program. If I may have the attention of the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD], I should like to refer his attention to the bottom of page 16, wherein the following paragraph appears:

> The committee is concerned about another area in the utilization of manpower, where it feels that an increase in the numbers of military personnel assigned might well be justified. In recent years the numbers of military men assigned to the junior Reserve Officers' Training Corps program has been decreased, and the budget estimate makes no reference to an increase. The committee suggests that the Army might find it possible to utilize some of the spaces found unnecessary elsewhere in the sphere of high-school ROTC instruction, particularly where the local community vigorously supports the program.

I should like to ask the gentleman whether it is not the intention of the subcommittee that the junior ROTC program be operated on an efficient and strong basis—one which will permit the high schools in cities such as Chicago to maintain a large effective program. Is not that the intention of the Appropriations Committee, I ask the gentleman?

Mr. FORD. The question asked by the gentleman from Illinois can be answered this way: The committee made no change in the dollar amounts that were requested by the Department of the Army for the high-school program. The funds requested for that program were fully allowed. In addition, the committee felt that the Department of the Army should vigorously and aggressively support those communities which have, in turn, actively supported the high-school ROTC program.

As the gentleman has pointed out to our committee on two occasions, in the hearings last year and again in the hearings this year, the city of Chicago does actively and aggressively believe in the program. We in the committee think that the Army should return that kind of enthusiasm with equal enthusiasm by the Army itself.

Mr. YATES. I thank the gentleman, not only for his part in approving the budget request, but as well for having helped me in my efforts to restore the program to the status it enjoyed prior to the unwarranted reduction by the Department of the Army. There has been a restoration in the staff of military instructors in Chicago high schools since we began our fight over a year ago. The program has not yet received the necessary staff employed prior to the reduction by the Army, but the outrageous cuts that had been made by the Department of the Army have been corrected in great measure. Today there are 13 officers and 53 enlisted men in the Chicago schools handling the ROTC program. Fourteen to 17 Chicago high schools have only 1 enlisted instructor. This is still an insufficient number even though it is an improvement over what it was in the past. In order for the Chicago high-school program to be operated properly, the bare minimum requirement for Army personnel is 16 officers and 70 enlisted men, and I trust that the Department of the Army will take immediate steps to assign this number of instructors to the Chicago school program.

In the testimony that appears on page 927 of the hearings, in response to questions from the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD], Colonel Lindeman testified that when ROTC units in high schools do not meet certain quotas, the training programs are dropped. I know it is the intention of the Appropriations Committee, in view of the fact that the program is so well appreciated and supported so vigorously in the city of Chicago, that as other high-school ROTC units are dropped, their instructor personnel will be made available for duty in the schools of Chicago.

Mr. BROOKS of Lousiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YATES. I yield.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I think the tendency all over the United States has been to cut down the staff of the junior ROTC. I think it is deplorable that that tendency has occurred. There is great enthusiasm for the junior ROTC. They have done an excellent job and it is very popular wherever it has been inaugurated and carried on. I am very glad that the gentleman has taken an interest in it. I would like to add one more word. We need a new ROTC bill covering both junior and senior ROTC's. We need some reorganization. We need a little more efficiency, and we need to place just a little more emphasis and more importance upon the ROTC program. I hope that we can come to the Congress within a reasonable period of time with a new ROTC bill completely overhauling and revamping the program of both the junior and senior ROTC.

Mr. YATES. I thank the gentleman for his remarks.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph do now close.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Maintenance and operations

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for the maintenance and opera-

tion of the Army, including administration and rentals at the seat of government; medical and dental care of personnel entitled thereto by law or regulation (including charges of private facilities for care of military personnel on duty or leave, except elective private treatment), and other measures necessary to protect the health of the Army; disposition of remains, including those of all Army personnel who die while on active duty; chaplains' activities; awards and medals; welfare and recreation; information and educational services for the Armed Forces; recruiting expenses; subsistence of prisoners at disciplinary barracks, and of civilian employees as authorized by law; expenses of apprehension and delivery of prisoners escaped from disciplinary barracks, including payment of rewards not exceeding $25 in any one case, and expenses of confinement of such prisoners in nonmilitary facilities; donations of not to exceed $25 to each prisoner upon each release from confinement in a disciplinary barracks; military courts, boards, and commissions; authorized issues of articles for use of applicants for enlistment and persons in military custody; civilian clothing, not to exceed $30 in cost, to be issued each person upon each release from confinement in an Army prison and to each soldier discharged otherwise than honorably, or sentenced by a civil court to confinement in a civil prison, or interned or discharged as an alien enemy; transportation services; communications services, including construction of communication systems; maps and similar data for military purposes; military surveys and engineering planning; alteration, extension, and repair of structures and property; acquisition of lands (not exceeding $5,000 for any one parcel), easements, rights-of-way, and similar interests in land, and, in administering the provisions of 43 U. S. C. 315q, rentals may be paid in advance; utility services for buildings erected at private cost, as authorized by law (10 U. S. C. 1346), and buildings on military reservations authorized by Army regulations to be used for a similar purpose; purchase of ambulances; hire of passenger motor vehicles; tuition and fees incident to training of military personnel at civilian institutions; field exercises and maneuvers, including payments in advance for rentals or options to rent land; expenses for the Reserve Officers' Training Corps and other units at educational institutions, as authorized by law; exchange fees, and losses in the accounts of disbursing officers or agents in accordance with law; expenses of inter-American cooperation, as authorized for the Navy by law (5 U. S. C. 421f) for Latin-American cooperation; not to exceed $4,396,400 for emergencies and extraordinary expenses, to be expended on the approval or authority of the Secretary of the Army, and payments may be made on his certificate of necessity for confidential military purposes, and his determination shall be final and conclusive upon the accounting officers of the Government; $2,792,179,000.

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROOSEVELT] offered an amendment in regard to the consumption of milk in the Armed Forces which the Chair has just ruled out of order.

At this time, I wish to call the attention of the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROOSEVELT] to the fact that I have introduced a bill, H. R. 8600, and that a companion bill has been introduced by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY]. Both of these bills have been referred to the Armed Services Committee. My bill and Mr. COOLEY's bill increase the daily allowance of milk, butter, and cheese in the Navy ration and require corresponding changes in the Army and Air Force ration. Both my colleague, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY], and I would gratefully accept the support of the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROOSEVELT] and any other Members of Congress in securing a hearing for our bills before the Armed Services Committee. I have written to all the members of the Armed Services Committee requesting such a hearing.

If our bills are enacted, the consumption of fresh milk or its equivalent by the armed services will be tripled. The use of cheese will be doubled and the consumption of butter will be increased substantially. The bills provide for an increase in the daily allowance of fresh milk for Navy personnel from one-half pint to one quart. The evaporated milk ration would be raised from 4 ounces to 1 pint, the powdered milk ration would be increased from 1 to 4 ounces and the cheese ration would be boosted from one-half ounce to 1 ounce.

The bills direct the President, under his administrative authority, to make like amounts of dairy products available to members of the other armed services.

I agree with the remarks of the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROOSEVELT] that the amount of milk available to our soldiers, sailors, and marines is tragically low. I believe there is no sense in worrying about so-called surpluses of butter and milk when much of it could be used to provide an adequate diet for the men who defend our country.

The equivalent of 2.6 billion pounds of whole milk from our domestic production was consumed by the armed services last year. They used 900 million pounds of fluid milk and cream; 103 million pounds of condensed and evaporated milk; 14 million pounds of dried whole milk; 10 million pounds of dried skim milk; 98 million pounds of ice cream, and 43 million pounds of butter. Although this may sound like a lot, still when you break it down to individual consumption figures, it becomes an unwisely low amount. I am convinced that the bills introduced by Congressman COOLEY and myself could very well be a partial answer to the dairy surplus problem that confronts our Nation. I also believe that we are not faced with a problem of overproduction, but rather one of underconsumption.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DONOHUE: On page 8, line 21, after the dollar sign, strike out "$2,792,179,000", and insert in lieu thereof "$2,795,722,986."

Mr. DONOHUE. 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 Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Chairman, the fundamental purpose of this amendment is to enable the Secretary of Defense, through the Army Surgeon General, to carry out Presidential instructions to provide adequate medical and dental care for military personnel and their families.

The immediate objective of this amendment is to enable the Department of the Army to continue the full operation of Murphy Army General Hospital, located in Waltham, Mass.

Testimony given by high military officials at a public meeting here yesterday revealed the Surgeon General does not want to close this admittedly superior medical facility. Statistics and charts of the treatment and services rendered at this hospital from its inception to this date demonstrated the resources of the hospital have been consistently and fully utilized. There is, therefore, no question and no doubt concerning the positive need for this medical military unit.

The location of the hospital, adjacent to Boston, Mass., one of the greatest and largest medical centers in the world, is an admittedly superior advantage over most other like hospitals. Patients are thereby accorded the particular benefit of observation and diagnosis, upon emergency, by some of the leading specialists and consultant civilian doctors in the country, without any obstacle of lengthy travel or contact difficulties. The military professional hospital staff is thereby easily afforded the educational and inspirational opportunity of intimate association with the most learned and experienced medical authorities in the Nation. Doctors, military personnel, and their dependents can go or be brought to the hospital in the speediest fashion as the highway routes are of the most modern type and Boston possesses one of the largest and most efficient railroad and air terminals in this country.

However, those are only a few of the physical factors involved. This general hospital is practically the only military hospital in the First Army area. It is designed to serve not only Massachusetts but the entire New England area and most of New York and parts of New Jersey.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONOHUE. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. It is the only military general hospital east of Valley Forge.

Mr. DONOHUE. That is right. Military officials have stated that that particular area is the densest recruiting area in the country.

If this hospital should close, those needing treatment would have to go, at great hardship, as far away as the general hospital in Pennsylvania or Walter Reed in Washington.

Mr. Chairman, the highest Government sources have expressed grave concern over the many and increasing signs of lowering morale among our present and potential military personnel. In my considered judgment, it is axiomatic that a military unit is no better than the spirit existing among its members, and the morale of their families behind them, despite whatever powerful war weapons that may be possessed. I believe, and I am sure you will all agree, it is only commonsense to judge that assurances to military personnel and their dependents that their medical needs will be fully and completely provided for is the

major factor in the maintenance of a high spirit and morale.

I must confess I know not how to measure morale and spirit in dollars and cents. As a Member of Congress, I am as vitally interested in promoting economy as anyone, but I emphatically feel, while we are granting billions to questionable allies, a comparatively small expenditure to insure an essential high spirit and morale in our fighting forces and their dependents is a very sound investment in the security of this Nation.

With the threatening shadow of Indochina hanging over us, no man can foretell the future. In the patriotic objective of preventing any further disastrous decline in our Armed Forces morale, I most earnestly and sincerely request and urge you, my colleagues, to unanimously approve this amendment in the national interest.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the closing of this hospital is in line with the overall program of the Department of the Army to accomplish its job effectively and well with a reduction in expenditures and a cutback in troop strength. I know of no other way that you can cut back expenditures except by making some change in a previous program that costs more.

The Army's program called for a closing of a total of three hospitals. The hospital in Massachusetts was one of the three selected. I think the Army has tried to make an intelligent evaluation of the necessity for this facility. The facts, as I understand them, are as follows: The total bed capacity is slightly over 500.

According to information that has been given to me, the facility has been used approximately 75 percent of the time. The average bed occupancy has been approximately 75 percent. I refer you to a statement placed in the RECORD by the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LANE] at page A3069 in the daily CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of yesterday. In other words, this facility in the State of Massachusetts has been used approximately 75 percent of the time for the past year.

It must be pointed out also that within a distance of 30 miles from Murphy General Hospital is Fort Devens. At Fort Devens they have a hospital facility which has a potential capacity of 800 beds. For the past year the hospital facilities at Camp Devens have been utilized approximately 80 percent.

The facility at Fort Devens is adequate in the estimation of the Army to handle the additional burden or patient load thrown upon it if Murphy General Hospital is closed.

In addition to the troops that are stationed in Fort Devens—as I understand there are around 12,000 or 15,000—there are only 4,000 additional military personnel in the area which the Murphy General Hospital serves. In other words, you wish to keep in operation a hospital that would serve only 4,000 additional personnel, when in reality the hospital at Fort Devens could adequately take care of this load.

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. HESELTON. It is my understanding that the Fort Devens Hospital is what you call a station hospital. It has no nursery; consequently, the benefits to the dependents of servicemen will be cut off entirely. I think I am stating the facts in connection with it.

Mr. FORD. The Department of the Army has tried to set standards for the closing of hospital facilities. Under this criterion, as I understand it, a hospital must have a record of 88-percent utilization. As I indicated before, the Murphy Army Hospital just does not meet that criteria.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GAVIN. I understand—maybe the gentleman can correct me if I am wrong—that no hospital is ever used to 100-percent capacity. The best that can be taken care of at any time is about 80 percent. If this hospital is being utilized to 88-percent capacity then they are overcrowded, I would say.

Mr. FORD. This hospital is not being used up to the standard set by the Army.

Mr. GAVIN. Does the gentleman mean the Murphy Army Hospital?

Mr. FORD. The Murphy Army Hospital; yes.

Mr. GAVIN. It has been used. I visited the hospital as a member of the Hospital Subcommittee of the Committee on the Armed Services when an attempt was made to close it in 1950, and it has been used ever since.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

(On request of Mr. SIKES, and by unanimous consent, Mr. FORD was allowed to proceed for 5 additional minutes.)

Mr. GAVIN. We have been there to look over that hospital. It is a very important hospital to Massachusetts and the area, and, in my opinion, it would be a drastic mistake if the Department of the Army were to close it up. It is needed, and needed badly.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. SIKES. I dislike very much to find myself in disagreement with my very able friend from Massachusetts [Mr. DONOHUE], and other members of the committee who want to see this hospital continued. I certainly would not willingly subscribe to the denial of any needed medical facilities for our Armed Forces. However, I do want to second what the chairman of the Army Subcommittee has stated. This is the best judgment of the Department of the Army, considering the budget under which they must operate and the troop strength for which they must provide medical facilities. It is an effort on their part to carry on a more efficient operation and at the same time to utilize more effectively the limited number of doctors and nurses that are available. We must take those things into consideration and I think we are on sound ground when we follow the recommendations made to the committee by the Department of the Army.

Mr. FORD. I thank the gentleman.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. General Hershey's office as of yesterday said that the number of soldier personnel being served out in Arkansas, which has not been closed, was 98,000, whereas the soldier personnel that would be served and is being served by the Murphy Army Hospital, and they take patients direct from New York, is several hundred thousand.

Mr. FORD. I may say to the distinguished gentlewoman from Massachusetts that I regret exceedingly the accusations that have been made that one geographical area was being preferred over another. I do not think that was the basis upon which the decision was made. If we want to be sectional about this situation, I may say that in the State of Michigan we have a hospital closed within the last 6 months. I daresay if you wanted to add up all the people who would be served in that area it would equally match the population figures cited by the distinguished gentlewoman from Massachusetts. We have to rely upon the intelligent, conscientious determinations made by the people in the Army who are, I believe, without any sectional preferences.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BATES. May I say to the gentleman that we met for 4½ hours yesterday with representatives of the Army on this very matter, and I can say further to the gentleman that a final determination by the Army has not been made. The information has been filed by us and offered to the Army on yesterday and it will be offered to Secretary Stevens at the earliest opportunity. But here is the strange position we find ourselves in: Unless the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts is agreed to there will be no way by which the Army can operate this hospital, regardless of what determination they might make. In fact, it does not do any good unless we have the funds with which to operate.

Mr. FORD. The record should be made clear that for the Surgeon General's utilization in this bill we have around $179 million in fiscal 1955 for the operation of hospitals, medical care, and related activities. I cannot help but believe that if a decision was made by the responsible people in the Department of the Army to continue the operation of Murphy Army Hospital, that out of the $179 million available for this program the Department could find adequate funds to keep Murphy Army Hospital open between July 1 and December 31. Certainly, they could exist, and then they could come back to the Congress in January for a supplemental. This committee, if the responsible officials in the Army want funds to keep that fine hospital open, would certainly concur.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD] be permitted to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. BATES. I will say to the gentleman from Michigan that certainly was our hope when we had the hearing yesterday.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, by the way, they said that this was excluded before the budget came up, that is, any appropriation for Murphy Army Hospital, is that correct; that this would have to be done in order for them to carry it on?

Mr. BATES. Unless this action is taken today, the hospital cannot possibly remain open during the coming fiscal year.

Mr. FORD. I will say to the gentleman from Massachusetts that if he will turn to the hearings on page 746, it indicates that the Department of the Army on March 15 said that they had closed Percy Jones Hospital in Battle Creek, Mich., and they were going to close two more.

Mr. BATES. They did not say anything on page 746 about the Murphy Army Hospital.

Mr. FORD. Earlier in the hearings, General Palmer, who is G-4 in the Army, on page 247 of the printed hearings, listed the facilities that were to be closed in fiscal 1954. Six have been closed and six more are to be closed. He lists on page 247 the closing of Murphy Army Hospital, so that on March 1, anyhow, according to the printed record, this hospital facility was to be closed.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman referred to the fact that recommendations by the Army were made, and I assume he meant from the Surgeon General, because this is in connection with hospitalization.

Mr. FORD. I am referring to the responsible people in the Army who have the job of making such recommendations.

Mr. McCORMACK. And certainly the gentleman would concede that the Surgeon General would be one of them.

Mr. FORD. He certainly is a qualified person, but I must say, and we all know that oftentimes someone in a position as responsible as the Surgeon General has his decision overruled by higher authority.

Mr. McCORMACK. The Surgeon General certainly would be one of those officials, would he not?

Mr. FORD. That is right.

Mr. McCORMACK. On October 5, 1953, I received a letter from Surg. Gen. George E. Armstrong in which he said in reply to my letter:

The current plans of the Army Medical Service do not contemplate that Murphy Army Hospital will be declared surplus to the needs of the Department of the Army. Murphy Army Hospital presently is scheduled to continue in operation as a specialized treatment center.

I asked General Carter yesterday, "Now, I construe that to mean not only to the end of the fiscal year but at least next fiscal year." And he agreed that that was a reasonable interpretation. I asked him yesterday if there was any different situation: "Is there just as much need now for Murphy Army Hospital as a specialized treatment center today as there was on October 5?" And he said, "Yes."

Mr. FORD. We have to go by the printed record which is submitted to us, and on page 247 of the hearings testimony by General Palmer, G-4, of the Army, indicates that Murphy Army Hospital was surplus to the needs of the Department of the Army.

Mr. McCORMACK. That was as of what date?

Mr. FORD. March 1.

Mr. McCORMACK. Well, the representative of the Surgeon General said yesterday the first notice he got was March 17. Is that not correct?

Mr. BATES. I believe that is correct.

Mr. McCORMACK. And on February 12 I had a letter from Secretary Stevens over his own signature that the decision had not been made and that a survey was being made.

Mr. BATES. And General Carter said also on page 746 of the hearings that the Army-Navy Hospital in Arkansas was going to be closed. Now he has changed his point of view in that particular respect. The point that I was trying to make with the gentleman was this: We had a 4½-hour hearing on yesterday. Mr. Young, a representative of the Secretary, said that he would convey to the Secretary the remarks which the Representatives from Massachusetts made, but that if the Secretary makes the determination that it is necessary to continue the operation of a hospital in Waltham, Mass., he will not have the funds, according to Mr. Young.

Mr. FORD. May I answer the statement by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES]? This bill will undoubtedly be approved here today with or without the funds requested. But if without—in other words, if this amendment is defeated—then the bill will go to the Senate. I am certain that this bill will not be approved in that distinguished body within the next month or two. The Army will have adequate time to make up its mind as to whether or not it should reverse itself in reference to Murphy General Hospital.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

(By unanimous consent (at the request of Mr. McCORMACK), Mr. FORD was granted an additional 2 minutes.)

Mr. BATES. I should say to the gentleman that it would work the other way, too.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. Of course, I think my friend recognizes that just turning this over to the other body puts us in a rather uncomfortable position. Here we have the distinguished Speaker of the House from Massachusetts; the distinguished ranking Republican of the Committee on Appropriations from the district in Massachusetts adjoining mine; the chairman of the Armed Services Committee of the Senate from Massachusetts. And here is a promise that we got that they would keep this hospital open. The gentleman's committee has done well, but they ought not to oppose this in the light of this evidence.

Mr. FORD. I will say that the potency of the opposition which I face here today, to be very realistic, is overwhelming. Nevertheless, the facts justify our position in opposing the amendment. We have just checked with the Department of the Army, and information has been given to me that instead of the $3,500,000 that the gentleman from Massachusetts has asked for in his amendment, in reality, the only amount that is needed in this section of the bill, "Maintenance and operation," for the continuation of Murphy General Hospital in fiscal year 1955, is $739,896.

Mr. DONOHUE. Those were the figures given to us by the Surgeon General's Office of the Department of the Army only yesterday.

Mr. FORD. The point that I am making is that to keep a hospital open you do not put all the money into the maintenance and operation portion of the bill. There should be a part of the additional funds in military personnel, Army, section.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I just want to say this in this connection.

Whether or not this hospital is to be kept open or closed must, of course, ultimately rest in the decision of the Department of the Army.

The Subcommittee on the Army who heard the testimony from the military officials, the subcommittee headed by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD] who has just spoken, made available every dollar requested for hospital purposes, except for certain reductions resulting from a decrease in the price levels in respect to certain supplies to be acquired for those hospitals.

As a Representative from the State of Massachusetts I have, of course, been greatly interested in this hospital, in the light of the need which so many people in the community feel should be sufficient to bring about favorable action on the part of the Department of the Army.

The Massachusetts delegation for a considerable period of time has been doing everything in its power to bring about a favorable decision. Only yesterday, as the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES] has pointed out, there was a long conference with officials of the Department of the Army with a view to presenting further evidence to this end.

I have this morning received a letter signed by Mr. T. A. Young, Special Assistant to the Secretary of the Army,

which under leave to extend my remarks I include at this point in the RECORD:

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF THE ARMY,
Washington, D. C., April 29, 1954.

Hon. RICHARD B. WIGGLESWORTH,
Chairman, Armed Services Subcommittee, Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: In accordance with the request received as to the current status of the Murphy Army Hospital, I should like to submit to you the following information:

The Murphy Army Hospital in Waltham, Mass., was approved for inactivation in March of this year, the inactivation to be effective in June of this year. Subsequent to the approval of the inactivation of this facility, the Secretary of the Army directed that the matter be reviewed. This review is currently underway and information submitted by the various Members of the Massachusetts delegation, which was submitted to the Department of the Army representatives on April 28, during a hearing called at the request of the Massachusetts delegation, will be considered during the course of this review.

Pending completion of this review and final determination of the Secretary of the Army concerning the future status of the Murphy Army Hospital, no further action is contemplated toward the inactivation of this facility.

With highest personal regards, I am
Sincerely yours,

T. A. YOUNG,
Special Assistant to the Secretary of the Army.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. As you will note, the letter points out that a decision was taken in March to inactivate the hospital in June, that subsequently the Secretary of the Army directed that the matter be reviewed, that the review is still underway, and that pending completion of the review and final determination by the Secretary of the Army concerning the future status of the hospital, no further action is contemplated toward the inactivation of this facility.

Under the circumstances, as a personal matter I shall support the appropriation of whatever funds are necessary for the continuation of the operation of the hospital with the understanding that if the decision of the Secretary is favorable to continuing the operation of the hospital the funds will be available, and that if it is unfavorable the funds will not be utilized and will revert to the Treasury.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I feel compelled at this time to take the floor in defense of Murphy General Hospital.

In 1950, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Hospitalization of the Committee on Armed Services, I and the members of that committee traveled 7,000 miles over this Nation reviewing the hospitals at the time when the then Secretary of Defense, Louis Johnson, embarked on the program of cutting the hospitalization in the armed services of this country. Murphy General was one of them. We went to Waltham, Mass., and went over every nook and cranny of that institution. The gentlemen from Massachusetts [Mr. DONOHUE and Mr. PHILBIN] came along and gave us abundant testimony on the need for this institution. The Surgeon General then was very much exercised about the unwarranted closing of this fine institution in the First Army area.

We saw the hospital installation at Fort Devens, which was not fit for human habitation, and it was our conclusion and recommendation that we retain and maintain Murphy General for the needs of the Army, their dependents, and for the good of the service, and to be particularly available for the First Army area, in which it was located.

We ought to keep this hospital. It is one of the few, I understand, in our military admitted to the American Hospital Association.

We do not know what is coming by those who are sponsoring our active participation in Indochina, but let me tell you this: Whether it be the First Army area, the Second Army area, or the Tenth Army area, every section of this Nation will be in that war or any other war if and when we participate in one. We need this hospital. We have jumping-off places in New England in case of a conflict, and you know that. No part of this Nation is totally independent of any other. We have to keep our hospitalization program a well rounded one. I do not know what funds are necessary to keep this fine institution in active operation, but I know this: I will bet my bottom dollar that the Surgeon General of the United States wants it, and if the budget will permit, I guarantee he will tell you that he wants to keep it open. I think we owe a responsibility to that area of this country in which the First Army Corps is located. We owe a responsibility to those fine people who are so actively participating in our overall defense effort. We owe a responsibility to the mission that this institution fulfills, and we owe a responsibility to our military. Let us vote whatever money is necessary, and let us tell the military and the Department of Defense and the Department of the Army that it is the sense of this Congress that that hospital be not closed; that its mission be sustained, that its mission be delineated, and that its mission, if necessary, be legislated here today. I make no reflection upon my fine colleague on the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations for the Military Establishment—you have done a fine job, but we all have a responsibility. Let us give these people and let us give this section of our country in the First Army area adequate hospitalization—anything short of that is not only foolhardy but very shortsighted and lacking in vision. Let us vote for this appropriation today.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS].

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, as chairman of the Massachusetts Republican delegation, I asked the Massachusetts Members and other interested persons to join in a meeting yesterday to consider certain facts in regard to the Murphy General Hospital in Waltham, Mass. I am delighted to state that the entire Massachusetts delegation gave their complete cooperation, and may I say that I am very grateful indeed that all of the Members of the delegation were represented. I am also very grateful for the cooperation of the Department of the Army and Department of Defense for sending down to this meeting high-ranking personnel to answer questions in regard to this very important matter.

I called this meeting yesterday for two reasons. I think it was important to obtain the facts in regard to the closing of the Murphy General Hospital in Waltham, Mass. The people of Massachusetts, as well as all of their Representatives in the Congress, and all other interested parties, certainly have a right to know these facts. Secondly, and what is to me much more important, I called this meeting to find out the constructive ways and means of keeping this hospital open. We are more concerned with keeping it open than we are with details surrounding its closing.

The categorical statement had been made that the Murphy General Hospital in Waltham was closed in order that a hospital in Arkansas might be kept open. It has been alleged that the closing of the Murphy Hospital was brought about by political pressure and political considerations. At this hearing yesterday this allegation was discussed and was quite precisely, quite definitely, and quite accurately considered.

It is my view our country is facing very grave times. The international situation is serious. In spite of our desires for peace and our prayers for peace we do not know at this time the course this great Nation must follow. Freedom is challenged and a challenge to the existence of freedom is a challenge to the existence of America.

In order to be constructive and to be helpful, and in view of this tense international situation, I suggest to the Department of the Army and to the Department of Defense that facilities such as the Murphy General Hospital not be closed. I request that the Murphy General Hospital be kept open for another year or until we have a chance to ascertain and determine whether or not its facilities will be required because of war, and God forbid that war should come. In my view, this is no time to be reducing the facilities which have a relationship upon the defense of our country. We cannot talk big at Geneva and talk little to the people of Massachusetts and other communities throughout this Nation.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out that when the Murphy General Hospital was closed in 1950 against my protest and over the protests of a great many in the First Corps area, it was only 2 or 3 months afterward that the so-called police action was declared in Korea, the terrific Korean conflict was underway and the Department of the Army was forced to open and reactivate the Murphy General Hospital. It is very costly to close a large facility such as the Murphy General. It is extremely expensive to deactivate a hospital and it is very expensive to reactivate a hospital. In view of the Indochina situation today, I feel somewhat superstitious about closing the Murphy General Hospital at this time. If the hospital is

closed there are no beds available for the military personnel in the First Corps area. From the Public Health Service I am informed there is a shortage of 800,000 beds in hospitals devoted to civilian service. There is a great shortage everywhere. The naval hospital servicing the Boston area is operating at capacity and cannot care for the patients normally served by the Murphy General Hospital. Chelsea Naval Hospital cannot assume such an increase. As a result there is no place for the Murphy patients to go if the Murphy Hospital is closed.

While attending the dedication of the new research laboratory at the Bedford Air Force Base, which is in my district, I talked over problems with a number of the military personnel.

One man said to me, "Mrs. ROGERS, my wife is going to have a baby; and if Murphy Hospital is closed, there is no military hospital in this area where she can go. If I should have to go to Indochina, how am I going to feel going away when there is no hospital available to take care of my wife? Prior to the decision to close it, my wife could be taken care of at the Murphy General Hospital."

Fort Devens also is in my district. There are not enough beds at Fort Devens to care for the additional patients caused by the closing of Murphy General Hospital. There is a shortage of beds everywhere, in both military and civilian hospitals. In view of this fact I hope my colleagues will approve an additional amount in this appropriation sufficient to keep the Murphy General Hospital open.

This order to close the Murphy General Hospital has met with unanimous opposition in Boston and throughout the First Corps area. The people are thoroughly aroused. The people are determined, and so am I, to keep the Murphy General Hospital open and in use. Bankers, businessmen, professional leaders, clergy, in fact everyone regardless of politics, are united in this objective. Everywhere the plea is to keep open the Murphy General Hospital in Waltham.

It is a comparatively easy act for the Congress to order young men and women into the military service, and for them to be sent to the four corners of the world in the defense of our freedom and our way of life. Surely we owe these young Americans our cooperation and our help here at home. Is it asking too much to keep open and in use hospital facilities already constructed and already available for the care not only of these service people but also their dependents while they are giving so much to their country?

Look into your hearts. Look into your own feelings. Listen to your conscience. Is it too much to ask that Murphy General Hospital be kept open in the heart of the greatest medical center in the world, in order to provide proper medical care to those entitled to it and who cannot obtain it elsewhere? Is this too much? My answer is that it certainly is not. I think you, my colleagues, will agree with me.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. PHILBIN].

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment would permit the continued operation of Murphy General Hospital at Waltham, Mass. It has been ably presented and advocated by my very distinguished friend, our esteemed colleague, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. DONOHUE], who represents the district in which the hospital is located. I hope I will not be too repetitious in this matter and that you will bear with me while I review a few of the facts.

At present the hospital is in operation under a suspension order by the Army. This hospital originally cost the Government about $5 million. It serves thousands of armed services personnel, including expectant mothers whose young husbands are spread all over the world protecting our Nation. This is the only general Army hospital in New England. If it is closed, armed services personnel and their dependents will have to go about 400 miles to Valley Forge Hospital at Phoenixville, Pa., to get adequate medical care and treatment.

Murphy General Hospital is well built, well equipped, and well staffed at the present time. I would say to you it commands perhaps the most distinguished medical consultants and specialists in the world. Certainly no metropolitan area anywhere has better or more able or more successful medical experts than the Boston area. Boston is admittedly a great medical center. People come from all over the world to get the benefit of the extraordinary medical skills, care, and hospital treatment that are available in that great city.

Why the Army should ever think of discontinuing this splendid general hospital and leave New England service personnel, their wives and families without proper, available and adequate medical and hospital care is quite beyond my understanding.

This is not the first time that Murphy General Hospital was sought to be closed. Back in 1950, just a few months before Korea, under a previous administration I regret to say, some people who should have known better ordered the closing of this institution. This was done, just as the present proposed closing is urged, in the name of economy.

How ridiculous this situation is. Our Nation is spending billions of dollars for human welfare overseas, and denying proper, adequate medical care and treatment to the defenders of the Nation and their dependents, their wives and children, and even wounded and stricken heroes of Korea. There is absolutely no justification for this closing. There is no possible justification for cutting off the services of this urgently needed installation. The record is filled with testimony that it is urgently needed. The medical branch of the Army, which was never informed of this proposed closing until after the closing order was issued by high level Pentagon pennypinchers, has stated the need. We listened all day to testimony from people who are well informed giving us the facts. We have secured the facts from many reputable sources. We are not relying alone on the judgment of military authorities, but other authorities who know what this situation is. The able Surgeon General of the Army is well aware of the need for this hospital.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILBIN. I yield to my distinguished friend.

Mr. McCORMACK. General Carter testified yesterday before the delegation that there is just as much need today for the specialized treatment of wounded at the Murphy General Hospital as there was when General Armstrong wrote to me on October 5.

Mr. PHILBIN. That is a very impressive piece of evidence. There is indeed just as much need as there was when General Armstrong informed you there was need for this hospital last October. In my opinion, there is a much greater need.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

(By unanimous consent (at the request of Mr. NICHOLSON), Mr. PHILBIN was granted 1 additional minute.)

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILBIN. I yield to my good friend, the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. NICHOLSON. I was going to make some remarks on this meritorious amendment, but after listening to the gentleman's splendid explanation of the question, I do not think it is necessary. I think you have admirably covered every point that should be covered.

Mr. PHILBIN. I thank the able gentleman. I am happy to have his generous comment.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, this is outside of the 5 minutes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LANE] is entitled to. He had been recognized and yielded.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SCRIVNER] asks unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 15 minutes, the first 5 to be used by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LANE]. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Chairman, far be it from me to attempt to prolong this debate; but may I repeat, as has already been stated in this argument on this amendment, that this matter is of grave importance to the membership of Congress from Massachusetts and the entire delegation from New England.

This, Mr. Chairman, is not a party matter. Proof of this is the fact that at the public hearing yesterday we had the present Governor of our Commonwealth, the former Member of the House, the Honorable Christian Herter; also

Senator SALTONSTALL, who is chairman of the Armed Services Committee of the other body; and all the members of the Massachusetts congressional delegation from both the right and left side of the middle aisle, all favoring the retention of Murphy Army Hospital.

I am sorry, Mr. Chairman, that the committee has seen fit to object to or oppose this amendment offered by my colleague, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. DONOHUE], in whose district this hospital is located. This amendment merely seeks to add three-million-odd dollars to the appropriation in order that we may continue the Murphy Army Hospital. I have no quarrel with the committee that studied this matter. It has made a recommendation in reference to the appropriation for the armed services, but as I read their report I find little or nothing in the report that could have been helpful to that committee in deciding whether or not the Murphy Army Hospital should be retained. There was little or nothing said by the officers who testified in the early part of March on page 247, where Lt. Gen. W. B. Palmer stated at that time that the Murphy Army Hospital was under consideration for closing. Since then we find that substantial evidence has been offered, especially on yesterday, to the Members of Congress that the Murphy Army Hospital should be retained.

May I repeat, because of the fact some Members were not present to hear the excellent statement made by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. DONOHUE], that this is the only Army hospital in the First Army area, which includes not only our New England States—Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, Maine, New Hampshire, and Vermont—but also goes into New York and New Jersey. This hospital serves the servicemen and their dependents in that area.

This fine hospital is located in Waltham. It is near Boston, and it is near all those great university units and institutions that we have there. The patients of the Murphy Army Hospital derive the benefit of all the various medical clinics and those specializing in different branches of medicine who are on the staff of the Massachusetts General, Boston City Hospital, Children's Medical Center, Lahey Clinic, New England Medical Center, the Pratt Diagnostic Hospital, and other institutions.

Also, Mr. Chairman, it derives the benefit of the staff of the Harvard Medical College, the Tufts Medical College, and Boston University.

The bed capacity has already been stated as being 515. So it is a substantial unit. Although it was originally established as a station hospital, over the years it has rendered such excellent service to our men in the armed services and our women in the armed services and their families and dependents that it was made a regional hospital and now is an Army general hospital.

May I say that from January 1 of last year up to the early part of this year—a period of a little over 1 year and 3 months—5,313 patients were admitted, of which 2,200-plus were military and 3,000 were civilian. There were 913 maternity cases and 537 military personnel admitted direct from overseas. In that same period of time there were 5,412 patients discharged, of which 2,347 were military and 3,065 civilians, and of the military patients 69 percent returned to duty.

The average daily patient census is 437. Average beds occupied 320—264 are military and 56 civilian. In the outpatient service there were 59,705 visits, including dental service, X-ray service, laboratory service, occupational and physical therapy, and so forth.

During the past 3 months the admissions have increased sizably over the same 3 months of last year by both military and civilian personnel. The cost of running this institution for last year was $3,643,986.

There have been too many off-again, on-again crises involving this hospital. More and more it is beginning to look that the Murphy Army Hospital is being used as a pawn in a game, to the increasing dissatisfaction of all veterans.

Nothing less than a firm commitment from the Department of Defense that it will not abandon this facility at this time will satisfy the New England delegation in Congress. We have been disturbed by raids on our industries. Alerted by this, we shall never permit the closing down of installations maintained by the Federal Government here, in order to transfer them elsewhere, under patronage pressure from other sections of the Nation.

Waltham is a heavily populated area of New England that has more than its share of our servicemen and veterans.

It is near Boston, which is the focal point of the Northeastern United States. Many of our veterans are suffering from sicknesses or disabilities that cannot be turned on or off by a directive from the Pentagon. In some cases they may need continuing care for as long as they live.

With this in mind, we want a promise from the Department of Defense that Murphy Army Hospital will be kept in operation as long as it is needed in this area. Furthermore, we want any thought of abandonment ruled out.

Mr. Chairman, I sincerely hope that this amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. DONOHUE] will be adopted so that adequate funds may be appropriated to continue the operation of the Murphy Army Hospital in Massachusetts.

Mr. O'NEILL. 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 Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Chairman, for many months, the members of the Massachusetts delegation have been most active in their efforts to prevent the inactivation of the Murphy General Hospital at Waltham, Mass.

The recent decision of the Department of Defense to close this hospital was a cruel and crushing blow to the more than 700,000 veterans who live in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts alone. It is the only Army hospital in the entire First Army Area, which comprises all six of the New England States, and parts of New York, and New Jersey. The nearest comparable Army hospital is the Valley Forge installation, located at Phoenixville, Pa.

The Murphy Army Hospital is one of the finest medical centers in the United States today. It is composed of 44 individual buildings connected by enclosed corridors. The 1-story height of the buildings which house the patients, affords maximum protection in the event of enemy attack. The hospital was the first Army institution to be accepted for membership by the highly regarded Massachusetts Hospital Association. Its location is ideal, for the reason that it is close to many of the foremost medical schools and hospitals, and thus has access for consultation to the very best of medical and surgical talent which could be made available anywhere. For example, the medical schools include those of Tufts, Harvard, and Boston University. The nearby hospitals are the New England Medical Center, including the Pratt Diagnostic Hospital, the Massachusetts General, the Boston City, the Massachusetts Memorial, the Children's Medical Center, and the well-known Lahey Clinic.

In the period from January 1, 1953, through April 9, 1954, the official records of the Murphy Army Hospital reveal that it admitted directly from overseas 537 military patients. The total number of patients admitted during that period were 5,313 of which 2,258 were military and 3,055 were civilians. In addition, the Obstetrical Division delivered 913 babies. The hospital cares for from at least 250 to 300 outpatient cases daily of both servicemen and their families. Approximately 35 percent of the patients are from the New England area, the great majority of whom are Korean casualties.

It is imperative that adequate care be provided for the military personnel and their dependents in the New England area. I hope that the membership of the Committee on the Whole will go on record in support of the amendment to provide for the continued operation of the Murphy General Hospital which has been offered by my colleague, the Honorable HAROLD D. DONOHUE of Worcester, Mass.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. NEAL].

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Chairman, every argument that has been made here this afternoon justifies retaining that hospital in Boston. In the first place, the Government has quite an investment. This is a hospital investment. It can be used for nothing else. Why close it, then, if it is being utilized to three-fourths of its capacity? It is not economical, by any means, to close this institution. Should an emergency come a little later, you will either have to reactivate that institution or spend money elsewhere to provide similar accommodations.

We should utilize the Government-operated hospitals that we have all over the country. There is a shortage of hospitals and there is a shortage of private beds everywhere. If you take away the

Government-supported hospitals you are only throwing that much more burden on the other privately operated facilities. These, already overcrowded, and not able to accommodate civilian needs cannot be expected to serve military personnel.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BOLAND].

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment of my colleague from Massachusetts [Mr. DONOHUE]. Yesterday the Massachusetts delegation in the Congress held a morning and afternoon conference with representatives from the Department of Defense, the Army, the Surgeon General's Office, and delegations from the Federal Employees Veterans Association, the Disabled American Veterans, and a number of other people from veterans organizations in Massachusetts. This conference was arranged to determine why the Murphy General Hospital was to be closed. All of the evidence adduced at this hearing clearly indicated that the proposal of the Defense Department to close this hospital was not justified. We were informed that there was no recommendation from the Surgeon General's Office indicating that this general hospital should be closed. It seems that the Department of Defense instituted the order without giving proper evaluation to the demands that have been made, are being made, and will continue to be made upon the facilities which this institution has offered to servicemen and their dependents in the entire New England area. My colleagues from Massachusetts this afternoon have outlined in precise detail just why Murphy General Hospital should remain open. I will not detain the House in reiterating those arguments. Suffice it to say that the arguments in favor of continuing the operation of this institution far outweigh the decision to close it on the ground of economy. When the military establishments are making daily pleas for volunteers for the armed services, I cannot see how the slashing of fringe benefits to military personnel and their dependents would result in anything but a rejection of volunteer service in our Armed Forces. All of the facts and figures that have been quoted here this afternoon emphatically indicate that this hospital has rendered great service to members of the military and some of their dependents. The area serviced by this hospital includes all of New England, and parts of New York and New Jersey. The elimination of this Army general hospital facility would mean that cases, the like of which have been previously treated at Murphy, would have to seek relief at some other Army general hospital far removed from this locality. This is a burden which should not be placed upon servicemen and their dependents. For these reasons and for the many others that have been pointed out by our congressional delegation, I trust that the amendment of Congressman DONOHUE will be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CURTIS].

Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment. The Army has announced that it is going to reconsider the closing of the Murphy General Hospital in Waltham, which is adjacent to the district which I am privileged to represent.

The chairman of the subcommittee, the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD], has told us that the Army can find the money to keep this hospital going, if it ultimately decides to do so. I agree that the Army should be able to find that money from its appropriation, but I am sure that the decision will be easier for it if a little more money is provided by the Congress.

Mr. Chairman, this is one hospital that should be kept open. It is in fine physical condition. It is located in one of the best areas for an Army hospital. It is close to that great medical center to which people come from all over the world for treatment, and I have in mind especially the recent visit of the Foreign Secretary of Great Britain. Nationally known specialists are available as consultants. The hospital has been certified by the American Hospital Association. It should not be closed.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK].

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that the evidence is overwhelming in favor of the amendment offered by the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. DONOHUE]. The amendment represents the viewpoint of all Members of the Massachusetts delegation. Everyone from Massachusetts is a cosponsor with the gentleman from Massachusetts who offered the amendment, Republicans and Democrats alike.

The gentleman from Michigan says it would take about $740,000 for maintenance, and this amendment is offered to that section. Well, that is true; but I think the Members should vote for the adoption of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. DONOHUE], and then the Senate can allocate it among maintenance and employees when the bill gets over in the other body.

I have here a definite promise made to me by General Armstrong on October 5, 1953, that the Murphy Army Hospital would be kept open as a specialized treatment center. General Armstrong wrote that letter in good faith, and his representative said yesterday there is just as much need today for it as there was when General Armstrong wrote that letter.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN].

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment. This Murphy Army Hospital should be kept open. The Department of Defense since 1950 has made a very determined effort to close this hospital, and they were just as wrong then as they are now. This hospital is of vital importance to that area. I speak after a visit to Murphy Army Hospital, looking over the facilities, talking to the staff, talking to the patients, and talking to the people. There is a need for the continuation of this hospital. We get letters every day from veterans seeking admission to hospitals. The replies are of waiting lists, waiting lists, waiting lists; veterans and others who cannot be admitted for hospitalization. In my opinion to close Murphy Army Hospital at this time would be a tragic mistake.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD].

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to yield the time allotted to me to Mr. MILLER of Maryland.

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 Massachusetts [Mr. DONOHUE].

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD] stated that the hospital is only 75 percent occupied. Well, the record indicates that out of the 510 beds the average daily census is 437, that is certainly more than 75 percent. But, this is still more significant. The record shows that last year 59,705 persons received outpatient treatment. Now, who are those that received this outpatient treatment? They were servicemen, their families and other dependents.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONOHUE. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. FORD. According to the information put in the Appendix of the daily CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 23, by the gentleman from Massachusetts, [Mr. LANE] on page A3069, the average number of beds occupied was 320.

Mr. DONOHUE. But the average daily census is 437 included in that same record.

Mr. FORD. That is correct, but there is a difference between beds and census. You have 510 beds, and the average daily occupancy is 320.

Mr. DONOHUE. Does not the gentleman think it significant that 59,705 people received outpatient treatment in the last year?

Mr. FORD. I agree that is quite significant, but that does not warrant keeping open a hospital as large as this one when the bed occupancy is so low.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, it takes a good deal of courage to rise against the entire Massachusetts delegation here, because they certainly have been eloquent, and added to that, my own fine chairman is a member of that great delegation, not to mention the Speaker and assistant minority leader.

Mr. Chairman, the question that we have before us is purely whether or not this is the time or place to decide on the merits of a very localized matter. Your committee has no judgment as to the need or the lack of need of this particular hospital as compared with 52 other fixed hospital sites in the present programing. There are also 9 infirmaries

and 90 dispensaries, all in continental United States, not to mention 40 hospitals, 1 infirmary, and 400 dispensaries overseas.

The bill, as it is written, has provided all the money to the Army for this purpose that has been sought. It has been made clear that the Army has under consideration perhaps revising its plans. But I can assure the Members of the House that if in this committee we suddenly added money to this bill at this point, we would be making the judgment, not the Army, as to what is best.

We have asked the Army to economize and at the same time to give ample and complete medical attention to all our troops. We are reducing the Army this year. Personnel will be substantially reduced, as has been pointed out. Sitting here as a committee or a subcommittee, if you please, we are not situated to properly decide where these contractions are to be made continentalwise. If the Army wishes to keep this installation, presumably it will do so. If we add this money at this point, it will be mandatory upon the Army to do it.

There is just one other point. There is no possible way that $3.5 million could be used for the purpose desired by the proponents of the amendment, because only $740,000 would be required in this maintenance operation section of the bill for this hospital. There would still be no money to provide the doctors and nurses and other services that a hospital requires in the appropriate sections of this bill. The result will be that you will have much more than needed for maintenance and operation at Murphy, and no provision for pay for doctors and nurses to staff it.

I suggest, therefore, that it be voted down.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. DONOHUE].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. DONOHUE) there were—ayes 64, noes 59.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. DONOHUE and Mr. FORD.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 93, noes 69.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read, as follows:

Ships and facilities

For expenses necessary for design, maintenance, operation, and alteration of vessels; maintenance and operation of facilities; procurement of plant equipment, appliances, and machine tools, and installation thereof in public or private plants; procurement of equipment, supplies, special clothing and services; installation, maintenance, and removal of ships' ordnance; lease of facilities and docks; charter and hire of vessels; relief of vessels in distress; maritime salvage services; industrial mobilization; and departmental salaries; $818,681,000, of which $15,675,000 shall be transferred to the appropriation "Coast Guard Operating Expenses, 1955" for the operation of ocean stations.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I hesitate to ask for and to take this time, but as acting chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, I feel that I have some obligation to do so because of certain testimony, which was presented to the committee on yesterday by Admiral Leggett. This morning, and this afternoon, we have heard some fine statements with respect to this bill. I am not one to say it is not a good bill, or that the committee has not done a wonderful job. We have heard talk about what this bill does in the way of providing for our national defense and for our preparedness program. The Army is taken care of, the Navy is taken care of and the Air Force is taken care of. But, I do want to say in connection with the defense program, if all we do in the way of providing for our national defense and preparedness program is to act upon this bill, then we will not have done enough. If that were my own opinion alone, then I would not even bother to take this time, but I do want to call the attention of the committee to a statement made by Admiral Leggett yesterday before the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee. I shall ask unanimous consent at the appropriate time to insert that statement in the RECORD at this point. I will not read the whole statement here because I do not have the time to do so, but I do want to call your attention to one pertinent statement.

I would like to repeat this statement for the benefit of the committee. At the close of Admiral Leggett's statement, he said:

In closing, I would like to repeat that the Navy is greatly concerned with the plight of the shipbuilding industry, which promises to become the most vulnerable area in our preparedness program.

Let me repeat that:

I would like to repeat that the Navy is greatly concerned with the plight of the ship building industry, which promises to become the most vulnerable area in our preparedness program.

He was not talking about Navy shipyards—he was talking about commercial shipyards. He did not say we were vulnerable with respect to airplanes, or guns, or tanks, or warships, or cruisers, or naval shipbuilding. He was talking about commercial or private shipbuilding. That is why I say that if all we do is to approve the pending bill we will not do enough for our preparedness program.

Now, that was not a careless statement on his part, because the committee questioned him. That was a calculated statement on the part of Admiral Leggett, who knew what he was talking about. He made that statement because of the experiences which we had in World War I and World War II. Admiral Leggett told our committee that at the present time or rather as of even last year, there was an immediate deficiency of 214 merchant-type vessels consisting of a certain number of cargo ships and a certain number of tankers. Without going into too great detail, let me tell you what happened in World War I and World War II. On both occasions, the Congress of the United States neglected its merchant marine to the point where it was caught short when World War I and World War II broke out. Now no one can tell how long World War I was prolonged nor how long World War II was prolonged simply because we lacked ships and shipbuilding facilities. But the Army and the Navy and the Air Force are all aware of the fact that we were caught short of ships and I am sure they are aware of the fact that the wars were prolonged at tremendous and inestimable cost in men and materials. It just seems to me that we are coming to the same condition in which we found ourselves in World War I and World War II. My purpose in discussing it now is simply that unless I, or somebody else, does it in connection with a defense program, then the Congress is not going to be too much impressed when we come before you with some ship construction or shipbuilding program because it is not as closely related to the defense program then as when we are discussing this kind of bill, and I mention it only so that I might be able in some way to impress upon this committtee the need for not neglecting our American merchant marine.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Washington has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. TOLLEFSON was granted 3 additional minutes.)

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Every President I know of from President Wilson to this date, including President Eisenhower, has recognized that the American merchant marine is the fourth arm of our national defense. They have so stated in one statement or another. This Congress has set forth a merchant marine policy, recognizing the fact that our American merchant marine is the fourth arm of our national defense. Admiral Leggett has made it plain in his statement. Admiral King, in 1945, made the same kind of statement, in which he said that the missions of the American Navy during World War II would never have been accomplished had it not been for the American merchant marine. So I say to you, if all we do this year is to appropriate money for the Army, the Navy, the Air Force, and the Marine Corps, we will not have done enough in the way of preparing ourselves for an emergency. We need to do something else, and I sincerely trust that when legislation dealing with the subject of our merchant marine comes before the House the Members will give due consideration to it, in light of the need of an American merchant marine in connectoin with our national defense.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TOLLEFSON. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. An excellent place to start would be to stop this offshore procurement of vessels; would it not?

Mr. TOLLEFSON. I agree with you wholeheartedly. Incidentally, we spent over $100 million in offshore procurement of vessels the year before last. Last year it was a little less. This year we are down to about $30 million, and I

hope we will not have to spend that money while our own shipyards are closing. In the State of Massachusetts, Quincy's shipyard was ready to close, and the Navy, recognizing the importance of the work it was doing, awarded them a contract.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TOLLEFSON. I yield.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I want to congratulate the gentleman on the statement he is making dealing with a matter of vital importance to our whole national defense picture. I want to assure him that this committee is fully alive to the gravity of the situation to which he has referred. In this bill we are providing for an increase to the extent of $322,400,000.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Of course, I am talking about commercial ships and shipyards, and not Navy ships and yards. We need both.

Mr. DEVEREUX. I would like to call to the attention of the gentleman and the Committee of the Whole that not long ago we had the representatives of the Navy Department, which is the agency for carrying out off-shore procurement as far as shipbuilding is concerned, before our committee, and they assured us that because of their responsibility for maintaining local business for our own yards they would thoroughly reexamine the whole picture and make a strong protest to the National Security Council in connection with keeping our own yards in operation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Washington has again expired.

(By unanimous consent, at the request of Mr. TABER, Mr. TOLLEFSON was granted 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TOLLEFSON. I yield.

Mr. TABER. In addition to the $322 million increase in construction of fighting vessels, there was $50 million additional for starting a new program of MSTS ships that we have never had in previous bills.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. I thank the gentleman for that statement.

Let me comment on what the gentleman has said. I noticed in the bill $50 million for MSTS ships. And the item mentioned by the gentleman from Massachusetts, [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH] but there is nothing in this bill, and properly so, to provide for merchant marine construction. I brought up this subject simply to call the attention of the House to the importance of the matter. I am not opposed to MSTS, in so far as they maintain only a nucleus fleet. But the Navy itself recognizes that we need a private American merchant marine to carry men and materials to the war fronts.

So I am speaking in behalf of Congress doing something in connection with the private American merchant marine, giving them every possible support, in the interests of our national defense program. I hope that when legislation dealing with the subject I am discussing comes before the House our committee and the legislation will get a sympathetic ear, because it is absolutely essential. The Navy itself recognizes that we have need for a private American merchant marine as an integral part of our national defense. That is clearly indicated by Admiral Leggett's statement.

STATEMENT OF REAR ADM. W. D. LEGGETT, JR., UNITED STATES NAVY, CHIEF OF THE NAVY'S BUREAU OF SHIPS, BEFORE THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES COMMITTEE OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, APRIL 28, 1954

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, it is a privilege to appear before you this morning to give you my views on H. R. 8637, a bill to amend title XI of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936.

There is an urgent requirement today for new ship construction, not only to modernize our merchant marine but, of equal importance, to provide critically needed assistance to our private shipbuilding industry. Both are essential to our national security.

Most of the ships in our active merchant fleet are approaching obsolescence. Nine-tenths of the dry-cargo ships in the national defense reserve fleet have a design speed of only 11 knots or less. These consist chiefly of about 1,400 Liberty ships, built under wartime conditions, and obsolete when their keels were laid.

The reserve fleet is also deficient in large oceangoing tankers and troopships of adequate speed.

Last summer the Department of Defense, during the course of a congressional hearing, went on record as to an immediate deficiency of 214 merchant-type vessels, consisting of 165 cargo ships, 6 large passenger ships, and 43 large tankers.

Correction of these deficiencies would not only strengthen the national defense, but would also revive the distressed private shipbuilding industry. This industry cannot be maintained by naval shipbuilding programs alone. It must also have the support of a healthy merchant marine.

As Coordinator of Shipbuilding, Conversion, and Repair for the Department of Defense, I have certain responsibilities for mobilization planning, for procurement of ships for defense purposes, and for coordinating repairs and conversions within the United States. I have a primary and continuing interest, therefore, in the maintenance of an adequate defense nucleus of operating shipyards which can be expanded, if necessary, to meet the sudden demands of a full-scale emergency.

The situation today in our private shipyards is so critical that I have grave concern whether the industry can meet mobilization production schedules.

You will recall that at the outset of both world wars, we had a year or two to recruit and train shipyard personnel, expand our facilities, and start building up our merchant marine. Even with this notice, our output of new ships barely managed to catch up with the serious losses we were encountering. In fact, most of our ship construction became available near the end or even after the termination of hostilities.

Our present situation is often compared to 1939. I believe this to be somewhat misleading. The situation now confronting us with regard to the shipbuilding industry is more like 1941 than 1939, in the sense that we cannot count on a prolonged period for mobilizing needed skills and facilities.

It is apparent that the industry is not prepared today to meet initial wartime requirements. Our private yards now have about 118,000 employees, less than one-third of the total in December 1941. They have only about 29 large oceangoing merchant ships under construction, a small fraction of the work under way in 1941. All of these 29, except 3, are scheduled for completion this year.

In order to improve the economic health of the industry, the Navy, for the past several years, has been awarding most of its shipbuilding to private industry. During fiscal 1954, all new naval construction is going to private yards. Up to the present, we have been reasonably successful in helping to maintain, through normal competition, a fairly broad base of operating yards widely dispersed throughout our coastal areas.

With regard to repair work, the Navy, last year, began awarding the overhauls of most active fleet auxiliaries, together with selected combatant ships, to private yards. Previously, these yards had been regularly receiving repairs to service craft, overhauls of reserve fleet ships and similar work. During the past 2½ years, the Navy has awarded repair and overhaul work having a dollar value of approximately $271 million to private yards.

I regret to say, however, that this additional Navy work has not stabilized private-yard employment which, in the last several months, has declined by another 3,000. A further drastic reduction is expected later on this year, as the privately owned and mariner construction now on the ways is completed.

This will result in an increase in the proportion of employees engaged in Navy work to total private yard employment. Unless new work is forthcoming, the Navy will thus find itself in the unenviable position of being the industry's principal support.

I am particularly concerned with the fact that highly skilled design and production personnel are rapidly being dispersed among other industries which can provide more stable employment. We may not have time, in the event of another emergency, to either recruit or train new workers.

The Merchant Marine Act of 1936 was enacted to foster the development and to encourage the maintenance of a merchant fleet capable of serving our needs in peace or in war. It was intended to provide adequate incentives for a continuing merchant ship program. This objective is not, at present, being attained.

Based upon our analysis of workload needs of the industry, it would appear that the shipbuilding potential of our country must be supported by some interim emergency program. It is not my responsibility to recommend what such a program should be. To provide a minimum sustaining workload for the industry, however, it should consist of at least 20 ships annually and start at the earliest possible time. It would not, in any sense, be a permanent solution to our problem. It would, however, keep a number of yards from closing in the next year.

The only permanent solution is, of course, to provide greater incentives to commercial operators to place orders for new merchant ships on a continuing basis. There are a number of legislative proposals now before the Congress which may help to accomplish this purpose.

I am authorized to say that the Department of Defense supports H. R. 8637 in principle. The Department is in accord with the purpose of the bill which is to stimulate new ship construction. More modern and improved types of ships may be brought into being and the industry may be greatly benefited. These are worthwhile objectives. While certain revisions may be desirable, the Department considers that specific comment on detailed provisions of the bill is primarily within the jurisdiction of other Government agencies. I am informed that the Bureau of the Budget has not yet formulated its position on the bill.

In closing, I would like to repeat that the Navy is gravely concerned with the plight of the shipbuilding industry which promises to become the most vulnerable area in our preparedness program.

Conditions have seriously deteriorated since 1952 when shipbuilding was in effect

declared a distressed industry. Many firms are today faced with the prospect of closing up, unless new work is forthcoming. The Navy will continue to do what it can to ease the situation. However, it is certain that the Navy's annual construction programs cannot alone support a mobilization base of operating shipyards capable of the expansion necessary to build a wartime merchant marine.

I wish to thank you, Mr. Chairman, and members of the committee, for inviting me to testify on this important subject.

Mr. GRANAHAN. 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 Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. GRANAHAN. Mr. Chairman, in a bill making possible the expenditure in the coming fiscal year of about $70 billion by the agencies of the Department of Defense, this figure representing $28 billion in the current bill and about $48 billion of unexpended balance from previous authorization, the Congress cannot very well specify where each of those dollars should be spent, and this bill gives us no opportunity to do so, even if we were so inclined. Of necessity, we must rely on the Defense Establishment and on the President and his advisers to set the policy for the use of defense funds and facilities. When they use bad judgment in this respect, we can protest, but there is, as I said, no opportunity here to force them to change that policy through this appropriation bill.

DISCRIMINATION AGAINST NAVAL SHIPYARDS

Nevertheless, I want to point out to the House that the Navy Department is following now and intends to follow in the coming year a shortsighted, discriminatory policy against our Government-owned naval shipyards which is grossly unfair to the loyal and faithful employees of those yards and is unfair, also, to the economies of Philadelphia and other sites of naval shipyards.

The policy under this administration is to channel virtually all naval construction away from Government-owned shipyards and to private enterprise. I am referring now not to merchant ships—not to standardized commercial vessels—but to tailor-made, fighting ships—ships which the naval yards over generations have specialized in and concentrated on and fabricated with great skill and economy.

Private shipyards admittedly are in bad financial shape at the moment because of the almost complete cessation of merchant ship construction. I thoroughly agree with the idea of helping these yards to stay in busines as an important part of our mobilization base for defense preparation. But the way that should be done is to take the necessary steps to stimulate and rejuvenate the merchant shipping construction program—to modernize our merchant fleet, get the newer cargo and passenger vessels built and operating. This administration has done absolutely nothing in that regard.

SHARING THE SHIP-CONSTRUCTION POVERTY

Instead, it has taken the ridiculous step of sharing-the-poverty in the ship construction field by virtually closing down the Government-owned shipyards and giving what naval ship construction jobs there are almost exclusively to private enterprise. The 30 new ships of all classes which are to be built in the 1955 Navy construction program cannot fully employ all the private shipyards in the country—they can help a few which might be engaged on some of the larger combat ships but the program will mean crumbs or nothing at all for other yards.

Yet in order to give out these crumbs to private enterprise—to a few among the private yards—the Navy will deprive its own shipyards of any important combat ship construction work. And it will thus pay much more for the work. I say that is not only shortsighted and discriminatory but completely unrealistic.

In the Philadelphia Navy Yard, employment has already been cut by thousands of men due to the Navy's discriminatory policy against its own installations and own employees. These thousands laid off, mind you, receive no unemployment compensation—they are not eligible for it. They are just turned loose with a "sorry, boys" with no consideration and no concern for the outstanding work they have done to help build up our Navy's strength. The same thing is happening in Brooklyn, and Norfolk on the east coast, and I assume at Long Beach, San Francisco, and Puget Sound.

These dismissed workers, as I said, are highly skilled in the production of fighting craft for the Navy. They have made careers of that. They are good at it. The Government has a tremendous investment in their skills and know-how, yet now, under the antinaval yard policy of this administration in throwing ship construction work to private enterprise, this valuable investment is thrown away. The Government yards, of course, are wholly dependent upon Navy work; they cannot compete, as the private yards can, for other types of work, and of course they should not. But under the policy of this administration, the workers in the naval yards are out and if there is no similar work in the area to provide jobs for them in their skills, they are completely on the rocks. As I said, they do not even qualify for unemployment compensation.

PHILADELPHIA YARD SHOULD GET PROPOSED ATOMIC SUBMARINE JOB

In this connection, I have spent many hours of effort, along with others from Philadelphia, in seeking to persuade the Navy to build in the Philadelphia yard the proposed atomic submarine projected for this coming year. There is no doubt that it can be built there—and built efficiently and well. The Navy concedes that. But so far we have received no commitment, no promise, no assurance. And the philosophy of the Navy as expounded by its top civilian officials in the Appropriations hearings makes clear that the Navy's proprivate enterprise stand makes our success somewhat doubtful.

Philadelphia businessmen—many of whom contributed quite handsomely to the Republican campaign funds in 1952—feel, as I do, that there is no economic or moral or political justification for discriminating against the Government-owned shipyards, particularly when it costs the Government a whole lot more in special subsidies to build the same ship outside a Government yard. In all fairness, then, we urge that this discrimination stop, and that the Philadelphia naval yard be assigned sufficient work to employ its men and facilities.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, yesterday during general debate I asked members of the committee a few questions about the amount of off-shore procurement and foreign aid in this bill, pointing out at the same time that the Army bought last year, principally from Denmark, nearly 5½ million pounds of butter. Some Members of the House seemed to doubt that the Army had bought that much butter overseas.

I have with me today a letter signed by H. M. Montgomery, lieutenant colonel, Liaison Division, Department of the Army, dated April 1, 1954. Let me read you an excerpt or two from this letter:

The Secretary of the Army has asked me to reply to your recent letter to the Secretary of Defense concerning the use of milk and butter by the Armed Forces. During the calendar year 1953 approximately 5,344,000 pounds of butter were purchased from overseas sources, principally Denmark, for use by the Far East Command.

Not in Europe—by the Far East Command.

Why did they buy this butter? I quote from the letter:

Consideration of the foreign-relations aspect of this question as presented to the Department of the Army by both the Department of Defense and the Department of State led, however, to the conclusion that it would not be desirable to vary from the long-continued practice of purchasing some of the butter for use overseas from overseas sources where it is readily available.

While the off-shore purchases of butter have represented relatively small portions of the production of the country involved, these countries have considered them to be of appreciable significance from the viewpoint of securing United States dollars.

Again we sacrifice the American farmer, American labor and industry to the dictation of the State Department and so-called foreign policy.

Now, what have you provided in this bill? And you wisely provided the same thing in last year's bill. Section 733 on page 47 of the present bill reads as follows:

SEC. 733. No part of any appropriation contained in this act shall be available for the procurement of any article of food, clothing, cotton or wool (whether in the form of fiber or yarn or contained in fabrics, materials, or manufactured articles) not grown, reprocessed, reused, or produced in the United States or its possessions, except to the extent that the Secretary of the Department concerned shall determine that a satisfactory quality and sufficient quantity of any articles of food or clothing or any form of cotton or wool grown, reprocessed, reused, or produced in the United States or its possessions cannot be procured as and when needed at United States market prices and except procurements outside the United States in support of combat operations, procurements by vessels in foreign waters and emergency—

And this bill and the law goes on to state—

That nothing herein shall preclude the procurement of foods manufactured or

processed in the United States or its possessions.

Under the terms of the provision which you have wisely put into law previously, I say to you that the State Department and the Department of Defense have violated the clear intent of Congress, if not deliberately violated the law in purchasing in one item alone, almost 5½ million pounds of butter from Denmark.

I should like to ask the committee: What do you propose to do to see that the agencies of government conform to the law? When you bring here to the floor of the House a bill and we enact it into law, it represents the intent and the will of the Congress. What do you propose to do to see that this law is enforced? Does any member of the committee want to answer the question? Somewhere, somebody ought to enforce the laws that this Congress passes.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. FORD. Does the gentleman know how much of this purchase he has referred to was financed under this bill and how much was financed under appropriations for foreign-aid purposes?

Mr. GROSS. I only know that the Department of Defense admits it bought almost 5½ million pounds of butter from Denmark. That is one instance alone. The Lord only knows how much more they bought.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. GROSS was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. The matter that the gentleman from Iowa refers to is very important and is one that should be looked into. It is possible that the purchases could have been largely or partly covered by foreign-aid funds as distinguished from the funds carried in this bill with the so-called Buy American provision.

Mr. GROSS. If foreign-aid funds had been used, I am sure the letter from the Secretary of Defense or his representative, would have so stated.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I think the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD], has some information in this connection.

Mr. FORD. I would prefer to take some time at the conclusion of the gentleman's statement to give additional facts which may be helpful.

Mr. GROSS. I certainly would be glad to have them.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, information has been submitted to the committee showing the actual purchases in calendar 1952, 1953, and 1954. In 1952 the offshore purchases of butter for troop consumption were 8,195,030 pounds. The average price per pound on the offshore procurements was 47½ cents. The average price per pound of continental United States purchases was 74-plus cents per pound.

Mr. GROSS. Was that the retail or wholesale price of butter?

Mr. FORD. This is the price that the Army paid for butter. The 2 prices quoted include 1 for offshore and 1 for continental United States. It should be added, in addition, that the price paid within the continental limits must have the added factor of transportation costs when it is shipped overseas.

In 1953 the purchases were 8,300,000 pounds. The average price per pound, offshore procurement, 50 cents. The average price per pound of continental United States purchases, 68 cents.

In 1954 the total purchases under offshore procurement were 6,300,000 pounds. The estimated price for offshore procurement, 50 cents. The estimated price per pound, continental United States, 56 cents per pound.

Mr. Chairman, that brings up one further fact. I have also checked to find out where the Army purchased butter in 1954 and the previous years. For the first time in 1954 the Army purchased butter from the Commodity Credit Corporation. In fact, in 1954, I understand that they purchased 21 million pounds at a price of 15 cents per pound. The other butter purchases in continental United States in 1954 totaled 9,466,000 pounds. It was purchased at a price of 67 cents per pound. When you combine the 67 cents per pound purchased on the open market in the United States and the 15 cents per pound—the figure at which they bought from CCC—that explains why in 1954 the price paid in continental United States is down to 56 cents, more nearly comparable to overseas price.

Mr. GROSS. Well, now, is the gentleman condoning the purchase of butter in Europe and shipping it all the way to Asia for our military forces?

Mr. FORD. From the facts given me by the gentleman, I think the Department was in error. I will concur in his observations, based on the facts as related by the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. If we are going to purchase products in Europe or anywhere else in a foreign country simply because they are cheaper than they are in the United States, we will be doing a pretty good job of wrecking the economy of this country if we carry it far enough. Is that not true?

Mr. FORD. I think under certain circumstances this country, if it has forces in other areas of the world for various reasons, must make purchases in those countries or in areas surrounding a particular country. I do not, from the facts that the gentleman from Iowa has given me, condone what was done in the purchase of butter in Denmark for the Far East. I repeat, nevertheless, I think the Army is doing the right thing as it did in 1954 in purchasing far greater supplies of butter from the Commodity Credit Corporation at a price of 15 cents per pound.

Mr. MASON. Who paid that price, the Commodity Credit Corporation? It was bought in the first place by the Commodity Credit Corporation, and whatever they lost came out of the same taxpayers.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MAHON. Of course, the inference of the statement of the gentleman from Michigan is that no offshore butter was purchased for use in the United States. All of the offshore butter was used outside the United States.

Mr. FORD. That is absolutely correct.

Mr. MAHON. Is it not true that Denmark, from which country about 84 percent of the butter was purchased, is a country which has provided the United States with those highly critical and vital bases in Greenland? I wish to share in the views expressed by the gentleman from Michigan that we certainly should not neglect the domestic producer or the American taxpayer, but I do think there is some excuse for the procurement of butter for European troops from our friends in Denmark under certain circumstances. I cannot see any excuse for sending it from Denmark to the Far East, and certainly a very minimum amount was used in that way.

The Clerk read as follows:

Shipbuilding and conversion

For expenses necessary for the construction, acquisition, or conversion of vessels as authorized by law, including armor and armament therefor, plant equipment, appliances, and machine tools, and installation thereof in public or private plants; designs for vessels to be constructed or converted in the future; and departmental salaries necessary for the purposes of this appropriation; $1,042,400,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That the total of obligations incurred under the heads "Shipbuilding and conversion" and "Ordnance for shipbuilding and conversion", 55 including those incurred against reimbursements credited to these appropriations pursuant to section 403 (b) of the Mutual Defense Assistance Act of 1949, as amended (22 U. S. C. 1574 (b)), shall not exceed $4,370,504,000.

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to address a question to members of the committee with reference to language on page 17, line 13, "maritime salvage services," and ask what that covers.

By way of explanation, I will say to whatever member of the committee will answer my query that a situation on the Pacific coast was recently called to my attention, where the Navy maintains in San Pedro a salvage tug named *Gear*, which understandably could be maintained and based there for salvage operations of naval vessels. However, I am advised that the Navy leases that tug out on bid to private steamship companies when one of their vessels goes on the beach or goes on the rocks and the bids submitted by private salvage operators do not satisfy the shipowner whose vessel is on the rocks.

I was advised of 3 instances in the past 8 months. In one a British ship burned off the coast of Mexico, for which private salvage companies on the Pacific coast made bids to go to her assistance. In 2 other cases, American vessels, privately owned and privately operated, went on the rocks off the Pacific coast. The private companies made bids when called upon by the operators, and they

were later informed, within a matter of hours, that another salvage tug would be used. The Navy tug *Gear*, maintained by the taxpayers of the United States for salvage work on naval vessels, was used, and the price was lower than that bid by the private operators, and in the two latter instances the private tug companies and salvage companies had to be subsequently called in because the naval vessel was unable to complete the salvage work.

Now, I want to know if it is the province of the Navy to maintain a salvage vessel which will compete with old established marine salvage firms operating on the Pacific coast in the salvage of private maritime vessels.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I would say to the gentleman from California [Mr. SHELLEY] that that is not my understanding. I understand, however, that the gentleman's colleague from California [Mr. SHEPPARD] has looked into this particular question to which he refers and I suggest that he yield to him on the matter.

Mr. SHELLEY. I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. SHEPPARD].

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, this is a part of the bill that has reoccurred over a period of many years, so far as appropriation bills are concerned. I can assure both my chairman and the gentleman from California [Mr. SHELLEY] who has directed the inquiry that it never was the intent of Congress in any way to do as he suggests; that is, for the Navy to go into a competitive status with private business. Their salvage operations originally were intended to take care of Government ships that were to be salvaged and only limited assistance was to be given to commercial companies in that category, in case of an emergency. But at no time were they to go into a competitive status with private concerns as a business. That was not the intent or the understanding of the Congress and if they are operating in such way, that matter should certainly be looked into by the committee. With the permission of the chairman I should like to say that I think we should discuss this matter with the Bureau of Ships.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. SHELLEY. I think the statement made is satisfactory and I thank the gentleman of the committee. I may say that I certainly would be glad to hold myself ready to discuss this matter further with the committee, because it is a matter that the committee should look into, to see that the policy, as expressed by my colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. SHEPPARD] is carried out by the Navy Department as the policy of the Congress.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 721. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, Executive order, or regulation, no part of the appropriations in this act shall be available for any expenses of operating aircraft under the jurisdiction of the Armed Forces for the purpose of proficiency flying except in accordance with regulations issued by the Secretaries of the departments concerned and approved by the Secretary of Defense which shall establish proficiency standards and maximum and minimum flying hours for this purpose, but not to exceed 100 hours during the fiscal year: *Provided*, That during the fiscal year, without regard to any provision of law or Executive order prescribing minimum flight requirements, such regulations may provide for the payment of flight pay at the rates prescribed in section 204 (b) of the Career Compensation Act of 1949 (63 Stat. 802) to certain officers of the Armed Forces otherwise entitled to receive flight pay (1) who have held aeronautical ratings or designations for not less than 20 years, or (2) whose particular assignment outside the United States makes it impractical to participate in regular aerial flights.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read the amendment as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi: On page 44, line 2, strike out all after the word "purpose," through and including all of line 3 to the colon.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, it will take some time to explain the import of this amendment. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, at the outset let me say that I think the committee has done a splendid job. I have nothing but praise for the committee's product, because I am convinced they have given us a maximum of military security at the least possible cost.

However, there is language, in the form of a limitation in this bill, which I seek to strike by this amendment, and which has given me personally a great deal of concern. I know that my concern is shared by every other Member of this House who has had personal experience in the operation of military aircraft. I am sure that this opinion is shared by every man who now serves as a flying officer in the United States Air Force, in the Marine Corps, in the Navy, or in any other flying arm of our service.

I think I know what the committee was intending to do by placing a limitation of 100 hours annually on the amount of flying time that any pilot not in an operational unit could use. The committee was seeking to eliminate abuses by so-called desk pilots in checking out military airplanes to use for weekend vacations at the expense of the United States. I agree with them 100 percent in their desire to stop these practices.

I would be the first to admit—as a veteran of the United States Air Force—that we have, unfortunately, men of that type who are rated pilots and who do take undue advantage of their Air Force privileges. On the other hand, Mr. Chairman, we also have a large number of young pilots, active pilots, who have been assigned to the Pentagon and other places over the country, to desk jobs, for tours of duty ranging anywhere from 6 months to 2 or 3 years, who will feel the effects of this limitation of 100 hours annually and who, when sent back to full flying status with an operational unit, will be so rusty as to become dangerous pilots.

I am not basing my opinion solely on my limited personal experiences, although my experience as a military pilot during World War II might render me to some degree qualified to know whereof I speak. However, on the day before yesterday I contacted by wire the 2 men in the United States whom I consider to be the best qualified in the world, perhaps, to determine whether 100 hours annually is sufficient time to maintain proficiency for a military pilot. I sent one to Capt. Eddie Rickenbacker, president of Eastern Air Lines, New York City. Surely no one would question his qualifications. It reads as follows:

Defense appropriations bill scheduled for House consideration tomorrow contains provision limiting proficiency flying to 100 hours per year for military pilots not assigned to operational units. Would appreciate your views regarding minimum flying time required per year to maintain proficiency for airline pilots, also any comment or observations you may care to express relating to aforementioned limitation on military proficiency flying.

This morning I received the following reply from Captain Rickenbacker:

NEW YORK, N. Y., *April 29, 1954.*

Hon. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS,
House of Representatives:

Airline pilots could maintain proficiency if they averaged 10 hours of flight time during month provided a maximum number of landings and takeoffs were accomplished during night and day conditions and continual review of instrument procedures were accomplished during flight. In my opinion military flight crews not assigned to operational combat units in order to maintain flying proficiency in the high performance aircraft of today would require at least twice that amount providing this flight time was accomplished in equal monthly amounts; further, that instrument procedures received maximum attention and a maximum number of landings and takeoffs were accomplished under day and night conditions.

EDDIE RICKENBACKER.

That is Captain Rickenbacker's studied opinion—that a minimum of 240 hours a year would be needed to maintain proficiency.

I wired Gen. James A. Doolittle also. I did not ask him about the airline-pilot situation because I understand he is not connected with an airline, but is employed with Shell Petroleum Co. But I did wire him for his opinon with respect to the 100-hour proficiency flying restriction imposed upon certain flying officers in this bill. General Doolittle did not reply by wire, but he did call me on the telephone yesterday afternoon during a stopover in Washington, and he gave me permission to quote him. I cannot quote him verbatim—I do not monitor telephone calls in my office—but I can quote the meaning of what he said. He said that in his opinion 100 hours is insufficient to maintain proficiency. He cited in proof of that his own case: "For 30 years," General Doolittle said, "I flew an average of an hour or more a day. When I took my present job, and my business duties began to consume so much of my time that I found I could not average more than 300 hours a year, I quit flying."

If a flier like General Doolittle, with all of his skill and experience, reaches the point where he feels he must have 300 hours a year to maintain minimum proficiency, think what we would be doing to those young fliers not in operational units by limiting them to 100 hours a year; and then 2 or 3 years later shipping them overseas to fly B-47's and 36's. No; this is not a question of economy, although that is the stated purpose of this limitation. What price economy as against the shedding of American blood?

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I yield.

Mr. TEAGUE. It seems there is another very important point in this connection which was brought out in the hearing. The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SCRIVNER] asked the question:

Is there any difference in the accident rates as they relate to proficiency flying and as they relate to operational flying generally speaking?

The answer was:

In 1953 a comprehensive study of the relation of duty assignment to pilot accident rates was completed. * * *

It was determined by that study that the pilots whose duty assignments are other than flying have an accident rate double that of pilots assigned to flying jobs, and that this difference in accident rates could be accounted for only by the differences in the amount of flying performed by each category.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I thank the gentleman for quoting from that report. I do not think anyone in this Chamber could take issue with what it says.

Mr. POFF. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I yield.

Mr. POFF. As a former flyer myself, I want to concur most heartily with the position taken by the gentleman and I shall support his amendment. May I ask the gentleman rhetorically: how many landings and takeoffs could he shoot in a B-29 in two hours a week?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. As my good friend, the gentleman from Virginia, knows, one takeoff and landing would probably consume a 2-hour flight in that type plane. Surely you couldn't shoot more than 2 in 2 hours. I am sure of that, although I have never flown one. The average flight of a B-29 is, I understand, even in training runs, some 8 to 10 hours.

I agree completely with the committee in what they are seeking to do here, and I am sure every other Member of the House does, but I am equally sure this is a matter which cannot be handled by the method of placing an arbitrary limitation in an appropriation bill. It can only be handled administratively, and my amendment leaves the language in the bill which permits that.

I admit, readily, that the Air Force has been lax in policing this kind of thing; but if our Air Force leadership, under the Secretary of Defense, will avail themselves of the authority granted to them under this section, there will be no need for an arbitrary limitation being placed in this bill. That can be handled administratively, and that is the only way it can be handled properly. If you will read section 721 of the bill, you will see that the machinery is provided for doing this administratively, without the 100-hour limitation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

(By unanimous consent, at the request of Mr. HOLT, Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi was granted 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I am sure you will be told by opponents of this amendment that there are ways of getting around this 100-hour limitation. If that is true, then why keep it in the bill? Why not be honest with ourselves and put the burden of responsibility where it belongs; that is, on our military leaders, and eliminate the obvious dangers which are inherent in this 100-hour limitation?

I wish I had more time in which to discuss the hearings on this provision. If you read the hearings, though, you will find that the Defense Department sent Mr. White, Under Secretary for Air, over here with instructions to support and recommend this 100-hour limitation.

You will also find, if you will read the hearings, that Mr. White then proceeded to make a perfect case against it.

Mr. POFF. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I yield.

Mr. POFF. Is it not the responsibility of those in power to enforce that limitation?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Of course it is. I do not think it is wise for Congress to try to decide matters of this kind; this should be left to administrative determination based on expert opinions.

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I yield.

Mr. PATTEN. I agree wholeheartedly with the gentleman and that the 100-hour limitation is false economy.

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 Arizona?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Chairman, the appropriations bill for the fiscal year 1955 budget has been reported out of committee, and it is the same old story of further reductions in the Air Force budget.

The President had recommended a budget of only $11.2 billion, which was modest, indeed, and under the budget of $11.4 billion appropriated last year. My colleagues will recall that last year there was considerable attack on the Air Force and even the integrity of Air Force planners. I recall some remarks of one of my distinguished colleagues to the effect that recurring signs of spring were the daffodils, cherry blossoms around the Tidal Basin, and a frenzied plea—on the part of Air Force leaders—for additional funds for a larger Air Force.

The implication of my colleague's remarks was that certainly it was nothing to get excited about, that the Air Force wanted more wings and more funds for its augmented structure. So only $11.4 billion was appropriated. It was less by $1.4 billion than was appropriated for the Army and only $1.9 billion more than was appropriated for the Navy. For the Air Force of the world's leading nation in the fight against aggressive communism, in the age of airpower and atomic power, it was certainly a modest budget—in no sense a generous one.

This year the administration was supposedly airpower minded. In his budget message the President told us that the fiscal year 1955 budget points toward the creation, maintenance, and full exploitation of modern airpower; and the Vice President has repeatedly stated that the administration's program of national security is based on the principle of massive retaliatory power—which means the power of our atom-bomb carrying, intercontinental bombers. But even favorably disposed as it is this year to the Air Force, the administration asked for only $11.2 billion, less, as I said, than was appropriated last year, and a very little more than was asked for for the Army or the Navy.

In an effort to correct a mistake of last year, in which the American people were told that the Air Force did not need to have 143 wings, we were told this year that we would have 137 wings—but that because of new developments in aircraft, and for other reasons, the 137 wings would have the combat strength of the 143-wing program that had been discarded. It was an attempt to reassure the American people that the present administration really is air-minded, in spite of the scuttling of the 143-wing Air Force program in the first session of the 83d Congress.

Well, the budget is out of committee—and the Air Force budget has been reduced again—this time to $10.8 billion, which is $6 million under what was appropriated last year—the year the Air Force was out of favor. If the administration really came out for an Air Force, saying we had to have the best in the world, I shudder to think what would happen. The appropriations would go down even more. I well remember that the brilliant junior Senator from Georgia remarked last year, that if a budget cut of $5 billion would bring us greater security, why not a budget cut of $10 billion, to make that security absolutely secure? This year we are certainly moving in the direction of such reverse thinking.

Analyzing the budget recommendations, I find that the amount recommended for aircraft procurement has not been touched—certainly a mark of caution on the part of the budget butchermen. It takes time to design, develop, and procure aircraft, as they perfectly well know. You don't turn out aircraft simply by turning on the faucet; you have to prime the pump. Last year we had some hope of speeding up procurement through use of the Air Force's heavy press program. That program got scuttled too. But, let us be grateful for

small favors. The funds for aircraft procurement have not been cut in this year's budget.

What has been cut is everything else—including funds for research and development. I recall that last year the Secretary of Defense accused the Air Force of a research project to discover why potatoes turn brown. The scientists of the Nation jumped on him about that one. The answer to why potatoes turn brown is expected to give the clue to some important discoveries connected with food preservation and, therefore, with the Air Force's program for escape and survival of personnel. But the Secretary's prejudice against research seems to have affected the budget ax-wielders as well.

Funds for research and development have been reduced $21 million. That is almost 5 percent. I should think funds for this essential purpose might well have been increased 5 percent. Research and Development gave us the jet engine—sometime after the Germans had developed one; today's guided missile—10 years after the Germans used guided missiles to devastate the Belgian seaports; and the hydrogen bomb—just a few months ahead of the Russians. Our research scientists are men of the highest capability; their training is of the best, and our resources are unlimited. If we have so far been able to do no better than merely keep ahead of our enemies, and sometimes even lag behind, is not it time we appropriate more, rather than less, for the research and development function?

Funds for maintenance and operations are cut approximately 7 percent—but because the function is tremendous, this reading accounts for the largest single item in the budget—almost a third greater than funds for aircraft procurement, and a quarter billion dollars greater than the funds for military personnel requirements. Aircraft do not remain operational unless they are maintained; aircraft are useless unless they are used.

How they are used today, and how they may be used, is causing grave concern not only in the Congress but throughout the Nation. There is a strange foreign name, already become familiar in the United States, that tells something of that use—the name is Dien Bien Phu. We are not at war in Indochina, but the future of democracy is at stake there, and even as I am speaking American aircraft are operating for the succor of that outpost. Secretary of Defense Wilson says such assistance as we are giving the French will not involve us in war. A President of the same name once made similar remarks, the reversal of which is a matter of history. This seems a strange time to reduce the funds for the maintenance and operation of our aircraft. Aircraft get lost when they get too close to anti-aircraft artillery; they also operate more in time of conflict than in peace, and require greater maintenance. A 7-percent cut in funds for this function hardly gibes with national policy of assistance to the democratic forces beleagured at Dien Bien Phu. Such a cut is like writing off Indochina, as we once did Korea—outside the perimeter of our interest.

Since I have given percentages, I shall continue. Major procurement of other than aircraft has been cut 8 percent—certainly a high percentage. I do not know on what basis this cut was made, or why this particular percentage. It seems consistent, however, with the other cuts.

Funds for military personnel requirements have been cut only 1.2 percent—as if the budget makers took fright from the Womble report. The Congress has cut fringe benefits and personnel privileges too much already. An election year is no time to cut appropriations for personnel any further. A cut of $21 million is window dressing, and a cut that hurts. But it is not consistent with other cuts in the budget—for which I am grateful.

The overall percentage is 3.4—a 3.4 percent cut in America's security. Air Force leaders make stirring speeches about the power of our Air Force. I wonder if they really believe all they say. How powerful will that Air Force be when the budget is whittled down every year—3.4 percent this year, 3.4 percent again next year, unless there is a real change of heart about the Air Force and real acceptance of the facts of airpower and atomic power. We are told we will have the 137-wing Air Force by mid-1957. Cuts in funds for the program do not encourage belief in the achievement of the goal.

Mr. Chairman, a very proper question is how much have funds for the other services been reduced. The answer is interesting. Funds for the Army have been cut 7.2 percent, and of this we shall hear more undoubtedly. The Army has some vigorous spokesmen. But funds for the Navy have been cut only 2.2 percent. So here we are again, just where we were last year, in spite of all the honeyed words of reconciliation, apology, and explanation. Up Navy, down Air Force. Keep the traditional service and strengthen it. Let the airpower get the lean of the budget while seapower gets the fat. Ignore the facts of atomic and hydrogen bombs. Forget commitments to the NATO allies, promises of aid to Indochina, and all the other functions that require a strengthened and enlarged Air Force. Lull the leaders of the Air Force into belief that what they have worked for, what they are willing to die for, what they know—and this Congress knows—the country must have, it will have—then dash those hopes; undo the good that has been done, and cut the budget.

Yes, spring has come again to Washington—but the signs are not only the cherry blossoms—now faded—and pleas for an augmented Air Force—largely ignored this year and evaded. A sure sign of spring in Washington is a cut in the Air Force budget. That cut has now been made.

The outlook for the summer is gloomy indeed—and news from Indochina only increases the gloom.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to commend wholeheartedly the presentation of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS], and urge my colleagues to support his amendment.

I would also like to mention to the House that the gentleman who has just preceded me, Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi, observes today the 10th anniversary of his discharge from the Air Force. It was 10 years ago that our colleague from Mississippi was separated from the Air Force, where he had a very commendable and honorable record as a pilot.

As the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] stated, this is a subject which can be and should be handled administratively by the Air Force. I appreciate the concern of the committee in regard to this matter. I know it is directed toward abuses in the proficiency-flying requirement. We all know there have been abuses in connection with proficiency flying, and the committee is to be commended for being concerned about those abuses. As a result of the interest of the subcommittee in this matter, many of the abuses over the past years have been corrected. A few of them remain today. Those that do remain can be further corrected by the administrative policy of the Department of the Air Force, and I am certain that they will be.

It seems to me we are closing our minds to the facts when we impose a limitation of 100 hours by law, and put it into legislative form. The facts are that first we are governed by the National Security Act in some of these things. Of course, that was by the action of Congress, and that act required the Air Force to be in readiness at all times for prompt and sustained air operation. The other fact is that readiness can be achieved only by sustained and required training.

There is something else to be understood about this 100-hour figure. It was originally established by the Air Force as a minimum for professional flight training for pilots in an administrative position.

We cannot overlook the fact that there will always be the necessity of placing many experienced pilots in administrative positions.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRICE. I yield to my colleague from Mississippi.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I have just this morning found out that the cost of a B-36 is somewhere in the vicinity of $3 million, and a B-47 runs to about $2 million. The destruction or crash of one B-36 by a rusty pilot would more than offset any savings that might accrue from placing this 100-hour limitation in this bill, not to mention the lives of the boys who might be in the air.

Mr. PRICE. The gentleman brings out a very good point, but regardless of that we have to take into consideration the primary mission of the Air Force. We have to recognize the fact that many officers are required to occupy administrative and other desk positions, who will be the men called upon in the first brush that the Air Force is brought into in case of trouble any place in the world. These are the men who will carry on the

first efforts and first action of our Air Force in the event of war.

The 100-hour flying limitation was originally established by the Air Force as a minimum for proficiency flight training for pilots in administrative, technical, and staff positions. It was never thought of as a maximum. It was determined by calculating the lowest rate of flying time at which the proficiency of the pilot does not retrogress into an increasing and unacceptable trend of accident occurrences. Any provision in the budget which sets 100 hours as the maximum for proficiency flying serves to vitiate and compromise the entire flying safety program. And that program, I would remind my colleagues, is directed toward insuring not only safety of flight but conservation of material and personnel resources. By personnel resources I mean lives—the lives of the men who fly the planes.

Here is the Air Force, then, on the one hand, striving for readiness, and making a truly herculean effort to promote safety—which, in the long run, means economy; and here is the Congress, on the other hand, telling the Air Force, in the name of economy, that it must take steps which will increase the pilots' chances of being injured or killed.

To me, this simply does not make sense. It is basically and fundamentally wrong. It serves to deplete our reservoir of trained pilots, and it weakens, even destroys, our Air Force's ability to engage in sustained air operations. It is false economy—economy on paper, not economy of resources.

Mr. Chairman, the destruction of only 1 or 2 modern aircraft, together with the loss of their highly trained crews, will negate any paper savings which might appear to result from this flying time limitation, with its saving of gasoline.

The Air Force found out, during the Korean war, that Reserve officers, recalled to active duty and given flight refresher courses, had a 45 percent higher accident rate than officers who had been flying the prescribed minimum of 100 hours per year. This alone proves that regularity of training is a contribution to safety. It follows that increased regularity increases the contribution. No commercial airline would entrust responsibility for a plane load of passengers to a pilot whose flying time was limited to 100 hours a year, and yet with the clouds growing ever darker on the horizon, we would limit the flying of one-third of all Air Force pilots.

It is essential that our pilots continue to be the most proficient flyers in the world. It is my urgent plea, therefore, that my colleagues support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment and ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, I wish to state that, because of the very high personal regard I have for the gentleman from Mississippi, who introduced this amendment, and an equally high regard for the splendid war record he has made, it becomes unpleasant for me to oppose his amendment; but all of the picture is not nearly as bad as he and the gentleman from Illinois have painted.

In the first place, he knows, and I know, that there are not going to be any rusty pilots put in B-36's or B-47's. In the second place, the purpose of this program has been misunderstood too many times by too many people. We all know that as of today perhaps 20,000 men who have been rated as pilots, as flying men, are on desk jobs which do not at this time call for flying. Many thousands of them will no longer fly. But in order for these men who are on desk jobs now to get their flying pay the practice has been established to set up what is known as minimum individual training—MIT, which we commonly refer to as proficiency flying. That is not a proper name for it, but it has been in use so long that we will continue to use it.

In order to get this flying pay there was a requirement that they have this minimum of 100 hours a year. We knew some of these people were flying some little Beechcraft C-46's, and so on, that they had a lot of fun doing it, that they took a lot of joyrides to various parts of the country, that they did a lot of things that not only were foolish but were quite expensive. That situation grew to such an extent some remedial action had to be taken inasmuch as the Department did not do so.

This section was adopted last year and up to now it has not impeded or impaired progress or training. This is just purely for these, as the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] calls them, desk pilots, or pilots now assigned to desk jobs, so that they can keep on getting their flying pay.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCRIVNER. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I might say that two of our best pilots in the category the gentleman is referring to would be John Meyer, who served here several years as liaison officer, and who went from here to F-86's in Korea; and later, Col. Jim Wilson, who also served here for several years, left here to take charge of a B-29 group in Korea. Those men could not have done that with the handicap of the 100-hour provision in effect during their service here at the Capitol.

Mr. SCRIVNER. The gentleman designated the category, and surely he does not believe they would be taken from a desk job to a B-47 without taking the required 100 to 120 days training pressure course?

I am not a flier. I have flown as a passenger quite a few thousand miles, and I want these men to be good pilots because they are the men who have my life in their hands. I would not do anything that would jeopardize the skill of these pilots because I might ride with one of them one of these days. But before they go back into active flying they are given 120 days training under pressure. If you will read the entire hearings and read the report, you will find that this provision does not restrict training flying in any degree.

I know the gentleman from Mississippi is interested in this matter and wants the whole story. This section does not restrict training flying one single solitary minute. There were some people who were getting flying pay we did not think were entitled to it. They have been taken off. The bill passed last year with this language in it. We have not changed it.

This act did not go into effect until late in August, so that by the time the regulations were drafted, the real effect of this provision in last year's bill did not come into effect until late in the fall. But even in that short time it was found that this has reduced the so-called proficiency flying. It stopped many abuses and probably saved somewhere in the neighborhood of $35 million or more.

Here is what the Defense Department is doing: They have now set up a review board composed of fliers who are going to go over the entire list of these men who have the nonflying assignments, considering years of experience, 14, 21, or 28 years, to see whether they should stay on or be removed from flying status. Then they are going to make still further study and make recommendations, and they will come up between now and the time the appropriation hearings are before us next spring, probably in January, with a complete report showing the effects of this provision during the period of time it has been in operation, and they are going to set up their standards, stop the abuses, and still make it possible for these men to keep their hand in. If they are not going to fly again, why waste all this time and just let them joyride around all over the country? I think the gentleman from Mississippi agrees that these abuses should be stopped.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I agree there were and are abuses, but if there are men in the Air Force who will never fly again operationally, let us remove them from flying status.

Mr. SCRIVNER. That will be one of the results.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I recognize the fact that the gentleman is as sincere as he can be in supporting this limitation, and I am sure that he will grant me the same concession.

Mr. SCRIVNER. There is never any question in my mind about the gentleman's sincerity.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I thank the gentleman. I think both of us would like to see the same end result, and the only difference between us is a difference of opinion as to what the ultimate effect of such a limitation would be.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Of course, it has not been in effect long enough to give us any real, definite conclusion. That is one reason I suggested, when we talked about this yesterday, that this provision be left in for a year, and by that time we will have some real facts to go on.

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCRIVNER. I yield to the gentleman from Texas, for whom I also have great admiration.

Mr. TEAGUE. The gentleman stated that no flight training has been restricted.

Mr. SCRIVNER. That is right.

Mr. TEAGUE. In reading the hearings, it seems there is a considerable difference of opinion between the committee and the Air Force as to what this amendment means and what it does.

Mr. SCRIVNER. I know, but all we can do is to write the provisions of the law. We cannot administer it for them. We found when this section came up before the committee that there was some question, and we were told that in so many words—and the gentleman from California and all of us were in on this discussion which you will find, I believe, on page 500 of the hearings—that this was to be confined solely to the maximum individual proficiency flying. The Secretary then read just exactly what the provision was, and he stated that there would be a limitation of 100 hours of proficiency flying. And I said, "That is right, proficiency flying." And that was when he got the flying pay. If you will go down further in the hearings, you will find where we told them that there was no intention whatsoever on the part of the committee or the section to stop flying training. The Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of Air, or any one of these youngsters in the Pentagon Building, if they find there is any need for them to get flying training, all they have to do is to get an order, and he gets it. It will not interfere with flying training whatsoever. I feel that the provision contained in the bill this year and last year should be retained and that the amendment should be voted down.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS]. It seems to me that the language of the bill on pages 43 and 44—paraphrased—clearly limits the time a pilot may fly to 100 hours a year. It reads:

> No part of the appropriations in this act shall be available for * * * operating aircraft * * * for the purpose of proficiency flying except in accordance with regulations issued by the Secretaries of the Departments concerned * * * which shall establish proficiency standards and maximum and minimum flying hours for this purpose, but not to exceed 100 hours during the fiscal year.

To me it seems clear that the time limited to any one pilot, and we are talking about those who are on some kind of desk duty but who are qualified USAF pilots, is 100 hours per year.

These pilots may have come from the Strategic Air Force, from a Fighter Squadron, from the Military Air Transport Service, from a Search and Rescue Squadron or from other categories in the USAF.

It is the policy of the Air Force to rotate its pilots to various kinds of jobs, so they will get a broad experience. In the group are some who later in their career will hold top positions in the USAF and this is a means of widening their experience and learning about their ability to handle important assignments. But these men are pilots and most of them young enough so they will, when a tour as a liaison officer or a personnel officer is over, go back to flying.

I conceive the word proficiency to mean the development of proficiency in flying, as well as indicating enough flying to place the pilot on a flying pay status.

The committee by statements in its report indicate that it believes proficiency means to do enough flying so as to qualify for flight pay. But I do not think that the committee can give an interpretation on what its language in the bill means, which is contrary to the express language of the act.

Proficiency to me means proficiency in flying. That means skill in flying. From a modest experience as a pilot many years ago in the air service, I do not think that 100 hours a year is enough flying—less than 2 hours a week—to keep a pilot sharp and keen. Flying and landing airplanes requires skill, coordination of muscle and eye, judgment as to speed and many other qualities. It is a skill that requires constant practice if the pilot is to be sharp as he should be to assure the maximum safety of the aircraft and passengers who are entrusted to him. It is just like any other skill—whether in golf, playing a violin, football, etc. To be good and to keep keen and sharp one must continually practice the skill.

The cost of this extra flying would be nominal. It is using aircraft which the USAF already has. It would merely cost the amount.

Noted pilots like Edward Rickenbacker and James Doolittle do not think 100 hours per year is enough to keep a pilot proficient. Everyone who has ever been in a squadron realizes that sharpness, which means superskill in handling the plane comes from constantly flying. A pilot learns something from almost every flight he makes. Being away from the cockpit of his plane makes him feel strange in it. It should really be his life and to make it such he should have a chance to fly as much as he wants to. That is the purpose of the amendment. Col. James Wilson was a liaison officer several years ago. Last fall when on an official trip for the Armed Services Committee I met him in Hawaii and he was in command of a bombardment wing. When he was in Washington he flew a lot to keep himself fit as a pilot. All these pilots who are on desk jobs should have full opportunity to fly so when they go back to flying, either as a commander of a squadron or other flying duty they will be fit to take over.

I think I am justified in quoting Hon. STUART SYMINGTON as saying in substance, when he was Secretary of the Air Force, "that we want our pilots in the air as much as possible. That is what makes them sharp, keen, and skillful in their particular specialty."

Unless one has lived in an air squadron, where flying was your only occupation, he cannot understand how important good flying is to morale. We had a commanding officer in my squadron who set an example by his excellent flying record. He was a model for us. We all strove to be as good as he was as a pilot and the morale of the squadron was wonderful.

I hope I may be pardoned for referring to my own personal experience. Another squadron operating out of the same field had a squadron commander who was a poor flier, who did not inspire his flying officers. He was soon removed as his attitude almost destroyed the morale of the squadron.

Our pilots today must be the best. They have superhuman tasks and on their skill rests our safety and security. It is a small but an important contribution to their efforts to be the best pilots in the world that we should give them all the time they want to increase their ability and proficiency to fly their planes.

I realize that a very few may abuse the rule required to be observed to draw flying pay. But that matter should be handled by the Air Force. We should not punish the many who are sincerely anxious to improve their flying skill because a few weak sisters drew flying pay who really should not have it.

This amendment should pass so the morale of the Air Force will remain good.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, I find on returning to the desk that I made a misstatement when I was presenting the matter. I said that these men should be given 120 hours refresher training. It is 120 days.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment. During 4 years' experience that I had in the United States Air Force I saw a lot of money wasted in the so-called proficiency flying program. I have been led to believe, since being discharged from the service in 1946, that there has continued to be some waste in this field. However, I am constrained to believe at this time that, granting that there might be a few million dollars wasted each year, based on my previous experience, I am convinced that 100 hours per year is not enough time. I do not want any money wasted. But if this waste cannot be terminated administratively—and certainly there should be some officials of the United States Air Force who can terminate it administratively—if it cannot be eliminated administratively, I would rather waste a few million dollars and maintain flight proficiency in the only branch of the service on which we can hope to depend for our future security, than to see it wasted as I did the day before yesterday in the sand hills of North Carolina. On the day before yesterday I drove through North Carolina and I saw millions of dollars being wasted there. I saw American boys with popguns playing hide and seek through the hills of North Carolina using tactics that would have been fine in World War I or II.

I am assuming that those who are directing the destinies of our Military Establishment are hoping that these boys, with popguns, can be expected to shoot down Russian TU-4's if and when the need arises, with Garand rifles. The only point that I am attempting to make

in these few minutes is that we should place these expenditures in proper perspective. If you cannot find administrative officers to man your Air Force in such a way as to keep money from being wasted in proficiency flying, then we should divert some of the money that is being wasted this week down in North Carolina training troops to engage in World War I and early World War II tactics and use that money to maintain flying proficiency in the Air Force.

I am one of those people who believes that our only hope for future security is to attain and maintain complete and positive control of the airlanes anywhere and everywhere in the world. I do not believe you can maintain proper flying proficiency among the pilot personnel with modern aircraft by restricting them to 100 hours per year.

I sincerely hope that this amendment will be adopted. By that I do not mean that this Congress should endorse the wasteful expenditure of money. But if we have got to waste money I would rather waste it in attempting to maintain flight proficiency than see it wasted in ground force maneuvers. The ground force maneuvers that I saw day before yesterday were just as obsolete as the caisson of World War I.

You cannot deliver H-bombs and A-bombs on Moscow or Smolensk with ground force divisions. You have got to have proficient flight personnel to pilot the highly technical equipment, if you are going to maintain the security of this country. I do not think that 100 hours per year is enough time. I believe that if a man does not need more than 100 hours, he should be dismissed from the Air Force as one of the flying personnel. If he does not need more than 100 hours, we do not need him at the controls of an airplane.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, when this proficiency flight matter was before the committee last year I did not support it and I did not champion it this year, but I think one has to admit that there have been, and there probably still are, some inexcusable abuses in this field. The gentleman from Mississippi nods assent to the statement which I make.

I should like to have the very careful attention of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SCRIVNER], the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], and the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MILLER], members of the subcommittee. If the interpretation they give to the present law is the correct interpretation, I do not see why anybody should be disturbed about the present limitation.

If you turn to the Department of Defense hearings—that is the Department of Defense, not one of the services—you will find on page 495 that Mr. White of the Air Force says this:

The Department of Defense supports enactment of section 720 in its present language.

That provision is now identified as section 721.

So the Air Force has officially said that it favors this language, and it has said that through the Assistant Secretary of the Air Force, Mr. White.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I think it is significant to note that none of the flying officers, including General Twining and others, were asked for their opinions by the committee on this subject.

Mr. MAHON. If the gentleman will let me proceed, I have here stated the darkest side of the picture from the standpoint of the gentleman's amendment. I want to be fair and give the full story.

The Secretary goes right on to say on the same page:

It is necessary to point out, however, that our experience with this legislation is extremely limited. During the short time it has been in effect it has not been possible to make a true evaluation of the long-range impact of restriction. We know that the restriction will in time reduce the overall experience of the pilot corps of each of the services.

I want to give the whole picture.

We know, too, daily advances in aviation and the increasing complexity and costs of air equipment demand even higher levels of pilot skill.

I skip down a little further, to where Mr. White says on page 495:

In other words, you were not driving, as I understood it, to just restrict everybody. Your feeling was that it had been abused—

That is true. I and other Members felt that it had been abused—

and a great many people were flying under proficiency flying who would never go into combat.

Mr. SCRIVNER. We were right in that belief, were we not?

Mr. WHITE. I think so; yes. However, the danger of the 100-hour limitation or any limitation like that is that the man who is going to combat some day can only fly 100 hours, too.

Mr. MILLER. Why is that, Mr. Secretary?

And then the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MILLER] further asked this very pointed question:

Why can't he fly more than 100 hours if it is for training purposes and you want him to fly more?

That is the way the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MILLER] apparently feels and that position seems to be sound.

Then the record reads further:

Mr. WHITE. As I understand the provision in the law, with the rotation that we have for officers, if a man is in SAC his flying hours are not covered by this provision. But the minute he gets rotated into the Pentagon Building or rotated somewhere else, for a year or two, then he is restricted to 100 hours, even though eventually he will go back to SAC.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. MAHON asked and was given permission to proceed for 5 additional minutes.)

Mr. MAHON. That is the way the Secretary interpreted it, apparently differently from the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MILLER.] But then the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MILLER] says this:

I would not think so. If your staff people want to extend the flying training to more hours there is nothing in this act to prevent it.

I was impressed by that statement at the time—more than I am now.

The gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MILLER] continued:

The only thing we say is that he need not fly more to draw flying pay.

And the record reads further:

Mr. WHITE. The act says that no part of the appropriation can be used—

Mr. White was interrupted and the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SCRIVNER] said:

It did not restrict the training flying whatsoever.

Mr. WHITE. Then we have been under a misapprehension in the Department.

I thought the language was not very important one way or the other in view of these statements because according to the committee, pilots could fly all they wanted to if it was for training purposes even though they were desk officers in the Pentagon. That is the clear implication from the hearing. If that were true, I would not be disturbed by this language as is the gentleman from Mississippi. But let me read a word on the next page. On page 496, the record is as follows:

Mr. MILLER. You certainly have. We have said it again and again. You still seem to say that we are trying to prevent training flying. We have not the slightest intention of doing that.

That is what the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MILLER] said, and if the gentleman from Maryland's [Mr. MILLER] word will be accepted at the Pentagon, there is no use having this amendment, and it might just as well be withdrawn.

I ask you now to read the section No. 721 as I have read it, and I do not believe the position of the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MILLER] can be at all sustained. I refer you to section 721 on page 43 of the bill I maintain the amendment says that a desk officer in the Pentagon cannot fly more than 100 hours under any circumstances or under any regulation. The bill reads as follows:

SEC. 721. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, Executive order, or regulation, no part of the appropriations in this act shall be available for any expenses of operating aircraft under the jurisdiction of the Armed Forces for the purpose of proficiency flying except in accordance with regulations issued by the Secretaries of the Departments concerned and approved by the Secretary of Defense—

If you do not go any further than that, that is fine. The Secretaries can make these regulations and they can provide for weekend flying in any desirable form, but the section reads further—

which shall establish proficiency standards and maximum and minimum flying hours for this purpose, but not to exceed 100 hours during the fiscal year.

If there is any way to avoid that interpretation, I cannot see it. I believe that some of the committee members have placed a strained interpretation on the language of the present law and that if the Air Force and Navy should

so interpret the law they would be subject to serious criticism.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, will the Gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield.

Mr. SCRIVNER. An astute attorney and practicing lawyer that the gentleman from Texas is, and I know that he is quite a good one because I have tangled with him in the committee, how you can interpret anything else into this language other than proficiency flying, I am unable to understand. That is all it relates to, proficiency flying. When you come to page 44, fixing the maximum and minimum hours for this purpose, that means for the purpose of proficiency flying. It has no other meaning, except that flying which is necessary for these men to draw flight pay. It does not exclude the Secretary or anybody in command from assigning these men to as many hours as officials thinks they should have.

Mr. MAHON. Let me ask the gentleman this question: Here is a young man 25 years of age, a young officer, transferred from some airfield into Washington. Perhaps he is in a liaison position or over at the Pentagon. It may be his actual duties have nothing to do with actual flying. Does the gentleman say that under the existing law, and under the regulations of the Secretary of the Air Force, approved by the Secretary of Defense, he may fly two or three hundred hours a year?

Mr. SCRIVNER. Not for proficiency flying, but the Secretary could assign him to any unlimited number of hours of training flying.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. MAHON was granted 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. MAHON. Does the gentleman mean to say that the legislative intent of this provision of this act is that any desk officer, under the circumstances mentioned, could be assigned to flight on weekends or at other times when he is not performing his duty as a liaison officer, in excess of 100 hours a year?

Mr. SCRIVNER. For training flying, yes.

Mr. MAHON. Does he have to be assigned to a specific unit?

Mr. SCRIVNER. That is a matter of mechanics that is not difficult to work out. But the gentleman knows and I know there is a tremendous difference between training flying and so-called proficiency flying. The difference is so great that I do not understand how anyone in the Pentagon could have any doubt about it.

Mr. MAHON. In other words, you think the law is being misinterpreted?

Mr. SCRIVNER. I think the application has been too limited.

Mr. MAHON. And that it should admit of desk officers flying more than a hundred hours for training purposes?

Mr. SCRIVNER. Surely. There is no question in my mind about it.

Mr. MAHON. If that is the understanding, and if the Pentagon will follow that policy, I do not see any need for the pending amendment.

Mr. RAYBURN. The trouble about that is the interpretation may be wrong. If you put the amendment in, there will be no question about the interpretation. We are not interpreting this law. We are passing it.

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield.

Mr. TEAGUE. Certainly the Air Force did not interpret this as our members of the subcommittee have interpreted it.

Mr. MAHON. I myself did not so interpret the language but if we could persuade officials to interpret it as the gentleman from Kansas interprets it, I do not see the necessity for a change in the law. However, I admit that it may be difficult for the Defense Department to follow the interpretation given by the committee in view of the express language in the bill.

Mr. TEAGUE. But I do not see how officials can follow the committee in view of the language in the present act.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. Yes; I yield.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close at the conclusion of the remarks of the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. Chairman, I would like 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman amend his request to allow the gentleman from Texas to have 5 minutes?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I will amend the request that all debate on the amendment and amendments thereto close in 10 minutes after the conclusion of the remarks by the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MILLER].

The CHAIRMAN. With 5 minutes allowed to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BENTSEN]?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. And the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. RHODES].

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Texas, my distinguished colleague [Mr. MAHON] has been reading part of this record. I will not read any more of it than necessary, but there are several more pages of it and it develops that not only did Mr. White interpret this provision contrary to the way the committee intended, but it also seems that General Asensio said on page 500 of the hearings:

> Sir, if I have been tilting at windmills, we will be very happy—

And to that I replied:

> You certainly have ever since this came into the law.

Then the general replied:

> Then we will be delighted to dispense with the windmill.

Your committee thought the matter had been cleared up there.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. What I would like to find out is this, and this is the crux of the whole question, in my opinion: Does proficiency flying mean only the minimum time you fly to get flight pay?

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. To draw flight pay. We want to remember that.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Does it not also include improving the man's proficiency as a flyer?

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. No, that would be training flying. Proficiency flying is a misnomer as it is used in this connection.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. With every flight his proficiency is enhanced, or his knowledge of flying skill is improved.

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. Yes, any time he flies he learns something, and therefore it might be considered training, but as far as the pay bill is concerned this word proficiency means enough flying to entitle him to draw flight pay.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. And who made that interpretation, that decision?

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. I call your attention, if you will, to page 7 of the committee report. So that there can be no further misunderstanding about it I would like the membership to note that the committee makes this statement in its report:

> The committee received testimony that the limitation on proficiency flying was, in certain instances, interpreted to restrict flying for training purposes. The history of this limitation, including the debate on the 1954 bill, includes no statement to the effect that training flying is to be limited. It is the intent of the committee that this limitation be so administered as to leave no question that training flying, as determined by the Secretary, is excluded from the limitations contained in section 721 of the bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. I have not much time left, but I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I do not see how the understanding of the committee and its statement in the report can overcome the specific language that is in the bill itself.

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. With the gentleman's permission I can only say that in my opinion as a lawyer that if there were any doubt as to what that language meant, the debate, the committee hearings, but more than anything else the fact that the language has been interpreted in the committee report should remove any doubt or uncertainty as to what was meant by this language. The committee has said what it means in its report. It would therefore seem to me that there could not be any doubt that training flying is not to be limited and that it is quite different from proficiency flying.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. But we cannot in the committee interpret a statute if it is contrary to what the act itself spells out.

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. Lawyers do not always agree on the meaning of language but when there is doubt, usually courts follow the legislative intent indicated by debate and particularly when set forth in a formal committee report.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BENTSEN].

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. Chairman, we have a situation here where the former chairman of the committee and the present chairman of the committee find themselves directly opposed to each other as to the interpretation and meaning of this language in the bill. In such a situation, and with the Air Force in a quandry as to the correct interpretation, it seems to me that the interests of the Air Force, the country and the Congress are best served by adopting the pending amendment.

We have heard a great deal of discussion about proficiency and training and the difference between them. We have been told there is a great difference and an obvious one. But to me, a pilot who is retaining or keeping up his proficiency is also in the process of training. In flying you are constantly running into new situations, I do not care how many hours you have flown in the past. A different type of engine failure, a new weather condition, a new icing condition, that results in continued training of that particular pilot. I think the difference is so nebulous and that there is such a faint line between proficiency and training that the present language in the bill is confusing; therefore should be removed.

One of the things you notice in combat overseas is the morale of the squadron, the group or the wing. Much of it is determined by the commander or "old man" of that particular unit. He must be able to fly as well as the men under his command if he is to have their respect; yet sometimes during World War II you saw commanders come in on a squadron, wing or group who were poorly trained flyers or who had been away from flying too long. They could not do the job of close formation flying, instrument flying and precision flying as well as men under their command. The reason was they had been at desk jobs and in many instances they did not keep up their proficiency and training for continued flying operations.

The SAC has set up some limits of minima of amount of flying hours needed before a man can fill certain flying positions. A B-47 co-pilot must have 900 hours, a B-47 pilot 1,500 to 2,000 hours depending on type, and a B-36 pilot 2,000 to 3,000 hours depending on type.

It is perfectly feasible to find a man who has served in the Pentagon for two 3-year tours who has been limited to 100 hours a year to suddenly find his training and proficiency have not kept up with his birthdays. The results are the age bracket for these positions in the SAC goes higher and higher for the type of men who are to command the B-47's or the B-36's. You find as they grow older their alertness is not as good, and you are losing the best physical years of these men who have command and executive capabilities. The young men who have the physical alertness are not achieving the level of proficiency and training as required. By the time they achieve the necessary total hours, they are bifocal pilots.

I believe the amendment should be adopted to eliminate the confusion between proficiency and training flights. It cannot be shown where one starts and whether the other stops.

Today we are building an all-weather Air Force, one that is operated by jets. That means a higher degree of training, that means a higher degree of proficiency for those men. If we are going to have them go out flying their missions with less hours, you are going to have a greater number of aircraft accidents. You are going to lose more planes and you are going to lose valuable men.

Captain Jarecki, the escaped Polish pilot, had this to say when interviewed by our intelligence officers:

> I was a pilot in a MIG squadron, and I had less than 150 hours in the air. Of those, 100 hours were in the conventional planes or training units. Then I was assigned to a tactical unit where I got 5 hours in a two-place jet trainer, the training version of the MIG. After I had 40 hours in the MIG, I escaped. I think most of the Red pilots flying in Korea probably have had the same kind of training, and this is no match for our American training.

So I say, let us not make a fair weather Air Force out of our most important deterrent to attack. It is my firm conviction that a maximum of 100 hours of flying a year will not retain a pilot's proficiency particularly when only a small portion of that is normally allocated to instruments.

You do not always know what your weather will be at the start of a flight despite weather predictions. You may start out on a nice clear day but the first thing you know you are surrounded by weather. You had better know how to fly on instruments and have had sufficient training.

In emergencies, because of malfunction of equipment or because of weather conditions, you simply have not time to have to think out each step of your procedure. Your training must have indoctrinated you to such an extent that your reactions are automatic.

If you lose one, or two, of the few of these expensive airplanes because of insufficient training or lack of proficiency, you will have lost not only the lives of the pilots but the planes. It is impossible to put a dollar value on the life of any young American, but we do know what it has cost the Government to train him and what the aircraft has cost. In dollars alone you will have lost more than you could save with this attempt at false economy.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENTSEN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. The gentleman is, indeed, an excellent pilot and has had a lot of experience. Is not this a fact, that you have to have good coordination of your eyes and muscles and use good judgment, and the more you fly the sharper you get?

Mr. BENTSEN. The more automatic your reaction is. I will say this to the gentleman: I used to think, as many of us did, that I was a pretty good pilot, but after the war, when I came back, I was a Sunday airplane driver. I do not pilot an airplane anymore, because I am not proficient in flying now, because I do not have the automatic reaction I would have to have. We must not relegate our Air Force officer while on administrative jobs to Sunday airplane drivers.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BENNETT].

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I support the amendment before us, but I do it for slightly different reasons than those so far announced. I have been impressed by the arguments made to the effect that a greater period of time in the air is needed; but the major reason I support the amendment before us today is because the provision in the bill is legislation on an appropriation bill and should properly be handled by the Committee on Armed Services, where it could be given adequate consideration.

One of the main reasons I have risen to speak is that I think it would be a grave mistake for Congress to leave in the record the impression that there is substantial support here for the idea that the infantry soldier is no longer needed. More people are being drafted into the Army today than in any other branch of the services. These men are making sacrifices for our country. Their chances for fatalities are greater than among the other services. They are greatly needed. That situation will continue for the foreseeable future. I remember before the Inchon landing in Korea one of the outstanding generals in the history of this country proposed that amphibious landings were a thing of the past, and only a few weeks after that he had to eat his own words. There were certainly very important amphibious landings at Inchon. I think it would be a mistake for people to believe that Congress feels that these current maneuvers in North Carolina are not needed. Certainly, the infantry soldiers are needed. They must be trained. The history of war shows that where you have one set of weapons and you acquire another, you merely add; you do not subtract, and I hope that it will be clear to everybody who is listening to this debate that the infantry soldier is greatly needed. As one who has been a foot soldier for approximately 5 years in World War II, I think I know what the infantry soldier is up against. Some people say that the infantry soldier is a thing of the past because the next war will be only a push-button war. I wish with all my heart that that would be so. I would gladly give my life to make it true that the infantry soldier is no longer needed. Unfortunately that is not true.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. I would like to make it clear that a large portion of the Congress do not regard the maneuvers for ground troops as a waste of the people's money; in fact, they are vitally necessary for the defense of the Nation.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. 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 New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that at this particular juncture it would be unwise for the Congress to restrict the Air Force in any manner as to the training of its personnel. True, the statement has been made that the Air Force officers failed to oppose the 100-hour limitation. However, it has also been pointed out that they were asked to cut their budget to the bone, and proficiency flying would appear to be the first cutback. I am alarmed at the possibility of Pentagon flying officers being limited in proficiency flying in jets. To stay on the top of the ball in jet flying it may be necessary to have far more than 100 hours provided as a limitation in this bill. Consequently, I must rise in support of the amendment striking out the limitation.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. RHODES].

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, might I have the attention of my good friend, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SCRIVNER], the chairman of the subcommittee?

Mr. SCRIVNER. The gentleman always has my attention when he talks.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I would like to say to the gentleman that it pains me deeply to be in favor of an amendment which the gentleman opposes. I have the greatest respect for him.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Never let my position interfere with your own judgment.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. One question I would like to ask that came to my mind as the result of the colloquy which preceded this particular matter. It is my understanding if I am assigned to the Pentagon Building as an officer in the Air Force, in the personnel section, and I have nothing to do with flying whatsoever except insofar as I am an officer of the Air Force, that I can only get 100 hours per year of flying. Further, it is my understanding that if the Secretary of the Air Force believes that at some time or other I am going to combat, that he can give me an additional duty involving training, and if that is done, I can then get as many hours of flying as there are aircraft available. Is that a correct statement?

Mr. SCRIVNER. I would not interpret it quite as broadly as the gentleman states, but if you read on page 501 of the hearings, we discussed that question. The 100 hours only relates to the drawing of proficiency pay; in other words, rated fliers have got to fly this time in order to get their flying pay. I think the gentleman understands that. That is what we normally call proficiency flying. It is an improper word, but if you will read on the bottom of page 501, we discussed the question that the gentleman asks. If a young officer were brought into the Pentagon Building out of SAC and is going to return to SAC and is going to be a combat pilot, then, in so many words, all in the world that the Secretary has to do is to assign him to flying training. It is just that simple, and I do not know why there has been so much confusion or doubt in this whole situation.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Actually the provision on line 3 of page 44 refers only to proficiency.

Mr. SCRIVNER. That is right.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. And the Secretary of Defense may assign any given officer to an additional duty which would allow him to fly more than 100 hours.

Mr. SCRIVNER. He would assign him to flying training.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SCRIVNER), there were—ayes 95, noes 63.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 737. In order more effectively to administer the funds appropriated to the Department of Defense, the President, to the extent he deems it necessary and appropriate in the interest of national defense, may authorize positions in the Department of Defense to be placed temporarily in grades 16, 17, and 18 of the General Schedule of the Classification Act of 1949 in accordance with the procedures and standards of that act, and such positions shall be additional to the number authorized by section 505 of that act. Under authority herein, grades 16, 17, and 18 in the Department of Defense may be increased only to the extent that the total of such grades in the Department of Defense shall not exceed 200.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is their objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, in a speech I made previously today I referred to the purpose of our military strength in connection with the attainment of national objectives in our foreign policy.

I shall enlarge on that thought in the remarks I am about to make.

I suppose I am in the marked minority but history has shown on many occasions the minority was right and the majority was wrong.

I have repeatedly said in and outside of this House: "The only thing the Communists respect is what they fear, and that is power and strength greater than they possess."

I further have said "For a Communist is possessed of the mind of a world killer."

It was only a few weeks ago when a tax reduction bill was being debated in this House that I said, in substance, "Instead of reducing taxes we should be thinking of greater defense: that if President Eisenhower were to recommend more appropriations for greater defense he could ask for an extension of expiring taxes, and the people would support him; that the American people are willing to make all sacrifices necessary for security and for world peace."

In considering the purpose of military strength it must be borne in mind it is directly and mainly connected with the attainment of national objectives in foreign policy.

There are only three ways that I know of how these objectives can be brought about or obtained.

First. In case of war by winning it.

Second. By creating such a preponderance of military strength that a nation can enforce its will without going to war.

Third. By negotiating around a bargaining table.

If we are not stronger from a military angle than the Soviet Union then the first two are out.

From the evidence I have we are not stronger than the Soviet Union.

My information is that the Soviet Union has at least 175 divisions in active service, plus some 50 to 75 European satellite divisions. This does not include the 250 to 300 reserve divisions, nor the armies of Red China.

Compare that with the land strength of our allies and ourself.

As I understand it, we have a warplane production of all types of about 12,000 a year which we must compare with the best estimate of 22,000 a year for the Soviet Union including 5,400 MIG jet fighters.

I have heard it said that the Soviet Union has been feverishly building a strong navy, and even some competent authorities have said that the overall strengths of the navy of the Soviet Union is second only to the United States.

I have heard competent authorities say that the submarine fleet of the Soviet Union exceeds the combined underwater fleet of the rest of the world. Also, that the Soviet Union is building 4 and possibly 5 new super battleships capable of launching guided missiles.

In the field of atomic and hydrogen bombs the knowledge exists that the Soviet Union has made considerable if not great progress.

We hear of the building of bombers capable of flying to a destination in the United States and of returning to the Soviet Union.

We cannot think today in terms of only a few years ago—1948—when we possessed the atomic bomb and, on the best information our intelligence had then, the Soviet Union did not.

Is there anyone who honestly thinks we have the strength and are building the strength to know if war should suddenly come we can win it?

Is there anyone who honestly thinks we have such a preponderance of military strength that the Soviet Union and its satellites and Red China fear the same, and that we have such strength that the Soviets would be afraid to carry out a sneak attack on us and our allies?

If we are not strong enough in the first two respects what chances would we have "on negotiation around a bargaining table?"

If we are not strong enough in the first two purposes I have mentioned, are we strong enough, or building in the immediate future, enough military strength to insure a favorable negotiated peace at some future conference table?

You will note I said "a favorable negotiated peace."

Certainly any unfavorable one would be just too bad for our country and for our people.

If I am going to err, I prefer to err on the side of strength than on the side of weakness.

In the world of today, between lower taxes and greater military strength—I prefer greater strength. As between dollars and liberty—I prefer liberty—and I know you and every other American does.

But have we got the military strength to enable our country to attain its national objectives in foreign policy, or if war is thrust upon us to be capable of winning the war?

These are questions that transcend party policies. They directly relate to the national interest of our country.

Exercising my judgment and searching my conscience I do not think we have that military strength.

President Eisenhower must answer these questions in communion with his conscience. So must all Americans, particularly those of us entrusted with responsibility.

For history is being made, and history will judge all of us and particularly the President of the United States, who mainly determines our policies for what we do or what we fail to do.

While I am pleased to note the new policy of 137 air wing groups by latter 1957, I do not feel happy with the reductions made in the other branches of our armed services, particularly in the Army.

With the world plotters of communism determined to conquer the world and to enslave all peoples, with the resultant viciousness and cruelty, my judgment tells me and my conscience dictates to me that this is not the sound or wise course to take.

To me, it is erring on the side of weakness and not on the side of strength.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read the amendment, as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. COUDERT: On page 50, add a new section, beginning on line 3, as follows:

"SEC. 738. None of the funds appropriated by this act shall be available for defraying any of the expenses of maintaining uniformed personnel of the United States in armed conflict anywhere in the world: *Provided*, That this prohibition shall not be applicable with respect to armed conflict pursuant to a declaration of war or other express authorization by Congress or with respect to armed conflict occasioned by an attack on the United States, its Territories or possessions, or an attack on any nation with whom the United States has a mutual defense or security treaty."

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for an additional 5 minutes and to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, I shall probably not require the 10 minutes to state my position on this matter, because yesterday afternoon, at the close of the general debate, I stated fully the reasons for this amendment. My statement appears on page 5694 of the RECORD, if any Member wishes to read it.

This amendment speaks for itself. It is the outgrowth of the resolution that I introduced 3½ years ago in January, which would have established the principle that funds appropriated for the military would not be available for foreign military adventures solely upon the individual responsibility and decision of any President, without full participation by the Congress, as provided in the Constitution itself where the war-declaring power was put in the Congress.

The resolution, which is now House Joint Resolution 20, has been reposing quietly in a pigeonhole of the Committee on Armed Services for these 3½ long years. Each year I have written to the chairman and requested that the committee give attention to that proposal to the end that something be done, something; and I have no such pride of authorship as to insist that my particular something be it. However, I insist that something be done to prevent another Korea in the near or distant future by any President who chooses to interpret the Constitution in such a way as to permit him to bypass the Congress in committing the people of the United States to great and bloody wars.

For 3 years we have sat silent in this House, we have done nothing, we have taken no steps, no constructive steps, to cure the situation that was revealed in the tragic Korean episode. I submit, Mr. Chairman, that we have been very remiss in that.

Insofar as I am concerned, had that resolution of mine or some similar resolution been reported out, had the House had an opportunity to express itself on this vitally important matter, I would not be here today with this amendment. This limitation on an appropriation bill is the only method available to bring this question before the House, because appropriation bills have to come out here, they have to be passed, and committees cannot keep them in pigeonholes. So this bill offers the only opportunity the Members of this House are going to have this year or any other year to take a position in defense of the constitutional prerogatives of the Congress so as to secure it in its constitutional power to make war or not to make war. In other words, this particular amendment would use the appropriating power, the power of the purse, to buttress the power to declare war, which we have seen so clearly can be vital.

I am very much disappointed that our President undertook this morning to express disapproval of this amendment. I frankly do not understand it. I am disappointed. I hoped he would go the other way. As I indicated in my remarks yesterday, he has repeatedly declared that he would not commit the United States to armed conflict in Indochina or anywhere else without the consent of the Congress. He having taken that position publicly, having proclaimed that position to the world, it certainly seemed to me that in offering this amendment I was taking him at his own word, and I was seeking to put on the books legislation that would carry out the very purpose and the very practice that he himself advocates and promises to pursue in dealing with the constitutional relations of the Executive with the Congress.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COUDERT. I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. I am glad the gentleman referred to the public statements of the President in respect to his recognition of the congressional responsibility concerning declarations of war. May I say to the gentleman I have heard him make those statements many times at other meetings where I have been in attendance, and I happen to be one of those who believe in his honesty of intention and purpose, and that he will follow that course. May I say to the gentleman: Do you understand if your amendment were adopted and one of our naval vessels was attacked on the high seas or a squadron of our planes were attacked over the high seas, under your amendment they could not even fire back until Congress decided to do something about it?

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, I understand that perfectly. I will take those two points one at a time. In the first place, I am naturally gratified, as every Member of this House is and every citizen of the United States is gratified, at the President's insistence that he will not commit the United States to war without congressional action. That being the case, I wonder if some people in the United States, however, and in this House, may not wonder why he, and his supporters and leaders in this House, should be opposed to this amendment which would in effect carry out exactly what he says he is going to do. That is a curious inconsistency on that point, I might say.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COUDERT. I yield.

Mr. TABER. The amendment that you have offered here would prevent any Governor of any State from calling out the militia to quell a riot. It would prevent the use of our troops to repel trouble in Okinawa and Japan where we have our troops quartered, and in Germany where we have our troops quartered. It would even knock us out of Formosa. That is the picture you are presenting to the Congress.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes so that I may complete my statement and also answer the points made by the gentlemen from New York and Indiana.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for just one more question?

Mr. COUDERT. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. In connection with an emergency, what could be done if the Congress were not in session?

Mr. COUDERT. All right, let us then take them all together. The first one was propounded by the gentleman from Indiana. It seems to me that airplanes, American naval and military planes have been shot out of the air by Soviet fighters in Germany and in the Far East. Now that is the sort of case he is presenting. I say as to that there is no reason under the sky why Congress should not be brought in before the question of war or peace is determined with respect to any isolated episodes of that sort.

As to the question raised by the gentleman from New York, my chairman for whom I have the warmest regard and the highest respect, the areas that he covered first, riots in the United States—this particular amendment refers to armed conflict. Certainly, no one is going to construe armed conflict as meaning riots for which the militia may be called out.

Mr. TABER. I am afraid the gentleman has not read his amendment.

Mr. COUDERT. My amendment refers to armed conflict anywhere in the world.

Mr. TABER. That would be it.

Mr. COUDERT. No. 2, as to Japan and Okinawa—Japan and Okinawa are covered in the exception to the limitation which excepts from the operation of the limitation all of those countries with which we have mutual defense or security treaties and that includes and covers Japan, Okinawa, and the areas in Germany in which we are in occupation. In other words, under this amendment everyone of the vital areas including in the NATO countries, the inter-American reciprocal aid countries which is pan America—all of North and South America—the tripartite Pacific treaty with New Zealand and Australia—it covers Japan, Okinawa, the Philippine Islands, South Korea, in other words, it leaves the President completely free and unhampered to do what he deems best to carry out our obligations under mutual defense pacts covering 593 million people on this earth. In other words, it leaves the President completely free and unhampered to do whatever he deems best to carry out our obligation of the various defense pacts covering 593 million people of this earth.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COUDERT. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS. The gentleman is aware, of course, that we have no such treaty with South Korea, so that an attack on our forces in South Korea could not be resisted under the gentleman's agreement? The gentleman doubtless did not look up some of these things.

Mr. COUDERT. Yes; the gentleman knew all about that. The Senate has ratified the South Korea treaty. The only thing that remains to be done is the exchange of ratifications, which is a ministerial act and can be done at any moment the Executive chooses to do it. So for all practical purposes South Korea is covered in this matter.

Mr. HALE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COUDERT. I yield to the gentleman from Maine.

Mr. HALE. What would be the status, under the gentleman's amendment, of the 100 or so airplane mechanics now supposed to be stationed with the French Army in Indochina?

Mr. COUDERT. I think it is a fair assumption, if we take the President's statements at face value, that they are not engaged in armed conflict. That is the limitation in this amendment. That is why I chose the term "armed conflict." It would not apply to any civilian or military help that was not engaged in armed conflict.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COUDERT. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. I think the gentleman said something about a mutual-defense treaty with Germany.

I know of no such treaty.

Mr. COUDERT. I consulted the State Department about that and I was advised that an attack upon any one of the occupying forces of the three forces would constitute an attack under NATO.

Mr. JAVITS. So far as I know, Germany is not a party to NATO. At the very least there is a knotty legal question involving the coming into force of the contractual basis with the German Federal Republic and the EDC. I do not see how we can risk the security of our forces in West Germany by tieing their hands by any such amendment as this.

Mr. COUDERT. Does the gentleman suggest for a moment that there is going to be a Russian attack on our forces in Germany that is not going to be a part of an overall massive attack that will violate the NATO agreement?

Mr. JAVITS. I say we should not act on the floor of this House on this amendment on the supposition that there will not be one and I do not think the House, being responsible, should speculate on the security of forces we have in Germany either.

Mr. COUDERT. Is there any limitation that the gentleman would accept upon the presently unlimited power of the President to commit the United States to war?

Mr. JAVITS. The President has no such unlimited power, under the Constitution or otherwise, and the gentleman knows it. The restrictions are now written into the Constitution. What the gentleman's amendment would do is to deprive the President of his powers as the Commander in Chief, which is set up by the Constitution as a power equal with the Congress' powers. The defect of the gentleman's amendment is that it seeks on an appropriation bill to deprive the President of his constitutional power.

Mr. COUDERT. Was the gentleman in this House in June 1950—I think he was—when the American forces were sent to Korea? Was the Congress consulted? Was the gentleman given an opportunity, or any one of us, to say whether we should do so?

Mr. JAVITS. The Congress that same day could have stopped the President from doing it, if it wanted to, by resolution. Also the general opinion at that time was that, if he had asked authority of Congress, the Congress would have given it to him that day.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, I am not going to prolong this any further. The issue is very simple. It is a matter for Members to answer each according to his own conscientious convictions. It is obvious that as of today, under the circumstances of today, there is a definite loophole in our system of operation. The President has the power, for all practical purposes, without limitation—and that was demonstrated in June 1950—to commit the United States to unlimited war without sending one word to this Capitol or stepping up here himself or asking for any action from us. For all practical purposes that is totalitarian power. It may be that in the case of the present incumbent, for whom I have the greatest admiration, he will observe the traditional division of powers and the traditional war or peacemaking authority under the Constitution of this body in which we sit.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. COUDERT was granted 1 additional minute.)

Mr. COUDERT. The fact that this President recognizes the situation, the traditional division of power and the traditional functions of the Executive and Congress, is no reason for not incorporating into law something that will prevent any future President from violating such traditions.

We are living in a world of tyranny; we are living in a world of flux and change, and there is nothing more important for us than to keep alive our representative institutions, our institutions of free goverment; and I deem that some such limitation as this must be written into our laws to protect the very existence of Congress as part of the governing body of the United States.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I regret very much that the pending amendment has been offered at this time.

I am opposed to it first because I think it is entirely unnecessary; secondly, because I think it has possibilities of producing far-reaching consequences at this critical moment in the world's history.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield.

Mr. VORYS. Did the gentleman from New York ever offer this amendment to the great Appropriations Committee when this bill was under consideration?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. It was never offered before the bill came to the floor of the House.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I will yield briefly, but I would like to make a statement. The gentleman has had 16 minutes.

Mr. COUDERT. It is in connection with the statement just made.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield.

Mr. COUDERT. Did not the gentleman from New York advise the Appropriations Committee on Monday that he intended to introduce this amendment?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. He did, but that was not the question which the gentleman from Ohio asked.

However the author of this amendment may construe it, the important thing is how it may be construed by those in other lands at this critical time in which we are living.

In my judgment the adoption of this amendment could handicap our negotiators overseas.

In my judgment it could be construed as a sign of weakness on the part of the American Government.

In my judgment it could be construed as lack of support of the President of the United States.

In my judgment it could be construed as an invitation to further aggression in Indochina.

It was not so many years ago that a statement was made by our Secretary of State, Secretary Acheson, in respect to the interest of this country in the Far East. However, Secretary Acheson may have construed that statement, it was apparently construed in the Far East as a declaration of lack of interest in Korea, or as an invitation, if you will, to move into Korea.

In any event, shortly after the statement, war broke out in Korea with all the suffering which it entailed.

Surely this House does not want to take any action at this time which might be construed in a similar way in the light of that experience.

Reference has been made to the point of view of the President in regard to involving this country in war.

I hold in my hand an extract from his press and radio conference of March 10, from which I quote as follows:

QUESTION. Mr. President, Senator STENNIS said yesterday that we were in danger of becoming involved in World War III in Indochina because of the Air Force technicians there. What will we do if one of those men is captured or killed?

The PRESIDENT. I will say this: There is going to be no involvement of America in war unless it is a result of the constitutional process that is placed upon Congress to declare it. Now, let us have that clear. And that is the answer.

On today's news ticker it appears that in a press conference this morning referring to the specific proposal before us at this time, the President made the following statement:

The President called it "an artificial restriction which could not fail to damage the flexibility needed by a Chief Executive to deal with a fluid international situation."

As for the prospects of this country becoming involved in combat in Indochina, the President repeated that the United States will not get into a war except through a declaration of war by Congress.

I repeat, Mr. Chairman, this amendment is entirely unnecessary. The Constitution places the war-declaring power in our hands. The President of the United States recognizes that fact and has stated repeatedly that he intends to abide by it.

I hope most sincerely that the committee will take no action at this time which could be misconstrued abroad and thereby jeopardize the peaceful attainment of objectives vital to America and to the entire free world.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. Of course, it is impossible for anyone upon brief examination of this amendment in the time we have to envision all of the circumstances that might arise; but in my questioning of the gentleman from New York on the effect of the amendment, I asked him if this amendment were adopted and an attack was made on our naval vessels on the high seas, whether or not it could be repelled by them at that time. He did not deny that possibility. All I ask you to do is to read the language. It says:

In the event of an attack on the United States or its Territories or possessions—

That is a geographical limitation. Clearly under that language, as I said before, if our naval vessels on the high seas were attacked, this amendment would say to those men, our men, being where they have a right to be: You cannot shoot back.

I certainly do not want to support that kind of an amendment.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of New York. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. COUDERT. I would like to ask the gentleman from Indiana if he would accept my amendment if there were added to "attack on the United States, its Territories, or possessions" the phrase "troops, ships, or airplanes of the Armed Forces of the United States"?

Mr. HALLECK. No, I would not, because it is full of other defects, in spite of what the gentleman says. Our troops are on Okinawa, and they could not defend themselves. If we do not have troops on Spanish bases now we will have and if they were attacked under this they could not defend themselves. I do not know how many other places there are where the effect of this amendment might be devastating. That ought to indicate, if nothing else, that this is a matter for careful consideration, if it is a matter of consideration at all, and that this is not the way to get at it.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, it is not a pleasant thing for a person who has served for years in this House to take what appears to be from the expressions here the unpopular side of a piece of legislation. But I am not afraid to follow my convictions.

Mr. Chairman, I support the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York. The President has repeatedly said that there could be no greater tragedy than getting our troops involved in the war in Indochina. However, the need for the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York is clear because the Vice President recently stated that he thought that our boys might have to be sent into the jungles of Indochina to support the French.

The time has come to serve notice on the rest of the world that the American people are going to stop being suckers. The main reason for the war in Indochina is the determined attempts of the French to impose French rule on that unfortunate land. It is interesting to note that the French have gotten us to assume over 80 percent of the cost of the Indochina war, even though the French only spend 11.1 percent of their national income for defense purposes, while we are required to spend 14 percent of our national income for defense, exclusive of the staggering billions that we spend on foreign economic aid. French taxes are far lower than American taxes. In France a married man with one child earning $3,000 a year pays only $82.50 in income taxes, whereas in this country he would pay $180 in Federal income taxes alone. The French have been fighting gallantly at Dien Bien Phu. However, the French have made it clear by law that no French draftee can be sent to Indochina. Of course, the French are anxious to get American boys into the fighting, and the Vice President apparently agrees with them under certain circumstances.

If the Vice President has his way, and the American boys are sent to Indochina, it will not be long before we are carrying the whole brunt of the fighting as we did in Korea.

If it is proper for the French to provide by law that their draftees cannot be sent to fight in Indochina, certainly it is the clear duty of this Congress to insist that our American boys have the same protection.

Mr. Chairman, I have absolute confidence in President Eisenhower. I figure that he will carry out his promises specifically. I do not worry about that, but I hope to God nothing happens to our President, for the good of America. But, changes can come, and we can just as well spell out through this amendment our constitutional prerogatives. It is the function of the Congress to act on all these war matters. It is a matter that involves thousands upon thousands of our boys, a matter affecting every home in America, a matter which might eventually lead us into bankruptcy. The people under our Constitution were supposed to have the last say in those vital matters. So, I stand here as an unpopular Member of this House in support of this amendment.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, by unanimous vote of the Committee on Foreign Affairs this morning, when we had a brief opportunity to consider this amendment, I was designated by the chairman to point out to the House that this amendment is, in

practical effect, important legislation on an appropriation bill, legislation of the type which comes under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and that this type of legislation is now under consideration in our committee.

Mr. Chairman, under the Reorganization Act, the Committee on Foreign Affairs is charged with—

1. Relations of the United States with foreign nations generally.

7. Intervention abroad and declarations of war.

The wording of this amendment demonstrates the need for committee consideration on a matter of such transcendent momentous importance.

As a practical limitation on the President's powers now, if someone distrusts President Eisenhower, this amendment is completely ineffective because it does not apply until funds are expended in fiscal 1955, and therefore it would be no restraint upon the troops now in being which are already equipped and being paid out of existing funds.

But, as a sense resolution now, which is all it can be at this time, it does not make sense. The author had to get up here and say that it did not mean what it said and offered to doctor it up on the floor of this House. I beg of you to realize that the proper way to consider a matter of this moment is through the ordinary legislative procedure of consideration in the legislative committee or in the Committee on Appropriations. This has had no such consideration.

I say this does not make sense. Telegraphing your punch is bad, but telegraphing your enemy in advance that you are not going to punch is worse. Three times we have done that in the past 38 years, and each time that sort of policy has been followed by war. In 1917 a President was inaugurated on the basis that he kept us out of war, and we got into World War I. In 1941 a President was inaugurated who said again and again and again the boys would not fight on foreign shores, and we went into World War II. In 1950 our Secretary of State said in January that Korea was not within our defense perimeter, and in June our troops were in there fighting. Will we never learn to do what President Monroe did in 1823? He laid down in polite diplomatic language in the Monroe Doctrine—and the threat then was not so much from Europe but from Russia—that any more attempts by outsiders to take over territory in this hemisphere might mean that someone would get into war with us. As a result of that plain statement we have never had to defend the Monroe Doctrine by war.

What does "armed conflict" mean as used in this present amendment? I looked in the United States Code index and this phrase is not there. It has been invented for legislative purposes by the gentleman from New York [Mr. COUDERT]. So I looked up "conflict" in Webster's Dictionary; and, among other things, it means "a fight, a battle," "competition or opposing action of incompatibles," "a collision, a clash."

Therefore, as has been pointed out, on Formosa, in Spain, in Korea, in many places around the world where we now have bases and troops, but where we do not have treaties of mutual aid, if bandits or guerrillas attacked one of our soldiers, he would have to look on his ammunition to see if it came out of fiscal year 1955 appropriations before he would know whether he could defend himself. If, in the United States, a dangerous fugitive prisoner was trying to escape, an MP would have to look on his shoes to see whether they were fiscal 1955 issue or not, to know whether he could run after him and arrest him, because there would be danger of armed conflict there, a clash of some kind.

I suggest that in this matter, instead of relying upon General COUDERT, the gentleman from New York, who comes down here to share his wisdom with us in military matters from time to time, this would be the time when it would be wise to rely upon General Eisenhower, President Eisenhower, who has declared his purpose to the country and to the Congress, and not let him down, and not let our negotiators down in Geneva and all over the world, and not invite conflict by trying to tell our enemies where it is we are not going to fight this time.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, today is not the first time I have thought of the pending subject. I recall very distinctly during the Korean war making a statement in the well of this House that the Congress of the United States should be made acquainted with all of the facts connected with the Korean situation, and the Congress of the United States should declare war on somebody and fight an objective war or get out of Korea.

It has never been a pleasant duty to vote to declare war. No man with normal good sense desires any opportunity to vote to declare war. But no man worthy of his salt or worthy of sitting on the floor of this House should run from this unpleasant responsibility if the duty should happen to fall upon him.

I do not regard this as a perfect amendment. But this is the first time an opportunity has presented itself to do something that would revive once more that very clear-cut, concise language in the Constitution which says that Congress and only Congress should have the power to declare war and thereby commit this Nation to war. And yet this body sat for 3 long years and witnessed thousands and thousands of boys dying, and everyone was very willing and ready then to say, "I did not start it. I did not vote for that war." Which was true, but the sad truth about the situation was that it was first called police action. Then an undeclared war. But regardless of what it was called, it went on and on. When I made the statement that we should take some definite action on the declaration of war, three-fourths of this House stood on their feet and cheered. That was not for me, that was because the majority of the Members on this floor felt that some definite action should be taken.

We are not placing any limitation upon the President that is not clearly written in the Constitution of the United States. I was in World War I. Then we accused the Kaiser of starting that war, and after the Kaiser's hide we went. In World War II it was Hitler, and after Hitler's hide we went. Then we ran up against the Korean situation. I do not know that anybody yet has definitely determined who started the Korean situation, but bloody fighting resulting in over 125,000 casualties went on for 3 years. The Congress of the United States was never called upon to declare war nor did we on our own initiative. The Commander in Chief committed our Armed Forces and in that situation there was nothing we could do but supply them.

I am not discussing the merits of it, I am not saying we should not have gone into Korea or that we should have, I am saying the Congress of the United States should have determined whether we were at war or not and then provided for all-out prosecution of it. That is exactly what our Founding Fathers intended when the Constitution was written.

I was in this body when the attack that started World War II came on December 7 so far as the United States of America was concerned. Within less than 24 hours we, the Congress, if you please, declared war on almost half this earth, and went at it. Then you say it is a limitation upon the powers of the President to repeat the language and expressed intent of the Constitution.

I say to my good friend to accept the precedent set by the President of the United States in the Korean situation as the existing law which would imply that the President now has the same power and God knows that is more power than a bad man should have and more power than a good man should want. The language in the Constitution should never have been questioned in the first place. It is a sad hour that after 150 years of existence of the greatest nation on God's earth, the finest government and best directed, that the clause in the Constitution which says only Congress shall declare war should now come up for either watering down, changing, or reinforcing.

I have the greatest respect for my friend from New York [Mr. REED]. I have seen him take the "gaff" before. Even when I think he is wrong I admire him, because he does not mind taking the "gaff" on any matter about which he has conscientious convictions. So far as I am concerned, I am proud to be in his ranks for I too have some very strong convictions on this subject.

I would not vouch for the accuracy of the amendment. I do not desire to be dubbed, as the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS] referred to the gentleman from New York, as General BARDEN. I have no ambitions in that direction at all. But I do say this, that I have confidence in the President of the United States, yes. I had confidence in the Democratic Presidents and I have confidence in the Republican President, but I am not willing to place all of that power in any President's hands and I do not care where he comes from or what party he belongs to. War is something the United States Congress should pass upon and not just one man.

If the amendment needs changing in some detail, why do not the gentleman from Indiana and the others who seem to be so interested in defeating it lend their attention and their efforts to the correction of it between now and the time it may go through the Senate and come back in the conference report? The gentleman has no reluctance in doing that with other things.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARDEN. I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. I did not know of the existence of this amendment or that it would be offered until I read about it in the papers. There are so many defects in it, as I said before, that are obvious even upon the most brief examination that again, I say, this is no time to undertake to perfect it or write it. As a matter of fact, this amendment should be voted down, and if there is something here that should be looked into, then let the proper legislative committee look into it. Of course, the gentleman knows the constitutional provision with respect to a declaration of war. He has referred to it.

Mr. BARDEN. Yes, that has been in existence for 150 years.

Mr. HALLECK. That is right. I just happen to believe that we have a President of the United States who believes in the Constitution and I believe that he will follow the constitutional process. As a matter of fact, if the President did not elect to follow the constitutional process, possibly he would not elect to follow any statute either. In my book, that is beside the point. The point I am making is fundamentally that this sort of action is not necessary at this time in the light of existing circumstances, and it can do more harm than good. Beyond that it is so drafted that it is full of errors and full of deficiencies and could well involve us in many serious and disastrous consequences.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, let me say that the gentleman has no monopoly in his admiration for and confidence in the President of the United States. He is my President. I like him personally and I like him officially. I have great confidence in the President of the United States. That issue is not on trial here. I have had great confidence in other Presidents. The gentleman has been pretty critical about what has happened in the past 4 years, in Korea, and many, many others on his side of the aisle, and many of us resolved if the occasion ever presented itself that we would do something about it. Here is where we are. The money bill is the only place that we can do anything about this. We have found that out in recent years. The money bill is the only place that you can do anything whatever about it. For after troops are committed and the war is on, just cutting off money and supplies is simply not practical. The gentleman knows that just as well as I do and yet he says it is not the right way to do it. The gentleman says it may have a bad effect in foreign countries. If we write it into the law that this country shall not be hurled into war by 1 man or any 2 men or 3 men, does that have any more disastrous effect than what the President himself has declared? The President himself has declared to the world, "No, this country is not going into war except upon the vote of the Congress of the United States."

Has that had any bad effect over the rest of the world? I am just getting to this point, Mr. Chairman. It hurts me to be asked a thousand questions about Indochina and about when our boys are going to war and every day they are dragging them out of the colleges and off the farms and out of the shops and putting them in uniform; they see a blast in the newspapers either from the Vice President, or the President, or Secretary Dulles, or some free-lance writer, and I tell you, sir, the American people are confused on this question of war and who has the right to start one, make no mistake about that. They want to know what is going on and what can happen; if you go by the past, anything can happen. I have no reluctance in saying to you that there should be a clarification of this supposed power and the sooner the better. I would not swear that this is a proper amendment, but the gentlemen who have the responsibility of writing this legislation could, in my opinion, well afford to lend their brains, their time, and intelligence to help work out the answer if they wanted it. But the thing that disturbs me is that we must now continue to exist on rumors and speculate whether or not we will wake up some morning in an undeclared war. I do not know what Secretary Dulles has promised anybody. I do not know whether or not our men are dying in Indochina right now. I understand that one airman was killed by ground fire there this week. The papers said so, and it is fast getting to the point that that is about the only place Congress can get news bearing on our foreign relations. I am tired of finding out what my Government is going to do and where we are going to fight a war next from a newspaper that is written by somebody who assumes that a certain other person intended to say so and so. If that is the way you want to continue, all right, but personally I cannot take it and I will not hesitate to express myself on a subject so vital to my country and to my people.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks at this point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. COUDERT] raises a question which cannot be disposed of hastily or carelessly.

I have a high regard for the patriotism, the integrity, and the ability of the gentleman from New York, the author of the amendment. His record in the House of Representatives demonstrates that he is a tireless and courageous worker for constitutional government, and I am confident that in offering this amendment he is moved by a sincere desire to do his duty to his Government and to the American people.

As I understand his amendment, the substantial effect of it would be to prevent our Armed Forces from engaging in armed conflict anywhere in the world, unless Congress had previously issued a declaration of war. An exception would be made in the case of an attack upon the United States or an attack upon any nation with which our Government has a mutual defense or security treaty.

At first blush, it would appear that this amendment follows that provision of our Constitution which places in Congress the authority to declare war. It would apparently go beyond the constitutional provision by excluding from its prohibition an attack upon us or an attack upon a nation with which our Government has a mutual defense or security treaty.

I think it is essential that the provisions of our Constitution be observed by every department of our Government—executive, legislative, and judicial. In that connection, I have noticed in recent years—and have protested against it—that the executive department and the judicial department have both encroached upon the legislative department. In every instance, such encroachment weakens our form of government and tends to destroy the rights and liberties which our Constitution was designed and intended to safeguard and preserve.

Under our Constitution it is the function of Congress to levy and collect the taxes necessary to provide for the common defense, to raise and support armies, to provide and maintain a navy, and to declare war. These powers are expressly given to Congress in section 8 of article I of the Constitution.

The President is not given authority to declare war, although the Constitution makes him the Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy and of the militia when called into Federal service.

It is the duty of the President, and he takes an oath so to do, to preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution. Certainly one of his duties in that respect is to refrain from usurping congressional functions, one of which is the declaration of war.

The President has said that he will not plunge America into war unless Congress, in the exercise of its constitutional power, declares war. That statement is gratifying, and I know has given comfort to the people of the United States as discussion has increased regarding the prospect of our being drawn into the Indochinese war. However, although the President may live up to that statement that he will not plunge this country into war, unless Congress in the exercise of its constitutional power declares war, it would be difficult for Congress to refuse to declare war if the President and the Secretary of State commit our Government to fight, and the President, under such commitment, calls upon Congress to declare war.

As I stated on the floor of this House on April 13, it begins to look dangerously like the American people are now being conditioned and readied for such an eventuality.

Again I want to point out, as I did on that date, that at this moment, the principal objective of our Government should be to prevent our being taken into an Asiatic war through the back door. If we have to fight another war, and again I say may Almighty God forbid such a calamity, but if we do have to fight another war, we ourselves should select the time, the place, and the opponent, and we should not permit ourselves to be made a victim of the plan and scheme of the Communists to bleed ourselves white and exhaust our resources of manpower and materials fighting wars which have been planned by Russia and her Communist satellites for that very purpose.

Mr. Chairman, I adhere firmly to the position that we should engage in no war except such as may begin constitutionally with a declaration of war by Congress. I sincerely hope that the President will live up to his constitutional obligation and his promise not to plunge us into war unless Congress shall first, under the Constitution, declare war.

However, I do not think that this is a subject upon which legislation should be enacted in the manner proposed, namely, by an amendment attached to an appropriation bill.

Legislation of this nature should be carefully considered by the appropriate committee, where adequate hearings can be held and where appropriate witnesses can be called before the committee to give necessary information. It is for these reasons that I will vote against this amendment.

My vote against it is in no sense an indication that I believe the President has any constitutional right to declare war. Neither is it any indication that I believe the Constitution should be ignored or disregarded. I believe the Constitution should be strictly observed by the President, by Congress, and by the Supreme Court. If it is to be changed in any way, it should be changed in the method which the Constitution itself provides for. Until and unless it is so changed, it should be strictly observed.

I vote against this amendment merely because I believe it should first be considered by the appropriate committee, and one of the questions to be considered by such committee is whether, in view of the definite provisions in our Constitution, there is any need at all for such provision to be enacted by Congress.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the House is indebted to the gentleman from New York [Mr. COUDERT] for raising this question. He has rendered a service to the Congress and the country by giving us an opportunity to pass on the proposal embodied in this amendment.

There is a school of thought in this country which has long advocated this measure. Resolutions have been drafted and bills have been introduced and constitutional amendments have been proposed and it should be disposed of here today. Its advocates constitute a small minority but it is a vocal minority and the atmosphere should be cleared. Unequivocal notice should be served both at home and abroad as to what the attitude of the Congress and the American people is on this question.

We must concede that while a democratic form of government is the best and most successful form of government in the world in time of peace, it is at a disadvantage in time of war. All democratic processes require time, and in that time the golden opportunity to act may pass. There must be someone in authority to act in an emergency, as there has been in 160 years of our national life.

You will remember that in the golden days of the Roman Republic they defended vigorously their freedom and their rights under their democratic government, but in time of war they completely abrogated the democratic control of the government to a dictatorship. They selected one man and placed in that one man supreme authority. One of the most significant of all beautiful paintings in this building is the depiction of the Roman Senate conferring upon Cincinnatus standing beside his plough supreme authority in a time of danger to the Republic.

This amendment is of course wholly impracticable and indefensible. Of all the Presidents, from George Washington to General Eisenhower, there has never been an Executive in whom we could not place confidence. There has never been an instance in American history in which this amendment, had it been in force at the time, could have served the best interests of the country and the American people. We not only have the most complete and abiding confidence in President Eisenhower—in his ability, his integrity, his patriotism, but we cannot conceive of the election of any man to that supreme office, in whom we could not place that same confidence.

Mr. Chairman, I trust that this amendment will be defeated and that it will be defeated so decisively that the question will never be again raised, either on this floor or in the press, or in any other forum of the Republic.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close at 5:30 o'clock.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close at 5:35 o'clock.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The time will be divided equally among the Members standing and will amount to about 1¼ minutes apiece.

The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. WHEELER] is recognized.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. Chairman, I was, to put it mildly, amazed by the statement by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] a few minutes ago when he said, in effect, that only a minority of the people of this country still support the Constitution of the United States.

I was also amazed at the suggestion by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK], when he implied that an attack on one of our naval or airships would not be construed as an attack upon this country.

The whole argument of the opponents of this amendment has been predicated on the idea that we have some superman in the White House. This superman in the White House has repeatedly said that he agreed with this amendment. He may be a superman and he may have more braid on his britches than I have, but he puts his britches on in the morning just like I do. He is subject to the same human foibles and mistakes that I am. It is certainly true that the President is not expected to make as many mistakes as I would probably make, but the fact remains that he is human. The suggestion has been made with reference to the President that those of us who support the pending amendment do not trust the President. The truth of the matter is that I, for one, do not trust any human to whom is given unlimited power, and the defeat of this amendment will, in effect, be an invitation to the President to exercise unlimited power as has been done by some of his predecessors.

It is impossible for me to understand why all the argument against the proposed amendment when the President has repeatedly and recently stated that he would not commit this Nation to war without the express consent of the Congress, as provided in the Constitution. In face of this denial of any intent on the part of the President to ignore the Constitution, it is here argued that expediency might dictate a reversal of this position by the President in such a way as to send our boys to other Koreas all over the world. Suffice it to say on this score, that grievous hurt has been done to human freedom throughout the ages in the compelling name of expediency, and history records that repeated hurt done human freedom under the guise of expediency has resulted in its demise.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, with the forces arrayed here today against this amendment and with the obvious disregard for the oath taken by many Members who have sworn to protect and defend the Constitution, there seems little question that the amendment will be defeated. If such defeat comes and the President decides to commit our forces to war, God forbid that such commitment be made under circumstances attendant to Korea where we were not allowed to win.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES].

Mr. DIES. Mr. Chairman, I yield my time to someone more anxious to speak than I.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH].

(By unanimous consent, Mr. COUDERT and Mr. GROSS yielded their time to the gentleman from Wisconsin.)

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH] is recognized for 4½ minutes.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, it is not an easy task to come to the well of this House and oppose those who are leading the fight against this amendment. We should clearly understand the intent behind it; we ought to take the cat out of the bag.

We are talking about Indochina in this amendment, make no mistake about that. A vote for the amendment will be construed as a vote to prevent the commitment of combat troops there. We have just returned from our districts and you were asked, as I was: What about Indochina? Will we send our boys in there to fight again?

Also the question: "When is Congress going to assert its prerogatives with reference to war?" The people are waiting for an answer to that question. They will get it when the vote comes on the amendment before us.

Make no mistake about it, if it is voted down the word will go out that the Republicans are not opposed to sending troops into Indochina. Whether or not that is the fact that will be the implication. I say to you there will be many of us who will not return on this very issue. The Republican Party cannot survive a war in China. The Democrats did not survive the war in Korea, as we know. As I see it, the American people are fed up with this international globaloney.

I hope you are going to get a chance to stand up and be counted on the record. The people want to know if they are really represented here or not.

We talk about the President. It is a lame excuse to say that the passage of this amendment will be a repudiation of him. This very day he has said that Congress will have the final say as to war in Indochina or any other place. So why all this concern about an offense to him. That is a specious argument.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. WHEELER. I want to ask the gentleman if he has heard within the past 4 years any criticism coming from his side of the aisle of the manner in which troops were sent to Korea?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I do not recall at this moment.

Mr. Chairman, this is not a challenge to the President's authority. It was only a short time ago that a high elected official was reported to have said: "If necessary, we may have to fight in Indochina."

Let us forget about all the technicalities, about the language and so forth, and realize that we are this afternoon taking a position on what we are going to do in Indochina. Any kind of argument contrary to that will not hold water so far as our constituents are concerned.

Just a short time ago Mr. Bedell Smith was asked a question about Indochina. He was asked this question:

> Can Indochina be saved, and how?

His reply:

> The position of the United States is that, if there is a united will among the free nations East and West, a will that is made clear to the Communists so there can be no misunderstanding on their part, that this of itself would give pause for further adventures and aggression.

Now, what is the situation? The French are making a deal with the Communists in Indochina today and we talk about collective security. When the Geneva Conference is over, your Uncle Sam will be holding the bag, as he did at the end of World War II and Korea.

Mr. Chairman, I repeat that the issue raised by this so-called Coudert amendment is one that involves the critical situation in Indochina. It is foolhardy for us to say that we may be compelled to fight alone there if the French will not fight on and if other nations are not willing to act. Is it in our national interest to carry that burden alone?

I submit that if the rest of the free world will not join in meeting the issues presented by Indochina, then the United States cannot alone undertake to stop communism in that area.

No one will deny, Mr. Chairman, that Indochina is a symbol at this time. So it is important to us and to the rest of the free world, but the price of our involvement, even with the strongest of alliances, must be seriously weighed. Our involvement, as the President has already said, risks tragedy; yes, the tragedy of billions of dollars, millions of lives, and possible defeat.

While we must admit that we do have a stake in Indochina of great interest, we must constantly remember the necessity of preserving our own strength. It must not be dissipated in the swamps and jungles of Indochina.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON].

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, this amendment in essence has been before the Congress for more than 3 years. I have had a similar resolution that has been dropped into the hopper and has been before the Congress since a year ago last January. This is not anything new. But under the situation that we face, this is the only way we can get this thing considered on the floor of the House. I say that it should not be here as a rider on this appropriation bill, I say that I do not believe it should be, but this is the only way we can get it considered and have a vote on this thing. Therefore it was brought before you in this form.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, there is yet another critical defect in this amendment and I would like to state it in a very considered way.

This is in effect an amendment to have big atomic and hydrogen mass wars, not just brush-fire engagements if need be. It says that any time we may consider it in our essential national security interest to repel aggression in some place or to have our troops defend themselves against an armed attack, the Congress has got to declare war.

This is an idea of the very same progeny as of those who did not like our defending against aggression in Korea yet who wanted us to bomb Peiping and Moscow which would have gotten us into a much bigger war.

The very flexibility which the Constitution gave us, where the President is the Commander in Chief, and only the Congress can declare war, carried out under the terms, intent, and spirit of our Constitution, has been our safeguard during the whole history of our country. This amendment would destroy that very balance which has worked for all these generations, and the real end of this amendment would be that every time Congress is called upon to declare war, to put out a brush fire, then sure as shooting the first time that occurs, atomic or hydrogen war will come, which is just exactly what we do not want.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING].

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, if called upon to vote today, with the information and evidence available to me, I could not support a move to send our troops into armed conflict in Indochina or anywhere else in the world. Yet that does not mean that I favor this amendment presented by the gentleman from New York [Mr. COUDERT]. Indeed, I am emphatically opposed to this amendment. However it may be motivated by its sponsor, whose high purpose and good faith I in no way impugn, it is dangerous in the extreme because of its effect both upon our friends and our potential enemies, most seriously the latter.

The men in the Kremlin look to us for any sign of weakness or division. This amendment, plausible as it may be on its face, will be construed as a sign of weakness, not of strength. The proposal is far more likely to lead toward war than away from war.

It is bound to be interpreted in the first place as an indication of a lack of confidence on the part of this Congress in our Chief Executive. President Eisenhower has said time and time again that he would not commit our troops to war without first obtaining congressional approval. I believe him, but what is far more important, I want the world to know that I believe him. I want the world to know that the executive and legislative branches of our great Government stand as one, that there is an unlimited mutual confidence, each in the other, in determination to meet unitedly any challenge or attack.

Adoption of this amendment would be construed as a formal declaration by the people's representatives that they are unsympathetic with the effort to resist by the united action of the free nations Communist aggression which threatens our national security. Certainly it would be the height of folly to inform any potential enemy in advance that we will not at all or will be slow to repel his attacks. Such an attitude, with the unscrupulous

forces unleashed in the world today, is the sure road to war, not peace.

The passage of this amendment would be a devastating blow to our negotiators now meeting in Geneva, attempting to handle most delicate and intricate problems. As responsible legislators, we have no right thus to torpedo their efforts.

There are fatal defects in the language of the amendment. The concessions offered by the gentleman from New York indicate his recognition of the deficiencies inherent in its language. For that reason alone, it should of course be defeated. But my basic objections go deeper than that. It is tragically ill-timed, ill-advised, and highly dangerous. It should be decisively defeated.

Mr. CONDON. 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 California?

There was no objection.

Mr. CONDON. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the amendment of the gentleman from New York [Mr. COUDERT].

I think I recognize as well as any Member of this body the extremely delicate situation which our country faces in its relations with other nations throughout the world. I know that the Geneva Conference is now going on. I know that there may be some hope of reaching an agreement at this Conference which will lessen the terrific tensions now existing throughout the globe.

I feel, however, in view of the recent statement made by a responsible member of the administration, the Vice President, that American troops may be involved in Indochina; this is, in itself, a sufficient warrant to pass the Coudert amendment. Obviously the Vice President was not speaking carelessly or without sanction from the administration. He is a member of the National Security Council and is fully privy to all our military plans and calculations. I, for one, will not allow the President, without protest, to have the untrammeled right to plunge us into war. The duty to declare war is lodged by the Constitution in the Congress. As I read this amendment, it merely confirms that which the Constitution attempted to insure.

I know there is great apprehension among the people of my district that we may somehow be pushed into the hopeless morass of Indochina. This apprehension goes still further; that if this step is taken, we may quickly become involved in the all-out horror of world war III. Even if those terrible devices of destruction, the atom and hydrogen bombs, are not used, world war III would undoubtedly mean our destruction. I am firmly convinced that before we skirt on the edges of world war III, the combined judgment of the men and women in the Congress of the United States should, and must, be consulted.

Mr. POWELL. 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 New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank my colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. COUDERT] for offering this amendment because it gives me an opportunity to register an emphatic protest which I would not otherwise be able to do.

For the 10 years that I have been a Member of this House of Representatives I have consistently voted against appropriations for the Armed Services because of the policy of segregation carried forward by our Armed Forces. I am extremely pleased, therefore, to stand here today and to announce with a clear conscience that I can vote for appropriations for the Defense Department of our Nation. In stating this I know I am stating the feelings of not only the 15 million peoples of my race, the Negro race, but also the scores of millions of right-thinking Americans who know that you cannot have a first-class army of democracy as long as any portion of it is composed of second-class citizens. Today, there is not a single segregated arm of our Defense Department. The last segregated unit in the Army was abolished within the past few days. On February 24, I presented charges to the Secretary of Defense, Mr. Wilson, that Negroes were rigidly "Jim Crow'ed," segregated, and discriminated against at the United States Military Academy at West Point, N. Y., where there was an all-Negro cadet mess detachment serving as waiters and dishwashers for the cadets. I want to congratulate Mr. Wilson and Mr. Stevens, the Secretary of the Army, for immediate reply and prompt action and I would like to read the letter dated April 9, 1954, from Mr. T. A. Young, Mr. Stevens' special assistant.

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF THE ARMY,
Washington D. C., April 9, 1954.

Hon. ADAM CLAYTON POWELL, Jr.,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. POWELL: I am replying to your letter of March 31 concerning further developments of the integration in the mess detachment of the 1802d Special Regiment of the United States Military Academy at West Point.

As you were previously advised, the Department is taking necessary steps to achieve a degree of integration in the mess detachment of the 1802d Special Regiment comparable to that attained in other Army units by replacement of a sufficient number of Negro soldiers presently assigned to the unit, with Caucasian personnel. As it was necessary to place a levy against the Continental Army Commands to obtain the required personnel, it is anticipated that a reasonable period of time will elapse before this integration is completed. On March 24, 1954, instructions were issued to the Commanding Generals of the First and Second Armies to procure approximately 40 individuals for assignment as replacements in the mess detachment at the Military Academy as the initial step in attaining the degree of integration desired. Individuals so assigned are to be volunteers. Upon receipt of your most recent communication, an inquiry was made to these field commanders to determine the status of the request for personnel. It was learned that they, in turn, had issued instructions to their various installations and unit commanders directing the procurement of the desired personnel.

A report at this time concerning the procurement of the desired personnel would be incomplete inasmuch as sufficient time has not yet elapsed between the date of the Department of the Army instructions to the field commanders and the date of this letter. I feel sure, however, that by no later than the end of this month, I will be in a position to furnish you with a more comprehensive report and perhaps will be able to advise you that some of the required personnel have reported for duty with the mess detachment of the 1802d Special Regiment. You may expect a further report at that time.

With regard to your acceptance of my invitation to visit West Point, I have asked that the Office of the Chief of Legislative Liaison, Department of the Army, contact your office to work out details regarding the date of your visit and your transportation.

In the interim, I trust the information I have been able to furnish, although not conclusive, will assist you in keeping abreast of the situation as it develops.

With highest personal regards, I am
Sincerely yours,

T. A. YOUNG,
Special Assistant to the Secretary of the Army.

However, I do want to register a protest against the sending of any of our fighting men to Indochina or any portion of Southeast Asia as long as present conditions continue to exist. The Coudert motion allows me this opportunity. If we send United States forces to Indochina, we will be sending them there not so much to stop communism but to preserve French colonialism. I stated this in my last Sunday morning's serman and was happy to read in the Monday newspapers a similar statement by the Ambassador from Burma to the United States. I was very happy to learn this afternoon that negotiations prompted by the United States are being concluded between France and the three independent states of Indochina to give them autonomy but I am withholding all comment until I hear what the peoples of those countries have to say themselves. When the native people of Indochina, through their own representatives, state that they are satisfied with the agreement presented to them by the French Government then and only then do I believe that the United States Armed Forces should be used. Further, the United States Armed Forces must never be used in any such conflict unless they are a part of the United Nations forces.

To send 1 single soldier, 1 single bullet, 1 single plane to Indochina would be a complete reversal of every concept and precept of our Founding Fathers. It would destroy all progress of democracy, both as a principle and as a practice.

Yes; communism must be defeated, but it must not be defeated by colonialism. It must be defeated by free men. I therefore support the Coudert amendment as a protest against sending American troops to preserve colonialism with the hope that with its passage, we here in the House will be able in future days to vote against any combat, whether war or police action, which will not further the concepts of democracy but will only preserve the status quo of yesterday's world of imperialism.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. PRICE, Mr. GREEN, and Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania were given permission to yield the time allotted them to Mr. DODD.)

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. DODD].

Mr. DODD. Mr. Chairman, I am very grateful for these generous offers of time. I will not take all of it, because what I have to say will not take anywhere near that amount of time.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to make 1 or 2 observations. Some people around here ought to have some sense of time and of the propriety of things. I think this amendment may have great merit as a matter of constitutional law, but it should be offered at another time. It seems to me that in the position in which we find ourselves at this hour, with Mr. Dulles in Geneva, with the explosive Indochina situation as it is, we have no business passing an amendment of this nature. I do not like arguments about great faith in individuals. I like the President, and I have confidence in him. But if there is a good question here of constitutional law we should at the right time consider it as a question of law and not of men. If the Members really feel deeply about it, there will be a right and a better time to discuss it, but my point is that this is a poor time and I feel we ought to turn it down now. I think we ought to tell the rest of the world that we are standing behind Mr. Dulles and we are standing behind the President of the United States, and that there is not the division in this country that some people would like to believe there is. If we do this we will all be better off.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to yield the time allotted me to Mr. JUDD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD].

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, if passing this amendment would keep us out of war, every single person would be for it. But we have to examine what the actual, practical effects would be. In fact, it would weaken our position in the world and strengthen the enemy's and thereby encourage him to take further aggressive steps which would increase, not decrease, the danger of war. One day we would have to resist in order to stay free. That is why the amendment is mischievous. And to introduce it at this particular time makes it even more mischievous. As the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. DODD] has so well said, this moment is of all times the worst to be enacting such an amendment. Passing it could do no good in preventing war and might do a lot of harm in encouraging action by the enemy which would lead to war.

We are standing at one of the watersheds of history. A crucial conference has just opened at Geneva. The Communists are united; the free nations are already too divided and wavering. For the Congress of the United States at this juncture to give anyone the impression, however unjustified, that we do not stand unitedly and firmly behind the efforts of our Government's representatives at Geneva to mobilize peoples throughout the world to get together against that which is a threat to the security of us all—if we were to do that, we might just as well call those representatives home and surrender the rest of Asia first as last. That, indeed, would lead to war.

I wonder why we so often imagine we can get peace by handcuffing ourselves. We do not tie the hands of the enemy; we just tie our own hands and imagine it will help to keep us out of war to announce officially what we will not do, so the enemy will be tempted to do the very things that you and I know we would then resist by war.

What is this resolution designed to do? I am sure its author hoped to do two things—one, to reduce the dangers of American involvement in war, and, two, reassure our people that the President is not going to get us into war without the authority of Congress, and that we, the people's representatives, are going to see that we carry out our constitutional responsibility in this all-important matter.

But let us look at the practical effect. If the amendment is passed, it makes more likely the war that it is designed to prevent, because it weakens our side and strengthens the enemy's side. It is completely self-defeating. On the other hand, if the amendment is defeated—and we have no choice but to defeat it, since it has been introduced—it may disturb some of our own people by seeming to indicate that Congress is abdicating its powers and turning them over to the President carte blanche to take us into war. That is why the amendment is so mischievous. There is no way you can vote on this that does not make trouble for our country. That is why it should not have been introduced.

But, inasmuch as it is here at a moment when we face a shrewd and calculating mortal enemy, dedicated to our destruction, it seems to me the more we do not want war the more we must vote against this amendment. To pass it would be to tell the enemy, "Go ahead in Asia or elsewhere. America is uncertain and divided." That could lead the enemy to try even more aggressive acts which one day, since they would inevitably involve American security or even personnel, the Congress would vote to resist.

If you do not want war and you do not want American involvement in war, I beg of you not to pass this amendment, which would encourage and strengthen the very forces we are today voting some $29 billion in this bill to resist. To spend all this money in order to increase our capacity to resist, and then to help destroy the will, not only of ourselves but of the one-third of the people of the world who are undivided, watching to see what America is going to do, would produce the opposite effect to that which we want. We will get peace from united strength and resolves, not from resolutions indicating indecision. What the world needs from America is leadership, not arrogant or truculent or chip-on-the-shoulder leadership, but steadfast, firm, consistent, dependable leadership in efforts to unite our people here in America and unite the peoples of free Europe and free Asia, and thereby prevent the war that we all want to avoid.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. WILSON].

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may extend my remarks in the RECORD immediately following the vote on this amendment and to yield back the balance of my time to the gentleman from New York [Mr. WAINWRIGHT].

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. WAINWRIGHT] for 3 minutes.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, this is the second time this year I have spoken on the floor of the House and each time it seems I have followed the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD] and my distinguished colleague from Connecticut [Mr. DODD].

There are only two points I see that I can add to this debate that have not been presented heretofore. The first one is that either the Coudert proposition is unconstitutional on its face, as a violation of the President's powers as Commander in Chief, or it is unnecessary because the Constitution itself already has given the Congress the power to declare war. So why are we adding to it?

The second point I would like to make is that when the Constitution was framed in the late 1700's, 1786, the constitutional framers certainly did not contemplate atomic warfare, thermonuclear warfare, where one man must make the decision, or the Security Council must make the decision, in a minute or 2 minutes, or the decision must have been made beforehand, because we cannot have a congressional debate as to whether we shall send our troops in one direction or another direction.

The final thing, to add to what my friend from Connecticut has said, is that this seems to be most ill-timed, to arrive at the very moment when our Secretary of State is debating with the known enemy, yet we are tying his hands.

I say that the Congress of the United States should reject this amendment and show our Secretary of State where we stand.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW].

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, as one who has had some experience in these matters, let me caution you that here you are dealing with questions relating to the balance of power. If you withdraw on our behalf that power to move in one direction or another as occasion demands, you stymie the efforts of the United States for peace.

I caution you to look at the record of 1914, 1915, and 1916, when we proclaimed that we would not go into a foreign war.

I caution you to look at the record of 1939, 1940, and the first part of 1941, similarly. We did not keep out of war because of vain pronouncements in relation to war. In fact, war started because we pronounced that we would not enter a foreign war and hence, we did not become the balance of power for

peace. We threw the balance of power into the hands of the enemies of freedom. Let us not do it again. Let us not adopt this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, it would be a very disastrous thing, in my opinion, to adopt this amendment at this time. It could only indicate an uncertainty or a weakness here at home at a time when our leaders need to be given as free a hand as possible.

As pointed out by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS], every time we have said we were not going to send our boys abroad to fight, usually it turned out the other way.

This is no time for vacillation. We do not know what would happen under this amendment if an attack were made on Formosa, if our ships were fired on at sea.

One thing we have gained over the last few months is to obtain the initiative in this cold-war situation. It would be disastrous if any indication went abroad from this Chamber today that there is vacillation on the part of our American people, that there is any doubt of our intent to back up our leaders in this crucial moment in our history.

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. 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 Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the Coudert amendment because I think, as others have also said, that it is not practical, it does not make sense and if adopted it would not be in the best interest of the United States. It would give advantage to our enemies and to the master minds of Communist world tyranny.

I am definitely opposed to any action that would involve us with ground troops in the jungle war in Indochina without the cooperation of the United Nations and the full cooperation of the free nations.

I am disturbed that the administration has not kept Congress and the people fully informed about Indochina and the part we are now playing in that conflict. We have technical forces there for the past year and are carrying a major part of the financial burden of the war. Many of us fear that we could be drawn into a full-scale war there without friends or allies.

The remarks of the Vice President a few weeks ago suggesting that we may have to go it alone should caution all of us against such a policy which I believe would be unwise and perhaps disastrous.

However, I cannot accept the theory that the proposed amendment will be a safeguard in keeping us out of war. It could have the opposite effect after the potential enemy has gained many advantages and has strengthened his position by gaining ground by numerous aggressive acts and advances on a small scale without danger of involvement in a global war.

It has been said here that commitments and promises to keep the Nation out of war were made in the past but did not prevent our involvement later. We were informed of statements made prior to World War I, World War II, and the Korean conflict—promises not to go to war. We might add to that list of statements and promises made by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS], the promise of General Eisenhower and others that we shall not fumble into another Korea. He said our sons would stay on the farms, the students in the schools. We were promised that we would not fall into the Communist trap of being nibbled into little wars all over the world. Despite such wild promises that have been made and forgotten, I will not support an amendment which cannot possibly work and which would, in the long run, help only communism and the aggressors.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] to close debate.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, to my mind this issue has been pretty well discussed. The amendment that has been offered is very dangerous. In the first place, it would prevent the governor of any State from calling out the militia and using them to quell a riot. In the second place, it would prevent our maintaining our position in Okinawa, Formosa, and Germany. In the third place, it would prevent our forces from replying if they were attacked individually. It is not only bad in that respect, that is, that it is badly drawn, but it will, as those have preceded me said, destroy the power of our representatives abroad. The President of the United States has made it plain on occasion after occasion that he does not intend to lead this Nation into war without a declaration by the Congress. There is no occasion for this amendment and it will cover so many things and embarrass us in so many ways that it is absolutely ridiculous for this Congress to vote for it. Furthermore, it will seriously impair the weight that can be given by other peoples to our representatives abroad who are trying to preserve peace and avoid a war with the Communists.

Mr. Chairman, I do not want myself to have the credit for having voted for something or fail to properly and to my full ability oppose something which I believe is dangerous and points the way toward trouble for the United States. I hope and believe that this Congress will meet its responsibility and at this time vote "no" upon this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. COUDERT].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. COUDERT) there were—ayes 37, noes 214.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I take this opportunity to commend the House Subcommittee on Military Appropriations for their elimination and liberalization of many of the restrictive riders that have previously hampered career personnel in one way or another. The elimination of riders that controlled voluntary retirement of Regular officers and promotions of all officers will be well received by the men and women of the services, who have felt the pinch of a progressive series of cutbacks and restrictions over the past 10 years.

The forthright action by this committee is the first major reversal of the unfortunate policy of continued whittling away of recognized benefits. It signifies an awareness to the acute morale problems of the military services today.

Other steps that have been taken in this bill that will be hailed by military people around the world include a liberalization of payment for shipment of household effects, educational benefits, and other privileges.

Additional action will be required of the Congress this session to provide adequate medical treatment of dependents, improvement in housing of military dependents, and a cost-of-living pay increase to bring the military back into line in comparison with other occupations.

We are spending $28 billion on our military machine in this bill. Our military machine is only as good as the men who run it. Facing a crucial period in our national existence, we must have the assurance that the men and women on whom we must rely for protection of our country and its people are qualified, trained, and competent to defend us. With morale at the lowest ebb in recent times, and reenlistment rates the lowest of all times, we must be prepared to act swiftly to retain career military personnel now. This bill goes part of the way. It is up to Congress to find additional means for rebuilding military morale and esprit to its most effective level.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 738. This act may be cited as the "Department of Defense Appropriation Act, 1955."

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

I have a letter from Gen. William Henry Harrison, Jr., adjutant general of the Massachusetts National Guard. I have conferred with members of the committee. Representatives of the National Guard Association appeared before the subcommittee and asked for an increase over the budget. Would the gentleman make an explanation for the record, please?

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, the Army Subcommittee gave the Army-National Guard joint construction program for armories the full amount requested in the budget, namely, $9 million. That is an increase of $900,000 over the amount that appeared in fiscal 1954. The figure that they will have available for obligation in fiscal 1955 totals $18,598,000. That figure of $18,598,000 is made up of the $9 million which the

committee proposed, plus $9,598,000 of previously appropriated funds which will not be obligated on June 30, 1954, and consequently will be available for obligation in fiscal 1955. At the end of fiscal 1955 out of the $18,598,000, the Army National Guard Bureau in the Pentagon does not anticipate that it will obligate $2 million of this fund. In other words, they will obligate only $16,598,000 out of the $18,598,000 that they expect to have available.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. HARRIS. Is this money available for the 2 categories which the national association was interested in, 1 item of $15 million and the other $5 million?

Mr. FORD. No. The total amount, $15 million, is for 3 parts of the Reserve forces construction program. Nine million dollars is for the joint State and Federal Government armory construction program. It is the Federal portion. The States make their own contribution to go with the Federal funds. One million dollars is the nonarmory construction for the National Guard, which is fully Federal financed. Then there is $5 million of the $15 million which is for the Army Reserve armory construction program. We gave the full amount requested by the President for all three portions of the program.

Mr. HARRIS. Is it not true that the national association thought they should have $5 million for the non-Federal program?

Mr. FORD. They came before our committee—representatives from four States—and requested additional funds. They are not Federal officials, but they were State adjutants general, I believe, and they naturally and properly requested more money. Although I think we must treat their requests certainly with high respect, after all, they are speaking like any other interested party, asking more funds for a program in which they happen to be particularly interested. Inasmuch as we gave the full amount the budget requested, more than we gave them last year, and $2 million more than they expect to obligate in fiscal 1955, the committee could not see the justification for more money.

Mr. HARRIS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. McCORMACK. May I read the minds of the members of the subcommittee when I say they are very favorably disposed toward the National Guard?

Mr. FORD. I think that is very true. We gave them all the money requested for construction; every penny requested for the regular National Guard program, $218,502,000, which is about $8 million more than was given in fiscal 1954.

Mr. McCORMACK. And if, through regular processes, a supplemental budget comes up, the subcommittee would view it favorably?

Mr. FORD. We would.

Mr. HAGEN of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word merely to ask a question which relates to a minor matter. It is in two parts and relates to a provision on page 39, section 717, dealing with commissary operation, if someone on the committee is familiar with it.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I may say to the gentleman that that is the same provision we carried in the bill for the current year.

Mr. HAGEN of California. This language for reimbursement is identical with the previous provision; is that correct?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. It is identical language.

Mr. HAGEN of California. And the language establishing criteria for operation in the United States; it would be the same as it was last year; is that correct?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. That is correct.

Mr. PELLY. 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 Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, during the reading of the Defense appropriations bill, when the clerk came to pages 17 and 18, as the members of the committee will remember, he read so fast that he passed over the paragraphs on construction of ships at the bottom of page 17 and the one on shipbuilding and conversion on the top of page 18 before I was recognized, although I was on my feet. Therefore, I have waited until this time to seek recognition to compliment the committee on these particular provisions for construction and conversion of ships.

The policy of the Department of the Navy, as I understand it, was to decommission a great many older combat ships, to put them in mothballs, and to place them in readiness should their services be required in the future. Meanwhile, the funds that would be needed to maintain those older vessels were to go into construction of modern vessels and in particular a fourth *Forrestal* class carrier.

I wish to commend the committee on their recognition of the wisdom of this policy through reporting out the appropriation bill, which provides the funds for this program.

The gentleman from Washington [Mr. TOLLEFSON], during the reading of the earlier section of the bill, mentioned the need of private merchant ships as an adjunct to defense. The Department of the Navy has been in the position of maintaining public and private shipyards for defense and, since we have little or no private merchant ships being built, the Navy has sought to allocate naval construction and repair to private and public yards and, of course, this has been spreading the butter on the bread pretty thin. There just was not enough work to sustain all our shipyards that are necessary for mobilization. In this connection, I think that the Bureau of Ships has been doing an excellent job. However, I think the members of this committee should recognize that the bulk of ship construction has been going to eastern shipyards. I do not criticize the Navy for this and I realize, of course, that any provision in an appropriation bill which would direct where ships should be built would be ruled out on a point of order.

Nevertheless, I think that Congress should recognize that the new *Forrestal* carriers cannot go through the Panama Canal. I feel that the members of the appropriate committees of Congress, particularly the Armed Services Committee, should bear in mind that on the west coast there must be the necessary skills and facilities to construct modern combat vessels. Moreover, we should disperse on a geographical basis in case of enemy air attack. Accordingly, in complimenting the appropriations committee, I, at the same time, want to urge that every possible consideration be given to allocating naval construction to the Pacific coast. The last figure that I saw was that 28.9 percent of naval construction was on the west coast as against 51.3 percent on the east coast, the balance being on the Great Lakes and the gulf coast. Since then, substantial contracts have been given to yards in these two latter areas. In conclusion, I urge that full consideration be given to allocating the fourth *Forrestal* class carrier for construction on the west coast.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill, as amended, do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. McCULLOCH, 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. 8873) making appropriations for the Department of Defense and related independent agency for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill, as amended, do pass.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and all amendments to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. 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.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. WHEELER. I am.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman qualifies. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WHEELER moves to recommit the bill to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to add section 738:

"SEC. 738. None of the funds appropriated by this act shall be available for defraying any of the expenses of maintaining uniformed personnel of the United States in armed conflict anywhere in the world: *Provided*, That this prohibition shall not be applicable with respect to armed conflict pursuant to a declaration of war or other express authorization by Congress or with respect to armed conflict occasioned by an attack on the United States, its Territories, or possessions, or an attack on any nation with whom the United States has a mutual defense or security treaty."

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken, and the Speaker announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH and Mr. MAHON demanded the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 378, nays 0, not voting 57, as follows:

[Roll No. 58]

YEAS—378

Abbitt
Abernethy
Adair
Addonizio
Albert
Alexander
Allen, Calif.
Allen, Ill.
Andersen, H. Carl
Andresen, August H.
Andrews
Angell
Arends
Ashmore
Aspinall
Auchincloss
Ayres
Baker
Barden
Barrett
Bates
Beamer
Becker
Belcher
Bennett, Fla.
Bennett, Mich.
Bentley
Bentsen
Berry
Betts
Bishop
Blatnik
Boggs
Boland
Bolling
Bolton, Frances P.
Bolton, Oliver P.
Bonin
Bonner
Bosch
Bow
Bowler
Bramblett
Bray
Brooks, La.
Brooks, Tex.
Brown, Ga.
Brown, Ohio
Brownson
Broyhill
Buchanan
Budge
Burdick
Burleson
Busbey
Bush
Byrd
Byrne, Pa.
Byrnes, Wis.
Campbell
Canfield
Cannon
Carnahan
Carrigg
Cederberg
Celler
Chenoweth
Chiperfield
Chudoff
Church
Clevenger
Cole, Mo.
Colmer
Condon
Cooley
Coon
Cooper
Corbett
Cotton
Coudert
Cretella
Crumpacker
Cunningham
Curtis, Mass.
Curtis, Mo.
Dague
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Tenn.
Davis, Wis.
Dawson, Ill.
Dawson, Utah
Deane
Delaney
Dempsey
Derounian
Devereux
D'Ewart
Dies
Dodd
Dolliver
Dondero
Donohue
Donovan
Dorn, N. Y.
Dorn, S. C.
Dowdy
Durham
Eberharter
Edmondson
Elliott
Ellsworth
Evins
Fallon
Feighan
Fenton
Fernandez
Fine
Fino
Fisher
Fogarty
Forand
Ford
Forrester
Fountain
Frazier
Frelinghuysen
Friedel
Fulton
Gamble
Garmatz
Gary
Gathings
Gavin
Gentry
George
Golden
Goodwin
Gordon
Granahan
Grant
Green
Gregory
Gross
Gubser
Gwinn
Hagen, Calif.
Hagen, Minn.
Hale
Halleck
Hand
Harden
Hardy
Harris
Harrison, Nebr.
Harrison, Wyo.
Harvey
Hays, Ark.
Hays, Ohio
Hébert
Heller
Hesselton
Hess
Hiestand
Hill
Hillelson
Hillings
Hinshaw
Hoeven
Hoffman, Ill.
Hoffman, Mich.
Holifield
Holmes
Holt
Holtzman
Hope
Horan
Hosmer
Hruska
Hunter
Hyde
Ikard
Jackson
James
Jarman
Javits
Jensen
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Wis.
Jonas, Ill.
Jonas, N. C.
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Mo.
Jones, N. C.
Judd
Karsten, Mo.
Kean
Kearns
Keating
Kee
Kelley, Pa.
Kelly, N. Y.
Keogh
Kilburn
Kilday
King, Pa.
Kirwan
Kluczynski
Knox
Krueger
Laird
Landrum
Lane
Lanham
Latham
LeCompte
Lesinski
Lipscomb
Long
Lovre
Lucas
Lyle
McCarthy
McConnell
McCormack
McCulloch
McDonough
McGregor
McIntire
McMillan
McVey
Machrowicz
Mack, Ill.
Mack, Wash.
Madden
Magnuson
Mahon
Mailliard
Marshall
Mason
Matthews
Meader
Merrow
Metcalf
Miller, Calif.
Miller, Kans.
Miller, Md.
Miller, Nebr.
Miller, N. Y.
Mills
Morano
Morgan
Moss
Moulder
Multer
Mumma
Natcher
Neal
Nelson
Nicholson
Norrell
Oakman
O'Brien, Ill.
O'Brien, Mich.
O'Brien, N. Y.
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Minn.
O'Neill
Osmers
Ostertag
Passman
Patman
Patten
Pattersen
Pelly
Perkins
Pfost
Philbin
Phillips
Pillion
Poage
Poff
Polk
Powell
Preston
Price
Priest
Prouty
Rabaut
Ray
Rayburn
Reams
Reece, Tenn.
Reed, N. Y.
Rees, Kans.
Regan
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rhodes, Pa.
Riehlman
Riley
Rivers
Robeson, Va.
Robsion, Ky.
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Rogers, Mass.
Rogers, Tex.
Roosevelt
Sadlak
St. George
Schenck
Scherer
Scrivner
Scudder
Secrest
Seely-Brown
Selden
Shafer
Sheehan
Shelley
Sheppard
Short
Shuford
Sikes
Simpson, Ill.
Simpson, Pa.
Small
Smith, Kans.
Smith, Miss.
Smith, Va.
Smith, Wis.
Spence
Springer
Staggers
Stauffer
Steed
Stringfellow
Sullivan
Taber
Taylor
Teague
Thomas
Thompson, La.
Thompson, Tex.
Thornberry
Tollefson
Trimble
Tuck
Utt
Van Pelt
Van Zandt
Vinson
Vorys
Vursell
Wainwright
Wampler
Warburton
Watts
Wharton
Wheeler
Whitten
Wickersham
Widnall
Wigglesworth
Williams, Miss.
Williams, N. J.
Williams, N. Y.
Willis
Wilson, Calif.
Wilson, Ind.
Winstead
Withrow
Wolcott
Wolverton
Yates
Young
Younger
Zablocki

NOT VOTING—57

Bailey
Battle
Bender
Boykin
Buckley
Camp
Carlyle
Chatham
Chelf
Clardy
Cole, N. Y.
Crosser
Curtis, Nebr.
Dingell
Dollinger
Doyle
Engle
Graham
Haley
Harrison, Va.
Hart
Herlong
Howell
Jenkins
Kearney
Kersten, Wis.
King, Calif.
Klein
Lantaff
Martin, Iowa
Merrill
Mollohan
Morrison
Murray
Norblad
O'Konski
Pilcher
Radwan
Rains
Reed, Ill.
Richards
Roberts
Rooney
Saylor
Scott
Sieminski
Sutton
Talle
Thompson, Mich.
Velde
Walter
Weichel
Westland
Wier
Wilson, Tex.
Yorty

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Clardy with Mr. Rains.
Mr. Kersten of Wisconsin with Mr. King.
Mr. Jenkins with Mr. Engel.
Mr. Martin of Iowa with Mr. Chatham.
Mr. O'Konski with Mr. Pilcher
Mr. Graham with Mr. Camp.
Mr. Reed of Illinois with Mr. Mollohan.
Mr. Cole of New York with Mr. Doyle.
Mr. Bender with Mr. Bailey.
Mr. Kearney with Mr. Dollinger.
Mr. Merrill with Mr. Buckley.
Mr. Norblad with Mr. Herlong.
Mr. Saylor with Mr. Lantaff.
Mr. Curtis of Nebraska with Mr. Haley.
Mr. Radwan with Mr. Harrison of Virginia.
Mr. Scott with Mr. Rooney.
Mr. Talle with Mr. Morrison.
Mr. Weichel with Mr. Klein.
Mr. Westland with Mr. Wilson of Texas.
Mr. Velde with Mr. Crosser.
Mrs. Thompson of Michigan with Mr. Howell.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

RESIGNATION FROM COMMITTEES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following resignation from a committee:

APRIL 29, 1954.

The Honorable JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Jr.,
Speaker of the House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I hereby tender my resignation as a member of the Committee on House Administration.

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES A. HALLECK.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation will be accepted.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication:

APRIL 26, 1954.

Hon. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Jr.,
Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Attached hereto is a letter from the Honorable BRENT SPENCE resigning as a member of the Joint Committee on Defense Production.

Pursuant to the authority vested in me by section 712 (a) of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, I hereby appoint the Honorable WRIGHT PATMAN, a member of the Committee on Banking and Currency of the House of Representatives, as a member of the Joint Committee on Defense Production.

Sincerely,

JESSE P. WOLCOTT,
Chairman.

APRIL 26, 1954.

Hon. JESSE P. WOLCOTT,
Chairman, Committee on Banking and Currency, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I herewith tender my resignation as a member of the Joint Committee on Defense Production, established by section 712 of the Defense Production Act of

1950, as amended, to be effective as of this date.

Sincerely,

BRENT SPENCE.

ELECTION TO COMMITTEE

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 522) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the following-named Members be, and they are hereby, elected members of the standing Committee of the House of Representatives on House Administration: WILL E. NEAL, West Virginia; D. BAILEY MERRILL, Indiana; and GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB, California.

The resolution was agreed to.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were 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 and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

On April 9, 1954:

H. J. Res. 461. Joint resolution making an additional appropriation for the Department of Labor for the fiscal year 1954, and for other purposes.

On April 13, 1954:

H. R. 1568. An act to amend section 6 of chapter 786 of the act of June 6, 1900, entitled "An act making further provision for a civil government for Alaska, and for other purposes" (31 Stat. 323; title 48, sec. 108, U. S. C.); and

H. R. 2747. An act 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.

On April 15, 1954:

H. R. 962. An act for the relief of Gabrielle Marie Smith (nee Staub);

H. R. 1148. An act for the relief of Antonino Cangialosi (or Anthony Consola);

H. R. 1529. An act to facilitate the development of building materials in Alaska through the removal of volcanic ash from portions of Katmai National Monument, Alaska, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3045. An act for the relief of Nickolas K. Ioannides;

H. R. 4024. An act to change the name of the Appomattox Court House National Historical Monument to the "Appomattox Court House National Historical Park";

H. R. 4056. An act for the relief of Manfred Singer;

H. R. 4707. An act for the relief of Lee Yim Quon;

H. R. 4886. An act for the relief of Ingrid Birgitta Maria Colwell (nee Friberg);

H. R. 4984. An act to remove certain limitations upon the sale or conveyance of land heretofore conveyed to the city of Miles City, Mont., by the United States;

H. R. 5085. An act for the relief of Mrs. Marie Tcherepnin; and

H. R. 6434. An act to amend sections 401 and 701 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act so as to simplify the procedures governing the establishment of food standards.

On April 17, 1954:

H. R. 889. An act for the relief of Scarlett Scoggin;

H. R. 2351. An act for the relief of Sam Rosenblat;

H. R. 2441. An act for the relief of Husnu Ataullah Berker;

H. R. 3306. An act to provide for the relief of certain reclamation homestead entrymen;

H. R. 3961. An act for the relief of Margherita Di Meo;

H. R. 4738. An act for the relief of Gabriel Hittrich;

H. R. 5529. An act to preserve within Manassas National Battlefield Park, Va., the most important historic properties relating to the Battles of Manassas, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 238. Joint resolution granting the status of permanent residence to certain aliens.

On April 22, 1954:

H. R. 6025. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Army to grant a license to the Leahi Hospital, a nonprofit institution, to use certain United States property in the city and county of Honolulu, T. H.;

H. R. 7110. An act to provide that title to school lands shall vest in the States under the act of January 25, 1927, notwithstanding any Federal leases which may be outstanding on such lands at the time they are surveyed; and

H. R. 7380. An act to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to reconvey certain property which the city of Boulder, Colo., donated to the Secretary of Commerce for the establishment of a radio propagation laboratory.

On April 27, 1954:

H. R. 6436. An act to amend the Communications Act of 1934, as amended.

On April 29, 1954:

H. R. 8539. An act to extend the period of election under the Uniformed Services Contingency Option Act of 1953 for certain members of the uniformed services.

THE RIGHT HONORABLE VINCENT MASSEY, GOVERNOR GENERAL OF CANADA

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order at any time on Tuesday, May 4, 1954, for the Speaker to declare a recess subject to the call of the Chair for the purpose of receiving in a joint meeting the Right Honorable Vincent Massey, Governor General of Canada.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY NEXT

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at noon on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

PROGRAM FOR NEXT WEEK

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, as I guess most of us know, on Tuesday next there are primary elections in the States of Alabama, Florida, Indiana, New Mexico, and Ohio, so in keeping with our practice we are arranging the program to suit the convenience of Members from those States.

On Monday we will call the Consent Calendar. There are not very many bills on the calendar, but I think we had better get back on schedule on both the Consent and Private Calendars.

Then there are two bills on which rules were granted some time ago, and which have been scheduled several times, and which should be disposed of. One of them is Senate bill 984 having to do with judicial review of certain tax-court decisions and H. R. 2550 having to do with the extradition of fugitives. It is our purpose to call up the rules and consider those measures starting on Monday after the call of the Consent Calendar.

On Tuesday, we will have the joint meeting which will be at 12:30 p. m. for which unanimous consent has just been granted.

We will call the Private Calendar and then we will continue with the bill to which I have just referred.

On Wednesday, we expect to call up Senate bill 2150 having to do with the construction of the St. Lawrence seaway. It is expected that general debate can be concluded on that day. I think there are 4 hours general debate and we certainly hope the general debate can be concluded on Wednesday and have the first section read so that on Thursday, and I want to say at this time we hope that we can come in at 11 o'clock on Thursday, we would take the bill up for amendment under the 5-minute rule and consider the bill to final passage. As I say, I hope on Thursday we can do that because a great many of our Members have made arrangements to make the annual outing and inspection trip to New York City on Friday, May 7.

S. 2150

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 523, Rept. No. 1549), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

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 (S. 2150) providing for creation of the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation to construct part of the St. Lawrence seaway in United States territory in the interest of national security; authorizing the Corporation to consummate certain arrangements with the Saint Lawrence Seaway Authority of Canada relative to construction and operation of the seaway; empowering the Corporation to finance the United States share of the seaway cost on a self-liquidating basis; to establish cooperation with Canada in the control and operation of the St. Lawrence seaway; to authorize negotiations with Canada of an agreement on tolls; 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 4 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.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order on Calendar Wednesday of next week may be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

EXCHANGE OF PERSONS PROGRAMS IN KOREA AND JAPAN

Mr. BROWNSON. 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 Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROWNSON. Mr. Speaker, on April 14, I made a speech on the floor of the House regarding the future of the international leader and student exchange program—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, pages 5142–5143.

Mr. Speaker, in view of the inquiries I have received in response to this speech and the timeliness of the subject, I am including as an integral part of my remarks, today, a carefully prepared statement on the leader and educational exchange programs in Japan and Korea. This statement has been approved informally by a majority of the members of the International Operations Subcommittee, House Government Operations Committee. It will form the basis of the exchange of persons sections of the forthcoming reports of the subcommittee as a part of its recent survey of Government programs in Japan and Korea. I hope and believe that the release of this information at this time will assist Members of the Congress and interested citizens throughout the country who are now giving active consideration to the future of these programs.

In connection with extensive studies made by the International Operations Subcommittee of United States operations in Korea and in Japan, specific inquiries were made into the exchange of persons programs in Korea. Because there appears to be a need for immediate consideration by the Congress of obstacles which hamper the execution of the exchange of persons programs, the subcommittee believes that this portion of its studies in the Far East should be issued at this time.

EXCHANGE OF PERSONS PROGRAMS

Since 1950, American objectives in Korea have centered on security from external aggression arising out of Communist Asia, and economic relief, reconstruction, and rehabilitation. Before 1950, considerable attention was given to the fostering of institutions, attitudes, and practices which are the bone and sinew of a free democratic society. Provided the threat of a renewal of hostilities does not increase, it is to be expected that efforts along these lines will now be resumed. Along with the Philippines and possibly Japan, Korea appears destined to be a showcase in which Asian peoples will seek to discover what American ideas and principles mean when applied in an oriental setting.

One of the most effective tools in the American kit for fostering Korean understanding and expertise in the practical side of operating a free democratic system is the exchange of persons programs. The Foreign Operations Administration—FOA—and the United Nations Korean Reconstruction Agency—UNKRA—are now developing exchange programs of the technical assistance type. Alongside of these there is an important role to be played by the educational and leader exchange programs under the Smith-Mundt and Fulbright Acts. These programs are especially acceptable to Koreans because of their binational character and the direct American-Korean professional contacts they provide. Because they are directed to Korean opinion leaders in various fields, they have considerable long-run impact.

Up till the present time, however, only a small Smith-Mundt leader-type program has been in operation. The attached table provides a breakdown of this program through 1955 fiscal year as projected in the President's budget request:

Educational exchange with Korea under Smith-Mundt Act (Public Law 402)—Current and projected programs

	1953 (actual)		1954 (allocated)		1955 (planned)	
	Grants	Cost	Grants	Cost	Grants	Cost
I. 3-YEAR SUMMARY						
Americans to Korea:						
Lecturers, research specialists			4	$40,480	4	$40,480
Teachers			2	15,240	2	15,240
Students						
Specialists	5	$44,380	4	21,920	4	21,920
Subtotal	5	44,380	10	77,640	10	77,640
Koreans to the United States:						
Lecturers, research specialists	12	53,640	1	4,470		
Teachers			3	10,530	2	7,020
Students			9	38,430	9	38,430
Specialists			3	9,570	5	15,950
Leaders	14	43,400	5	15,950	10	31,900
Subtotal	26	97,040	21	78,950	26	93,300
Total	31	141,420	31	156,590	36	170,940

Unusual delays have beset the activation of a Fulbright foreign-currency program in Korea. Pursuant to the Surplus Property Settlement Agreement of 1948, the hwan equivalent of $4 million, out of the $25,000,000 accruing to the United States in settlement for surplus United States property transferred to the Korean Government, was earmarked to finance "such educational programs as may be mutually agreed upon by the two Governments." In April 1950 an executive agreement—Treaties and Other International Acts, series 2059—between the two Governments, pursuant to Public Law 584, 79th Congress—the Fulbright Act—provided definitely that up to $2 million of this Korean currency account would be made available for educational-exchange purposes. This agreement further stipulated that no more than $400,000 in hwan equivalent would be spent in any 1 year. It also provided that the Secretary of State will make available for expenditure, as authorized by a binational commission set up under the agreement, Korean currency available under the program "in such amounts as may be required for the purposes of the agreement." All such expenditures by the commission, however, were to be made "pursuant to an annual budget to be approved by the Secretary of State." The Fullbright agreement further provided that—

The Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Republic of Korea shall make every effort to facilitate the exchange-of-persons programs authorized in this agreement and to resolve problems which may arise in the operations thereof.

The outbreak of war in 1950 created conditions unfavorable to the activation of a program under the United States-Korean agreement of 1950. Various other circumstances have resulted in the agreement remaining inactive until the present. For the fiscal year 1955 the State Department first proposed a program of $400,000 equivalent, and later reduced the proposed expenditure to $200,000 in view of the stress on budget economies. However, even this was eliminated in the President's budget as a result of a decision reached in or through the Bureau of the Budget that the worldwide program of educational exchanges could not exceed the appropriation for 1954. This was $15 million in round figures. This decision, in effect, eliminated funds required by the Department of State to acquire from the Treasury foreign currency for the activation of the Fulbright program in Korea. Since there had been no Korean program in 1954, any amount allotted in 1955 to Korea would have the effect of reducing programs in other countries or reducing the Smith-Mundt program, which is financed primarily by dollar expenditures.

It is understood that a similar situation has arisen in other countries, including several Asian countries, where foreign currency educational exchange programs were to be stepped up or activated for the first time. In many countries, in-

cluding Korea and Japan, a large volume of foreign currencies is available, or can be made available, for United States educational exchange programs which cannot be converted into dollars because of the unfavorable foreign exchange position of these countries. Further, the expanded use of these currencies for educational exchange purposes will have no significant effect on internal inflationary conditions. In these instances it appears to be to the clear advantage of the United States to employ these currencies in expanded educational exchange programs.

Many studies and surveys of these programs have been made within the Congress, by presidential advisory commissions, and by nongovernmental groups. The verdicts rendered have been favorable in virtually all instances.

The programs requested for 1955 fiscal year by the Republic of Korea and the American Embassy and given first priority by the Department of State are not included in other U. N. or FOA plans. They include:

(a) Sending United States professors and teacher-trainers to Korea: These educators would be drawn from the fields of political science, philosophy, physical sciences, law, and police.

(b) Assistance in staffing a Korean university: This university would include in its program, first, refresher courses for lawyers, judges, and procurators on elements of a democratic legal system; second, a department of law enforcement and police administration for short courses for law-enforcement officials.

(c) Assistance in establishing and operating American schools in Korea: Under the Fulbright Act, it is possible to designate American schools abroad and to pay the costs of travel and tuition for Korean scholars to attend such institutions. Since the 1955 program as proposed for Korea placed major emphasis on this feature, it would be necessary to, first, review the various Korean institutions to determine which, if any, meet the criteria required, are interested in being assisted and utilized, and have facilities adaptable for expansion; second, assist the Korean institutions so selected by providing American Fulbright professors; third, provide travel and tuition grants to selected Korean scholars from Korean Fulbright funds to attend these American schools in Korea.

(d) Bringing Korean specialists, scholars, and professors to the United States: The Republic of Korea and the United States Embassy desire to send Korean students, scholars, and professors for study and training in the United States. There is also a proposal to send national, prefectural and municipal leaders and specialists to the United States to establish a concept of democratic government and the need for an enlightened citizenry. This would require some Public Law 402 dollars—Smith-Mundt. However, the costs of international travel can be defrayed in considerable part by won currency.

These programs require some dollar support—approximately 20 to 25 percent of the foreign currency cost. Therefore, in order to activate an annual program in Korea involving the expenditure of the won equivalent of $400,000 approximately $100,000 in dollars from the United States Treasury will be required. In other words the American taxpayers are required to put up only one-fifth of the total.

It is believed, therefore, that the Korean educational exchange program should be activated without further delay. It also is believed that budget ceilings should not be applied so as to require that programs in other countries be reduced by the dollar equivalent of the won that is programed for Korea for educational exchange. It is further believed that appropriation requests for this program should indicate clearly, first, how much will be returned to the United States Treasury; and, second, that it is submitted in order to implement the clear intent of an international agreement duly entered into by the United States pursuant to authorizing acts of the Congress. The Supplemental Appropriation Act of 1954, Public Law 207, section 1313, 83d Congress, reaffirmed the authority of the Secretary of State to enter into such agreements.

Last year the President approved a request by the State Department that the Rabaut amendment—section 1415, Public Law 547, 82d Congress—this requires dollar appropriations in order to use foreign credits owed to or owned by the United States—not apply to the use of foreign currencies for international educational exchange which are available for this purpose under international agreements made pursuant to statute. The Hickenlooper subcommittee, the United States Advisory Commission on Educational Exchange, and the President's Board of Foreign Scholarships made similar recommendations. However, it is believed such an exemption for these programs is not needed if the foregoing suggestions are carried out.

COORDINATION AMONG EXCHANGE OF PERSONS PROGRAMS

Exchange of persons programs in Korea are being conducted by UNKRA, by the U. N. Technical Assistance Board, by the Department of State under the International Educational Exchange program, and by the ROK's. The Department of the Army under the CRIK program furnishes some technical assistance to the Koreans. The FOA is planning a large exchange program which will gear technical agencies such as the Department of Agriculture into the operation.

As long as separate United States and international agencies are operating programs in Korea multiple exchange of persons programs are inevitable. The exchange of persons is a technique used in the execution of programs rather than a major program category in its own right. However, regardless of different purposes and different professional and occupational fields serviced by the various exchange programs, coordination is an obvious necessity. It is necessary that each agency have a clear and up-to-date knowledge of programs administered by other agencies, that fields of operation be delineated, that common facilities, standards, procedures, et cetera, be employed where appropriate.

Up to the present, adequate coordination has not been achieved at the Washington end. The exchange of persons clearinghouse operated by the United States Office of Education under contract with the Department of State for the purpose of assembling data on all Government-operated exchanges does not appear to be operating successfully—at least for Korea. In Korea good working relations have been established among all parties concerned, except in some instances with the Korean Government. However, reasonably clear delineations between the types of programs to be operated by the respective agencies have not yet materialized. This is illustrated particularly in the field of education. This problem has not yet been a serious one, however, because of the small scale of programs actually in operation. In view of the enlarged programs envisaged under current plans, however, it is important that corrective steps be taken without delay. At the very least, responsibility should be clearly fixed on one agency—probably the Department of State—to gather, assemble, and disseminate information on exchanges in effect or being planned.

THE EDUCATIONAL EXCHANGE PROGRAM, JAPAN

Testimony concerning this program was received in Japan from Donald Ranard, Chief of the Exchange of Persons Branch. Although in Washington, the International Educational Exchange Service is organizationally separated from the United States Information Service, in Japan as in other parts of the world as a result of Reorganization Plan 8, the Chief of the exchange operation reports to the Public Affairs Officer of USIS. This is no change however from the situation that existed prior to the effective date of Reorganization Plan 8. This apparently is a temporary arrangement. Whether it will be continued is not known by the subcommittee at this time. The subcommittee was advised, however, that in Japan this organizational arrangement is working out satisfactorily. Information received concerning the IES program in Japan was as follows:

BACKGROUND

The Department of the Army initiated an exchange-of-persons program under the occupation. This Army program brought approximately 800 Japanese students and 800 leaders to the United States during the period September 1949 to April 1952.

A program designed to bring Japanese business executives, government officials, political leaders and technicians to the United States was initiated in 1949 under Japanese Government auspices. Approximately 1,500 Japanese have been brought to the United States under this program from 1950–53, inclusive. In 1953 the Department of State assisted in arranging itineraries for 289 such visitors. All program costs other than that required for staff time for planning travel programs is borne by the Japanese Government and commercial firms. Initially the Department of the Army transferred yen credits to the Japanese

Government to finance the program. The assistance provided by the Department during 1953 will be provided by the Japanese Embassy in Washington in 1954 and subsequent years.

The responsibility for administering the educational exchange program with Japan was transferred to the Department of State on July 1, 1952. Close coordination between the Departments of State and Army was maintained during fiscal year 1953, since many of the grants had been issued by the Department of the Army prior to the official transfer of responsibility for program administration. United States Government exchange of person programs are now financed solely through funds allotted under the Fulbright Act—Public Law 584, 79th Congress—and the Smith-Mundt Act—Public Law 402, 80th Congress. The purposes and methods of these two acts are similar in many respects. The Smith-Mundt Act, however, places more emphasis on the promotion of "a better understanding of the United States in other countries" and increasing "mutual understanding between the people," and less on education and research as such, than the Fulbright Act. Also, the Smith-Mundt Act is broader in coverage in that it includes exchanges outside educational and academic institutions in its trainee, specialist, lecturer, and leader program.

The binational executive agreement between the United States and Japan providing for a 5-year program of educational exchanges under the Fulbright Act was signed August 28, 1951, and established a foreign currency allocation of $4,750,000 equivalent to support this program. The terms of the agreement provided a budget of $1 million per annum except for the first year program of $750,000 during the academic year 1952. It is estimated that at the end of the 1954 fiscal year, $1,614,000 in yen equivalent will be available to finance future program.

CURRENT AND FUTURE PROGRAM

The attached table gives a breakdown of the 1953 program, which is now in effect, the 1954 fiscal programs, and the program requested for 1955 fiscal:

Educational exchange with Japan, current and project programs [1]

Americans to Japan	1953 (actual)	1954 (allocated)	1955 (planned)
I. PUBLIC LAW 584 PROGRAM			
Lecturers, research specialists	28	37	37
Teachers	7	12	12
Students (graduate)	19	28	28
Specialists (seminar)	----------	3	10
Subtotal	54	80	87
Japanese to the United States:			
Lecturers, research specialists	47	25	25
Teachers	36	36	36
Students (graduate)	145	150	150
Subtotal	228	211	211
Total	282	291	298

[1] Generally exchanges take place the year following the fiscal year funds from which they are financed.

Educational exchange with Japan, current and project programs—Continued

Americans to Japan	1953 (actual)	1954 (allocated)	1955 (planned)
II. PUBLIC LAW 402 PROGRAM			
United States specialists	9	2	2
Japanese specialists	----------	9	10
Japanese leaders	49	16	36
Total	58	27	48
	1953	1954	1955 (planned)
III. BUDGET COSTS			
Foreign currency (Public Law 584)	$800,000	$900,000	$1,000,000
Public Law 402 dollar support	336,520	339,440	289,240
Total Fulbright program	1,136,520	1,239,440	1,289,240
Public Law 402 program (non-Fulbright)	164,130	103,700	175,100
Total 402/584 program	1,300,650	1,343,140	1,464.340
Total dollars	500,650	443,140	464,340

For the 1953 fiscal year the combined exchange of persons programs included 63 grants to Americans and 277 to Japanese at a cost of approximately $1,300,650, including $800,000 in yen currency equivalent. This is the program in effect during the 1953–54 academic year. These grants were subdivided as follows:

	Americans	Japanese
Leaders and specialists	9	[1] 49
Lecturers and research specialists	26	47
Teachers	7	36
Students	19	145
	63	277

[1] Includes high-status trainees.

The authorized 1954 fiscal year appropriations were approximately the same as for 1953. But in view of the contemplated use of $900,000 in yen equivalent, the dollar amount was less. The number of American grantees was slightly expanded with reduced emphasis on leaders—or specialists—and increased emphasis on lecturers and research scholars. The total number of Japanese grantees was reduced by 15 percent as a result of a 50 percent reduction in the number of leader, specialist, lecturer, and research scholar grants to Japanese. The 1955 appropriation request was slightly higher, but in view of the contemplated use of $1 million in yen currency, the dollar costs would remain approximately the same as for 1954 fiscal. Under this request, the number of American grants would increase slightly while the number of Japanese grants would be increased to approximately the 1953 fiscal level.

FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

On the basis of its rather limited observations of the United States-Japanese exchange of persons program in operation, the subcommittee received a favorable impression of its operation.

This program is of great potential consequence in checking the unfortunate amount of anti-American sentiment in Japan, in increasing Japanese understanding of the United States, in winning support for the free world in its strategic opposition to Communist expansionism, and in preserving and supporting the spirit behind some of the occupation era reforms.

It is especially effective with the Japanese because of their interest in and respect for professional and cultural leaders and because it places influential Japanese in direct contact with those aspects of American life we wish Japanese opinion to understand. Furthermore, the Japanese participate in making most of the selections. In this connection, the subcommittee supports the recommendation of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee that "wherever practicable the binational commissions abroad functioning as part of the Fulbright program shall also make selections of educational exchanges under the Smith-Mundt Act"—report on overseas information program of the United States. Report No. 406, 83d Congress, 1st session, June 15, 1953. The subcommittee also suggested that consideration be given to extending the grants of Japanese students in the United States to 2 years in instances where this is appropriate. One year is a short period for a young Japanese to absorb what the United States has to offer.

The cost of this program to the United States taxpayer is running less than one-half a million dollars a year. There has been no economic aid program for Japan since the end of the occupation. In 1954 it is planned to allocate to economic support $10 million of the yen proceeds from the sale of surplus agricultural commodities. There has been no Government-financed technical assistance program. In the Philippines, for example, there will be five times as many United States Government-financed exchanges in 1954 on a per capita basis. In view of the importance of the contributions which the exchange-of-persons program can make to the achievement of our objectives in Japan, the subcommittee believes it should be expanded.

In the Far East, to a greater degree than in any other geographic region of the world, few exchange visits have occurred except as assisted by United States Government grants. The factors which stimulate citizens of one nation to visit another nation under private resources, such as cultural similarity, proximity, common language, religious affiliation, commercial interdependence, et cetera, are relatively weak between the United States and the Far East. Very few exchange visits have occurred or will occur with nations of the Far East except as stimulated and assisted by the United States Government. The subcommittee received testimony on the fine work of private American organizations such as church groups, Socony-Vacuum, the Crew Foundation, the Rockefeller Foundation, the Bancroft Foundation, and college groups. The subcommittee feels that maximum encouragement should be given to private exchanges.

There is sufficient flexibility in the Smith-Mundt Act to permit it to be used to achieve some of the purposes in the technical assistance field which are

served in other countries by programs under the provisions of Mutual Security and International Development legislation. It can be adjusted to bring substantial numbers of influential Japanese industrialists and leaders in technical fields to the United States. Such adjustment would be in accord with the objectives of this act if grantees were selected on the basis of their opinion-molding potential and if program experiences were designed to emphasize pro-American orientation.

It is to be noted that during the occupation period, on an annual basis, some 500 to 800 Japanese were brought to the United States under the Exchange-of-Persons program of the Department of the Army. In addition, approximately 300 Japanese were annual recipients of grants to the United States under the Japanese Government program, which was financed largely by Department of the Army yen credits.

During the same period, thousands of Americans were in Japan as employees of the Department of the Army. During this period also, numerous projects and programs were initiated to strengthen democratic institutions in the governmental and economic field. Subsequent to the occupation period, however, the scope of exchanges has been reduced suddenly and drastically. In many instances this has eliminated United States followup on worthy occupation programs and has minimized the show of United States interest in many Japanese problems of substantial concern to the United States. This is indicated most forcibly by the following data on the number of visits of Japanese leaders to the United States under United States Government programs:

1951	500
1952	250
1953	49
1954	25

The number of Japanese students brought to the United States annually under the State Department's program has been less than 50 percent of the number previously brought over during the occupation period.

The State Department has given high priority to minor increases in the Japan fiscal year 1955 program but has not asked for the funds necessary to support the Embassy's full request, in view of the fact that under a Budget Bureau ruling the worldwide appropriations request for fiscal year 1955 educational exchange program must not exceed the actual 1954 allocation.

This program in Japan along with the cultural centers probably can be increased, without extra cost to the American taxpayer, by the allocation of Japanese yen to support them under the provisions of the GARIO settlement to be negotiated in April. Under the Rabaut amendment—section 1415, Public Law 547, 82d Congress—dollar appropriations must be obtained for all United States-administered programs even though they actually are financed in whole or in part by foreign currencies. The subcommittee supports the application of the Rabaut amendment to foreign currency exchange programs and, therefore, is not sympathetic with the efforts that have been made to exempt these programs from the requirement that they obtain dollar appropriations.

However, where foreign currencies, not otherwise available to the United States, are, or can be made, available for sound and useful cooperative cultural and exchange programs, the subcommittee urges that they be used. If the facts are clearly presented to the Appropriations Committees of the Congress, there should be no difficulty in securing the appropriation of dollars, which, in fact, either will not be drawn from the Treasury or will be drawn only on a 25-cents-to-the-dollar ratio. Overall budgetary ceilings should not be applied so as to prevent the use of foreign currencies for desirable programs, when those currencies cannot otherwise be obtained or, if obtainable, cannot be used without replacing dollars needed by the foreign country for balance of payments reasons.

Those cultural and exchange programs are, in effect, binational. Therefore, in negotiations such as the GARIO settlement, the foreign government most probably will agree to set aside for them local currency over and beyond what it probably would agree to pay over to the United States for an exclusive United States expenditure—especially to replace a United States expenditure normally met in dollars. In the case of exchange programs and cultural centers, the small amounts involved and the uses for which the expenditures are made, preclude a significant inflationary impact on the local country.

The President's budget requested $1,464,340 for these programs for the 1955 fiscal year—$1 million of which represented available yen credits. This was the Japanese portion of the request of $15 million for the worldwide exchange program—$7,560,166 of which represented available foreign currencies. H. R. 8067 cut this request to $9 million and specified that $7,560,166 of this "shall be used to purchase foreign currencies or credits owed to or owned by the Treasury of the United States." As applied to Japan, this appropriates $1,062,000 of which only $62,000 would represent dollars drawn from the United States Treasury. This would eliminate the Smith-Mundt leader and specialist—dollar—program and necessitate a large reduction in the Fulbright—yen—program since a 1-to-4 ratio of dollars to yen is estimated to be the lowest that is feasible.

In effect, H. R. 8067 would cut the undersized 1954 program of $1,343,140 more than 50 percent. The subcommittee would regard any such action as dangerous in national security terms.

Before the passage of H. R. 8067, the State Department was preparing a supplemental appropriation request which would permit a 20-percent increase in the 1955 Japanese exchange of persons program as compared with 1954. On the basis of its survey in Japan, the subcommittee would recommend that this supplemental request, if presented, be approved so far as it applies to Japan.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I have a special order for tonight which I wish to have withdrawn, and now ask unanimous consent that I may address the House for 30 minutes on Monday next, following the legislative program of the day and the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce may have until midnight tomorrow night to file a report on the bill H. R. 8357, and that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MACK] may have the privilege of filing minority views therewith.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

PRICES OF DAIRY PRODUCTS

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous material therewith.

The SPEAKER. Is these objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, some time ago on the floor of this House we had quite a discussion about the position that we were finding ourselves in, in connection with export trade for American farm products. On page 1129 of the hearings on the Department of Agriculture appropriation bill some questions were asked concerning the world price of American farm products. Particularly were we interested in dairy products and we asked some questions about the price of dairy products. We find that the price of dried milk varied, according to the figures furnished by the Department of Agriculture, from 12.8 cents to 8.5 cents per pound. We were interested in finding that on April 22, and I will include the press release with my remarks, that the Commodity Credit Corporation, Department of Agriculture, decided that they were going to dispose of their milk for animal feed for 3½ cents and 4 cents a pound.

Mr. Speaker, in all candor, I ask you what kind of a position is the United States of America in when they refuse to put the prices of American farm produts onto the world market at the world price, and charge the taxpayers of this country with the difference between 15 cents a pound, which they are paying, and 3½ cents or 4 cents a pound that they are moving those products for feed for livestock? That does not make sense to me.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, April 22, 1954.

PART OF CCC DRIED MILK SURPLUSES TO BE SOLD FOR FEED USE

A program under which part of the big surplus of nonfat dried milk solids held by the Commodity Credit Corporation will be sold for a limited period at reduced prices for

use in mixed animal and poultry feeds was announced today by Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson.

The stocks of dried milk were acquired by CCC in carrying out mandatory price support operations. As of April 14, the Corporation was holding more than 589 million pounds of dried milk in its inventories.

"This is the fifth specific action since late March in the series of steps we are taking to improve the current dairy situation," Secretary Benson said in commenting on the sale program.

"We are fortunately in position to realize two beneficial results from the program announced today. Supplies of high-protein feed supplements are short, due primarily to the reduced 1953 soybean crop. We can, therefore, move substantial amounts of our dried milk into feed use, relieving the Government of the need to carry some of the burdensome stocks. At the same time we can help stabilize the protein feed-supplement market to the advantage of livestock and poultry farmers. We will be putting some skim milk, for which there is no other current outlet, back into a normal and historic use as livestock feed.

"The feed-sale use will not interfere in any way with our programs to move dried milk stocks for human consumption. We have so much on hand that we can, and will, continue vigorously every effort to secure greatest possible distribution through such outlets as the school lunch program, donations for the relief of needy people both at home and abroad, sales for export, and other special programs. Distribution of CCC stocks of dried milk for human consumption during the past 2 years has totaled nearly 300 million pounds.

"When I outlined the general plans for a broad dairy program on March 29 I said that we were prepared to take a loss on Government surplus stocks of dairy products. The sale of extra surpluses of dried milk at reduced prices for feed use is the sort of constructive program we had in mind."

Actions to improve the dairy situation which have been announced previously include: (1) A promotion campaign to push the consumption of dairy products, especially during June Dairy Month; (2) a nationwide educational program to increase the culling of low-producing dairy cattle; (3) offers to sell CCC stocks of cheese and dried milk for export at prices comparable with the world markets; and (4) a special program to facilitate the use of United States-produced butter and nonfat dried milk solids, for recommendation and sale as fluid milk in friendly countries abroad.

Sales of dried milk for feed use under the program announced today will begin in a few days, as soon as the necessary administrative procedures can be set up in field offices. Through August 31, 1954, CCC stocks of nonfat dried milk solids will be offered for sale for limited use by the domestic feed industry in most States at 3½ cents a pound. In the States of Arizona, California, Idaho, Nevada, Oregon, Utah, and Washington the sales price will be 4 cents a pound. This price differential is in line with the normal freight differentials on shipments of other mixed feed materials to these States. The sales price includes delivery f. o. b. at destination points.

Nonfat dried milk purchased under this sales program must be bought prior to September 1, 1954, must be used in addition to the buyer's normal purchases of dairy products, fermentation byproduct feeds, fish solubles, and riboflavin supplements, and must be incorporated in mixed animal or poultry feeds prior to November 1, 1954.

A sales announcement will be mailed to the feed trade with all necessary details of the program. When sales start they will be made daily through Commodity Stabilization Service commodity offices in Cincinnati, New Orleans, Dallas, Kansas City, Mo., Minneapolis, and Portland, Oreg. The dried milk will grade U. S. Standard or better. Copies of the sales announcement will be available from the CSS commodity offices or from the Livestock and Dairy Division, CSS, USDA, Washington 25, D. C.

On April 14 the USDA had stocks of nonfat dried milk solids amounting to 589.6 million pounds, costing approximately 16.73 cents per pound. Sales and other uses for this product have amounted to 165.9 million pounds for export, 20.3 million pounds for section 32 distribution, 101.3 million pounds for section 416 donation, 6.8 million pounds to the United States Army, and 1.7 million pounds for other disposals. The nonfat dried milk for these uses has come from purchases of over 885 million pounds of the product primarily under the 1952–53 (beginning April 1, 1952) and the 1953–54 (beginning April 1, 1953) dairy price support programs.

Officials of the Department do not believe the sale of CCC-owned dried milk for feed use will seriously affect the market for other feed supplements. The dried milk will be used largely to make up for the current shortage of soybean meal before the new crops come in. It has been estimated that production of soybean meal in the 1953–54 year will be around three-quarters of a million tons below the production a year earlier, and the effects of this reduction will be especially pronounced during the April–September period. However, the Department is considering the development of a program for use in the event that it is advisable to protect the market for other animal protein supplements such as dry and condensed whey and dry buttermilk.

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, April 22, 1954.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS ON SALE OF NONFAT DRY MILK SOLIDS FOR USE IN LIVESTOCK AND POULTRY MIXED FEEDS

1. Why the sale of nonfat dry milk at low prices for animal feed use now?

There are two good reasons. One, the Government has extremely large stocks of nonfat dry milk solids that have been piling up despite every effort to move them into various uses. This inventory is now approximately 600 million pounds, or equal to about a year's supply at current consumption. The other reason is the current shortage of high protein supplement for mixed feeds—primarily of soybean meal because of the smaller 1953 soybean crop. Use of Government stocks at this time will relieve the short protein supply situation until the new crops come on next fall. Use of skim milk as livestock feed is a normal and historic use.

2. Why the low price for the nonfat dry milk for this use?

At the price of 4 cents a pound on the West Coast and 3½ cents a pound for the rest of the country, the dry milk is at a price comparable to other vegetable protein feed supplements. If the program is to be practical, the offering price must be at comparable levels.

3. Why not use the nonfat dry milk for human food rather than for animals?

This program will not stop the efforts being made to expand the distribution and use of Government stocks of dry milk for human use, and is in addition to and not a replacement of these other programs. During the past 12 months, vigorous action has found outlets for more than 250 million pounds of Government-owned dry milk for human feeding in this country and abroad. (Over 100 million pounds has been donated to church and other welfare agencies for feeding needy persons abroad. An additional 115 million pounds has been sold at 1 cent per pound to the United Nations International Children's Emergency Fund for feeding children in the hungry areas of the world). But despite these efforts, heavy purchases moved dry milk into Government ownership much faster than outlets could be found. During the past 12 months, purchases amounted to over 660 million pounds, adding nearly 400 million pounds to Government inventories. While soybean feed is short, it is highly practical to develop a program now to move some of these large Government stocks of dry milk.

4. Is this program going to interfere with the sale of other animal protein feeds to the feed industry?

No. Feed manufacturers, to qualify for the purchase of this dry milk, must agree to continue to use the same amount of dairy by-product feeds such as dried, condensed or semi-solid whey, buttermilk and skim milk. They must also continue to use the same quantities of fermentation by-product feeds, such as distillers' solubles and brewers' dried yeast and also fish solubles and riboflavin supplements, during the life of this program as was used in feeds during the same period a year ago. This program was not set up to supplant the use of any proteins; it was established to fill a gap in supplies caused by the smaller 1953 soybean crop.

5. Can the dry milk purchased by feed manufacturers be resold or exported as dry milk?

No. It cannot be exported or resold except in mixed feeds.

6. Will this program continue indefinitely?

No. The program is set up to last only until the new crop comes in. Supplies of high protein feed should then be available in sufficient quantities again. Sales by the Government will be discontinued on August 31, and feed manufacturers must use the dry milk in mixed feeds before November 1, 1954. This will prevent feed manufacturers from accumulating a big inventory of this milk to use later.

7. How does the selling price compare with the cost of the dry milk to the Government?

The selling prices of 3½ and 4 cents per pound compare to an estimated inventory cost of 16.73 cents per pound. However, the recovery to the Government for other disposals of dry milk has been little or nothing. The price established under this program will permit some recovery of Government costs and at the same time relieve the Government of costly and difficult storage problems.

8. Was this program begun because the Government-owned milk is spoiling and the Government wants to unload it?

No. Nearly all of the milk in Government stocks is suitable for food use and the milk being offered for sale is U. S. Standard grade or higher, which is highly suitable for food use. However, there is no prospect that the present large stocks can be used for food use in the next year or two. The dry milk will not remain in top condition indefinitely and this program provides another satisfactory outlet that will help reduce Government inventories. It is important to stop storage costs, which on nonfat dry milk are now running around $400,000 a month. Also, continued large purchases of this commodity are in prospect. Currently, nonfat dry milk is coming into Government ownership at a rate of about 2 million pounds a day.

REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 1 OF 1954—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 381)

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CANFIELD) laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, together with the accompanying papers,

without objection, was referred to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1954, prepared in accordance with the Reorganization Act of 1949, as amended.

The reorganization plan establishes a new Government agency, the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission of the United States; transfers to that Commission the functions of the War Claims Commission and of the International Claims Commission of the United States; and abolishes the latter two Commissions.

The Foreign Claims Settlement Commission will be composed of three members appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The President will designate one of the members as Chairman of the Commission. The Chairman will be responsible for the internal management of the affairs of the Commission. The reorganization plan contains provisions designed to assure smooth administration of functions during the period of transition to the new organization.

The War Claims Commission was created as a temporary agency by the War Claims Act of 1948. The Commission was made responsible for settling certain claims of former United States World War II prisoners of war, civilian internees captured or in hiding to avoid capture in the Philippines, Guam, Wake Island, and the Midway Islands, and certain religious organizations in the Philippines which had aided American forces during the war. In 1952, the Commission was assigned, additionally, the administration of claims of Philippine religious organizations which sustained losses of their educational, medical, and welfare facilities in the war, and of benefits to United States prisoners of war for inhumane treatment during internment by the enemy.

From its inception in 1949 to April 1, 1954, approximately 500,000 claims were filed with the War Claims Commission, and approximately $134 million was paid to claimants. Approximately 96,000 remaining claims are in the process of settlement, and the Commission must complete action on them, together with such appeals as may be filed, by March 31, 1955.

The International Claims Commission was established within the Department of State by the International Claims Settlement Act of 1949. Its immediate function was to adjudicate claims covered by a settlement of $17 million which was deposited with the Government of the United States by the Yugoslav Government primarily to compensate our nationals for losses sustained through nationalization of properties. The act also authorized the Commission to settle such claims as might be included later in any similar agreement between the United States and a foreign government. Subsequently, the Commission was assigned the administration of a $400,000 settlement negotiated with the Government of Panama.

From its establishment in 1950 to April 1, 1954, the International Claims Commission has settled 531 claims out of a total of 1,622 filed. Of this total, 1,555 claims were against Yugoslavia and 67 were against Panama. Under the act, settlement of the remaining Yugoslav claims must be completed by December 31, 1954.

The accompanying reorganization plan has substantial potential advantages. The Foreign Claims Settlement Commission will be able to administer any additional claims programs financed by funds derived from foreign governments without the delay which has often characterized the initiation of past programs. Moreover, the use of an existing agency will be more economical than the establishment of a new commission to administer a given type of foreign claims program. Consolidation of the affairs of the two present Commissions will also permit the retention and use of the best experience gained during the last several years in the field of claims settlement. The declining workload of current programs can be meshed with the rising workload of new programs with maximum efficiency and effectiveness.

A proposed new claims program now pending before the Senate would provide benefits similar to those paid to World War II victims under the War Claims Act for losses and internments resulting from hostilities in Korea. The executive branch of the Government has recommended approval of this program by the Congress. I now suggest that this program be assigned by law to the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission.

There should also be assigned to this new Commission the settlement of such of the claims programs as may be authorized from among those recommended by the War Claims Commission in its report made pursuant to section 8 of the War Claims Act. That report, posing many complex policy, legal, and administrative problems, is now being reviewed by executive agencies; and recommendations will soon be sent to the Congress.

By peace treaties and an international agreement, the United States has acquired the right to utilize certain external assets and settlement funds of several countries. A total of about $39 million is available to indemnify claims of United States nationals against the Governments of Rumania, Hungary, Bulgaria, and Italy arising out of war damage or confiscations in those countries. In addition, claims growing out of United States losses from default on obligations and nationalization of properties may be settled by awards from $9 million realized from an agreement made in 1933 with the Soviet Union, known as the Litvinov assignment. Action by the Congress is necessary before these various funds may be assigned for settlement, and recommendations of the executive branch in this connection will be transmitted at an early date.

In addition to the reorganizations I have described, the reorganization plan transfers to the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission the functions of the Commissioner provided for in the joint resolution of August 4, 1939. Those functions involve the receipt and administration of claims covered by the Litvinov assignment. The Office of Commissioner, for which funds have never been appropriated and which has never been filled, is abolished.

The reorganization plan does not transfer the war claims fund or the Yugoslav claims fund from the Department of the Treasury, or divest the Secretary of the Treasury of any functions under the War Claims Act of 1948, as amended, or under the International Claims Settlement Act of 1949, as amended. It does not limit the responsibility of the Secretary of State with respect to the conduct of foreign affairs. The reorganizations contained in the reorganization plan will not prejudice any interest or potential interest of any claimant.

After investigation, I have found and hereby declare that each reorganization included in the accompanying reorganization plan is necessary to accomplish one or more of the purposes set forth in section 2 (a) of the Reorganization Act of 1949, as amended. I have also found and hereby declare that it is necessary to include in the accompanying reorganization plan, by reason of reorganizations made thereby, provisions for the appointment and compensation of officers specified in section 1 of the plan. The rate of compensation fixed for each of these officers is that which I have found to prevail in respect of comparable officers in the executive branch of the Government.

The statutory citation for certain functions of the Secretary of State with respect to the International Claims Commission which are abolished by the reorganization plan, is the third and fourth sentences of section 3 (c) of the International Claims Settlement Act of 1949, 64 Stat. 13, as amended.

It is at this time impracticable to specify the reductions of expenditures which it is probable will be brought about by the taking effect of the reorganizations contained in the plan.

Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1954 provides a single agency for the orderly completion of present claims programs. In addition, it provides an effective organization for the settlement of future authorized claims programs by utilizing the experience gained by present claims agencies. It provides unified administrative direction of the functions concerned, and it simplifies the organizational structure of the executive branch. I urge that the Congress allow the reorganization plan to become effective.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *April 29, 1954.*

REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 2 OF 1954—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 382)

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CANFIELD) laid before the House the following message from the President of the

United States which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, was referred to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1954, prepared in accordance with the Reorganization Act of 1949, as amended. The reorganization plan assigns to appropriate agencies the liquidation of certain affairs of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

First, the reorganization plan transfers to the Export-Import Bank of Washington loans made to foreign financial institutions and to foreign governments, including a loan to the Republic of the Philippines; all foreign bonds and securities acquired in the liquidation of Corporation lending programs; and functions with respect to the liquidation of those assets. The bank is this Government's principal instrument for the administration of similar matters and can readily integrate the liquidation of the transferred assets with its other activities in the field of foreign finance.

Second, the reorganization plan transfers to the Small Business Administration loans made by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to victims of floods or other catastrophes, together with the function of liquidating those loans. The Small Business Administration is responsible for a similar loan program. Thus, by this transfer, related activities are concentrated in a single agency for effective administration.

Third, the reorganization plan transfers to the Federal National Mortgage Association, in the Housing and Home Finance Agency, real-estate mortgages made or acquired under the authority of the RFC Mortgage Company and the Defense Homes Corporation, and the function of liquidating these assets. The Association is responsible under its basic authority for the servicing, liquidation, and sale of the bulk of residential real-estate mortgages held by the Government of the United States. Through its field offices, the Association maintains continuous relationships with lending and investing institutions specializing in home financing. It is, therefore, the Federal agency best situated to liquidate the assets of a similar type transferred to it by the reorganization plan.

Under existing authority, the completion of the liquidation of the assets and the winding up of the affairs of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation will be carried out under the direction of the Secretary of the Treasury after the succession of the Corporation expires on June 30, 1954. The reorganization plan modifies that arrangement by placing responsibility for the completion of each of the activities described above under the jurisdiction of an agency responsible for a similar continuing program. Thus, the reorganization plan facilitates the orderly and expeditious liquidation of the affairs of the Corporation.

It is not, however, practicable at this time to specify the reductions of expenditures which it is probable will be brought about by the taking effect of the reorganizations contained in the plan.

After investigation, I have found and hereby declare that each reorganization included in Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1954 is necessary to accomplish one or more of the purposes set forth in section 2 (a) of the Reorganization Act of 1949, as amended.

I urge that the Congress allow the reorganization plan to become effective.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *April 29, 1954.*

REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 2 OF 1954

(Prepared by the President and transmitted to the Senate and the House of Representatives in Congress assembled, April 29, 1954, pursuant to the provisions of the Reorganization Act of 1949, approved June 20, 1949, as amended)

LIQUIDATION OF CERTAIN AFFAIRS OF THE RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION

SECTION 1. Transfer of functions: The functions of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation (hereinafter referred to as the Corporation) with respect to the following-described matters, together with the functions of the Secretary of the Treasury under section 10 of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended, and under the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Liquidation Act, with respect to the said matters, are hereby transferred as follows:

(a) There are transferred to the Export-Import Bank of Washington the said functions relating to:

(1) The loan made by the Corporation to the Republic of the Philippines under section 3 of the joint resolution of August 7, 1946, ch. 811, 60 Stat. 902.

(2) The loans made by the Corporation to the Government of Ecuador and the Newfoundland Railway of St. Johns, Newfoundland.

(3) The capital stock of the Banco de Borracha (now known as the Amazon Credit Bank, Belem, Brazil).

(4) All foreign bonds and securities acquired by the Corporation in the liquidation of its lending programs.

(b) There are transferred to the Small Business Administration the said functions relating to loans made by the corporation to victims of floods or other catastrophes.

(c) There are transferred to the Federal National Mortgage Association the said functions relating to mortgages held by the corporation which were made or acquired under the authority of the RFC Mortgage Company or the Defense Homes Corporation.

SEC. 2. Transfer of incidental functions: There are hereby transferred to each transferee agency so much of the functions of the Corporation, and so much of the functions of the Secretary of the Treasury under section 10 of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended, and under the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Liquidation Act, as is incidental to, or necessary for, the performance by the transferee agency of the functions specified in section 1 (a), (b), or (c) hereof, as the case may be, including, in respect of the functions specified in sections 1 (a), (1), 1 (b), and 1 (c) hereof, the authority to issue notes or other obligations to the Secretary of the Treasury, which may be purchased by the Secretary, under section 7 of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended, and the duty of making payments on such notes or obligations issued by or transferred to the transferee agency hereunder.

SEC. 3. Transfer of assets; miscellaneous transfers: (a) The loans, bonds, securities, mortgages, and capital stock referred to in section 1 of this reorganization plan, together with accrued interest thereon, property acquired in connection therewith, and contracts and other instruments pertaining thereto, are hereby transferred from the corporation to the respective transferee agencies.

(b) In addition to the transfers made by section 3 (a) above, there shall be transferred to each transferee agency so much as the Director of the Bureau of the Budget shall determine to be appropriate by reason of transfers made by sections 1, 2, and 3 (a) of this reorganization plan of the property, personnel, records, liabilities, and commitments of the Corporation and of the authorizations, allocations, and funds available or to be made available to the Corporation or the Treasury Department.

(c) Such further measures and dispositions as the Director of the Bureau of the Budget shall determine to be necessary in order to effectuate the transfers provided for in sections 3 (a) and 3 (b) above, shall be carried out in such manner and by such agencies as the Director shall direct.

SEC. 4. Definition: As used in this reorganization plan, the term "transferee agencies" means the Export-Import Bank of Washington, the Small Business Administration, and the Federal National Mortgage Association.

SEC. 5. Effective date: The provisions of this reorganization plan shall take effect at the time determined under the provisions of section 6 (a) of the Reorganization Act of 1949, as amended, or at the close of June 30, 1954, whichever is later, and shall be effective notwithstanding any heretofore enacted provisions of law transferring the duty of completing the liquidation of the assets and the winding up of the affairs of the Corporation.

DEFECTS IN THE FEDERAL PRISON AND PAROLE SYSTEMS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BROYHILL] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. BROYHILL. Mr. Speaker, on two occasions recently I have brought to the attention of the House certain defects in our Federal prison and parole systems which are in immediate need of investigation and correction. From time to time I hope to give this distinguished body specific instances reflecting adversely on the administration of those systems in the belief that my colleagues on the Committee on Rules will deem it appropriate to speedily consider and favorably approve a resolution which I introduced and is currently pending before that committee.

I am not unmindful of the difficulties I face. My good and able friend the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] warned me this month of the roadblocks in my path. Those obstacles are already becoming apparent. It is quite obvious to me that the Federal Director of Prisons, Mr. James V. Bennett, has done an excellent job of entrenching himself and of worming his way into the esteem of persons high in the councils of both major political parties. I fully appreciate that a freshman Congressman attempting to fight this alliance has two strikes on him at the very start.

But, Mr. Speaker, I have not struck out yet, and I am going to remain at the bat until I strike out or until I hit a home run which will rally the American people to my support. Let me say that I have an abiding faith in the American people—in their fair play and in their wisdom. I am firmly convinced that

they are dedicated to the cause of clean government.

In my previous remarks I referred to the coddling of Communists in our prisons and reformatories. My colleague from the opposite side of the aisle, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. SUTTON], gave you music and verse on the case of the Communist Marzani. On the Senate side Senator FERGUSON also developed astounding facts in this case. I refer you to the hearings before the Subcommittee on the Committee on Appropriations, United States Senate, 82d Congress, 2d session, on H. R. 7289, making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953. Your attention is invited to pages 1731 through 1738. It is unnecessary for me to repeat the facts of this glaring case. It suffices to say that this commie received preferred treatment.

But today I have another case involving a bigger and much more important Communist. In fact he is one of the top 11 Reds convicted for conspiracy to overthrow our form of government by force and violence. His picture was among those which Attorney General Brownell waved before a television audience last month.

This man is John Gates, former editor of the Communist Daily Worker. John Gates was serving his time in Atlanta penitentiary and subsequent events have shown that even while incarcerated he was still serving the Communist cause. He was called upon and permitted to write a chapter of a book on the Communist Abraham Lincoln Brigade in Spain.

When Federal Prison Director James V. Bennett was before the Senate Appropriations Committee on June 20, 1952, Senator FERGUSON asked him and I quote:

> Now, did Gates write an article about the Communist Brigade in Spain?

Mr. Bennett replied:

> Well, I don't know. He might have.

This exchange can be found on page 1739 of the hearings.

Mr. Speaker, I submit that Mr. Bennett was evasive in his answer. I submit that Mr. Bennett definitely knew that Gates had written the chapter and that Mr. Bennett facilitated the return of the corrected proof to the publishers.

Let us go further into this case, because to me it is quite alarming when a Communist who would destroy our Nation is permitted to write and disseminate, through the assistance of the head of our Federal Prison Bureau, Communist propaganda from his prison cell. If we tolerate this there was indeed little sense in taking him away from his job as editor of the Communist Daily Worker and jailing him.

At the time Gates was moved from Atlanta to the prison at Danbury, Conn., he had already prepared the chapter on the Abraham Lincoln Brigade, in which he served when the Communists tried to take over Spain. Gates was temporarily placed in Danbury to make him available to his attorneys, Vito Marcantonio and John Abt, so that he could be briefed for an appearance before the Subversive Control Board.

Upon reaching the Danbury prison, Gates, on Bennett's personal orders, was placed in a comfortable hospital room despite the objections of the warden. This hospital was comparable or better than the average hospital in your county or mine. And let me say that at this time Gates was not entitled to hospitalization by reason of illness or bad health.

Now, Mr. Speaker, here is the payoff. While Gates was whiling away his time in a comfortable hospital room, the warden received from Mr. Bennett the printed proof of the chapter Gates had written in Atlanta for the book. Bennett had sent this proof to the warden to be turned over to Gates for proofreading and correction so that Bennett could then return the proof to the publishers of the book. Accompanying a note in longhand from Bennett was a letter from the publishers addressed to Gates stating that they could offer Gates only a $10 honorarium for writing the chapter, but that this fee might be increased, depending upon the sale of the book.

Mr. Speaker, the warden objected to handling this most unusual transaction, to put it mildly, and was again overruled by Mr. Bennett. Yes, Mr. Bennett, the Director of our Federal prisons, ordered his warden at Danbury to turn the proof over to Gates for correction and return it to Washington. Thus, Mr. Speaker, the Director of our Federal prisons permitted and facilitated the dissemination of Communist propaganda by one of the top Communist leaders in the United States.

The warden naturally obeyed his orders, permitted Gates to review the proof which was returned by the warden to Bennett as instructed, along with a note from Gates to the publishers indicating no changes were necessary in the story and that the $10 fee for his services would be acceptable. Obviously this traitor was much more interested in having his propaganda published than he was in receiving pay for it.

This incident occurred about the 1st of June 1952 shortly before our Mr. Bennett went before the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee and blandly told Senator FERGUSON that he, Bennett, did not know whether Gates had written an article on the Communist brigade or not. Bennett knew full well that Gates had written such an article.

Let us pursue the treatment—the soft treatment if you please, Mr. Speaker—Gates received at Danbury.

Original orders from Bennett were to the effect that Gates was to receive no visitors while he was being held for the previously mentioned briefing of Marcantonio and Abt. Your knowledge of Marcantonio and Abt makes it unnecessary for me to review their past connections. Of late they have become the chief mouthpieces of the Commies and fellow travelers.

Now to go on with our story:

Either the first or second day Marcantonio and Abt interviewed Gates. Marcantonio asked the officer in charge—not the warden—whether Gates could not have visits from his relatives in New York. The officer in charge called attention to his orders that no visitors be permitted. Asked who gave the orders, that officer said he understood they came from the director in Washington. On his way out that evening, Marcantonio stopped by the warden's office and repeated his request that Gates be permitted to receive visitors. The warden refused permission. Marcantonio again asked where such orders came from and the warden told him they came from James V. Bennett. Mr. Marcantonio then stated in effect: "Jim Bennett and I are old friends. I'll call him tonight and he will approve the visits."

Sure enough, much to the surprise of the warden, within 48 hours he received instructions by telephone from Bennett to permit Gates to receive visitors.

Now, Mr. Speaker, information from responsible sources to support these facts are in my possession. I am prepared to present this information to a House committee, such as I have advocated, in sworn testimony.

This is indeed an amazing case—a case that demonstrates conclusively that there is coddling of Communists in our prisons. It demonstrates also that the man who heads our Federal Bureau of Prisons is unfit for the responsible position he holds. In effect he has acted as a courier in the transmission of Communist propaganda.

But, Mr. Speaker, there are other cases of Communist coddling. With the permission of the House, I will soon address you regarding another top Commie who found that a prison sentence for trying to overthrow our form of government can become a very, very soft berth.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROYHILL. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. RABAUT. The gentleman used phrases like "the warden." Who is this warden?

Mr. BROYHILL. I am unable to reveal his name at this time. I have the statement documented, I have it taken before nine witnesses, and it can be proven in proper form.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROYHILL. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HYDE. Is the gentleman from Virginia aware of the fact that the transfer of Gates from Atlanta to Danbury was made at the request of the Subversive Activities Control Board?

Mr. BROYHILL. Yes.

Mr. HYDE. The gentleman does not allege, then, that Mr. Bennett did that on his own?

Mr. BROYHILL. No; I do not allege that. I am not alleging anything. I am relating the facts that have been placed before me in documentary form with witnesses.

Mr. HYDE. Has the gentleman himself investigated the conditions at the Danbury prison?

Mr. BROYHILL. I have not personally, no. I have talked to former wardens and I have talked to former guards.

Mr. HYDE. Is the gentleman aware that these conditions were investigated by newspaper reporters in Danbury?

Mr. BROYHILL. Oh, yes; they have been investigated by newspaper reporters. I have a large number of clippings myself.

Mr. HYDE. Has the gentleman called any of these facts of alleged misconduct in the running of the Federal Bureau of Prisons to the attention of the Attorney General and turned them over so that the Attorney General might investigate them?

Mr. BROYHILL. I have discussed the matter with the Attorney General. The Attorney General has a great deal of this information, and the FBI has a great deal of this information.

Mr. HYDE. Has the gentleman turned over——

Mr. BROYHILL. Just a moment. I am not here for cross-examination by the gentleman from Maryland. I am merely trying to portray the situation. A large portion of this information was given to me in confidence and in good faith by reliable witnesses, and I have been asked not to betray the confidence or the source of this information. These people have conveyed information before and have suffered reprisals. In the case of the reformatory down at Petersburg, Va., when the FBI came in in 1953 to make an investigation, certain questions were asked of the guards down there, and every guard that testified before the FBI, who had been there any length of time in a supervisory capacity, has since been transferred or retired. The prison personnel are afraid to convey this information to any source, not that they do not have confidence in the Attorney General or anyone else, but they are afraid it will infiltrate back to the Bureau of Prisons, and that they may subject themselves to losing their jobs. And, I do not blame them a great deal.

Mr. HYDE. Is the gentleman aware that there are standing committees of the Senate and the House which have jurisdiction over the Bureau of Prisons, and has the gentleman offered to turn over to those committees for investigation any of the facts he has?

Mr. BROYHILL. I have not offered to turn over this confidential information. Certain members of the committee have been approached and unfortunately statements have been made which have more or less proved conclusively that Mr. Bennett stands in very high favor with some of these people, and they more or less prejudge the case before any investigation is made; therefore these people do not want this information conveyed to this source.

Mr. HYDE. Is the gentleman suggesting, then, that those people do not mind turning it over to a special committee but mind having it turned over to a regular committee?

Mr. BROYHILL. These people are willing to appear under oath before a select committee that will investigate the whole reformatory system, because they feel once we have a select committee assigned, they will go into this thing and they will throw the whole thing sky high and there will be no reprisals later on.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROYHILL. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. RABAUT. The gentleman says he has not been to these prisons; has the gentleman visited these prisons?

Mr. BROYHILL. I have not.

Mr. RABAUT. I have visited many of the prisons of the United States during my 20 years of service in the Congress. At one time I had charge of the committee handling appropriations for the Bureau of Prisons. There is no man for whom I have greater respect than Mr. James Bennett.

Mr. BROYHILL. The gentleman has a right to his own opinion. I think I have a right to mine.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

FOUR-YEAR TERMS FOR CONGRESSMEN WITH VACANCIES FILLED IN THE SAME MANNER AS SENATORIAL VACANCIES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ANGELL] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include H. J. Res. 507.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, my 16 years of service in the House of Representatives has impressed upon me the necessity of changing the method of filling vacancies in the House, as well as extending the term of House Members.

We know that senatorial vacancies are filled by the governors of the respective States. However, in the House of Representatives, all vacancies must be filled by elections. In most cases this means calling a special election at heavy expense to the State and a long delay in qualifying a House Member to take over the congressional duties of the district involved. The Speaker of the House, under a recent legislative enactment, is now next in line to the Vice President for the Presidency in the case of the death or inability to act of both President and Vice President. In these days of both the atomic and hydrogen bombs when, as scientists advise, an atomic bomb can be reduced in size so that it may be carried on the person, it is not inconceivable that an attack on the House of Representatives similar to that recently carried out by the Puerto Rican terrorists might very well deprive the House not only of the Speaker but enough House Members to deprive the House of a quorum. It seems imperative that a more simple and workable law should be enacted by amending the Constitution so that House vacancies may be filled immediately by governors of the States, as is now done with vacancies occurring in the Senate.

We all recall that at the time of the assassination of Abraham Lincoln attacks were attempted to be carried out on other high-ranking officials, which should put us on notice that in these days of unrest and revolutionary and terrorist attacks on heads of governments, it is entirely possible that we might be faced with a situation in which the President, Vice President, and the Speaker of the House would all be killed in a common conspiracy.

The original reasoning that prompted fixing the term of office for Members of the House of Representatives for 2 years was that by frequent 2-year elections they would be nearer the people and in the event of changes in legislative and political philosophy frequent elections would keep the House in accord with prevailing views obtaining throughout the Nation. The Senatorial term was fixed at 6 years in order that it might be the more conservative and stabilizing body. However, as it has turned out in practice the election of House Members every 2 years has placed a burden upon the Members of almost continuous campaigns, having to campaign in primary and general elections every 2 years. The expense and labor involved under modern conditions has resulted in slowing down the effectiveness of Members of Congress and placing on them a burden which could be removed by extending the term of office to 4 years, one-half of the House membership to be elected at each biennial election. This would to some extent preserve the original plan of the Constitution founders by electing one-half of the House every 2 years as well as one-third of the Senate.

This arrangement in my judgment would be infinitely more satisfactory than the existing one. I have therefore introduced House Joint Resolution 507 to amend the Constitution to effectuate these changes, both in the election and the term of office of House Members. This bill is identical with one introduced in the Senate by Senator CASE, one of our former colleagues in the House. I hope that this bill will receive the approval of the House. I include the bill as a part of these remarks:

House Joint Resolution 507

Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the filling of temporary vacancies in the House of Representatives by appointment and providing for a term of 4 years for Members of the House of Representatives

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following article is proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, and shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States:

"ARTICLE —

"SECTION 1. The fourth clause of section 2 of article I of the Constitution of the United States is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof a colon and the following: '*Provided*, That the Executive thereof shall have power to make temporary appointments until the people fill the vacancies by election as the legislature may direct.'

"SEC. 2. Section 2 of article I of the Constitution of the United States is amended by striking out the first clause of such section and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

" 'The House of Representatives shall be composed of Members chosen for terms of 4 years, except as hereinafter provided, by the people of the several States, and the electors in each State shall have the qualifi-

cations requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature. For each State, the duly elected Members of the House of Representatives shall be divided by lot into two classes, as nearly equal in number as may be. States which have but one Member in the House of Representatives shall be alternated alphabetically as to class I and class II. The first division of Members into classes shall be made immediately after the House of Representatives shall be assembled in consequence of the first election of Members to whom section 1 of this clause applies, and a division of Members into such classes shall be made immediately after the House Representatives shall be assembled in consequence of every election of Members which next follows a reapportionment of Representatives among the several States. In those cases where the representation of a State in the House of Representatives is increased or decreased by reapportionment, the resulting membership shall be reclassified in the same manner as herein provided. The seats of the Members of the first class shall be vacated at the expiration of the second year and the seats of the Members of the second class shall be vacated at the expiration of the fourth year, so that one-half, as nearly as may be, of the Members may be chosen every second year. The terms of all Members in States whose representation is increased or decreased by reapportionment shall end at noon on the 3d day of January after each election which next follows a reapportionment of Representatives among the several States.'

"This section shall not be construed as to affect the election or term of any Members chosen before it becomes valid as part of the Constitution.

"SEC. 3. The amendment made by section 2 shall first apply in the case of Representatives elected for terms beginning on January 3 of the first odd-numbered year which begins more than 1 year after the ratification of this article.

"SEC. 4. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the States within 7 years from the date of the submission hereof to the States by the Congress."

JAMES V. BENNETT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HYDE] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HYDE] yield to me?

Mr. HYDE. Yes; I am glad to yield.

Mr. RABAUT. I wanted to say a word about Jim Bennett because I feel it my duty on an occasion such as this to defend the rights of a man of the character of James Bennett, of the Bureau of Prisons.

I have visited most of the prisons in this country. I have eaten their fare. If you had gone to Atlanta during the war you would have seen a demonstration of loyalty within those prison walls that would have been an example even to those who were free men outside. That condition did not just grow. It was the result of the leadership that the prisons have had in the personage of James Bennett. Over and above that, time and time again, I have had put into the book of the Federal prisons articles by Father Coogan, the Jesuit, which can be read in the magazines.

It is a very easy thing to tear down, but it is quite something different to construct.

I do not want to take too much of the time of the gentleman who has been good enough to yield to me; but this comes as a shock to me. I learned only yesterday that it was going to occur, and I thought I would wait here until this late hour to hear what would be said about a faithful public servant.

I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

Mr. HYDE. I thank the gentleman for his kind remarks about the Director of the Bureau of Prisons, Mr. James V. Bennett.

James V. Bennett, Director, Bureau of Prisons, United States Department of Justice, has been criticized on the floor of the House for transferring John Gates, a convicted Communist, from the Atlanta Penitentiary to the Federal Correction Institution at Danbury, Conn. In fairness to Mr. Bennett the record should show that he made this transfer at the request of the Subversive Activities Control Board. The fact of this request and the reasons therefor are shown by the following letter addressed to Mr. Bennett by Peter Campbell Brown, chairman, Subversive Activities Control Board.

Mr. BROYHILL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HYDE. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. BROYHILL. In the letter to Mr. Bennett do they ask him to put Gates in a private hospital room and to let him continue his writings or proofreading?

Mr. HYDE. They do not, and I will touch on that in a moment.

The letter is as follows:

SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES CONTROL BOARD,
Washington, D. C., February 17, 1953.

Hon. JAMES V. BENNETT,
Director, Bureau of Prisons,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. BENNETT: This will serve to confirm my distinct recollection to the effect that as a result of my personal request as Chairman of this Board you were good enough to transfer John Gates to the Federal correctional institution at Danbury. Gates' presence at Danbury enabled counsel for the Communist Party to very thoroughly discuss with him the testimony that Gates was to give before this Board. I was very anxious that this opportunity to interview Gates be afforded the counsel for the Communist Party in accord with my view that every citizen of the United States must be afforded every protection and guaranty of the Constitution. The fact was that the Attorney General initiated this proceeding and is the petitioner against the Communist Party. Under the law the respondent is entitled to present its defense which would, of course, include convenient access to potential witnesses in the respondent's behalf. Gates was one of such witnesses.

I wish to observe at this time that I was fully cognizant of the custodial considerations with which you were faced on the occasion of my requests to you concerning Gates. Nevertheless, you cooperated with me to the fullest extent by granting the many requests which I made of you because I believed such a procedure was so vital to the successful conduct of this proceeding.

With many thanks again for your valuable assistance, and with all my good wishes,

Yours sincerely,

PETER CAMPBELL BROWN,
Chairman.

The record should further show that prior to the request by the Subversive Activities Control Board, a request for a transfer of Gates from Atlanta to Danbury was made by Gates' attorneys and refused by Mr. Bennett.

In addition, I believe the record should clarify the conditions at the Danbury institution under which Gates was confined. That institution has been described as a "country club." The conditions under which Gates was confined were investigated by a reporter of the Danbury News-Times on February 19, 1954, and in justice to the Federal Bureau of Prisons and Mr. Bennett, I think the following excerpts from the reporter's report should be inserted in the RECORD:

NEWSMAN FINDS GATES' CELL WAS PRIVATE, IN FACT, THAT IT WAS DOWNRIGHT SOLITARY

(By William J. Lauf)

One need only spend 10 minutes in the same cell at the Federal correctional institution, Pembroke district, where Daily Worker Editor John Gates was held in 1952, to agree with a Congressman from Tennessee that it was a "private room."

In fact, I found it to be more private than possibly the southern legislator who made the charge himself realizes. A lot more private than the other cell blocks where prisoners can converse with and see each other to break up the monotony of prison life. The cell blocks have the traditional bars. The one I was in had a steel door with only a small window in it.

Yes, there was what you might call room service. When you're in this cell the meals are brought to you. They don't allow you to go to the dining hall where most of the prisoners eat together. Private room, maybe. Solitary would be a better word for it.

CHARGES PROMPTED VISIT

Warden Harold E. Hegstrom permitted our visit after newpapers yesterday published charges by Representative SUTTON, Democrat, of Tennessee, that the Danbury institution had coddled Communists. SUTTON voiced the charge in a House speech Wednesday in which he proposed a sweeping investigation of the Federal prison system. He specifically mentioned the editor of the Daily Worker, saying that in 1952 Gates had been given a "private room" in the prison hospital, was permitted to have visits from New York relatives and given privileges denied others.

Warden Hegstrom, who was not at the institution when Gates was there, May 22 to June 6, 1952, said he learned from the records and from talking with Gates' guards that the latter was transferred to Danbury from Atlanta at the direction of a Senate investigating committee chairman who wanted the prisoner available for hearings in New York. While here he was under 24-hour surveillance, the warden said, and the only relative to visit him was his mother, who came here once. Only others allowed to see him were his attorneys in connection with the subpena to the New York hearing. Gates is now serving out a 5-year sentence in Atlanta.

THE VIEW

The cell is on the inside portion of the sprawling building, facing south into the

prison yard. The cell window allows a view of the three other inside walls of the institution. You can see a tall water tower, the prison yard, and recreation areas. But mostly you see sky. There are a few well-pruned trees immediately outside the window. And you gaze at hundreds of other barred windows in the three interior walls within your view, where possibly others among the 570 prisoners may be gazing your way and seeing the same monotonous scene. The location doesn't allow a view of the picturesque Berkshire foothills.

The windowpanes are only 5½ inches wide. There are 36 glass panes surrounded by heavy steel sash. In the center is a 9-by-15-inch air vent.

We talked to two men who guarded Gates during his stay here, and also to the captain and supervisor of the custodial force. The guards were Senior Officer Morris Berkofsky, who has had 15 years in the prison service, and William D. Cutting, a correctional officer with 12 years. The captain is Stanley Wiencik, who is a veteran of 21 years of service.

PRIVATE, YET NO PRIVACY

Officer Berkofsky, who guarded Gates from 8 to 4:30 p. m., and Officer Cutting, who was on duty from 3:30 to midnight, were those principally involved in keeping Gates under 24-hour surveillance. One of them was always with him when he was taken into the yard once a day for exercise. However, he was not allowed to converse with other prisoners. When his lawyers came to see him, there was a parole officer present in the room and a custodial officer on guard outside, Berkofsky related. Private, yet no privacy.

Both guards said Gates had no complaints about his cell, but quickly added neither did he have any compliments.

The Tennessee Congressman was quoted as saying that Gates was permitted to have visits from New York relatives. The prison records show that he was granted one visit, by his mother, during his stay here. The prison rules allow inmates to have 2 hours of visitation per month, except toward termination of their sentence, when the visiting time is extended to 3 hours.

BENNETT ISSUES DENIAL

James V. Bennett, Director of the Bureau of Prisons, said in Washington yesterday afternoon that Gates was granted "no special privileges" and that, "as a matter of fact, had fewer than would have been required were he held elsewhere."

His statement is as follows:

"Congressman SUTTON states that Gates was (1) moved to Danbury from Atlanta, so that he could be briefed by attorneys on evidence he was to give before the Subversive Activities Control Board; (2) he was not confined in a cell, but given a private room in the hospital, a more comfortable room than would otherwise have been available; (3) he was given certain privileges other Americans would not receive; (4) he was permitted to have visits from relatives in New York City, which were arranged by the Director with Gates' attorneys.

"Gates was transferred from Atlanta on May 22, 1952, upon the urgent request of the Subversive Activities Control Board, upon the grounds that such action would materially assist the proceedings before the Board and be to the best interests of the Government. He remained until June 6, 1952, when brought to Washington for the hearings before the Board.

"While at Danbury, he was confined in a secure and locked hospital cell for four reasons: (1) It was as secure as any other cell in the institution; (2) there would be no opportunity for contact with other prisoners; (3) he would be under officer supervision 24 hours a day; and (4) this location would employ the requirement of no other officers, which would have been required were he held elsewhere.

"Gates was granted no special privileges and as a matter of fact, had fewer than would have been available to him in Atlanta.

"He had no visits except his attorneys and one visit from his wife, which would have been permitted had he been at Atlanta."

While here Gates was on what is termed a holdover status. Warden Hegstrom explained that this means he never received a Danbury prison number. On June 6, 1952, a United States marshal from Washington took him out and he was subsequently returned to Atlanta.

NO COUNTRY CLUB

Warden Hegstrom didn't come right out and say so, but one can sense that he's a bit provoked at charges made by persons far removed from here who have never visited the Danbury FCI. For instance, some columnists have nicknamed the institution the Federal country club. One wonders if these same men would consider it a country club if they had to spend a few months there. Or a few weeks. Yes, even an hour, such as I did.

Sitting on the same bed that Gates slept in and looking at the dull walls, the cramped space, the few bare necessities in furnishings, the steel in the window and the solid steel of the door, and knowing that the way out was guarded by numerous barred doors, each one with a separate key and different guard, we could not imagine how anyone could be contented in such circumstances, much less feel coddled.

And we wondered, too, how many of the more than 10,500 prisoners confined at Danbury FCI at one time or another in its 14 years could honestly say they had been coddled here.

It felt good in a way words cannot adequately describe when we got into our car and drove out of the prison gate.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BROYHILL] has also charged that Gates was permitted to correct proof on a chapter he had written relative to his experiences in the Abraham Lincoln Brigade in Spain. As a matter of fact, this chapter was written prior to the time Gates was committed and his publisher was not permitted to confer with him although he had made the request. He was permitted, however, to authenticate the proof for reasons which cannot be disclosed now since the case in which he was a principal witness is still pending before the courts. A copy of this book following its publication was sent to Gates but he was not permitted to see it.

Mr. Speaker, I fear that reckless statements condemning the Federal prison system and its Director, Mr. James V. Bennett, may do much harm and possibly lead to trouble within the prisons. The fact is that our Federal penitentiaries are probably the best-run penal systems in the world. There have been no outbreaks of violence in them such as has been the case in several State institutions. Certainly every effort should be made to have any imperfections in the system corrected and incompetent officials removed by orderly administrative process before public criticism is made on the floor of the House of Representatives. If such orderly administrative processes fail to produce the desired results, then, of course, it would become necessary to call the matter to the attention of Congress on the floor of the House.

Moreover, Mr. Speaker, the standing Senate and House committees which have the subject of the Bureau of Prisons under their jurisdiction should certainly be provided with any facts from which it is alleged the prisons are improperly run or incompetently administered.

NO TROOP INVOLVEMENT IN INDOCHINA

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CANFIELD). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SHEEHAN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. SHEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, in the summer of 1950, when I first campaigned for the House of Representatives from the 11th Illinois District on the northwest side of Chicago, I found the majority of the people I contacted to be violently opposed to the Korean police action. As a result, I was highly critical of President Truman and the then encumbent Democrat Congressman for their part in the Korean fiasco. My stand on the Korean question, I feel, was very much instrumental in enabling me to win election to the 82d Congress by a substantial majority.

In my reelection campaign in 1952, the voters in my district were convinced that with the election of a Republican President and a Republican Congressman from the 11th District, they would see definite action with regard to ending the Korean mess. When President Eisenhower ended the Korean war, the people reacted most favorably.

By reviewing the recent pronouncements of President Eisenhower, Vice President Nixon, and Secretary of State Dulles, a real possibility exists that we will become embroiled in the southeast Asian war before the end of this year. From recent statements of Mr. Churchill of England, Mr. St. Laurent of Canada, and others, we alone seem to be heading into this war, in spite of President Eisenhower's thought that the free nations will present a concert of readiness to react in whatever way is necessary.

To my way of thinking, this will mean, as in Korea, the United States will suffer over 90 percent of the casualties and pay more than 90 percent of the costs.

From mail received from my constituents, and from direct conversations while home over the Easter recess, I have not heard a single word in favor of using our boys to fight in Indochina.

Experience proves that if we attempt to fight a limited war as we did in Korea, we cannot win. Experience proves once a war is started, no one can control its course. Experience proves that three wars in the present generation—World War I, World War II, and Korea—have not eased world tension or brought peace. Experience proves that Soviet communism thrives on wars, as evidenced by the fact that communism today governs or controls 800 million people as against 180 million during World War I, not to mention the vast increase in control of land and resources. Experience proves that military victories alone do not solve world problems.

It is my belief that the American people are not ready for world leadership, because it entails conquest, occupation,

and governing the conquered people. It would forever entail a forced contribution to military service from every American home, huge foreign aid outlays, and overburdening taxation, all of which would bring on socialism or government control of our lives.

From a purely practical standpoint, getting involved in Indochina would, as a famous American general remarked about Korea, be a war against the wrong enemy, at the wrong time, and in the wrong place.

If President Eisenhower and the Republican leadership commit our troops into southeast Asia, I am of the opinion the people will show their disgust by returning a Democrat-controlled Congress in November, and a Democrat president in 1956.

Knowing that the will of the majority of my constituents is firmly against committing our boys in another Korean type of war, and knowing from recent experience that military victories do not bring peace, if Congress is given to vote on this issue—which President Eisenhower says will happen—I will vote against sending our troops to Indochina and southeast Asia.

PANAMA CANAL CONSTRUCTION ENGINEERS FAVOR INTEROCEANIC CANALS COMMISSION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEOGH] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, among the important questions considered in 1945 by the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, of which I was a member, was that of additional Panama Canal facilities. The current discussion of conditions in the canal reemphasizes the need for further consideration without delay.

Under the impact of the then recent advent of the atomic bomb, the Congress enacted Public Law 280, 79th Congress, authorizing the Governor of the Panama Canal to investigate the means for increasing its capacity and security to meet the future needs of interoceanic commerce and national defense. The report of his study was transmitted to the Congress by the President on December 1, 1947, without recommendation, and it was not published.

Since that time, however, the interoceanic canal problem has been extensively discussed in periodical literature of the United States and foreign countries, and in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The resulting clarifications produced a reorientation of thinking on the fundamental aspects of the canal subject and focused attention on its main issues. They were important factors contributing to the reorganization of the canal enterprise under Public Law 841, 81st Congress, which created the Canal Zone Government and the Panama Canal Company.

The canal question is highly complicated. Its principal points have been admirably summarized in a remarkably concise memorandum to the Members of the Congress by a number of eminent constructional engineers who, in varying capacities, participated in building the Panama Canal, and are qualified to speak. In this they have been joined by certain other distinguished and well-informed authorities, who are also qualified to speak. Attention of the Congress is invited to the experience records of the petitioners, which are unique.

All these men earnestly urge the creation by the Congress of an independent Interoceanic Canals Commission along the lines provided in H. R. 1048, 83d Congress, introduced by Representative THOMAS E. MARTIN, of Iowa, and supported by Representative CLARK W. THOMPSON, of Texas, both of whom have long been careful and judicious students of Panama Canal problems.

The purpose of this measure is to formulate and recommend the long-range Isthmian Canal policy that should be adopted by the Congress of the United States.

In order that this illuminating memorandum and its forwarding letter from Consulting Engineer W. R. McCann of Hopewell, Va., may be readily available, under leave accorded, I include their full texts:

MARCH 24, 1954.

Hon. EUGENE J. KEOGH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN KEOGH: Growing daily in national importance is the problem of modernizing and increasing the capacity of the Panama Canal. H. R. 1048, now before the 83d Congress, contemplates legislation that would provide for constructive studies of the problem and for the establishing of an impartial commission to recommend a comprehensive policy on which to proceed.

Bearing on the Panama Canal problem, the enclosed self-explanatory memorandum reflects the considered judgment of a notable (but unorganized) group of engineers, constructors, industrialists, and administrators, all of whom in varying capacities participated, years ago, in the building of the Panama Canal. Individually and collectively, we believe their opinion should carry great weight.

These men consider it a public duty to make known their views. They would be derelict not to do so. The matter of which they speak is of worldwide import; it transcends, indeed, all local and personal considerations.

Solicited is your most careful attention to the statements of these men; and thereupon, perhaps, you may find time to write me—for the benefit of the signers—a brief expression of your thought upon this vital subject.

Respectfully,

W. R. MCCANN.

THE PANAMA CANAL PROBLEM

(A memorandum to the Members of the Congress, 1954)

Honorable Members of the Congress of the United States:

The undersigned, who in various capacities participated in the construction of the Panama Canal, venture to bring to your attention the matters hereinafter discussed:

1. The necessity for increased capacity and operational improvement of the Panama Canal—a much-neglected waterway, now approaching obsolescence—has been long recognized. The traffic volume is the highest since 1914. With the saturation point approaching, it is essential to provide, without further delay, the additional transit capacity and operational improvements required to meet future needs.

2. The two major proposals for increased facilities are:

(a) Improvement of the existing canal by completing the authorized third locks project, adapted to include the features of the well-conceived Terminal Lake plan (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 94, pt. 10, p. A2449—approved in principle by the Governor of the Panama Canal in hearings on H. R. 4480, 79th Cong., Nov. 15, 1945, p. 9). A total of $75 million was expended on this project, mainly on lock-site excavations at Gatun and Miraflores, before work on it was suspended. The Terminal Lake plan provides for removing all lock structures from Pedro Miguel and for regrouping of all Pacific locks at or near Miraflores, thus enabling uninterrupted navigation at the Gatun Lake level between the Atlantic and Pacific locks, with a greatly needed terminal lake anchorage at the Pacific end of the canal. As thus improved, the modified third locks project can be completed at relatively low cost, estimated under $600 million. The soundness of this proposal has been established by 40 years of satisfactory operation of a similar arrangement at Gatun.

(b) Construction of a practically new Panama Canal known as the sea-level project, initially estimated in 1947 to cost $2.5 billion, and which would be of less operational value than the existing canal it was designed to replace, but which, under present conditions, would likely cost several times that amount. The Governor of the Panama Canal (a member of the Corps of Engineers) at that time definitely went on record as advocating none but the so-called sea-level project for the major increase of canal facilities, which action served to exclude what may be the best solution when evaluated from all angles. This report, under Public Law 280, 79th Congress, was transmitted to the Congress by the President, December 1, 1947, and, significantly, without comment or recommendation. The Congress took no action, and the report was not published.

3. The Terminal Lake third-locks project has been strongly urged as the proper form of modernization by experienced civilian engineers who took part in the construction of the present canal. They have spoken from personal knowledge of the original construction. Their views are shared by many independent engineers and navigators who have studied the subject. All these insist that the present lake-lock type should be preserved as supplying the best canal for the transit of vessels which it is economically feasible to construct. They, together with many of the leading atomic warfare authorities, stress the points that the defense of the canal is an all-inclusive Federal responsibility which must be met by active military and naval measures and by industrial planning in the United States, that passive protective features embodied in construction design are inadequate, and that the proper bases for planning canal improvements are capacity and navigational efficiency. Moreover, it must be borne in mind that the effective destructive power of the atomic bomb has been tremendously increased since the formal recommendation for a sea-level canal. Any canal, whatsoever the type, can be destroyed by atomic bombing, if permitted to strike.

4. The recent authorization to expend funds for repairs and alterations of present lock structures at an estimated cost of $26,500,000 is, as we believe, makeshift in character, and is without real merit. Consummation thereof, in lieu of fundamental improvements, will inevitably delay the basic and long-overdue solution of the problems involved.

5. In addition to the Panama projects, there are urgent proposals for canals at other locations, some of which have strong support, particularly Nicaragua. In developing

a long-range Isthmian Canal policy to meet future interoceanic transit needs, these should certainly receive full and unbiased consideration.

6. Transcending personal considerations, but nevertheless to state the matter candidly, we submit that the third-locks project, as originally planned in 1939 by the Governor of the Panama Canal, has proven most disappointing. We have every reason to believe that the insistently advocated sea-level project (which, as a matter of fact, would require tidal locks as well as vulnerable flood-control reservoirs and dikes) would prove to be a monumental boondoggle, costing the American taxpayer billions of dollars. Both of these efforts were directed by routine administrative agencies, and at heavy public expense.

7. We wish to stress the fact that, aside from the A-bomb, the recurrent discussions as to the relative advantages and disadvantages of the lake-lock and sea-level types of canal were exhaustively investigated, debated, and considered in 1905–06 when the Congress and the President decided in favor of the lake-lock plan—under which the canal was constructed, and (with the exception of certain operational defects in the Pacific sector) has been successfully operated. The operational defects, we believe, can be adequately corrected.

8. It must be always borne in mind that the greater the cost of increased facilities at Panama the heavier will be the load on the already overwhelmingly burdened American taxpayer; and that also such cost must be reflected in ship-transit tolls, with all that increased tolls imply.

9. We respectfully urge the early enactment of H. R. 1048, 83d Congress, introduced by Representative THOMAS E. MARTIN, of Iowa, and supported by Representative CLARK W. THOMPSON, of Texas, who introduced a like measure in the 82d Congress. Both of these experienced and highly competent legislators have been thorough students of interoceanic canal problems, which have grave diplomatic implications affecting all maritime nations and the relations of the United States with all Latin-American countries—especially Panama. As to Panama, we would most strongly emphasize that among the features overlooked in the report under Public Law 280, 79th Congress, is the fact that the sea-level project recommended in that report is not covered by existing canal treaties and would necessitate the negotiation of a new treaty with a tremendous indemnity and greatly increased annuity payments involved. As evidence of this, it may be noted that upon demand of the Panamanian Government, and the appointment by it of a commission for the purpose, the United States Government has named a like commission, to negotiate various questions, including that of the present annuity of $430,000 (originally $250,000), which Panama insists should be substantially increased. These negotiations began in September 1953; when the President of Panama and members of the Panamanian Commission visited Washington in behalf of the indicated demands.

10. References to the Governor of the Panama Canal herein apply to the incumbent Governor at the time of the stated action.

CONCLUSION

Because of these considerations, it would seem to be clear that the indicated commission should be created without delay, and put to work, so as to develop a timely, definite, and wisely reasoned Isthmian Canal policy. Such a body should be made up of unbiased, broad-gaged, and independent men of the widest engineering, operational, governmental, and business experience, and not of persons from routine agencies, all too often involved in justifying their own groups.

Respectfully submitted.

James T. B. Bowles, Baltimore, Md.; Ralph Budd, Chicago, Ill.; Howard T. Critchlow, Trenton, N. J.; Roy W. Hebard, New York, N. Y.; Herbert D. Hinman, Newport News, Va.; William R. McCann, Hopewell, Va.; E. Sydney Randolph, Baton Rouge, La.; Hartley Rowe, Boston, Mass.; William E. Russell, New York, N. Y.; Caleb Mills Saville, Hartford, Conn.; John Frank Stevens, Brooklyn, N. Y.; Ellis D. Stillwell, Monrovia, Calif.; William G. B. Thompson, New Haven, Conn.; Robert E. Wood, Lake Forest, Ill.; Daniel E. Wright, St. Petersburg, Fla.

THE PETITIONERS

James T. B. Bowles: Chemical engineer; in charge water supplies, superintendent filtration plants Canal Zone, 1910–14; lieutenant-colonel, Corps of Engineers, A. E. F.; director, secretary, and technologist of Crown Petroleum Corp.

Ralph Budd: Civil engineer; chief engineer Panama Railroad, 1909–13; president Great Northern Railway; transportation commissioner, The Advisory Commission to the Council of National Defense; president Burlington Railroad; now chairman of Chicago Transit Authority.

Howard T. Critchlow: Civil and hydraulic engineer; district and chief hydrographer Panama Canal, 1910–14; New Jersey Department of Conservation and Economic Development on water supply, construction of dams, and flood control; past-president American Water Works Association; now director and chief engineer Division Water Policy and Supply (New Jersey).

Roy W. Hebard: Assistant engineer, resident engineer, and contractor, Panama Canal, 1905–11; Major, Corps of Engineers, A. E. F.; president, R. W. Hebard & Co. Inc., builders of highways, railroads, waterworks, and divers structures throughout Central and South America.

Herbert D. Hinman: Construction engineer whose first job for the Pacific Division in 1907 was boring to find rock for the locks; assistant engineer in charge construction of the Pedro Miguel locks, and later in the building of the fortifications on the Pacific side; president of Virginia Engineering Corp., engaged in divers heavy construction in Virginia and the Southeastern States.

William R. McCann: Assistant engineer and supervisor of construction, First Division Panama Canal, 1907–14; engineer, Stone & Webster, Inc.; engineer, Allied Chemical & Dye Corp.; project manager, Buckeye Ordnance Works; now consulting engineer.

E. Sydney Randolph: Civil engineer; Panama Canal service, 1910–46; office engineer, designing engineer, construction engineer, principal engineer, and consulting engineer, handling various projects such as technical supervision of maintenance and lock improvement, Madden Dam and Power project, exploration and investigations for additional locks, defense structures, emergency gates, increased spillway capacity, and augmented power facilities; now consulting engineer.

Hartley Rowe: Electrical and construction engineer, various divisions, Panama Canal, 1905–15; engineering and construction, Lockwood, Greene & Co.; member of General Advisory Committee, Atomic Energy Commission; chief engineer, United Fruit Co.; now vice president thereof.

William E. Russell: Panama Canal service, 1905–9, under all three chief engineers, attached to office of superintending architect, and engaged in building construction; attorney, New York City; chairman of the board of several magazines in which he has controlling interests; headed committee for reevaluation of housing in New York State; has been lifelong student of Panama Canal affairs, and of the treaties pertaining thereto.

Caleb M. Saville: Hydraulic engineer; in charge Third Division Panama Canal, 1907–11, investigating foundations for Gatun Dam, flow through spillway, and Chagres River hydrology; manager and chief engineer, Hatford Metropolitan District; now consulting engineer thereto.

John Frank Stevens: Life student of Panama Canal problems; son of first chairman and chief engineer, Isthmian Canal Commission, who planned the construction organization and plant, and was largely responsible for the adoption of the lock-lake type of waterway.

Ellis D. Stillwell: Electrical engineer; served on Panama Canal, 1912–49, assistant superintendent Gatun locks, superintendent Gatun locks, and superintendent locks division in charge of lock operations and transits, and responsible for lock maintenance and biennial overhauling.

William G. B. Thompson: Civil engineer; Panama Canal service 1909–16 supervising, among other assignments, construction of Balboa terminal; State highway engineer of New Jersey; vice president and chief engineer, Gandy Bridge Co., St. Petersburg, Fla.; with Allied Chemical & Dye Corp. as superintendent of construction, and as project manager Kentucky Ordnance Works; now consulting engineer.

Robert E. Wood: Assistant quartermaster, chief quartermaster, and director Panama Railroad, 1907–14; brigadier general, United States Army (retired), and later acting quartermaster general; president Sears, Roebuck & Co.; now chairman of the board thereof.

Daniel E. Wright: Civil engineer; Panama Canal service, 1904–18 as municipal and sanitary engineer, Central Division, extended subsequently to all divisions and to Panama City and Colon; contracting and consulting in Central and South America; with Rockefeller Foundation and United States Public Health Service as sanitary expert on various commissions to Middle East, Greece, France, Burma, China, India, Egypt, and elsewhere; captain, United States Army, World War I; colonel, United States Army, World War II.

In addition, I also include the text of H. R. 1048, 83d Congress, which follows:

H. R. 1048

A bill to create the Interoceanic Canals Commission, and for other purposes

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "Interoceanic Canals Commission Act of 1953."

SEC. 2. (a) A commission is hereby created, to be known as the "Interoceanic Canals Commission" (hereinafter referred to as the "Commission"), and to be composed of nine members to be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, as follows: One member shall be a commissioned officer of the line (active or retired) of the United States Army; one member shall be a commissioned officer of the line (active or retired) of the United States Navy; one member shall be a commissioned officer of the line (active or retired) of the United States Air Force; and six members from civil life. The President shall designate one of the members from civil life as Chairman, and shall fill all vacancies on the Commission in the same manner as are made the original appointments. The Commission shall cease to exist upon the completion of its work hereunder.

(b) The Chairman of the Commission shall receive compensation at the rate of $20,000 per annum, and the other members shall receive compensation at the rate of $15,000 per annum, each; but the members appointed from the Army, Navy, and Air

Force shall receive only such compensation, in addition to their pay and allowances, as will make their total compensation from the United States $15,000 each.

SEC. 3. The Commission is authorized and directed to make and conduct a comprehensive investigation and study of all problems involved or arising in connection with plans or proposals for—

(a) an increase in the capacity and operational efficiency of the present Panama Canal through the construction of improved or additional facilities;

(b) the construction of a new Panama Canal of sea-level design, or any modification thereof;

(c) the construction and ownership, by the United States, of another canal or canals connecting the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans;

(d) the operation, maintenance, and protection of the Panama Canal, and of any other canal or canals which may be recommended by the Commission;

(e) treaty and territorial rights which may be deemed essential hereunder; and

(f) estimates of the respective costs of the undertakings herein enumerated.

SEC. 4. For the purpose of conducting all inquiries and investigations deemed necessary by the Commission in carrying out the provisions of this act, the Commission is authorized to utilize any official reports, documents, data, and papers in the possession of the United States Government and its officials; and the Commission is given power to designate and authorize any member, or other officer, of the Commission, to administer oaths and affirmations, subpena witnesses, take evidence, procure information and data, and require the production of any books, papers, or other documents and records which the Commission may deem relevant or material for the purposes herein named. Such attendance of witnesses, and the production of documentary evidence, may be required from any place in the United States, or any Territory, or any other area under the control or jurisdiction of the United States, including the Canal Zone.

SEC. 5. The Commission shall submit to the President and the Congress, not later than 2 years after the date of the enactment hereof, a final report containing the results and conclusion of its investigations and studies hereunder, with recommendations; and may, in its discretion, submit interim reports to the President and the Congress concerning the progress of its work. Such final report shall contain—

(a) the recommendations of the Commission with respect to the Panama Canal, and to any new interoceanic canal or canals which the Commission may consider feasible or desirable for the United States to construct, own, maintain, and operate;

(b) the estimates of the Commission as regards the approximate cost of carrying out its recommendations; and like estimates of cost as to the respective proposals and plans considered by the Commission and embraced in its final report; and

(c) such information as the Commission may have been able to obtain with respect to the necessity for the acquisition, by the United States, of new, or additional, rights, privileges, and concessions, by means of treaties or agreements with foreign nations, before there may be made the execution of any plans or projects recommended by the Commission.

SEC. 6. The Commission shall appoint a secretary, who shall receive compensation at the rate of $10,000 per annum, and shall serve at the pleasure of the Commission.

SEC. 7. The Commission is hereby authorized to appoint and fix the compensation—without regard to the civil service laws or the Classification Act of 1923, as amended—of such engineers, surveyors, experts, advisers, and other employees deemed by the Commission necessary hereunder; and may make such expenditures—including those for actual travel and subsistence of members of the Commission and its employees—not exceeding $10 for subsistence expense for any one person for any calendar day; for rent of quarters at the seat of government, or elsewhere; for personal services at the seat of government, or elsewhere; and for printing and binding necessary for the efficient and adequate functions of the Commission hereunder. All expenses of the Commission shall be allowed and paid upon the presentation of itemized vouchers therefor approved by the Chairman of the Commission, or such other official of the Commission as the Commission may designate.

SEC. 8. The books and accounts of the Commission, and of all persons and agencies who, or which may handle any of the funds relative to the work herein authorized to be made, shall, at all times, be open to the examination of the Comptroller General, who is hereby charged with the authority and duty of making audits and reports in the premises.

SEC. 9. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions and purposes of this Act.

INTEROCEANIC CANALS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMPSON] was recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I have been very much interested in the remarks of the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEOGH]. I have been deeply interested in the affairs of the Panama Canal ever since I served as chairman of the special subcommittee to investigate the operations of the canal, under House Resolution 44, 81st Congress. In view of some recent articles concerning slides in the Canal and the consequent threat of suspension of operation, further consideration of the overall problem of interoceanic canals is especially timely.

In 1949, when directing the indicated investigation, I prepared a comprehensive bibliographical list on the Isthmian Canal policy of the United States, published in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of August 25, 1949, volume 95, part 16, page A5580.

Subsequent issues of the RECORD contain a number of additional enlightening contributions, including cogent statements by distinguished Members of the Congress who have studied the canal question.

As a result of our examinations of the interoceanic canal problem over a number of years, the gentleman from Iowa, Representative THOMAS E. MARTIN and I, in the 82d Congress, introduced identical measures for the creation of an Interoceanic Canals Commission.

The gentleman from Iowa, Congressman MARTIN, introduced the same bill, H. R. 1048, in the present Congress. This, I believe, offers the Congress best means for the adequate resolution of this tremendously important problem, and should be enacted.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. HÉBERT and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. CELLER in four instances.

Mr. DODD in two instances.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ENGLE (at the request of Mr. SHELLEY).

Mr. SHELLEY.

Mr. PRICE in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HELLER (at the request of Mr. MULTER) in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. SHAFER.

Mr. TOLLEFSON to revise and extend remarks made this afternoon on the appropriation bill, and to include a statement by Admiral Leggett.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts.

Mr. FRIEDEL.

Mr. YORTY in two instances.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. SCHERER, for May 3 through and including May 14, on account of hearings of the Un-American Activities Committee at Detroit, Flint, and Lansing, Mich.

Mr. SCOTT (at the request of Mr. ARENDS), for the rest of the week, on account of official business.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 2665. An act to amend the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, and the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 42 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, May 3, 1954, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1488. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated December 22, 1953, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a cooperative beach erosion control study of that portion of the shore of

Florida in Pinellas County lying between Big Pass and Pass-a-Grille Pass, prepared under the provisions of section 2 of the River and Harbor Act approved on July 3, 1930, as amended and supplemented (H. Doc. No. 380); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with 14 illustrations.

1489. A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend the District of Columbia Public School Food Services Act"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1490. A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend the act entitled 'An act to amend an act entitled "An act to create a juvenile court in and for the District of Columbia," and for other purposes,' approved June 1, 1938"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1491. A letter from the Acting Attorney General, transmitting the draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to require the registration of certain persons who have knowledge of or have received instruction or assignment in the espionage, counter-espionage, or sabotage service or tactics of a foreign government or foreign political party, and for other purposes"; 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. ALLEN of Illinois: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 523. Resolution for consideration of S. 2150, an act providing for creation of the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation to construct part of the St. Lawrence seaway in United States territory in the interest of national security; authorizing the Corporation to consummate certain arrangements with the St. Lawrence Seaway Authority of Canada relative to construction and operation of the seaway; empowering the Corporation to finance the United States share of the seaway cost on a self-liquidating basis; to establish cooperation with Canada in the control and operation of the St. Lawrence seaway; to authorize negotiations with Canada of an agreement on tolls; and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1549). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BROYHILL:

H. R. 8947. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DODD:

H. R. 8948. A bill to outlaw the Communist Party and similar organizations; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of New York:

H. R. 8949. A bill to establish a code of fair procedure for the conduct of congressional investigations; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. SCOTT:

H. R. 8950. A bill to extend the application of the Classification Act of 1949 to certain positions in, and employees of, the executive branch of the Government; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SCRIVNER:

H. R. 8951. A bill to authorize a modification of the project for flood protection for the Kansas Citys, Kans. and Mo.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H. R. 8952. A bill to authorize the transfer of funds available to the Commodity Credit Corporation so as to increase the ration of whole fluid milk for members of the armed services and for children served by schools participating in the school-lunch program; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WAMPLER:

H. R. 8953. A bill to permit volunteer fire departments and rescue squads to receive property surplus to the needs of the Federal Government for use in preserving life and property; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. BENNETT of Michigan:

H. J. Res. 512. Joint resolution to make it unlawful, without the consent of Congress, to send or maintain abroad members of the Armed Forces for the purpose of engaging in armed hostilities at or in the vicinity of Indochina; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. GRANAHAN:

H. J. Res. 513. Joint resolution to amend the pledge of allegiance to the flag of the United States of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'HARA of Illinois:

H. J. Res. 514. Joint resolution to amend the pledge of allegiance to the flag of the United States of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COLE of New York:

H. Con. Res. 228. Concurrent resolution felicitating and congratulating New York State and its board of regents; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McGREGOR:

H. Res. 521. Resolution to authorize the Committee on Armed Services to investigate and study the pay allowances, and other benefits authorized by law for members of the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. TOLLEFSON:

H. R. 8954. A bill to authorize the President to provide assistance to an expedition to the Antarctic in furtherance of the interests of the United States; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BRAMBLETT:

H. R. 8955. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Hattie Sears Sullivan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DONOVAN:

H. R. 8956. A bill for the relief of Lydia Kunder; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 8957. A bill for the relief of Arvid Kalnins; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 8958. A bill for the relief of Rosita Zysman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARRINGTON:

H. R. 8959. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Uto Ginoza; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORANO:

H. R. 8960. A bill for the relief of Carol Brandon (Valtrude Probst); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHAFER (by request):

H. R. 8961. A bill for the relief of Cornelis Willem Van Nus; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey:

H. R. 8962. A bill for the relief of Denes Deutsch; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

687. Mr. GRAHAM presented a petition of 87 members of the First United Presbyterian Church, of Beaver Falls, Pa., deploring the advertising of alcoholic beverages on radio and TV where it can be heard and seen by children, and in magazines and daily papers where it is read by children and urging the passage of the Bryson bill, H. R. 1227, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

A Monstrous Lawsuit Is Forestalled in Central Valley Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAIR ENGLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 29, 1954

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege in October 1951 to serve as chairman of a special six-member Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation which held hearings in Sacramento, Calif., on the Central Valley project. The purpose of the hearings was to consider Federal-State relationships in the management of the Central Valley project and to obtain factual information on the project water supplies, the water requirements of the lands to be served by the project, and the water rights necessary to operate it. The subcommittee made a critical analysis of several problems relating to project management and made some very definite findings and specific recommendations.

One of the matters which was covered at the hearings and on which findings and recommendations were made concerned the adjudication of Sacramento Valley water rights. The subcommittee found that the State of California and Bureau of Reclamation officials were making plans for an adjudication of Sacramento Valley water rights in the Federal court. It appeared to us on the subcommittee that such a procedure would result in a monstrous lawsuit, a "legal Frankenstein" which would destroy all hope for State control of Central Valley water rights. The cost of such a lawsuit would be enormous. It would embroil the Central Valley project in litigation for decades, and would probably delay further water development in the Central Valley of California. The subcommittee felt very strongly that all other means of settlement should be completely exhausted before resorting to such a lawsuit over the waters of the

Sacramento River. We recommended that the State engineer of California should proceed as far as possible to settle the problem by administrative action, having in mind that a settlement should be attempted through negotiations looking toward the achievement of a practical operating agreement.

I am pleased to report to my colleagues that, as a result of the hearings and the recommendations of the special subcommittee, an attempt is being made to negotiate a settlement of the complex water-rights problem without recourse to litigation. A trial distribution of water program is now under way. Water users owning some 350,000 acres and diverting 94 percent of the water being taken from the Sacramento River above the delta are participating in the program. They have agreed to keep certain records and furnish information relative to the water they are diverting during this irrigation season. At the end of the year, after the information is all in, a report will be prepared by the State engineer on the actual utilization of water for irrigation during the summer and this report will form the basis for another trial distribution next year. The cooperation that has been given to this program is very encouraging and the achievement of a practical operating agreement is one step nearer. Messrs. ASPINALL, YORTY, D'EWART, POULSON, and BOW, who served with me on the special subcommittee, deserve a lot of credit for heading off this huge lawsuit, and keeping the Central Valley project on an even keel.

Statement by Hon. John F. Shelley, of California, to House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service on Salary Increase for Classified Government Employees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN F. SHELLEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 29, 1954

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement by me to House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service on salary increase for classified Government employees:

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, when I appeared before you on March 1, 1954, to give my views on the need for salary increases for Government employees, my discussion was largely limited to the case for Post Office workers, although I did devote some attention to the problems of classified employees in general. Since the committee has now decided to report legislation affecting both groups at the same time, and since the administration's proposals for the classified employees are now more thoroughly understood, I would like to add to my previous testimony and amplify on my belief that all Federal employees should have a substantial salary increase without delay.

The shortcomings of the Civil Service Commission recommendations are now apparent, as far as meeting the needs of employees in the lower classifications is concerned. The arbitrary method that was used in arriving at their recommendation is also apparent. Instead of sitting down and giving real consideration to what amount of increase was needed in each of the different pay classifications to provide a fair and decent raise, adequate to compensate for higher living costs, it is obvious that the administration people who wrote the plan began by asking themselves "What is the absolute minimum overall increase we can recommend which will appear to give some satisfaction to Government employees but won't damage our claims that we are achieving economy in Government?" They settled on 2.5 percent of the total classified payroll and from that point proceeded to work up a scheme for apportioning the 2.5 percent among the various pay groups and to camouflage the inadequacy of the plan by disguising it as a new classification system. The end result, as might be expected, does practically nothing to give the lower paid employees of the Government additional money to buy their bread and butter, to clothe their families, and to pay the rent. I say "pay the rent" because at the present price of real estate, the good Lord knows that not very many of them can put up the downpayment to buy a decent home.

If there is any justification for setting an arbitrary ceiling on the total amount the administration feels it can afford to recommend for salary increases—and I refuse to admit that any ceiling below an amount sufficient to provide an adequate salary scale for all Government employees can be justified—there is certainly no justification for euchering employees in the lower classifications out of their fair share of such an increase. I do not quarrel with the fact that employees in the upper classifications should have a substantial increase, and I agree firmly with the proposition that there should be adequate differentials in the pay of supervisory employees and those who work under them. However, I cannot agree that these adjustments should be made at the expense of those for whom the need is immediate and urgent.

My personal belief is that really substantial increases, such as those provided in H. R. 4556, the Withrow bill, should be voted at once. That is the type of action I am fighting for in this Congress. Following that step the committee, working with the departments and with the recognized employee groups, should give mature study to the question of reclassifying positions and adjusting differentials. To attempt to do that now on the basis of unilateral recommendations by the Civil Service Commission will further reduce the present low morale of the rank and file Government worker. You can't feed a hungry dog by throwing him a rubber bone. Neither can you satisfy the justifiable demands of underpaid Government workers by tossing them a fancy package which, when stripped to the essentials, does nothing for them or their families.

I have received any number of letters from Government employees in San Francisco in both supervisory and rank and file positions. They are unanimous in citing the lag between pay increases for blue-collar workers and private industrial employees and the granting of similar raises to white-collar employees of the Federal Government. They are also unanimous in their demand for a full adjustment in all pay grades to compensate for cost-of-living increases. That time lag is the fault of Congress and it is also our responsibility to remedy the situation without delay.

I therefore again urge the committee to act favorably on legislation to bring Government employees' salaries up to a level which reflect a realistic understanding of how hard they have been hit. In normal collective bargaining in industry such wage adjustments could be made retroactive to help employees pay off some of the debts saddled on them because their raises were overdue. Since we cannot do that for Government workers because of our system, then let us by all means make the increase we do provide big enough so that when they get their first larger paycheck they won't be ashamed to take it home to their wives and families.

Outlaw Wiretapping Save by Court Order and Then Only in Cases Involving National Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 29, 1954

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement by me before the Special Subcommittee on Wire Tapping Legislation of the Senate Judiciary Committee, on Wednesday, April 28, 1954, at 10 a. m.:

Interception of wired or wireless communication should be outlawed except in those cases where it is specifically permissible, such as in espionage, sabotage, subversion, and matters pertaining to our national security and defense, and in cases where it is permitted by State law. In those permissible cases, no tapping should be permitted unless, as in the case of a search warrant, a court order ex parte shall have been obtained.

It is time to call a halt to this wretched practice, so obnoxious to all our citizens. Wiretapping is a media for extortion, blackmail, and corruption, used by cheats, procurers, prostitutes, gamblers, racketeers, bootleggers, bookmakers, and kidnapers. The roster is revolting, and it permeates our whole society. Such malefactors should be denied the right to tap wires and anyone who installs the apparatus should be punished.

Wiretapping is also used by the FBI, the CIA, the Army, Air, and Navy Intelligence Services, the city police, State troopers, private detectives, business executives, political parties, and labor unions. All these entities should be prohibited from intercepting calls or messages except in cases involving national defense and security and in cases permitted by State law. Conversations of Members of Congress have been intercepted and recorded. * * * Not even the office of the President is immune. The late Senator Tobey used a tape recorder to take down a conversation deemed private by former President Truman.

The FBI does considerable wiretapping, and I quote from the Reporter magazine: "The FBI, which probably does more wiretapping than any other Federal agency, is at constant pains to deprecate its use of the technique. J. Edgar Hoover's recent public statement on the subject of tapping was made before a House Appropriations subcommittee early in 1950, when the FBI Director said his agents were tapping less than 170 telephones at the moment. Assuming 5 conversations over the average phone each day, 170 telephones would carry more than 300,000 tapped conversations a year. Such a figure is merely a guess, but it compares favorably with the concurrent testimony of Mrs. Sophie Saliba, head of the record file room of the New York office of the FBI. Mrs.

Saliba disclosed that more than 3,500 discs of FBI-tapped conversations had been destroyed in 1949. Since a disc can easily hold 5 telephone conversations, probably these discs held at least 17,500 conversations—all obviously the work of the New York office alone.

We supposed that we had proscribed the indiscriminate use of wire taps by section 605 of the Communications Act, but legalistic juggling of words balked our efforts and limited our meaning. The tap apparently incurs no penalty. Only the evidence obtained by a wiretap cannot be deemed legally admissible in evidence. It is the "fruit of a poisonous tree."

Let us now not lose the opportunity to outlaw wiretapping once and for all, except in those cases where it is necessary for our national security. Any wiretapping bill creates a conflict. On the one side we have the ideals of freedom and individual privacy. On the other we have the need to use the most modern techniques to ferret out and prosecute crime, to get after saboteurs, espionage agents, and to protect our national security. The conflict must be resolved. Let us resolve it then with the least injury to our liberties. The requirement of a court order is a proper safeguard. A court order would prevent abuse of the power. I quote from a statement made by the Association of the Bar of the City of New York:

"The importance of a prior court order for any wiretap is much the same as in the case of a search warrant. The requirement of a search warrant is made 'so that an objective mind might weigh the need. * * * The right of privacy was deemed too precious to entrust to the discretion of those whose job is the detection of crime and the arrest of criminals. Power is a heady thing.'" (*McDonald* v. *U. S.* (335 U. S. 451, 455).)

District Attorney Miles F. McDonald testified favorably as to his experience under the New York statute requiring a prior court order for any wiretap: "I think prosecutors, myself included, can be overzealous. * * * The judge is a safeguard." He also testified that he had never had any bad experience so far as leakages in the court are concerned. (Hearings, pp. 80, 82.)

It is not asking too much to give up a bit of our freedom to enable (after a court order has been obtained) the FBI, the CIA, and the Intelligence Services of our Army, Navy, and Air Force, to track down spies, saboteurs, and the disloyal, who would deprive us of all our liberties.

I would oppose any bill that would leave the power to tap in the discretion of the Attorney General, or any designee of his. This is too great a power to lodge in any one individual. Power begets power, and the use of power for power's sake is tempting. Such inordinate power could be used even for political purposes and thus abused. We must remember that we legislate for the future. No one can foretell who our future Attorneys General will be. There is nothing personal in this argument. The court is the proper determining agent. We are a Government of law, not a Government of men. To my mind, wiretapping involves the presence of an unexpected, silent, furtive, and unwelcome guest at your telephone. It is like the invasion of your proverbial castle. You may not enter anybody's home, even if you suspect a crime has been committed there or is about to be committed, without a search warrant. Is there any difference when you enter the hearth and home by way of a telephone wire? Why should we not in commonsense require a court order in those circumstances just as we do in a case of a search and seizure? Also the agency which does the eavesdropping ought not to be in sole control. The Attorney General should not, because he cannot adequately do so, police himself. No time would be lost in getting the court order and there would be no danger of leaks. In my State of New York, where a court order is required before a wiretap is permitted, experience has shown that the wrongdoer is never apprised beforehand of the intended tapping. Incidentally, Communists no longer communicate by telegraph or telephone. They have received orders not to do so, and they would be fools indeed to use such a form of the transfer of ideas and instructions and propaganda.

I hope the argument made in the House for a wiretap bill with absolute power residing in the Attorney General, will not be made in the Senate. It was most unfortunate that the bill was called an antitraitor bill. This is a slick slogan which has an appeal to sensation not sanity, to passion not patience, to fear and not frankness. It implies that anyone opposing the bill for the best of reasons, might be branded as one who renders aid and comfort to traitors, which, of course, is absurd.

One might inquire as to why I, or someone else, did not seek to amend the bill that passed the House, by inserting a clause which would have outlawed wiretapping save in the cases I have indicated above. We have rigid rules of jurisdiction in the House, and we were actually considering only a rule-of-evidence bill; a bill involving procedure in the Federal courts. We were not considering an amendment to section 605 of the Federal Communications Act, which involves wiretapping. If such an amendment had been offered, it would have been subject to a point of order, and the Speaker would have been compelled to sustain the point of order.

At this point I should like to go back a bit into the history of wiretapping. In 1934 the Federal Communications Commission was established as an independent agency. Included in the enabling act, as section 605, was a provision intended to outlaw wiretapping once and for all. It read, in part:

"No person not being authorized by the sender shall intercept any communication and divulge or publish the * * * contents * * * to any person * * * and no person having received such intercepted communication * * * shall * * * use the same or any information therein contained for his own benefit or for the benefit of another."

Violations were made subject to a $10,000 fine, 2 years in prison, or both.

Three years later the Supreme Court reviewed section 605 of the Communications Act.

Several defendants in Nardone against United States appealed their convictions of liquor smuggling on the ground that the evidence used against them was the result of taps by Federal agents.

The Court ruled that section 605 applied to all persons—persons as Federal agents and all others. But the Court also ruled that the evidence was inadmissible since the agents violated the law in obtaining such evidence.

But the Federal agents who violated section 605 by tapping were never prosecuted. No one has ever been prosecuted for illegal tapping—except in one case, that of a lawyer named Gruber. The Department of Justice has never gotten after its men for wiretapping. Attorney General Jackson said in 1940:

"I do not feel that the Department of Justice can, in good conscience, prosecute persons for a practice engaged in by the Department itself, and regarded as legal by the Department."

In March 1941, Attorney General Jackson made this new construction of section 605 public:

"There is no Federal statute that prohibits or punishes wiretapping alone."

Jackson said: "Any person, with no risk of penalty, may tap telephone wires and eavesdrop on his competitor, employer, workman, or others, and act upon what he hears or make any use of it that does not involve divulging or publication."

In 1939 Nardone was reconvicted not on direct-wire evidence but from evidence obtained in turn from wiretap leads. The court held the evidence was "fruit of the poisonous tree" and was thus inadmissible. Nardone was again freed.

In conclusion I repeat: Thow clear safeguards around the power to tap; insist upon the court order.

Secretary of Interior McKay's Assurance of Sympathy to Governors of Coal-Producing States Not Supported by Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 29, 1954

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, Secretary of Interior Douglas McKay told a group of governors of the coal-producing States that there is no easy solution to the problems of the coal business.

He went on to say that the way to meet the situation was to have an intensive research program, which, he told the governors, was being undertaken in his Department.

No one who has any knowledge of the coal business can deny the difficulty in solving its problems nor can anyone deny the need for an intensive research program.

We can, and do, quarrel with the assertion of Mr. McKay that his administration is fostering such a program.

Despite his pious assertion of sympathy, the Secretary, who seems to be the first-string quarterback when the administration shifts into its give-away formation, has this record in the field of coal research:

First. Under his administration the synthetic liquid fuels pilot plant at Louisiana, Mo., has been closed and all research stopped.

Second. Under his administration the synthetic liquid fuels pilot plant at Rifle, Colo., has been closed.

Third. Mr. McKay's budget request for the current year for the synthetic liquid fuels program was drastically cut.

Fourth. In fact, Mr. McKay's pruning knife made perhaps its deepest cuts in the whole Bureau of Mines program, and then officials of his Department made only weak attempts to justify the work of this all-important agency, wherein coal research is carried out.

Perhaps there is more than coincidence in the fact that the synthetic liquid fuels program has been cut back and the fact that coalminers, by and large, supported Governor Stevenson in 1952 while the oil barons were heavy contributors to the Republican campaign fund.

My Opposition To Sending American Troops to Indochina

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 29, 1954

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, I wish to make clear my opposition to sending United States Armed Forces to Indochina.

The issue in Indochina is not whether the advance of communism should be stopped, but, rather, how best to stop it. Even if we concede that the Soviet Union and Communist China have captured control of the Viet Minh movement, the driving force of that movement remains the same as it was 8 years ago. That force is nationalism. The mainspring of that nationalism has nothing whatever to do with the politico-social theories of Marx, Lenin, Stalin, or Mao Tse-tung. That driving force has its basis in the desire of the peoples to be free from Western domination. France could have granted independence at the time the Philippines, Indonesia, Burma, India, Ceylon, and Pakistan were made independent. The fact that she has not granted complete and unequivocal independence to date only serves as fuel to the burning fires of nationalism.

Eight years of civil war have demonstrated that those fires cannot be quenched by military means alone. Just as French Union forces have been increased, the Viet Minh forces have grown. As the United States has increased provisions of materiel to the French Union forces, Czechoslovakia, the Soviet Union, and China have increased the flow of arms to the Viet Minh. After 8 years of fighting, it may realistically be said that the territory under French control remains the same as at the outstart.

In the psychological and the political war—the war to win the loyalty of the people, the war which takes precedence over military conflict—the French are on the defensive and no military measures can be successful until the people are granted the freedom to which they have so long aspired.

When military measures have failed in the limited area in which this war has been fought during the past 8 years, it is not likely that success will be found by increasing the intensity of operations on both sides. More American planes, compensated by more Soviet planes, cannot basically alter the will for freedom in the Indochinese people. An extension of this war, locking Communist China and the United States in a death struggle, will not serve to gain the freedom of the Indochinese people.

Whether the United States were to send troops into Indochina on her own, or under the cloak of a 10-nation southeast Asian defense arrangement, does not alter the material fact that military measures are secondary to the winning of this war.

Whatever constructive rule the United States may assume in resolving this conflict, the intended results will not be served by sending United States troops to Indochina, and I, personally am definitely opposed to such action. All of the shooting in the past 8 years has proven that all the people of Indochina want is their independence. Had this independence been granted long ago, this war could have been avoided.

Economic Aid to India Is Imperative

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 29, 1954

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, rumblings of discontent if not extreme hostility can be heard from some Members of the House and Senate to the proposed plan of the administration to give India $85 million in economic assistance and $19 million in technical aid for the coming fiscal year. Senators KNOWLAND and DIRKSEN, and Representatives JUDD and SMITH voice their opposition in terms of their resentment to Prime Minister Nehru's so-called dynamic neutrality and his differences with United States policy on Red China, the H-bomb, and the collective security program.

Yet Nehru, on balance, is one of our best friends in Asia, and India is desperately in need of the proffered help for her industrial development. Nehru maintains a policy of persistent and vigorous opposition to communism in his country. He has jailed 10,000 Communists since India became an independent state. He vigilantly weeds Communists out of the civil service and his Congress Party is a constant thorn in the side of the Communists.

Senator KNOWLAND has been quoted as saying that Nehru does not speak for Asia. But we know that Nehru carries India on his back like Sinbad carried the Old Man of the Sea. Certainly, he speaks for India, and when he speaks, all Asia and all southeast Asia listen to him. Nehru is a man not only to be reckoned with, but to be encouraged. Deprecate him too much and India, like China, will be lost to us. And we cannot afford to lose India especially with Indochina teetering on the Communist brink.

How short-sighted and inept can these "China Firsters" get? They insist on labeling all our aid as anti-Communist, and they insist on paeans of praise and gratitude from all governments receiving our aid. These nations do not want to be looked upon as pawns in the East-West conflict. Proud nations like India resent this attitude which robs the giver of his grace and the recipient of his pride.

The point 4 aid now being contemplated for India, is worth many millions of dollars of military aid. India is a democracy. The "right to dissent" is inherent in democracy, and India has the right to criticize us just as we have the right to criticize her. If we cut off economic aid to India because of her dynamic neutrality in the cold war—just as we in our early history were neutral in European conflicts and via our Monroe Doctrine—India might well fall on "t'other side."

Reserve Judgment in the Army-McCarthy Case Until All Evidence Is In

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 29, 1954

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, I have just returned from a hurried trip to Michigan, and while there I found that there is an understandable temptation to pass an exasperated and adverse snap judgment on the current proceedings in the McCarthy-Army controversy.

In my opinion, however, it will be most unfortunate if thoughtful Americans yield to this temptation. I believe it is of the utmost importance that the judgment of public opinion be held in abeyance as far as possible until all of the evidence is in.

It is significant, and ironical, that the pressures for a snap judgment, and one hostile to Senator MCCARTHY, are strongest from the professional McCarthy-haters.

This is the same crowd that has ceaselessly clamored for the adoption of regular courtroom procedures in congressional investigations, particularly the right of cross-examination of witnesses. Now that there is cross-examination with a vengeance from all sides, and a clear determination to bring all of the facts at issue to light, this same element is deploring the dragged out proceedings and objecting to the so-called public washing of dirty linen.

Already evidence is developing in the hearings that the commanding general at Fort Monmouth had commended the McCarthy committee investigation of subversives and security risks at that highly sensitive military installation, and that he was under heavy pressure from within the Department of the Army to remove the suspensions of certain security risks. This is a highly relevant disclosure and has a most important bearing on the fundamental issue of who it is in the Federal Government who wants to relax or eliminate the hunt for traitors and potential traitors in the military.

In urging that thoughtful Americans reserve judgment on the entire matter I should like to remind them of 4 or 5 facts which have been temporarily obscured by the present proceedings:

First. An Army major was promoted and honorably discharged after he had repeatedly invoked the protection of the fifth amendment.

Second. An Army general did refuse to give information as to who was responsible for this promotion and honorable discharge, acting under orders of top Department of Army officials.

Third. The Secretary of the Army did agree to provide this information, but as a result of enormous pressures from within the military and from the left-wing press, who charged him with surrendering to McCarthy, began a diversionary attack upon McCarthy.

Fourth. The counsel for the Army gave added impetus to this diversionary tactic by releasing charges of demands for special favors for Private Schine.

Fifth. It has already been conceded, in the current hearings, that the Secretary of the Army desired to substitute self-investigation of subversives by the Army for congressional investigations, in spite of the statement of the Fort Monmouth commander that more had been accomplished in 2 weeks by the Senate investigating committee than had been accomplished in 2 years by the Army itself.

I do not ask, or expect, a verdict in favor of McCarthy in advance of a full exploration of the facts. But I strongly believe that the foregoing considerations, and the eagerness of the anti-McCarthy crowd to discredit him by discrediting the current proceedings, is a fair warning against an adverse snap judgment.

Of course, it is unfortunate that the controversy developed and that it reached its present stage. But it would be infinitely more unfortunate if there were any turning back in the Senate committee's expressed determination to get all of the facts, or if there were a superficial judgment rendered by a careless or impatient public before the evidence is all in.

Judge Robert Palmer Anderson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. DODD

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 29, 1954

Mr. DODD. Mr. Speaker, the United States District Court for the District of Connecticut is soon to have a new judge, Robert Palmer Anderson, of Noank, Conn.

Judge Anderson's appointment by President Eisenhower and the confirmation of his appointment by the United States Senate means that the Federal court in Connecticut will continue, as it has in the past, to be known for the outstanding ability and sterling character of its judges.

Judge Robert Anderson has earned an enviable reputation in Connecticut as State's attorney for New London County and as a judge of our superior court. Judge Anderson is young enough to be vigorous and enthusiastic and experienced enough to be moderate, careful, and scholarly. By temperament, by training, and by intellectual achievement, he is well qualified to become one of the outstanding judges in our Federal system.

I am sure that, in paying this tribute to Judge Anderson and to his appointment by President Eisenhower, I am joined by my fellow citizens of the State of Connecticut.

Celler Protests United States Arms Agreement With Iraq

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 29, 1954

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, it is now revealed that the United States has executed an agreement for arms aid to Iraq and has indicated the existence of a similar agreement with Saudi Arabia. Strangely enough, the news of this agreement broke in Bagdad, and Washington was then forced to confirm it. Why was Washington reluctant to reveal the pact here? Did it wish to keep it under wraps? The Department of State well knew that the contemplation of sending arms to Iraq and Saudi Arabia was met with great protest from many Members of the House and Senate as well as by others.

Iraq says the aid is unconditional. The State Department indirectly indicates that the arms are for self-defense and will not be delivered if they are to be used against Israel. It is pertinent to ask what guaranties were demanded from Iraq that the arms be not so used. It is equally as pertinent to ask what will the United States do if Israel is attacked. We have no answer to those questions. Has the State Department an answer?

It is supposed that these arms will be used by Iraq against possible Soviet aggression. The Arab States do not acknowledge any threat of Soviet aggression. Witness the recent action of Vishinsky in the Security Council, who exercised two vetoes recently in favor of the Arab States.

The one hostility openly acknowledged by the Arab States, is their hostility against Israel. Iraq, the recipient of arms, has refused to enter into any armistice agreement with Israel. Iraq has banded together with other Arab nations into the Arab League. We know by its own word that the Arab League is bent on Israel's destruction. Nuri Said, speaking before the Iraqi Parliament said:

> The Arab League Security Pact is designed to protect us against only one danger—the Zionist danger.

On March 3 of this year, the Embassy of Iraq in Washington issued a lengthy statement urging Arab unity against Israel. King Saud of Saudi Arabia stated in January of last year:

> Israel to the Arab world is like a cancer to the human body, and the only remedy is to uproot it just like a cancer.

The tensions in the Middle East between the Arab States and Israel are grave. Certainly, this agreement of arms to Iraq can hardly serve the interests of peace in that area.

I renew my protest against the shipment of arms to Iraq. I demand to know the exact term of this arms agreement executed by the United States and Iraq.

Trade Relations With Japan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK E. SMITH

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 29, 1954

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include the following copy of a letter which I have sent to Secretary of Defense Wilson:

> APRIL 29, 1954.
>
> The Honorable CHARLES E. WILSON,
> *Secretary of Defense,*
> *Washington, D. C.*
>
> DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I understand that protests have been made to you in regard to bids submitted by Japanese firms on equipment necessary for the Dalles Dam on the Columbia River. I would like to strongly urge that the Japanese bids be considered on the same basis with any other bids which have been received from responsible sources.
>
> As a member of the House Public Works Committee, which recently authorized an increased appropriation to cover costs of construction for the Dalles Dam, I was very much impressed with the record of economy achieved by the Portland District of the Corps of Engineers. Through division of the work to encourage competition from contractors, and other steps to gain both economy and efficiency, the cost of the dam will be well below initial estimates, in spite of generally increased construction costs since the time of those estimates. From the standpoint of the Corps of Engineers, and from the best interest of American taxpayer, it would be very disappointing for this record to be spoiled by arbitrary action ignoring low bidders for equipment for the dam.
>
> I believe it would be a great mistake for the Defense Department to participate in the development of a policy which would make normal trade relations with Japan more difficult. Japan is an anchor of American defense policy in Asia. The development of healthy trade relations with that country should be an essential part of our defense policy, in addition to being good common sense from an economic standpoint.
>
> I understand that the question has been raised in regard to possible hardship if an American firm loses this bid. There is no comparison between the hardship involved for an individual firm and the millions of Americans who produce for export and who will feel the results if our trade relations with Japan continue to deteriorate.
>
> Any prejudicial action against a bid pending before your Department will be directly contrary to the President's recommendations in regard to the "Buy-American" act. I am confident that you will carry out the President's policy in this regard.
>
> Cordially,
>
> FRANK E. SMITH,
> *Member of Congress.*

Retirement for Reservists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS B. HELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 29, 1954

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill in Congress to liberalize the requirements of the Army and Air Force Vitalization and Retirement Equalization Act of 1948 for retirement of reservists who served on active duty during World War I and World War II. This act is known as Public Law 810 and was passed by the 80th Congress.

At the present time, a reservist who was a member of a Reserve component prior to August 15, 1945—that is, prior to V-J Day—may be granted retirement pay under Public Law 810 if he meets the following qualifications: (a) He must have at least 20 years of satisfactory Federal service; (b) he must have served during World War I or World War II; (c) he must attain the age of 60.

Recently, in discussions with a friend of mine, I learned that there is a small group of reservists who have completed more than 30 years of creditable service with our Armed Forces during both World Wars, and some even in the Korean war, but their contribution is being overlooked or ignored under the existing retirement law. Although my friend is not planning to retire soon, his record of service is typical of the men in this small group who have accumulated similar experience.

He entered the Army during World War I, served on the European battlefields, and subsequently remained in the Reserves. He also served in World War II and in the Korean war, accumulating a total of more than three decades of Reserve and active duty service for his country. He is still in the Reserves to this day.

Mr. Speaker, only a small number of men remain in this category who could still benefit from the retirement privileges provided in my bill. Some of them no longer retain their health or ability to pursue their occupations. Even at this late date we should be liberal in our recognition of the great services they performed, and not the least of these is the fact that they stayed in the various Reserve components between the two wars and helped to maintain our Reserve units up to strength. Most of these men are now in the middle fifties or close to 60, and some among them with not too much of this world's goods to their name.

It is my opinion that these men are entitled to receive special recognition for their contribution to the security of our country. They have responded far and above the call of duty. I believe that in recognition of their record of patriotic service they should be granted the privilege of retiring at the age of 55 instead of 60. Consequently, I drafted a bill which seeks to set up a new class of persons entitled to be retired under Public Law 810.

My bill provides that, in order to be entitled to retirement pay as a member of the new class, an individual must meet the following qualifications: (a) he must have at least 30 years of satisfactory Federal service; (b) he must have served during both World Wars I and II; (c) he must have attained the age of 55.

Mr. Speaker, I am strongly of the opinion that Congress should take into consideration the service rendered by these men over such a long time and during two great wars, and that we should recognize their contribution and their sacrifices by liberalizing the retirement law in their behalf. They have given a great deal of their life and time to our Armed Forces. Now they are so few in number, and even fewer are the years left to them in which they could benefit by this recognition. I urge you to give serious and prompt consideration to my proposal. In so doing, we shall at the same time boost the morale of all those serving in our Reserve components and those making a career for themselves in our Armed Forces.

The text of my bill is as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the portion of subsection (a) of section 302 of the Army and Air Force Vitalization and Retirement Equalization Act of 1948 (10 U. S. C., sec. 1036a) which precedes the colon preceding the first proviso thereof is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(a) Any person—

"(1) who, upon attaining or having attained the age of 60 years, has performed satisfactory Federal service as defined in this section in the status of a commissioned officer, warrant officer, flight officer, or enlisted person in the Army of the United States or the Air Force of the United States, including the respective Reserve components thereof, and also including the federally recognized National Guard prior to 1933, the United States Navy, including the Reserve components thereof, the United States Marine Corps, including the Reserve components thereof, and has completed an aggregate of 20 or more years of such satisfactory service in any or all of the aforesaid services, or

"(2) who, upon attaining or having attained the age of 55 years, has performed satisfactory Federal service in any status referred to in paragraph (1) in any of the components of the Armed Forces referred to in paragraph (1), and has completed an aggregate of 30 or more years of such satisfactory service in any or all of the aforesaid services, part of which service was performed as active Federal service during any part of both of the two periods referred to in the last proviso of this subsection,

shall, upon application therefor, be granted retired pay."

Case No. 1

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 29, 1954

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, here is a typical case of extreme hardship caused by the numerous unfair provisions of the McCarran-Walter Act. This case and scores like it demand drastic changes in the act:

Error of pennies in 1922 leads to deporting move.

Herewith find the New York Times report of the tragic happenings under our present immigration laws:

DETROIT, April 11.—Samuel Jones, a 72-year-old Detroit pensioner, faced deportation to his native England today because he forgot to pay for a newspaper more than 30 years ago.

Mr. Jones came to this country in 1922. The newspaper incident occurred shortly after his arrival in Detroit.

He said that while running for a streetcar he grabbed a newspaper and failed to drop any pennies in the coin box. Arrested, he was convicted of simple larceny and fined $15.

Later, Mr. Jones made a 2-week visit to Canada. Under immigration regulations, any alien who leaves the country is considered a new entrant when he returns. In applying for reentry Mr. Jones neglected to tell immigration officials about his conviction. The concealment of the conviction was a violation of immigration laws and Mr. Jones now faces possible deportation.

Mr. Speaker, certainly a case of this sort should be adjusted administratively by a responsible official. The law must be amended to that end.

A Bill To Outlaw the Communist Party in the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. DODD

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 29, 1954

Mr. DODD. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to outlaw the Communist Party in the United States.

The bill which I have introduced is identical with the bill introduced by Senator MIKE MANSFIELD in the United States Senate on March 25, 1954.

For a long time I have been trying to draw up a piece of legislation which would provide for the outlawing of the Communist Party, and in this effort I have examined all of the proposals which have been made over a period of several years.

It is my judgment that Senator MANSFIELD's bill is the best proposal that has been made, and as I introduce the measure in this House I am desirous of giving full credit to Senator MANSFIELD for the authorship of this measure.

The bill is as follows:

A bill to outlaw the Communist Party and similar organizations

Be it enacted, etc., That whoever knowingly and willfully becomes or remains a member of the Communist Party, or of any other organization having for one of its purposes or aims the establishment, control, conduct, seizure, or overthrow of the Government of the United States, or the government of any State or political subdivision thereof, by the use of force or violence, shall be fined not more than $10,000 or imprisoned not more than 10 years, or both. For the purposes of this section, the term "Communist Party"

means the political organization now known as the Communist Party of the United States of America, whether or not any change is hereafter made in such name.

SEC. 2. This act shall take effect on the first day of the third calendar month following the month in which it is enacted.

Slogans Don't Make a Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 29, 1954

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, some folk define "public relations" as the art of making what is not seem to be. Personally, I do not hold with this cynical concept. In fact, I believe any public relations program based upon such a philosophy is, in the long run, a poor program; one that is doomed to eventual failure.

This appears to be the philosophy of the hucksters in the present administration. Every campaign seems to be based upon an effort to make what is not seem to be.

We were first exposed to this technique in the matter of the mission of the Seventh Fleet at Formosa. During the 1952 campaign we were subjected to a brain washing, intending to make it appear that Chiang Kai-shek was straining at the leash on Formosa, held back by the Seventh Fleet from invading China, throwing the Communists out and solving all problems in Asia.

Well, the Seventh Fleet was told it should continue to protect Formosa, but should let the powerful legions of Chiang cross to the mainland at will. It turned out, however, that what was not just was not, regardless of how hard the hucksters attempted to make it seem to be. Chiang continued to make a few piddling raids, which he had been doing all along anyhow. But the brain washing then went to another, double mission.

Slowly we were built up to the need for a New Look at our military situation. Finally, after about 6 months of brain washing, we were given two new slogans. A New Look in the military, and a foreign-military policy of "instant, massive retaliation," which required great airpower, which the New Look, according to the hucksters, was supposed to supply.

I have called attention repeatedly to the fallacy of the so-called New Look military policy. When we examined the military budget we found, first, the Air Force was getting only a part of the program that had been cut back a year before; and, second, the New Look, with its supposed emphasis on airpower to carry out "instant, massive retaliation," was nothing more nor less than a means of hiding a simple, meat-ax budget cut. Moreover, no less a person than Admiral Radford, the new Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, said it was not a New Look at all, merely a continuing evaluation of the situation.

So it turned out that the brain washing was just one more attempt to make what is not seem to be.

While this was going on, we were subjected to still another brain washing. We began to hear a great deal about initiative in the cold war. Finally, in January, we were told by the President that we had gained the initiative. Most of us hoped this was true.

Now, it appears to have been just another public-relations gimmick to make what is not seem to be, or else I have an erroneous understanding of the meaning of initiative.

Last Friday, Mr. Speaker, R. H. Shackford, a foreign correspondent for Scripps-Howard newspapers, in a dispatch from Geneva, reported that the Communists "now have the West on the run diplomatically as well as militarily in Asia." He further reported a "tougher tactical line" on the part of the Communists.

Is this the "initiative"?

On the same day, Crosby S. Noyes, in a special dispatch from Geneva to the Washington Star, said, and I quote:

> Already there is evidence that the initiative at this Conference is very much in the hands of the Communists.

End of quotation.

Sunday morning we read the following headline in one Washington newspaper: "United States Defeat Looms at Geneva." Then there was a subhead which read, "France, Britain Fail To Back American Bluff on Asia Policy."

The other Washington newspaper had the following headline on its main Geneva story: "Dulles' Failure on Geneva Aim Laid to Impossible Conditions."

The subhead in this paper read, "Secretary Returning Home After Week Viewed as Disastrous Diplomatically."

So far as I am concerned none of this adds up to the "initiative," although I admit the possibility that my understanding of the term might differ from that of the hucksters. But it is not a very complicated word.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to include the Noyes and Shackford dispatches as a part of my remarks.

This concept that public relations is the art of making what is not seem to be might be acceptable in a program designed to sell mouth wash. It should not be carried out in the Government of the United States at any time, and particularly in times as perilous as now.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I beseech the hucksters to forget the lessons learned while peddling their soap and detergents. I urge them to operate on the basis of frank statements of the problems faced, and frank statements of the alternate solutions.

We can only legislate with the support of the people, who must be informed.

The above-mentioned dispatches follow:

IKE SPIKED THE PARLEY—THUS FAR REDS ARE ON TOP AT GENEVA

(By R. H. Shackford)

GENEVA, April 30.—The Communists—Russian, Chinese, North Korean, and Indochinese—are the only happy people at the Geneva Conference today.

President Eisenhower's seeming press conference suggestions that a deal with the Communists in southeast Asia is all that is possible now hit the Western delegates here between wind and water. There wasn't much spunk before Ike spoke, and his comments fixed it.

The question here is:

Can even a deal on the partition of Indochina be made?

Will the Communists, who now have the West on the run diplomatically as well as militarily in Asia, be satisfied with a half loaf when by pressing on they see chances of a whole loaf?

The answer to both questions here seems as of now to be "No."

REDS ON OFFENSIVE

Neither Soviet Foreign Minister V. M. Molotov nor Red China's Premier-Foreign Minister Chou En-lai show any sign of being lenient. On the contrary, every sign at this conference is that the post-Stalin period of sweetness and light is ending and a tougher tactical line is in the works.

From an American point of view this Geneva Conference—only in its fifth day—must be labeled a colossal failure.

The formal conference itself has been a farce. Each day the delegates of 19 nations ride to the Palais Des Nations in their limousines and a couple of them deliver set speeches. They are supposed to cover Korea but the Communists talk about everything under the sun.

INDOCHINA NEXT

Now it looks as though the Indochinese phase of the conference may get under way late this coming week or the next one. By then Dien Bien Phu may well have fallen, since many here believe the Communists can take it any hour they wish and currently are toying with it like a cat with a mouse.

Amidst the confusion, one thing stands out—that the West's tough talk of a few weeks ago, especially by the Americans with respect to Indochina, has turned out to be just talk. The Communists called that bluff.

For weeks the French have been criticized for an appeasement approach to Indochina.

Earlier this week it was the British who were being beaten over the heads—especially by Americans—for blocking "united action."

Today it is the Americans who are being accused of having talked too boldly in recent weeks without the will to carry it through.

The truth is that all 3 nations are in a mess together and all 3 must bear in varying degrees responsibility for the diplomatic victory now in prospect for the Communists in southeast Asia.

EISENHOWER STATEMENT CAUSES AMERICAN CONFUSION IN GENEVA—REPORT HE FAVORED INDOCHINA PARTITION LATER DENIED, SEEN AS DAMAGING POSITION

(By Crosby S. Noyes)

GENEVA, April 30.—Reports trickling into Geneva from President Eisenhower's news conference yesterday have caused the greatest consternation and confusion in the American delegation here.

To emphasize the isolation of this conference, top delegates still are professing ignorance of what the President actually said.

The reports themselves are confusing. The first stories carried a strong implication that General Eisenhower had implied a settlement in Indochina on the basis of partition of the country between the Communists and French Union forces by suggesting an arrangement similar to that in Germany and Berlin. Later reports indicated the President had specifically denied he was talking about partition.

Although they are unsure where they stand, the American spokesmen are insisting that partition in Indochina is still out of the question so far as the United States is concerned. It is felt strongly among observers here that such a suggestion would amount to an open admission of bankruptcy of the Allies position in southwest Asia.

REDS HAVE INITIATIVE

Already there is evidence that the initiative at this conference is very much in the hands of the Communists.

In the present phase it is clear that the Communists are not even considering the possibility of a political settlement in Korea. They are playing the issue strictly for its propaganda value, and—in the opinion of people who should know—they are doing a shrewd job of it.

Secretary of State Dulles, who planned to expose the Red Chinese before the bar of public opinion, is finding the going much tougher than he could have expected. His case on Korea may be grounded solidly on history and law and it undoubtedly makes a strong appeal to Europeans here. On the other hand, the Communist case is aimed squarely and accurately at Asians and is grounded no less surely on nationalism and "anti-foreign" sentiment in the countries involved. It is childish to believe that this battle of words can sway fixed opinions on countries immediately involved or arrive at any solution of the Korean problem, but things said here can have a profound effect on such fence-sitting countries as India and it is in this direction that Chou En-lai and Russian Foreign Minister Molotov are making their pitch.

RED CONCESSIONS DOUBTED

So far as Indochina is concerned, there is the gravest doubt that the Communists will give an inch. From their point of view a settlement based on division of the country would be an unnecessary concession at a point where they hold both the military and political advantage. If an armistice in Indochina is arranged here under present circumstances, it would only seem possible on the basis of a general cease-fire and a subsequent political assimilation of the country by the Communists.

The effect of any such "solution" in Indochina is not hard to predict. It isn't only a question of losing Southeast Asia to communism. Throughout the world the fact would be interpreted as evidence of political importance of the United States to act when its vital interests were threatened. Already, there is a bitterness in Western Europe over what appears to be an attempt to pin the responsibility for failure on France and Britain.

For better or worse, American prestige throughout the world is at stake in Indochina and the Communists are standing by to rake in the chips.

Exposition and Parade of Progress on Rehabilitation and Employment of the Physically Handicapped

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 29, 1954

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of the House to the Exposition and Parade of Progress on Rehabilitation and Employment of the Physically Handicapped to be held in the departmental auditorium on Constitution Avenue, April 28–30. A special invitation has been extended by the President's Committee on Employment of the Physically Handicapped to all Members of Congress and their families to attend the exposition which will feature advances made during the past 25 years in methods of rehabilitating physically handicapped individuals and in methods of placing them in jobs suited to their abilities.

I understand that the exhibits will include a number of actual handicapped workers demonstrating their abilities to perform many different kinds of work. The exposition will be open from 12 noon to 5 p. m. and from 7 to 10 p. m. each of the 3 days.

The special room set aside for the developments in artificial limbs, will, I know, interest many Members since much of this research was made possible by grants from congressional appropriations.

The exposition has nationwide interest because, as I understand it, exhibitors from more than 20 States are providing displays covering the gamut of activities performed by the handicapped. I wish to personally urge that as many of you as possible attend.

My Record in Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS B. HELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 29, 1954

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Speaker, in March of this year I had the privilege of completing 5 years of service in the House of Representatives to which I was elected in a special election in 1949. In 1952 there was a reapportionment of the congressional districts in Brooklyn, with the result that my district was changed in certain respects: some sections were detached from the district, while others were added to it, notably Greenpoint, parts of Williamsburgh, the Bushwick area, and so forth.

It has been my practice every year to render a report to my constituents setting forth my work in Congress, my record of achievements, and my views on major legislation. Because of the geographic changes in my district, I deem it my duty and responsibility to summarize my past record and the work which I have performed in the United States Congress as the Representative of the newly formed Eighth Congressional District.

PAST LEGISLATIVE RECORD

In covering a period of 5 years it is obviously impossible to list the full record of my activity during this period. I shall therefore limit this review to major legislation and how I voted on these issues.

I. In the 81st Congress, covering the years 1949 and 1950, my record was as follows:

Taft-Hartley Labor Act: I strenuously opposed this act as being antilabor and urged that it be repealed. In one of my first addresses in Congress I pointed out how this law is undermining collective bargaining, provoking unnecessary strife, and stripping workers of their basic rights. I have since then continuously fought against this act and have advocated that it be repealed entirely, or at least be liberalized by eliminating certain sections which are harmful to the interests of labor.

Displaced Persons Act: The problem of immigration has always been a matter of deep interest to me. My maiden speech in Congress shortly after taking my oath of office was in favor of amending the Displaced Persons Act to admit an additional 100,000 refugees. It was my opinion that the United States should exert moral leadership in the solution of the displaced persons problem.

Civil rights: I have always been in favor of safeguarding the rights of minority groups and the elimination of discrimination. I voted against the poll tax; I have urged the adoption of legislation to establish fair employment practices without regard to race, color, religion, or national origin; I called for an early end to racialism and segregation in our Armed Forces, as well as other guaranties of civil rights.

Social security: I supported the expansion of the social-security program and the extension of its benefits to wider segments of our population.

Public health: I favored passage of a national health insurance and public health bill to secure for the people of this country a reduction in sickness and premature death. It is my conviction that our prosperity, our well-being and the welfare of the communities in which we live depend in large measure upon maintaining the highest level of health.

Postal and Federal employees: The plight of the underpaid postal workers and Federal employees is well known to me. One of my first acts in Congress was to introduce a bill to correct this inequity by raising the salaries of these people to enable them to cope with the high cost of living. I have supported their cause all along during my 5 years in office.

Brooklyn Navy Yard: This famous Government shipyard, located in my congressional district, once employed over 20,000 people. Employment there has fallen off to about 18,000. I have kept in touch with the Navy Department to see that it assigns sufficient work to the yard, and that a high level of employment is maintained at all times. In 1950, when 760 workers at the Brooklyn Navy Yard were on the verge of being laid off, I appealed to President Truman and to the Secretary of Defense and was successful in saving the jobs for these people. On another occasion disabled war veterans were dismissed from their jobs at the yard. I made a personal investigation, took up the matter with the admiral in charge and succeeded in regaining employment for them at the yard. These are only a few of the many problems, in addition to an endless stream of individual cases involving navy-yard workers who appeal to me directly for help.

International affairs: World affairs have always been of primary interest to me. The security of our Nation, world peace, Communist aggression, aid to our allies—these and other matters are of vital importance to every American. I have strongly supported our foreign-aid

program, including military and economic assistance to the free nations. Back in 1950 I warned against recognition of Communist China and the expansion of Communist domination in southeast Asia. I voted for President Truman's point-4 program to make available American technical aid to underdeveloped areas of the world to improve the standard of living in those areas. I voiced strong protests against the suppression of human freedom in countries behind the Iron Curtain and against religious persecution of Catholics, Protestants, and Jews in those countries.

II. In the 82d Congress covering the years 1951 and 1952, this was my record on major issues:

Price control: The danger of inflation and runaway prices was a serious threat to our economy during this period. I favored economic controls as a protection to the consumer against rising prices, black markets, and the high cost of living. I called for an effective price-control law to give the wage earner and the low-income groups the fullest protection in obtaining food and other essentials. I introduced a bill to roll back prices to the level existing before the Korean war, but Congress adopted a weak measure which failed to halt rising prices.

Rent control and housing: I consistently supported continuation of rent control, construction of low-cost housing, elimination of firetraps and slum clearance in order to maintain a high standard of living and proper health standards. In 1951 I introduced a bill to extend rent control for another 2 years and to make the law more effective, and also a bill to repeal the limitations on construction of low-rent housing and authorizing the construction of 75,000 dwelling units annually. In 1952 efforts were made to kill the housing program, but, after a bitter struggle, we succeeded in gaining approval for 35,000 units.

Civil rights: I continued to fight for civil rights, particularly the abolition of discrimination in employment, in housing, and education. I voted for the FEPC bill. I supported the Price amendment to the universal military bill to eliminate segregation in the Armed Forces. I introduced a bill in 1952 to establish severe penalties for those committing acts of violence against racial or religious groups or their institutions. I urged a strengthened civil-rights section in the Justice Department, statehood for Hawaii and Alaska, and home rule for the District of Columbia.

Labor and social security: I continued to oppose the Taft-Hartley law and to urge its repeal. I supported a higher minimum wage. I advocated maximum payments in unemployment insurance and a broadening of the system so that more workers would be entitled to unemployment benefits. I voted for the bill, H. R. 7800, to increase the monthly social-security payments by 12½ percent, and I urged that outside income for retired workers be increased from $50 to $100 per month. I also voted for an increase in pension of railroad workers, widows, war veterans, and others.

Veterans' affairs: I supported pensions for veterans or their dependents, benefits for disabled veterans, to widows and surviving children of veterans, aid in finding employment for jobless veterans, and so forth. In 1951 I introduced a bill to extend to veterans of the Korean war the same benefits granted to World War II veterans. I introduced a bill, passed by Congress in April 1952, to compensate United States war prisoners captured by the Japanese and the Germans during World War II. When the Veterans' Administration sought to remove its regional office from Brooklyn, which serves 400,000 veterans in our borough, I introduced a bill to stop this move and also intervened with President Truman and thus succeded in saving the jobs of 2,000 VA employees.

Immigration: In 1952 the discriminatory McCarran-Walter immigration bill came up. I vigorously opposed it, voted against it, and when President Truman vetoed the measure I voted to uphold the President's veto but Congress overrode him and it became law. I stated then, and repeated it on numerous occasions since, that passing the McCarran-Walter Act was a grievous mistake and that I would exert every power to amend or revise the act. I supported a bill to admit 300,000 refugees from Europe. I also introduced a bill to admit 50,000 immigrants from Italy outside of quota restrictions.

Aid to Israel: Since 1951 I have continually supported American economic aid to Israel to enable her to absorb the hundreds of thousands of refugees entering that country. I urged the State Department to use its good offices to obtain peace between the Arab States and Israel, and more recently I protested against sending arms to the Arab countries.

Miscellaneous: There were many other issues on which I expressed my views frankly and fully. I urged tax exemptions for the low-income groups and placing the burden of taxation more on big business. I called for economy in Government expenditures, but not at the expense of fundamental needs of our population, such as endangering social security, housing, education, health, and so forth. I introduced a bill to investigate illegal sales of narcotics and a bill to create a United States Medical Academy.

MY RECORD IN THE PRESENT CONGRESS

The 83d Congress was elected for the 2 years 1953 and 1954. Since we are now in the midst of our legislative work for the current year, this phase of my report covers only the 1953 session and the first 4 months of 1954 until the end of April.

The giveaway Congress: The present Congress, which is under Republican control, will go down in our history as the "giveaway Congress" because of the giveaway of our country's national wealth and resources to big business and to the privileged few. The administration's giveaway program includes the offshore oil and other national resources under our coastal waters, public power, mineral deposits, housing, public lands and forests, synthetic-rubber plants, and so forth. I was among those in Congress who advocated that the income from offshore oil be used for educational purposes. I introduced a resolution to set up a congressional Committee on Natural Resources to maintain a careful watch over our Nation's natural wealth. It is clear by now that the Republican-controlled 83d Congress will enact a minimum program of legislation and has thus far failed to amend the Taft-Hartley labor law, to revise the McCarran-Walter immigration law, to grant statehood to Hawaii and Alaska, to expand social security, and to take any action on civil rights. But it did eliminate price control and rent control, it curtailed public housing, and gave away the offshore oil.

International affairs: Problems of world peace, security, and defense of our country remain the dominant factor in our thinking and hopes for the future. I have been disturbed that the Eisenhower administration has reduced our defense budget. In the light of events, I feel this is not the time for such reductions, because the security of the Nation is endangered. I voted in favor of the resolution to keep Communist China out of the United Nations because of her inhumane treatment of American prisoners of war in Korea. To aid the free world, I voted to continue the foreign-aid program, renewal of the Reciprocal Trade Agreement Act to encourage international trade, to send surplus wheat to the famine-stricken people of Pakistan and other countries.

Economic conditions: The high cost of living still continues under the Eisenhower administration. Prices of food, housing, medical care, and other essentials pushed the cost of living to a record high during the past year, which resulted from the removal of all economic controls. Last year I introduced a bill to provide standby controls in the event of a continued rise in prices, but the Republicans would not even consider it. Earlier this year unemployment began to grow at an alarming pace. I have spoken on the floor of the House at least three times recently on the subject, urging Congress to take action. On February 4 I discussed the unemployment situation in my congressional district. A month later, on March 4, I reported that unemployment was reaching serious stages with nearly 4 million unemployed in the country, and I suggested a program to deal with this problem. On March 31 I cited unemployment figures and introduced a resolution to establish a congressional committee to investigate the unemployment situation in the country.

Housing: In 1935 the housing program was cut to shreds by the Republicans when only 20,000 units were authorized for construction. Similarly, rent control was completely abolished and rents were increased in many areas. This year, President Eisenhower submitted a program calling for the construction of 35,000 housing units, but his own party sought to kill the program and in fact defeated it in the House. Fortunately the Senate restored the appropriation. I voted for the program of 35,000 units, but I emphasized it was inadequate.

Labor and social security: I am convinced that under a Republican-controlled Congress the Taft-Hartley labor law will never be repealed, and that if it is in any way amended it will be for the worse, not for the better. I introduced 2 important bills in 1953 dealing with the extension of social security and old-age pensions. My social-security bill calls for broadening coverage to include 10 million people who are not now entitled to these benefits, to increase the minimum monthly payments from $25 to $40, to use a better wage base so that the benefits can be higher, to increase the allowance for outside monthly earnings from $75 to $100, and to lower the age limit from 65 to 60 years. My pension bill provides for a monthly pension of $40 to all persons over 65, which is to be paid in addition to social-security benefits.

Immigration: Congress has taken no steps to revise the discriminatory McCarran-Walter law. Its only action concerning immigration was to pass the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, which I wholeheartedly supported, to admit 214,000 refugees over a 3-year period. This measure, however, has thus far turned out to be a huge hoax. At last reports, only 6 refugees have been admitted in the 9 months since its enactment due to the numerous restrictions. I introduced 2 major immigration bills: One called for the admission of 100,000 Italian immigrants; the other was an omnibus immigration bill, prepared in conjunction with 32 of my colleagues in Congress under the leadership of Senator HERBERT H. LEHMAN, to recodify our immigration and naturalization laws and replace the McCarran-Walter Act.

Taxes: I have always favored larger tax exemptions for the low-income groups. The tax revision now under consideration in Congress, however, proposes to revise our tax laws in such a way as to benefit big business, not the wage earner. For this reason, I have fought and voted for the amendment to raise the income-tax exemption from $600 to $700, but voiced the view that it should be raised to $800 this year and to $1,000 next year as the only way to help the low-income people. I also supported repeal of the excise taxes on theater admissions, liquor, furs, cosmetics, and other goods. I voted for extension of the excess-profits tax on the big corporations. I introduced two tax relief measures: one to grant tax deduction to working mothers who must provide care for their children; the other, a deduction up to $1,000 for the education of a dependent child whom the taxpayer is maintaining at school or college.

Civil rights: I regret to report that absolutely nothing has been done by the Republican-controlled 83d Congress in the way of civil rights legislation to date. No FEPC, anti-lynching, anti-poll tax or other civil rights measures came before either House of Congress. I introduced two such bills in 1953: One, for the abolition of the poll tax as a prerequisite for voting in a primary or regular election; the other, for protection against vandalism committed on account of racial or religious prejudices. This year I introduced a resolution which suggests a set of rules of procedure governing investigations by congressional committees. There is great dissatisfaction in our country with the investigative methods used by certain committees and there has been a good deal of abuse of the civil rights and liberties of American citizens which threatens our way of life.

Miscellaneous: When the Secretary of Agriculture recently requested Congress to cut the school-lunch program by $15 million thereby causing much hardship to many communities benefiting from this program, I urged that the appropriation be restored and I addressed the House pleading that the full program be continued as in the past.

I presented my views to the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee in support of an adequate increase in salaries for postal workers and Federal employees.

I introduced a bill to reduce from 4½ percent to 4 percent the maximum interest rate on home loans to war veterans. I also joined in the effort to restore cuts in the appropriation for the veterans' hospitalization program.

When 2,300 workers at the Brooklyn Navy Yard were threatened with the loss of their jobs in the spring and summer of 1953, I called a conference of the Democratic Congressmen from Brooklyn who designated me as chairman to negotiate with the responsible officials to help these people. We were successful in saving their jobs for 1953, and to some extent also during the current year.

CONCLUSION

I receive numerous calls and requests from my constituents for help in personal matters, such as immigration cases, veterans' problems, housing needs, pensions and social security, military allotments, requests for Government publications, and other services. I have tried my utmost to be helpful in such instances.

This is the record of my work and my achievements in Congress and my views on major issues, as I enter my 6th year of service in Congress in behalf of the people of my district. It is a brief accounting of my stewardship of office which I am proud to present to my constituents, together with my assurances that I shall continue to serve their best interests in the future.

The Federal-State Rehabilitation Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL W. YORTY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 29, 1954

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Speaker, the Federal-State vocational rehabilitation program has its origin in the Vocational Rehabilitation Act of 1920. The Barden-La Follette amendment of 1943 markedly broadened the scope of the services.

Through Federal-State cooperation for the purpose of making handicapped persons employable, rehabilitation agencies now offer a number of services which directly benefit the individuals who receive them, and indirectly benefit the Nation as a whole. These services include medical and psychological diagnosis, hospitalization and surgery, the furnishing of training supplies and placement equipment, and counseling through the rehabilitation process. The Federal-State cooperative effort now gives some aid to about 200,000 disabled persons annually and restores earning power to about 65,000 persons each year.

This program must be maintained and strengthened. The Federal Government is annually spending huge sums for public assistance—rather than rehabilitation—of handicapped persons. Unless more is done to rehabilitate such individuals, expenditures for public assistance to persons classified as totally and permanently disabled may soon reach $300 million or $400 million annually—estimate obtained from the National Rehabilitation Association. The Federal appropriation for rehabilitation for the 1953–54 fiscal year was only $23 million.

The values of rehabilitation in increasing the available manpower and production and in reducing dependency, are well known. Accomplishment of these objectives is a national concern. Increase of Federal assistance for rehabilitation would be good business for the Federal Government.

S. 2759, pending in the 83d Congress, would replace the Vocational Rehabilitation Act with a new program. It provides for three types of Federal grants to the States, namely, a fund for the basic rehabilitation program called rehabilitation services, a fund for improvement and extension projects, and a third fund for special projects.

The present rehabilitation program is financed under Public Law 113 of the 78th Congress, which provides that the Federal Government shall reimburse the States for 100 percent of expenditures for necessary administration, guidance, and placement, and 50 percent of expenditures for case service. S. 2759 would discard this method of financing the basic program and substitute for it allotments based upon population, weighted by per capita income, and a Federal share based upon relative per capita income of the States.

The Federal-State rehabilitation program has been operating on a national average of about 2 Federal dollars to 1 State dollar. The proposed legislation, S. 2759, is aimed at an eventual 50–50 sharing of the cost by the Federal and State Governments.

Certain provisions of the bill would ease the transfer from one system of financing to another, particularly during 1955 and 1956. Nevertheless, establishment of the proposed system of financing would create for many of the States serious difficulties in immediately securing enough State funds to replace the Federal funds lost. Some of these States would be unable to replace the lost Federal funds, so there would actually be

less rehabilitation service in these States during 1955 and 1956 than before, under this legislation.

The broad aim of S. 2759 to expand rehabilitation services will not be soon achieved unless there is a reduction in hardships from changing methods of financing.

One way of reducing such hardships is proposed in S. 3039, which would provide Federal allotments to the States for the basic rehabilitation program in two parts, as follows:

First. An amount equal to 100 percent of the administration, guidance, and placement expenditures for 1953 and 50 percent case service expenditures for the same year. If a State should in future utilize less State money than in 1953 it would receive proportionately less Federal assistance.

Second. Federal funds available in excess of the amount needed for the purpose stated above would be allotted on a population basis to States expending more for rehabilitation than in 1953. The Federal share of the additional expenditure would be 50 percent in all the States.

This plan would maintain rehabilitation programs in the States at their present levels, while encouraging their expansion on a 50–50 basis.

Other alternatives to S. 2759 have been proposed. Copies of several alternatives in typescript form have been prepared and distributed by the National Rehabilitation Association. They merit careful study.

Since first, the California Legislature has already approved the budget for vocational rehabilitation for the year 1954–55, and second, there will be no opportunity for the legislature to appropriate additional amounts to compensate for the loss of Federal funds under the financing formula contained in S. 2759, enactment of this bill as originally introduced would be a serious temporary, if not permanent, injury to the vocational-rehabilitation program in California.

At the least, S. 2759 should be amended to provide for a continuance of Federal payments to the States for the fiscal year 1955 equal to the contribution of the Federal Government in 1953. This would give the States a breathing space to make adjustments to the different financing provisions of S. 2759. Under no circumstances should we permit pennywise cuts to reduce the size and scope of the rehabilitation program.

Rural Electrification Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 29, 1954

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, if there is one thing I enjoy more than a good laugh it is a real belly laugh.

I appreciate the sense of humor which some of our department heads display from time to time. The country at large has a wrong impression of the lack of humor and the inability to joke so often attributed to bureaucrats.

Ancher Nelsen, rural electrification administrator, displayed a terrific sense of humor with tongue in cheek praise for his agency recently in my native New Orleans.

Mr. Nelsen was in New Orleans to tell the people down there what a great job the REA was doing. He was wonderfully pleased with himself and the manner in which the REA was operating under his direction. He was so pleased he even had this to say to the folks down there who took his statement at face value and undoubtedly believed what he was saying, because they had no way to know what a jocular fellow he was and how be enjoyed his little joke.

Mr. Nelsen said this:

> In the 10 months since I took office REA has approved more loans in terms of number and amounts than were approved in the corresponding period the year before.
>
> This means that we are aggressively meeting the needs of the borrowers.

Now that is really a giggle.

On the same day that the good and well-satisfied Mr. Nelsen was making that pretty speech, his own agency, after having under consideration for some 4 years, 10 months of which belonging to Mr. Nelsen's stewardship, was finally waking up to learn what its policy was.

Unbelievable?

Not if you have ever had any dealings with the REA.

Having in the major part an urban district, I have not previously been thrown in contact with the REA on a practical basis, although I have always been suspicious of its expressed intent and the manner in which it actually operated. This experience has, indeed, been enlightening.

It all started back in 1950, when a group of individuals headed by Mr. John E. Pottharst, a leading civic and businessman in New Orleans, accepted the expressed intentions of the REA at its face value. He had not as yet learned the true facts about this agency. He really believed that the REA wanted to supply electricity to rural areas where electricity could not otherwise be supplied. Silly boy.

First it was one thing and then it was another. It was always going to be consummated shortly—that "shortly" soon became an apparent eternity.

First one set of questions would be asked. When they would be answered then another set of questions would be forthcoming. But the patience of Mr. Pottharst and his associates was something to admire. Job had nothing on them.

Through the years the stumbling, the fumbling, and the bumbling continued and still no electricity for the people of lower Plaquemines Parish.

Ah, but a new day was to dawn. A new administration came into power. The redoubtable Mr. Ancher Nelsen was made the Administrator. I breathed a sign of relief and satisfaction. I was willing to forget the years and months which had gone before, because now here was action in its finest form and did not Mr. Nelsen boast about his expeditious way of handling things. I did not know he was such a jokester at that time.

Well, after 10 months haggling during which time I was promised repeatedly that everything would be all right I finally saw the application of the folks interested sent to the so-called legal department of the REA for a perfunctory examination. I was assured and reassured, and so was Mr. Pottharst, that the signing of the paper was almost a mere formality and perfunctionary piece of business.

What a brute for punishment I was. I actually believed them though I dread to think that my naivete should leak out.

Tired by more delay I asked for a "yes" or "no" answer by a certain day and I got it.

The answer was "No."

Anyway it was the first time that something definite had been said after 4 years, but imagine my surprise when I was informed that it was suddenly discovered that it was against the policy of the REA to make such loans for rural electrification. It took Mr. Nelsen 10 months to find out what the policy of the REA was and he came up with the scintillating observation that the REA was only for farmers and to hell with everybody else. That one really threw me. I did not recall having read anywhere in the law that REA was only for farmers so I asked to be shown the law. You will enjoy reading the reply.

I am including my letter and the reply so you can wonder how foolish can some people get.

Anyway, it now appears that the policy of the REA has been finally established.

It is all right to lend money to five unqualified individuals, but it is not all right to lend money to an established small public utilities which only wants to do business as an operator under what has been called free enterprise.

The REA, under its existing policy, would much prefer to subsidize a group where there is no chance of getting the taxpayers' money back than to assist a small concern to help the people of a specific area.

It matters little to the REA that this small utility company has spent much money on the false promises of the REA. It means little to the REA that actual work orders were issued. After all they were only scraps of paper.

Anyway, here is the chronological story of this fantastic transaction as furnished to me by Mr. Pottharst. Read it and you will understand why Mr. Nelsen's remarks at New Orleans gave me such a belly laugh.

At the end I am also including the letter from Mr. Fred H. Strong; my letter to him asking what does he mean "only farmers can get aid"; and then his reply to me. They are all good for a laugh, but unfortunately there is tragedy in this laugh because as usual the taxpayer and the little fellow gets it in the neck and the bureaucrat sits back and gets his laugh at the Congress. But why should he not laugh because Congress will not do anything at all about it.

The moral of this experience is that bureaucrats and bureaucracy have not

changed a bit even if the name of the party has changed from Democrat to Republican.

Here is the story for the record—but remember the people still do not have the electricity and the chances they will not get electricity as long as the REA takes years to make decisions and months to determine policy and interpret the law to its own satisfaction:

LOUISIANA 27—PLAQUEMINES

Mr. Kenneth C. Barranger wrote Mr. E. E. Karns, REA, August 15, 1949, reorganizing limited profit corporation of electric cooperative for line to run from Venice, across the river, 8 miles down east bank to Pilottown, then 18 miles from there to Burrwood.

Letter application to REA, October 22, 1949, $488,000 for purchasing and installing dual fuel (natural gas) powerplant.

Application for generating plant allocation with REA by Peoples Utilities, November 2, 1949: Louisiana 27—Plaquemines.

Capacity of plant, 5,000 kilowatts.

Estimated cost of generating plant including substation at plant, $970,000.

Mr. Pottharst wrote Mr. Karns January 25, 1950, submitting application for loan of $520,189; $194,815 of this for extension of distribution system to areas not now served, and $325,374 for installation of new equipment.

Congressman HÉBERT wired Mr. Pottharst February 3, 1950: "Karns assures will expedite to fullest. * * * Involves powerplant heavy rural construction. Necessary studies must be made before final action taken. Will take few weeks to complete."

Mr. Karns wired Mr. Pottharst February 7, 1950: "Application under study. Unable to predict time limit for final decision."

Mr. Pottharst wrote Congressman HÉBERT June 14, 1950: "All legal technicalities are dispensed with. * * * The last time we talked with them they said what with people going on vacations and other very simple projects to lend money to, they had put ours off (because it was a tough one) until they had plenty of time."

Congressman HÉBERT wrote Mr. Pottharst July 3, 1950, that he was that day advised by Mr. K. T. Hutchinson, Assistant Secretary, Department of Agriculture, that application for loan funds submitted by Peoples Utilities, Inc., presents some rather complex problems because funds have been requested to finance the purchase and installation of a generating unit in company's existing generating plant, as well as funds to finance rural distribution facilities, and that he hopes a decision on application can be reached within next 60 to 90 days.

Mr. Barranger wrote a memo to Mr. Pottharst September 7, 1950, to the effect that Mr. Karns had advised him over the phone that morning that he had reopened the file and was writing Mr. Tom Hardeman, his field man, to come to New Orleans on Monday or Tuesday of coming week to confer with Mr. Waldemar Nelson (Peoples Utilities' engineering firm). Mr. Karns told him that classification of consumers and load estimates should be gone over again, that according to present estimates, the load on the existing lines is increasing too rapidly. Mr. Karns mentioned that the estimated cost of construction of the line from Venice to Burrwood and Port Eads had jumped from $180,000 to $300,000.

Information in great detail given to Mr. Tom Hardeman on September 15, 1950, in line with foregoing.

Congressman HÉBERT wrote Secretary Brannan, Department of Agriculture, October 5, 1950, that the matter was hanging fire for over a year, that he had phoned Mr. Karns that date and was informed by him "it would be disposed of at some future date."

Senator RUSSELL LONG wrote Administrator Wickard, REA, Washington, on October 12, 1950, that 1 year had elapsed since he had a conference with some of their officials, and requesting prompt action.

Mr. Karns wired Mr. Pottharst October 19, 1950: "Relative letter regarding joint use of facilities regret final recommendations cannot be made until application for a loan has been approved."

Congressman HÉBERT sent Mr. Pottharst on October 20, 1950, a copy of a letter from Mr. Hutchinson, Acting Secretary, Agriculture Department, dated October 18, 1950, advising that "the only simple answer that could have been given up to now would have been disapproval of the application for loan funds for this project." Mr. Hutchinson further stated:

"The first request for REA assistance in meeting the electric needs of the people in the area around Pilottown and Burrwood came in the form of a letter dated August 15, 1949, requesting information regarding forming cooperative. Application for loan to cooperative was submitted October 25, 1949. Within a month REA completed preliminary studies and four proposals emerged. Two discarded immediately as unfeasible because of limited number of potential customers to be served and because of the unusually high costs of wholesale power, construction, and operation which could be anticipated. Third possibility was purchase of the facilities of Peoples Utilities by a cooperative to serve entire area; this was dropped because cost of acquisition, $700,000, was found to be too high to allow for reasonable rates and repayment of the loan.

"Sole remaining possibility seemed to be loan to Peoples Utilities to serve all those in the area wanting electricity, and Mr. J. E. Pottharst, for the company, was so informed. On January 25, 1950, an application was submitted for loan in amount $520,189. By middle of June all requested data was submitted, and REA members began preparation of a detailed loan recommendation for Administrator's consideration. Questions of feasibility and loan security were narrowed down to two rather fundamental items:

"1. Peoples Utilities, because already mortgaged, apparently not in position to give REA adequate security for loan.

"2. Company, even before reducing rates as indicated would be done to bring rates in line with others in area, was operating at loss averaging about $1,000 per month.

"Until these two points could be cleared up, no loan could be approved.

"REA undertook to develop solutions to these problems. Some thought was given to possibility of setting up a subsidiary corporation which would then be in position to offer first mortgage as security for Government loan, but no realistic basis could be found for separating facilities for such subsidiary.

"During August REA learned company had under consideration substantial refinancing on its own initiative, which might strengthen company position for further consideration of Government loan, however, this would change financial structure of company and render useless much of survey completed last spring. As soon as applicant has completed refinancing REA will be in position to take additional steps toward a decision on feasibility of loan."

Congressman HÉBERT wrote Mr. Pottharst November 29, 1950, that he was that day advised by Mr. Claude Wickard, Administrator, REA, that representative of Power Division of his Administration would be sent to New Orleans on December 4, 1950, to meet with fieldmen of Finance and Loan Divisions to discuss application.

Mr. Karns wired Mr. Pottharst November 29, 1950, that meeting would be held at Monteleone Hotel, then proceed to area to be served, and asking if Mr. Pottharst, attorney and engineer could meet with them on December 4, 1950, with available details to assist with study. Mr. Pottharst wired Mr. Karns interested parties would be on hand December 4, 1950.

Mr. E. F. Renshaw, regional head, Applications and Loans Division, REA, wrote Mr. Barranger May 21, 1951, "unable to say when our study will be completed but assure you we will give it every possible consideration."

Mr. Wickard, Administrator, REA, wrote Congressman HÉBERT June 8, 1951, that revised application submitted by Plaquemines Electric Cooperative, Inc., in February 1951, is for 68 miles of line to serve 236 customers near mouth of Mississippi River, that considerable work has been gone into, and problems encountered very difficult; that under the plan as now proposed the cooperative contemplates purchasing wholesale power from Peoples Utilities, Inc., and that REA had recently written Peoples Utilities, Inc., for proposal and if they agree to supply a satisfactory wholesale rate to the cooperative, REA will be in position to resume their studies of the loan application.

Mr. Barranger sent June 11, 1951, to Mr. Thomas B. Dunphy, Head, Power Procurement Division, REA, copy of contract submitted to Plaquemines Electric Cooperative, Inc., by Peoples Utilities, Inc.

Receipt of Mr. Barranger's letter June 11, 1951, to Mr. Dunphy, acknowledged by Mr. E. F. Renshaw, Section Head, Applications and Loans Division, REA on July 23, 1951, advising they were proceeding to analyze the feasibility of the application based on rate contained in proposal.

Mr. William C. Wise, Acting Administrator, REA, wrote Senator LONG on September 18, 1951, that according to the terms of the contract submitted by Peoples Utilities to Plaquemines Electric Cooperative, the average cost of power would be approximately ⅕ cent per kilowatt-hour, which is far in excess of what REA-financed borrowers in Louisiana are paying for purchased power, and that it was believed that they would be in a position to make a decision within the near future.

On September 24, 1951, Mr. William C. Wise, Acting Administrator, authorized allotment on Form ADM-125A, United States Department of Agriculture, REA, controlled material allotment serial No. 8-6934, system designation, Louisiana 27 Plaquemines, of 64,800 pounds of copper wire for third quarter of 1952.

On October 2, 1951, Mr. Thomas B. Dunphy wrote Mr. Barranger that while previous discussions with Peoples Utilities indicated average cost of purchased power would approximate 1.25 cent per kilowatt-hour the average cost of power under the proposed rate schedule before adjustment by the "All Commodities Index" would be 1.91 cent per kilowatt-hour for 300 hours use of maximum allowable demand, which is still above the level of feasibility for the proposed loan. Mr. Dunphy suggested that negotiations with Peoples Utilities, Inc. be reopened for the purpose of agreeing upon a contract approximately the "Standard Contract Form" attached to his letter of October 2, 1951 and providing average power cost approaching 1.25 cent level mentioned in earlier discussions, and that the possibility of supply from the system of Louisiana Power & Light Co. should be more thoroughly investigated from the viewpoint of competitive cost and adequacy of service as compared with Peoples Utilities, Inc.

On November 16, 1951, Mr. William H. Callaway, Section Head, Applications and Loan Division, REA, wrote Mr. Barranger that field appraisal would be made early part of December of the entire area to be served eventually by Plaquemines Electric Cooperative prior to REA giving final consideration to their application for loan.

Mr. Thomas Dunphy wrote Mr. Barranger December 21, 1951, giving schedules under which cooperatives in Louisiana were purchasing electric service from Louisiana Power & Light Co., Gulf States Utilities Co., and Central Louisiana Electric Co., Inc.

Mr. William C. Wise, Deputy Administrator wrote Congressman HÉBERT on January 28, 1952, that REA was considering the application for a loan from the Plaquemines Electric Cooperative, Inc.

Mr. Pottharst wrote Mr. Barranger April 22, 1952, offering to reduce rates of Peoples Utilities to Cooperative, which data Mr. Barranger sent on to Mr. Calloway and Mr. Dunphy on April 23, 1952.

On May 2, 1952, Mr. R. E. Payne, Section Engineer, Engineering Division, REA, Washington, advised Peoples Utilities that due to the necessity for providing assistance to the telephone program it had been decided to give certain field engineers specialized training in telephone engineering to more actively participate, and that Mr. Sprout, field engineer, would be absent from his headquarters from May 8, 1952, to June 13, 1952, and requesting that all routine matters requiring his attention be deferred until his return.

On October 2, 1952, Mr. Herbert Wales wrote Mr. Pottharst (acting for Mr. John W. Scott, Director, Southwest Area Office, REA, requesting conference with Mr. Pottharst and their field representatives, Glazier and Cox during October or November. This letter for some reason not received until November 4, 1952, after Mr. Glazier had visited Mr. Pottharst, on which date Mr. Pottharst advised Mr. Wales that Mr. Glazier had called on him. Mr. Scott acknowledged this letter of November 24, 1952, stating they hoped to be able to advise Peoples Utilities about the middle of December 1952 regarding their analysis of Peoples Utilities proposal.

Mr. Pottharst wrote Mr. Scott on January 6, 1953, that Peoples Utilities were expecting to hear from REA daily. Mr. Richard Richter replied for Mr. Scott that their field representative, Mr. Cox, would arrange to visit at an early date.

Congressman HÉBERT advised Mr. Pottharst January 19, 1953, that he had talked with Mr. Scott's office and was informed they had been in contact with Mr. Pottharst and had a field representative scheduled to talk with him the following week.

Mr. Cox confirmed on February 4, 1953, to Mr. Pottharst the matters discussed with him on his recent visit.

Mr. Pottharst wrote Mr. Scott on February 6, 1953, outlining the basis that Mr. Cox stated REA would be willing to consider application for loan funds.

On February 18, 1953, Mr. Scott wrote Mr. Pottharst REA were continuing their studies on the basis of his letter of February 6, 1953, borrowing funds up to 80 percent of cost of facilities and Peoples Utilities contributing 20 percent, and stated that they hoped to advise Mr. Pottharst in approximately 2 to 3 weeks regarding his proposal.

Mr. Pottharst wrote Mr. Scott February 25, 1953, requesting that the matter be given preferred attention.

Mr. Scott wrote Mr. Pottharst March 17, 1953, that conferences had been held with Power Division, who were then completing a preliminary study to determine size of unit required to provide firm power for farm and nonfarm establishments to be served. Advised future designation of application would be "Louisiana PUI."

Mr. Scott requested further data from Mr. Pottharst on April 20, 1953, which was given to him in detail April 27, 1953.

After conference with Mr. Scott on May 11, 1953, Mr. Pottharst forwarded to Mr. Scott information requested, which Mr. Richter acknowledged on May 15, 1953, stating they were transmitting to Power Division. Now designated as "Louisiana 28 PREC."

Mr. Pottharst wrote Congressman HÉBERT May 25, 1953, requesting he contact Mr. Scott for approval.

Congressman HÉBERT wired Mr. Pottharst May 29, 1953: "Agriculture Department reports in touch with you all day yesterday. Should have definite information today."

Another wire from Congressman HÉBERT to Mr. Pottharst, May 29, 1953: "Scott advises talked with you today. Doing everything possible to assist. States he plans to call you again June 8 re matter."

Mr. Scott wrote Mr. Pottharst May 29, 1953, requesting further information, which was furnished him on June 8, 1953.

On June 16, 1953, after phone conversation with Mr. Scott, Mr. Pottharst wrote him in great detail re data requested. Acknowledged on June 19, 1953.

Congressman HÉBERT wrote Mr. Pottharst on July 3, 1953 advising that he had been that day advised by the Administrator, REA, that a preliminary study of the application had been completed and letter had been written to Mr. Pottharst outlining in detail REA's conclusions.

On September 3, 1953, Mr. J. K. O'Shaughnessey for Mr. Ancher Nelsen, Administrator, REA, wrote Congressman HÉBERT acknowledging the Congressman's letter of August 25, 1953, inquiring as to the status of the application for loan, stating that there were a number of legal problems to be resolved before they could complete their final analysis and that they expected this would require at least 2 or 3 weeks to work out the details.

On September 10, 1953, Mr. Pottharst wrote Mr. Scott that he had just returned from a month's vacation and found that nothing had transpired on the project since their last conversation.

Mr. Barranger, as representative of Plaquemines Rural Electric Corp., wrote Mr. Scott on September 10, 1953, requesting that he phone him and discuss the progress of the application. This was acknowledged by Mr. R. E. Cole, director, southwest area, to Mr. Barranger on September 18, 1953, stating that as soon as the matter has reached the stage where action on his part would be required, he would be advised without delay.

Mr. Cole wrote Mr. Pottharst September 22, 1953, inquiring if new subsidiary corporation had been organized. Acknowledged by Mr. Pottharst October 1, 1953.

Congressman HÉBERT wrote Mr. Pottharst October 16, 1953, advising that he had talked with Mr. Cole and was informed REA office was then preparing their recommendations on application for loan, but it would be 2 to 4 weeks before final review could be made.

Mr. Fred H. Strong for Administrator, REA, wired Congressman HÉBERT November 16, 1953: "Reurtel R. E. Cole loan recommendation prepared by area office October 21. Application now receiving administrative review. Will inform Mr. Pottharst results as soon as possible."

Mr. R. E. Cole wired Mr. Pottharst November 19, 1953: "Please airmail copy of mortgage as executed by Peoples Utilities to National Bank of Commerce." Airmailed to him that day.

As requested in telephone conversation between Mr. Cole and Mr. Pottharst, Mr. Pottharst sent Mr. Cole on November 24 1953, copy of audit report of Peoples Utilities for fiscal year ending August 31, 1953.

Mr. Pottharst wired Mr. Cole December 14, 1953, if Peoples Utilities were granted loan to include line to Venice and tidewater oilfield south of Venice, $75,000, it would be agreeable for loan to be with Peoples Utilities on 80-percent basis.

Wire received from Mr. R. E. Cole by Mr. Pottharst December 12, 1953: "Re tel we will telephone you to discuss possible revisions of loan basis as soon as Office of Solicitor completes its review of indenture and related matters."

In phone conversation with Mr. Pottharst, Mr. Cole stated on December 22, 1953, that administrative department would make a definite proposal by wire that afternoon or the following morning, and if it was acceptable REA would proceed on that basis.

Wire proposal sent to Mr. Pottharst by Mr. Ancher Nelsen on December 23, 1953.

Mr. Pottharst wired Mr. Nelsen at length on December 30, 1953.

Mr. Pottharst wired Mr. Cole on January 8, 1954, there would be no refinancing involved.

This brings us up to Mr. Robert T. Beall's letter of January 13, 1954 (for Mr. Nelsen, Administrator), and Mr. Pottharst's reply of January 18, 1954.

WORK ORDERS

Excerpt from letter by Mr. J. H. Rixse, Jr., REA, to Peoples Utilities, Inc., April 18, 1950:

"We understand that you desire to construct several short extensions by your own crews prior to the making of a loan and that you desire to reimburse your funds by loan funds if and when a loan is made. As you are aware, however, we cannot authorize construction in anticipation of a loan. Such work when accomplished is considered as member extensions and is reported to REA and recorded in the borrower's records by means of construction and retirement work orders. The procedure and documents required are thoroughly explained in the manual of work order procedure, a copy of which is enclosed."

Mr. Waldemar Nelson (of Bedell & Nelson, engineers) wrote Mr. E. E. Karns, REA, re work orders Nos. 101, 102, 103, and 104.

Mr. Nelson advised Mr. Pottharst April 28, 1950, they had received from Washington office of REA following work orders approved by the Application and Loans Division and Engineering Division:

	Amount	Total cost [1]
Work order No. 101—Empire Menhaden Co., extension REA No. D80257, item FP-8-A1	$2,694.58	$2,541.28
Work order No. 102—Quinn Fisheries Co., REA No. D80258, item FP-8-A2	3,841.80	4,176.36
Work order No. 103—Lake Hermitage unit, REA No. D80259	9,349.95	10,215.52
Work order No. 104—Main line extension along highway to feed Lake Hermitage unit extension, item LH-1-A	5,454.81	7,157.26

[1] (Mr. Dubourg, our auditor, advised total cost material and labor.)

Mr. Nelson wrote Mr. H. H. Sprout, Pineville, La., REA representative, May 12, 1950, re Louisiana 27—Plaquemines, regarding having work order No. 104 for Lake Hermitage line approved by applications and loans division and engineering division, and that Peoples Utilities proposed to do the construction with their line crew, and asking that he come down and look this over.

"Mr. Sprout coming down on May 24 to review work," Mr. Nelson advised over phone, May 16, 1950.

Mr. Nelson wrote Pottharst on June 6, 1950, that Mr. Sprout inspected construction already completed on Lake Hermitage extension and passed on Mr. Sprout's recommendations. Mr. Sprout discussed accounting for expenditures, advising in addition to records of labor and material, a record should be kept of the truck mileage.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C. March 31, 1954.

Mr. J. E. POTTHARST, Sr.,
President, Peoples Utilities Co., Inc.,
New Orleans, La.

DEAR MR. POTTHARST: This is in reference to your application for an REA loan to finance 85 percent of the cost of a generating unit and building at Buras, a three-phase line to Venice, and approximately 50 miles of line south of Venice—construction which, together with associated items, would require a loan of approximately $570,000.

After careful review of your application, we regret to advise you that we cannot approve the desired loan.

Under the Rural Electrification Act, the Administrator, in making any loan, must make certain specific findings in respect of feasibility and security. Without reflection upon your company or its future prospects, we have concluded that, with due regard to all relevant consideration—including: (1) The relationship of the proffered REA security to your existing indebtedness (as affecting both generating facilities and distribution system); (2) the practical security problems relating to power supply in the event the Government should be obliged to exercise its remedies under the proposed mortgage; and (3) the problem of continuity of management—we would be unable, under existing standards, to make such certification in the present case.

Moreover, as you know, it was the primary intent of the Congress in enacting the Rural Electrification Act, to provide for the extension of electric service to farmers and related consumers in rural areas. Though the proposed loan would enable you to serve some rural residences, it appears: (1) That approximately 90 percent of the anticipated revenue would be derived from commercial and industrial consumers and approximately 55 percent of the total revenues would be derived from two large industrial loads.

APRIL 2, 1954.

Mr. FRED H. STRONG,
Deputy Administrator, Rural Electrification Administration, Department of Agriculture, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. STRONG: Thank you very much for your letter of March 31, and enclosed copy of letter which you addressed to Mr. Pottharst in connection with the belated realization that it was contrary to the policy of REA to make loans under such circumstances. The strange thing to me is that it took you 3 months to ascertain the policy of REA in connection with making these loans. Of course, this 3-month period is what you admit; the remaining 2 years and 9 months during which this application has been before the REA is something which you disown but still rests at the door of the Administration itself.

In this connection I would like for you to quote to me specifically and in detail the justification for the statement in your letter which reads: "Moreover, as you know, it was the primary intent of the Congress in enacting the Rural Electrification Act, to provide for the extension of electric service to farmers and related consumers in rural areas."

I would like to know the exact language in the law or the authorization which causes you to make such a statement. My appreciation of the supposed benefit of the law was the extension of electricity to rural areas which otherwise could not be supplied with this power. To be further specific, because my experience in dealing with your agency indicates I must be specific, I want to know where in the law is the term "electric service to farmers and related consumers in rural areas" used.

I will appreciate your cooperation in this matter and hope I may get an answer before next Christmas as I have my Christmas gifts arranged for and won't like to include this one as a gift.

Sincerely yours,

F. EDWARD HÉBERT.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., April 6, 1954.

Hon. F. EDWARD HÉBERT,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. HÉBERT: This is responsive to your letter of April 2 concerning the application of Peoples Utilities Co. for an REA loan.

As stated in my letter of March 31, 1954, to Mr. Pottharst, the REA decision that the pending loan application could not be approved was based upon full study of the application, with due regard to all relevant considerations, including: (1) the relationship of the proffered security to the applicant's existing indebtedness (as affecting both generating facilities and distribution facilities); (2) the practical security problems relating to power supply in the event the Government should be obliged to exercise its remedies under the proposed mortgage; and (3) the problem of continuity of management.

Specifically, however, you inquire concerning my further observation, in such letter, as follows:

"Moreover, as you know, it was the primary intent of the Congress in enacting the Rural Electrification Act, to provide for the extension of electric service to farmers and related consumers in rural areas."

The language of the act (found in sec. 4 thereof) is:

"The Administrator is authorized and empowered * * * to make loans for rural electrification * * * for the purpose of financing the construction and operation of generating plants, electric transmission and distribution lines or systems for the furnishing of electric energy to persons in rural areas who are not receiving central station service."

It was not our intent to draw any distinction, for the purpose of this section, as between a farm on the one hand and an establishment such as a rural residence, a rural store, a rural school or church, etc., on the other. To do so would, we agree, obviously be unsound. Rather, we were pointing out that this entire group of consumers was, as shown by rather clear legislative history in the hearings and debates on the original Rural Electrification Act of 1936, the intended beneficiaries of the act—the persons for whose benefit the act was passed. Suppose, however, as an extreme case, that REA received an application for a loan to a new enterprise in a sizable amount the sole purpose of which was to extend electric service to a single customer—a huge new industrial plant which was technically a "person" in a "rural" area. It would seem doubtful, to say the least, whether such an application would qualify for a loan even under the strictly legal test, and I think you would share such doubt.

Between this extreme case and the normal case of a loan to serve farmers and related rural consumers (such as rural residences, etc.) there are, of course, many conceivable gradations in degree. Though the point was not necessary to our decision in his case, we, in our letter to Mr. Pottharst, were pointing out that elements of this problem were involved in his application since it appeared that approximately 90 percent of the anticipated revenue would be derived from commercial and industrial consumers and approximately 55 percent of the total revenues would be derived from two relatively large industrial loads.

Sincerely yours,

FRED H. STRONG,
Deputy Administrator.

Mr. Speaker, can you imagine such a reply to a specific question? Even if the excuse was valid, imagine waiting 10 months to come up with such an answer.

You say it could not happen.

But it did happen, and here in Washington.

Perhaps REA, instead of standing for Rural Electrification Administration, should be changed to mean "resist every attempt" to get results.

Offshore Procurement of Ships

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL W. YORTY
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 29, 1954

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Speaker, that the essential shipbuilding industry of the United States is approaching a desperate condition owing to a dearth of construction work is becoming more evident day by day. Orders are very slow, work in progress is tailing off, employment is declining, and some yards have already closed while others face that prospect in the near future. It is a serious problem and one for genuine national concern in view of the security importance of our shipyards. Consequently, I think it must be agreed that any policy or practice of our Government which serves to aggravate these difficulties should be challenged and reexamined.

For several years, under the offshore procurement program, it has been the practice of our Government to place contracts for ship construction, particularly of smaller craft, with European shipyards of the NATO countries. It is reported that in the fiscal years 1952 and 1953 the United States Government expended or contracted for the expenditure of $237 million for such offshore procurement of small vessels to be built in Europe. This has been a part of the much larger general program of offshore procurement under which the United States has been purchasing military equipment abroad for delivery to its allies.

Now, I recognize the importance of this procurement program in promoting desirable trade relations with friendly foreign nations, in building up the military potential and self-sufficiency of the NATO countries, in strengthening their economies as vital segments of the free world, and frequently as a measure of economy in obtaining the necessary defense facilities at lowest cost.

It is also important to bear in mind, however, that there are other important considerations to be taken into account in determining how far to go with this kind of program. We must be concerned with how our own economy and

security are affected. In fact, the directive issued by the Department of Defense in 1951 setting forth its offshore procurement policy specifically provided that the items selected for European procurement should not result in "serious adverse effects upon the United States economy, employment, or industrial mobilization base" or interpose "any threat to the security interests of the United States."

Let us see, then, what these provisions signify when applied to our own domestic shipbuilding industry. We find, in the first place, that it is our declared national policy as stated in the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 and again in the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946 to foster the development and maintenance of a strong merchant marine and shipbuilding industry at all times as an essential arm of our national defense and security. Why this is so is altogether clear from our experiences in both World Wars I and II when we were desperately in need of ships and shipbuilding and could not turn to others to furnish them. Never must we allow our atttention to be diverted from this basic security need for a vigorous shipbuilding industry in our own country.

The 1951 directive of the Department of Defense also stated that the offshore procurement program must not seriously injure the domestic economy. What about that as applied to shipbuilding? Over the past months shipyard activities and employment have declined sharply and are continuing to do so. The order books of the domestic shipyards, both large and small, are virtually bare and prospects of immediate improvement are poor. Some of our shipyards have already shut down for lack of work and others will have to do so before long unless conditions change.

In contrast with the situation in this country, foreign shipbuilding, with its comparative cost advantages, is generally active and in some areas is booming. Circumstances being what they are, it would seem to be perfectly evident that, so far as ship construction is concerned, the need for stimulation now is not in these foreign countries but in our own. It seems very clear, also, that to continue offshore ship procurement with the expenditure of United States funds under existing conditions runs directly contrary to the terms of the directive which the Department of Defense laid down in 1951 to guide its program.

A few weeks ago there were indications that the Department of Defense, in connection with the Navy Department's offshore ship-procurement program, was about to let additional contracts with various foreign shipyards in the total amount of approximately $52 million. Representatives of the Department were about to leave for Europe to undertake final negotiations and the signing of the contracts.

Fortunately, through the timely intervention of certain interested Members of Congress and protesting American shipyards, and with the cooperation of the Secretary of Defense, these plans have now been modified. About half of the amount which had previously been earmarked for expenditure in the busy foreign shipyards will instead be used in this country to provide some urgently needed work for our own shipyards. It is intended that contracts amounting to $27,500,000 will be let soon on a negotiated basis for building 8 to 10 minesweepers of the medium class. This is a type of work which has usually been performed by our smaller shipyards, now so greatly in need of business to keep their operations going.

This is surely a step in the right direction, and it may be hoped that from now on more vigilant attention will be given to our own essential shipyards in awarding construction contracts. In the present situation, with our own domestic shipyards in dire need of work, the placing of contracts with foreign shipyards is unjustified and is, as I have said, actually contrary to the directive issued by the Department of Defense itself to govern the administration of the offshore procurement program.

SENATE

MONDAY, MAY 3, 1954

(Legislative day of Wednesday, April 14, 1954)

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

Rev. F. Norman Van Brunt, associate minister, Foundry Methodist Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, within the sanctuary of our hearts our inmost thoughts and desires are sobered by the immense implications of the commission that is ours. In these days when our very thoughts affect our fellow men, not only here and there but everywhere across the vast expanses of this earth, for today and tomorrow, yea, even forever, we pause that our hearts might be in tune with Thee. Create within us, we beseech Thee, such insight of loyalty and wisdom that every act will portray those truths which cannot be shaken. As we depend upon Thee, may there emanate from this historic place such confidence that no days of darkness or conference of confusion can incite fear in the hearts of men. We pray in the Redeemer's name. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D. C., May 3, 1954.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. WALLACE F. BENNETT, a Senator from the State of Utah, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

STYLES BRIDGES,
President pro tempore.

Mr. BENNETT 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, April 29, 1954, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6251) to authorize the abolishment of the Shoshone Cavern National Monument and the transfer of the land therein to the city of Cody, Wyo., for public recreational use, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1815) to amend the Recreation Act of June 14, 1926, to include other public purposes and to permit nonprofit organizations to lease public lands for certain purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. D'EWART, Mr. SAYLOR, Mr. HARRISON of Wyoming, Mr. REGAN, and Mr. ASPINALL were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message further announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2098) to provide for the compensation of certain persons whose lands have been flooded and damaged by reason of fluctuations in the water level of the Lake of the Woods; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. JONAS of Illinois, Mr. BURDICK, and Mr. LANE were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 8481) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. TABER, Mr. WIGGLESWORTH, Mr. CLEVENGER, Mr. CANNON, and Mr. ROONEY were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message further announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 8873) making appropriations for the Department of Defense and related independent agency for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were